
SURVEY RESULTS REPORT

TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: Joshua Blakemore, Assistant to the City Administrator

DATE: August 27, 2007 Regular City Council Meeting

RE: Municipal Service Survey Results

Attached please find a copy of the 2007 Municipal Service Survey Results for your review and analysis. For future reference, a survey such as this should be administered every 3 or 4 years to allow for a comparison of the data and to view the City's progress.

A total of 2,641 survey questionnaires were mailed to households in Marengo and 780 surveys were returned, giving this survey a 29.53% response rate. This is a respectable return rate for a self-administered survey.

As you are aware, the purpose of this survey was to gauge the residents' views and perceptions toward the City's service and policies. These results can be employed at the Council and staff levels to guide planning and decision making, as well as help to identify areas of service which are in need of enhancement.

Had this survey been based on a random sample only 335 or 12.7% would have been required to provide statistically valid data that would be representative of the entire population with a 95% confidence interval. Because the population was small, it was feasible and economical to survey each household. Given the number of responses and response rate, staff feels this survey provides adequate strength and integrity to the results and allows the survey to effectively serve its purpose as a gauge for the views and perceptions of the community. For the purposes of this analysis the use of the phrase "significant relationships" does not indicate there is statistically proven relationship, but rather a point of interest.

The attached survey results will serve as a useful and effective tool for the City Council for long term planning and short term goal setting. In addition, the compiled data will provide useful considerations for making future policy and budgeting decisions.

In addition, the survey results will be utilized at the staff level to provide an evaluation of City services and policies in identifying service areas in need of improvement. Specific needs of the community can be determined and addressed, which will improve the overall services provided to the residents.

As policy and decision-makers, the City Council should apply discretion to the results and determine if the responses are within an acceptable threshold. For example, if a question produces results that are 75% positive and 25% negative, a determination has to be made as to whether or not the 25% negative response rate is acceptable. Please keep in mind that there are inherent biases that must be considered, such as different levels of exposure to and experience with City services, as well as varying degrees of awareness and information regarding City services and policies among the responding population.

I would like to formally acknowledge and thank City Administrator Scott Hartman for his assistance and input to develop the survey and results report. In addition I would like to thank Anna Leyrer and Sally Millermon for their support and assistance in putting this document together.

Format:

In most cases, the results are presented in a cross tabulation format with a demographic variable on the left-hand side and the response rate indicators for the survey question across the top. Each cell provides the response data as it relates to the row and includes the number of responses in bold type and the percentage based on that row in italic.

The total per row is shown to the right of the table. Beneath the table is the overall total for each response indicator and its percentage of the total number of responses.

1. *How would you describe the general condition of the streets and sidewalks in Marengo?*

Demographic Variable Indicator	By Area										Total		
	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		D/N			N/R	
1	4	<i>2%</i>	40	<i>21%</i>	75	<i>40%</i>	55	<i>29%</i>	12	<i>6%</i>	1	<i>1%</i>	187
2	0	<i>0%</i>	12	<i>14%</i>	38	<i>44%</i>	30	<i>35%</i>	1	<i>1%</i>	5	<i>6%</i>	86
3	0	<i>0%</i>	14	<i>17%</i>	36	<i>44%</i>	27	<i>33%</i>	3	<i>4%</i>	1	<i>1%</i>	81
4	1	<i>1%</i>	39	<i>21%</i>	70	<i>37%</i>	68	<i>36%</i>	9	<i>5%</i>	0	<i>0%</i>	187
5	0	<i>0%</i>	26	<i>14%</i>	65	<i>35%</i>	88	<i>47%</i>	8	<i>4%</i>	1	<i>1%</i>	188
N/R	1	<i>2%</i>	12	<i>24%</i>	16	<i>31%</i>	15	<i>29%</i>	4	<i>8%</i>	3	<i>6%</i>	51
Total	6		143		300		283		37		11		780
Percentage	1%		18%		38%		36%		5%		1%		

Total # of Responses / **% of Total Responses**

Cross-tabulated Response Data
of Responses / % for the Row

Total # of Responses

Throughout the analysis, a “D/N” is used to represent the “don’t know / no opinion” response indicator. Similarly, “N/R” is used to represent a “no response” for those cases in which a question was left blank or had an invalid response (i.e. two responses to a question when only one can be accepted).

The primary demographic variable for the survey is “Area” since it most effectively allows the reader to gauge the views and perceptions throughout the City. In some cases, the data has been cross-tabulated against other demographic variables to show relationships or the absence of relationships for that question.

Questions that allow more than one response are noted to have the responses and percentages reported as non-exclusive, that is, one respondent may have been counted for two or more different responses.

Also, please note that “filter” questions, such as questions #8 and #11, have not been included in the analysis. These questions were necessary to isolate a specific population who had first hand experience with a particular service or interaction with a particular department.

In the case of open ended response questions, such as questions # 4, 5, 29, 32, 45, 48, 54, 55 and 56, the verbatim responses are listed in an appendix. Additionally, question 55 was separated into two parts, 55a and 55b. Answers to 55a are positive responses and answers to 55b are negative responses. A categorized summary of open ended questions is provided in the analysis. In the event that an open ended question had a limited number of responses, the verbatim response was included in the actual analysis.

Summary of the Results

The purpose of this summary is to describe the results of the survey. This report does not explain or speculate the reasons as to why these were the results since that type of inference cannot be made from the data collected. Again, with this being the first survey of its kind for quite some time in Marengo a comparative analysis of results will not be possible.

Demographic Analysis

Of the 780 respondents 36.7% were male, 54.1 % were female and 9.2% either did not respond or checked both male and female. This is a significant variation from the normally expected census proportion of males and females. Regarding Age, 44.6% of respondents are age 40-64, which was the largest group of those surveyed. The next highest group was 65+ with 26.4%, followed by 25-39 with 20.4% and 1.3% surveyed were under 25. Finally, 7.3% did not respond.

The greatest number of respondents (40.8%) have lived in the community for more than 15 years, followed by 1-5 years (25.9%) and 6-15 years (24.2%). As would be expected, most respondents reside in a single family detached home (74.0%).

The breakdown of which area the respondents lived in was balanced fairly well. The response for which area of town you live in was as follows: Area 1, north of Rt. 176 and east of Rt. 23, 24.0%; Area 2, north of Rt. 20 and west of Rt. 23, 11%; Area 3, south of Rt. 176, north of Rt. 20 and east of Rt. 23, 10.4%; Area 4, south of Rt. 20 and west of Rt. 23, 24.0%; and Area 5, south of Rt. 20 and east of Rt.23, 24.1%.

Public Works

Question #1, regarding the condition of the streets and sidewalks in Marengo yielded a 1% “excellent”, 18% “good,” 38% “fair,” and a 36% “poor” response. When broken down by *Area*, this response was fairly consistent throughout the City. Area 5 however did have a noticeably high “poor” rating, with 47% of those responding in that area choosing “poor”.

1. How would you describe the general condition of the streets and sidewalks in Marengo?

	By Area										Total		
	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		D/N			N/R	
1	4	2%	40	21%	75	40%	55	29%	12	6%	1	1%	187
2	0	0%	12	14%	38	44%	30	35%	1	1%	5	6%	86
3	0	0%	14	17%	36	44%	27	33%	3	4%	1	1%	81
4	1	1%	39	21%	70	37%	68	36%	9	5%	0	0%	187
5	0	0%	26	14%	65	35%	88	47%	8	4%	1	1%	188
N/R	1	2%	12	24%	16	31%	15	29%	4	8%	3	6%	51
Total	6		143		300		283		37		11		780
Percentage	1%		18%		38%		36%		5%		1%		

When cross-tabulated with *Years in the Community*, the results are again consistent, regardless of year. It should be noted that given the low number of those who have been in the community less than one year, these results are likely not representative of that entire portion of the population. Also, there is a significant difference in the percentage of people responding “good” if they have lived in the community more than 15 years.

1. How would you describe the general condition of the streets and sidewalks in Marengo?

	By Years in the Community										Total		
	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		D/N			N/R	
Less than 1	0	0%	2	8%	13	50%	10	38%	1	4%	0	0%	26
1 to 5	4	2%	45	22%	76	38%	65	32%	9	4%	3	1%	202
6 to 15	0	0%	40	21%	68	36%	71	38%	7	4%	3	2%	189
15 plus	1	0%	42	13%	129	41%	127	40%	17	5%	2	1%	318
N/R	1	2%	14	31%	14	31%	10	22%	3	7%	3	7%	45
Total	6		143		300		283		37		11		780
Percentage	1%		18%		38%		36%		5%		1%		

Question #2, which asked if the City provides clear and ice free streets on a timely basis after a snowfall generated an 85% “yes” response and 8% “no”. Results were well balanced throughout each area, though areas 2 and 5 did respond “no” slightly more than did the other areas of the community.

2. Do you think the City provides ice free streets on a timely basis after a snowfall?

	By Area								Total
	Yes		No		D/N		N/R		
1	167	89%	9	5%	10	5%	1	1%	187
2	67	78%	9	10%	6	7%	4	5%	86
3	72	89%	3	4%	5	6%	1	1%	81
4	163	87%	13	7%	11	6%	0	0%	187
5	151	80%	24	13%	12	6%	1	1%	188
N/R	40	78%	5	10%	3	6%	3	6%	51
Total	660		63		47		10		780
Percentage	85%		8%		6%		1%		

Question #3a, regarding the leaf collection program produced somewhat mixed results, with 13% saying “excellent,” 42% “good,” 15% “fair” and 5% “poor”. Nearly one in four respondents (24%) said they did not know or had no opinion. Area 5 in particular had a significantly higher number of “D/N” responses.

3a. In your opinion how would you describe the leaf collection program?

	By Area												Total
	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		D/N		N/R		
1	25	13%	85	45%	22	12%	9	5%	45	24%	1	1%	187
2	10	12%	39	45%	20	23%	2	2%	11	13%	4	5%	86
3	12	15%	39	48%	14	17%	4	5%	11	14%	1	1%	81
4	27	14%	89	48%	22	12%	7	4%	42	22%	0	0%	187
5	21	11%	58	31%	29	15%	12	6%	66	35%	2	1%	188
N/R	5	10%	18	35%	10	20%	5	10%	10	20%	3	6%	51
Total	100		328		117		39		185		11		780
Percentage	13%		42%		15%		5%		24%		1%		

Question #4 was open ended, asking how the leaf collection program can be improved. The summarized results are as follows:

<u>Summarized Response Categories</u>					
	# of responses			# of responses	
1. More Frequent Collections	78		6. General (i.e. more trucks)	17	
2. Better Notification/Scheduling	30		7. Permit Leave Burning	4	
3. Extend Service-Earlier Start/Later Finish	30		8. Call In for Pickup	4	
4. Nothing To Improve- Service Is OK	15		9. Free Yard Waste Collection	4	
5. Unfamiliar With Program/ Do Not Use Service	10		10. Ticket Non Rakers	1	
Total number of responses received: 190			*See Appendix for a listing of actual responses		

Question #3b, which asked respondents to describe the brush collection program, yields results very similar to that of question #3a (leaf pickup). Again, Area 5 had a significantly higher amount of “D/N” responses than any other section.

3b. In your opinion how would you describe the brush pickup program?

		By Area												
		Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		D/N		N/R		Total
1		29	16%	82	44%	25	13%	6	3%	44	24%	1	1%	187
2		11	13%	34	40%	20	23%	6	7%	11	13%	4	5%	86
3		11	14%	39	48%	16	20%	3	4%	11	14%	1	1%	81
4		32	17%	84	45%	24	13%	7	4%	40	21%	0	0%	187
5		20	11%	62	33%	29	15%	11	6%	64	34%	2	1%	188
N/R		5	10%	15	29%	12	24%	6	12%	9	18%	4	8%	51
Total		108		316		126		39		179		12		780
Percentage		14%		41%		16%		5%		23%		2%		

Question #5 was also open ended, asking how the brush collection program can be improved. The summarized results are as follows:

<u>Summarized Response Categories</u>					
	# of responses			# of responses	
1. More Frequent Collections	77		6. General Service Comment	7	
2. Better Notification/Scheduling	27		7. Permit Burning	6	
3. Earlier Start/Later Finish-Spring Service	16		8. Call In for Pickup	3	
4. Nothing To Improve- Service Is OK	17		9. Free Yard Waste Collections	2	
5. Unfamiliar With Program/ Do Not Use Service	10		10. Allow For Larger/Smaller Branches	12	
Total number of responses received: 173			*See Appendix for a listing of actual responses		

Question #3c asked respondents to describe the street repair and improvement program. Results were mixed with 2% saying “excellent,” 18% saying “good,” 34% saying “fair” and 38% saying poor. Area 2 and particularly Area 5 had significantly higher amount of “poor” responses.

3c. In your opinion how would you describe the street repair/improvement program?

	By Area												Total
	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		D/N		N/R		
1	6	3%	40	21%	58	31%	66	35%	16	9%	1	1%	187
2	2	2%	13	15%	31	36%	36	42%	0	0%	4	5%	86
3	1	1%	14	17%	34	42%	26	32%	5	6%	1	1%	81
4	1	1%	43	23%	65	35%	61	33%	17	9%	0	0%	187
5	4	2%	22	12%	55	29%	92	49%	13	7%	2	1%	188
N/R	3	6%	11	22%	19	37%	12	24%	3	6%	3	6%	51
Total	17		143		262		293		54		11		780
Percentage	2%		18%		34%		38%		7%		1%		

Question #3d, regarding snow plowing in the City, produced rather evenly distributed results with 32% saying “excellent,” 49% saying “good,” 10% saying “fair” and 3% saying “poor”. There were no major variations in responses when cross-tabulated throughout the community.

3d. In your opinion how would you describe the snow plowing?

	By Area												Total
	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		D/N		N/R		
1	70	37%	90	48%	18	10%	0	0%	8	4%	1	1%	187
2	31	36%	34	40%	11	13%	5	6%	1	1%	4	5%	86
3	23	28%	46	57%	7	9%	1	1%	3	4%	1	1%	81
4	61	33%	95	51%	15	8%	6	3%	10	5%	0	0%	187
5	48	26%	97	52%	21	11%	11	6%	9	5%	2	1%	188
N/R	13	25%	21	41%	8	16%	3	6%	3	6%	3	6%	51
Total	246		383		80		26		34		11		780
Percentage	32%		49%		10%		3%		4%		1%		

Question #6 asked residents if they feel there is adequate street lighting in their neighborhood. Overall, 72% said “yes” and 20% said “no”. Areas 1 and 4 were slightly above the average of “no” responses when compared with the rest of the City.

6. Do you think there is adequate street lighting in your neighborhood?

	By Area								Total
	Yes		No		D/N		N/R		
1	130	70%	47	25%	9	5%	1	1%	187
2	65	76%	14	16%	3	3%	4	5%	86
3	63	78%	13	16%	4	5%	1	1%	81
4	131	70%	44	24%	12	6%	0	0%	187
5	149	79%	26	14%	12	6%	1	1%	188
N/R	26	51%	15	29%	6	12%	4	8%	51
Total	564		159		46		11		780
Percentage	72%		20%		6%		1%		

Question #7 asked respondents to describe the overall condition of the community. In summary, 3% of respondents said “excellently maintained,” 25% “well maintained,” 57% “adequately maintained” and 9% said “poorly maintained”. Area 1 had a significantly higher amount of “well maintained” responses, while Area 5 responded “poor” more often than the average throughout the rest of the community.

7. How would you describe the overall condition of the community?

	By Area										Total		
	Excellent		Well		Adequate		Poor		D/N			N/R	
1	4	2%	70	37%	94	50%	12	6%	6	3%	1	1%	187
2	2	2%	15	17%	60	70%	4	5%	1	1%	4	5%	86
3	1	1%	21	26%	50	62%	5	6%	3	4%	1	1%	81
4	8	4%	38	20%	112	60%	17	9%	12	6%	0	0%	187
5	7	4%	39	21%	100	53%	28	15%	13	7%	1	1%	188
N/R	1	2%	9	18%	27	53%	5	10%	6	12%	3	6%	51
Total	23		192		443		71		41		10		780
Percentage	3%		25%		57%		9%		5%		1%		

Question #9 asked those who had contact with the Public Works Department during the last two years to rate the staff's professionalism. Of those that responded, 32% rated the Public Works staff as "excellent," 37% "good," 18% "fair" and 11% "poor". Area 3's responses were significantly more favorable when compared with the rest of the community.

9. How would you rate the professionalism and courtesy of the Public Works staff?

	By Area										Total		
	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		D/N			N/R	
1	16	29%	19	34%	13	23%	8	14%	0	0%	0	0%	56
2	9	38%	6	25%	6	25%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	24
3	13	57%	6	26%	2	9%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	23
4	15	31%	22	46%	8	17%	2	4%	1	2%	0	0%	48
5	17	30%	22	39%	9	16%	6	11%	2	4%	0	0%	56
N/R	2	12%	8	47%	2	12%	4	24%	1	6%	0	0%	17
Total	72		83		40		25		4		0		224
Percentage	32%		37%		18%		11%		2%		0%		

Question #10 asked residents to describe the quality of their tap water. Results were mixed, with 4% of respondents rating the water as "excellent," 31% saying "good," 31% saying "fair" and 28% rating the water as poor. When cross tabulated with an area of the City, Area 5 had a significantly greater amount of "poor" responses than other areas.

10. How would you describe the quality of your tap water?

	By Area										Total		
	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		D/N			N/R	
1	11	6%	65	35%	47	25%	51	27%	12	6%	1	1%	187
2	3	3%	31	36%	27	31%	19	22%	2	2%	4	5%	86
3	2	2%	26	32%	25	31%	24	30%	3	4%	1	1%	81
4	4	2%	59	32%	65	35%	50	27%	9	5%	0	0%	187
5	6	3%	38	20%	69	37%	64	34%	10	5%	1	1%	188
N/R	2	4%	22	43%	11	22%	9	18%	4	8%	3	6%	51
Total	28		241		244		217		40		10		780
Percentage	4%		31%		31%		28%		5%		1%		

When cross tabulated with *Years in the Community*, a correlation was found between years in the community and the description of the water quality. That is, the longer a respondent lived in the community the more likely they were to favorably describe the water. Inversely, respondents who lived in the community 5 years or less were the most likely to describe the water as “poor.”

10. How would you describe the quality of your tap water?

	By years in the community										Total		
	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		D/N			N/R	
Less than 1	0	0%	9	35%	5	19%	12	46%	0	0%	0	0%	26
1 to 5	4	2%	41	20%	68	34%	76	38%	10	5%	3	1%	202
6 to 15	8	4%	58	31%	55	29%	58	31%	7	4%	3	2%	189
15 +	12	4%	115	36%	105	33%	64	20%	21	7%	1	0%	318
N/R	4	9%	18	40%	11	24%	7	16%	2	4%	3	7%	45
Total	28		241		244		217		40		10		780
Percentage	4%		31%		31%		28%		5%		1%		

Question #11 was a filter question for question #12. Those who had contact with the Water Department in the last two years, were included in the cross tabulation for #12, which then asked residents to rate the professionalism of the Water Department. Results were mixed throughout the community, however there was no significant correlation with any other response indicator, such as years in the community. Of those responding, 24% rated the staff as “excellent,” 37% “good,” 27% “fair” and 12% said “poor.” As you can see the results were varied based on *Area*, but no significant relationship existed between *Area* and the responses. This is likely due to a smaller sample size for this question.

12. How would you rate the professionalism of the Water Dept.?

	By Area										Total		
	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		D/N			N/R	
1	17	33%	17	33%	12	23%	6	12%	0	0%	0	0%	52
2	5	22%	10	43%	7	30%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	23
3	7	39%	6	33%	2	11%	3	17%	0	0%	0	0%	18
4	9	20%	19	43%	13	30%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	44
5	9	16%	21	36%	18	31%	9	16%	1	2%	0	0%	58
N/R	3	19%	5	31%	5	31%	3	19%	0	0%	0	0%	16
Total	50		78		57		25		1		0		211
Percentage	24%		37%		27%		12%		0%		0%		

Public Safety

Question #13 asked residents if they have called 9-1-1 in the last two years for a police emergency. Of those that responded, 182 said “yes” to question #13 and were then included in the cross tabulation for #14, which asked respondents to rate how the dispatcher handled their call. Again, with small sample size, there were no significant relationships between responses and any of the demographic variables. Of those that responded, 51% rated the dispatcher as “excellent,” 34% said “good,” 11% said “fair” and 4% said responded “poor.”

14. How would you rate the dispatcher(s) in handling your call?

		By Area										Total		
		Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		D/N		N/R		
1		27	59%	15	33%	4	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	46
2		9	47%	7	37%	2	11%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	19
3		8	47%	7	41%	0	0%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	17
4		20	51%	10	26%	6	15%	2	5%	1	3%	0	0%	39
5		21	45%	17	36%	7	15%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	47
N/R		7	50%	5	36%	1	7%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	14
Total		92		61		20		8		1		0		182
Percentage		51%		34%		11%		4%		1%		0%		

Question #15 which asked respondents how often they see a patrol car in their neighborhood produced a 32% “very often” response, 55% “occasionally,” 11% “rarely” and 1% “never.” Results were similar across the board throughout the community. Area 3 however was most likely to respond “very often” and least likely to respond “never”, which could be due to the Police Department being located in that area.

15. How often do you see a patrol car in your neighborhood?

		By Area										Total		
		Very Often		Occasion		Rarely		Never		D/N		N/R		
1		51	27%	113	60%	20	11%	2	1%	1	1%	0	0%	187
2		31	36%	46	53%	9	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	86
3		33	41%	40	49%	6	7%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%	81
4		49	26%	114	61%	21	11%	1	1%	2	1%	0	0%	187
5		65	35%	95	51%	28	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	188
N/R		20	39%	20	39%	5	10%	2	4%	3	6%	1	2%	51
Total		249		428		89		5		8		1		780
Percentage		32%		55%		11%		1%		1%		0%		

When asked how safe and secure do you feel your neighborhood is, responses were well balanced throughout the community. Overall, 42% of respondents felt “very safe,” 50% “somewhat safe” and 7% responded “somewhat unsafe” or “very unsafe.”

16. How safe and secure do you feel your neighborhood is?

		By Area										
		Very Safe		S. Safe		S. Unsafe		V. Unsafe		N/R		Total
1		87	47%	94	50%	4	2%	1	1%	1	1%	187
2		38	44%	42	49%	5	6%	1	1%	0	0%	86
3		33	41%	41	51%	5	6%	0	0%	2	2%	81
4		74	40%	93	50%	14	7%	3	2%	3	2%	187
5		76	40%	97	52%	12	6%	3	2%	0	0%	188
N/R		16	31%	26	51%	4	8%	1	2%	4	8%	51
Total		324		393		44		9		10		780
Percentage		42%		50%		6%		1%		1%		

In response to question #17, that asked respondents to describe the Police Department’s efforts in enforcing traffic violations, 12% said “excessive,” 61% said “adequate,” 13% said “inadequate” and 14% responded “D/N.” Again, given the location of the Department though, Area 3 was most likely to respond “excessive” and least likely to respond “inadequate.” Aside from Area 3, responses were well balanced throughout the community.

17. How would you describe the Police Dept.'s efforts in enforcing traffic violations?

		By Area										
		Excessive		Adequate		Inadequate		D/N		N/R		Total
1		23	12%	111	59%	26	14%	27	14%	0	0%	187
2		9	10%	54	63%	15	17%	8	9%	0	0%	86
3		14	17%	54	67%	4	5%	9	11%	0	0%	81
4		15	8%	119	64%	21	11%	32	17%	0	0%	187
5		26	14%	106	56%	33	18%	23	12%	0	0%	188
N/R		5	10%	28	55%	2	4%	14	27%	2	4%	51
Total		92		472		101		113		2		780
Percentage		12%		61%		13%		14%		0%		0%

Question #18 asking if respondents have had contact with the Police Department in the last two years is a filter question and therefore is not included in this analysis. Those that responded “yes” to #18 were asked to respond to five different questions regarding their experience with the Police Department. When averaging the response to those five questions (labeled 19a-19e), 29% of respondents rated the Department as “excellent,” 43% “good,” 14% “fair” and 8% “poor.” Results were rather evenly distributed when cross tabulated with the other demographic variables. Please keep in mind contact with the Police Department could have been under difficult circumstances, which could affect the respondent’s perception.

When asked to rate the overall service of the Police Department (#19a), results produced were 30% saying “excellent,” 51% “good,” 12% “fair” and 6% saying “poor.” These results were common throughout each area of the City.

19a. If yes, how would you rate the overall service and performance of the Police Dept.?

	By Area										Total		
	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		D/N			N/R	
1	36	32%	64	57%	8	7%	3	3%	1	1%	0	0%	112
2	14	30%	22	48%	7	15%	2	4%	1	2%	0	0%	46
3	10	22%	22	49%	9	20%	3	7%	1	2%	0	0%	45
4	29	33%	43	49%	10	11%	5	6%	0	0%	1	1%	88
5	31	28%	55	49%	13	12%	11	10%	1	1%	1	1%	112
N/R	8	36%	9	41%	4	18%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	22
Total	128		215		51		25		4		2		425
Percentage	30%		51%		12%		6%		1%		0%		

Question #19b, regarding the Police Department’s proactive approach to law enforcement shows that 23% of respondents rate the department as “excellent,” 41% “good,” 16% “fair” and 8% “poor.” Results were somewhat varied throughout the community. Respondents in Areas 1 and 4 were most likely to rate the Department as “excellent” or “good,” while Areas, 2, 3 and 5 responses were slightly less favorable.

19b. Pro-active approach to law enforcement

	By Area										Total		
	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		D/N			N/R	
1	24	21%	56	50%	16	14%	5	4%	11	10%	0	0%	112
2	14	30%	13	28%	9	20%	4	9%	6	13%	0	0%	46
3	6	13%	17	38%	10	22%	4	9%	8	18%	0	0%	45
4	22	25%	40	45%	10	11%	5	6%	10	11%	1	1%	88
5	24	21%	38	34%	22	20%	11	10%	15	13%	2	2%	112
N/R	6	27%	10	45%	1	5%	5	23%	0	0%	0	0%	22
Total	96		174		68		34		50		3		425
Percentage	23%		41%		16%		8%		12%		1%		

Question #19c asked respondents to rate the professionalism of the officers. Overall, 33% of respondents replied “excellent,” 44% “good,” 12% “fair” and 7% said “poor.” In this instance Areas 1, 2 and 4 were more likely to respond favorably than Areas 3 and 5. Areas 3 and 5 in particular had a significantly higher number of responses of “fair” or “poor.”

19c. Professionalism and general attitude of the officers

	By Area												Total
	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		D/N		N/R		
1	42	38%	55	49%	9	8%	3	3%	3	3%	0	0%	112
2	17	37%	20	43%	4	9%	3	7%	2	4%	0	0%	46
3	11	24%	21	47%	8	18%	4	9%	1	2%	0	0%	45
4	34	39%	37	42%	9	10%	5	6%	2	2%	1	1%	88
5	29	26%	45	40%	21	19%	13	12%	4	4%	0	0%	112
N/R	9	41%	10	45%	2	9%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	22
Total	142		188		53		29		12		1		425
Percentage	33%		44%		12%		7%		3%		0%		

Question #19d asked respondents to rate the explanation of situations and actions by officers. Of those responding, 29% said “excellent,” 39% “good,” 15% “fair” and 9% “poor.” Once again, Areas 3 and 5 were more likely to have a less favorable response of the Police Department.

19d. Explanation of situations and actions by officers

	By Area												Total
	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		D/N		N/R		
1	38	34%	45	40%	15	13%	6	5%	8	7%	0	0%	112
2	14	30%	14	30%	10	22%	4	9%	4	9%	0	0%	46
3	10	22%	18	40%	8	18%	6	13%	3	7%	0	0%	45
4	30	34%	34	39%	12	14%	6	7%	5	6%	1	1%	88
5	25	22%	46	41%	16	14%	14	13%	11	10%	0	0%	112
N/R	8	36%	8	36%	3	14%	2	9%	1	5%	0	0%	22
Total	125		165		64		38		32		1		425
Percentage	29%		39%		15%		9%		8%		0%		

Question #19e, regarding the Department’s responsiveness to citizens questions and needs produced a response of 32% “excellent,” 41% “good,” 13% “fair” and 9% “poor.” Results were again mixed throughout the community. There was a considerable amount of variation between responses of “excellent” and “good” in each area, however both would be considered a favorable rating though.

19e. Responsiveness to your questions and needs

	By Area												Total
	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		D/N		N/R		
1	33	29%	52	46%	18	16%	5	4%	4	4%	0	0%	112
2	18	39%	15	33%	5	11%	6	13%	2	4%	0	0%	46
3	10	22%	24	53%	6	13%	4	9%	1	2%	0	0%	45
4	35	40%	29	33%	7	8%	11	13%	5	6%	1	1%	88
5	32	29%	43	38%	18	16%	13	12%	6	5%	0	0%	112
N/R	6	27%	12	55%	3	14%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	22
Total	134		175		57		40		18		1		425
Percentage	32%		41%		13%		9%		4%		0%		

Building Department

Question #20 has been left out of this analysis because it was a filter question used to isolate those respondents who have applied for a building permit in the last two years. Results show that 160 respondents or 21% have applied for a building permit in the last two years.

Question #21, asked those that have applied for a building permit if the process was clear and easy to understand. Overall, 89% of those responding said “yes” and 7% said “no.” Results were fairly even across the board, with just Area 2 being slightly more likely to respond “no.” As a reminder, questions with a smaller sample size, such as this, are not as valid statistically.

21. Do you feel the application process was clear and easy to understand?

	By Area								Total
	Yes		No		D/N		N/R		
1	37	88%	4	10%	1	2%	0	0%	42
2	16	80%	3	15%	1	5%	0	0%	20
3	16	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	17
4	31	91%	2	6%	0	0%	1	3%	34
5	34	94%	1	3%	0	0%	1	3%	36
N/R	8	73%	0	0%	3	27%	0	0%	11
Total	142		11		5		2		160
Percentage	89%		7%		3%		1%		

Question #22, regarding the timeliness of the Building Department in processing the application, produced a response of 44% “excellent,” 39% “good,” 9% “fair” and 7% “poor.”

22. How would you describe the timeliness of the Bldg. Dept. in processing your application?

	By Area												Total
	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		D/N		N/R		
1	16	38%	16	38%	6	14%	4	10%	0	0%	0	0%	42
2	10	50%	4	20%	4	20%	1	5%	1	5%	0	0%	20
3	6	35%	10	59%	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	17
4	15	44%	14	41%	2	6%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	34
5	18	50%	13	36%	2	6%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	36
N/R	6	55%	5	45%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	11
Total	71		62		14		11		2		0		160
Percentage	44%		39%		9%		7%		1%		0%		

With regard to the Building Department’s professionalism, results were positive, with 44% responding “excellent,” 43% “good,” 9% “fair” and 4% saying “poor.”

23. How would you describe the professionalism of the Building Department staff?

	By Area												Total
	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		D/N		N/R		
1	14	33%	23	55%	5	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	42
2	10	50%	7	35%	1	5%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	20
3	8	47%	8	47%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	17
4	15	44%	14	41%	2	6%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	34
5	20	56%	11	31%	4	11%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	36
N/R	4	36%	5	45%	1	9%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	11
Total	71		68		14		6		1		0		160
Percentage	44%		43%		9%		4%		1%		0%		

When asked to describe the Department’s efforts in enforcing building codes, 4% of the responses were “excessive”, 35% “adequate,” 8% “inadequate” and 52% had no opinion. As you can see from the cross tabulation, results were very evenly distributed throughout the community

24. How would you describe the Building Dept.'s efforts in enforcing City building codes?

	By Area										Total
	Excessive		Adequate		Inadequate		D/N		N/R		
1	10	5%	65	35%	14	7%	98	52%	0	0%	187
2	2	2%	28	33%	9	10%	42	49%	5	6%	86
3	2	2%	28	35%	8	10%	42	52%	1	1%	81
4	5	3%	67	36%	11	6%	103	55%	1	1%	187
5	8	4%	63	34%	18	10%	97	52%	2	1%	188
N/R	3	6%	19	37%	6	12%	22	43%	1	2%	51
Total	30		270		66		404		10		780

Question #25, produced similar results throughout the community, with 37% of respondents saying that building inspections conducted by the City were “adequate,” 5% saying “inadequate,” 3% “excessive” and 54% did not know or had no opinion on the matter.

25. You consider building inspections to be:

	By Area										Total
	Adequate		Inadequate		Excessive		D/N		N/R		
1	74	40%	11	6%	5	3%	96	51%	1	1%	187
2	25	29%	5	6%	6	7%	45	52%	5	6%	86
3	33	41%	3	4%	1	1%	44	54%	0	0%	81
4	63	34%	10	5%	4	2%	109	58%	1	1%	187
5	75	40%	8	4%	3	2%	100	53%	2	1%	188
N/R	18	35%	5	10%	1	2%	26	51%	1	2%	51
Total	288		42		20		420		10		780
Percentage	37%		5%		3%		54%		1%		

When asked how they felt about building permit fees, 9% of respondents felt they were “excessive,” 31% “reasonable” and 59% responded “D/N.”

26. You think building permit fees are:

	By Area										Total
	Excessive		Reasonable		D/N		N/R				
1	24	13%	65	35%	97	52%	1	1%			187
2	12	14%	23	27%	47	55%	4	5%			86
3	3	4%	21	26%	57	70%	0	0%			81
4	16	9%	53	28%	117	63%	1	1%			187
5	14	7%	62	33%	109	58%	3	2%			188
N/R	5	10%	15	29%	30	59%	1	2%			51
Total	74		239		457		10				780
Percentage	9%		31%		59%		1%				

City Communications

Question #27 regarding how effectively the City communicates with the public yielded a response of 7% “very effectively,” 49% “somewhat effectively,” 29% “not effectively” and 15% “D/N.” Results were fairly even throughout each age group when cross tabulated, however, those here less than one year were much more likely to respond “D/N.”

27. How effectively does the City communicate information regarding project, issues & policies?

	By Years in the Community										Total
	Very Effectively		Somewhat Effectively		Not Effectively		D/N		N/R		
Less than 1	1	4%	9	35%	8	31%	8	31%	0	0%	26
1 to 5	15	7%	95	47%	65	32%	27	13%	0	0%	202
6 to 15	12	6%	92	49%	59	31%	26	14%	0	0%	189
15 plus	19	6%	166	52%	88	28%	45	14%	0	0%	318
N/R	5	11%	23	51%	7	16%	9	20%	1	2%	45
Total	52		385		227		115		1		780
Percentage	7%		49%		29%		15%		0%		

Question #28 was a “check all that apply” question, asking residents what source(s) they use regarding information about the City. Results are shown below along with what percent of respondents use that particular source. The most popular source for information regarding the City was “newspapers,” followed by “public access channel.” A listing of the open ended responses from those who checked “other” is provided in the appendix.

28. What primary sources do you utilize for information regarding the City? (check all that apply)

Newspapers	578	74%	M/U View	127	16%
Neighbors	305	39%	Call City	48	6%
Public Access			Hall		
Channel	392	50%	Attend	100	13%
Talk to Elected			Meetings		
Officials	68	9%	City	121	16%
Other	17	2%	Website		

Question #29, an open ended question, asked respondents to what other sources the City could use to communicate with the public. A summary of the results is below.

1. Website/Internet	12	7. Mailings & Flyers	47
2. Newsletter/More Frequent Newsletters	31	8. Fine As It Is	1
3. E-Mail	16	9. Town Hall Meetings/Gatherings	9
4. Event Sign/Marquee/Public Bulletin Board	15	10. Miscellaneous	7
5. Cable Access Channel/Broadcast Meetings	16	11. Radio	2
6. Better Use Of Papers/Agendas & Meeting Highlights	17		

Question #30, regarding how many times the respondent has visited the City website produced mixed results. Overall, 61% of respondents said they have not visited the City’s website in the last year. In total, 38% of respondents have visited the website at least once during the last year. When cross tabulated with *Years in the Community*, it was found that the less time you have lived in Marengo, the more likely you are to visit the City’s website.

30. How many times have you visited the City website in the past year?

	By Years in the Community										Total		
	None		1		2 or 3		4 or 5		6+			N/R	
Less than 1	15	58%	2	8%	5	19%	1	4%	3	12%	0	0%	26
1 to 5	99	49%	18	9%	43	21%	10	5%	31	15%	1	0%	202
6 to 15	116	61%	11	6%	35	19%	10	5%	17	9%	0	0%	189
15 plus	213	67%	25	8%	45	14%	16	5%	18	6%	1	0%	318
N/R	36	80%	2	4%	2	4%	3	7%	1	2%	1	2%	45
	479		58		130		40		70		3		780
	61%		7%		17%		5%		9%		0%		

Question #31 found that most respondents who have visited the website are looking for “general information.” The responses for those who selected “other” are listed in the appendix.

31. If you have been to the City's website in the last year, what was your reason? (Check all that apply)

General Information			Specific Information		
Minutes/Agendas	229	29%	Forms/Applications	92	12%
View Documents	38	5%	Other	39	5%
	61	8%		13	2%

Question #32 was open ended and asked respondents what information they would like to see on the City’s website. A categorized summary of the responses is provided below.

	# of responses		# of responses
1. Schedule Of Events	13	7. Online News Letter	7
2. Agendas & Minutes	3	8. Projects/Plans	16
3. Codes/Zoning Information	3	9. Never Used Website	6
4. Leaf Collection Info	1	10. Miscellaneous	23
5. Directory/Contact Info	4	11. No Changes	4
6. City/Community History	2	12. Pay Bills Online	5

Total number of responses: 84 *See Appendix for a listing of responses

Of those that have visited the City’s website in the last year, 16% found it to be “very helpful,” 69% “somewhat helpful” and 6% “not helpful.”

33. How would you rate the City website?

	By Years in the Community					Total
	Very helpful	Somewhat helpful	Not helpful	D/N	N/R	
Less than 1	6 55%	4 36%	1 9%	0 0%	0 0%	11
1 to 5	14 14%	76 75%	5 5%	7 7%	0 0%	102
6 to 15	13 18%	50 68%	4 5%	6 8%	0 0%	73
15 plus	16 15%	69 66%	7 7%	12 12%	0 0%	104
N/R	0 0%	7 88%	1 13%	0 0%	0 0%	8
	49 16%	206 69%	18 6%	25 8%	0 0%	298

When asked if you would utilize the option to pay utility bills online, 32% of respondents said “yes,” 50% “no,” and 18% “D/N.” A significant relationship exists here, showing that the less tenured population in the City would be more likely to use the option of paying bills online.

34. If available, would you utilize the option to pay utility bills online?

	By Years in the Community				Total
	Yes	No	D/N	N/R	
Less than 1	10 38%	11 42%	5 19%	0 0%	26
1 to 5	92 46%	79 39%	30 15%	1 0%	202
6 to 15	61 32%	93 49%	35 19%	0 0%	189
15 plus	79 25%	186 58%	53 17%	0 0%	318
N/R	6 13%	20 44%	16 36%	3 7%	45
	248 32%	389 50%	139 18%	4 1%	780

Question #35, regarding the helpfulness of City staff, produced a response of 54% “very helpful,” 20% “somewhat helpful” and 2% “not helpful.” Results were evenly distributed when cross tabulated with years in the community.

35. When you call or visit the City offices, how courteous and helpful is the staff in answering your questions or addressing your concerns?

	By Years in the Community										Total
	Very helpful		Somewhat helpful		Not Helpful		D/N		N/R		
Less than 1	9	35%	3	12%	0	0%	14	54%	0	0%	26
1 to 5	97	48%	45	22%	6	3%	51	25%	3	1%	202
6 to 15	117	62%	32	17%	2	1%	36	19%	2	1%	189
15 plus	172	54%	68	21%	6	2%	71	22%	1	0%	318
N/R	23	51%	9	20%	2	4%	10	22%	1	2%	45
	418		157		16		182		7		780
	54%		20%		2%		23%		1%		

Question #36 was used as a filter question and asked the respondent if they have tried to contact their Aldermen in the last two years. Those that said “yes” were included in the following analysis of question #37, which asked if you think your Aldermen are accessible to talk with you. Of those responding, 66% said “yes,” 18% “somewhat available,” 2% “somewhat unavailable” and 11% “no.”

37. Do you think your Aldermen are generally accessible to talk with you?

	By Area										Total		
	Yes		Somewhat Available		Somewhat Unavailable		No		D/N			N/R	
1	21	68%	5	16%	2	6%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	31
2	11	69%	3	19%	0	0%	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%	16
3	7	58%	3	25%	0	0%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	12
4	33	87%	3	8%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	38
5	14	47%	9	30%	0	0%	5	17%	2	7%	0	0%	30
N/R	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%	5
	87		24		3		15		3		0		132
	66%		18%		2%		11%		2%		0%		

Question #38, asking if respondents feel the City Council is responsive to the needs of the community produced results of 11% “yes,” 27% “somewhat responsive,” 6% “somewhat unresponsive,” 11% “no” and 44% “D/N.”

38. Do you think the City Council is responsive to your needs and those of the community?

	By Area												Total
	Yes		Somewhat Responsive		Somewhat Unresponsive		No		D/N		N/R		
1	11	6%	51	27%	10	5%	19	10%	96	51%	0	0%	187
2	13	15%	22	26%	2	2%	7	8%	40	47%	2	2%	86
3	9	11%	21	26%	2	2%	6	7%	42	52%	1	1%	81
4	29	16%	50	27%	15	8%	15	8%	76	41%	2	1%	187
5	19	10%	54	29%	12	6%	29	15%	70	37%	4	2%	188
N/R	5	10%	12	24%	2	4%	10	20%	21	41%	1	2%	51
	86		210		43		86		345		10		780
	11%		27%		6%		11%		44%		1%		

Like Question #36, question # 39 was a filter question and is not included in this analysis. Question #40, asked that if you have tried to contact the City Administrator, was he available to speak with you. Of those responding, 47% said “yes,” 28% “somewhat available,” 13% “somewhat unavailable” and 11% said “no.” Once again, results were evenly balanced throughout the community.

40. Was the Administrator accessible to talk with you?

	By Area												Total
	Yes		Somewhat available		Somewhat unavailable		No		D/N		N/R		
1	14	52%	7	26%	5	19%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	27
2	4	40%	2	20%	1	10%	2	20%	1	10%	0	0%	10
3	4	40%	4	40%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	10
4	11	44%	6	24%	3	12%	4	16%	0	0%	1	4%	25
5	15	54%	9	32%	1	4%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	28
N/R	3	33%	2	22%	2	22%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	9
	51		30		14		12		1		1		109
	47%		28%		13%		11%		1%		1%		

Overall, 10% said “yes,” the Administrator is responsive to the needs of the community, 13% “somewhat responsive,” 3% “somewhat unresponsive” and 6% “no.” Again, results were evenly distributed throughout the community, with no significant relationships between the question and any of the demographic information.

41. Do you think the City Administrator is responsive to your needs and those of the community?

	By Area												
	Yes		Somewhat Responsive		Somewhat Unresponsive		No		D/N		N/R		Total
1	12	6%	28	15%	8	4%	8	4%	130	70%	1	1%	187
2	5	6%	11	13%	1	1%	4	5%	62	72%	3	3%	86
3	6	7%	11	14%	2	2%	3	4%	56	69%	3	4%	81
4	23	12%	14	7%	9	5%	8	4%	129	69%	4	2%	187
5	22	12%	31	16%	4	2%	15	8%	112	60%	4	2%	188
N/R	7	14%	5	10%	1	2%	5	10%	31	61%	2	4%	51
	75		100		25		43		520		17		780
	10%		13%		3%		6%		67%		2%		

Planning and Growth

Results for question #42 were mixed, with 21% of respondents describing the recent growth in the City as “excessive,” 41% “conservative,” 23% “well managed” and 14% said “D/N.” These results were fairly common throughout each area of the community. However when cross tabulated with years in the community, a relationship was found that shows that those who have lived here longer were more likely to say “excessive” whereas newer population in the City was more likely to respond “conservative.”

42. How would you describe the recent growth and development within Marengo?

	By Years in the Community										Total
	Excessive		Conservative		Well Managed		D/N		N/R		
Less than 1	4	15%	8	31%	4	15%	9	35%	1	4%	26
1 to 5	23	11%	98	49%	56	28%	23	11%	2	1%	202
6 to 15	37	20%	77	41%	51	27%	23	12%	1	1%	189
15 plus	89	28%	125	39%	61	19%	43	14%	0	0%	318
N/R	10	22%	14	31%	6	13%	13	29%	2	4%	45
	163		322		178		111		6		780
	21%		41%		23%		14%		1%		

Question #43 asked residents what kind of new development they would like to see in Marengo. The results showed that the highest demand among residents was for “commercial and retail” development, which was selected by 71% of those responding followed by “light industry” with 49%.

43. What kind of new development would you like to see in Marengo? (check all that apply)

Traditional Neighborhoods	278	36%	Light Industry	382	49%
Suburban/Estate Development	109	14%	Office Space	138	18%
Commercial/Retail	557	71%	Apartments	41	5%
Townhomes/Condos	81	10%	None	59	8%

Similarly, question #44 asked what type of businesses the City should actively recruit. With 66%, “general retail” was the most popular answer, followed by “entertainment/restaurant” (47%) and “light industry” (43%).

44. What types of businesses should the City actively recruit? (check all that apply)

Corporate Offices	158	20%	General Retail	513	66%
Banquet/Convention Center	98	13%	Light Industry	337	43%
Entertainment/Restaurant	368	47%	Hotel/Motel	173	22%
Professional Services	194	25%	Health Care Facility	275	35%
Specialty Retail	268	34%	Other	59	8%

A categorized summary of the responses to #44, “other” is provided below.

	# of responses		# of responses
1. Grocery Stores	33	5. Commuter Rail Station	1
2. Department Stores	11	6. Hospital	1
3. Pharmacy	10	7. Miscellaneous	7
4. Entertainment	16		

Total number of responses received: 66 *See Appendix for a listing of actual responses

Question #45 was an open ended question asking respondents for suggestions on how to improve the downtown area. A categorized summary of the responses is provided in this analysis. The most common answers involved renovating the downtown and attracting more businesses.

	# of responses		# of responses
1. More Businesses	114	7. More Police Presence	13
2. Improve Traffic Flow	36	8. Train Station	5
3. Renovate/Beautify	200	9. Handicap Accessibility	2
4. Bypass for Truck Traffic	53	10. Less Bars/Smoking Ban	7
5. More Parking	24	11. No Changes	11
6. Street Repair	5	12. Pedestrian Safety	14

Total number of responses received: 375 *See Appendix for a listing of actual responses

Miscellaneous

When asked if City employees are safe and courteous while driving municipal vehicles, 72% responded “yes,” 4% “no” and 24% “D/N.”

46. Do you think City employees are safe and courteous while driving municipal vehicles?

	By Area								Total
	Yes		No		D/N		N/R		
1	143	76%	4	2%	40	21%	0	0%	187
2	65	76%	7	8%	13	15%	1	1%	86
3	56	69%	2	2%	23	28%	0	0%	81
4	129	69%	9	5%	49	26%	0	0%	187
5	135	72%	10	5%	43	23%	0	0%	188
N/R	30	59%	3	6%	16	31%	2	4%	51
	558		35		184		3		780
	72%		4%		24%		0%		

Question #47 asked residents if they feel there are enough recreational facilities in Marengo. Results were evenly balanced throughout each area of the community, but respondents with children were significantly more likely to say “no.” Overall, 56% of respondents replied “yes” and 32% said “no.”

47. Do you think there are enough recreational facilities in Marengo?

	By Number of Children								Total
	Yes		No		D/N		N/R		
0	288	63%	104	23%	62	14%	1	0%	455
1 or 2	100	49%	94	46%	12	6%	0	0%	206
3 or more	15	29%	35	67%	2	4%	0	0%	52
N/R	32	48%	19	28%	14	21%	2	3%	67
	435		252		90		3		780
	56%		32%		12%		0%		

Question #48 then asked residents to suggest what types of recreational facilities are needed. A summary of the responses are provided in this analysis.

	# of responses		# of responses
1. Parks/Playgrounds	43	7. Skate Park/Ice Rink	18
2. Bowling Alley	28	8. Dog Parks	7
3. Ball Fields	33	9. Tennis Courts	4
4. Movie Theater	16	10. Miscellaneous i.e. — City pond, mini-golf	28
5. Pool	27	11. Rec. Center/Gym	21
6. Walking/Bike Paths	67	12. Teen/Youth Center	35

Total number of responses received: 225 *See Appendix for a listing of actual responses

Question #49 asked what area the City should focus on for future capital projects / improvements. The most common selection was sidewalk and street repairs and improvements with 67%, followed by general community appearance, with 30%. The open ended responses of those who replied “other” are listed in the appendix.

Recreation/Community Facilities	181	23%
Community Appearance/Landscaping Infrastructure & Utility Improvements	212	27%
Sidewalks/Street Repair & Improvements	522	67%
Other	28	4%

Similarly to #49, question #50 asked residents what areas of service the City needs to enhance. “Streets and infrastructure” was the most common response with 61% followed by “economic development” with 41% and “water and sewer with 40%.

Police Protection	118	15%	Water & Sewer	312	40%
Economic Development	321	41%	Capital Projects	87	11%
Traffic Violations Code/Ordinance Enforcement	106	14%	Administration	28	4%
	90	12%	Streets & Infrastructure	475	61%

Question #51 was open ended and asked residents what additional services the City should provide. A categorized summary is provided in this analysis.

	# of responses		# of responses
1. Transportation (Metra, dial a ride, taxi's)	8	10. Water Improvements	4
2. More Businesses	6	11. Hospital	1
3. Code Enforcement Officer	3	12. Wireless Internet	3
4. Bypass	2	13. Leaf Burning	1
5. Recreational Facilities/Activities	8	14. Street/Sidewalk Repair	1
6. Enhance Existing Services	5	15. Recycling Center	1
7. Drug Task Force/Gang Task Force	2	16. More Parking	1
8. Police-More Squads/Traffic Control	4	17. Online Bill Pay	1
9. Senior Services	2		

Total number of responses received: 53 *See Appendix for a listing of actual responses

Question # 52 asked residents to describe the overall quality of life in Marengo. Overall, results were evenly balanced throughout the community with 13% replying “excellent,” 56% “good,” 21% “fair” and just 2% saying “poor.”

52. Overall, how would you rate the quality of life in Marengo?

	By Area												Total
	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		D/N		N/R		
1	40	21%	99	53%	35	19%	2	1%	9	5%	2	1%	187
2	11	13%	48	56%	20	23%	0	0%	5	6%	2	2%	86
3	8	10%	53	65%	17	21%	0	0%	3	4%	0	0%	81
4	22	12%	106	57%	35	19%	3	2%	18	10%	3	2%	187
5	18	10%	114	61%	40	21%	7	4%	7	4%	2	1%	188
N/R	6	12%	18	35%	14	27%	2	4%	9	18%	2	4%	51
Total	105		438		161		14		51		11		780
Percentage	13%		56%		21%		2%		7%		1%		

When cross tabulated with years in the community, the quality of life according to each group was virtually identical across the board.

52. Overall, how would you rate the quality of life in Marengo?

	By Years in the Community												Total
	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		D/N		N/R		
Less than 1	4	15%	17	65%	1	4%	1	4%	1	4%	2	8%	26
1 to 5	23	11%	117	58%	44	22%	5	2%	12	6%	1	0%	202
6 to 15	23	12%	110	58%	39	21%	2	1%	14	7%	1	1%	189
15 plus	45	14%	181	57%	64	20%	5	2%	18	6%	5	2%	318
N/R	10	22%	13	29%	13	29%	1	2%	6	13%	2	4%	45
Total	105		438		161		14		51		11		780
Percentage	13%		56%		21%		2%		7%		1%		

Question #53, which asked residents if they feel they are getting a good value for their tax dollar, produced mixed results. There were several points of interesting relationships found regarding this question. Overall, 35% of respondents said “yes,” 27% “no” and 37% “D/N.” Area 5 was interesting in particular, as it was the only area in the City in which there were more “no” responses than “yes.”

53. Do you think you are getting a good value for your tax dollar? Total 270, 213, 288, 90, 780
Percentage 35%, 27%, 37%, 1%

	By Area								Total
	Yes		No		D/N		N/R		
1	69	37%	47	25%	69	37%	2	1%	187
2	26	30%	25	29%	32	37%	3	3%	86
3	28	35%	21	26%	32	40%	0	0%	81
4	74	40%	33	18%	79	42%	1	1%	187
5	64	34%	72	38%	51	27%	1	1%	188
N/R	9	18%	15	29%	25	49%	2	4%	51

When cross tabulated with years in the community, respondents who have lived in Marengo 1-5 years were found as the most likely to respond “no.” Although it was only by a slight difference, those who have been in the community 1-5 years were the only group to have more “no” than “yes” responses.

53. Do you think you are getting a good value for your tax dollar?

	By Years in the Community								Total
	Yes		No		D/N		N/R		
Less than 1	7	27%	5	19%	13	50%	1	4%	26
1 to 5	68	34%	71	35%	62	31%	1	0%	202
6 to 15	65	34%	48	25%	75	40%	1	1%	189
15 plus	117	37%	79	25%	118	37%	4	1%	318
N/R	13	29%	10	22%	20	44%	2	4%	45
Total	270		213		288		9		780
Percentage	35%		27%		37%		1%		

Another point of interest is that only one age group (25-39) more frequently replied “no” than “yes.” Also those 65 and over were more likely to respond “D/N.”

53. Do you think you are getting a good value for your tax dollar?

	By Age								Total
	Yes		No		D/N		N/R		
Under 25	4	40%	1	10%	5	50%	0	0%	10
25 - 39	40	25%	66	42%	53	33%	0	0%	159
40 - 64	139	40%	102	29%	103	30%	4	1%	348
65 plus	76	37%	24	12%	103	50%	3	1%	206
N/R	11	19%	20	35%	24	42%	2	4%	57
Total	270		213		288		9		780
Percentage	35%		27%		37%		1%		

A final interesting relationship regarding question #53 shows that those with children were less likely to say “yes” they are getting a good value for their tax dollar.

53. Do you think you are getting a good value for your tax dollar?

	By Number of Children								Total
	Yes		No		D/N		N/R		
0	183	40%	95	21%	173	38%	4	1%	455
1 or 2	62	30%	81	39%	62	30%	1	0%	206
3 or more	13	25%	19	37%	20	38%	0	0%	52
N/R	12	18%	18	27%	33	49%	4	6%	67
Total	270		213		288		9		780
Percentage	35%		27%		37%		1%		

Question #54 was an open ended question that asked residents what issues currently facing the City of Marengo most concern them. Respondents produced a wide range of replies that were then broken down into the following 30 categories:

54. What issue or issues currently facing the City of Marengo most concern you?

	# of responses		# of responses
1. Not Enough Growth	8	16. Downtown	16
2. Too Much Growth	11	17. Lack of Youth Activities	12
3. Growth in General	78	18. Code Enforcement	13
4. Lack of Business	61	19. Lack of Jobs	7
5. Traffic Congestion	76	20. Lack of Industry	18
6. Water	69	21. Immigration	7
7. Streets Condition	63	22. Park District/Recreation	7
8. Bypass for traffic	28	23. Chemtool	14
9. Sidewalks	13	24. Parking	7
10. P.D. - Bad Press	21	25. Senior Citizens	4
11. Property Taxes	30	26. Pedestrian Safety	2
12. Widen Rt. 20	5	27. Transportation	4
13. Gangs/Drugs	18	28. I-90 & 23	1
14. Infrastructure	16	29. City Council	3
15. Schools	15	30. Miscellaneous	24

Total number of responses received: 436 *See Appendix for a listing of actual responses

Question #55 asked residents what in general, they like or dislike about the community. For the purpose of this analysis, this question was divided into #55a (likes) and #55b (dislikes). Each group of responses was then broken down into different response categories. By a wide margin, the most common theme in the responses to the question was “the City’s feel/environment.”

55a. In general, what do you like about the community?

	# of responses
1. The City's Environment / Feel (i.e. "small town feel", "I like it here")	121
2. The People	34
3. Safety / Quietness	33
4. Schools	20
5. City Services (i.e. plowing, brush pick up)	9
6. Community Events and Places (i.e. Settlers Day's, parks, stores)	17
7. Miscellaneous	9

Total number of responses received: 184 *See Appendix for a listing of actual responses

The common theme of things that respondents dislike about the community is the lack of commercial and/or industrial growth in the City. The second most noticeable theme seen in the responses to this question was the dislike of the traffic and congestion in the community. Other common comments involved the lack of youth and/or senior activities, the condition of the City's streets and the overall appearance of the community.

55b. In general, what do you dislike about the community?

	# of responses		# of responses
1. Lack of Commercial / Industrial Growth	120	15. Community Fighting / Attitude of Citizens	7
2. High Taxes	21	16. Problems with City Officials & Employees	10
3. No youth / Senior Activities	35	17. Lack of Parking/ No Street Parking	9
4. Problems with the Police Department	19	18. Too Many Apartments	4
5. Condition of City Streets	32	19. WWTP Smell	1
6. Lack of Transportation	5	20. Lack of Job Opportunities	3
7. Traffic/Congestion	50	21. City Communication / Hours	1
8. Bypass	8	22. Too Many Bars	8
9. City Appearance	28	23. Animal Control	4
10. Excessive Growth	9	24. School Issues	2
11. Lack of Growth	12	25. Immigration	9
12. Condition of the Downtown Area	16	26. Junk Cars / Cars on Lawns	8
13. Condition or Lack of Sidewalks	21	27. Code Enforcement	22
14. Water Quality & Rates	20	28. Miscellaneous	15

Total number of responses received: 328 *See Appendix for a listing of actual responses

Question # 56 asked for comments or suggestions regarding the services and quality of life in Marengo. Responses were highly varied, thus making categorizing responses difficult. Below is a categorized listing of all responses. As you will notice, the categories are rather broad and encompassing. In general, most comments made would reiterate points made from previous questions.

56. Do you have any comments or suggestions regarding the services and the quality of life in Marengo?

Summarized Response Categories

	# of responses		# of responses
1. Not Enough Growth	11	21. Downtown	16
2. Too much Growth	7	22. Lack of Youth Activities	20
3. Growth in general	24	23. Code Enforcement	23
4. Lack of Commercial	67	24. Lack of Jobs	1
5. Traffic Congestion	21	25. Lack of industry	4
6. Water	20	26. Immigrants	4
7. Streets Condition	26	27. Park District/Recreation	16
8. Bypass	18	28. Chemtool	1
9. Sidewalks	12	29. Parking	5
10. P.D. - Positive	7	30. Senior Citizens	3
11. P.D. - Negative	25	31. WWTP	3
12. Property Taxes	16	32. Pedestrians	5
13. Widen Rt. 20	2	33. Transportation	4
14. Gangs/Drugs	11	34. I-90 & 23	4
15. Infrastructure	7	35. City Council	6
16. Schools	11	36. Library	3
17. Overall Appearance	20	37. Community Events	7
18. City Communication	11	38. Animals	6
19. No Changes/Comment	4	39. Miscellaneous	32
20. Happy with the City	31		

Total number of responses received: 514 *See Appendix for a listing of actual responses

Appendix K

Open Responses to Question #55b

In general, what do you dislike about the community?"

Summarized Response Categories

# of Responses		# of Responses			
1	Lack of Com/Ind Growth	120	15	Communiy Fighting/Attitude of Citizens	7
2	High Taxes	21	16	Problems W/Officials & Employees	10
3	No Youth/Senior Services	35	17	Lack of Parking/No Street Parking	9
4	Problems W/Police	19	18	Too Many Apartments	4
5	Streets Condition	32	19	WWTP	1
6	Lack of Transportation	5	20	Lack of Job Opportunities	3
7	Traffic/Congestion	50	21	City Communications/Hours	1
8	Bypass	8	22	Too Many Bars	8
9	City Appearance	28	23	Animal Control	4
10	Excessive Growth	9	24	School Issues	2
11	Lack of Growth	12	25	Immigration	9
12	Conditions of Downtown	16	26	Junk Cars/Cars on Lawns	8
13	Sidewalks	21	27	Code Enforcement	22
14	Water Quality/Rates	20	28	Miscellaneous	15

Total number of responses received: 328