

# Yakima, WA

Trends over Time

2015



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



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

# **Summary**

The National Citizen Survey™ (The NCS™) is a collaborative effort between National Research Center, Inc. (NRC) and the International City/County Management Association (ICMA). The survey and its administration are standardized to assure high quality research methods and directly comparable results across The NCS communities. The NCS captures residents' opinions within the three pillars of a community (Community Characteristics, Governance and Participation) across eight central facets of community (Safety, Mobility, Natural Environment, Built Environment, Economy, Recreation and Wellness, Education and Enrichment and Community Engagement). This report discusses trends over time, comparing the 2015 ratings for the City of Yakima to its previous survey results in 2012, 2013 and 2014. Additional reports and technical appendices are available under separate cover.

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

Meaningful differences between survey years have been noted within the following tables as being "higher" or "lower" if the differences are greater than five percentage points between the 2014 and 2015 surveys, otherwise the comparison between 2014 and 2015 are noted as being "similar." Additionally, benchmark comparisons for all survey years are presented for reference. Changes in the benchmark comparison over time can be impacted by various trends, including varying survey cycles for the individual communities that comprise the benchmarks, regional and national economic or other events, as well as emerging survey methodologies.

Overall, ratings in Yakima for 2015 generally remained stable. Of the 128 items for which comparisons were available, 99 items were rated similarly in 2014 and 2015, 20 items showed a decrease in ratings and 9 showed an increase in ratings. Notable trends over time included the following:

- Several aspects of Community Characteristics decreased from 2014 to 2015. These included: travel by public transportation, public parking, affordable quality housing, housing options, overall built environment, availability of affordable quality mental health care, availability of affordable quality child care/preschool, openness and acceptance toward people of diverse backgrounds and neighborliness.
- Within the pillar of Governance, several items were trending down and several were trending up from 2014 to 2015. Ratings decreased for street repair, bus or transit services, land use, planning and zoning, the overall direction the City is taking, welcoming citizen involvement, confidence in City government, acting in the best interest of Yakima, being honest and treating all residents fairly. Ratings increased from 2014 to 2015 for police services, fire services, ambulance or emergency medical services, natural areas preservation, storm drainage and customer service.
- Within Participation, fewer residents in Yakima reported that they had walked or biked instead of driving or that they had recycled at home in 2015 compared to 2014. However, more residents indicated that they thought the economy would have a positive impact on their income, that they had eaten at least 5 portions of fruits and vegetables a day and that they planned to remain in Yakima in 2015 than in 2014.

Table 1: Community Characteristics General

	Percent	Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)					Comparison t	to benchmark	
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2015 rating compared to 2014	2012	2013	2014	2015
Overall quality of life	44%	41%	46%	48%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
Overall image	19%	21%	21%	19%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
Place to live	49%	50%	52%	55%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
Neighborhood	60%	60%	61%	65%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
Place to raise children	38%	42%	44%	42%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
Place to retire	46%	45%	44%	42%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
Overall appearance	29%	28%	30%	28%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower

Table 2: Community Characteristics by Facet

		Percent r	ating positivel very/some		ent/good,	2015 rating	Comparison to benchmark				
		2012	2013	2014	2015	compared to 2014	2012	2013	2014	2015	
	Overall feeling of safety	NA	23%	29%	31%	Similar	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	
	Safe in neighborhood	77%	74%	76%	78%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower	
Safety	Safe downtown/commercial area	62%	60%	60%	63%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	
	Overall ease of travel	NA	69%	69%	67%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	
	Paths and walking trails	49%	52%	52%	48%	Similar	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	
	Ease of walking	48%	46%	48%	45%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower	
	Travel by bicycle	43%	33%	36%	36%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower	
	Travel by public transportation	NA	51%	52%	44%	Lower	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	
	Travel by car	64%	64%	67%	69%	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	
	Public parking	NA	40%	43%	36%	Lower	NA	NA	Similar	Lower	
Mobility	Traffic flow	42%	49%	54%	50%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	
	Overall natural environment	49%	56%	54%	50%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower	
Natural Environment	Cleanliness	31%	29%	31%	28%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	
	Overall built environment	NA	36%	39%	34%	Lower	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	
	New development in Yakima	39%	33%	38%	35%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower	
Built Environment	Affordable quality housing	33%	36%	33%	25%	Lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Lower	

		Percent r	ating positivel very/some	y (e.g., excell what safe)	ent/good,	2015 rating	Comparison to benchmark			
		2012	2013	2014	2015	compared to 2014	2012	2013	2014	2015
	Housing options	46%	37%	36%	29%	Lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Public places	NA	35%	30%	27%	Similar	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower
	Overall economic health	NA	24%	26%	25%	Similar	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower
	Vibrant downtown/commercial area	NA	21%	22%	20%	Similar	NA	NA	Lower	Lower
	Business and services	43%	40%	40%	41%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Cost of living	NA	35%	39%	40%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Shopping opportunities	39%	37%	33%	33%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Employment opportunities	15%	19%	27%	27%	Similar	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Place to visit	NA	36%	37%	33%	Similar	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
							Much			
Economy	Place to work	38%	40%	44%	42%	Similar	lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Health and wellness	NA	47%	48%	45%	Similar	NA	NA	Lower	Lower
	Mental health care	NA	43%	40%	32%	Lower	NA	NA	Similar	Lower
	Preventive health services	NA	47%	46%	50%	Similar	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Health care	NA	45%	45%	47%	Similar	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Food	NA	53%	50%	53%	Similar	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Recreation and	Recreational opportunities	41%	50%	46%	43%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
Wellness	Fitness opportunities	NA	55%	57%	54%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Lower
	Religious or spiritual events and activities	62%	71%	66%	67%	Similar	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Cultural/arts/music activities	41%	43%	44%	42%	Similar	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Adult education	NA	47%	43%	45%	Similar	NA	NA	Lower	Similar
	K-12 education	46%	54%	49%	48%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
Education and Enrichment	Child care/preschool	27%	50%	43%	37%	Lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Social events and activities	38%	36%	41%	41%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Neighborliness	NA	36%	40%	35%	Lower	NA	NA	Lower	Lower
Community Engagement	Openness and acceptance	35%	33%	37%	32%	Lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower

### The National Citizen Survey $^{\scriptscriptstyle\mathsf{TM}}$

	Percent i	rating positive very/some	ly (e.g., excelle what safe)	2015 rating	Comparison to bench			mark	
	2012	2013	compared to 2014	2012	2013	2014	2015		
Opportunities to participate in community matters	45%	41%	47%	43%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
Opportunities to volunteer	65%	56%	59%	62%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Similar

Table 3: Governance General

	Percent ra	ting positivel	y (e.g., excel	lent/good)			Comparison t	to benchmark	
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2015 rating compared to 2014	2012	2013	2014	2015
Services provided by Yakima	45%	47%	46%	46%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
Customer service	60%	48%	43%	53%	Higher	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower
Value of services for taxes paid	27%	26%	32%	27%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
Overall direction	28%	31%	38%	30%	Lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
Welcoming citizen involvement	29%	32%	33%	22%	Lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
Confidence in City government	NA	28%	29%	18%	Lower	NA	NA	Lower	Much lower
Acting in the best interest of Yakima	NA	31%	33%	22%	Lower	NA	NA	Lower	Much lower
Being honest	NA	32%	33%	24%	Lower	NA	NA	Lower	Much lower
Treating all residents fairly	NA	29%	32%	24%	Lower	NA	NA	Lower	Much lower
Services provided by the Federal Government	28%	33%	30%	33%	Similar	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar

Table 4: Governance by Facet

		Pe	rcent rating exceller	positively (e nt/good)	.g.,	2015 rating compared to		Comparison t	o benchmark	
		2012	2013	2014	2015	2014	2012	2013	2014	2015
	Police	54%	54%	53%	60%	Higher	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Fire	84%	83%	82%	87%	Higher	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Ambulance/EMS	83%	79%	79%	85%	Higher	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Crime prevention	22%	22%	28%	32%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Fire prevention	56%	55%	52%	53%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Animal control	28%	26%	31%	32%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
Safety	Emergency preparedness	35%	34%	33%	30%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Much lower
	Traffic enforcement	47%	43%	43%	44%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Street repair	22%	19%	47%	31%	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Lower
	Street cleaning	42%	38%	49%	45%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Lower
Mobility	Street lighting	41%	40%	47%	45%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Lower

		Pei		positively (e nt/good)	.g.,	2015 rating compared to		Comparison to benchmark				
		2012	2013	2014	2015	2014	2012	2013	2014	2015		
	Snow removal	36%	42%	43%	45%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower		
	Sidewalk maintenance	27%	29%	28%	31%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower		
	Traffic signal timing	44%	36%	43%	44%	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar		
							Much					
	Bus or transit services	62%	59%	61%	56%	Lower	higher	Similar	Similar	Similar		
	Garbage collection	79%	81%	81%	80%	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar		
	Recycling	43%	42%	42%	39%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower		
	Yard waste pick-up	58%	61%	63%	64%	Similar	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar		
	Drinking water	64%	61%	58%	62%	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar		
	Natural areas preservation	NA	45%	34%	39%	Higher	NA	Similar	Lower	Lower		
Natural Environment	Open space	NA	39%	30%	33%	Similar	NA	Much lower	Lower	Lower		
	Storm drainage	46%	37%	42%	47%	Higher	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower		
	Sewer services	71%	63%	68%	69%	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar		
	Utility billing	NA	54%	52%	55%	Similar	NA	Lower	Similar	Similar		
	Land use, planning and zoning	28%	27%	28%	22%	Lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower		
	Code enforcement	15%	15%	16%	16%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower		
Built Environment	Cable television	NA	47%	43%	45%	Similar	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar		
Economy	Economic development	23%	24%	25%	27%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower		
	City parks	56%	57%	54%	54%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower		
	Recreation programs	43%	40%	45%	45%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower		
	Recreation centers	43%	37%	41%	37%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower		
Recreation and Wellness	Health services	NA	47%	50%	49%	Similar	NA	Lower	Similar	Lower		
Education and	Special events	NA	41%	38%	40%	Similar	NA	Much lower	Lower	Lower		
Enrichment	Public libraries	70%	74%	69%	74%	Similar	Much lower	Similar	Lower	Similar		
Community Engagement	Public information	48%	47%	46%	46%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower		

Table 5: Participation General

	Percent rating	positively (e.g., alw month	rays/sometimes, mo n, yes)	ore than once a	2015 rating compared to	Comparison to benchmark					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2014	2012	2013	2014	2015		
						Much	Much	Much	Much		
Sense of community	34%	31%	28%	27%	Similar	lower	lower	lower	lower		

	Percent rating	positively (e.g., alw month	rays/sometimes, mo n, yes)	ore than once a	2015 rating compared to	Comparison to benchmark					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2014	2012	2013	2014	2015		
Recommend Yakima	59%	55%	54%	56%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower		
Remain in Yakima	73%	79%	73%	78%	Higher	Much lower	Similar	Lower	Similar		
Contacted Yakima employees	42%	33%	35%	39%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Similar		

Table 6: Participation by Facet

	·	Percent rati	ng positively (e. than once a	g., always/some month, yes)	etimes, more	2015 rating		Comparison	to benchma	rk
		2012	2013	2014	2015	compared to 2014	2012	2013	2014	2015
	Stocked supplies for an emergency	NA	32%	33%	32%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Did NOT report a crime	NA	58%	65%	67%	Similar	NA	NA	Lower	Lower
Safety	Was NOT the victim of a crime	74%	29%	75%	73%	Similar	Much lower	Higher	Lower	Lower
	Used public transportation instead of driving	NA	23%	22%	17%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Lower
	Carpooled instead of driving alone	NA	51%	49%	48%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
Mobility	Walked or biked instead of driving	NA	52%	52%	47%	Lower	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
Natural Environment	Recycled at home	78%	71%	73%	68%	Lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Did NOT observe a code violation	NA	33%	34%	29%	Similar	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower
Built Environment	NOT under housing cost stress	54%	40%	64%	62%	Similar	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Purchased goods or services in Yakima	NA	92%	93%	92%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Economy will have positive impact on income	17%	24%	22%	28%	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Economy	Work in Yakima	NA	62%	63%	61%	Similar	NA	NA	Higher	Higher
	Used Yakima recreation centers	60%	60%	58%	60%	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Visited a City park	87%	83%	80%	82%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Ate 5 portions of fruits and vegetables	NA	79%	79%	85%	Higher	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
Recreation and	Participated in moderate or vigorous physical activity	NA	76%	79%	80%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
Wellness	In very good to excellent health	NA	52%	50%	52%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
Education and Enrichment	Used Yakima public libraries	60%	57%	56%	51%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower

		Percent ratir	ng positively (e. than once a	. , .	2015 rating	Comparison to benchmark				
		2012	2013	2014	2015	compared to 2014	2012	2013	2014	2015
	Attended a City-sponsored event	NA	46%	45%	43%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Contacted Yakima elected officials	NA	16%	14%	16%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Volunteered	54%	46%	47%	44%	Similar	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Participated in a club	38%	34%	35%	31%	Similar	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Talked to or visited with neighbors	NA	NA	89%	88%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Done a favor for a neighbor	NA	NA	83%	81%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Attended a local public meeting	18%	18%	17%	15%	Similar	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Watched a local public meeting	47%	38%	35%	34%	Similar	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Read or watched local news	NA	86%	86%	89%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
Community Engagement	Voted in local elections	65%	78%	79%	81%	Similar	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar