

Ann Arbor, MI

Trends over Time

2018



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



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

Summary

The National Citizen Survey™ (The NCS™) is a collaborative effort between National Research Center, Inc. (NRC) and the International City/County Management Association (ICMA). The survey and its administration are standardized to assure high quality research methods and directly comparable results across The NCS communities. The NCS captures residents' opinions within the three pillars of a community (Community Characteristics, Governance and Participation) across eight central facets of community (Safety, Mobility, Natural Environment, Built Environment, Economy, Recreation and Wellness, Education and Enrichment and Community Engagement). This report discusses trends over time, comparing the 2018 ratings for the City of Ann Arbor to its previous survey results in 2007, 2008, 2013 and 2015. Additional reports and technical appendices are available under separate cover.

Trend data for Ann Arbor represent important comparison data and should be examined for improvements or declines. Deviations from stable trends over time, especially, represent opportunities for understanding how local policies, programs or public information may have affected residents' opinions.

Meaningful differences between survey years have been noted within the following tables as being "higher" or "lower" if the differences are greater than five percentage points between the 2015 and 2018 surveys, otherwise the comparisons between 2015 and 2018 are noted as being "similar." Additionally, benchmark comparisons for all survey years are presented for reference. Changes in the benchmark comparison over time can be impacted by various trends, including varying survey cycles for the individual communities that comprise the benchmarks, regional and national economic or other events, as well as emerging survey methodologies.

Overall, ratings in Ann Arbor for 2018 generally remained stable. Of the 134 items for which comparisons were available, 104 items were rated similarly in 2015 and 2018, seven items showed a decrease in ratings and 23 showed an increase in ratings. Notable trends over time included the following:

- Within the pillar of Community Characteristics, ratings for ten aspects increased and five decreased since 2015. Three of the increases were related to Mobility, including the overall ease of travel, ease of walking and availability of paths and walking trails in Ann Arbor. Within Economy, employment opportunities and business and service establishments improved since the last survey administration; however, aspects related to affordability (the variety of housing options, availability of affordable quality housing and cost of living) decreased from 2015 to 2018. Other notable changes included increases in the ratings for Ann Arbor as a place to retire and as a place to raise children.
- Ratings for services and amenities provided by Ann Arbor largely remained stable over time, but eight increases and only one decrease were noted in 2018. More residents were pleased with measurements of government performance (the City welcoming citizen involvement and customer service provided by City employees), as well as crime prevention, storm drainage and City-sponsored special events, among others.
- In 2018, more Ann Arbor residents reported they planned to remain in the community for the next five years. Additionally, survey respondents also reported higher levels of using public transit, attending City-sponsored events, voting and campaigning than in 2015.

Table 1: Community Characteristics General

	Percer	nt rating po	sitively (e.g	., excellent	/good)		Comparison to benchmark						
	2007	2008	2013	2015	2018	2018 rating compared to 2015	2007	2008	2013	2015	2018		
Overall quality of life	90%	92%	92%	93%	94%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher		
Overall image	93%	93%	92%	92%	94%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Much higher		
Place to live	91%	94%	95%	94%	95%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher		
Neighborhood	84%	86%	88%	90%	93%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar		
Place to raise children	89%	90%	92%	92%	97%	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher		
Place to retire	58%	67%	71%	68%	75%	Higher	Similar	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Higher		
Overall appearance	84%	85%	87%	85%	89%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Higher		

Table 2: Community Characteristics by Facet

		Percen		sitively (e.g somewhat		t/good,	2018 rating	Comparison to benchmark					
		2007	2008	2013	2015	2018	compared to 2015	2007	2008	2013	2015	2018	
	Overall feeling of safety	NA	NA	89%	91%	93%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Higher	
	Safe in neighborhood	97%	98%	97%	97%	98%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	
Safety	Safe downtown/commercial area	96%	95%	92%	94%	96%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	
	Overall ease of travel	NA	NA	72%	71%	76%	Higher	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	
	Paths and walking trails	NA	79%	81%	80%	89%	Higher	NA	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher	
	Ease of walking	82%	86%	86%	83%	89%	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher	
	Travel by bicycle	63%	64%	62%	59%	55%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	
	Travel by public transportation	NA	NA	61%	61%	64%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Higher	Higher	
	Travel by car	53%	59%	51%	52%	57%	Similar	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	
	Public parking	NA	NA	36%	39%	42%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Similar	
Mobility	Traffic flow	46%	46%	39%	39%	43%	Similar	NA	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	
	Overall natural environment	NA	88%	92%	91%	90%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher	
	Cleanliness	NA	84%	82%	85%	87%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	
Natural Environment	Air quality	86%	84%	88%	89%	91%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Similar	
	Overall built environment	NA	NA	74%	72%	72%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	
	New development in Ann Arbor	62%	56%	63%	62%	61%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	
Built Environment	Affordable quality housing	23%	29%	28%	26%	18%	Lower	Much lower	Similar	Lower	Lower	Lower	

		Percen		sitively (e.g /somewhat		t/good,	2018 rating		Compa	rison to ben	chmark	
		2007	2008	2013	2015	2018	compared to 2015	2007	2008	2013	2015	2018
	Housing options	NA	56%	52%	53%	37%	Lower	NA	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Public places	NA	NA	79%	80%	86%	Higher	NA	NA	Similar	Higher	Higher
	Overall economic health	NA	NA	83%	85%	88%	Similar	NA	NA	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Vibrant downtown/commercial area	NA	NA	83%	83%	84%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher
	Business and services	NA	81%	83%	80%	86%	Higher	NA	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Cost of living	NA	NA	32%	28%	21%	Lower	NA	NA	Similar	Lower	Lower
	Shopping opportunities	72%	72%	75%	77%	81%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Employment opportunities	52%	51%	63%	66%	77%	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Much higher	Much higher
	Place to visit	NA	NA	78%	81%	85%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Higher	Higher
								Much	Much	Much		Much
Economy	Place to work	78%	80%	86%	85%	90%	Similar	higher	higher	higher	Higher	higher
	Health and wellness	NA	NA	90%	90%	93%	Similar	NA	NA	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Mental health care	NA	NA	67%	71%	63%	Lower	NA	NA	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Preventive health services	NA	76%	81%	86%	87%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Health care	NA	NA	78%	81%	80%	Similar	NA	NA	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Food	NA	NA	77%	73%	79%	Higher	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Higher
Recreation and	Recreational opportunities	84%	87%	83%	87%	90%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
Wellness	Fitness opportunities	NA	NA	84%	85%	89%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Higher	Higher
	Education and enrichment opportunities	NA	NA	94%	96%	97%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher
	Religious or spiritual events and activities	NA	88%	88%	91%	92%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Cultural/arts/music activities	90%	88%	92%	93%	93%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher
	Adult education	NA	NA	90%	90%	93%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher
Education and	K-12 education	79%	86%	86%	88%	92%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
Enrichment	Child care/preschool	NA	NA	63%	65%	53%	Lower	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Similar
Community	Social events and activities	NA	86%	81%	85%	88%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Much higher
Engagement	Neighborliness	NA	NA	69%	72%	77%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar

	Percent	.	sitively (e.g somewhat	•	t/good,	2018 rating		Compa	rison to ben	chmark	
	2007	2008	2013	2015	2018	compared to 2015	2007	2008	2013	2015	2018
							Much	Much			
Openness and acceptance	85%	87%	83%	79%	80%	Similar	higher	higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
Opportunities to participate in community matters	NA	77%	77%	79%	84%	Higher	NA	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
								Much			
Opportunities to volunteer	NA	91%	84%	87%	92%	Similar	NA	higher	Higher	Higher	Higher

Table 3: Governance General

	Percent r	ating posi	tively (e.g	., exceller	nt/good)			Comparison to	o benchma	ark	
	2007	2008	2013	2015	2018	2018 rating compared to 2015	2007	2008	2013	2015	2018
Services provided by Ann Arbor	82%	84%	81%	85%	86%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Customer service	100%	78%	77%	78%	84%	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Value of services for taxes paid	58%	55%	58%	57%	61%	Similar	Higher	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
Overall direction	63%	63%	66%	63%	61%	Similar	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Welcoming citizen involvement	68%	58%	60%	60%	66%	Higher	Much higher	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
Confidence in City government	NA	NA	60%	62%	63%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Acting in the best interest of Ann Arbor	NA	NA	64%	63%	65%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Being honest	NA	NA	67%	66%	66%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Treating all residents fairly	NA	NA	66%	62%	62%	Similar	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Similar
Services provided by the Federal Government	37%	37%	49%	52%	39%	Lower	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

Table 4: Governance by Facet

		F		ting posit cellent/go	ively (e.g. od)	.,	2018 rating compared		Compa	rison to ben	chmark	
		2007	2008	2013	2015	2018	to 2015	2007	2008	2013	2015	2018
	Police	79%	82%	80%	82%	84%	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Fire	92%	95%	89%	93%	97%	Similar	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Ambulance/EMS	91%	94%	94%	94%	95%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Crime prevention	72%	75%	71%	75%	85%	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Fire prevention	79%	82%	77%	82%	84%	Similar	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Animal control	75%	75%	74%	72%	77%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Safety	Emergency preparedness	NA	69%	65%	76%	64%	Lower	NA	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Traffic enforcement	61%	67%	58%	59%	63%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Mobility	Street repair	39%	30%	25%	21%	20%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower

		2007 2008 2013 2015 2018					2018 rating compared		Compa	rison to ben	chmark	
		2007	2008	2013	2015	2018	to 2015	2007	2008	2013	2015	2018
	Street cleaning	65%	66%	57%	59%	56%	Similar	Higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Street lighting	58%	61%	63%	67%	69%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Snow removal	65%	49%	53%	51%	49%	Similar	Similar	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Sidewalk maintenance	50%	53%	55%	53%	57%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Traffic signal timing	49%	48%	46%	54%	50%	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Bus or transit services	76%	78%	77%	73%	78%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Much higher
	Garbage collection	86%	91%	88%	91%	90%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Simila
	Recycling	86%	89%	90%	90%	86%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Similar
	Yard waste pick-up	77%	84%	80%	84%	82%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Drinking water	77%	80%	84%	85%	85%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Natural areas preservation	NA	75%	77%	77%	79%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
Natural Environment	Open space	NA	NA	74%	73%	78%	Higher	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Higher
	Storm drainage	69%	78%	67%	71%	80%	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Simila
	Sewer services	84%	83%	85%	85%	89%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Power utility	NA	76%	78%	80%	77%	Similar	NA	Higher	Similar	Similar	Simila
	Utility billing	NA	NA	75%	78%	78%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Simila
	Land use, planning and zoning	52%	56%	54%	58%	56%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Simila
	Code enforcement	66%	63%	53%	55%	66%	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Highe
Built Environment	Cable television	47%	54%	58%	53%	56%	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Simila
Economy	Economic development	62%	54%	69%	70%	68%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Simila
	City parks	90%	92%	90%	90%	92%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Higher	Highe
	Recreation programs	89%	89%	87%	86%	91%	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Highe
	Recreation centers	86%	87%	87%	83%	88%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Highe
Recreation and Wellness	Health services	85%	86%	87%	89%	92%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher

		F		ting posit cellent/go		.,	2018 rating compared		Compar	ison to ben	chmark	
		2007	2008	2013	2015	2018	to 2015	2007	2008	2013	2015	2018
	Special events	NA	NA NA 81% 79%				Higher	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Higher
Education and Enrichment	Public libraries	93%	94%	91%	95%	96%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
Community Engagement	,			78%	81%	86%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Higher

Table 5: Participation General

	Percent rat	ing positively (e.g., always/sor	metimes, more	than once a						
			month, yes)			2018 rating compared to		Comparison	to benchn	nark	
	2007	2008	2013	2015	2018	2015	2007	2008	2013	2015	2018
							Much	Much			
Sense of community	73%	76%	69%	73%	77%	Similar	higher	higher	Similar	Similar	Higher
								Much			
Recommend Ann Arbor	NA	92%	93%	92%	94%	Similar	NA	higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
								Much			
Remain in Ann Arbor	NA	69%	76%	77%	83%	Higher	NA	lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
Contacted Ann Arbor								Much			
employees	47%	50%	37%	41%	42%	Similar	NA	lower	Lower	Similar	Similar

Table 6: Participation by Facet

		Percent ra	ating positive than c	ely (e.g., alv once a montl		mes, more	2018 rating		Com	parison to be	enchmark	
		2007	2008	2013	2015	2018	compared to 2015	2007	2008	2013	2015	2018
	Stocked supplies for an emergency	NA	NA	20%	22%	20%	Similar	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Did NOT report a crime	NA	NA	85%	85%	88%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Higher
Safety	Was NOT the victim of a crime	91%	92%	90%	90%	93%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Used public transportation instead of driving	NA	NA	61%	54%	60%	Higher	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher
	Carpooled instead of driving alone	NA	NA	52%	51%	55%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Higher
Mobility	Walked or biked instead of driving	NA	NA	83%	82%	82%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher
	Conserved water	NA	NA	75%	78%	80%	Similar	NA	NA	Lower	Similar	Similar
	Made home more energy efficient	NA	NA	73%	73%	74%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Natural Environment	Recycled at home	94%	97%	95%	97%	96%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Similar
	Did NOT observe a code violation	NA	NA	59%	64%	65%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Higher	Higher
Built Environment	NOT under housing cost stress	NA	58%	63%	68%	70%	Similar	NA	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar

									Com	parison to be	enchmark	
		2007	2008	2013	2015	2018	2018 rating compared to 2015	2007	2008	2013	2015	2018
	Purchased goods or services in Ann Arbor	NA	NA	98%	99%	99%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Economy will have positive impact on income	14%	5%	24%	28%	27%	Similar	NA	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
Economy	Work in Ann Arbor	NA	NA	68%	65%	70%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher
	Used Ann Arbor recreation centers	61%	56%	61%	68%	70%	Similar	NA	Similar	Similar	Higher	Higher
	Visited a City park	90%	94%	90%	94%	95%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Similar	Higher	Higher
	Ate 5 portions of fruits and vegetables	NA	NA	89%	89%	92%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Recreation	Participated in moderate or vigorous physical activity	NA	NA	89%	92%	91%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
and Wellness	In very good to excellent health	NA	NA	76%	73%	72%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Used Ann Arbor public libraries	76%	78%	70%	73%	74%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Higher
Education and	Participated in religious or spiritual activities	NA	51%	48%	43%	41%	Similar	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Enrichment	Attended a City-sponsored event	NA	NA	60%	63%	72%	Higher	NA	NA	Similar	Higher	Higher
	Campaigned for an issue, cause or candidate	NA	NA	24%	25%	39%	Higher	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Higher
	Contacted Ann Arbor elected officials	NA	NA	15%	16%	21%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Volunteered	54%	59%	52%	55%	58%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Similar	Higher	Higher
	Participated in a club	NA	39%	NA	42%	40%	Similar	NA	Much higher	NA	Higher	Higher
	Talked to or visited with neighbors	NA	NA	NA	89%	84%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Done a favor for a neighbor	NA	NA	NA	77%	73%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Attended a local public meeting	21%	20%	15%	16%	17%	Similar	NA	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Similar
	Watched a local public meeting	39%	36%	19%	19%	18%	Similar	NA	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Similar
	Read or watched local news	NA	NA	75%	78%	76%	Similar	NA	NA	Lower	Similar	Similar
Community Engagement	Voted in local elections	73%	85%	68%	76%	82%	Higher	NA	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar