



# 2022 City of Washougal Community Survey Findings Report

Presented to the City of Washougal,  
Washington

November 2022



# Contents

Executive Summary .....	i
Section 1: Charts and Graphs .....	1
Section 2: Benchmarking Analysis .....	38
Section 3: Importance-Satisfaction Analysis .....	47
Section 4: Tabular Data .....	63
Section 5: PowerPoint Presentation .....	95
Section 6: Survey Instrument .....	111



# Executive Summary

# 2022 City of Washougal Community Survey

## Executive Summary



### Purpose

ETC Institute administered the *DirectionFinder*® survey for the City of Washougal during the fall of 2022. The survey was administered as part of the City's effort to assess citizen satisfaction with the quality of services. The information gathered from the survey will help the City align its priorities with the needs of residents. This is the fifth time that Washougal has administered a community survey with ETC Institute; the first survey was conducted in the summer of 2014.

### Methodology

A six-page survey was mailed to a random sample of households in the City of Washougal. The survey was accompanied by a cover letter from the Mayor explaining the purpose of the survey and included a link for giving residents the option to complete the survey online. Of the households that received a survey, 513 completed the survey. The results for the random sample of 513 households have a 95% level of confidence with a precision of at least +/-4.3%.

The percentage of "don't know" responses has been excluded from many of the graphs shown in this report to facilitate valid comparisons of the results from the City of Washougal with the results from other communities in the *DirectionFinder*® database. Since the number of "don't know" responses often reflects the utilization and awareness of City services, the percentage of "don't know" responses has been provided in the tabular data section of this report. When the "don't know" responses have been excluded, the text of this report will indicate that the responses have been excluded with the phrase "who had an opinion." Furthermore, the percentage of "neutral" responses (a rating of "3" on a 5-point scale) indicates that residents are, for the most part, satisfied with City services. They believe improvements could be made, but they do not have strong feelings of dissatisfaction for a particular service.

This report contains:

- a summary of the methodology for administering the survey and major findings
- charts and graphs
- benchmarking data that show how the results for the City of Washougal compare to other cities
- Importance-Satisfaction analysis
- tables that show the results for each question on the survey
- PowerPoint slides highlighting key survey findings
- a copy of the survey instrument

# 2022 City of Washougal Community Survey

## Executive Summary



### Major Findings

**Satisfaction with City Services.** Eighty-three percent (83%) of residents surveyed, who had an opinion, were satisfied (rating of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale) with the quality of fire, emergency medical and ambulance services; 72% were satisfied with the quality of police services, 61% were satisfied with the quality of customer service from City employees, and 59% were satisfied with the quality of City parks. Residents were least satisfied with effectiveness of economic development efforts (27%).

**City Services That Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next 2 Years.** Based on the sum of their top three choices, the services that residents indicated should receive the most emphasis from the City over the next two years were: (1) quality of city water utilities, (2) maintenance of City streets, and (3) effectiveness of economic development efforts.

**Perceptions of the City.** Sixty-eight percent (68%) of residents surveyed, who had an opinion, indicated that they were satisfied (rating of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale) with the overall feeling of safety in the City; 60% were satisfied with the overall quality of life in the City, and 54% were satisfied with the quality of services provided by the City. Residents were least satisfied with the availability of job opportunities (20%).

**Parks and Recreation.** Fifty-six percent (56%) of residents surveyed, who had an opinion, were satisfied (rating of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale) with the quality of facilities (picnic shelters, etc.) in Washougal parks. Residents were least satisfied with the number of City parks (47%).

**Public Safety.** Seventy-seven percent (77%) of residents surveyed, who had an opinion, were satisfied (rating of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale) with the quality of local fire protection and rescue services; 76% were satisfied with how quickly fire and rescue personnel respond, 71% were satisfied with the quality of local ambulance service, and 69% were satisfied with how quickly ambulance personnel respond. Residents were least satisfied with parking enforcement services (45%).

**Communication.** Thirty-eight percent (38%) of residents surveyed, who had an opinion, were satisfied (rating of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale) with the overall quality of the city's website; 34% were satisfied with the availability of information about city programs/services, and 29% were satisfied with the City's efforts to keep residents informed about local issues. Residents were least satisfied with the level of public involvement in local decision making (19%).

**Streets.** Fifty-seven percent (57%) of residents surveyed, who had an opinion, were satisfied (rating of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale) with the adequacy of City street lighting, and 54% were satisfied with the maintenance of major City streets. Residents were least satisfied with the condition of sidewalks in the City (39%).

# 2022 City of Washougal Community Survey

## Executive Summary



**Code Enforcement.** Twenty-eight percent (28%) of residents surveyed, who had an opinion, were satisfied (rating of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale) with the enforcement of codes designed to protect public safety and health. Residents were least satisfied with the enforcement of the cleanup of litter and debris on private property (21%).

**Customer Service.** Forty-three percent (43%) of residents surveyed indicated they had contacted the City with a question, problem, or complaint during the past year. Of those, 74% felt it was “very easy” or “somewhat easy” to contact the person they needed to reach. With regard to various behaviors exhibited by City employees, 88% of residents surveyed, who had an opinion, indicated that employees were “always” or “usually” courteous and polite, and 71% said the employees “always” or “usually” gave prompt, accurate, and complete answers to questions.

### Other Findings

- 52% of residents surveyed prefer to receive news and information about City programs, services, and events from a newsletter or other insert inside their utility bill envelope, and 49% get news and information from the City email update service.
- When asked about the City’s current pace of development, 66% of residents surveyed, who had an opinion, indicated that retail development was too slow, while 59% felt the pace of multi-family residential development was too fast.
- When asked about their expectations for various services, 73% of residents surveyed, who had an opinion, indicated that the level of service for the maintenance of infrastructure should be higher. With regard to fire, EMS and ambulance services, 64% believe the level of service provided by the City should stay the same.

# 2022 City of Washougal Community Survey

## Executive Summary



### Opportunities for Improvement

In order to help the City identify opportunities for improvement, ETC Institute conducted an Importance-Satisfaction (I-S) Priorities Analysis. This analysis examined the importance that residents placed on each City service and the level of satisfaction with each service. By identifying services of high importance and low satisfaction, the analysis identified which services will have the most impact on overall satisfaction with City services over the next two years. If the City wants to improve its overall satisfaction rating, the City should prioritize improvements in services with the highest Importance-Satisfaction (I-S) ratings. Details regarding the methodology for the analysis are provided in Section 3 of this report.

Based on the results of the Importance-Satisfaction (I-S) Priorities Analysis, ETC Institute recommends the following:

**Overall Priorities for the City by Major Category.** The first level of analysis reviewed the importance of and satisfaction with major categories of City services. This analysis was conducted to help set the overall priorities for the City. Based on the results of this analysis, the major services that are recommended as the top three opportunities for improvement over the next two years in order to raise the City's overall satisfaction rating are listed below in descending order of the Importance-Satisfaction rating:

- Quality of City water utilities
- Effectiveness of economic development efforts
- Maintenance of City streets

**Priorities within Departments/Specific Areas.** The second level of analysis reviewed the importance of and satisfaction of services within departments and specific service areas. This analysis was conducted to help departmental managers set priorities for their department. Based on the results of this analysis, the services that are recommended as the top priorities within each department over the next two years are listed below:

- **Parks:** appearance and maintenance of existing city parks and quality of facilities
- **Public Safety:** visibility of police in the community
- **Communication:** efforts to inform about local issues, level of public involvement in local decision making, and quality of information about City programs/services
- **Streets:** condition of sidewalks in the City and maintenance of major City streets
- **Code Enforcement:** enforcing the cleanup of litter and debris on private property, enforcing codes designed to protect public safety and health, and enforcing the mowing and trimming of grass and weeds on private property




# Charts and Graphs




# Q1. Satisfaction with Major Categories of Service Provided by the City

by percentage of respondents (excluding "don't know")




# TRENDS: Satisfaction with Major Categories of Service Provided by the City - 2014 to 2022

by percentage of respondents (excluding "don't know")




## Q2. City Services That Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next 2 Years

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top three choices



# Q3. Satisfaction With Items That Influence the Perception Residents Have of the City


by percentage of respondents (excluding “don't know”)



# TRENDS: Satisfaction With Items That Influence the Perception Residents Have of the City


## 2014 to 2022

by percentage of respondents (excluding “don't know”)




## Q4. Satisfaction with Parks and Recreation

by percentage of respondents (excluding “don't know”)




# TRENDS: Satisfaction With Parks and Recreation 2014 to 2022

by percentage of respondents (excluding "don't know")



# Q5. Park and Recreation Services That Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next 2 Years


by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top two choices





## Q6. Satisfaction with Public Safety


by percentage of respondents (excluding “don't know”)



# TRENDS: Satisfaction With Public Safety


## 2014 to 2022

by percentage of respondents (excluding "don't know")




# Q7. Public Safety Services That Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next 2 Years

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top two choices




# Q8. How Residents Prefer to Receive News and Information About City Programs, Services, and Events

by percentage of respondents (multiple selections could be made)




# Q9. Satisfaction with Communication

by percentage of respondents (excluding "don't know")




# TRENDS: Satisfaction With Communication 2014 to 2022

by percentage of respondents (excluding "don't know")




# Q10. Communication Issues That Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next 2 Years

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top two choices



# Q11. Satisfaction With Streets

by percentage of respondents (excluding “don't know”)






# TRENDS: Satisfaction With Streets


## 2014 to 2022

by percentage of respondents (excluding "don't know")




# Q12. Street Issues That Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next 2 Years

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top two choices




# Q13. How Residents Rate the City's Current Pace of Development

by percentage of respondents (excluding "don't know")




# Q14. Satisfaction With Code Enforcement

by percentage of respondents (excluding “don’t know”)




# TRENDS: Satisfaction With Code Enforcement 2014 to 2022

by percentage of respondents (excluding "don't know")



# Q15. Code Enforcement Issues That Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next 2 Years


by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top two choices



# Q16. Have you called, e-mailed or visited the City with a question, problem, or complaint during the past year?


by percentage of respondents

## Q16a. How easy was it to contact the person you needed to reach?




# Q16. Have you called, e-mailed or visited the City with a question, problem, or complaint during the past year?

by percentage of respondents




## Q16b. What department did you contact? (multiple selections could be made)





# Q16c. How often did the employees contacted display the following behaviors?


by percentage of respondents who contacted the City during the past year (excluding "don't know")



# TRENDS: How often did the employees contacted display the following behaviors?


## 2014 to 2022

by percentage of respondents who contacted the City during the past year (excluding "don't know")




# Q17. How the Level of Service Provided by the City Should Change

by percentage of respondents (excluding "don't know")




# Q18. Would you be willing to pay more in taxes or fees to support an increase in service levels?

by percentage of respondents




# Q19. Support for Allowing the Following Uses in Washougal

by percentage of respondents (excluding "not provided" - multiple selections could be made)




## Q20. Support for the Following Fireworks Restrictions

by percentage of respondents (excluding "don't know")




## Q21a. Would you be willing to pay more in taxes or fees to support a new community amenity provided by the City?

by percentage of respondents (excluding "don't know")



## Q22. Approximately how many years have you lived in Washougal?


by percentage respondents (excluding “not provided”)






# Q23. What is your age?

by percentage respondents (excluding “not provided”)




## Q24. Children Under Age 18 Living in the Household

by percentage respondents (excluding “not provided”)




## Q25. Gender

by percentage respondents (excluding “not provided”)



## Q26. Annual Household Income

by percentage respondents (excluding “not provided”)





# 2

# Benchmarking Analysis

# Benchmarking Analysis



## Overview

ETC Institute's *DirectionFinder*® program was originally developed in 1999 to help community leaders use statistically-valid community survey data as a tool for making better decisions. Since November 1999, the survey has been administered in more than 500 cities and counties in 49 states. Most participating communities conduct the survey on an annual or biennial basis.

This report contains benchmarking data from two sources: (1) a national survey that was administered by ETC Institute during the fall of 2021 to a random sample of more than 9,000 residents in the continental United States and (2) a regional survey that was administered by ETC Institute during the fall of 2021 to a random sample of residents living in the Northwest Region of the United States. The Northwest Region includes the states of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana.

The charts on the following pages show how the results for the City of Washougal compare to the national average and the Northwest regional average. The blue bar shows the results for the City of Washougal, the red bar shows the national average, and the yellow bar shows the results for the Northwest Region.


# National Benchmarks

**Note: The benchmarking data contained in this report is protected intellectual property. Any reproduction of the benchmarking information in this report by persons or organizations not directly affiliated with the City of Washougal is not authorized without written consent from ETC Institute.**

# Overall Ratings of City Services

## Washougal vs. Northwest Region vs. the U.S.


by percentage of respondents who gave positive ratings for the item (excluding don't knows)





# Ratings of Items that Influence Perceptions of the City Washougal vs. Northwest Region vs. the U.S.


by percentage of respondents who gave positive ratings for the item (excluding don't knows)



# Ratings of Public Safety Services

## Washougal vs. Northwest Region vs. the U.S.


by percentage of respondents who gave positive ratings for the item (excluding don't knows)



# Ratings of Communication Services

## Washougal vs. Northwest Region vs. the U.S.


by percentage of respondents who gave positive ratings for the item (excluding don't knows)



# Ratings of Street Maintenance Services

## Washougal vs. Northwest Region vs. the U.S.


by percentage of respondents who rated the item 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale where 5 was "very satisfied" and 1 was "very dissatisfied" (excluding don't knows)



# Ratings of the Enforcement of Codes and Ordinances

## Washougal vs. Northwest Region vs. the U.S.

by percentage of respondents who gave positive ratings for the item (excluding don't knows)





# 3 Importance-Satisfaction Analysis

# Importance-Satisfaction Analysis



## Overview

Today, community leaders have limited resources which need to be targeted to activities that are of the most benefit to their citizens. Two of the most important criteria for decision making are (1) to target resources toward services of the highest importance to citizens; and (2) to target resources toward those services where citizens are the least satisfied.

The Importance-Satisfaction (I-S) rating is a unique tool that allows public officials to better understand both of these highly important decision-making criteria for each of the services they are providing. The Importance-Satisfaction (I-S) rating is based on the concept that public agencies will maximize overall customer satisfaction by emphasizing improvements in those areas where the level of satisfaction is relatively low, and the perceived importance of the service is relatively high.

The rating is calculated by summing the percentage of responses for items selected as the first, second, and third most important services for the City to emphasize over the next two years. The sum is then multiplied by 1 minus the percentage of respondents who indicated they were positively satisfied with the City's performance in the related area (the sum of the ratings of 4 and 5 on a 5-point scale excluding "Don't Know" responses). "Don't Know" responses are excluded from the calculation to ensure the satisfaction ratings among service categories are comparable.

$$\text{I-S Rating} = \text{Importance} \times (1 - \text{Satisfaction})$$

## Example of the Calculation

Respondents were asked to identify the major categories of City services that were most important to their household. Nearly half (48.9%) of the respondent households selected "*overall quality of city water utilities*" as one of the most important services for the City to emphasize.

With regard to satisfaction, 33% of respondents surveyed rated "*overall quality of city water utilities*" as a "4" or "5" on a 5-point scale (where "5" means "Very Satisfied") excluding "Don't Know" responses. The I-S rating was calculated by multiplying the sum of the most important percentages by one minus the sum of the satisfaction percentages. In this example, 48.9% was multiplied by 67% (1-0.33). This calculation yielded an I-S rating of 0.3276, which ranked first out of eleven major categories of City services analyzed.

# Importance-Satisfaction Analysis



The maximum rating is 1.00 and would be achieved when 100% of the respondents select an item as one of their top three choices of importance and 0% indicate they are positively satisfied with the delivery of the service.

The lowest rating is 0.00 and could be achieved under either of the following two situations:

- If 100% of the respondents were positively satisfied with the delivery of the service
- If none (0%) of the respondents selected the service as one of the three most important areas.

## Interpreting the Ratings

Ratings that are greater than or equal to 0.20 identify areas that should receive significantly more emphasis. Ratings from 0.10 to 0.20 identify service areas that should receive increased emphasis. Ratings less than 0.10 should continue to receive the current level of emphasis.

- Definitely Increase Emphasis (I-S > 0.20)
- Increase Current Emphasis (I-S = 0.10 - 0.20)
- Maintain Current Emphasis (I-S < 0.10)

Tables showing the results for the City of Washougal are provided on the following pages.



# Importance-Satisfaction Rating

## City of Washougal

### OVERALL

Category of Service	Most Important %	Most Important Rank	Satisfaction %	Satisfaction Rank	Importance-Satisfaction Rating	I-S Rating Rank
<b><u>Very High Priority (IS &gt;.20)</u></b>						
Quality of city water utilities	49%	1	33%	10	0.3276	1
Effectiveness of economic development efforts	33%	3	27%	11	0.2416	2
Maintenance of city streets	42%	2	45%	7	0.2316	3
<b><u>High Priority (IS .10-.20)</u></b>						
Enforcement of city codes and ordinances	22%	6	35%	9	0.1411	4
Quality of city parks	27%	5	59%	4	0.1123	5
Quality of city sewer services	20%	7	47%	6	0.1055	6
Effectiveness of communication with the public	19%	8	43%	8	0.1055	7
<b><u>Medium Priority (IS &lt;.10)</u></b>						
Quality of police services	29%	4	72%	2	0.0806	8
Effectiveness of management of storm water runoff	10%	10	50%	5	0.0480	9
Quality of fire/emergency medical/ambulance svcs.	18%	9	83%	1	0.0306	10
Quality of customer service from city employees	6%	11	61%	3	0.0238	11

**Note:** The I-S Rating is calculated by multiplying the "Most Important" % by (1-'Satisfaction' %)

**Most Important %:**

The "Most Important" percentage represents the sum of the first, second and third most important responses for each item. Respondents were asked to identify the items they thought were most important for the City to emphasize.

**Satisfaction %:**

The "Satisfaction" percentage represents the sum of the ratings "4" and "5" excluding 'don't knows.' Respondents ranked their level of satisfaction with each of the items on a scale of 1 to 5 with "5" being very satisfied and "1" being very dissatisfied.

© 2022 DirectionFinder by ETC Institute

## Importance-Satisfaction Rating

### City of Washougal

### Parks

Category of Service	Most Important %	Most Important Rank	Satisfaction %	Satisfaction Rank	Importance-Satisfaction Rating	I-S Rating Rank
<b><i>Very High Priority (IS &gt;.20)</i></b>						
Appearance/maintenance of existing City parks	64%	1	56%	2	0.2794	1
Quality of facilities (picnic shelters, etc.)	52%	2	56%	1	0.2275	2
<b><i>High Priority (IS .10-.20)</i></b>						
Number of City parks	36%	3	47%	4	0.1887	3
Quality of outdoor athletic fields	26%	4	55%	3	0.1166	4

**Note: The I-S Rating is calculated by multiplying the "Most Important" % by (1-'Satisfaction' %)**

**Most Important %:**

The "Most Important" percentage represents the sum of the first and second most important responses for each item. Respondents were asked to identify the items they thought were most important for the City to emphasize.

**Satisfaction %:**

The "Satisfaction" percentage represents the sum of the ratings "4" and "5" excluding 'don't knows.' Respondents ranked their level of satisfaction with each of the items on a scale of 1 to 5 with "5" being very satisfied and "1" being very dissatisfied.

© 2022 DirectionFinder by ETC Institute

# Importance-Satisfaction Rating

## City of Washougal

### Public Safety

Category of Service	Most Important %	Most Important Rank	Satisfaction %	Satisfaction Rank	Importance-Satisfaction Rating	I-S Rating Rank
<b><u>Very High Priority (IS &gt;.20)</u></b>						
The city's overall efforts to prevent crime	50%	1	54%	7	0.2295	1
<b><u>High Priority (IS .10-.20)</u></b>						
The visibility of police in the community	35%	2	59%	6	0.1439	2
<b><u>Medium Priority (IS &lt;.10)</u></b>						
Enforcement of local traffic laws	18%	3	52%	8	0.0850	3
Quality of animal control	12%	6	46%	9	0.0648	4
How quickly police respond to emergencies	16%	4	63%	5	0.0599	5
Parking enforcement services	9%	8	45%	10	0.0506	6
Quality of local fire protection and rescue svcs.	14%	5	77%	1	0.0329	7
How quickly fire and rescue personnel respond	11%	7	76%	2	0.0262	8
How quickly ambulance personnel respond	8%	9	69%	4	0.0236	9
Quality of local ambulance service	5%	10	71%	3	0.0131	10

**Note: The I-S Rating is calculated by multiplying the "Most Important" % by (1-'Satisfaction' %)**

**Most Important %:**

The "Most Important" percentage represents the sum of the first and second most important responses for each item. Respondents were asked to identify the items they thought were most important for the City to emphasize.

**Satisfaction %:**

The "Satisfaction" percentage represents the sum of the ratings "4" and "5" excluding 'don't knows.' Respondents ranked their level of satisfaction with each of the items on a scale of 1 to 5 with "5" being very satisfied and "1" being very dissatisfied.

© 2022 DirectionFinder by ETC Institute

# Importance-Satisfaction Rating

## City of Washougal

### Communication

Category of Service	Most Important %	Most Important Rank	Satisfaction %	Satisfaction Rank	Importance-Satisfaction Rating	I-S Rating Rank
<b><u>Very High Priority (IS &gt;.20)</u></b>						
Efforts to keep you informed about local issues	54%	1	29%	3	0.3848	1
Level of public involvement in decision making	37%	3	19%	6	0.2965	2
Availability of info about city programs/services	40%	2	34%	2	0.2660	3
<b><u>High Priority (IS .10-.20)</u></b>						
City e-mail information update service	17%	4	24%	5	0.1277	4
Timeliness of information provided by the city	16%	5	29%	4	0.1108	5
<b><u>Medium Priority (IS &lt;.10)</u></b>						
Overall quality of the city's website	10%	6	38%	1	0.0595	6

**Note: The I-S Rating is calculated by multiplying the "Most Important" % by (1-'Satisfaction' %)**

**Most Important %:**

The "Most Important" percentage represents the sum of the first and second most important responses for each item. Respondents were asked to identify the items they thought were most important for the City to emphasize.

**Satisfaction %:**

The "Satisfaction" percentage represents the sum of the ratings "4" and "5" excluding 'don't knows.' Respondents ranked their level of satisfaction with each of the items on a scale of 1 to 5 with "5" being very satisfied and "1" being very dissatisfied.

© 2022 DirectionFinder by ETC Institute

# Importance-Satisfaction Rating

## City of Washougal

### Streets

Category of Service	Most Important %	Most Important Rank	Satisfaction %	Satisfaction Rank	Importance-Satisfaction Rating	I-S Rating Rank
<b><u>Very High Priority (IS &gt;.20)</u></b>						
Condition of sidewalks in the City	36%	3	39%	5	0.2184	1
Maintenance of major City streets	47%	1	54%	2	0.2162	2
<b><u>High Priority (IS .10-.20)</u></b>						
Mowing & trimming along streets/other public areas	34%	4	42%	4	0.1966	3
Maintenance of streets in your neighborhood	40%	2	51%	3	0.1965	4
<b><u>Medium Priority (IS &lt;.10)</u></b>						
Adequacy of City street lighting	23%	5	57%	1	0.0989	5

**Note: The I-S Rating is calculated by multiplying the "Most Important" % by (1-'Satisfaction' %)**

**Most Important %:**

The "Most Important" percentage represents the sum of the first and second most important responses for each item. Respondents were asked to identify the items they thought were most important for the City to emphasize.

**Satisfaction %:**

The "Satisfaction" percentage represents the sum of the ratings "4" and "5" excluding 'don't knows.' Respondents ranked their level of satisfaction with each of the items on a scale of 1 to 5 with "5" being very satisfied and "1" being very dissatisfied.

© 2022 DirectionFinder by ETC Institute

## Importance-Satisfaction Rating

### City of Washougal

### Code Enforcement

Category of Service	Most Important %	Most Important Rank	Satisfaction %	Satisfaction Rank	Importance-Satisfaction Rating	I-S Rating Rank
<b><u>Very High Priority (IS &gt;.20)</u></b>						
Enforcing cleanup of litter/debris	63%	1	21%	4	0.4985	1
Enforcing codes designed to protect public safety	46%	2	28%	1	0.3312	2
Enforcing mowing/trimming of grass/weeds	36%	3	22%	3	0.2769	3
<b><u>High Priority (IS .10-.20)</u></b>						
Enforcing sign regulation	22%	4	25%	2	0.1620	4

**Note: The I-S Rating is calculated by multiplying the "Most Important" % by (1-'Satisfaction' %)**

**Most Important %:**

The "Most Important" percentage represents the sum of the first and second most important responses for each item. Respondents were asked to identify the items they thought were most important for the City to emphasize.

**Satisfaction %:**

The "Satisfaction" percentage represents the sum of the ratings "4" and "5" excluding 'don't knows.' Respondents ranked their level of satisfaction with each of the items on a scale of 1 to 5 with "5" being very satisfied and "1" being very dissatisfied.

© 2022 DirectionFinder by ETC Institute

# Importance-Satisfaction Analysis



## Importance-Satisfaction Matrix Analysis

The Importance-Satisfaction rating is based on the concept that public agencies will maximize overall customer satisfaction by emphasizing improvements in those areas where the level of satisfaction is relatively low, and the perceived importance of the service is relatively high. ETC Institute developed an Importance-Satisfaction Matrix to display the perceived importance of major services that were assessed on the survey against the perceived quality of service delivery. The two axes on the matrix represent Satisfaction (vertical) and relative Importance (horizontal).

The I-S (Importance-Satisfaction) matrix should be interpreted as follows.


- **Continued Emphasis (above average importance and above average satisfaction).** This area shows where the City is meeting customer expectations. Items in this area have a significant impact on the customer's overall level of satisfaction. The City should maintain (or slightly increase) emphasis on items in this area.
- **Exceeding Expectations (below average importance and above average satisfaction).** This area shows where the City is performing significantly better than customers expect the City to perform. Items in this area do not significantly affect the overall level of satisfaction that residents have with City services. The City should maintain (or slightly decrease) emphasis on items in this area.
- **Opportunities for Improvement (above average importance and below average satisfaction).** This area shows where the City is not performing as well as residents expect the City to perform. This area has a significant impact on customer satisfaction, and the City should DEFINITELY increase emphasis on items in this area.
- **Less Important (below average importance and below average satisfaction).** This area shows where the City is not performing well relative to its performance in other areas; however, this area is generally considered to be less important to residents. This area does not significantly affect overall satisfaction with City services because the items are less important to residents. The agency should maintain current levels of emphasis on items in this area.

Matrix charts showing the results for the City of Washougal are provided on the following pages.

# 2022 City of Washougal DirectionFinder Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix

## -Overall-

(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)






# 2022 City of Washougal DirectionFinder Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix

## -Parks-


(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)



# 2022 City of Washougal DirectionFinder Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix

## -Public Safety-


(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)



# 2022 City of Washougal DirectionFinder Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix

## -Communication-


(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)



# 2022 City of Washougal DirectionFinder Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix

## -Streets-


(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)



# 2022 City of Washougal DirectionFinder Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix

## -Code Enforcement-

(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)





# 4

# Tabular Data

**Q1. Major categories of services provided by the City of Washougal are listed below. Please rate each item using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied."**

(N=513)

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't know
Q1-1. Overall quality of police services	26.3%	39.4%	20.3%	5.1%	0.6%	8.4%
Q1-2. Overall quality of fire, emergency medical & ambulance services	32.6%	38.8%	12.9%	1.2%	0.4%	14.2%
Q1-3. Overall quality of City parks	11.3%	44.6%	25.9%	10.7%	1.9%	5.5%
Q1-4. Overall maintenance of City streets	7.0%	37.4%	25.9%	23.0%	6.0%	0.6%
Q1-5. Overall quality of City water utilities	7.0%	25.5%	20.3%	19.7%	24.2%	3.3%
Q1-6. Overall quality of City sewer services	9.7%	33.5%	26.3%	12.3%	10.9%	7.2%
Q1-7. Overall effectiveness of City management of storm water runoff	8.0%	35.3%	28.1%	8.8%	7.0%	12.9%
Q1-8. Overall enforcement of City codes & ordinances	7.4%	22.4%	37.0%	15.0%	5.5%	12.7%
Q1-9. Overall quality of customer service you receive from City employees	18.3%	35.7%	29.0%	4.1%	1.6%	11.3%
Q1-10. Overall effectiveness of City communication with the public	8.2%	32.2%	36.5%	15.4%	2.7%	5.1%
Q1-11. Overall effectiveness of City economic development efforts	4.5%	19.7%	36.1%	20.5%	7.8%	11.5%

**WITHOUT "DON'T KNOW"**

**Q1. Major categories of services provided by the City of Washougal are listed below. Please rate each item using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (without "don't know")**

(N=513)

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
Q1-1. Overall quality of police services	28.7%	43.0%	22.1%	5.5%	0.6%
Q1-2. Overall quality of fire, emergency medical & ambulance services	38.0%	45.2%	15.0%	1.4%	0.5%
Q1-3. Overall quality of City parks	12.0%	47.2%	27.4%	11.3%	2.1%
Q1-4. Overall maintenance of City streets	7.1%	37.6%	26.1%	23.1%	6.1%
Q1-5. Overall quality of City water utilities	7.3%	26.4%	21.0%	20.4%	25.0%
Q1-6. Overall quality of City sewer services	10.5%	36.1%	28.4%	13.2%	11.8%
Q1-7. Overall effectiveness of City management of storm water runoff	9.2%	40.5%	32.2%	10.1%	8.1%
Q1-8. Overall enforcement of City codes & ordinances	8.5%	25.7%	42.4%	17.2%	6.3%
Q1-9. Overall quality of customer service you receive from City employees	20.7%	40.2%	32.7%	4.6%	1.8%
Q1-10. Overall effectiveness of City communication with the public	8.6%	33.9%	38.4%	16.2%	2.9%
Q1-11. Overall effectiveness of City economic development efforts	5.1%	22.2%	40.7%	23.1%	8.8%



**Q2. Which THREE of the items listed in Question 1 do you think should receive the MOST EMPHASIS from City leaders over the next TWO years?**

<u>Q2. Top choice</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Overall quality of police services	75	14.6 %
Overall quality of fire, emergency medical & ambulance services	26	5.1 %
Overall quality of City parks	37	7.2 %
Overall maintenance of City streets	68	13.3 %
Overall quality of City water utilities	156	30.4 %
Overall quality of City sewer services	8	1.6 %
Overall effectiveness of City management of storm water runoff	9	1.8 %
Overall enforcement of City codes & ordinances	26	5.1 %
Overall quality of customer service you receive from City employees	4	0.8 %
Overall effectiveness of City communication with the public	14	2.7 %
Overall effectiveness of City economic development efforts	62	12.1 %
None chosen	28	5.5 %
Total	513	100.0 %

**Q2. Which THREE of the items listed in Question 1 do you think should receive the MOST EMPHASIS from City leaders over the next TWO years?**

<u>Q2. 2nd choice</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Overall quality of police services	41	8.0 %
Overall quality of fire, emergency medical & ambulance services	39	7.6 %
Overall quality of City parks	50	9.7 %
Overall maintenance of City streets	72	14.0 %
Overall quality of City water utilities	58	11.3 %
Overall quality of City sewer services	61	11.9 %
Overall effectiveness of City management of storm water runoff	16	3.1 %
Overall enforcement of City codes & ordinances	36	7.0 %
Overall quality of customer service you receive from City employees	9	1.8 %
Overall effectiveness of City communication with the public	33	6.4 %
Overall effectiveness of City economic development efforts	54	10.5 %
None chosen	44	8.6 %
Total	513	100.0 %

**Q2. Which THREE of the items listed in Question 1 do you think should receive the MOST EMPHASIS from City leaders over the next TWO years?**

<u>Q2. 3rd choice</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Overall quality of police services	32	6.2 %
Overall quality of fire, emergency medical & ambulance services	27	5.3 %
Overall quality of City parks	54	10.5 %
Overall maintenance of City streets	76	14.8 %
Overall quality of City water utilities	37	7.2 %
Overall quality of City sewer services	33	6.4 %
Overall effectiveness of City management of storm water runoff	24	4.7 %
Overall enforcement of City codes & ordinances	49	9.6 %
Overall quality of customer service you receive from City employees	18	3.5 %
Overall effectiveness of City communication with the public	48	9.4 %
Overall effectiveness of City economic development efforts	54	10.5 %
None chosen	61	11.9 %
Total	513	100.0 %

**SUM OF TOP 3 CHOICES**

**Q2. Which THREE of the items listed in Question 1 do you think should receive the MOST EMPHASIS from City leaders over the next TWO years? (top 3)**

<u>Q2. Sum of top 3 choices</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Overall quality of police services	148	28.8 %
Overall quality of fire, emergency medical & ambulance services	92	17.9 %
Overall quality of City parks	141	27.5 %
Overall maintenance of City streets	216	42.1 %
Overall quality of City water utilities	251	48.9 %
Overall quality of City sewer services	102	19.9 %
Overall effectiveness of City management of storm water runoff	49	9.6 %
Overall enforcement of City codes & ordinances	111	21.6 %
Overall quality of customer service you receive from City employees	31	6.0 %
Overall effectiveness of City communication with the public	95	18.5 %
Overall effectiveness of City economic development efforts	170	33.1 %
None chosen	28	5.5 %
Total	1434	

**Q3. Several items that may influence your perception of the City of Washougal are listed below. Please rate each item using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied."**

(N=513)

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't know
Q3-1. Overall quality of services provided by City of Washougal	6.6%	44.6%	34.7%	7.2%	1.6%	5.3%
Q3-2. Overall value that you receive for your City tax dollars & fees	3.5%	25.9%	30.4%	26.1%	10.3%	3.7%
Q3-3. Overall image of City	5.7%	33.5%	32.7%	22.0%	4.3%	1.8%
Q3-4. How well City is managing growth & development	2.3%	19.9%	30.4%	30.8%	11.3%	5.3%
Q3-5. Overall quality of life in City	13.1%	46.2%	27.9%	9.7%	1.2%	1.9%
Q3-6. Overall feeling of safety in City	17.9%	49.1%	17.5%	11.5%	2.7%	1.2%
Q3-7. Availability of job opportunities	3.1%	11.7%	37.6%	15.2%	3.9%	28.5%
Q3-8. Overall quality of new development	2.9%	21.8%	33.7%	23.4%	9.7%	8.4%
Q3-9. Appearance of residential property in City	3.7%	32.9%	38.0%	19.5%	3.7%	2.1%
Q3-10. Appearance of commercial property in City	2.7%	31.4%	39.8%	21.2%	3.5%	1.4%

**WITHOUT "DON'T KNOW"**

**Q3. Several items that may influence your perception of the City of Washougal are listed below. Please rate each item using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (without "don't know")**

(N=513)

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
Q3-1. Overall quality of services provided by City of Washougal	7.0%	47.1%	36.6%	7.6%	1.6%
Q3-2. Overall value that you receive for your City tax dollars & fees	3.6%	26.9%	31.6%	27.1%	10.7%
Q3-3. Overall image of City	5.8%	34.1%	33.3%	22.4%	4.4%
Q3-4. How well City is managing growth & development	2.5%	21.0%	32.1%	32.5%	11.9%
Q3-5. Overall quality of life in City	13.3%	47.1%	28.4%	9.9%	1.2%
Q3-6. Overall feeling of safety in City	18.1%	49.7%	17.8%	11.6%	2.8%
Q3-7. Availability of job opportunities	4.4%	16.3%	52.6%	21.3%	5.4%
Q3-8. Overall quality of new development	3.2%	23.8%	36.8%	25.5%	10.6%
Q3-9. Appearance of residential property in City	3.8%	33.7%	38.8%	19.9%	3.8%
Q3-10. Appearance of commercial property in City	2.8%	31.8%	40.3%	21.5%	3.6%

**Q4. Please rate your satisfaction with each of the Parks and Recreation items listed below using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied."**

(N=513)

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't know
Q4-1. Quality of facilities such as picnic shelters & playgrounds in City parks	7.6%	43.9%	26.1%	11.9%	1.6%	9.0%
Q4-2. Quality of outdoor athletic fields (e.g., baseball, soccer, & football)	9.2%	36.6%	27.1%	9.0%	2.3%	15.8%
Q4-3. Appearance & maintenance of existing City parks	8.0%	44.4%	26.3%	14.0%	1.6%	5.7%
Q4-4. Number of City parks	8.6%	35.1%	26.7%	18.7%	3.7%	7.2%

**WITHOUT "DON'T KNOW"**

**Q4. Please rate your satisfaction with each of the Parks and Recreation items listed below using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (without "don't know")**

(N=513)

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
Q4-1. Quality of facilities such as picnic shelters & playgrounds in City parks	8.4%	48.2%	28.7%	13.1%	1.7%
Q4-2. Quality of outdoor athletic fields (e.g., baseball, soccer, & football)	10.9%	43.5%	32.2%	10.6%	2.8%
Q4-3. Appearance & maintenance of existing City parks	8.5%	47.1%	27.9%	14.9%	1.7%
Q4-4. Number of City parks	9.2%	37.8%	28.8%	20.2%	4.0%

**Q5. Which TWO of the Parks and Recreation items listed in Question 4 do you think should receive the MOST EMPHASIS from City leaders over the next TWO years?**

Q5. Top choice	Number	Percent
Quality of facilities such as picnic shelters & playgrounds in City parks	122	23.8 %
Quality of outdoor athletic fields (e.g. baseball, soccer, & football)	72	14.0 %
Appearance & maintenance of existing City parks	176	34.3 %
Number of City parks	89	17.3 %
None chosen	54	10.5 %
Total	513	100.0 %

**Q5. Which TWO of the Parks and Recreation items listed in Question 4 do you think should receive the MOST EMPHASIS from City leaders over the next TWO years?**

Q5. 2nd choice	Number	Percent
Quality of facilities such as picnic shelters & playgrounds in City parks	143	27.9 %
Quality of outdoor athletic fields (e.g. baseball, soccer, & football)	61	11.9 %
Appearance & maintenance of existing City parks	150	29.2 %
Number of City parks	94	18.3 %
None chosen	65	12.7 %
Total	513	100.0 %

**SUM OF TOP 2 CHOICES**

**Q5. Which TWO of the Parks and Recreation items listed in Question 4 do you think should receive the MOST EMPHASIS from City leaders over the next TWO years? (top 2)**

Q5. Sum of top 2 choices	Number	Percent
Quality of facilities such as picnic shelters & playgrounds in City parks	265	51.7 %
Quality of outdoor athletic fields (e.g. baseball, soccer, & football)	133	25.9 %
Appearance & maintenance of existing City parks	326	63.5 %
Number of City parks	183	35.7 %
None chosen	54	10.5 %
Total	961	

**Q6. Please rate your satisfaction with each of the following public safety items using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied".**

(N=513)

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't know
Q6-1. Visibility of police in the community	16.4%	40.9%	25.0%	13.1%	3.3%	1.4%
Q6-2. City's overall efforts to prevent crime	9.7%	39.4%	28.7%	10.9%	2.7%	8.6%
Q6-3. Enforcement of local traffic laws	9.6%	39.2%	26.7%	12.9%	5.1%	6.6%
Q6-4. Parking enforcement services	8.6%	27.9%	31.2%	10.5%	3.1%	18.7%
Q6-5. How quickly police respond to emergencies	16.2%	30.2%	21.1%	4.7%	1.2%	26.7%
Q6-6. Overall quality of local fire protection & rescue services	25.0%	38.6%	16.8%	1.4%	0.8%	17.5%
Q6-7. How quickly fire & rescue personnel respond to emergencies	24.6%	33.1%	14.8%	2.3%	1.0%	24.2%
Q6-8. Quality of local ambulance service	21.1%	29.2%	18.7%	1.2%	0.6%	29.2%
Q6-9. How quickly ambulance personnel respond to emergencies	21.2%	26.1%	19.1%	2.3%	0.8%	30.4%
Q6-10. Quality of animal control	10.1%	23.4%	29.0%	7.8%	3.9%	25.7%

**WITHOUT "DON'T KNOW"**

**Q6. Please rate your satisfaction with each of the following public safety items using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied". (without "don't know")**

(N=513)

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
Q6-1. Visibility of police in the community	16.6%	41.5%	25.3%	13.2%	3.4%
Q6-2. City's overall efforts to prevent crime	10.7%	43.1%	31.3%	11.9%	3.0%
Q6-3. Enforcement of local traffic laws	10.2%	42.0%	28.6%	13.8%	5.4%
Q6-4. Parking enforcement services	10.6%	34.3%	38.4%	12.9%	3.8%
Q6-5. How quickly police respond to emergencies	22.1%	41.2%	28.7%	6.4%	1.6%
Q6-6. Overall quality of local fire protection & rescue services	30.3%	46.8%	20.3%	1.7%	0.9%
Q6-7. How quickly fire & rescue personnel respond to emergencies	32.4%	43.7%	19.5%	3.1%	1.3%
Q6-8. Quality of local ambulance service	29.8%	41.3%	26.4%	1.7%	0.8%
Q6-9. How quickly ambulance personnel respond to emergencies	30.5%	37.5%	27.5%	3.4%	1.1%
Q6-10. Quality of animal control	13.6%	31.5%	39.1%	10.5%	5.2%



**Q7. Which TWO of the public safety items listed in Question 6 do you think should receive the MOST EMPHASIS from City leaders over the next TWO years?**

Q7. Top choice	Number	Percent
Visibility of police in the community	102	19.9 %
City's overall efforts to prevent crime	159	31.0 %
Enforcement of local traffic laws	50	9.7 %
Parking enforcement services	18	3.5 %
How quickly police respond to emergencies	42	8.2 %
Overall quality of local fire protection & rescue services	27	5.3 %
How quickly fire & rescue personnel respond to emergencies	25	4.9 %
Quality of local ambulance service	6	1.2 %
How quickly ambulance personnel respond to emergencies	7	1.4 %
Quality of animal control	30	5.8 %
None chosen	47	9.2 %
Total	513	100.0 %

**Q7. Which TWO of the public safety items listed in Question 6 do you think should receive the MOST EMPHASIS from City leaders over the next TWO years?**

Q7. 2nd choice	Number	Percent
Visibility of police in the community	78	15.2 %
City's overall efforts to prevent crime	97	18.9 %
Enforcement of local traffic laws	41	8.0 %
Parking enforcement services	29	5.7 %
How quickly police respond to emergencies	41	8.0 %
Overall quality of local fire protection & rescue services	46	9.0 %
How quickly fire & rescue personnel respond to emergencies	31	6.0 %
Quality of local ambulance service	17	3.3 %
How quickly ambulance personnel respond to emergencies	32	6.2 %
Quality of animal control	32	6.2 %
None chosen	69	13.5 %
Total	513	100.0 %

**SUM OF TOP 2 CHOICES**

**Q7. Which TWO of the public safety items listed in Question 6 do you think should receive the MOST EMPHASIS from City leaders over the next TWO years? (top 2)**

Q7. Sum of top 2 choices	Number	Percent
Visibility of police in the community	180	35.1 %
City's overall efforts to prevent crime	256	49.9 %
Enforcement of local traffic laws	91	17.7 %
Parking enforcement services	47	9.2 %
How quickly police respond to emergencies	83	16.2 %
Overall quality of local fire protection & rescue services	73	14.2 %
How quickly fire & rescue personnel respond to emergencies	56	10.9 %
Quality of local ambulance service	23	4.5 %
How quickly ambulance personnel respond to emergencies	39	7.6 %
Quality of animal control	62	12.1 %
None chosen	47	9.2 %
Total	957	

**Q8. Which of the following would be your preferred way(s) to receive news and information about City programs, services, and events?**

Q8. Your preferred way(s) to receive news & information about City programs, services, & events	Number	Percent
City website	200	39.0 %
City social media (Facebook, Twitter)	166	32.4 %
Public meetings (e.g. open houses, community forums)	106	20.7 %
City email update service	252	49.1 %
Newsletter or other insert inside utility bill envelope	267	52.0 %
Other	18	3.5 %
Total	1009	

**Q8-6. Other**

Q8-6. Other	Number	Percent
Mail	5	27.8 %
River Talk	2	11.1 %
Post Record	2	11.1 %
River Talk provides a lot more information than Facebook	1	5.6 %
Email	1	5.6 %
Text, in emergencies	1	5.6 %
Monthly magazine	1	5.6 %
Weekly newspaper	1	5.6 %
Flyers	1	5.6 %
Send out a monthly flyer talking about local events	1	5.6 %
Banners	1	5.6 %
Town Hall meetings	1	5.6 %
Total	18	100.0 %

**Q9. Please rate your satisfaction with each of the following items concerning City communication using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied."**

(N=513)

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't know
Q9-1. Availability of information about City programs & services	3.1%	27.1%	35.5%	21.8%	2.7%	9.7%
Q9-2. City efforts to keep you informed about local issues	3.5%	23.4%	36.1%	24.4%	4.9%	7.8%
Q9-3. Overall quality of City's website	2.5%	26.9%	36.6%	9.7%	1.4%	22.8%
Q9-4. Level of public involvement in local decision making	1.8%	13.3%	38.2%	19.3%	7.4%	20.1%
Q9-5. Timeliness of information provided by City	2.1%	21.4%	41.5%	13.5%	2.7%	18.7%
Q9-6. City email information update service	2.5%	12.7%	34.5%	11.9%	2.9%	35.5%

**WITHOUT "DON'T KNOW"**

**Q9. Please rate your satisfaction with each of the following items concerning City communication using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (without "don't know")**

(N=513)

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
Q9-1. Availability of information about City programs & services	3.5%	30.0%	39.3%	24.2%	3.0%
Q9-2. City efforts to keep you informed about local issues	3.8%	25.4%	39.1%	26.4%	5.3%
Q9-3. Overall quality of City's website	3.3%	34.8%	47.5%	12.6%	1.8%
Q9-4. Level of public involvement in local decision making	2.2%	16.6%	47.8%	24.1%	9.3%
Q9-5. Timeliness of information provided by City	2.6%	26.4%	51.1%	16.5%	3.4%
Q9-6. City email information update service	3.9%	19.6%	53.5%	18.4%	4.5%

**Q10. Which TWO of the communication items listed in Question 9 do you think should receive the MOST EMPHASIS from City leaders over the next TWO years?**

Q10. Top choice	Number	Percent
Availability of information about City programs & services	136	26.5 %
City efforts to keep you informed about local issues	142	27.7 %
Overall quality of City's website	22	4.3 %
Level of public involvement in local decision making	94	18.3 %
Timeliness of information provided by City	22	4.3 %
City email information update service	37	7.2 %
None chosen	60	11.7 %
Total	513	100.0 %

**Q10. Which TWO of the communication items listed in Question 9 do you think should receive the MOST EMPHASIS from City leaders over the next TWO years?**

Q10. 2nd choice	Number	Percent
Availability of information about City programs & services	71	13.8 %
City efforts to keep you informed about local issues	136	26.5 %
Overall quality of City's website	27	5.3 %
Level of public involvement in local decision making	94	18.3 %
Timeliness of information provided by City	58	11.3 %
City email information update service	49	9.6 %
None chosen	78	15.2 %
Total	513	100.0 %

**SUM OF TOP 2 CHOICES**

**Q10. Which TWO of the communication items listed in Question 9 do you think should receive the MOST EMPHASIS from City leaders over the next TWO years? (top 2)**

Q10. Sum of top 2 choices	Number	Percent
Availability of information about City programs & services	207	40.4 %
City efforts to keep you informed about local issues	278	54.2 %
Overall quality of City's website	49	9.6 %
Level of public involvement in local decision making	188	36.6 %
Timeliness of information provided by City	80	15.6 %
City email information update service	86	16.8 %
None chosen	60	11.7 %
Total	948	

**Q11. Please rate your satisfaction with each of the following items concerning City streets using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied."**

(N=513)

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't know
Q11-1. Maintenance of major City streets	7.0%	46.6%	21.4%	17.7%	5.8%	1.4%
Q11-2. Maintenance of streets in your neighborhood	10.9%	39.2%	18.9%	17.7%	11.9%	1.4%
Q11-3. Mowing & trimming along City streets & other public areas	6.4%	34.1%	29.6%	18.5%	8.6%	2.7%
Q11-4. Adequacy of City street lighting	9.4%	46.0%	27.7%	12.3%	2.7%	1.9%
Q11-5. Condition of sidewalks in City	5.1%	31.8%	29.0%	20.5%	8.4%	5.3%

**WITHOUT "DON'T KNOW"**

**Q11. Please rate your satisfaction with each of the following items concerning City streets using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (without "don't know")**

(N=513)

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
Q11-1. Maintenance of major City streets	7.1%	47.2%	21.7%	18.0%	5.9%
Q11-2. Maintenance of streets in your neighborhood	11.1%	39.7%	19.2%	18.0%	12.1%
Q11-3. Mowing & trimming along City streets & other public areas	6.6%	35.1%	30.5%	19.0%	8.8%
Q11-4. Adequacy of City street lighting	9.5%	46.9%	28.2%	12.5%	2.8%
Q11-5. Condition of sidewalks in City	5.3%	33.5%	30.7%	21.6%	8.8%

**Q12. Which TWO of the street related items listed in Question 11 do you think should receive the MOST EMPHASIS from City leaders over the next TWO years?**

<u>Q12. Top choice</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Maintenance of major City streets	159	31.0 %
Maintenance of streets in your neighborhood	114	22.2 %
Mowing & trimming along City streets & other public areas	79	15.4 %
Adequacy of City street lighting	47	9.2 %
Condition of sidewalks in City	73	14.2 %
None chosen	41	8.0 %
Total	513	100.0 %

**Q12. Which TWO of the street related items listed in Question 11 do you think should receive the MOST EMPHASIS from City leaders over the next TWO years?**

<u>Q12. 2nd choice</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Maintenance of major City streets	82	16.0 %
Maintenance of streets in your neighborhood	92	17.9 %
Mowing & trimming along City streets & other public areas	95	18.5 %
Adequacy of City street lighting	71	13.8 %
Condition of sidewalks in City	111	21.6 %
None chosen	62	12.1 %
Total	513	100.0 %

**SUM OF TOP 2 CHOICES**

**Q12. Which TWO of the street related items listed in Question 11 do you think should receive the MOST EMPHASIS from City leaders over the next TWO years? (top 2)**

<u>Q12. Sum of top 2 choices</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Maintenance of major City streets	241	47.0 %
Maintenance of streets in your neighborhood	206	40.2 %
Mowing & trimming along City streets & other public areas	174	33.9 %
Adequacy of City street lighting	118	23.0 %
Condition of sidewalks in City	184	35.9 %
None chosen	41	8.0 %
Total	964	

**Q13. Land Development. Using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Much Too Slow" and 1 means "Much Too Fast," please rate the city's current pace of development in each of the following areas.**

(N=513)

	Much too slow	Too slow	Just right	Too fast	Much too fast	Don't know
Q13-1. Office development	2.1%	16.6%	33.3%	9.0%	6.0%	32.9%
Q13-2. Industrial development	2.5%	15.6%	43.3%	7.6%	3.7%	27.3%
Q13-3. Multi-family residential development	1.6%	9.4%	24.6%	25.3%	25.5%	13.6%
Q13-4. Single-family residential development	3.5%	12.1%	35.7%	21.6%	13.1%	14.0%
Q13-5. Retail development	21.2%	37.0%	22.2%	3.5%	3.5%	12.5%

**WITHOUT "DON'T KNOW"**

**Q13. Land Development. Using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Much Too Slow" and 1 means "Much Too Fast," please rate the city's current pace of development in each of the following areas. (without "don't know")**

(N=513)

	Much too slow	Too slow	Just right	Too fast	Much too fast
Q13-1. Office development	3.2%	24.7%	49.7%	13.4%	9.0%
Q13-2. Industrial development	3.5%	21.4%	59.5%	10.5%	5.1%
Q13-3. Multi-family residential development	1.8%	10.8%	28.4%	29.3%	29.6%
Q13-4. Single-family residential development	4.1%	14.1%	41.5%	25.2%	15.2%
Q13-5. Retail development	24.3%	42.3%	25.4%	4.0%	4.0%



**Q14. Please rate your satisfaction with each of the code enforcement items listed below using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied."**

(N=513)

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't know
Q14-1. Enforcing cleanup of litter & debris on private property	2.3%	15.4%	31.4%	24.4%	13.5%	13.1%
Q14-2. Enforcing mowing & trimming of grass & weeds on private property	2.9%	15.8%	33.1%	23.4%	10.1%	14.6%
Q14-3. Enforcing codes designed to protect public safety & health	3.5%	19.1%	38.4%	13.3%	4.9%	20.9%
Q14-4. Enforcing sign regulation	2.7%	16.0%	39.0%	13.1%	5.8%	23.4%

**WITHOUT "DON'T KNOW"**

**Q14. Please rate your satisfaction with each of the code enforcement items listed below using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (without "don't know")**

(N=513)

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
Q14-1. Enforcing cleanup of litter & debris on private property	2.7%	17.7%	36.1%	28.0%	15.5%
Q14-2. Enforcing mowing & trimming of grass & weeds on private property	3.4%	18.5%	38.8%	27.4%	11.9%
Q14-3. Enforcing codes designed to protect public safety & health	4.4%	24.1%	48.5%	16.7%	6.2%
Q14-4. Enforcing sign regulation	3.6%	20.9%	50.9%	17.0%	7.6%

**Q15. Which TWO of the code enforcement items listed in Question 14 do you think should receive the MOST EMPHASIS from City leaders over the next TWO years?**

<u>Q15. Top choice</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Enforcing cleanup of litter & debris on private property	213	41.5 %
Enforcing mowing & trimming of grass & weeds on private property	56	10.9 %
Enforcing codes designed to protect public safety & health	130	25.3 %
Enforcing sign regulation	41	8.0 %
None chosen	73	14.2 %
Total	513	100.0 %

**Q15. Which TWO of the code enforcement items listed in Question 14 do you think should receive the MOST EMPHASIS from City leaders over the next TWO years?**

<u>Q15. 2nd choice</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Enforcing cleanup of litter & debris on private property	111	21.6 %
Enforcing mowing & trimming of grass & weeds on private property	126	24.6 %
Enforcing codes designed to protect public safety & health	106	20.7 %
Enforcing sign regulation	70	13.6 %
None chosen	100	19.5 %
Total	513	100.0 %

**SUM OF TOP 2 CHOICES**

**Q15. Which TWO of the code enforcement items listed in Question 16 do you think should receive the MOST EMPHASIS from City leaders over the next TWO years? (top 2)**

<u>Q15. Sum of top 2 choices</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Enforcing cleanup of litter & debris on private property	324	63.2 %
Enforcing mowing & trimming of grass & weeds on private property	182	35.5 %
Enforcing codes designed to protect public safety & health	236	46.0 %
Enforcing sign regulation	111	21.6 %
None chosen	73	14.2 %
Total	926	

**Q16. Have you called, emailed, or visited the City with a question, problem, or complaint during the past year?**

Q16. Have you called, emailed, or visited City with a question, problem, or complaint during past year	Number	Percent
Yes	222	43.3 %
No	291	56.7 %
Total	513	100.0 %

**Q16a. How easy was it to contact the person you needed to reach?**

Q16a. How easy was it to contact the person you needed to reach	Number	Percent
Very easy	73	32.9 %
Somewhat easy	91	41.0 %
Difficult	33	14.9 %
Very difficult	23	10.4 %
Don't know	2	0.9 %
Total	222	100.0 %

**WITHOUT "DON'T KNOW"****Q16a. How easy was it to contact the person you needed to reach? (without "don't know")**

Q16a. How easy was it to contact the person you needed to reach	Number	Percent
Very easy	73	33.2 %
Somewhat easy	91	41.4 %
Difficult	33	15.0 %
Very difficult	23	10.5 %
Total	220	100.0 %

**Q16b. What department did you contact?**

<u>Q16b. What department did you contact</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Police	44	19.8 %
Fire	9	4.1 %
Community Development	22	9.9 %
Parks	18	8.1 %
Event Permits	4	1.8 %
Utility Billing	72	32.4 %
Municipal Services (streets/water/sewer)	74	33.3 %
Other	47	21.2 %
Total	290	

**Q16b-8. Other**

<u>Q16b-8. Other</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Code Enforcement	14	29.8 %
Animal Control	8	17.0 %
Permitting Office	6	12.8 %
City Council	3	6.4 %
Tried to reach the person about a tree on my property	1	2.1 %
We needed a hazardous oak tree taken down but they wouldn't let us	1	2.1 %
Building Permits	1	2.1 %
City parcels not being taken care of, overgrowth onto sidewalks, etc.	1	2.1 %
Dog license	1	2.1 %
Road department	1	2.1 %
City Ordinance	1	2.1 %
Inquire about community center	1	2.1 %
Building codes	1	2.1 %
City Hall	1	2.1 %
Community garden	1	2.1 %
Speeding	1	2.1 %
911	1	2.1 %
Parking violations	1	2.1 %
Waste Management	1	2.1 %
Pool water hatching mosquitos	1	2.1 %
Total	47	100.0 %

**Q16c. Several factors that may influence your perception of the quality of customer service you receive from City employees are listed below. For each item, please rate how often the employees you have contacted during the past year have displayed the behavior described using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Always" and 1 means "Never."**

(N=222)

	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Seldom	Never	Don't know
Q16c-1. They were courteous & polite	47.3%	36.0%	7.2%	3.2%	1.4%	5.0%
Q16c-2. They gave prompt, accurate, & complete answers to questions	36.5%	31.5%	15.3%	8.1%	5.0%	3.6%
Q16c-3. They did what they said they would do in a timely manner	35.1%	25.2%	17.1%	5.4%	6.8%	10.4%
Q16c-4. They helped you resolve an issue to your satisfaction	31.5%	20.3%	19.8%	9.5%	12.6%	6.3%

**WITHOUT "DON'T KNOW"**

**Q16c. Several factors that may influence your perception of the quality of customer service you receive from City employees are listed below. For each item, please rate how often the employees you have contacted during the past year have displayed the behavior described using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Always" and 1 means "Never." (without "don't know")**

(N=222)

	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
Q16c-1. They were courteous & polite	49.8%	37.9%	7.6%	3.3%	1.4%
Q16c-2. They gave prompt, accurate, & complete answers to questions	37.9%	32.7%	15.9%	8.4%	5.1%
Q16c-3. They did what they said they would do in a timely manner	39.2%	28.1%	19.1%	6.0%	7.5%
Q16c-4. They helped you resolve an issue to your satisfaction	33.7%	21.6%	21.2%	10.1%	13.5%

**Q17. Expectations for Services. Using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means the level of service provided by the City "Should be Much Higher" than it is now and 1 means it "Should be Much Lower," please indicate how the level of service provided by the City should change in each of the areas listed below.**

(N=513)

	Should be much higher	Should be a little higher	Should stay the same	Should be a little lower	Should be much lower	Don't know
Q17-1. Law enforcement	11.1%	35.9%	40.7%	0.8%	0.8%	10.7%
Q17-2. Fire, EMS & ambulance	5.8%	22.8%	52.2%	0.6%	0.2%	18.3%
Q17-3. Parks & open space	11.1%	38.8%	39.6%	1.2%	0.2%	9.2%
Q17-4. Recreation facilities	12.5%	38.2%	36.3%	1.2%	0.2%	11.7%
Q17-5. Maintenance of infrastructure (streets, sidewalks)	23.6%	46.4%	24.8%	1.0%	0.4%	3.9%

**WITHOUT "DON'T KNOW"**

**Q17. Expectations for Services. Using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means the level of service provided by the City "Should be Much Higher" than it is now and 1 means it "Should be Much Lower," please indicate how the level of service provided by the City should change in each of the areas listed below. (without "don't know")**

(N=513)

	Should be much higher	Should be a little higher	Should stay the same	Should be a little lower	Should be much lower
Q17-1. Law enforcement	12.4%	40.2%	45.6%	0.9%	0.9%
Q17-2. Fire, EMS & ambulance	7.2%	27.9%	64.0%	0.7%	0.2%
Q17-3. Parks & open space	12.2%	42.7%	43.6%	1.3%	0.2%
Q17-4. Recreation facilities	14.1%	43.3%	41.1%	1.3%	0.2%
Q17-5. Maintenance of infrastructure (streets, sidewalks)	24.5%	48.3%	25.8%	1.0%	0.4%

**Q18. Would you be willing to pay more in taxes or fees to support an increase in the service level?**

Q18. Would you be willing to pay more in taxes or fees to support an increase in service level	Number	Percent
Yes, I would be willing to pay more in taxes or fees	139	27.1 %
No, I would not be willing to pay more in taxes or fees	256	49.9 %
Not applicable-I do not think any levels of service need to be higher	33	6.4 %
Don't know	85	16.6 %
Total	513	100.0 %

**WITHOUT "DON'T KNOW"****Q18. Would you be willing to pay more in taxes or fees to support an increase in the service level? (without "don't know")**

Q18. Would you be willing to pay more in taxes or fees to support an increase in service level	Number	Percent
Yes, I would be willing to pay more in taxes or fees	139	32.5 %
No, I would not be willing to pay more in taxes or fees	256	59.8 %
Not applicable-I do not think any levels of service need to be higher	33	7.7 %
Total	428	100.0 %

**Q19. Washington voters approved Initiative 502 in November 2012 to allow for the production, processing and retail sales of recreational marijuana. Cities have discretion to regulate or prohibit such uses within their jurisdiction. These uses have been prohibited in Washougal. Pursuant to State rules, the City could allow one marijuana retail store to be located within the City. Cities that allow production, processing and retail sales of marijuana receive a portion of the generated excise tax from the retail sales, which can be used for government services, including public safety. For example, in 2021 the City of Battle Ground received \$46,000. Please indicate if you support allowing the following uses in Washougal by circling YES or NO below.**

(N=513)

	Yes	No	Not provided
Q19-1. Marijuana Production	45.0%	50.3%	4.7%
Q19-2. Marijuana Processing	45.8%	49.5%	4.7%
Q19-3. Marijuana Retail Sales	54.2%	41.7%	4.1%

**WITHOUT "NOT PROVIDED"**

**Q19. Washington voters approved Initiative 502 in November 2012 to allow for the production, processing and retail sales of recreational marijuana. Cities have discretion to regulate or prohibit such uses within their jurisdiction. These uses have been prohibited in Washougal. Pursuant to State rules, the City could allow one marijuana retail store to be located within the City. Cities that allow production, processing and retail sales of marijuana receive a portion of the generated excise tax from the retail sales, which can be used for government services, including public safety. For example, in 2021 the City of Battle Ground received \$46,000. Please indicate if you support allowing the following uses in Washougal by circling YES or NO below. (without "not provided")**

(N=513)

	Yes	No
Q19-1. Marijuana Production	47.2%	52.8%
Q19-2. Marijuana Processing	48.1%	51.9%
Q19-3. Marijuana Retail Sales	56.5%	43.5%



**Q20. In 2017, the City Council passed an ordinance restricting the use of personal fireworks within City limits to "Safe and Sane" fireworks (which are those that do not fly, explode, or travel more than one foot into the air or more than six feet on the ground). These restrictions have been in effect since New Year's Eve 2018. Prior to enacting this restriction, all fireworks legal in the State of Washington were legal in Washougal, with limits on the times when they could be used. Vancouver has a complete ban on all personal fireworks. Camas allows personal fireworks that are allowed by the State of Washington, with limits on the times they can be used. Knowing this, which of the following statements reflects your preference regarding fireworks restrictions?**

Q20. Which statement reflects your preference regarding fireworks restrictions	Number	Percent
I support current restriction for safe & sane fireworks	172	33.5 %
I would support a complete ban on use of personal fireworks	172	33.5 %
I would support overturning current restriction & restoring previous allowance of all legal personal fireworks with limits on the times they can be used	160	31.2 %
Don't know	9	1.8 %
Total	513	100.0 %

### **WITHOUT "DON'T KNOW"**

**Q20. In 2017, the City Council passed an ordinance restricting the use of personal fireworks within City limits to "Safe and Sane" fireworks (which are those that do not fly, explode, or travel more than one foot into the air or more than six feet on the ground). These restrictions have been in effect since New Year's Eve 2018. Prior to enacting this restriction, all fireworks legal in the State of Washington were legal in Washougal, with limits on the times when they could be used. Vancouver has a complete ban on all personal fireworks. Camas allows personal fireworks that are allowed by the State of Washington, with limits on the times they can be used. Knowing this, which of the following statements reflects your preference regarding fireworks restrictions? (without "don't know")**

Q20. Which statement reflects your preference regarding fireworks restrictions	Number	Percent
I support current restriction for safe & sane fireworks	172	34.1 %
I would support a complete ban on use of personal fireworks	172	34.1 %
I would support overturning current restriction & restoring previous allowance of all legal personal fireworks with limits on the times they can be used	160	31.7 %
Total	504	100.0 %

**Q21a. Would you be willing to pay more in taxes or fees to support this new community amenity?**

Q21a. Would you be willing to pay more in taxes or fees to support this new community amenity	Number	Percent
Yes	169	62.4 %
No	85	31.4 %
Not provided	17	6.3 %
Total	271	100.0 %

**WITHOUT "NOT PROVIDED"****Q21a. Would you be willing to pay more in taxes or fees to support this new community amenity? (without "not provided")**

Q21a. Would you be willing to pay more in taxes or fees to support this new community amenity	Number	Percent
Yes	169	66.5 %
No	85	33.5 %
Total	254	100.0 %

**Q22. Approximately how many years have you lived in Washougal?**

Q22. How many years have you lived in Washougal	Number	Percent
0-5	119	23.2 %
6-10	97	18.9 %
11-15	60	11.7 %
16-20	82	16.0 %
21-30	73	14.2 %
31+	71	13.8 %
Not provided	11	2.1 %
Total	513	100.0 %

**WITHOUT "NOT PROVIDED"****Q22. Approximately how many years have you lived in Washougal? (without "not provided")**

Q22. How many years have you lived in Washougal	Number	Percent
0-5	119	23.7 %
6-10	97	19.3 %
11-15	60	12.0 %
16-20	82	16.3 %
21-30	73	14.5 %
31+	71	14.1 %
Total	502	100.0 %

**Q23. What is your age?**

Q23. Your age	Number	Percent
18-34	91	17.7 %
35-44	98	19.1 %
45-54	100	19.5 %
55-64	105	20.5 %
65+	110	21.4 %
Not provided	9	1.8 %
Total	513	100.0 %

**WITHOUT "NOT PROVIDED"****Q23. What is your age? (without "not provided")**

Q23. Your age	Number	Percent
18-34	91	18.1 %
35-44	98	19.4 %
45-54	100	19.8 %
55-64	105	20.8 %
65+	110	21.8 %
Total	504	100.0 %

**Q24. How many children under age 18 live in your household?**

Q24. How many children under age 18 live in your household	Number	Percent
0	311	60.6 %
1	88	17.2 %
2	67	13.1 %
3	22	4.3 %
4+	8	1.6 %
Not provided	17	3.3 %
Total	513	100.0 %

**WITHOUT "NOT PROVIDED"****Q24. How many children under age 18 live in your household? (without "not provided")**

Q24. How many children under age 18 live in your household	Number	Percent
0	311	62.7 %
1	88	17.7 %
2	67	13.5 %
3	22	4.4 %
4+	8	1.6 %
Total	496	100.0 %

**Q25. What is your gender?**

Q25. Your gender	Number	Percent
Male	250	48.7 %
Female	248	48.3 %
Not provided	15	2.9 %
Total	513	100.0 %

**WITHOUT "NOT PROVIDED"****Q25. What is your gender? (without "not provided")**

Q25. Your gender	Number	Percent
Male	250	50.2 %
Female	248	49.8 %
Total	498	100.0 %

**Q26. Would you say your total annual household income is...**

<u>Q26. Your total annual household income</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Under \$25K	32	6.2 %
\$25K to \$49,999	64	12.5 %
\$50K to \$74,999	76	14.8 %
\$75K to \$99,999	78	15.2 %
\$100K to \$124,999	83	16.2 %
\$125K+	116	22.6 %
Not provided	64	12.5 %
Total	513	100.0 %

**WITHOUT "NOT PROVIDED"****Q26. Would you say your total annual household income is... (without "not provided")**

<u>Q26. Your total annual household income</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Under \$25K	32	7.1 %
\$25K to \$49,999	64	14.3 %
\$50K to \$74,999	76	16.9 %
\$75K to \$99,999	78	17.4 %
\$100K to \$124,999	83	18.5 %
\$125K+	116	25.8 %
Total	449	100.0 %



**5**

# PowerPoint Presentation

# City of Washougal 2022 Resident Survey Findings Report



PRESENTED BY ETC INSTITUTE  
NOVEMBER 7, 2022



Since 2012,  
ETC Institute Has  
Surveyed More  
Than **3,000,000**  
Persons in  
More Than  
**1,000 communities**  
around the world

**ETC Institute** is the Nation's  
Leading Provider of Market  
Research for Local Governments

For more than 35 years, **our mission** has been  
to help local governments gather and use  
survey data to help make better decisions

# Agenda

Purpose, Methodology, and Demographics

Local Issues

Trends

Comparative Strengths & Weaknesses

Opportunities for Improvement

Questions

3

# Purpose

To gather input from residents on issues that are important to the community

To identify opportunities to improve the quality of City services

To track the City's performance against itself and other communities over time

4




# Methodology

Survey Description	Method of Administration	Sample	Margin of Error
<p>Similar to previous surveys conducted by ETC Institute.</p> <p>The last survey was conducted in 2020.</p> <p>The first survey was conducted in 2014.</p>	<p>Administered by mail, phone and online.</p> <p>ETC Institute encouraged participation with texts and emails.</p>	<p>The sample was designed to ensure the results would be statistically representative of the City's population.</p>	<p>513 completed surveys were collected</p> <p>+/- 4.3% at the 95% level of confidence</p>


Good Representation by AGE

## What is your age?




Good Representation by YEARS OF RESIDENCY

Approximately how many years have you lived in Washougal?



7


Good Representation by GENDER



8


Good Representation by INCOME

### Annual Household Income



Median Household Income Census: \$89,608

Good Representation by LOCATION




Location of Survey Respondents

# How Residents Feel About Various Community Issues

The Majority of Residents Support Retail Sales of Marijuana in the City


## Support for Allowing the Following Marijuana Uses in Washougal

by percentage of respondents who said YES




Residents Were Evenly Split on the Level of Restrictions to Place on Personal Fireworks

### Support for the Following Restrictions on Personal Fireworks




Residents Think the Level of Service for Some City Services Should Be Increased

### How the Level of Service for Various Services Provided by the City Should Change



Half (50%)  
Would Not Be  
Willing to Pay  
More Taxes or  
Fees to Support  
Higher Service  
Levels

**Would you be willing to pay more in taxes or fees to support an increase in service levels?**




15

**Top 3 Suggestions**

- Dog Park
- Community/  
Recreation Center
- Swimming Pool

**Can you identify ONE community amenity that could be provided by the City to Enhance Quality of Life?**




16

Two Thirds of Those Who Suggested a New Community Amenity Would Be Willing to Pay More in Taxes or Fees to Fund the Development of the Amenity

### Would you be willing to pay more in taxes or fees to support the development of the new community amenity you suggested?

By Percentage Who Suggested Something



17


## Satisfaction with Major City Services and Trends from Previous Surveys

---

18

### Satisfaction with Major Categories of Service Provided by the City


by percentage of respondents ( excluding "don't know" )



### TRENDS: Satisfaction with Major Categories of Service Provided by the City

by percentage of respondents ( excluding "don't know" )

Decreases in Satisfaction from 2020-2022 Mirror National Trends with the Exception of the Decrease in Ratings for Water and Sewer Services





## Long-Term Trends 2014-2022

Largest Increases	Availability of job opportunities
	Overall image of the city
	Effectiveness of management of storm water runoff
	Value received for city tax dollars and fees
	Overall quality of the city's website
Largest Decreases	Quality of city water utilities
	Mowing & trimming along streets/other public areas
	The visibility of police in the community
	Enforcement of local traffic laws
	Ability of customer service personnel to resolve issues

21

## Short-Term Trends 2020-2022


ETC Institute Conducted 104 Surveys Between July 1-Oct 31, 2022. The results decreased in 93 of these cities.

Largest Increases	Maintenance of major City streets
	Maintenance of streets in your neighborhood
	Quality of outdoor athletic fields
	Overall maintenance of city streets
	Courtesy and politeness of employees
Largest Decreases	Quality of city water utilities
	Mowing & trimming along streets/other public areas
	Enforcing sign regulation
	Enforcement of city codes and ordinances
	Efforts to keep you informed about local issues

22

# How Washougal Compares to Other Communities


## Overall Ratings of Major City Services Washougal vs. Other Communities




# Opportunities for Improvement

## City Services That Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next 2 Years

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top three choices





27

Importance-Satisfaction Rating						
<b>OVERALL</b>						
Category of Service	Most Important %	Most Important Rank	Satisfaction %	Satisfaction Rank	e-Satisfaction Rating	I-S Rating Rank
<b>Very High Priority (IS &gt;.20)</b>						
Quality of city water utilities	49%	1	33%	10	0.3276	1
Effectiveness of economic development efforts	33%	3	27%	11	0.2416	2
Maintenance of city streets	42%	2	45%	7	0.2316	3
<b>High Priority (IS .10-.20)</b>						
Enforcement of city codes and ordinances	22%	6	35%	9	0.1411	4
Quality of city parks	27%	5	59%	4	0.1123	5
Quality of city sewer services	20%	7	47%	6	0.1055	6
Effectiveness of communication with the public	19%	8	43%	8	0.1055	7
<b>Medium Priority (IS &lt;.10)</b>						
Quality of police services	29%	4	72%	2	0.0806	8
Effectiveness of management of storm water runoff	10%	10	50%	5	0.0480	9
Quality of fire/emergency medical/ambulance svcs.	18%	9	83%	1	0.0306	10
Quality of customer service from city employees	6%	11	61%	3	0.0238	11

28

## Summary

---

- The majority (57%) of those surveyed supported retail marijuana sales in the City
- Residents were evenly split on the level of restrictions that should be placed on the use of personal fireworks
- Although many residents think some city service levels should increase, 50% are not willing to pay more for service level increases
- Satisfaction levels for most city services have decreased since 2020, but most of the decreases follow national trends with the exception of water and sewer services
- The Importance-Satisfaction Analysis identified three services as **very high priorities** for improvement:
  - Water utilities, economic development, and street maintenance

29

## Questions?

---

THANK YOU!

30

A large, dark blue circle with a white outline, containing the number 6 in a bold, dark blue font.

# Survey Instrument



CITY HALL  
1701 C Street Washougal,  
WA 98671  
(360) 835-8501  
Fax (360) 835-8808

POLICE DEPARTMENT  
1320 A Street Washougal,  
WA 98671  
(360) 835-8701  
Fax (360) 835-7559

FIRE & RESCUE  
1400 A Street Washougal,  
WA 98671  
(360) 835-2211  
Fax (360) 699-4859

Dear Washougal Resident,

**Your input on the enclosed survey is extremely important.** The City of Washougal is conducting a survey of residents to gather information about city priorities and the quality of city programs and services. The survey, conducted every two years, is this year part of our process to develop a new updated strategic plan for the community, and to assist us in making important decisions over the next several months. To assist us in aligning the city's priorities with the needs of our residents, *we need to know what you think.*

**We appreciate your time.** We realize this survey takes some time to complete, but every question is important. The time you invest in this survey will influence decisions we must make regarding the future of our city.

**Please take a few minutes to complete and return this survey in the next few days.** A postage-paid return envelope, addressed to ETC Institute, has been provided for your convenience. You may also complete the survey on-line by going to [WashougalSurvey.com](http://WashougalSurvey.com).

We have again selected ETC Institute as our partner for this project because of its outstanding record of performance in working with communities nationwide. ETC will compile the results and present a report to the city in early November. The report will be a valuable resource as we work to provide you with the most responsive government possible. Look for a summary of the survey results on the city's website, [www.cityofwashougal.us](http://www.cityofwashougal.us).

If you have any questions, please call Rose Jewell, Community Engagement Manager, at (360) 835-8501 ext. 602. On behalf of the City Council, thank you for your participation in this important process.

Sincerely,

David Scott  
City Manager



## 2022 City of Washougal Community Survey

Please take a few minutes to complete this survey. Your input is an important part of the city's on-going effort to identify and respond to citizen concerns. If you have questions, please call Rose Jewell, Community Engagement Manager, at 360-835-8501.

- 1. Major categories of services provided by the City of Washougal are listed below. Please rate each item using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied."**

How satisfied are you with...	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
01. Overall quality of police services	5	4	3	2	1	9
02. Overall quality of fire, emergency medical and ambulance services	5	4	3	2	1	9
03. Overall quality of city parks	5	4	3	2	1	9
04. Overall maintenance of city streets	5	4	3	2	1	9
05. Overall quality of city water utilities	5	4	3	2	1	9
06. Overall quality of city sewer services	5	4	3	2	1	9
07. Overall effectiveness of city management of storm water runoff	5	4	3	2	1	9
08. Overall enforcement of city codes and ordinances	5	4	3	2	1	9
09. Overall quality of customer service you receive from city employees	5	4	3	2	1	9
10. Overall effectiveness of city communication with the public	5	4	3	2	1	9
11. Overall effectiveness of city economic development efforts	5	4	3	2	1	9

- 2. Which THREE of the items listed in Question 1 do you think should receive the MOST EMPHASIS from city leaders over the next TWO years? [Write in your answers below using the numbers from the list in Question 1.]**

1st: \_\_\_\_      2nd: \_\_\_\_      3rd: \_\_\_\_

- 3. Several items that may influence your perception of the City of Washougal are listed below. Please rate each item using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied."**

How satisfied are you with...	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
01. Overall quality of services provided by the City of Washougal	5	4	3	2	1	9
02. Overall value that you receive for your city tax dollars and fees	5	4	3	2	1	9
03. Overall image of the city	5	4	3	2	1	9
04. How well the city is managing growth and development	5	4	3	2	1	9
05. Overall quality of life in the city	5	4	3	2	1	9
06. Overall feeling of safety in the city	5	4	3	2	1	9
07. Availability of job opportunities	5	4	3	2	1	9
08. Overall quality of new development	5	4	3	2	1	9
09. Appearance of residential property in the city	5	4	3	2	1	9
10. Appearance of commercial property in the city	5	4	3	2	1	9



4. Please rate your satisfaction with each of the Parks and Recreation items listed below using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied."

How satisfied are you with...	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
1. Quality of facilities such as picnic shelters and playgrounds in city parks	5	4	3	2	1	9
2. Quality of outdoor athletic fields (e.g., baseball, soccer, and football)	5	4	3	2	1	9
3. Appearance and maintenance of existing city parks	5	4	3	2	1	9
4. Number of city parks	5	4	3	2	1	9

5. Which TWO of the Parks and Recreation items listed in Question 4 do you think should receive the MOST EMPHASIS from city leaders over the next TWO years? [Write in your answers below using the numbers from the list in Question 4.]

1st: \_\_\_\_\_ 2nd: \_\_\_\_\_

6. Please rate your satisfaction with each of the following public safety items using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied."

How satisfied are you with...	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
01. The visibility of police in the community	5	4	3	2	1	9
02. The city's overall efforts to prevent crime	5	4	3	2	1	9
03. Enforcement of local traffic laws	5	4	3	2	1	9
04. Parking enforcement services	5	4	3	2	1	9
05. How quickly police respond to emergencies	5	4	3	2	1	9
06. Overall quality of local fire protection and rescue services	5	4	3	2	1	9
07. How quickly fire and rescue personnel respond to emergencies	5	4	3	2	1	9
08. Quality of local ambulance service	5	4	3	2	1	9
09. How quickly ambulance personnel respond to emergencies	5	4	3	2	1	9
10. Quality of animal control	5	4	3	2	1	9

7. Which TWO of the public safety items listed in Question 6 do you think should receive the MOST EMPHASIS from city leaders over the next TWO years? [Write in your answers below using the numbers from the list in Question 6.]

1st: \_\_\_\_\_ 2nd: \_\_\_\_\_

8. Which of the following would be your preferred way(s) to receive news and information about city programs, services, and events? [Check all that apply.]

- \_\_\_\_(1) City website  
 \_\_\_\_ (2) City social media (Facebook, Twitter)  
 \_\_\_\_ (3) Public meetings (e.g., open houses, community forums)  
 \_\_\_\_ (4) City e-mail update service  
 \_\_\_\_ (5) Newsletter or other insert inside utility bill envelope  
 \_\_\_\_ (6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

9. Please rate your satisfaction with each of the following items concerning city communication using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied."

How satisfied are you with...	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
1. The availability of information about city programs and services	5	4	3	2	1	9
2. City efforts to keep you informed about local issues	5	4	3	2	1	9
3. Overall quality of the city's website	5	4	3	2	1	9
4. The level of public involvement in local decision making	5	4	3	2	1	9
5. Timeliness of information provided by the city	5	4	3	2	1	9
6. City e-mail information update service	5	4	3	2	1	9

10. Which TWO of the communication items listed in Question 9 do you think should receive the MOST EMPHASIS from city leaders over the next TWO years? [Write in your answers below using the numbers from the list in Question 9.]

1st: \_\_\_\_ 2nd: \_\_\_\_

11. Please rate your satisfaction with each of the following items concerning city streets using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied."

How satisfied are you with...	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
1. Maintenance of major city streets	5	4	3	2	1	9
2. Maintenance of streets in your neighborhood	5	4	3	2	1	9
3. Mowing and trimming along city streets and other public areas	5	4	3	2	1	9
4. Adequacy of city street lighting	5	4	3	2	1	9
5. Condition of sidewalks in the city	5	4	3	2	1	9

12. Which TWO of the street related items listed in Question 11 do you think should receive the MOST EMPHASIS from city leaders over the next TWO years? [Write in your answers below using the numbers from the list in Question 11.]

1st: \_\_\_\_ 2nd: \_\_\_\_

13. **Land Development.** Using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Much Too Slow" and 1 means "Much Too Fast;" please rate the city's current pace of development in each of the following areas.

Type of Development	Much Too Slow	Too Slow	Just Right	Too Fast	Much Too Fast	Don't Know
1. Office development	5	4	3	2	1	9
2. Industrial development	5	4	3	2	1	9
3. Multi-family residential development	5	4	3	2	1	9
4. Single-family residential development	5	4	3	2	1	9
5. Retail development	5	4	3	2	1	9

14. Please rate your satisfaction with each of the code enforcement items listed below using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied."

How satisfied are you with...	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
1. Enforcing the cleanup of litter and debris on private property	5	4	3	2	1	9
2. Enforcing the mowing and trimming of grass and weeds on private property	5	4	3	2	1	9
3. Enforcing codes designed to protect public safety and health	5	4	3	2	1	9
4. Enforcing sign regulation	5	4	3	2	1	9

15. Which TWO of the code enforcement items listed in Question 14 do you think should receive the MOST EMPHASIS from city leaders over the next TWO years? [Write in your answers below using the numbers from the list in Question 14.]

1st: \_\_\_\_ 2nd: \_\_\_\_

**16. Have you called, e-mailed, or visited the city with a question, problem, or complaint during the past year?**

\_\_\_(1) Yes [Answer Q16a-c.]      \_\_\_(2) No [Skip to Q17.]      \_\_\_(9) Don't Know [Skip to Q17.]

**16a. How easy was it to contact the person you needed to reach?**

\_\_\_(4) Very easy    \_\_\_(3) Somewhat easy    \_\_\_(2) Difficult    \_\_\_(1) Very difficult    \_\_\_(9) Don't know

**16b. What department did you contact? [Check all that apply.]**

- \_\_\_(1) Police
- \_\_\_(2) Fire
- \_\_\_(3) Community Development
- \_\_\_(4) Parks
- \_\_\_(5) Event permits
- \_\_\_(6) Utility Billing
- \_\_\_(7) Municipal Services (streets/water/sewer)
- \_\_\_(8) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**16c. Several factors that may influence your perception of the quality of customer service you receive from city employees are listed below. For each item, please rate how often the employees you have contacted during the past year have displayed the behavior described using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Always" and 1 means "Never."**

Frequency that...	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Seldom	Never	Don't Know
1. They were courteous and polite	5	4	3	2	1	9
2. They gave prompt, accurate, and complete answers to questions	5	4	3	2	1	9
3. They did what they said they would do in a timely manner	5	4	3	2	1	9
4. They helped you resolve an issue to your satisfaction	5	4	3	2	1	9

**17. Expectations for Services. Using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means the level of service provided by the city "Should be Much Higher" than it is now and 1 means it "Should be Much Lower," please indicate how the level of service provided by the city should change in each of the areas listed below.**

	Should Be Much Higher	Should Be a Little Higher	Should Stay the Same	Should Be a Little Lower	Should Be Much Lower	Don't Know
1. Law enforcement	5	4	3	2	1	9
2. Fire, EMS and ambulance	5	4	3	2	1	9
3. Parks and open space	5	4	3	2	1	9
4. Recreation facilities	5	4	3	2	1	9
5. Maintenance of infrastructure (streets, sidewalks)	5	4	3	2	1	9

**18. Would you be willing to pay more in taxes or fees to support an increase in the service level?**

- \_\_\_(1) Yes, I would be willing to pay more in taxes or fees
- \_\_\_(2) No, I would not be willing to pay more in taxes or fees
- \_\_\_(3) Not applicable - I do not think any levels of service need to be higher
- \_\_\_(9) Don't know

**19. Washington voters approved Initiative 502 in November 2012 to allow for the production, processing and retail sales of recreational marijuana. Cities have discretion to regulate or prohibit such uses within their jurisdiction. These uses have been prohibited in Washougal. Pursuant to State rules, the City could allow one marijuana retail store to be located within the City. Cities that allow production, processing and retail sales of marijuana receive a portion of the generated excise tax from the retail sales, which can be used for government services, including public safety. For example, in 2021 the City of Battle Ground received \$46,000. Please indicate if you support allowing the following uses in Washougal by circling YES or NO below.**

(A) Marijuana Production	YES	NO
(B) Marijuana Processing	YES	NO
(C) Marijuana Retail Sales	YES	NO

20. In 2017, the City Council passed an ordinance restricting the use of personal fireworks within city limits to "Safe and Sane" fireworks (which are those that do not fly, explode, or travel more than one foot into the air or more than six feet on the ground). These restrictions have been in effect since New Year's Eve 2018. Prior to enacting this restriction, all fireworks legal in the State of Washington were legal in Washougal, with limits on the times when they could be used. Vancouver has a complete ban on all personal fireworks. Camas allows personal fireworks that are allowed by the State of Washington, with limits on the times they can be used. Knowing this, which of the following statements reflects your preference regarding fireworks restrictions?

- (1) I support the current restriction for safe and sane fireworks
- (2) I would support a complete ban on the use of personal fireworks
- (3) I would support overturning the current restriction and restoring the previous allowance of all legal personal fireworks with limits on the times they can be used
- (9) Don't know

21. **Community amenities provided by the City can enhance the quality of life in Washougal. If you could identify ONE community amenity that could be provided by the City, what would it be?**

---

21a. **[If you listed something in Question 21.] Would you be willing to pay more in taxes or fees to support this new community amenity?**

- (1) Yes       (2) No

22. **Approximately how many years have you lived in Washougal?** \_\_\_\_\_ years

23. **What is your age?** \_\_\_\_\_ years

24. **How many children under age 18 live in your household?** \_\_\_\_\_ children

25. **What is your gender?**     (1) Male     (2) Female

26. **Would you say your total annual household income is...**

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (1) Under \$25,000       | <input type="checkbox"/> (3) \$50,000 to \$74,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> (5) \$100,000 to \$124,999 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (2) \$25,000 to \$49,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> (4) \$75,000 to \$99,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> (6) \$125,000 or more      |

27. **If you have suggestions for improving the quality of city programs, facilities, or services, please write your suggestions in the space below.**

---

---

---

---

28. **Would you be willing to participate in future surveys sponsored by the City of Washougal?**

- (1) Yes [Answer 28a.]     (2) No

28a. **Please provide your contact information.**

Mobile Phone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_

**This concludes the survey. Thank you for your time!**  
Please return your completed survey in the enclosed postage-paid envelope addressed to:  
ETC Institute, 725 W. Frontier Circle, Olathe, KS 66061

Your responses will remain completely confidential. The information printed to the right will ONLY be used to help identify which areas of the city are having difficulties with city services. If your address is not correct, please provide the correct information. Thank you.