



TOWN OF JUPITER, FL 2011



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



777 North Capitol Street NE, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20002
www.icma.org • 202-289-ICMA

C O N T E N T S

Survey Background..... 1
 About The National Citizen Survey™ 1
 Understanding the Results 3

Executive Summary 5

Community Ratings 7
 Overall Community Quality 7
 Community Design 9
 Transportation 9
 Housing 13
 Land Use and Zoning 15
 Economic Sustainability..... 18
 Public Safety 21
 Environmental Sustainability..... 26
 Recreation and Wellness 29
 Parks and Recreation 29
 Culture, Arts and Education 31
 Health and Wellness 33
 Community Inclusiveness..... 35
 Civic Engagement..... 38
 Civic Activity..... 38
 Information and Awareness 41
 Social Engagement 42
 Public Trust..... 43
 Town of Jupiter Employees 46

From Data to Action 48
 Resident Priorities 48
 Town of Jupiter Action Chart 49
 Using Your Action Chart™ 51

Custom Questions 53

Appendix A: Complete Survey Frequencies 54
 Frequencies Excluding “Don’t Know” Responses 54
 Frequencies Including “Don’t Know” Responses..... 64

Appendix B: Survey Methodology 78


Appendix C: Survey Materials..... 88

SURVEY BACKGROUND

ABOUT THE NATIONAL CITIZEN SURVEY™

The National Citizen Survey™ (The NCS) is a collaborative effort between National Research Center, Inc. (NRC) and the International Town/County Management Association (ICMA). The NCS was developed by NRC to provide a statistically valid survey of resident opinions about community and services provided by local government. The survey results may be used by staff, elected officials and other stakeholders for community planning and resource allocation, program improvement and policy making.

FIGURE 1: THE NATIONAL CITIZEN SURVEY™ METHODS AND GOALS



The NCS focuses on a series of community characteristics and local government services, as well as issues of public trust. Resident behaviors related to civic engagement in the community also were measured in the survey.

FIGURE 2: THE NATIONAL CITIZEN SURVEY™ FOCUS AREAS



The survey and its administration are standardized to assure high quality research methods and directly comparable results across The National Citizen Survey™ jurisdictions. Participating households are selected at random and the household member who responds is selected without bias. Multiple mailings give each household more than one chance to participate with self-addressed and postage-paid envelopes. Results are statistically weighted to reflect the proper demographic composition of the entire community. A total of 315 completed surveys were obtained, providing an overall response rate of 31%. Typically, response rates obtained on citizen surveys range from 25% to 40%.

The National Citizen Survey™ customized for the Town of Jupiter was developed in close cooperation with local jurisdiction staff. Jupiter staff selected items from a menu of questions about services and community problems and provided the appropriate letterhead and signatures for mailings. Town of Jupiter staff also augmented The National Citizen Survey™ basic service through a variety of add-on options, including a custom set of benchmark comparisons and custom questions.

UNDERSTANDING THE RESULTS

As shown in Figure 2, this report is based around respondents' opinions about eight larger categories: community quality, community design, public safety, environmental sustainability, recreation and wellness, community inclusiveness, civic engagement and public trust. Each report section begins with residents' ratings of community characteristics and is followed by residents' ratings of service quality. For all evaluative questions, the percent of residents rating the service or community feature as "excellent" or "good" is presented. To see the full set of responses for each question on the survey, please see Appendix A: Complete Survey Frequencies.

Margin of Error

The margin of error around results for the Town of Jupiter Survey (315 completed surveys) is plus or minus five percentage points. This is a measure of the precision of your results; a larger number of completed surveys gives a smaller (more precise) margin of error, while a smaller number of surveys yields a larger margin of error. With your margin of error, you may conclude that when 60% of survey respondents report that a particular service is "excellent" or "good," somewhere between 55-65% of all residents are likely to feel that way.

Comparing Survey Results

Certain kinds of services tend to be thought better of by residents in many communities across the country. For example, public safety services tend to be received better than transportation services by residents of most American communities. Where possible, the better comparison is not from one service to another in the Town of Jupiter, but from Town of Jupiter services to services like them provided by other jurisdictions.

Interpreting Comparisons to Previous Years

This report contains comparisons with prior years' results. In this report, we are comparing this year's data with existing data in the graphs. Differences between years can be considered "statistically significant" if they are greater than eight percentage points. Trend data for your jurisdiction 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.

Benchmark Comparisons

NRC's database of comparative resident opinion is comprised of resident perspectives gathered in citizen surveys from approximately 500 jurisdictions whose residents evaluated local government services and gave their opinion about the quality of community life. The comparison evaluations are from the most recent survey completed in each jurisdiction; most communities conduct surveys every year or in alternating years. NRC adds the latest results quickly upon survey completion, keeping the benchmark data fresh and relevant.

The Town of Jupiter chose to have comparisons made to the entire database and a subset of similar jurisdictions from the database (Florida benchmarks). A benchmark comparison (the average rating from all the comparison jurisdictions where a similar question was asked) has been provided when a similar question on the Town of Jupiter survey was included in NRC's database and there were at least five jurisdictions in which the question was asked. For most questions compared to the entire dataset, there were more than 100 jurisdictions included in the benchmark comparison.

Where comparisons for quality ratings were available, the Town of Jupiter results were generally noted as being “above” the benchmark, “below” the benchmark or “similar” to the benchmark. For some questions – those related to resident behavior, circumstance or to a local problem – the comparison to the benchmark is designated as “more,” “similar” or “less” (for example, the percent of crime victims, residents visiting a park or residents identifying code enforcement as a problem.) In instances where ratings are considerably higher or lower than the benchmark, these ratings have been further demarcated by the attribute of “much,” (for example, “much less” or “much above”). These labels come from a statistical comparison of the Town of Jupiter's rating to the benchmark.

“Don’t Know” Responses and Rounding

On many of the questions in the survey respondents may answer “don’t know.” The proportion of respondents giving this reply is shown in the full set of responses included in Appendix A. However, these responses have been removed from the analyses presented in the body of the report. In other words, the tables and graphs display the responses from respondents who had an opinion about a specific item.

For some questions, respondents were permitted to select more than one answer. When the total exceeds 100% in a table for a multiple response question, it is because some respondents did select more than one response. When a table for a question that only permitted a single response does not total to exactly 100%, it is due to the customary practice of percentages being rounded to the nearest whole number.

For more information on understanding The NCS report, please see Appendix B: Survey Methodology.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report of the Town of Jupiter survey provides the opinions of a representative sample of residents about community quality of life, service delivery, civic participation and unique issues of local interest. A periodic sounding of resident opinion offers staff, elected officials and other stakeholders an opportunity to identify challenges and to plan for and evaluate improvements and to sustain services and amenities for long-term success.

Most residents experienced a good quality of life in the Town of Jupiter and believed the Town was a good place to live. The overall quality of life in the Town of Jupiter was rated as “excellent” or “good” by 92% of respondents. Almost all reported they plan on staying in the Town of Jupiter for the next five years.

A variety of characteristics of the community was evaluated by those participating in the study. The three characteristics receiving the most favorable ratings were the overall image or reputation of Jupiter, the overall appearance of Jupiter, and the quality of the overall natural environment in Jupiter. The three characteristics receiving the least positive ratings were ease of bus travel, employment opportunities, and the availability of affordable quality housing in Jupiter.

Ratings of community characteristics were compared to the benchmark database. Of the 29 characteristics for which comparisons were available, 28 were above the national benchmark comparison, none were similar to the national benchmark comparison and one was below.

Residents in the Town of Jupiter were civically engaged. While only 25% had attended a meeting of local elected public officials or other local public meeting in the previous 12 months, 95% had provided help to a friend or neighbor. Close to half had volunteered their time to some group or activity in the Town of Jupiter, which was similar to the national benchmark.

In general, survey respondents demonstrated strong trust in local government. A majority rated the overall direction being taken by the Town of Jupiter as “good” or “excellent.” This was much higher than the benchmark. Those residents who had interacted with an employee of the Town of Jupiter in the previous 12 months gave high marks to those employees. Almost all rated their overall impression of employees as “excellent” or “good.”

On average, residents gave highly favorable ratings to almost all local government services. Town services rated were able to be compared to the benchmark database. Of the 34 services for which comparisons were available, 32 were above the benchmark comparison, one was similar to the benchmark comparison and one was below.

A Key Driver Analysis was conducted for the Town of Jupiter which examined the relationships between ratings of each service and ratings of the Town of Jupiter's services overall. Those key driver services that correlated most strongly with residents' perceptions about overall Town service quality have been identified. By targeting improvements in key services, the Town of Jupiter can focus on the services that have the greatest likelihood of influencing residents' opinions about overall service quality. Services found to be influential in ratings of overall service quality from the Key Driver Analysis were:

- Land use, planning and zoning
- Police services
- Traffic enforcement
- Preservation of natural areas

For all key driver services, the Town of Jupiter was above the benchmark and should continue to ensure high quality performance.

COMMUNITY RATINGS

OVERALL COMMUNITY QUALITY

Overall quality of community life may be the single best indicator of success in providing the natural ambience, services and amenities that make for an attractive community. The National Citizen Survey™ contained many questions related to quality of community life in the Town of Jupiter – not only direct questions about quality of life overall and in neighborhoods, but questions to measure residents’ commitment to the Town of Jupiter. Residents were asked whether they planned to move soon or if they would recommend the Town of Jupiter to others. Intentions to stay and willingness to make recommendations provide evidence that the Town of Jupiter offers services and amenities that work.

Most of the Town of Jupiter’s residents gave high ratings to their neighborhoods and the community as a place to live. Further, many reported they would recommend the community to others and plan to stay for the next five years. These ratings had remained stable since 2009.

FIGURE 3: RATINGS OF OVERALL COMMUNITY QUALITY BY YEAR




FIGURE 4: LIKELIHOOD OF REMAINING IN COMMUNITY AND RECOMMENDING COMMUNITY BY YEAR




FIGURE 5: OVERALL COMMUNITY QUALITY BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Overall quality of life in Jupiter	Much above	Much above
Your neighborhood as place to live	Much above	Much above
Jupiter as a place to live	Much above	Much above
Recommend living in Jupiter to someone who asks	Much above	Much above
Remain in Jupiter for the next five years	Much above	Much above

COMMUNITY DESIGN

Transportation

The ability to move easily throughout a community can greatly affect the quality of life of residents by diminishing time wasted in traffic congestion and by providing opportunities to travel quickly and safely by modes other than the automobile. High quality options for resident mobility not only require local government to remove barriers to flow but they require government programs and policies that create quality opportunities for all modes of travel.

Residents responding to the survey were given a list of six aspects of mobility to rate on a scale of “excellent,” “good,” “fair” and “poor.” Ease of car travel in Jupiter was given the most positive rating, followed by the availability of paths and walking trails. These ratings tended to be much higher than the benchmark and similar to the past survey year.

FIGURE 6: RATINGS OF TRANSPORTATION IN COMMUNITY BY YEAR




FIGURE 7: COMMUNITY TRANSPORTATION BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Ease of car travel in Jupiter	Much above	Much above
Ease of bus travel in Jupiter	Much below	Similar
Ease of bicycle travel in Jupiter	Much above	Much above
Ease of walking in Jupiter	Much above	Much above
Availability of paths and walking trails	Much above	Much above
Traffic flow on major streets	Much above	Much above

Seven transportation services were rated in Jupiter. As compared to most communities across America, ratings tended to be favorable. Five were much above the benchmarks. Bus or transit services were below the national benchmark and similar to the custom benchmark. Traffic signal timing was similar to the national benchmark and much above the custom benchmark.

FIGURE 8: RATINGS OF TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING SERVICES BY YEAR




FIGURE 9: TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING SERVICES BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Street repair	Much above	Much above
Street cleaning	Much above	Much above
Street lighting	Much above	Much above
Sidewalk maintenance	Much above	Much above
Traffic signal timing	Similar	Much above
Bus or transit services	Below	Similar
Amount of public parking	Much above	Much above

By measuring choice of travel mode over time, communities can monitor their success in providing attractive alternatives to the traditional mode of travel, the single-occupied automobile. When asked how they typically traveled to work, single-occupancy (SOV) travel was the overwhelming mode of use. However, 1% of work commute trips were made by transit, 2% by bicycle and 3% by foot.

FIGURE 10: FREQUENCY OF BUS USE IN LAST 12 MONTHS BY YEAR




FIGURE 11: FREQUENCY OF BUS USE BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Ridden a local bus within Jupiter	Much less	Much less

FIGURE 12: MODE OF TRAVEL USED FOR WORK COMMUTE BY YEAR




FIGURE 13: DRIVE ALONE BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Average percent of work commute trips made by driving alone	Similar	Similar

Housing

Housing variety and affordability are not luxuries for any community. When there are too few options for housing style and affordability, the characteristics of a community tilt toward a single group, often of well-off residents. While this may seem attractive to a community, the absence of affordable townhomes, condominiums, mobile homes, single family detached homes and apartments means that in addition to losing the vibrancy of diverse thoughts and lifestyles, the community loses the service workers that sustain all communities – police officers, school teachers, house painters and electricians. These workers must live elsewhere and commute in at great personal cost and to the detriment of traffic flow and air quality. Furthermore lower income residents pay so much of their income to rent or mortgage that little remains to bolster their own quality of life or local business.

The survey of the Town of Jupiter residents asked respondents to reflect on the availability of affordable housing as well as the variety of housing options. The availability of affordable housing was rated as “excellent” or “good” by 48% of respondents, while the variety of housing options was rated as “excellent” or “good” by 71% of respondents. The rating of perceived affordable housing availability was better in the Town of Jupiter than the ratings, on average, in comparison jurisdictions.




FIGURE 15: HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Availability of affordable quality housing	Above	Above
Variety of housing options	Much above	Above

To augment the perceptions of affordable housing in Jupiter, the cost of housing as reported in the survey was compared to residents' reported monthly income to create a rough estimate of the proportion of residents of the Town of Jupiter experiencing housing cost stress. About 42% of survey participants were found to pay housing costs of more than 30% of their monthly household income.

FIGURE 16: PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS EXPERIENCING HOUSING COST STRESS BY YEAR




FIGURE 17: HOUSING COSTS BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Experiencing housing costs stress (housing costs 30% or MORE of income)	More	Similar

Land Use and Zoning

Community development contributes to a feeling among residents and even visitors of the attention given to the speed of growth, the location of residences and businesses, the kind of housing that is appropriate for the community and the ease of access to commerce, green space and residences. Even the community's overall appearance often is attributed to the planning and enforcement functions of the local jurisdiction. Residents will appreciate an attractive, well-planned community. The NCS questionnaire asked residents to evaluate the quality of new development, the appearance of the Town of Jupiter and the speed of population growth. Problems with the appearance of property were rated, and the quality of land use planning, zoning and code enforcement services were evaluated.

The overall quality of new development in the Town of Jupiter was rated as "excellent" or "good" by 75% of respondents. The overall appearance of Jupiter was rated as "excellent" or "good" by 92% of respondents and was much higher than the benchmark. When rating to what extent run down buildings, weed lots or junk vehicles were a problem in the Town of Jupiter, 3% thought they were a "major" problem. The services of land use, planning and zoning, code enforcement and animal control were rated above the benchmark. Ratings were consistent compared to the past survey year.

FIGURE 18: RATINGS OF THE COMMUNITY'S "BUILT ENVIRONMENT" BY YEAR




FIGURE 19: BUILT ENVIRONMENT BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Quality of new development in Jupiter	Much above	Much above
Overall appearance of Jupiter	Much above	Much above

FIGURE 20: RATINGS OF POPULATION GROWTH BY YEAR




FIGURE 21: POPULATION GROWTH BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Population growth seen as too fast	Much more	More

FIGURE 22: RATINGS OF NUISANCE PROBLEMS BY YEAR




FIGURE 23: NUISANCE PROBLEMS BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Run down buildings, weed lots and junk vehicles seen as a "major" problem	Much less	Much less

FIGURE 24: RATINGS OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY CODE ENFORCEMENT SERVICES BY YEAR




FIGURE 25: PLANNING AND COMMUNITY CODE ENFORCEMENT SERVICES BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Land use, planning and zoning	Much above	Much above
Code enforcement (weeds, abandoned buildings, etc.)	Much above	Much above
Animal control	Above	Much above

ECONOMIC SUSTAINABILITY

The United States has been in recession since late 2007 with an accelerated downturn occurring in the fourth quarter of 2008. Officially we emerged from recession in the third quarter of 2009, but high unemployment lingers, keeping a lid on a strong recovery. Many readers worry that the ill health of the economy will color how residents perceive their environment and the services that local government delivers. NRC researchers have found that the economic downturn has chastened Americans' view of their own economic futures but has not colored their perspectives about community services or quality of life.

Survey respondents were asked to rate a number of community features related to economic opportunity and growth. The most positively rated features were the overall quality of business and service establishments and Jupiter as a place to work. Receiving the lowest rating was employment opportunities; however this rating had increased over time and was much above the benchmarks.

FIGURE 26: RATINGS OF ECONOMIC SUSTAINABILITY AND OPPORTUNITIES BY YEAR




FIGURE 27: ECONOMIC SUSTAINABILITY AND OPPORTUNITIES BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Employment opportunities	Much above	Much above
Shopping opportunities	Much above	Above
Jupiter as a place to work	Much above	Much above
Overall quality of business and service establishments in Jupiter	Much above	Much above

Residents were asked to evaluate the speed of jobs growth and retail growth on a scale from “much too slow” to “much too fast.” When asked about the rate of jobs growth in Jupiter, 72% responded that it was “too slow,” while 29% reported retail growth as “too slow.” A much smaller proportion of residents in Jupiter compared to other jurisdictions believed that retail growth was too slow and about the same number of residents believed that jobs growth was too slow when compared to the nation.

FIGURE 28: RATINGS OF RETAIL AND JOB GROWTH BY YEAR




FIGURE 29: RETAIL AND JOB GROWTH BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Retail growth seen as too slow	Much less	Much less
Jobs growth seen as too slow	Similar	Much less

FIGURE 30: RATINGS OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SERVICES BY YEAR




FIGURE 31: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SERVICES BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Economic development	Much above	Much above

Residents were asked to reflect on their economic prospects in the near term. Seventeen percent of the Town of Jupiter residents expected that the coming six months would have a “somewhat” or “very” positive impact on their family. The percent of residents with an optimistic outlook on their household income was the same as comparison jurisdictions.

FIGURE 32: RATINGS OF PERSONAL ECONOMIC FUTURE BY YEAR




FIGURE 33: PERSONAL ECONOMIC FUTURE BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Positive impact of economy on household income	Similar	Similar

PUBLIC SAFETY

Safety from violent or property crimes creates the cornerstone of an attractive community. No one wants to live in fear of crime, fire or natural hazards, and communities in which residents feel protected or unthreatened are communities that are more likely to show growth in population, commerce and property value.

Residents were asked to rate their feelings of safety from violent crimes, property crimes, fire and environmental dangers and to evaluate the local agencies whose main charge is to provide protection from these dangers. Most gave positive ratings of safety in the Town of Jupiter. About 87% of those completing the questionnaire said they felt “very” or “somewhat” safe from violent crimes and 89% felt “very” or “somewhat” safe from environmental hazards. Daytime sense of safety was better than nighttime safety. These ratings had remained steady over time.

FIGURE 34: RATINGS OF COMMUNITY AND PERSONAL PUBLIC SAFETY BY YEAR




FIGURE 35: COMMUNITY AND PERSONAL PUBLIC SAFETY BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
In your neighborhood during the day	Above	Much above
In your neighborhood after dark	Above	Much above
In Jupiter's downtown area during the day	Similar	Above
In Jupiter's downtown area after dark	Much above	Much above
Violent crime (e.g., rape, assault, robbery)	Much above	Much above
Property crimes (e.g., burglary, theft)	Much above	Much above
Environmental hazards, including toxic waste	Much above	Much above

As assessed by the survey, 12% of respondents reported that someone in the household had been the victim of one or more crimes in the past year. Of those who had been the victim of a crime, 76% had reported it to police. Compared to other jurisdictions about the same percent of Jupiter residents had been victims of crime in the 12 months preceding the survey and about the same percent of Jupiter residents had reported their most recent crime victimization to the police when compared to the nation. Reporting was much lower when compared to other Jurisdictions in Florida.




FIGURE 37: CRIME VICTIMIZATION AND REPORTING BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Victim of crime	Similar	Similar
Reported crimes	Similar	Much less

Residents rated six Town public safety services; of these, all were rated above the benchmark comparison. Fire services and ambulance or emergency medical services received the highest ratings, while crime prevention and traffic enforcement received the lowest ratings. All were rated similar compared to the previous survey year.




FIGURE 39: PUBLIC SAFETY SERVICES BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Police services	Above	Much above
Fire services	Above	Above
Ambulance or emergency medical services	Above	Above
Crime prevention	Much above	Much above
Traffic enforcement	Much above	Much above
Emergency preparedness (services that prepare the community for natural disasters or other emergency situations)	Much above	Much above

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

Residents value the aesthetic qualities of their hometowns and appreciate features such as overall cleanliness and landscaping. In addition, the appearance and smell or taste of the air and water do not go unnoticed. These days, increasing attention is paid to proper treatment of the environment. At the same time that they are attending to community appearance and cleanliness, cities, counties, states and the nation are going “Green”. These strengthening environmental concerns extend to trash haul, recycling, sewer services, the delivery of power and water and preservation of open spaces. Treatment of the environment affects air and water quality and, generally, how habitable and inviting a place appears.

Residents of the Town of Jupiter were asked to evaluate their local environment and the services provided to ensure its quality. The overall quality of the natural environment was rated as “excellent” or “good” by 90% of survey respondents and it was much above the benchmark. The rating for preservation of natural areas had increased over time.

FIGURE 40: RATINGS OF THE COMMUNITY'S NATURAL ENVIRONMENT BY YEAR




FIGURE 41: COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENT BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Cleanliness of Jupiter	Much above	Much above
Quality of overall natural environment in Jupiter	Much above	Much above
Preservation of natural areas such as open space, farmlands and greenbelts	Much above	Much above

Resident recycling was much greater than recycling reported in comparison communities and had remained stable compared to the previous survey year.

FIGURE 42: FREQUENCY OF RECYCLING IN LAST 12 MONTHS BY YEAR




FIGURE 43: FREQUENCY OF RECYCLING BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Recycled used paper, cans or bottles from your home	Much more	Much more

Of the seven utility services rated by those completing the questionnaire, all were higher than the benchmark comparisons. These service ratings were similar when compared to the past survey.

FIGURE 44: RATINGS OF UTILITY SERVICES BY YEAR




FIGURE 45: UTILITY SERVICES BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Sewer services	Much above	Much above
Drinking water	Much above	Much above
Storm drainage	Much above	Much above
Yard waste pick-up	Much above	Above
Recycling	Much above	Much above
Garbage collection	Much above	Much above

RECREATION AND WELLNESS

Parks and Recreation

Quality parks and recreation opportunities help to define a community as more than the grind of its business, traffic and hard work. Leisure activities vastly can improve the quality of life of residents, serving both to entertain and mobilize good health. The survey contained questions seeking residents' perspectives about opportunities and services related to the community's parks and recreation services.

Recreation opportunities in the Town of Jupiter were rated positively as were services related to parks and recreation. Town parks, recreation programs or classes and recreation centers or facilities were rated much higher than the benchmark. Parks and recreation ratings have stayed constant over time.

Resident use of Jupiter parks and recreation facilities tells its own story about the attractiveness and accessibility of those services. The percent of residents that used Jupiter recreation centers was greater than the percent of users in comparison jurisdictions. However, recreation program use in Jupiter was about the same as use in national comparison jurisdictions. Rates of use had remained stable compared to the 2009 survey.

FIGURE 46: RATINGS OF COMMUNITY RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES BY YEAR




FIGURE 47: COMMUNITY RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Recreation opportunities	Much above	Much above

FIGURE 48: PARTICIPATION IN PARKS AND RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES BY YEAR




FIGURE 49: PARTICIPATION IN PARKS AND RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Used Jupiter recreation centers	More	More
Participated in a recreation program or activity	Similar	Much more
Visited a neighborhood park or Town park	More	Much more

FIGURE 50: RATINGS OF PARKS AND RECREATION SERVICES BY YEAR




FIGURE 51: PARKS AND RECREATION SERVICES BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Town parks	Much above	Much above
Recreation programs or classes	Much above	Much above
Recreation centers or facilities	Much above	Much above

Culture, Arts and Education

A full service community does not address only the life and safety of its residents. Like individuals who simply go to the office and return home, a community that pays attention only to the life sustaining basics becomes insular, dreary and uninspiring. In the case of communities without thriving culture, arts and education opportunities, the magnet that attracts those who might consider relocating there is vastly weakened. Cultural, artistic, social and educational services elevate the opportunities for personal growth among residents. In the survey, residents were asked about the quality of opportunities to participate in cultural and educational activities.

Opportunities to attend cultural activities were rated as “excellent” or “good” by 66% of respondents. Educational opportunities were rated as “excellent” or “good” by 77% of respondents. Compared to the benchmark data, educational opportunities were much above the average of comparison jurisdictions, as were cultural activity opportunities.

About 71% of Jupiter residents used a Town library at least once in the 12 months preceding the survey. This participation rate for library use was similar to comparison jurisdictions. The rate of library use was the same as use reported in the previous survey year.

FIGURE 52: RATINGS OF CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES BY YEAR




FIGURE 53: CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Opportunities to attend cultural activities	Much above	Much above
Educational opportunities	Much above	Much above

FIGURE 54: PARTICIPATION IN CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES BY YEAR




FIGURE 55: PARTICIPATION IN CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Used Jupiter public libraries or their services	Similar	Similar

FIGURE 56: PERCEPTION OF CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES BY YEAR




FIGURE 57: CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Public schools	Much above	Much above
Public library services	Much above	Much above

Health and Wellness

Healthy residents have the wherewithal to contribute to the economy as volunteers or employees and they do not present a burden in cost and time to others. Although residents bear the primary responsibility for their good health, local government provides services that can foster that well being and that provide care when residents are ill.

Residents of the Town of Jupiter were asked to rate the community’s health services as well as the availability of health care, high quality affordable food and preventive health care services. The availability of preventive health services was rated most positively for the Town of Jupiter. These ratings were similar compared to the past survey year.

Among Jupiter residents, 68% rated affordable quality health care as “excellent” or “good.” Those ratings were much greater than the ratings of comparison communities.

FIGURE 58: RATINGS OF COMMUNITY HEALTH AND WELLNESS ACCESS AND OPPORTUNITIES BY YEAR




FIGURE 59: COMMUNITY HEALTH AND WELLNESS ACCESS AND OPPORTUNITIES BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Availability of affordable quality health care	Much above	Much above
Availability of affordable quality food	Above	Much above
Availability of preventive health services	Much above	Much above

Health services offered in the Town of Jupiter were rated as “excellent” or “good” by 83% of respondents and were much above the benchmark.

FIGURE 60: RATINGS OF HEALTH AND WELLNESS SERVICES BY YEAR




FIGURE 61: HEALTH AND WELLNESS SERVICES BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Health services	Much above	Much above

COMMUNITY INCLUSIVENESS

Diverse communities that include among their residents a mix of races, ages, wealth, ideas and beliefs have the raw material for the most vibrant and creative society. However, the presence of these features alone does not ensure a high quality or desirable space. Surveyed residents were asked about the success of the mix: the sense of community, the openness of residents to people of diverse backgrounds and the attractiveness of the Town of Jupiter as a place to raise children or to retire. They were also questioned about the quality of services delivered to various population subgroups, including older adults, youth and residents with few resources. A community that succeeds in creating an inclusive environment for a variety of residents is a community that offers more to many.

About nine in ten residents rated the Town of Jupiter as an “excellent” or “good” place to raise kids and about nine in ten residents rated it as an “excellent” or “good” place to retire. Most residents felt that the local sense of community was “excellent” or “good.” Further, a majority of survey respondents felt the Town of Jupiter was open and accepting towards people of diverse backgrounds. The availability of affordable quality child care was rated the lowest by residents but was much higher than the benchmarks and had increased compared to the previous survey. Other ratings were similar to the past survey year.

FIGURE 62: RATINGS OF COMMUNITY QUALITY AND INCLUSIVENESS BY YEAR




FIGURE 63: COMMUNITY QUALITY AND INCLUSIVENESS BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Sense of community	Much above	Much above
Openness and acceptance of the community toward people of diverse backgrounds	Much above	Much above
Availability of affordable quality child care	Much above	Much above
Jupiter as a place to raise kids	Much above	Much above
Jupiter as a place to retire	Much above	Much above

Services to more vulnerable populations (e.g., seniors, youth or low-income residents) ranged from 60% to 80% with ratings of “excellent” or “good.” All were much above the benchmarks. The ratings for services to seniors had increased, while the rating for services to youth was lower compared to the previous survey and the rating for services to low-income people has remained the same.

FIGURE 64: RATINGS OF QUALITY OF SERVICES PROVIDED FOR POPULATION SUBGROUPS BY YEAR




FIGURE 65: SERVICES PROVIDED FOR POPULATION SUBGROUPS BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Services to seniors	Much above	Much above
Services to youth	Much above	Much above
Services to low income people	Much above	Much above

CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

Community leaders cannot run a jurisdiction alone and a jurisdiction cannot run effectively if residents remain strangers with little to connect them. Elected officials and staff require the assistance of local residents whether that assistance comes in tacit approval or eager help; and commonality of purpose among the electorate facilitates policies and programs that appeal to most and causes discord among few. Furthermore, when neighbors help neighbors, the cost to the community to provide services to residents in need declines. When residents are civically engaged, they have taken the opportunity to participate in making the community more livable for all. The extent to which local government provides opportunities to become informed and engaged and the extent to which residents take those opportunities is an indicator of the connection between government and populace. By understanding your residents' level of connection to, knowledge of and participation in local government, the Town can find better opportunities to communicate and educate citizens about its mission, services, accomplishments and plans. Communities with strong civic engagement may be more likely to see the benefits of programs intended to improve the quality of life of all residents and therefore would be more likely to support those new policies or programs.

Civic Activity

Respondents were asked about the perceived community volunteering opportunities and their participation as citizens of the Town of Jupiter. Survey participants gave high ratings to volunteer opportunities in the Town of Jupiter. Opportunities to attend or participate in community matters were also rated favorably.

Ratings of civic engagement opportunities were above ratings from comparison jurisdictions where these questions were asked.

FIGURE 66: RATINGS OF CIVIC ENGAGEMENT OPPORTUNITIES BY YEAR




FIGURE 67: CIVIC ENGAGEMENT OPPORTUNITIES BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Opportunities to participate in community matters	Above	Much above
Opportunities to volunteer	Above	Above

Most of the participants in this survey had not attended a public meeting or participated in a club in the 12 months prior to the survey, but the vast majority had helped a friend. The participation rates of these civic behaviors were compared to the rates in other jurisdictions. Those who had participated in a club or civic group in Jupiter provided help to a friend or neighbor or attended a meeting of local elected officials or other local public meeting showed similar rates of involvement. Volunteerism showed higher rates when compared to other Florida jurisdictions. Those who had watched a meeting of local elected officials or other public meeting showed lower rates of community engagement.

FIGURE 68: PARTICIPATION IN CIVIC ENGAGEMENT OPPORTUNITIES BY YEAR¹





FIGURE 69: PARTICIPATION IN CIVIC ENGAGEMENT OPPORTUNITIES BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Attended a meeting of local elected officials or other local public meeting	Similar	Similar
Watched a meeting of local elected officials or other public meeting on cable television, the Internet or other media	Much less	Much less
Volunteered your time to some group or activity in Jupiter	Similar	More
Participated in a club or civic group in Jupiter	Similar	Similar
Provided help to a friend or neighbor	Similar	Similar

¹ Over the past few years, local governments have adopted communication strategies that embrace the Internet and new media. In 2010, the question, “Watched a meeting of local elected officials or other local public meeting on cable television” was revised to include “the Internet or other media” to better reflect this trend.

Town of Jupiter residents showed the largest amount of civic engagement in the area of electoral participation. Eighty-four percent reported they were registered to vote and 82% indicated they had voted in the last general election. This rate of self-reported voting was higher than that of comparison communities.

FIGURE 70: REPORTED VOTING BEHAVIOR BY YEAR



Note: In addition to the removal of “don’t know” responses, those who said “ineligible to vote” also have been omitted from this calculation. The full frequencies appear in Appendix A.

FIGURE 71: VOTING BEHAVIOR BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Registered to vote	Similar	Similar
Voted in last general election	More	More

Information and Awareness

Those completing the survey were asked about their use and perceptions of various information sources and local government media services. When asked whether they had visited the Town of Jupiter Web site in the previous 12 months, 65% reported they had done so at least once. Public information services were rated favorably compared to benchmark data. These ratings were similar to the previous survey year.

FIGURE 72: USE OF INFORMATION SOURCES BY YEAR




FIGURE 73: USE OF INFORMATION SOURCES BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Read Jupiter Newsletter	Much more	Much more
Visited the Town of Jupiter Web site	More	Similar

FIGURE 74: RATINGS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT MEDIA SERVICES AND INFORMATION DISSEMINATION BY YEAR




FIGURE 75: LOCAL GOVERNMENT MEDIA SERVICES AND INFORMATION DISSEMINATION BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Public information services	Much above	Much above

Social Engagement

Opportunities to participate in social events and activities were rated as “excellent” or “good” by 77% of respondents. This rating was above both benchmarks and had increased compared to the previous survey year.

FIGURE 76: RATINGS OF SOCIAL ENGAGEMENT OPPORTUNITIES BY YEAR




FIGURE 77: SOCIAL ENGAGEMENT OPPORTUNITIES BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Opportunities to participate in social events and activities	Much above	Much above

Residents in Jupiter reported a strong amount of neighborliness. About 67% indicated talking or visiting with their neighbors at least several times a week. This amount of contact with neighbors was much more than the amount of contact reported in other communities.

FIGURE 78: CONTACT WITH IMMEDIATE NEIGHBORS BY YEAR




FIGURE 79: CONTACT WITH IMMEDIATE NEIGHBORS BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Has contact with neighbors at least several times per week	Much more	Much more

PUBLIC TRUST

When local government leaders are trusted, an environment of cooperation is more likely to surround all decisions they make. Cooperation leads to easier communication between leaders and residents and increases the likelihood that high value policies and programs will be implemented to improve the quality of life of the entire community. Trust can be measured in residents' opinions about the overall direction the Town of Jupiter is taking, their perspectives about the service value their taxes purchase and the openness of government to citizen participation. In addition, resident opinion about services provided by the Town of Jupiter could be compared to their opinion about services provided by the state and federal governments. If residents find nothing to admire in the services delivered by any level of government, their opinions about the Town of Jupiter may be colored by their dislike of what all levels of government provide.

A majority of respondents felt that the value of services for taxes paid was "excellent" or "good." When asked to rate the job the Town of Jupiter does at welcoming citizen involvement, 64% rated it as "excellent" or "good." Of these four ratings, all were much above the benchmarks.

FIGURE 80: PUBLIC TRUST RATINGS BY YEAR




FIGURE 81: PUBLIC TRUST BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Value of services for the taxes paid to Jupiter	Much above	Much above
The overall direction that Jupiter is taking	Much above	Much above
Job Jupiter government does at welcoming citizen involvement	Much above	Much above
Overall image or reputation of Jupiter	Much above	Much above

On average, residents of the Town of Jupiter gave the highest evaluations to their own local government and the lowest average rating to the Federal Government. The overall quality of services delivered by the Town of Jupiter was rated as “excellent” or “good” by 87% of survey participants. The Town of Jupiter’s rating was above the benchmark when compared to other communities. Ratings of overall Town services have remained stable over the last two years.

FIGURE 82: RATINGS OF SERVICES PROVIDED BY LOCAL, STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENTS BY YEAR




FIGURE 83: SERVICES PROVIDED BY LOCAL, STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENTS BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Services provided by the Town of Jupiter	Much above	Much above
Services provided by the Federal Government	Similar	Similar
Services provided by the State Government	Similar	Similar
Services provided by Palm Beach County Government	Similar	Similar

Town of Jupiter Employees

The employees of the Town of Jupiter who interact with the public create the first impression that most residents have of the Town of Jupiter. Front line staff who provide information, assist with bill paying, collect trash, create service schedules, fight fires and crime and even give traffic tickets are the collective face of the Town of Jupiter. As such, it is important to know about residents' experience talking with that "face." When employees appear to be knowledgeable, responsive and courteous, residents are more likely to feel that any needs or problems may be solved through positive and productive interactions with the Town of Jupiter staff.

Those completing the survey were asked if they had been in contact with a Town employee either in-person, over the phone or via email in the last 12 months; the 46% who reported that they had been in contact (a percent that is much lower than the benchmark comparisons) were then asked to indicate overall how satisfied they were with the employee in their most recent contact. Town employees were rated highly; 93% of respondents rated their overall impression as "excellent" or "good." Employees' ratings were much higher than the benchmarks and the ratings for overall impression and courtesy were higher than the past survey.

FIGURE 84: PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS WHO HAD CONTACT WITH TOWN EMPLOYEES IN PREVIOUS 12 MONTHS BY YEAR




FIGURE 85: CONTACT WITH TOWN EMPLOYEES BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Had contact with Town employee(s) in last 12 months	Much less	Much less

FIGURE 86: RATINGS OF TOWN EMPLOYEES (AMONG THOSE WHO HAD CONTACT) BY YEAR




FIGURE 87: RATINGS OF TOWN EMPLOYEES (AMONG THOSE WHO HAD CONTACT) BENCHMARKS

	National comparison	Florida comparison
Knowledge	Much above	Much above
Responsiveness	Much above	Much above
Courteousness	Much above	Much above
Overall impression	Much above	Much above

FROM DATA TO ACTION

RESIDENT PRIORITIES

Knowing where to focus limited resources to improve residents' opinions of local government requires information that targets the services that are most important to residents. However, when residents are asked what services are most important, they rarely stray beyond core services – those directed to save lives and improve safety.

In market research, identifying the most important characteristics of a transaction or product is called Key Driver Analysis (KDA). The key drivers that are identified from that analysis do not come from asking customers to self-report which service or product characteristic most influenced their decision to buy or return, but rather from statistical analyses of the predictors of their behavior. When customers are asked to name the most important characteristics of a good or service, responses often are expected or misleading – just as they can be in the context of a citizen survey. For example, air travelers often claim that safety is the primary consideration in their choice of an airline, yet key driver analysis reveals that frequent flier perks or in-flight entertainment predicts their buying decisions.

In local government core services – like fire protection – invariably land at the top of the list created when residents are asked about the most important local government services. And core services are important. But by using KDA, our approach digs deeper to identify the less obvious, but more influential services that are most related to residents' ratings of overall quality of local government services. Because services focused directly on life and safety remain essential to quality government, it is suggested that core services should remain the focus of continuous monitoring and improvement where necessary – but monitoring core services or asking residents to identify important services is not enough.

A KDA was conducted for the Town of Jupiter by examining the relationships between ratings of each service and ratings of the Town of Jupiter's overall services. Those Key Driver services that correlated most highly with residents' perceptions about overall Town service quality have been identified. By targeting improvements in key services, the Town of Jupiter can focus on the services that have the greatest likelihood of influencing residents' opinions about overall service quality. Because a strong correlation is not the same as a cause, there is no guarantee that improving ratings on key drivers necessarily will improve ratings. What is certain from these analyses is that key drivers are good predictors of overall resident opinion and that the key drivers presented may be useful focus areas to consider for enhancement of overall service ratings.

Services found to be most strongly correlated with ratings of overall service quality from the Jupiter Key Driver Analysis were:

- Land use, planning and zoning
- Police services
- Traffic enforcement
- Preservation of natural areas

TOWN OF JUPITER ACTION CHART

The 2011 Town of Jupiter Action Chart™ on the following page combines three dimensions of performance:


- Comparison to resident evaluations from other communities. When a comparison is available, the background color of each service box indicates whether the service is above the national benchmark (green), similar to the benchmark (yellow) or below the benchmark (red).
- Identification of key services. A black key icon (🔑) next to a service box indicates it as a key driver for the Town.
- Trendline icons (up and down arrows), indicating whether the current ratings are higher or lower than the previous survey.

Twenty-five services were included in the KDA for the Town of Jupiter. Of these, 24 were above the benchmark and one was similar to the benchmark.

Considering all performance data included in the Action Chart, a jurisdiction typically will want to consider improvements to any key driver services that are not at least similar to the benchmark. In the case of Jupiter, no key drivers were below the benchmark. More detail about interpreting results can be found in the next section.

Services with a high percent of respondents answering “don’t know” were excluded from the analysis and were considered services that would be less influential. See Appendix A: Complete Survey Frequencies, Frequencies Including “Don’t Know” Responses for the percent “don’t know” for each service.

FIGURE 88: TOWN OF JUPITER ACTION CHART™



USING YOUR ACTION CHART™

The key drivers derived for the Town of Jupiter provide a list of those services that are uniquely related to overall service quality. Those key drivers are marked with the symbol of a key in the action chart. Because key driver results are based on a relatively small number of responses, the relationships or correlations that define the key drivers are subject to more variability than is seen when key drivers are derived from a large national dataset of resident responses. To benefit the Town of Jupiter, NRC lists the key drivers derived from tens of thousands of resident responses from across the country. This national list is updated periodically so that you can compare your key drivers to the key drivers from the entire NRC dataset. Where your locally derived key drivers overlap national key drivers, it makes sense to focus even more strongly on your keys. Similarly, when your local key drivers overlap your core services, there is stronger argument to make for attending to your key drivers that overlap with core services.

As staff review key drivers, not all drivers may resonate as likely links to residents' perspectives about overall service quality. For example, in Jupiter, planning and zoning and police services may be obvious links to overall service delivery (and each is a key driver from our national database), since it could be easy for staff to see how residents' view of overall service delivery could be colored by how well they perceive police and land use planning to be delivered. But animal control could be a surprise. Before rejecting a key driver that does not pass the first test of conventional wisdom, consider whether residents' opinions about overall service quality could reasonably be influenced by this unexpected driver. For example, in the case of animal control, was there a visible case of violation prior to the survey data collection? Do Jupiter residents have different expectations for animal control than what current policy provides? Are the rare instances of violation serious enough to cause a word of mouth campaign about service delivery?

If, after deeper review, the "suspect" driver still does not square with your understanding of the services that could influence residents' perspectives about overall service quality (and if that driver is not a core service or a key driver from NRC's national research), put action in that area on hold and wait to see if it appears as a key driver the next time the survey is conducted.

In the following table, we have listed your key drivers, core services and the national key drivers and we have indicated (in **bold** typeface and with the symbol "•"), the Town of Jupiter key drivers that overlap core services or the nationally derived keys. In general, key drivers below the benchmark may be targeted for improvement. Additionally, we have indicated (with the symbol "°") those services that neither are local nor national key drivers nor are they core services. It is these services that could be considered first for resource reductions.

FIGURE 89: KEY DRIVERS COMPARED

Service	Town of Jupiter Key Drivers	National Key Drivers	Core Services
• Police services	✓	✓	✓
Fire services			✓
Ambulance and emergency medical services			✓
Traffic enforcement	✓		
Street repair			✓
◦ Street cleaning			
◦ Street lighting			
◦ Sidewalk maintenance			
◦ Traffic signal timing			
Garbage collection			✓
◦ Recycling			
Storm drainage			✓
Drinking water			✓
Sewer services			✓
◦ Town parks			
◦ Recreation centers or facilities			
• Land use planning and zoning	✓	✓	
Code enforcement			✓
◦ Animal control			
Economic development		✓	
Health services			✓
◦ Public library			
Public information services		✓	
Public schools		✓	
Preservation of natural areas	✓		

- Key driver overlaps with national and or core services
- Service may be targeted for reductions it is not a key driver or core service

CUSTOM QUESTIONS

“Don’t know” responses have been removed from the following questions.

Custom Question 1	
The Town of Jupiter is considering undergrounding utility wire in order to prevent damage from weather and storms. This project would require a financial contribution from residents and businesses. Please indicate the extent to which you would support or oppose undergrounding the utility wires in Jupiter.	Percent of respondents
Strongly support	38%
Somewhat support	41%
Somewhat oppose	13%
Strongly oppose	7%
Total	100%

Custom Question 2	
The Town of Jupiter is considering establishing “quiet zones” along the existing freight train lines (along Alternate A1A) to prevent train whistles from blowing (except in the case of safety issues or emergencies). In order to establish the “quiet zones,” funding for safety infrastructure would be required from the Town and from the residents it benefits. Please indicate to what extent you would support or oppose the Town taking this action.	Percent of respondents
Strongly support	25%
Somewhat support	32%
Somewhat oppose	25%
Strongly oppose	18%
Total	100%

APPENDIX A: COMPLETE SURVEY FREQUENCIES

FREQUENCIES EXCLUDING "DON'T KNOW" RESPONSES

Question 1: Quality of Life					
Please rate each of the following aspects of quality of life in Jupiter:	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
Jupiter as a place to live	66%	31%	3%	0%	100%
Your neighborhood as a place to live	49%	41%	9%	0%	100%
Jupiter as a place to raise children	48%	41%	11%	0%	100%
Jupiter as a place to work	37%	38%	16%	8%	100%
Jupiter as a place to retire	61%	30%	7%	2%	100%
The overall quality of life in Jupiter	56%	35%	8%	0%	100%

Question 2: Community Characteristics					
Please rate each of the following characteristics as they relate to Jupiter as a whole:	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
Sense of community	19%	60%	20%	2%	100%
Openness and acceptance of the community towards people of diverse backgrounds	20%	54%	23%	3%	100%
Overall appearance of Jupiter	38%	54%	8%	0%	100%
Cleanliness of Jupiter	37%	52%	11%	0%	100%
Overall quality of new development in Jupiter	28%	47%	22%	4%	100%
Variety of housing options	21%	51%	22%	6%	100%
Overall quality of business and service establishments in Jupiter	26%	51%	19%	4%	100%
Shopping opportunities	23%	43%	24%	10%	100%
Opportunities to attend cultural activities	19%	47%	27%	6%	100%
Recreational opportunities	36%	47%	16%	2%	100%
Employment opportunities	13%	31%	37%	19%	100%
Educational opportunities	23%	54%	18%	5%	100%
Opportunities to participate in social events and activities	23%	54%	20%	3%	100%
Opportunities to volunteer	27%	56%	15%	2%	100%
Opportunities to participate in community matters	22%	50%	24%	4%	100%
Ease of car travel in Jupiter	31%	49%	14%	6%	100%
Ease of bus travel in Jupiter	12%	25%	27%	36%	100%
Ease of bicycle travel in Jupiter	15%	47%	29%	10%	100%
Ease of walking in Jupiter	24%	46%	23%	7%	100%
Availability of paths and walking trails	24%	49%	19%	9%	100%
Traffic flow on major streets	12%	46%	30%	13%	100%
Amount of public parking	19%	53%	23%	5%	100%
Availability of affordable quality housing	14%	34%	34%	18%	100%

Question 2: Community Characteristics					
Please rate each of the following characteristics as they relate to Jupiter as a whole:	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
Availability of affordable quality child care	15%	43%	32%	10%	100%
Availability of affordable quality health care	21%	47%	22%	10%	100%
Availability of affordable quality food	24%	47%	21%	8%	100%
Availability of preventive health services	30%	43%	21%	6%	100%
Quality of overall natural environment in Jupiter	40%	50%	10%	0%	100%
Overall image or reputation of Jupiter	45%	47%	7%	1%	100%

Question 3: Growth						
Please rate the speed of growth in the following categories in Jupiter over the past 2 years:	Much too slow	Somewhat too slow	Right amount	Somewhat too fast	Much too fast	Total
Population growth	0%	3%	45%	36%	16%	100%
Retail growth (stores, restaurants, etc.)	4%	25%	55%	9%	6%	100%
Jobs growth	24%	49%	26%	1%	0%	100%

Question 4: Code Enforcement	
To what degree, if at all, are run down buildings, weed lots or junk vehicles a problem in Jupiter?	Percent of respondents
Not a problem	27%
Minor problem	54%
Moderate problem	16%
Major problem	3%
Total	100%

Question 5: Community Safety						
Please rate how safe or unsafe you feel from the following in Jupiter:	Very safe	Somewhat safe	Neither safe nor unsafe	Somewhat unsafe	Very unsafe	Total
Violent crime (e.g., rape, assault, robbery)	45%	42%	8%	4%	1%	100%
Property crimes (e.g., burglary, theft)	22%	50%	13%	13%	1%	100%
Environmental hazards, including toxic waste	50%	40%	6%	3%	1%	100%

Question 6: Personal Safety						
Please rate how safe or unsafe you feel:	Very safe	Somewhat safe	Neither safe nor unsafe	Somewhat unsafe	Very unsafe	Total
In your neighborhood during the day	74%	24%	2%	0%	1%	100%
In your neighborhood after dark	40%	42%	8%	8%	2%	100%
In Jupiter's downtown area during the day	55%	35%	6%	2%	1%	100%
In Jupiter's downtown area after dark	21%	51%	14%	11%	3%	100%

Question 7: Crime Victim	
During the past 12 months, were you or anyone in your household the victim of any crime?	Percent of respondents
No	88%
Yes	12%
Total	100%

Question 8: Crime Reporting	
If yes, was this crime (these crimes) reported to the police?	Percent of respondents
No	24%
Yes	76%
Total	100%

Question 9: Resident Behaviors						
In the last 12 months, about how many times, if ever, have you or other household members participated in the following activities in Jupiter?	Never	Once or twice	3 to 12 times	13 to 26 times	More than 26 times	Total
Used Jupiter public libraries or their services	29%	21%	28%	10%	13%	100%
Used Jupiter recreation centers	38%	27%	20%	7%	8%	100%
Participated in a recreation program or activity	51%	26%	11%	6%	7%	100%
Visited a neighborhood park or Town park	8%	21%	39%	18%	14%	100%
Ridden a local bus within Jupiter	93%	5%	1%	1%	1%	100%
Attended a meeting of local elected officials or other local public meeting	75%	20%	4%	1%	0%	100%
Watched a meeting of local elected officials or other Town-sponsored public meeting on cable television, the Internet or other media	72%	18%	8%	2%	1%	100%
Read Jupiter Newsletter	10%	37%	32%	9%	13%	100%
Visited the Town of Jupiter Web site (at www.jupiter.fl.us.com)	35%	28%	22%	7%	8%	100%
Recycled used paper, cans or bottles from your home	6%	4%	9%	11%	71%	100%

Question 9: Resident Behaviors						
In the last 12 months, about how many times, if ever, have you or other household members participated in the following activities in Jupiter?	Never	Once or twice	3 to 12 times	13 to 26 times	More than 26 times	Total
Volunteered your time to some group or activity in Jupiter	55%	20%	12%	3%	10%	100%
Participated in a club or civic group in Jupiter	69%	14%	6%	4%	7%	100%
Provided help to a friend or neighbor	5%	15%	34%	23%	23%	100%

Question 10: Neighborliness	
About how often, if at all, do you talk to or visit with your immediate neighbors (people who live in the 10 or 20 households that are closest to you)?	Percent of respondents
Just about everyday	35%
Several times a week	32%
Several times a month	17%
Less than several times a month	16%
Total	100%

Question 11: Service Quality					
Please rate the quality of each of the following services in Jupiter:	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
Police services	34%	48%	17%	1%	100%
Fire services	48%	46%	6%	0%	100%
Ambulance or emergency medical services	46%	47%	7%	0%	100%
Crime prevention	28%	52%	16%	4%	100%
Traffic enforcement	24%	55%	18%	3%	100%
Street repair	22%	51%	22%	5%	100%
Street cleaning	25%	50%	23%	2%	100%
Street lighting	19%	52%	24%	5%	100%
Sidewalk maintenance	20%	55%	20%	6%	100%
Traffic signal timing	12%	41%	34%	13%	100%
Bus or transit services	16%	33%	28%	23%	100%
Garbage collection	44%	46%	8%	1%	100%
Recycling	47%	43%	10%	0%	100%
Yard waste pick-up	32%	54%	12%	2%	100%
Storm drainage	28%	50%	15%	7%	100%
Drinking water	43%	40%	10%	8%	100%
Sewer services	37%	51%	11%	1%	100%
Town parks	51%	47%	2%	0%	100%
Recreation programs or classes	38%	53%	9%	1%	100%
Recreation centers or facilities	37%	52%	11%	0%	100%
Land use, planning and zoning	15%	51%	23%	10%	100%
Code enforcement (weeds, abandoned buildings, etc.)	16%	55%	21%	8%	100%

Question 11: Service Quality					
Please rate the quality of each of the following services in Jupiter:	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
Animal control	16%	57%	17%	10%	100%
Economic development	14%	54%	21%	12%	100%
Health services	27%	56%	13%	5%	100%
Services to seniors	32%	48%	18%	2%	100%
Services to youth	23%	45%	21%	11%	100%
Services to low-income people	21%	39%	23%	17%	100%
Public library services	42%	54%	4%	0%	100%
Public information services	27%	55%	13%	4%	100%
Public schools	39%	45%	13%	3%	100%
Emergency preparedness (services that prepare the community for natural disasters or other emergency situations)	26%	63%	11%	0%	100%
Preservation of natural areas such as open space, farmlands and greenbelts	36%	52%	10%	3%	100%

Question 12: Government Services Overall					
Overall, how would you rate the quality of the services provided by each of the following?	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
The Town of Jupiter	32%	55%	12%	1%	100%
The Federal Government	8%	35%	33%	24%	100%
The State Government	7%	40%	31%	22%	100%
Palm Beach County Government	11%	44%	28%	16%	100%

Question 13: Contact with Town Employees	
Have you had any in-person, phone or email contact with an employee of the Town of Jupiter within the last 12 months (including police, receptionists, planners or any others)?	Percent of respondents
No	54%
Yes	46%
Total	100%

Question 14: Town Employees					
What was your impression of the employee(s) of the Town of Jupiter in your most recent contact?	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
Knowledge	53%	40%	5%	2%	100%
Responsiveness	60%	28%	4%	7%	100%
Courtesy	67%	28%	3%	3%	100%
Overall impression	55%	38%	4%	3%	100%

Question 15: Government Performance					
Please rate the following categories of Jupiter government performance:	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
The value of services for the taxes paid to Jupiter	25%	41%	32%	2%	100%
The overall direction that Jupiter is taking	20%	51%	25%	4%	100%
The job Jupiter government does at welcoming citizen involvement	22%	42%	30%	7%	100%

Question 16: Recommendation and Longevity					
Please indicate how likely or unlikely you are to do each of the following:	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely	Total
Recommend living in Jupiter to someone who asks	73%	22%	3%	2%	100%
Remain in Jupiter for the next five years	74%	19%	4%	3%	100%

Question 17: Impact of the Economy	
What impact, if any, do you think the economy will have on your family income in the next 6 months? Do you think the impact will be:	Percent of respondents
Very positive	5%
Somewhat positive	11%
Neutral	46%
Somewhat negative	32%
Very negative	6%
Total	100%

Question 18a: Custom Question 1	
The Town of Jupiter is considering undergrounding utility wire in order to prevent damage from weather and storms. This project would require a financial contribution from residents and businesses. Please indicate the extent to which you would support or oppose undergrounding the utility wires in Jupiter.	Percent of respondents
Strongly support	38%
Somewhat support	41%
Somewhat oppose	13%
Strongly oppose	7%
Total	100%

Question 18b: Custom Question 2	
The Town of Jupiter is considering establishing “quiet zones” along the existing freight train lines (along Alternate A1A) to prevent train whistles from blowing (except in the case of safety issues or emergencies). In order to establish the “quiet zones,” funding for safety infrastructure would be required from the Town and from the residents it benefits. Please indicate to what extent you would support or oppose the Town taking this action.	Percent of respondents
Strongly support	25%
Somewhat support	32%
Somewhat oppose	25%
Strongly oppose	18%
Total	100%

Question D1: Employment Status	
Are you currently employed for pay?	Percent of respondents
No	33%
Yes, full-time	54%
Yes, part-time	14%
Total	100%

Question D2: Mode of Transportation Used for Commute	
During a typical week, how many days do you commute to work (for the longest distance of your commute) in each of the ways listed below?	Percent of days mode used
Motorized vehicle (e.g., car, truck, van, motorcycle, etc.) by myself	75%
Motorized vehicle (e.g., car, truck, van, motorcycle, etc.) with other children or adults	10%
Bus, rail, subway or other public transportation	1%
Walk	3%
Bicycle	2%
Work at home	7%
Other	2%

Question D3: Length of Residency	
How many years have you lived in Jupiter?	Percent of respondents
Less than 2 years	9%
2 to 5 years	17%
6 to 10 years	19%
11 to 20 years	30%
More than 20 years	26%
Total	100%

Question D4: Housing Unit Type	
Which best describes the building you live in?	Percent of respondents
One family house detached from any other houses	49%
House attached to one or more houses (e.g., a duplex or townhome)	21%
Building with two or more apartments or condominiums	30%
Mobile home	0%
Other	1%
Total	100%

Question D5: Housing Tenure (Rent/Own)	
Is this house, apartment or mobile home...	Percent of respondents
Rented for cash or occupied without cash payment	25%
Owned by you or someone in this house with a mortgage or free and clear	75%
Total	100%

Question D6: Monthly Housing Cost	
About how much is the total monthly housing cost for the place you live (including rent, mortgage payment, property tax, property insurance and homeowners' association (HOA) fees)?	Percent of respondents
Less than \$300 per month	5%
\$300 to \$599 per month	7%
\$600 to \$999 per month	15%
\$1,000 to \$1,499 per month	26%
\$1,500 to \$2,499 per month	26%
\$2,500 or more per month	22%
Total	100%

Question D7: Presence of Children in Household	
Do any children 17 or under live in your household?	Percent of respondents
No	71%
Yes	29%
Total	100%

Question D8: Presence of Older Adults in Household	
Are you or any other members of your household aged 65 or older?	Percent of respondents
No	64%
Yes	36%
Total	100%

Question D9: Household Income	
How much do you anticipate your household's total income before taxes will be for the current year? (Please include in your total income money from all sources for all persons living in your household.)	Percent of respondents
Less than \$24,999	12%
\$25,000 to \$49,999	20%
\$50,000 to \$99,999	40%
\$100,000 to \$149,000	15%
\$150,000 or more	15%
Total	100%

Question D10: Ethnicity	
Are you Spanish, Hispanic or Latino?	Percent of respondents
No, not Spanish, Hispanic or Latino	96%
Yes, I consider myself to be Spanish, Hispanic or Latino	4%
Total	100%

Question D11: Race	
What is your race? (Mark one or more races to indicate what race(s) you consider yourself to be.)	Percent of respondents
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0%
Asian, Asian Indian or Pacific Islander	7%
Black or African American	1%
White	90%
Other	3%
Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option	

Question D12: Age	
In which category is your age?	Percent of respondents
18 to 24 years	4%
25 to 34 years	16%
35 to 44 years	11%
45 to 54 years	25%
55 to 64 years	15%
65 to 74 years	17%
75 years or older	12%
Total	100%

Question D13: Gender	
What is your sex?	Percent of respondents
Female	52%
Male	48%
Total	100%

Question D14: Registered to Vote	
Are you registered to vote in your jurisdiction?	Percent of respondents
No	15%
Yes	82%
Ineligible to vote	3%
Total	100%

Question D15: Voted in Last General Election	
Many people don't have time to vote in elections. Did you vote in the last general election?	Percent of respondents
No	17%
Yes	80%
Ineligible to vote	3%
Total	100%

Question D16: Has Cell Phone	
Do you have a cell phone?	Percent of respondents
No	9%
Yes	91%
Total	100%

Question D17: Has Land Line	
Do you have a land line at home?	Percent of respondents
No	32%
Yes	68%
Total	100%

Question D18: Primary Phone	
If you have both a cell phone and a land line, which do you consider your primary telephone number?	Percent of respondents
Cell	35%
Land line	42%
Both	23%
Total	100%

FREQUENCIES INCLUDING “DON’T KNOW” RESPONSES

These tables contain the percentage of respondents for each response category as well as the “n” or total number of respondents for each category, next to the percentage.

Question 1: Quality of Life												
Please rate each of the following aspects of quality of life in Jupiter:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Jupiter as a place to live	66%	208	31%	99	3%	9	0%	0	0%	0	100%	316
Your neighborhood as a place to live	49%	155	41%	131	9%	29	0%	1	0%	0	100%	316
Jupiter as a place to raise children	42%	131	36%	110	10%	30	0%	1	12%	38	100%	309
Jupiter as a place to work	29%	90	29%	92	13%	40	6%	19	23%	71	100%	311
Jupiter as a place to retire	54%	169	26%	82	6%	19	2%	6	11%	35	100%	312
The overall quality of life in Jupiter	56%	179	35%	112	8%	26	0%	0	0%	0	100%	316

Question 2: Community Characteristics												
Please rate each of the following characteristics as they relate to Jupiter as a whole:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Sense of community	18%	55	58%	177	19%	58	2%	6	2%	7	100%	303
Openness and acceptance of the community towards people of diverse backgrounds	18%	55	49%	152	21%	64	3%	8	10%	31	100%	310
Overall appearance of Jupiter	38%	120	54%	168	8%	25	0%	0	0%	0	100%	313
Cleanliness of Jupiter	37%	115	52%	162	11%	34	0%	1	0%	1	100%	313
Overall quality of new development in Jupiter	26%	82	43%	136	20%	63	3%	10	7%	21	100%	312
Variety of housing options	19%	60	48%	148	21%	65	6%	18	6%	18	100%	309
Overall quality of business and service establishments in Jupiter	26%	79	50%	154	19%	59	4%	11	2%	6	100%	309
Shopping opportunities	23%	74	43%	135	24%	76	10%	31	0%	0	100%	315
Opportunities to attend cultural activities	18%	56	44%	137	25%	80	6%	19	7%	22	100%	314
Recreational opportunities	35%	108	46%	140	15%	47	2%	5	2%	7	100%	308
Employment opportunities	10%	31	23%	71	27%	85	14%	45	25%	78	100%	310
Educational opportunities	19%	59	46%	141	16%	48	4%	13	15%	47	100%	307
Opportunities to participate in social events and activities	21%	67	49%	153	18%	57	3%	9	8%	25	100%	310
Opportunities to volunteer	21%	66	44%	138	12%	38	2%	6	20%	63	100%	310

Question 2: Community Characteristics												
Please rate each of the following characteristics as they relate to Jupiter as a whole:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
	Opportunities to participate in community matters	18%	55	41%	127	20%	61	3%	10	18%	57	100%
Ease of car travel in Jupiter	31%	94	48%	147	14%	42	6%	18	2%	5	100%	307
Ease of bus travel in Jupiter	6%	19	13%	41	14%	43	19%	59	48%	148	100%	310
Ease of bicycle travel in Jupiter	12%	36	36%	113	22%	69	8%	24	22%	68	100%	310
Ease of walking in Jupiter	22%	70	42%	131	22%	67	6%	19	8%	25	100%	312
Availability of paths and walking trails	22%	68	46%	143	17%	54	8%	25	7%	23	100%	313
Traffic flow on major streets	12%	37	45%	141	29%	92	12%	39	1%	4	100%	313
Amount of public parking	18%	56	50%	155	21%	66	4%	14	6%	20	100%	311
Availability of affordable quality housing	11%	35	28%	89	28%	88	15%	46	17%	54	100%	311
Availability of affordable quality child care	7%	22	21%	64	16%	47	5%	16	51%	154	100%	304
Availability of affordable quality health care	18%	55	40%	122	18%	57	9%	26	15%	48	100%	308
Availability of affordable quality food	23%	72	45%	141	20%	64	8%	24	4%	11	100%	313
Availability of preventive health services	23%	71	34%	105	17%	50	5%	14	21%	64	100%	305
Quality of overall natural environment in Jupiter	39%	122	50%	156	10%	30	0%	1	1%	2	100%	311
Overall image or reputation of Jupiter	45%	141	47%	146	7%	22	1%	2	0%	1	100%	312

Question 3: Growth														
Please rate the speed of growth in the following categories in Jupiter over the past 2 years:	Much too slow		Somewhat too slow		Right amount		Somewhat too fast		Much too fast		Don't know		Total	
	Population growth	0%	1	2%	7	37%	115	30%	93	13%	40	17%	52	100%
Retail growth (stores, restaurants, etc.)	4%	11	23%	70	50%	152	8%	25	6%	17	9%	28	100%	304
Jobs growth	15%	44	31%	92	17%	50	1%	2	0%	0	37%	112	100%	300

Question 4: Code Enforcement		
To what degree, if at all, are run down buildings, weed lots or junk vehicles a problem in Jupiter?	Percent of respondents	Count
Not a problem	23%	70
Minor problem	47%	142
Moderate problem	14%	42
Major problem	3%	9
Don't know	13%	38
Total	100%	300

Question 5: Community Safety														
Please rate how safe or unsafe you feel from the following in Jupiter:	Very safe		Somewhat safe		Neither safe nor unsafe		Somewhat unsafe		Very unsafe		Don't know		Total	
	Violent crime (e.g., rape, assault, robbery)	45%	138	41%	126	8%	25	4%	12	1%	3	1%	4	100%
Property crimes (e.g., burglary, theft)	22%	67	49%	151	13%	41	12%	38	1%	4	2%	6	100%	307
Environmental hazards, including toxic waste	45%	140	36%	112	6%	18	3%	10	1%	3	8%	26	100%	307

Question 6: Personal Safety														
Please rate how safe or unsafe you feel:	Very safe		Somewhat safe		Neither safe nor unsafe		Somewhat unsafe		Very unsafe		Don't know		Total	
	In your neighborhood during the day	74%	228	24%	73	2%	6	0%	0	1%	2	0%	1	100%
In your neighborhood after dark	39%	122	42%	129	8%	26	8%	25	2%	5	1%	3	100%	310
In Jupiter's downtown area during the day	49%	152	31%	96	6%	18	2%	6	1%	4	11%	33	100%	308
In Jupiter's downtown area after dark	18%	56	43%	132	12%	36	9%	28	3%	8	15%	48	100%	307

Question 7: Crime Victim		
During the past 12 months, were you or anyone in your household the victim of any crime?	Percent of respondents	Count
No	88%	269
Yes	12%	37
Don't know	0%	0
Total	100%	305

Question 8: Crime Reporting		
If yes, was this crime (these crimes) reported to the police?	Percent of respondents	Count
No	24%	9
Yes	76%	28
Don't know	0%	0
Total	100%	37

Question 9: Resident Behaviors												
In the last 12 months, about how many times, if ever, have you or other household members participated in the following activities in Jupiter?	Never		Once or twice		3 to 12 times		13 to 26 times		More than 26 times		Total	
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
Used Jupiter public libraries or their services	29%	89	21%	63	28%	86	10%	30	13%	38	100%	307
Used Jupiter recreation centers	38%	116	27%	81	20%	61	7%	21	8%	24	100%	304
Participated in a recreation program or activity	51%	153	26%	78	11%	34	6%	17	7%	21	100%	303
Visited a neighborhood park or Town park	8%	26	21%	62	39%	117	18%	56	14%	41	100%	302
Ridden a local bus within Jupiter	93%	280	5%	15	1%	3	1%	2	1%	2	100%	302
Attended a meeting of local elected officials or other local public meeting	75%	228	20%	60	4%	11	1%	4	0%	1	100%	304
Watched a meeting of local elected officials or other Town-sponsored public meeting on cable television, the Internet or other media	72%	215	18%	53	8%	23	2%	6	1%	3	100%	299
Read Jupiter Newsletter	10%	30	37%	110	32%	95	9%	27	13%	38	100%	299

Question 9: Resident Behaviors												
In the last 12 months, about how many times, if ever, have you or other household members participated in the following activities in Jupiter?	Never		Once or twice		3 to 12 times		13 to 26 times		More than 26 times		Total	
	Visited the Town of Jupiter Web site (at www.jupiter.fl.us.com)	35%	105	28%	83	22%	66	7%	20	8%	24	100%
Recycled used paper, cans or bottles from your home	6%	19	4%	11	9%	26	11%	31	71%	212	100%	299
Volunteered your time to some group or activity in Jupiter	55%	167	20%	60	12%	35	3%	10	10%	29	100%	301
Participated in a club or civic group in Jupiter	69%	210	14%	42	6%	18	4%	13	7%	21	100%	304
Provided help to a friend or neighbor	5%	16	15%	47	34%	104	23%	69	23%	71	100%	307

Question 10: Neighborliness		
About how often, if at all, do you talk to or visit with your immediate neighbors (people who live in the 10 or 20 households that are closest to you)?	Percent of respondents	Count
Just about everyday	35%	107
Several times a week	32%	99
Several times a month	17%	52
Less than several times a month	16%	49
Total	100%	307

Question 11: Service Quality												
Please rate the quality of each of the following services in Jupiter:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
	Police services	32%	99	44%	138	16%	51	1%	2	7%	21	100%
Fire services	38%	115	37%	112	4%	13	0%	1	21%	64	100%	306
Ambulance or emergency medical services	38%	118	38%	119	6%	18	0%	0	18%	56	100%	311
Crime prevention	23%	69	42%	130	13%	39	3%	10	19%	59	100%	306
Traffic enforcement	21%	66	49%	152	16%	51	2%	7	11%	35	100%	310
Street repair	21%	66	50%	156	22%	68	5%	14	2%	5	100%	309
Street cleaning	24%	75	48%	150	22%	69	2%	7	3%	8	100%	309
Street lighting	18%	57	52%	161	24%	74	5%	15	1%	3	100%	310

Question 11: Service Quality												
Please rate the quality of each of the following services in Jupiter:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
	Sidewalk maintenance	19%	59	53%	164	19%	59	5%	17	3%	10	100%
Traffic signal timing	12%	37	40%	123	33%	102	13%	39	2%	7	100%	309
Bus or transit services	6%	18	12%	38	11%	33	9%	27	62%	187	100%	303
Garbage collection	43%	133	45%	139	7%	23	1%	4	3%	11	100%	310
Recycling	45%	139	41%	127	10%	29	0%	0	5%	14	100%	310
Yard waste pick-up	28%	85	46%	143	10%	31	2%	5	14%	44	100%	309
Storm drainage	25%	77	45%	137	13%	40	6%	19	10%	31	100%	304
Drinking water	41%	126	38%	118	10%	30	7%	23	3%	11	100%	308
Sewer services	33%	101	46%	140	10%	29	1%	3	10%	31	100%	305
Town parks	49%	148	45%	137	2%	6	0%	1	4%	12	100%	304
Recreation programs or classes	25%	77	35%	107	6%	17	1%	2	33%	102	100%	307
Recreation centers or facilities	28%	86	40%	121	8%	25	0%	0	24%	73	100%	304
Land use, planning and zoning	12%	36	40%	121	18%	54	8%	24	23%	69	100%	305
Code enforcement (weeds, abandoned buildings, etc.)	13%	39	43%	131	17%	51	6%	19	22%	66	100%	306
Animal control	12%	38	43%	133	13%	40	8%	23	24%	74	100%	309
Economic development	10%	31	40%	122	16%	48	9%	27	25%	75	100%	303
Health services	21%	64	42%	131	10%	29	4%	11	24%	74	100%	309
Services to seniors	17%	52	26%	79	10%	30	1%	4	47%	143	100%	307
Services to youth	12%	36	24%	72	11%	34	6%	17	47%	140	100%	300
Services to low-income people	9%	26	16%	49	10%	29	7%	21	58%	176	100%	301
Public library services	36%	111	46%	142	4%	11	0%	0	14%	43	100%	308
Public information services	20%	61	40%	122	10%	30	3%	9	27%	81	100%	302
Public schools	28%	83	32%	97	9%	28	2%	7	28%	85	100%	300
Emergency preparedness (services that prepare the community for natural disasters or other emergency situations)	18%	54	43%	130	8%	23	0%	0	31%	94	100%	302
Preservation of natural areas such as open space, farmlands and greenbelts	30%	91	44%	132	8%	25	2%	7	16%	48	100%	302

Question 12: Government Services Overall												
Overall, how would you rate the quality of the services provided by each of the following?	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
	The Town of Jupiter	31%	95	52%	163	11%	36	1%	2	5%	15	100%
The Federal Government	6%	20	30%	91	28%	86	21%	64	15%	47	100%	307
The State Government	6%	18	34%	103	26%	81	19%	57	15%	48	100%	308
Palm Beach County Government	9%	29	38%	116	24%	74	14%	43	15%	46	100%	308

Question 13: Contact with Town Employees		
Have you had any in-person, phone or email contact with an employee of the Town of Jupiter within the last 12 months (including police, receptionists, planners or any others)?	Percent of respondents	Count
No	54%	165
Yes	46%	140
Total	100%	305

Question 14: Town Employees												
What was your impression of the employee(s) of the Town of Jupiter in your most recent contact?	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
	Knowledge	53%	74	40%	56	4%	6	2%	2	1%	2	100%
Responsiveness	60%	83	28%	40	4%	6	7%	10	0%	0	100%	139
Courtesy	67%	93	28%	39	3%	4	3%	4	0%	0	100%	140
Overall impression	55%	76	38%	53	4%	6	3%	4	0%	0	100%	139

Question 15: Government Performance												
Please rate the following categories of Jupiter government performance:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
	The value of services for the taxes paid to Jupiter	21%	66	35%	110	27%	85	2%	6	14%	45	100%
The overall direction that Jupiter is taking	17%	54	45%	140	23%	70	4%	12	11%	33	100%	309
The job Jupiter government does at welcoming citizen involvement	15%	48	30%	91	21%	65	5%	15	29%	89	100%	308

Question 16: Recommendation and Longevity												
Please indicate how likely or unlikely you are to do each of the following:	Very likely		Somewhat likely		Somewhat unlikely		Very unlikely		Don't know		Total	
	Recommend living in Jupiter to someone who asks	72%	225	21%	66	3%	9	2%	7	2%	5	100%
Remain in Jupiter for the next five years	71%	222	18%	58	3%	11	3%	10	4%	14	100%	315

Question 17: Impact of the Economy		
What impact, if any, do you think the economy will have on your family income in the next 6 months? Do you think the impact will be:	Percent of respondents	Count
Very positive	5%	15
Somewhat positive	11%	36
Neutral	46%	142
Somewhat negative	32%	99
Very negative	6%	19
Total	100%	310

Question 18a: Custom Question 1		
The Town of Jupiter is considering undergrounding utility wire in order to prevent damage from weather and storms. This project would require a financial contribution from residents and businesses. Please indicate the extent to which you would support or oppose undergrounding the utility wires in Jupiter.	Percent of respondents	Count
Strongly support	36%	114
Somewhat support	38%	121
Somewhat oppose	12%	39
Strongly oppose	7%	22
Don't know	6%	19
Total	100%	315

Question 18b: Custom Question 2		
The Town of Jupiter is considering establishing "quiet zones" along the existing freight train lines (along Alternate A1A) to prevent train whistles from blowing (except in the case of safety issues or emergencies). In order to establish the "quiet zones," funding for safety infrastructure would be required from the Town and from the residents it benefits. Please indicate to what extent you would support or oppose the Town taking this action.	Percent of respondents	Count
Strongly support	22%	70
Somewhat support	28%	87
Somewhat oppose	22%	68
Strongly oppose	16%	51
Don't know	12%	38
Total	100%	315

Question D1: Employment Status		
Are you currently employed for pay?	Percent of respondents	Count
No	33%	100
Yes, full-time	54%	165
Yes, part-time	14%	42
Total	100%	306

Question D2: Mode of Transportation Used for Commute	
During a typical week, how many days do you commute to work (for the longest distance of your commute) in each of the ways listed below?	Percent of days mode used
Motorized vehicle (e.g., car, truck, van, motorcycle, etc.) by myself	75%
Motorized vehicle (e.g., car, truck, van, motorcycle, etc.) with other children or adults	10%
Bus, rail, subway or other public transportation	1%
Walk	3%
Bicycle	2%
Work at home	7%
Other	2%

Question D3: Length of Residency		
How many years have you lived in Jupiter?	Percent of respondents	Count
Less than 2 years	9%	27
2 to 5 years	17%	54
6 to 10 years	19%	58
11 to 20 years	30%	93
More than 20 years	26%	80
Total	100%	312

Question D4: Housing Unit Type		
Which best describes the building you live in?	Percent of respondents	Count
One family house detached from any other houses	49%	152
House attached to one or more houses (e.g., a duplex or townhome)	21%	65
Building with two or more apartments or condominiums	30%	93
Mobile home	0%	0
Other	1%	3
Total	100%	312

Question D5: Housing Tenure (Rent/Own)		
Is this house, apartment or mobile home...	Percent of respondents	Count
Rented for cash or occupied without cash payment	25%	75
Owned by you or someone in this house with a mortgage or free and clear	75%	229
Total	100%	304

Question D6: Monthly Housing Cost		
About how much is the total monthly housing cost for the place you live (including rent, mortgage payment, property tax, property insurance and homeowners" association (HOA) fees)?	Percent of respondents	Count
Less than \$300 per month	5%	15
\$300 to \$599 per month	7%	20
\$600 to \$999 per month	15%	44
\$1,000 to \$1,499 per month	26%	79
\$1,500 to \$2,499 per month	26%	77
\$2,500 or more per month	22%	64
Total	100%	300

Question D7: Presence of Children in Household		
Do any children 17 or under live in your household?	Percent of respondents	Count
No	71%	220
Yes	29%	91
Total	100%	312

Question D8: Presence of Older Adults in Household		
Are you or any other members of your household aged 65 or older?	Percent of respondents	Count
No	64%	201
Yes	36%	111
Total	100%	312

Question D9: Household Income		
How much do you anticipate your household's total income before taxes will be for the current year? (Please include in your total income money from all sources for all persons living in your household.)	Percent of respondents	Count
Less than \$24,999	12%	33
\$25,000 to \$49,999	20%	55
\$50,000 to \$99,999	40%	113
\$100,000 to \$149,000	15%	41
\$150,000 or more	15%	42
Total	100%	284

Question D10: Ethnicity		
Are you Spanish, Hispanic or Latino?	Percent of respondents	Count
No, not Spanish, Hispanic or Latino	96%	297
Yes, I consider myself to be Spanish, Hispanic or Latino	4%	14
Total	100%	310

Question D11: Race		
What is your race? (Mark one or more races to indicate what race(s) you consider yourself to be.)	Percent of respondents	Count
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0%	1
Asian, Asian Indian or Pacific Islander	7%	20
Black or African American	1%	2
White	90%	280
Other	3%	9
Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option		

Question D12: Age		
In which category is your age?	Percent of respondents	Count
18 to 24 years	4%	12
25 to 34 years	16%	50
35 to 44 years	11%	35
45 to 54 years	25%	77
55 to 64 years	15%	47
65 to 74 years	17%	51
75 years or older	12%	37
Total	100%	308

Question D13: Gender		
What is your sex?	Percent of respondents	Count
Female	52%	161
Male	48%	147
Total	100%	307

Question D14: Registered to Vote		
Are you registered to vote in your jurisdiction?	Percent of respondents	Count
No	15%	46
Yes	79%	247
Ineligible to vote	3%	9
Don't know	3%	9
Total	100%	310

Question D15: Voted in Last General Election		
Many people don't have time to vote in elections. Did you vote in the last general election?	Percent of respondents	Count
No	17%	53
Yes	78%	243
Ineligible to vote	3%	9
Don't know	2%	5
Total	100%	310

Question D16: Has Cell Phone		
Do you have a cell phone?	Percent of respondents	Count
No	9%	29
Yes	91%	281
Total	100%	310

Question D17: Has Land Line		
Do you have a land line at home?	Percent of respondents	Count
No	32%	100
Yes	68%	211
Total	100%	311

Question D18: Primary Phone		
If you have both a cell phone and a land line, which do you consider your primary telephone number?	Percent of respondents	Count
Cell	35%	64
Land line	42%	78
Both	23%	42
Total	100%	184

APPENDIX B: SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The National Citizen Survey™ (The NCS) was developed to provide local jurisdictions an accurate, affordable and easy way to assess and interpret resident opinion about important community issues. While standardization of question wording and survey methods provide the rigor to assure valid results, each jurisdiction has enough flexibility to construct a customized version of The NCS that asks residents about key local services and important local issues.

Results offer insight into residents' perspectives about local government performance and as such provide important benchmarks for jurisdictions working on performance measurement. The NCS is designed to help with budget, land use and strategic planning as well as to communicate with local residents. The NCS permits questions to test support for local policies and answers to its questions also speak to community trust and involvement in community-building activities as well as to resident demographic characteristics.

SURVEY VALIDITY

The question of survey validity has two parts: 1) how can a jurisdiction be confident that the results from those who completed the questionnaire are representative of the results that would have been obtained had the survey been administered to the entire population? and 2) how closely do the perspectives recorded on the survey reflect what residents really believe or do?

To answer the first question, the best survey research practices were used for the resources spent to ensure that the results from the survey respondents reflect the opinions of residents in the entire jurisdiction. These practices include:

- Using a mail-out/mail-back methodology, which typically gets a higher response rate than phone for the same dollars spent. A higher response rate lessens the worry that those who did not respond are different than those who did respond.
- Selecting households at random within the jurisdiction to receive the survey. A random selection ensures that the households selected to receive the survey are similar to the entire population. A non-random sample may only include households from one geographic area, or from households of only one type.
- Over-sampling multi-family housing units to improve response from hard-to-reach, lower income, or younger apartment dwellers.
- Selecting the respondent within the household using an unbiased sampling procedure; in this case, the "birthday method." The cover letter included an instruction requesting that the respondent in the household be the adult (18 years old or older) who most recently had a birthday, irrespective of year of birth.
- Contacting potential respondents three times to encourage response from people who may have different opinions or habits than those who would respond with only a single prompt.
- Soliciting response on jurisdiction letterhead signed by the highest ranking elected official or staff member, thus appealing to the recipients' sense of civic responsibility.
- Providing a self-addressed, postage-paid return envelope.
- Offering the survey in Spanish when appropriate and requested by Town officials.
- Using the most recent available information about the characteristics of jurisdiction residents to weight the data to reflect the demographics of the population.

The answer to the second question about how closely the perspectives recorded on the survey reflect what residents really believe or do is more complex. Resident responses to surveys are influenced by a variety of factors. For questions about service quality, residents' expectations for

service quality play a role as well as the “objective” quality of the service provided, the way the resident perceives the entire community (that is, the context in which the service is provided), the scale on which the resident is asked to record his or her opinion and, of course, the opinion, itself, that a resident holds about the service. Similarly a resident’s report of certain behaviors is colored by what he or she believes is the socially desirable response (e.g., reporting tolerant behaviors toward “oppressed groups,” likelihood of voting a tax increase for services to poor people, use of alternative modes of travel to work besides the single occupancy vehicle), his or her memory of the actual behavior (if it is not a question speculating about future actions, like a vote), his or her confidence that he or she can be honest without suffering any negative consequences (thus the need for anonymity) as well as the actual behavior itself.

How closely survey results come to recording the way a person really feels or behaves often is measured by the coincidence of reported behavior with observed current behavior (e.g., driving habits), reported intentions to behave with observed future behavior (e.g., voting choices) or reported opinions about current community quality with objective characteristics of the community (e.g., feelings of safety correlated with rates of crime). There is a body of scientific literature that has investigated the relationship between reported behaviors and actual behaviors. Well-conducted surveys, by and large, do capture true respondent behaviors or intentions to act with great accuracy. Predictions of voting outcomes tend to be quite accurate using survey research, as do reported behaviors that are not about highly sensitive issues (e.g., family abuse or other illegal or morally sanctioned activities). For self-reports about highly sensitive issues, statistical adjustments can be made to correct for the respondents’ tendency to report what they think the “correct” response should be.

Research on the correlation of resident opinion about service quality and “objective” ratings of service quality tend to be ambiguous, some showing stronger relationships than others. NRC’s own research has demonstrated that residents who report the lowest ratings of street repair live in communities with objectively worse street conditions than those who report high ratings of street repair (based on road quality, delay in street repair, number of road repair employees). Similarly, the lowest rated fire services appear to be “objectively” worse than the highest rated fire services (expenditures per capita, response time, “professional” status of firefighters, breadth of services and training provided). Whether or not some research confirms the relationship between what residents think about a community and what can be seen “objectively” in a community, NRC has argued that resident opinion is a perspective that cannot be ignored by government administrators. NRC principals have written, “If you collect trash three times a day but residents think that your trash haul is lousy, you still have a problem.”


SURVEY SAMPLING

“Sampling” refers to the method by which survey recipients were chosen. All households within the Town of Jupiter were eligible to participate in the survey; 1,200 were selected to receive the survey. These mayor households were randomly selected from a comprehensive list of all housing units within the Town of Jupiter boundaries. The basis of the list of all housing units was a United States Postal Service listing of housing units within zip codes. Since some of the zip codes that serve the Town of Jupiter households may also serve addresses that lie outside of the jurisdiction, the exact geographic location of each housing unit was compared to jurisdiction boundaries, using the most current municipal boundary file (updated on a quarterly basis), and addresses located outside of the Town of Jupiter boundaries were removed from consideration.

To choose the 1,200 survey recipients, a systematic sampling method was applied to the list of households known to be within the Town of Jupiter. Systematic sampling is a procedure whereby a complete list of all possible items is culled, selecting every Nth one until the appropriate amount of items is selected. Multi-family housing units were over sampled as residents of this type of housing typically respond at lower rates to surveys than do those in single-family housing units.

FIGURE 90: LOCATION OF SURVEY RECIPIENTS


The National Citizen Survey™ Jupiter, FL 2011



An individual within each household was selected using the birthday method. The birthday method selects a person within the household by asking the “person whose birthday has most recently passed” to complete the questionnaire. The underlying assumption in this method is that day of birth has no relationship to the way people respond to surveys. This instruction was contained in the cover letter accompanying the questionnaire.

In response to the growing number of the cell-phone population (so-called “cord cutters”), which includes a large proportion of young adults, questions about cell phones and land lines are included on The NCS™ questionnaire. As of the middle of 2010 (the most recent estimates available as of the end of 2010), 26.6% of U.S. households had a cell phone but no landline.² Among younger adults (age 18-34), 53.7% of households were “cell-only.” Based on survey results, Jupiter has an overall “cord cutter” population greater than the nationwide 2010 estimates.

FIGURE 91: PREVALENCE OF CELL-PHONE ONLY RESPONDENTS IN JUPITER



SURVEY ADMINISTRATION

Selected households received three mailings, one week apart, beginning November 14, 2011. The first mailing was a prenotification postcard announcing the upcoming survey. The next mailing contained a letter from the mayor inviting the household to participate, a questionnaire and a postage-paid return envelope. The final mailing contained a reminder letter, another survey and a postage-paid return envelope. The second cover letter asked those who had not completed the survey to do so and those who have already done so to refrain from turning in another survey. Completed surveys were collected over the following five weeks.

SURVEY RESPONSE RATE AND CONFIDENCE INTERVALS

It is customary to describe the precision of estimates made from surveys by a “level of confidence” and accompanying “confidence interval” (or margin of error). A traditional level of confidence, and the one used here, is 95%. The 95% confidence interval can be any size and quantifies the sampling error or imprecision of the survey results because some residents' opinions are relied on to estimate all residents' opinions. The confidence interval for the Town of Jupiter survey is no greater than plus or minus five percentage points around any given percent reported for the entire sample (315 completed surveys).

A 95% confidence interval indicates that for every 100 random samples of this many residents, 95 of the confidence intervals created will include the “true” population response. This theory is applied in practice to mean that the “true” perspective of the target population lies within the confidence interval created for a single survey. For example, if 75% of residents rate a service as “excellent” or “good,” then the 4% margin of error (for the 95% confidence interval) indicates that the range of likely responses for the entire jurisdiction is between 71% and 79%. This source of error is called sampling error. In addition to sampling error, other sources of error may affect any

² <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhis/earlyrelease/wireless201012.pdf>

survey, including the non-response of residents with opinions different from survey responders. Though standardized on The NCS, on other surveys, differences in question wording, order, translation and data entry, as examples, can lead to somewhat varying results.

For subgroups of responses, the margin of error increases because the sample size for the subgroup is smaller. For subgroups of approximately 100 respondents, the margin of error is plus or minus 10 percentage points

SURVEY PROCESSING (DATA ENTRY)

Completed surveys received by NRC were assigned a unique identification number. Additionally, each survey was reviewed and “cleaned” as necessary. For example, a question may have asked a respondent to pick two items out of a list of five, but the respondent checked three; NRC staff would choose randomly two of the three selected items to be coded in the dataset.

Once all surveys were assigned a unique identification number, they were entered into an electronic dataset. This dataset was subject to a data entry protocol of “key and verify,” in which survey data were entered twice into an electronic dataset and then compared. Discrepancies were evaluated against the original survey form and corrected. Range checks as well as other forms of quality control were also performed.

SURVEY DATA WEIGHTING

The demographic characteristics of the survey sample were compared to those found in the 2010 Census estimates for adults in the Town of Jupiter. Sample results were weighted using the population norms to reflect the appropriate percent of those residents. Other discrepancies between the whole population and the sample were also aided by the weighting due to the intercorrelation of many socioeconomic characteristics.

The variables used for weighting were housing tenure, housing unit type, race and ethnicity and sex and age. This decision was based on:

- The disparity between the survey respondent characteristics and the population norms for these variables
- The saliency of these variables in detecting differences of opinion among subgroups
- The importance to the community of ethnic representation
- The historical use of the variables and the desirability of consistently representing different groups over the years

The primary objective of weighting survey data is to make the survey sample reflective of the larger population of the community. This is done by: 1) reviewing the sample demographics and comparing them to the population norms from the most recent Census or other sources and 2) comparing the responses to different questions for demographic subgroups. The demographic characteristics that are least similar to the Census and yield the most different results are the best candidates for data weighting. A third criterion sometimes used is the importance that the community places on a specific variable. For example, if a jurisdiction feels that accurate race representation is key to staff and public acceptance of the study results, additional consideration will be given in the weighting process to adjusting the race variable.

A special software program using mathematical algorithms is used to calculate the appropriate weights. Data weighting can adjust up to 5 demographic variables. Several different weighting “schemes” may be tested to ensure the best fit for the data.

The process actually begins at the point of sampling. Knowing that residents in single family dwellings are more likely to respond to a mail survey, NRC oversamples residents of multi-family dwellings to ensure their proper representation in the sample data. Rather than giving all residents an equal chance of receiving the survey, this is systematic, stratified sampling, which gives each resident of the jurisdiction a known chance of receiving the survey (and apartment dwellers, for example, a greater chance than single family home dwellers). As a consequence, results must be weighted to recapture the proper representation of apartment dwellers.

The results of the weighting scheme are presented in the table on the following page.

Jupiter, FL Citizen Survey Weighting Table			
Characteristic	Population Norm	Unweighted Data	Weighted Data
Housing			
Rent home	25%	16%	25%
Own home	75%	84%	75%
Detached unit	51%	34%	49%
Attached unit	49%	66%	51%
Race and Ethnicity			
White	91%	96%	89%
Not white	9%	4%	11%
Not Hispanic	89%	98%	96%
Hispanic	11%	2%	4%
White alone, not Hispanic	85%	93%	86%
Hispanic and/or other race	15%	7%	14%
Sex and Age			
Female	51%	55%	52%
Male	49%	45%	48%
18-34 years of age	22%	6%	20%
35-54 years of age	36%	21%	36%
55+ years of age	42%	73%	44%
Females 18-34	10%	3%	10%
Females 35-54	19%	14%	19%
Females 55+	22%	38%	23%
Males 18-34	12%	3%	11%
Males 35-54	18%	8%	18%
Males 55+	19%	35%	20%

SURVEY DATA ANALYSIS AND REPORTING

The survey dataset was analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Frequency distributions were presented in the body of the report.

Use of the “Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor” Response Scale

The scale on which respondents are asked to record their opinions about service and community quality is “excellent,” “good,” “fair” or “poor” (EGFP). This scale has important advantages over other scale possibilities (very good to very bad; very satisfied to very dissatisfied; strongly agree to strongly disagree, as examples). EGFP is used by the plurality of jurisdictions conducting citizen surveys across the U.S. The advantage of familiarity was one that NRC did not want to dismiss when crafting The National Citizen Survey™ questionnaire, because elected officials, staff and residents already are acquainted with opinion surveys measured this way. EGFP also has the advantage of offering three positive options, rather than only two, over which a resident can offer an opinion. While symmetrical scales often are the right choice in other measurement tasks, NRC has found that ratings of almost every local government service in almost every jurisdiction tend, on average, to be positive (that is, above the scale midpoint). Therefore, to permit finer distinctions among positively rated services, EGFP offers three options across which to spread those ratings. EGFP is more neutral because it requires no positive statement of service quality to judge (as agree-disagree scales require) and, finally, EGFP intends to measure absolute quality of service delivery or community quality (unlike satisfaction scales which ignore residents’ perceptions of quality in favor of their report on the acceptability of the level of service offered).

“Don’t Know” Responses

On many of the questions in the survey respondents may answer “don’t know.” The proportion of respondents giving this reply is shown in the full set of responses included in Appendix A. However, these responses have been removed from the analyses presented in the body of the report. In other words, the tables and graphs display the responses from respondents who had an opinion about a specific item.

Benchmark Comparisons

NRC has been leading the strategic use of surveys for local governments since 1991, when the principals of the company wrote the first edition of what became the classic text on citizen surveying. In *Citizen Surveys: how to do them, how to use them, what they mean*, published by ICMA, not only were the principles for quality survey methods articulated, but both the idea of benchmark data for citizen opinion and the method for gathering benchmark data were pioneered. The argument for benchmarks was called “In Search of Standards.” “What has been missing from a local government’s analysis of its survey results is the context that school administrators can supply when they tell parents how an 80 percent score on the social studies test compares to test results from other school systems...”

NRC’s database of comparative resident opinion is comprised of resident perspectives gathered in citizen surveys from approximately 500 jurisdictions whose residents evaluated local government services. Conducted with typically no fewer than 400 residents in each jurisdiction, opinions are intended to represent over 30 million Americans. NRC has innovated a method for quantitatively integrating the results of surveys that are conducted by NRC with those that others have conducted. The integration methods have been thoroughly described not only in the Citizen Surveys book, but also in *Public Administration Review, Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*. Scholars who specialize in the analysis of citizen surveys regularly have relied on this work (e.g., Kelly, J. &

Swindell, D. (2002). Service quality variation across urban space: First steps towards a model of citizen satisfaction. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 24, 271-288.; Van Ryzin, G., Muzzio, D., Immerwahr, S., Gulick, L. & Martinez, E. (2004). Drivers and consequences of citizen satisfaction: An application of the American Customer Satisfaction Index Model to New York Town, *Public Administration Review*, 64, 331- 341). The method described in those publications is refined regularly and statistically tested on a growing number of citizen surveys in NRC's proprietary databases. NRC's work on calculating national benchmarks for resident opinions about service delivery and quality of life won the Samuel C. May award for research excellence from the Western Governmental Research Association.

The comparison evaluations are from the most recent survey completed in each jurisdiction; most communities conduct surveys every year or in alternating years. NRC adds the latest results quickly upon survey completion, keeping the benchmark data fresh and relevant.

The Role of Comparisons

Benchmark comparisons are used for performance measurement. Jurisdictions use the comparative information to help interpret their own citizen survey results, to create or revise community plans, to evaluate the success of policy or budget decisions and to measure local government performance. Taking the pulse of the community has little meaning without knowing what pulse rate is too high and what is too low. When surveys of service satisfaction turn up "good" citizen evaluations, jurisdictions need to know how others rate their services to understand if "good" is good enough. Furthermore, in the absence of national or peer community comparisons, a jurisdiction is left with comparing its fire protection rating to its street maintenance rating. That comparison is unfair. Streets always lose to fire. More important and harder questions need to be asked; for example, how do residents' ratings of fire service compare to opinions about fire service in other communities?

A police department that provides the fastest and most efficient service – one that closes most of its cases, solves most of its crimes and keeps the crime rate low – still has a problem to fix if the residents in the community it intends to protect believe services are not very good compared to ratings given by residents to their own objectively "worse" departments. The benchmark data can help that police department – or any department – to understand how well citizens think it is doing. Without the comparative data, it would be like bowling in a tournament without knowing what the other teams are scoring. NRC recommends that citizen opinion be used in conjunction with other sources of data about budget, personnel and politics to help managers know how to respond to comparative results.

Jurisdictions in the benchmark database are distributed geographically across the country and range from small to large in population size. Most commonly, comparisons are made to the entire database. Comparisons may also be made to subsets of jurisdictions (for example, within a given region or population category). Despite the differences in jurisdiction characteristics, all are in the business of providing local government services to residents. Though individual jurisdiction circumstances, resources and practices vary, the objective in every community is to provide services that are so timely, tailored and effective that residents conclude the services are of the highest quality. High ratings in any jurisdiction, like SAT scores in any teen household, bring pride and a sense of accomplishment.

Comparison of Jupiter to the Benchmark Database

The Town of Jupiter chose to have comparisons made to the entire database and a subset of similar jurisdictions from the database (Florida). A benchmark comparison (the average rating from all the comparison jurisdictions where a similar question was asked) has been provided when a similar question on the Town of Jupiter Survey was included in NRC's database and there were at least five jurisdictions in which the question was asked. For most questions compared to the entire dataset, there were more than 100 jurisdictions included in the benchmark comparison.

Where comparisons for quality ratings were available, the Town of Jupiter results were generally noted as being "above" the benchmark, "below" the benchmark or "similar" to the benchmark. For some questions – those related to resident behavior, circumstance or to a local problem – the comparison to the benchmark is designated as "more," "similar" or "less" (for example, the percent of crime victims, residents visiting a park or residents identifying code enforcement as a problem.) In instances where ratings are considerably higher or lower than the benchmark, these ratings have been further demarcated by the attribute of "much," (for example, "much less" or "much above"). These labels come from a statistical comparison of the Town of Jupiter's rating to the benchmark where a rating is considered "similar" if it is within the margin of error; "above," "below," "more" or "less" if the difference between your jurisdiction's rating and the benchmark is greater the margin of error; and "much above," "much below," "much more" or "much less" if the difference between your jurisdiction's rating and the benchmark is more than twice the margin of error.

APPENDIX C: SURVEY MATERIALS

The following pages contain copies of the survey materials sent to randomly selected households within the Town of Jupiter.

Dear Jupiter Resident,

Your household has been selected at random to participate in an anonymous citizen survey about the Town of Jupiter. You will receive a copy of the survey next week in the mail with instructions for completing and returning it. Thank you in advance for helping us with this important project!

Sincerely,



Karen J. Golonka
Mayor

Dear Jupiter Resident,

Your household has been selected at random to participate in an anonymous citizen survey about the Town of Jupiter. You will receive a copy of the survey next week in the mail with instructions for completing and returning it. Thank you in advance for helping us with this important project!

Sincerely,



Karen J. Golonka
Mayor

Dear Jupiter Resident,

Your household has been selected at random to participate in an anonymous citizen survey about the Town of Jupiter. You will receive a copy of the survey next week in the mail with instructions for completing and returning it. Thank you in advance for helping us with this important project!

Sincerely,



Karen J. Golonka
Mayor

Dear Jupiter Resident,

Your household has been selected at random to participate in an anonymous citizen survey about the Town of Jupiter. You will receive a copy of the survey next week in the mail with instructions for completing and returning it. Thank you in advance for helping us with this important project!

Sincerely,



Karen J. Golonka
Mayor



TOWN OF JUPITER
210 Military Trail
Jupiter, Florida 33458

Presorted
First Class Mail
US Postage
PAID
Boulder, CO
Permit NO. 94



TOWN OF JUPITER
210 Military Trail
Jupiter, Florida 33458

Presorted
First Class Mail
US Postage
PAID
Boulder, CO
Permit NO. 94



TOWN OF JUPITER
210 Military Trail
Jupiter, Florida 33458

Presorted
First Class Mail
US Postage
PAID
Boulder, CO
Permit NO. 94



TOWN OF JUPITER
210 Military Trail
Jupiter, Florida 33458

Presorted
First Class Mail
US Postage
PAID
Boulder, CO
Permit NO. 94



TOWN OF JUPITER

November 2011

Dear Jupiter Resident:

The Town of Jupiter wants to know what you think about our community and municipal government. You have been randomly selected to participate in Jupiter's 2011 Citizen Survey.

Please take a few minutes to fill out the enclosed Citizen Survey. Your feedback will help the Town set benchmarks for tracking the quality of services provided to residents. Your answers will help the Town Council make decisions that affect our community. You should find the questions interesting and we will definitely find your answers useful. Please participate!

To get a representative sample of Jupiter residents, the adult (anyone 18 years or older) in your household who most recently had a birthday should complete this survey. Year of birth of the adult does not matter.

Please have the appropriate member of the household spend a few minutes to answer all the questions and return the survey in the enclosed postage-paid envelope. **Your responses will remain completely anonymous.**

Your participation in this survey is very important – especially since your household is one of only a small number of households being surveyed. If you have any questions about the Citizen Survey please call (561) 741-2575.

Please help us shape the future of Jupiter. Thank you for your time and participation.

Sincerely,

Karen J. Golonka
Mayor



TOWN OF JUPITER

November 2011

Dear Town of Jupiter Resident:

About one week ago, you should have received a copy of the enclosed survey. **If you completed it and sent it back, we thank you for your time and ask you to discard this survey. Please do not respond twice.** If you have not had a chance to complete the survey, we would appreciate your response. The Town of Jupiter wants to know what you think about our community and municipal government. You have been randomly selected to participate in the Town of Jupiter's Citizen Survey.

Please take a few minutes to fill out the enclosed Citizen Survey. Your feedback will help the Town set benchmarks for tracking the quality of services provided to residents. Your answers will help the Town Council make decisions that affect our community. You should find the questions interesting and we will definitely find your answers useful. Please participate!

To get a representative sample of Jupiter residents, the adult (anyone 18 years or older) in your household who most recently had a birthday should complete this survey. Year of birth of the adult does not matter.

Please have the appropriate member of the household spend a few minutes to answer all the questions and return the survey in the enclosed postage-paid envelope. **Your responses will remain completely anonymous.**

Your participation in this survey is very important – especially since your household is one of only a small number of households being surveyed. If you have any questions about the Citizen Survey please call (561) 741-2575.

Please help us shape the future of Jupiter. Thank you for your time and participation.

Sincerely,

Karen J. Golonka
Mayor

The Town of Jupiter 2011 Citizen Survey

Please complete this questionnaire if you are the adult (age 18 or older) in the household who most recently had a birthday. The adult's year of birth does not matter. Please select the response (by circling the number or checking the box) that most closely represents your opinion for each question. Your responses are anonymous and will be reported in group form only.

1. Please rate each of the following aspects of quality of life in Jupiter:

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Jupiter as a place to live	1	2	3	4	5
Your neighborhood as a place to live	1	2	3	4	5
Jupiter as a place to raise children	1	2	3	4	5
Jupiter as a place to work	1	2	3	4	5
Jupiter as a place to retire	1	2	3	4	5
The overall quality of life in Jupiter	1	2	3	4	5

2. Please rate each of the following characteristics as they relate to Jupiter as a whole:

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Sense of community	1	2	3	4	5
Openness and acceptance of the community toward people of diverse backgrounds	1	2	3	4	5
Overall appearance of Jupiter	1	2	3	4	5
Cleanliness of Jupiter	1	2	3	4	5
Overall quality of new development in Jupiter	1	2	3	4	5
Variety of housing options	1	2	3	4	5
Overall quality of business and service establishments in Jupiter	1	2	3	4	5
Shopping opportunities	1	2	3	4	5
Opportunities to attend cultural activities	1	2	3	4	5
Recreational opportunities	1	2	3	4	5
Employment opportunities	1	2	3	4	5
Educational opportunities	1	2	3	4	5
Opportunities to participate in social events and activities	1	2	3	4	5
Opportunities to volunteer	1	2	3	4	5
Opportunities to participate in community matters	1	2	3	4	5
Ease of car travel in Jupiter	1	2	3	4	5
Ease of bus travel in Jupiter	1	2	3	4	5
Ease of bicycle travel in Jupiter	1	2	3	4	5
Ease of walking in Jupiter	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of paths and walking trails	1	2	3	4	5
Traffic flow on major streets	1	2	3	4	5
Amount of public parking	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of affordable quality housing	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of affordable quality child care	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of affordable quality health care	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of affordable quality food	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of preventive health services	1	2	3	4	5
Quality of overall natural environment in Jupiter	1	2	3	4	5
Overall image or reputation of Jupiter	1	2	3	4	5

3. Please rate the speed of growth in the following categories in Jupiter over the past 2 years:

	<i>Much too slow</i>	<i>Somewhat too slow</i>	<i>Right amount</i>	<i>Somewhat too fast</i>	<i>Much too fast</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Population growth	1	2	3	4	5	6
Retail growth (stores, restaurants, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	6
Jobs growth	1	2	3	4	5	6

4. To what degree, if at all, are run down buildings, weed lots or junk vehicles a problem in Jupiter?

- Not a problem
 Minor problem
 Moderate problem
 Major problem
 Don't know

5. Please rate how safe or unsafe you feel from the following in Jupiter:

	Very safe	Somewhat safe	Neither safe nor unsafe	Somewhat unsafe	Very unsafe	Don't know
Violent crime (e.g., rape, assault, robbery)	1	2	3	4	5	6
Property crimes (e.g., burglary, theft).....	1	2	3	4	5	6
Environmental hazards, including toxic waste.....	1	2	3	4	5	6

6. Please rate how safe or unsafe you feel:

	Very safe	Somewhat safe	Neither safe nor unsafe	Somewhat unsafe	Very unsafe	Don't know
In your neighborhood during the day.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
In your neighborhood after dark.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
In Jupiter's downtown area during the day	1	2	3	4	5	6
In Jupiter's downtown area after dark.....	1	2	3	4	5	6

7. During the past 12 months, were you or anyone in your household the victim of any crime?

- No → Go to Question 9
 Yes → Go to Question 8
 Don't know → Go to Question 9

8. If yes, was this crime (these crimes) reported to the police?

- No
 Yes
 Don't know

9. In the last 12 months, about how many times, if ever, have you or other household members participated in the following activities in Jupiter?

	Never	Once or twice	3 to 12 times	13 to 26 times	More than 26 times
Used Jupiter public libraries or their services	1	2	3	4	5
Used Jupiter recreation centers	1	2	3	4	5
Participated in a recreation program or activity	1	2	3	4	5
Visited a neighborhood park or Town park	1	2	3	4	5
Ridden a local bus within Jupiter	1	2	3	4	5
Attended a meeting of local elected officials or other local public meeting	1	2	3	4	5
Watched a meeting of local elected officials or other Town-sponsored public meeting on cable television, the Internet or other media.....	1	2	3	4	5
Read Jupiter Newsletter.....	1	2	3	4	5
Visited the Town of Jupiter Web site (at www.jupiter.fl.us)	1	2	3	4	5
Recycled used paper, cans or bottles from your home.....	1	2	3	4	5
Volunteered your time to some group or activity in Jupiter.....	1	2	3	4	5
Participated in a club or civic group in Jupiter.....	1	2	3	4	5
Provided help to a friend or neighbor	1	2	3	4	5

10. About how often, if at all, do you talk to or visit with your immediate neighbors (people who live in the 10 or 20 households that are closest to you)?

- Just about every day
 Several times a week
 Several times a month
 Less than several times a month

The Town of Jupiter 2011 Citizen Survey

11. Please rate the quality of each of the following services in Jupiter:

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Police services	1	2	3	4	5
Fire services	1	2	3	4	5
Ambulance or emergency medical services.....	1	2	3	4	5
Crime prevention	1	2	3	4	5
Traffic enforcement.....	1	2	3	4	5
Street repair	1	2	3	4	5
Street cleaning	1	2	3	4	5
Street lighting.....	1	2	3	4	5
Sidewalk maintenance	1	2	3	4	5
Traffic signal timing	1	2	3	4	5
Bus or transit services.....	1	2	3	4	5
Garbage collection.....	1	2	3	4	5
Recycling.....	1	2	3	4	5
Yard waste pick-up	1	2	3	4	5
Storm drainage.....	1	2	3	4	5
Drinking water.....	1	2	3	4	5
Sewer services	1	2	3	4	5
Power (electric and/or gas) utility	1	2	3	4	5
Town parks	1	2	3	4	5
Recreation programs or classes	1	2	3	4	5
Recreation centers or facilities.....	1	2	3	4	5
Land use, planning and zoning	1	2	3	4	5
Code enforcement (weeds, abandoned buildings, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Animal control.....	1	2	3	4	5
Economic development	1	2	3	4	5
Health services	1	2	3	4	5
Services to seniors.....	1	2	3	4	5
Services to youth.....	1	2	3	4	5
Services to low-income people	1	2	3	4	5
Public library services	1	2	3	4	5
Public information services	1	2	3	4	5
Public schools.....	1	2	3	4	5
Emergency preparedness (services that prepare the community for natural disasters or other emergency situations)	1	2	3	4	5
Preservation of natural areas such as open space, farmlands and greenbelts.....	1	2	3	4	5

12. Overall, how would you rate the quality of the services provided by each of the following?

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
The Town of Jupiter	1	2	3	4	5
The Federal Government	1	2	3	4	5
The State Government	1	2	3	4	5
Palm Beach County Government.....	1	2	3	4	5

13. Have you had any in-person, phone or email contact with an employee of the Town of Jupiter within the last 12 months (including police, receptionists, planners or any others)?

- No → Go to Question 15 Yes → Go to Question 14

14. What was your impression of the employee(s) of the Town of Jupiter in your most recent contact? (Rate each characteristic below.)

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Knowledge.....	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness.....	1	2	3	4	5
Courtesy.....	1	2	3	4	5
Overall impression.....	1	2	3	4	5

15. Please rate the following categories of Jupiter government performance:

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
The value of services for the taxes paid to Jupiter.....	1	2	3	4	5
The overall direction that Jupiter is taking.....	1	2	3	4	5
The job Jupiter government does at welcoming citizen involvement.....	1	2	3	4	5

16. Please indicate how likely or unlikely you are to do each of the following:

	<i>Very likely</i>	<i>Somewhat likely</i>	<i>Somewhat unlikely</i>	<i>Very unlikely</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Recommend living in Jupiter to someone who asks.....	1	2	3	4	5
Remain in Jupiter for the next five years.....	1	2	3	4	5

17. What impact, if any, do you think the economy will have on your family income in the next 6 months? Do you think the impact will be:

- Very positive Somewhat positive Neutral Somewhat negative Very negative

18. Please check the response that comes closest to your opinion for each of the following questions:

- a. The Town of Jupiter is considering undergrounding utility wire in order to prevent damage from weather and storms. This project would require a financial contribution from residents and businesses. Please indicate the extent to which you would support or oppose undergrounding the utility wires in Jupiter.
- Strongly support
 - Somewhat support
 - Somewhat oppose
 - Strongly oppose
 - Don't know
- b. The Town of Jupiter is considering establishing "quiet zones" along the existing freight train lines (along Alternate A1A) to prevent train whistles from blowing (except in the case of safety issues or emergencies). In order to establish the "quiet zones," funding for safety infrastructure would be required from the Town and from the residents it benefits. Please indicate to what extent you would support or oppose the Town taking this action.
- Strongly support
 - Somewhat support
 - Somewhat oppose
 - Strongly oppose
 - Don't know

The Town of Jupiter 2011 Citizen Survey

Our last questions are about you and your household. Again, all of your responses to this survey are completely anonymous and will be reported in group form only.

D1. Are you currently employed for pay?

- No → Go to Question D3
- Yes, full time → Go to Question D2
- Yes, part time → Go to Question D2

D2. During a typical week, how many days do you commute to work (for the longest distance of your commute) in each of the ways listed below? (Enter the total number of days, using whole numbers.)

- Motorized vehicle (e.g., car, truck, van, motorcycle, etc.) by myself days
- Motorized vehicle (e.g., car, truck, van, motorcycle, etc.) with other children or adults days
- Bus, rail, subway or other public transportation days
- Walk days
- Bicycle days
- Work at home days
- Other days

D3. How many years have you lived in Jupiter?

- Less than 2 years 11-20 years
- 2-5 years More than 20 years
- 6-10 years

D4. Which best describes the building you live in?

- One family house detached from any other houses
- House attached to one or more houses (e.g., a duplex or townhome)
- Building with two or more apartments or condominiums
- Mobile home
- Other

D5. Is this house, apartment or mobile home...

- Rented for cash or occupied without cash payment?
- Owned by you or someone in this house with a mortgage or free and clear?

D6. About how much is your monthly housing cost for the place you live (including rent, mortgage payment, property tax, property insurance and homeowners' association (HOA) fees)?

- Less than \$300 per month
- \$300 to \$599 per month
- \$600 to \$999 per month
- \$1,000 to \$1,499 per month
- \$1,500 to \$2,499 per month
- \$2,500 or more per month

D7. Do any children 17 or under live in your household?

- No Yes

D8. Are you or any other members of your household aged 65 or older?

- No Yes

D9. How much do you anticipate your household's total income before taxes will be for the current year? (Please include in your total income money from all sources for all persons living in your household.)

- Less than \$24,999
- \$25,000 to \$49,999
- \$50,000 to \$99,999
- \$100,000 to \$149,999
- \$150,000 or more

Please respond to both question D10 and D11:

D10. Are you Spanish, Hispanic or Latino?

- No, not Spanish, Hispanic or Latino
- Yes, I consider myself to be Spanish, Hispanic or Latino

D11. What is your race? (Mark one or more races to indicate what race you consider yourself to be.)

- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Asian, Asian Indian or Pacific Islander
- Black or African American
- White
- Other

D12. In which category is your age?

- 18-24 years 55-64 years
- 25-34 years 65-74 years
- 35-44 years 75 years or older
- 45-54 years

D13. What is your sex?

- Female Male

D14. Are you registered to vote in your jurisdiction?

- No Ineligible to vote
- Yes Don't know

D15. Many people don't have time to vote in elections. Did you vote in the last general election?

- No Ineligible to vote
- Yes Don't know

D16. Do you have a cell phone?

- No Yes

D17. Do you have a land line at home?

- No Yes

D18. If you have both a cell phone and a land line, which do you consider your primary telephone number?

- Cell Land line Both

Thank you for completing this survey. Please return the completed survey in the postage-paid envelope to: National Research Center, Inc., PO Box 549, Belle Mead, NJ 08502



TOWN OF JUPITER

210 Military Trail
Jupiter, Florida 33458

Presorted
First Class Mail
US Postage
PAID
Boulder, CO
Permit NO.94

