Residents are satisfied with their quality of life in Suisun City.

Respondents to the survey were most concerned with reducing crime and law enforcement issues.

Respondents were also concerned with road repair service and would like to increase service levels.

Respondents would like to consider a local sales tax measure to maintain and enhance these services, and such a measure is strongly viable.
Overview and Research Objectives

Suisun City commissioned The Lew Edwards Group and Godbe Research to conduct initial assessment services through a community survey with the following research objectives:

- Assess overall perceptions of living in Suisun City;
- Gauge satisfaction with the City’s performance in providing community services and programs, as well as understand relative importance of those services and programs;
- Assess awareness of the City’s financial situation;
- Determine the most pressing problems facing the City;
- Evaluate whether residents perceive the City to be responsible with taxpayer dollars;
- Gauge support for potential local funding measures to maintain City services; and
- Conduct detailed analysis based on demographic considerations.
Methodology Overview

- **Data Collection**: Telephone and Internet Interviewing
- **Universe**: 9,259 likely November 2016 voters in Suisun City
- **Fielding Dates**: November 11 through November 24, 2015 and November 30, 2015
- **Interview Length**: 18 minutes
- **Sample Size**: 306
- **Margin of Error**: ± 5.51%

The data have been weighted to reflect the actual population characteristics of likely voters in Suisun City in terms of their gender, age, and political party type.
Key Findings
Opinion on Quality of Life

Your neighborhood as a place to live: 1.98
Suisun City as a place to live: 1.97
Suisun City as a place to raise children: 1.80
Suisun City as a place to retire: 1.69
Suisun City as a place to work: 1.32

Note: The above rating questions have been abbreviated for charting purposes, and responses were recoded to calculate mean scores: “Excellent” = +3, “Good” = +2, “Fair” = +1, and “Poor” = 0.
Satisfaction With City Services

- Very satisfied: 22.0%
- Somewhat satisfied: 53.2%
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 14.1%
- Very dissatisfied: 4.8%
- Not sure [DK/NA]: 6.0%
Importance of City Services

Note: The above rating questions have been abbreviated for charting purposes, and responses were recoded to calculate mean scores: “Extremely Important” = +3, “Very Important” = +2, “Somewhat Important” = +1, and “Not at all Important” = 0.
Importance of City Services (Continued)

Note: The above rating questions have been abbreviated for charting purposes, and responses were recoded to calculate mean scores: “Extremely Important” = +3, “Very Important” = +2, “Somewhat Important” = +1, and “Not at all Important” = 0.
Note: The above rating questions have been abbreviated for charting purposes, and responses were recoded to calculate mean scores: “Very Satisfied” = +2, “Somewhat Satisfied” = +1, “Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied” = 0, “Somewhat Dissatisfied” = -1, and “Very Dissatisfied” = -2.
Perception of City’s Financial Situation

- Excellent: 9.2%
- Good: 29.7%
- Fair: 30.1%
- Poor: 7.3%
- Very poor: 1.8%
- Not sure [DK/NA]: 21.9%
- Not sure [DK/NA]
Reactions to potential simple majority requirement Sales Tax Measure

To provide funding, that cannot be taken by the State, to maintain Suisun City services that make neighborhoods safer including:

- rapid 9-1-1 emergency response times;
- neighborhood police patrols;
- youth crime and gang prevention programs;
- fire prevention and protection;
- fixing potholes;
- maintaining city streets and street lights;
- maintaining parks and street trees; and
- other vital city services;

shall Suisun City enact an ongoing one cent (1%) sales tax, providing $1.8 million dollars annually, with annual audits, citizens’ oversight, all funds spent locally in Suisun City?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Support Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely Yes</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably Yes</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely No</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably No</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure [DK/NA]</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Support: 63.4%
Reactions to Potential simple majority requirement UUT Measure

To provide funding, that cannot be taken by the State, to maintain Suisun City services that make neighborhoods safer including:

- rapid 9-1-1 emergency response times;
- neighborhood police patrols;
- youth crime and gang prevention programs;
- fire prevention and protection;
- fixing potholes;
- maintaining city streets and street lights;
- maintaining parks and street trees; and
- other vital city services;

shall Suisun City enact an ongoing 3.6 percent utility users tax, providing $1.8 million dollars annually, with annual audits, citizens’ oversight, all funds spent locally in Suisun City?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely No</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably No</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure [DK/NA]</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely Yes</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably Yes</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Support</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opinions on Level of Services

Maintaining neighborhood police patrols
Maintaining youth crime prevention and gang programs
Repairing potholes and maintaining city streets
Maintaining fire and 911 emergency response times
Providing senior citizen services
Maintaining after-school programs
Maintaining recreation programs

Note: The above rating questions have been abbreviated for charting purposes, and responses were recoded to calculate mean scores: "Increase Significantly" = +2, "Increase Somewhat" = +1, "Keep the Same" = 0, "Reduce Somewhat" = -1, and "Reduce Significantly" = -2.
Reactions to Informational Statements About City Services

Note: The above rating questions have been abbreviated for charting purposes, and responses were recoded to calculate mean scores: “Strongly Agree” = +2, “Somewhat Agree” = +1, “Neither Agree or Disagree” = 0, “Somewhat Disagree” = -1, and “Strongly Disagree” = -2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months</th>
<th>Key Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter/Spring 2016</td>
<td>Expand Community Engagement Conversations, including Interactive Mechanisms, community presentations, and Opinion Leader updates to solicit additional feedback on constituent perspectives for upcoming City budget. Reflect the community’s perspectives in FY 2016-2017 budget adoption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td>Following budget adoption conduct a second opinion survey to further assess interest in local funding options. If feasible to proceed, develop and present parameters of a potential local funding measure to City Council for consideration. If Council chooses to place a measure on the ballot, the deadline for submittal to the County Elections Officer is typically the first week in August.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>Continue to keep the public fully informed of pertinent budget and policy issues. Respond to constituent inquiries about budget and service issues. Post or disseminate official measure information where appropriate and helpful to the public.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This community survey should be viewed as only one of several steps in the City’s ongoing efforts to inform and engage the public around service and budget needs, and to get more input and resident perspectives reflected in the City’s budget process.

In other Cities this typically takes the form of:

- A presentation on the current budget
- Interactive engagement tools to provide additional perspectives on service priorities and community needs
- Posting pertinent budget information on the website and publicizing where people can get information about the budget and provide input on their service priorities