

---

## Survey Overview

---

**D**ecision Resources, Ltd., is pleased to present the results of this study to the City of Fridley. This section provides a brief introduction to the specifications of the survey and a guide to the organization of the written analysis.

While the most statistically sound procedures have been used to collect and analyze the information presented herein, it must always be kept in mind that surveys are not predictions. They are designed to measure public opinion within identifiable limits of accuracy at *specific points in time*. This survey is in no way a prediction of opinions, perceptions, or actions at any future point in time. After all, in public policy analysis, the major task is to impact these revealed opinions in a constructive fashion.

The Principal Investigator for this study was Dr. William D. Morris; the Project Director overseeing all phases of the research and analysis was Mr. Peter Leatherman.

---

## Research Design

---

This study contains the results of a telephone survey of 400 randomly selected residents of the City of Fridley. Survey responses were gathered by professional interviewers across the community between December 4<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup>, 2013.

The average interview took 28 minutes.

All respondents interviewed in this study were part of a randomly generated sample of the City of Fridley. In general, random samples such as this yield results projectable to their respective universe within  $\pm 5.0$  percent in 95 out of 100 cases.

Interviews were conducted by **Decision Resources, Ltd.**, trained personnel from telephone banks in St. Paul, Minnesota. Approximately twenty percent of all interviews were independently validated for procedure and content by a Decision Resources, Ltd., supervisor. Completed interviews were edited and coded at the company's headquarters in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Statistical analysis and cross-tabulations were produced by the company's CfMC Mentor Analysis System and SPSS 22.0 FOR WINDOWS.

---

## Organization of the Study

---

The results of this study are presented in the following order:

The *Analysis* consists of a written report of the major findings. The results contained herein were also presented verbally to the client.

The *Questionnaire* reproduces the survey instrument as it was used in the interviewing process. This section also includes a response frequency distribution for each question.

Any further questions the reader may have about this study which are not answered in this report should be directed to either Dr. Morris or Mr. Leatherman.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Chapter One: Residential Demographics. . . . .</b>	<b>6</b>
Residential Demographics. . . . .	7
Residential Longevity. . . . .	7
Household Composition. . . . .	8
Home Ownership. . . . .	9
Age of Respondent. . . . .	9
Household Income. . . . .	10
Gender. . . . .	10
Area of Residence. . . . .	11
Summary and Conclusions. . . . .	11
<b>Chapter Two: Quality of Life Issues. . . . .</b>	<b>12</b>
Quality of Life Issues. . . . .	13
Expect to Live in Fridley. . . . .	13
Like Most. . . . .	14
Most Serious Issue. . . . .	15
Currently Missing. . . . .	16
Quality of Life. . . . .	17
Connection to Fridley. . . . .	18
Community Identity. . . . .	18
Closest Connection. . . . .	19
Direction of City. . . . .	20
Community Characteristics. . . . .	21
Neighborhood Appearance. . . . .	30
Business Appearance. . . . .	31
Summary and Conclusions. . . . .	32
<b>Chapter Three: City Taxes and City Services. . . . .</b>	<b>34</b>
City Taxes and City Services. . . . .	35
Percentage of City Property Tax. . . . .	35
Perception of Taxes. . . . .	36
Tax Increase to Maintain City Services. . . . .	37
Tax Increase to Enhance City Services. . . . .	38
General Value of City Services. . . . .	38
City Service Ratings. . . . .	39
City Drinking Water. . . . .	46
Garbage Collection. . . . .	47
Municipal Liquor Stores. . . . .	49
Summary and Conclusions. . . . .	52
<b>Chapter Four: Public Safety Issues. . . . .</b>	<b>54</b>
Public Safety Issues. . . . .	55
Unsafe Areas. . . . .	55
Safe Walking Alone. . . . .	57
Safe in Home. . . . .	58
Police Patrolling. . . . .	58

Traffic Enforcement.....	59
Traffic Speeding.....	59
Stop Sign Violations.....	60
Greatest Public Safety Concern.....	61
Summary and Conclusions.....	62
<b>Chapter Five: Park and Recreation Issues.....</b>	<b>63</b>
Park and Recreation Issues.....	64
Park and Recreational Facility Rating.....	64
Importance of Park and Recreational Facilities.....	64
Importance of Neighborhood Park.....	65
Usage and Rating of Park and Recreational Facilities.....	66
Facilities Meet Household Needs.....	69
Property Tax Increase for Referendum.....	70
Park and Recreation Programs.....	71
Programs Meet Needs of Household.....	73
Recreational Leakage.....	73
Community Center.....	74
Summary and Conclusions.....	77
<b>Chapter Six: City Government.....</b>	<b>79</b>
City Government.....	80
Have a Say.....	80
Mayor and City Council.....	81
City Staff.....	82
City Hall.....	83
Summary and Conclusions.....	86
<b>Chapter Seven: Communications Issues.....</b>	<b>88</b>
Communications Issues.....	89
Principal Source of Information.....	89
Preferred Source of Information.....	90
Sources of Information.....	90
City Newsletter.....	96
Cable Television.....	98
Internet Access.....	101
City Website.....	103
Social Media.....	105
Summary and Conclusions.....	110
<b>Chapter Eight: Concluding Thoughts.....</b>	<b>112</b>
Concluding Thoughts.....	113

**Analysis**

# **Chapter One: Residential Demographics**

# Residential Demographics

Residents of the City of Fridley were asked a series of questions about their demographic backgrounds. These questions were asked for two reasons: first, to validate this sample against the 2010 U.S. Census findings; and, second, to track any differences between subgroups and the rest of the population. There were no statistically significant differences between the findings of this survey and the census data. And, throughout the course of this study, subgroup differences will be discussed.

## Residential Longevity

Respondents were asked:

*Approximately how many years have you lived in Fridley?*

The typical Fridley resident lived in the community for 17.3 years:

LESS THAN TWO YEARS. . . . .	5%
TWO TO FIVE YEARS. . . . .	15%
5.1 TO TEN YEARS. . . . .	16%
10.1 TO TWENTY YEARS. . . . .	20%
20.1 TO THIRTY YEARS. . . . .	18%
OVER THIRTY YEARS. . . . .	26%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	0%

Twenty percent were newcomers during the past five years, while 26% were “settlers” living in the city for at least 30 years.

“Two to five years” is stated more frequently by:

- those planning to move in the next five years
- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- households with children
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households
- Ward Three residents

“5.1 to ten years” is indicated more often by:

- those planning to move in the next six to ten years
- households with children
- renters

- eighteen to forty-four year olds

“10.1 to twenty years” is cited more often by:

- those rating the value of city services negatively
- households with children
- forty-five to sixty-four year olds
- men

“20.1 to thirty years” is posted more frequently by:

- those with no plans to move
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- empty nesters
- homeowners
- forty-five to sixty-four year olds
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households

“Over thirty years” is stated more often by:

- those with no plans to move
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center opponents
- households with seniors
- empty nesters
- homeowners
- over sixty-four year olds
- women

## **Household Composition**

Respondents were asked a series of short queries about their household composition:

### *Persons 65 or over?*

Twenty-four percent reported the presence of seniors:

NONE. ....	76%
ONE . . . . .	13%
TWO OR MORE. ....	11%

Single seniors were more often present than senior couples.

***Adults under 65?***

Fifteen percent of the city’s households are composed entirely of seniors:

NONE. ....	15%
ONE .....	27%
TWO .....	50%
THREE OR MORE. ....	9%

A majority of residences contain two adults.

***School-aged children and pre-schoolers?***

School-aged children and pre-schoolers were present in 32% of the households:

NONE. ....	68%
ONE .....	13%
TWO .....	15%
THREE OR MORE. ....	4%

Multiple children at home were reported in a majority of households containing either school-aged children or pre-schoolers.

**Home Ownership**

Fridley residents were next asked:

***Do you own or rent your present residence?***

Sixty-seven percent reported owning their current residences:

OWN .....	67%
RENT .....	33%

Thirty-three percent rented.

**Age of Respondent**

Interviewees were asked:

***What is your age, please?***

The typical adult Fridley resident was 50.3 years old:

18-24	5%
25-34	12%
35-44	23%
45-54	25%
55-64	18%
65 AND OVER.	17%

Seventeen percent posted ages under 35 years old, while 17% were 65 years old or older.

---

## Household Income

---

Residents were queried:

*And now, for one final question, keeping in mind that your answers are held strictly confidential....*

*Is your pre-tax yearly household income over or under \$75,000? Is it over \$100,000? Is it over \$125,000? Is it under \$50,000?*

The median pre-tax household income was \$56,500.00 annually:

UNDER \$50,000.	40%
\$50,001-\$75,000.	31%
\$75,001-\$100,000.	17%
\$100,000-\$125,000.	5%
OVER \$125,000.	4%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.	4%

Forty percent reported incomes less than \$50,000.00, and 26% posted incomes over \$75,000.00.

---

## Gender

---

The gender of each respondent was noted:

MALE.	48%
FEMALE.	52%

Women outnumbered men by four percent in the sample.

---

## Area of Residence

---

The Ward of each residence in the sample was noted:

WARD ONE. ....	35%
WARD TWO.....	34%
WARD THREE.....	32%

Thirty-five percent resided in Ward One, while 34% lived in Ward Two, and 32% resided in Ward Three.

---

## Summary and Conclusions

---

Fridley is a demographically balanced first-ring suburban community. The median longevity of adult residents is 17.3 years. Twenty percent of the sample report moving to the city during the past five years, while 26% were there for over three decades. Twenty-four percent of Fridley households are completely composed of residents over 65 years old. Thirty-two percent of them contain school-aged children or pre-schoolers. Sixty-seven percent own their current homes, while 33% rent. The median pre-tax yearly household income is \$56,500.00. But, 26% report household incomes above \$75,000.00 annually.

The average age of respondents is 50.3 years old. Thirty-five percent of the sample fall into the over 55 years age range, while 17% are less than 35 years old. Women outnumber men by four percent in the sample. The Ward of residence of each respondent was noted: Wards One contains 35% of the sample; Ward Two, 34%; and Ward Three contains 32% of the sample.

# **Chapter Two: Quality of Life Issues**

# Quality of Life Issues

Fridley residents were asked a series of questions about general quality of life issues. These queries focused on likes and dislikes about city living, attachment to the community, general direction of the city, community characteristics, and general appearance of neighborhoods and business areas.

---

## Expect to Live in Fridley

---

Residents were initially asked:

*As things now stand, how long in the future do you expect to live in Fridley?*

Twenty-one percent of the sample expected to move from the community within the next ten years; eleven percent saw a move within five years:

LESS THAN TWO YEARS. ....	4%
TWO TO FIVE YEARS. ....	7%
5.1 TO 10 YEARS.....	10%
OVER TEN YEARS. ....	11%
REST OF LIFE. ....	52%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	15%

Seventy-eight percent saw no move in the upcoming ten years, with 52% reporting they intended to spend the “rest of their life” in the Fridley.

“5.1 to ten years” is cited more often by:

- residents for ten years or less
- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- renters
- Ward Three residents

“Over ten years” is posted more often by:

- residents for eleven to thirty years
- Community Center supporters
- households with children
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households
- Ward One residents

“Rest of life” is indicated more often by:

- residents for over ten years
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center opponents
- those feeling empowered
- households with seniors
- empty nesters
- homeowners
- over forty-four year olds
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- Ward One residents

---

## Like Most

---

Respondents were asked:

*What do you like most, if anything, about living in Fridley?*

Twenty-five percent pointed to the “convenient location” of Fridley within the Metropolitan Area:

UNSURE. ....	1%
NOTHING. ....	2%
CONVENIENT LOCATION..	25%
CLOSE TO FAMILY AND FRIENDS. ....	17%
CLOSE TO JOB. ....	16%
SAFE . ....	5%
SMALL TOWN FEEL.....	18%
PARKS AND TRAILS. ....	2%
FRIENDLY PEOPLE. ....	4%
NEIGHBORHOOD/HOUSING. ....	2%
CLOSE TO SHOPPING. ....	4%
SCHOOLS. ....	2%
SCATTERED. ....	2%

Eighteen percent liked the “small town feel” of the city, while 17% were “close to family and friends,” and 16% were “close to their place of work.”

“Convenient location” is key to:

- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- empty nesters
- homeowners

“Small town feel” is posted at a higher rate by:

- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- households with seniors

“Close to family and friends” is stated more often by:

- those thinking Fridley is “home”

“Close to job” is cited more frequently by:

- residents for ten years or less
- those planning to move in the next five years
- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center supporters
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households
- men
- Ward One residents

---

## Most Serious Issue

---

Fridley residents were asked:

*What do you think is the most serious issue facing  
Fridley today?*

Twenty-one percent pointed to “rising crime,” while seven percent focused on the “aging infrastructure:”

UNSURE. ....	9%
NOTHING. ....	41%
HIGH TAXES. ....	4%
RISING CRIME.. ....	21%
LACK OF JOBS. ....	5%
AGING INFRASTRUCTURE.. ....	7%
PROPERTY MAINTENANCE.. ....	5%
DRINKING WATER.. ....	2%
STREET MAINTENANCE.. ....	2%
SCATTERED. ....	2%

However, a large 41% reported there were “no serious issues” facing the community. This level of “city boosters” is almost seven times higher than the Metropolitan Area suburban norm.

“Nothing” is stated more often by:

- residents for ten years or less
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those thinking there are not unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered

“Rising crime” is a concern among:

- those planning to move in the next five years
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- those not feeling empowered
- households with children
- renters

---

## Currently Missing

---

Next, respondents were asked:

*What, if anything, is currently missing from the City of Fridley which, if present, would greatly improve the quality of life for residents?*

Fifty-seven percent could think of nothing currently missing from the City of Fridley which, if present, would greatly improve the quality of life:

UNSURE. . . . .	9%
NOTHING. . . . .	48%
COMMUNITY CENTER. . . . .	4%
JOBS . . . . .	4%
RESTAURANTS. . . . .	6%
RETAIL. . . . .	9%
BETTER MAINTENANCE. . . . .	6%
ENTERTAINMENT. . . . .	2%
DOWNTOWN AREA. . . . .	3%
PARKS AND TRAILS. . . . .	2%
SCATTERED. . . . .	7%

Nine percent suggested “more retail shopping opportunities,” while six per cent each urged “more restaurants” or “better maintenance.”

“Nothing” is posted more often by:

- those rating the value of city services positively

- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- those feeling empowered
- households with seniors
- over sixty-four year olds

---

## Quality of Life

---

Residents were queried:

*How would you rate the quality of life in Fridley – excellent, good, only fair or poor?*

Eighty-eight percent favorably rated the quality of life, while 13% were more critical:

EXCELLENT.....	28%
GOOD. ....	60%
ONLY FAIR.....	13%
POOR .....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

In fact, 28% rated the quality of life as “excellent.”

Ratings are higher among:

- residents for over thirty years
- those with no plans to move
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered
- over sixty-four year olds

They are lower among:

- those planning to move in the next five years
- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center opponents
- those not feeling empowered
- forty-five to sixty-four year olds
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households

---

## Connection to Fridley

---

Fridley interviewees were asked:

*Which of the following two statements comes closer to your feelings:*

*A) I call Fridley “home,” or*

*B) Fridley is just a place to live; I’d be just as happy elsewhere.*

Sixty-eight percent call “Fridley ‘home,’” while 27% see it as “just a place to live:”

STATEMENT A. . . . .	68%
STATEMENT B. . . . .	27%
BOTH OF ABOVE. . . . .	6%
NEITHER. . . . .	0%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	0%

“Statement A” is cited more often by:

- residents for over ten years
- those with no plans to move
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- those feeling empowered
- households with seniors
- homeowners
- over forty-four year olds
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

“Statement B” is mentioned most frequently by:

- residents for ten years or less
- those planning to move in the next ten years
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- those not feeling empowered
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households

---

## Community Identity

---

Respondents were queried:

*How would you rate the strength of community identity*

*and the sense of neighborliness in Fridley – excellent, good, only fair or poor?*

Seventy-six percent favorably rated the strength of community identity and sense of neighborliness in Fridley:

EXCELLENT.....	15%
GOOD.....	61%
ONLY FAIR.....	22%
POOR.....	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Twenty-four percent rated it lower.

Ratings increase among:

- those with no plans to move
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered
- homeowners

They decrease among:

- residents for ten years or less
- those planning to move in the next five years
- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center opponents
- those not feeling empowered
- renters

---

## **Closest Connection**

---

Interviewees were asked:

*To which of the following do you feel a closer connection to:*

- A) The City of Fridley as a whole;*
- B) Your neighborhood; or*
- C) Your school district?*

Fifty-eight percent felt closest to “[their] neighborhood,” while 24% felt the same way about “the City of Fridley, as a whole.”

STATEMENT A. ....	24%
STATEMENT B. ....	58%
STATEMENT C. ....	12%
NONE. ....	6%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Only 12% felt the closest connection to “[their] school district.”

“Statement A” is stated most frequently by:

- residents for over thirty years
- those with no plans to move
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- those feeling empowered
- empty nesters
- over sixty-four year olds

“Statement B” is indicated more frequently by:

- Community Center opponents
- those not feeling empowered
- Ward Two residents

“Statement C” is posted more frequently by:

- residents for ten years or less
- those planning to move in the next six to ten years
- Community Center supporters
- households with children
- eighteen to forty-four year olds

---

## Direction of City

---

Residents were asked:

*All in all, do you think things in Fridley are generally headed in the right direction, or do you feel things are off on the wrong track?*

A very high 85% think things in Fridley are “generally headed in the right direction:”

RIGHT DIRECTION.....	85%
WRONG TRACK. ....	9%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	6%

Nine percent think things are “off on the wrong track.”

“Right direction” is posted at a higher rate by:

- those with no plans to move
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered

---

## Community Characteristics

---

Respondents were instructed:

*I would like to read you a list of characteristics of a community. For each one, please tell me if you think Fridley currently has too many or too much, too few or too little, or about the right amount.*

A list of 18 characteristics was then read:

*affordable housing, defined by the Metropolitan Council as a single family home costing less than \$160,250?*

Sixty-three percent thought Fridley contained “about the right amount” of affordable housing:

TOO MUCH. ....	12%
TOO LITTLE.....	12%
ABOUT THE RIGHT AMOUNT.....	63%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED.....	14%

“Too much” is cited more often by:

- those planning to move in the next five years
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- those not feeling empowered
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households

“Too little” is mentioned most frequently by:

- households with children

“About the right amount” is indicated most frequently by:

- those with no plans to move
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those feeling empowered
- homeowners

***affordable rental units?***

Fifty-five percent thought Fridley contained “about the right amount” of affordable rental units, while 20% thought there were “too many.”

TOO MANY. . . . .	20%
TOO FEW. . . . .	11%
ABOUT THE RIGHT AMOUNT. . . . .	55%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	15%

“Too many” is cited more often by:

- residents for eleven to thirty years
- those planning to move in the next ten years
- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center opponents
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households
- Ward One residents

“Too few” is mentioned most frequently by:

- residents for eleven to thirty years
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- Community Center supporters
- renters

“About the right amount” is indicated most frequently by:

- residents for ten years or less
- those thinking there are not unsafe areas in Fridley

***luxury rental units?***

Forty-six percent thought Fridley contained “about the right amount” of luxury housing, while 29% felt there were “too few.”

TOO MANY. . . . .	3%
TOO FEW. . . . .	29%
ABOUT THE RIGHT AMOUNT. . . . .	46%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	23%

“Too few” is mentioned most frequently by:

- those planning to move in the next six to ten years
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- empty nesters
- homeowners
- forty-five to sixty-four year olds
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households
- Ward One residents

“About the right amount” is indicated most frequently by:

- those with no plans to move
- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those feeling empowered
- households with children
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- Ward Two residents

*condominiums?*

Fifty-eight percent thought Fridley contained “about the right amount” of condominiums:

TOO MANY. . . . .	3%
TOO FEW. . . . .	20%
ABOUT THE RIGHT AMOUNT. . . . .	58%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	19%

“Too few” is mentioned most frequently by:

- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- homeowners

“About the right amount” is indicated most frequently by:

- those rating the value of city services positively
- Ward Two residents

***townhouses?***

Sixty-six percent thought Fridley contained “about the right amount” of townhouses:

TOO MANY. ....	4%
TOO FEW. ....	16%
ABOUT THE RIGHT AMOUNT.....	66%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED.....	15%

“Too few” is mentioned most frequently by:

- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- homeowners
- women
- Ward Three residents

“About the right amount” is indicated most frequently by:

- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center opponents
- men

***starter homes for young families?***

Sixty-three percent thought Fridley contained “about the right amount” of starter homes for young families:

TOO MANY. ....	8%
TOO FEW. ....	19%
ABOUT THE RIGHT AMOUNT.....	63%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED.....	10%

“Too few” is mentioned most frequently by:

- Community Center supporters
- households with children

“About the right amount” is indicated most frequently by:

- those rating the value of city services positively
- those feeling empowered
- empty nesters
- homeowners

***“move up” housing?***

Fifty-nine percent thought Fridley contained “about the right amount” of “move up” housing, while 24% thought there was “too little:”

TOO MUCH. ....	2%
TOO LITTLE.....	24%
ABOUT THE RIGHT AMOUNT.....	59%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED.....	15%

“Too little” is mentioned most frequently by:

- households with children
- homeowners
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households

“About the right amount” is indicated most frequently by:

- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those rating the value of city services positively
- empty nesters
- forty-five to sixty-four year olds
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

### ***higher cost housing?***

Fifty-three percent thought Fridley contained “about the right amount” of higher cost housing, while 28% thought there was “too little:”

TOO MUCH. ....	4%
TOO LITTLE.....	28%
ABOUT THE RIGHT AMOUNT.....	53%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED.....	16%

“Too little” is mentioned most frequently by:

- those planning to move in the next six to ten years
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households
- Ward One residents

“About the right amount” is indicated most frequently by:

- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those feeling empowered

### ***nursing homes?***

Fifty-one percent thought Fridley contained “about the right amount” of nursing homes; but, 29% felt there were “too few.”

TOO MANY. ....	1%
TOO FEW. ....	29%
ABOUT THE RIGHT AMOUNT. ....	51%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	19%

“Too few” is mentioned most frequently by:

- residents for over thirty years
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- households with seniors
- empty nesters
- homeowners
- over sixty-four year olds
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

“About the right amount” is indicated most frequently by:

- residents for eleven to thirty years
- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center opponents
- those feeling empowered
- homeowners
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households
- Ward One residents

***assisted living for seniors?***

Forty-nine percent thought Fridley contained “about the right amount” of assisted living for seniors; however, 32% saw “too little” in the community:

TOO MUCH. ....	1%
TOO LITTLE. ....	32%
ABOUT THE RIGHT AMOUNT. ....	49%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	19%

“Too little” is mentioned most frequently by:

- those planning to move in the next six to ten years
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those feeling empowered
- households with seniors
- over sixty-four year olds

- Ward Two residents

“About the right amount” is indicated most frequently by:

- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center opponents
- homeowners
- Ward One residents

***one level housing for seniors maintained by an association?***

Thirty-eight percent thought there was “too little” one-level housing for seniors maintained by an association, while 37% thought there was “about the right amount.”

TOO MUCH. ....	0%
TOO LITTLE.....	38%
ABOUT THE RIGHT AMOUNT.....	37%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	25%

“Too little” is mentioned most frequently by:

- households with seniors
- empty nesters
- over sixty-four year olds
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households

“About the right amount” is indicated most frequently by:

- residents for eleven to thirty years
- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center opponents
- those feeling empowered
- households with children
- homeowners
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

***parks and open spaces?***

Ninety-two percent thought there was “about the right amount” of parks and open spaces in the community:

TOO MANY. ....	2%
TOO FEW. ....	5%
ABOUT THE RIGHT AMOUNT.....	92%

DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... 2%

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

***trails and bikeways?***

Ninety-one percent thought Fridley contained “about the right amount” of trails and bikeways:

TOO MANY. ....	1%
TOO FEW. ....	5%
ABOUT THE RIGHT AMOUNT.....	91%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	3%

“About the right amount” is indicated most frequently by:

- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- forty-five to sixty-four year olds
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

***service establishments?***

Eighty percent thought Fridley contained “about the right amount” of service establishments:

TOO MANY. ....	1%
TOO FEW. ....	17%
ABOUT THE RIGHT AMOUNT.....	80%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	3%

“About the right amount” is indicated most frequently by:

- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered

***retail shopping opportunities?***

Fifty-eight percent thought Fridley contained “about the right amount” of retail shopping opportunities, while 41% thought there was “too few:”

TOO MANY. ....	0%
TOO FEW. ....	41%
ABOUT THE RIGHT AMOUNT.....	58%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

“Too few” is mentioned most frequently by:

- Community Center opponents

- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

“About the right amount” is indicated most frequently by:

- members of under \$50,000 annual income households

***entertainment establishments?***

Fifty percent thought there were “too few” entertainment establishments, while 48% saw “too few:”

TOO MANY. ....	1%
TOO FEW. ....	50%
ABOUT THE RIGHT AMOUNT.....	48%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

“Too few” is mentioned most frequently by:

- those planning to move in the next five years

***dining establishments?***

Fifty-seven percent thought Fridley contained “about the right amount” of dining establishments, while 42% saw “too few:”

TOO MANY. ....	1%
TOO FEW. ....	42%
ABOUT THE RIGHT AMOUNT.....	57%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

“Too few” is mentioned most frequently by:

- those planning to move in the next five years
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center opponents

“About the right amount” is indicated most frequently by:

- those with no plans to move
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley

***day care opportunities?***

Fifty percent thought Fridley contained “about the right amount” of affordable housing; but, 44% were “unsure” about the number:

TOO MANY. ....	0%
TOO FEW. ....	6%
ABOUT THE RIGHT AMOUNT.....	50%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	44%

“About the right amount” is indicated most frequently by:

- residents for eleven to thirty years
- those with no plans to move
- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered
- households with children
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

## **Neighborhood Appearance**

Fridley residents were asked:

*How would you rate the general appearance of your neighborhood – excellent, good, only fair or poor?*

A high 87% rated the general appearance of their neighborhood as either “excellent” or “good:”

EXCELLENT.....	16%
GOOD. ....	71%
ONLY FAIR.....	13%
POOR . ....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Fourteen percent rate it lower.

Ratings are higher among:

- those with no plans to move
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- those feeling empowered

They are lower among:

- those planning to move in the next six to ten years
- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- those not feeling empowered

- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

## **Business Appearance**

Respondents were asked:

*How would you rate the general appearance of business and commercial areas in the city – excellent, good, only fair or poor?*

A very solid 80% rated the general appearance of business and commercial areas as either “excellent” or “good:”

EXCELLENT.....	6%
GOOD. ....	74%
ONLY FAIR.....	19%
POOR .....	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Twenty-one percent rated it as “only fair” or “poor.”

Ratings increase among:

- those with no plans to move
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered
- homeowners
- Ward Two residents

They decrease among:

- those planning to move in the next five years
- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center opponents
- those not feeling empowered
- renters

---

## Summary and Conclusions

---

Only eleven percent report they will move in the next five years; in contrast, 78% have no plans to leave during the next ten years, with 52% sure to spend the “rest of their lives” in the city.

Eighty-eight percent rate their quality of life as either “excellent” or “good.” In fact, 15% deem it “excellent.” Thirteen percent rate the quality of life lower. While the overall positive rating is in the top quartile of suburban communities, the “excellent” rating is comparatively weak.

At 25%, “convenient location” leads the list of attributes people liked most about living in the community. “Small town feel” is second, at 18%, followed by “close to family and friends,” at 17%, and “close to job,” at 16%. The most serious issues facing the city are “rising crime,” at 21%, and “aging infrastructure,” at seven percent. A “booster” group of 41% says there are “no” serious issues facing the community; the size of the booster group in Fridley is over six times higher than the norm for a Metropolitan Area suburb.

Fifty-seven percent of the sample offers no suggestions for anything currently missing from the community which could greatly improve the quality of life. Nine percent would like to see “more retail shopping opportunities,” while six percent each suggest “restaurants” or “better property maintenance.”

Seventy-six percent of the sample report the general sense of community in the City of Fridley was “excellent” or “good,” a moderately high rating; twenty-four percent rate it lower. Sixty-eight percent call Fridley “home,” while 27% see it as “just a place to live and I’d be just as happy elsewhere.” Twenty-four percent report a closer connection to the City “as a whole,” while 58% have a closer connection to their “neighborhood.” Twelve percent report a closer connection to the “School District,” and six percent have “no connections” at all. Eighty-five percent think all in all things in Fridley are generally headed in the right direction; but, nine percent think things are “off on the wrong track,” and six percent are “unsure.”

In assessing the number or quantity of various community characteristics, majorities of residents think Fridley has “about the right amount” of 14 of the 18 discussed. These 14 attributes are: affordable housing, affordable rental units, condominiums, townhouses, starter homes for young families, “move up” housing, higher cost housing, nursing homes, parks and open space, trails and bikeways, service establishments, retail shopping opportunities, dining establishments, and day care opportunities.

Forty-nine percent report there are “about the right number” of assisted living for seniors options, while 32% believe there are “too few.” Forty-eight percent see “about the right number” of entertainment establishments, but 50% believe there are “too few.” Forty-six percent think there are “about the right number” of luxury rental units, while 29% believe there are “too few.” Thirty-seven percent see “about the right number” of one-level housing for seniors maintained by an association, while 38% think there are “too few.”

Eighty-seven percent rate the general appearance of their neighborhood as either “excellent” or “good;” fourteen percent are more critical in their evaluations. Similarly, 80% rate the general appearance of business and commercial areas in the city as either “excellent” or “good;” but 21% rate their general appearance lower.

# **Chapter Three: City Taxes and City Services**

# City Taxes and City Services

Fridley residents were asked a series of questions about property taxes and city services. Level of taxation, potential increases and value of services in terms of quality versus costs were discussed. Next, city service ratings were garnered, and specific ratings of garbage collection, drinking water and Municipal Liquor Stores were obtained.

---

## Percentage of City Property Tax

---

Respondents were asked:

*Property tax revenues are divided among the City of Fridley, Anoka County, and your local public school district.*

*For each dollar of the property taxes you pay, about what percentage do you think goes to city government?*

The median estimate was 20.2%, about 10% lower than the actual level:

TEN PERCENT OR LESS. ....	8%
11 TO 20 PERCENT. ....	31%
21 TO 30 PERCENT. ....	22%
31 TO 40 PERCENT. ....	7%
41 TO 50 PERCENT. ....	4%
OVER 50 PERCENT. ....	3%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	26%

But, 29% did estimate the percentage between 21% and 40%.

“Eleven to twenty percent” is indicated more frequently by:

- those rating the value of city services positively
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- those feeling empowered
- homeowners
- forty-five to sixty-four year olds

“Twenty-one to thirty percent” is cited more often by:

- residents for over thirty years

- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those feeling empowered
- homeowners
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households

---

## Perception of Taxes

---

Fridley interviewees were asked:

*Do you consider the city portion of your property taxes to be very high, somewhat high, about average, somewhat low, or very low in comparison with neighboring cities?*

Twenty-eight percent felt they were “comparatively high,” while 50% considered them “about average:”

VERY HIGH. ....	3%
SOMEWHAT HIGH. ....	25%
ABOUT AVERAGE. ....	50%
SOMEWHAT LOW. ....	4%
VERY LOW. ....	1%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	18%

Eighteen percent reported they were “unsure.”

“High” is posted more often by:

- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- Community Center opponents
- those feeling empowered
- homeowners
- forty-five to sixty-four year olds
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- Ward One residents

“About average” is indicated more frequently by:

- residents for over ten years
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services

- those rating the value of city services positively
- empty nesters
- homeowners
- over sixty-four year olds

---

## Tax Increase to Maintain City Services

---

Interviewees were asked:

*Would you favor or oppose an increase in YOUR city property tax if it were needed to maintain city services at their current level?*

By a narrow margin of 45% to 41%, residents opposed a property tax increase to maintain city services at their current level:

FAVOR. ....	41%
OPPOSE.....	45%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	14%

Supporters tend to be:

- residents for over thirty years
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered
- homeowners
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

Opponents are typically:

- residents for eleven to thirty years
- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- Community Center opponents
- homeowners
- forty-five to sixty-four year olds
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households

---

## Tax Increase to Enhance City Services

---

Next, residents were asked:

*And, would you favor or oppose an increase in YOUR city property tax if it were used to improve and enhance city services?*

By a narrow 44%-42% margin, residents supported an increase in their city property taxes to improve or enhance city services:

FAVOR. ....	44%
OPPOSE.....	42%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	15%

Supporters are more apt to be:

- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered
- households with seniors
- homeowners
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

Opponents are more likely to be:

- residents for eleven to thirty years
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- Community Center opponents
- homeowners
- forty-five to sixty-four year olds
- Ward One residents

---

## General Value of City Services

---

Respondents were queried:

*When you consider the property taxes you pay and the quality of city services you receive, would you rate the general value of city services as excellent, good, only fair or poor?*

Seventy-six percent rated the value as either “excellent” or “good:”

EXCELLENT.....	9%
GOOD. ....	67%
ONLY FAIR.....	12%
POOR .....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	12%

Only 13% thought it was “only fair” or “poor.”

Ratings are higher among:

- residents for over ten years
- those with no plans to move
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those feeling empowered
- households with seniors
- homeowners
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households
- men

They are lower among:

- those planning to move in the next five years
- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center opponents
- those not feeling empowered
- Ward Three residents

---

## **City Service Ratings**

---

Fridley residents were instructed:

*I would like to read you a list of a few city services. For each one, please tell me whether you would rate the quality of the service as excellent, good, only fair or poor?*

A list of eight city services was then read:

***Police protection?***

Ninety-four percent favorably rated police protection:

EXCELLENT.....	39%
GOOD.....	55%
ONLY FAIR.....	5%
POOR.....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Six percent were more critical in their evaluations.

Ratings peak among:

- those with no plans to move
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- homeowners
- over sixty-four year olds

***Fire protection?***

Ninety-eight percent rated fire protection highly:

EXCELLENT.....	47%
GOOD.....	51%
ONLY FAIR.....	1%
POOR.....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	2%

Only one percent was more critical.

Favorable ratings are posted by:

- those rating the value of city services positively
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- homeowners

***Recycling?***

Ninety-six percent rated recycling services as either “excellent” or “good:”

EXCELLENT.....	33%
----------------	-----

GOOD. ....	63%
ONLY FAIR.....	2%
POOR .....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	2%

A tiny three percent rated the services lower.

Favorable ratings are given more often by:

- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered
- homeowners

***Storm drainage and flood control?***

Eighty-four percent rated storm drainage and flood control favorably:

EXCELLENT.....	13%
GOOD. ....	71%
ONLY FAIR.....	10%
POOR .....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	7%

Ten percent rated them lower.

Ratings are higher among:

- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- those feeling empowered
- homeowners

They are lower among:

- those rating the value of city services negatively
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center opponents
- those not feeling empowered

***Park maintenance?***

Ninety-three percent rated park maintenance favorably:

EXCELLENT.....	28%
GOOD. ....	65%
ONLY FAIR.....	6%
POOR . . . . .	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Only seven percent rated it unfavorably.

Ratings peak among:

- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered

***City-sponsored recreation programs?***

Eighty-one percent rated city-sponsored recreation programs as either “excellent” or “good:”

EXCELLENT.....	20%
GOOD. ....	61%
ONLY FAIR.....	7%
POOR . . . . .	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	12%

Eight percent saw them as “only fair” or “poor.”

Favorable ratings are cited more often by:

- those rating the value of city services positively
- those feeling empowered
- homeowners
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

***Animal control?***

Seventy-eight percent rated animal control highly:

EXCELLENT.....	11%
GOOD. ....	67%
ONLY FAIR.....	9%
POOR . . . . .	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	13%

Ten percent were more critical.

Ratings increase among:

- residents for eleven to thirty years
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those feeling empowered

They decrease among:

- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- those rating the value of city services negatively

### ***Code enforcement?***

Seventy-three percent rated code enforcement favorably:

EXCELLENT.....	13%
GOOD. ....	60%
ONLY FAIR.....	16%
POOR .....	3%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	9%

But, nineteen percent posted unfavorably ratings for this service.

Ratings are higher among:

- those with no plans to move
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered
- homeowners
- renters

They are lower among:

- those planning to move in the next ten years
- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center opponents
- those not feeling empowered
- forty-five to sixty-four year olds

Then, residents were further instructed:

*Now for the next three city services, please consider only their job on city-maintained streets and roads. That means excluding interstate highways, state and county roads that are taken care of by other levels of government. Hence, Interstate 694, Highway 65, or University Avenue, should not be considered. How would you rate....*

Three additional services were then read:

***City street repair and maintenance?***

Seventy-six percent rated city street repair and maintenance as either “excellent” or “good:”

EXCELLENT.....	9%
GOOD. ....	67%
ONLY FAIR..	21%
POOR .....	3%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Twenty-four percent saw it as “only fair” or “poor.”

Ratings increase among:

- those with no plans to move
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley

They decrease among:

- those planning to move in the next five years
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- those not feeling empowered
- Ward Three residents

***Snow plowing?***

Seventy-five percent rated snow plowing favorably:

EXCELLENT.....	12%
GOOD. ....	63%
ONLY FAIR..	20%
POOR .....	5%

DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... 0%

Twenty-five percent were more negative in their evaluations.

Ratings are higher among:

- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered

They are lower among:

- those planning to move in the next five years
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center opponents

***Street lighting?***

Street lighting was rated favorably by 69% of the sample:

EXCELLENT.....	7%
GOOD. ....	62%
ONLY FAIR.....	22%
POOR .....	9%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Thirty-one percent posted negative ratings of this service.

Favorable ratings are posted at a higher rate by:

- those rating the value of city services positively
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- those feeling empowered

Unfavorable ratings are indicated most frequently by:

- those rating the value of city services negatively
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- those not feeling empowered

## City Drinking Water

Residents were asked:

*How would you rate the quality of drinking water in the City of Fridley – excellent, good, only fair or poor?*

While 70% rated the quality of city drinking water highly, 28% rated it lower:

EXCELLENT.....	5%
GOOD. ....	65%
ONLY FAIR.....	19%
POOR .....	9%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	2%

Ratings are higher among:

- those with no plans to move
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley

They are lower among:

- those rating the value of city services negatively
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- forty-five to sixty-four year olds

Next, respondents were queried:

*How concerned are you about the safety of drinking water in the city – are you very concerned, somewhat concerned, not too concerned, or not at all concerned?*

Forty-five percent were either “very concerned” or “somewhat concerned” about the safety of drinking water in the city:

VERY CONCERNED.....	12%
SOMEWHAT CONCERNED.....	31%
NOT TOO CONCERNED.....	27%
NOT AT ALL CONCERNED.....	30%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Fifty-seven percent, though, were either “not too concerned” or “not at all concerned” about it.

Concern increases among:

- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- forty-five to sixty-four year olds

It decreases among:

- eighteen to forty-four year olds

---

## Garbage Collection

---

Fridley respondents were told:

*Most communities have one of two systems for garbage collection. In an open collection system, like the City of Fridley currently has, residents choose their hauler from several different companies serving the community. Other cities use an organized collection system, where the City contracts with haulers for collection throughout the city.*

They were then asked:

*Would you favor or oppose the City of Fridley changing from the current system in which residents may choose from several different haulers to a system where the City chooses a specific haulers for the whole community? Do you feel strongly that way?*

By a 47%-35% plurality, residents oppose the City of Fridley changing from its current system of garbage hauler designation:

STRONGLY FAVOR. ....	6%
FAVOR. ....	29%
OPPOSE.. ....	34%
STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	13%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.. ....	19%

Supporters tend to be:

- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered

- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

Opponents are typically:

- residents for over thirty years
- those with no plans to move
- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center opponents
- homeowners
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households

Respondents offering opinions were next asked:

*Could you tell me one or two reasons for your decision?*

The major reason for support of the current system was “want to make the choice:”

LIKE CURRENT HAULER. . . . .	12%
WANT CHOICE. . . . .	36%
CHOICE/LOWER COST. . . . .	12%
LESS TRUCK TRAFFIC. . . . .	21%
LESS STREET MAINTENANCE. . . . .	3%
LESS NOISE. . . . .	2%
LESS POLLUTION. . . . .	2%
ORGANIZED/LOWER COST. . . . .	13%

The major reason for support of designated haulers was “less truck traffic on city streets.”

“Want choice” is posted more often by:

- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households

“Less truck traffic” is indicated more often by:

- Community Center supporters
- renters

“Organized/Low cost” is stated more frequently by:

- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- Ward Two residents

“Like current hauler” is cited more often by:

- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- forty-five to sixty-four year olds

“Choice/Lower cost” is mentioned most frequently by:

- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- men

---

## Municipal Liquor Stores

---

Fridley interviewees were asked:

*As you may know, the City of Fridley owns and operates two municipal liquor stores.*

*Do you favor or oppose the City continuing to operate its municipal liquor stores?*

By a nearly unanimous 94%-4% majority, residents favor the City continuing to operate its municipal liquor stores:

FAVOR. ....	94%
OPPOSE.....	4%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	2%

Support peaks among:

- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services

The very small sub-sample of opponents was asked a follow-up query:

*Do you still oppose the continued operation of the municipal liquor stores if closing of the liquor stores would result in a \$250,000 loss of revenue for the city?*

Sixty-nine percent of opponents changed their opinions:

YES .....	31%
NO .....	69%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Only 31% stood pat.

“Yes” is stated most frequently by:

- Ward Three residents

“No” is mentioned more often by:

- those rating the value of city services positively

All interviewees were next asked:

***Have you visited any of these stores during the past twelve months?***

Fifty-nine percent reported they had visited the stores during the past twelve months:

YES .....	59%
NO .....	41%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Visitors tend to be:

- those planning to move in the next five years
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households
- men

Non-visitors are typically:

- those with no plans to move
- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- over sixty-four year olds
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households
- women

Visitors were next asked:

***Which store do you generally shop on University Avenue or Highway 65?***

Seventy percent of the visitors tended to shop at the University Avenue location:

UNIVERSITY AVENUE. ....	70%
HIGHWAY 65.....	30%

DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... 0%

“University Avenue” is posted more often by:

- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live

Visitors were then instructed:

*Please rate the store and/or staff on each of the following criteria. For each one, please tell me if you would rate it as excellent, good, only fair or poor. If you have no opinion, just say so....*

A list of three customer satisfaction dimensions was then read:

***Product selection?***

A solid 91% rated product selection highly:

EXCELLENT.....	11%
GOOD. ....	80%
ONLY FAIR.....	9%
POOR . ....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Only nine percent were more critical.

Ratings are higher among:

- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- those feeling empowered

They are lower among:

- those rating the value of city services negatively
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- those not feeling empowered
- households with seniors

***Price of products?***

Eighty-four percent rated the price of products highly:

EXCELLENT.....	8%
GOOD. ....	76%
ONLY FAIR.....	14%

POOR .....	3%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Seventeen percent were more critical.

Ratings increase among:

- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services

They decrease among:

- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those not feeling empowered

*Courtesy and friendliness of staff?*

Ninety-six percent rated the courtesy and friendliness of the staff highly:

EXCELLENT.....	26%
GOOD. ....	70%
ONLY FAIR.....	3%
POOR .....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Only three percent were more critical.

Ratings peak among:

- those rating the value of city services positively

In each case, positive ratings were higher than the 80% threshold used to demote “high quality” customer service.

---

**Summary and  
Conclusions**

---

Fridley residents can be classified as fiscal moderates. Twenty-eight percent think their property taxes are “high” in comparison with neighboring suburban communities, while 50% see them as “about average. Seventy-six percent of the residents view city services as either an “excellent” or a “good” value for the property taxes paid; this endorsement level places Fridley within the top quartile of Metropolitan Area suburbs. The general property tax climate in Fridley can be best described as “fiscally benign.” The typical resident estimates the city’s share of the property tax to be 20.2%. Thirty-nine percent thought it was less than 20%, while another 36% thought the

share was over 20%.

By a 45%-41% margin, residents narrowly oppose an increase in city property taxes if it were needed to maintain city services at their current level. But, by a 44%-42% margin, residents would narrowly support an increase in city property taxes if it were used to improve and enhance city services.

In evaluating specific city services, the mean approval rating is 83.4%, within the top quartile of summary ratings in the Metropolitan Area. Over 90% rate fire protection, police protection, recycling, and park maintenance as either “excellent” or “good.” Between 80% and 90% favorably rate storm drainage and flood control and city-sponsored recreation programs. Between 70% and 80% favorably rate animal control, code enforcement, city street repair and maintenance, and snow plowing. Sixty-nine percent similarly rate street lighting.

Seventy percent rate the quality of drinking water in the City of Fridley as either “excellent” or “good;” eighteen percent are more critical in their evaluations. Similarly 43% are either “very concerned” or “somewhat concerned” about the safety of drinking water in the city; but, only 12% are “very concerned.”

By a 47%-35% margin, residents oppose changing from the current garbage hauling system, in which residents may choose from several different haulers, to a system where the City chooses one or more haulers for the whole community. Supporters of the current system base their decisions on “liking current hauler,” “lower cost,” and “want choice.” Supporters of city designation base their decision on “less truck traffic” and “less damage to roads”

Ninety-four percent favor the City continuing to operate its municipal liquor stores. Among the four percent who oppose its continuation, only 31% -- effectively one percent of the citizenry -- still oppose the municipal liquor stores when informed that their closing would result in \$250,000 loss of revenue for the city. Fifty-nine percent of the sample visited the stores during the past twelve months, with 70% of these shoppers usually going to the store on University Avenue and the remainder patronizing the store on Highway 65. Ninety-six percent rated the courtesy and friendliness of the staff as either “excellent” or “good,” while 91% similarly rate the product selection and 84%, the price of products.

# **Chapter Four: Public Safety Issues**

# Public Safety Issues

Fridley residents were asked a series of questions about public safety issues. Initially, areas in the city which are considered unsafe areas were identified and discussed. The neighborhood police presence was discussed in some detail. Finally, respondents were asked to identify what they considered to be the greatest public safety concern facing Fridley.

## Unsafe Areas

Interviewees were asked:

*Are there areas in the City of Fridley where you do not feel safe?*

Twenty-six percent can think of areas in the City of Fridley where they do not feel safe:

YES .....	26%
NO .....	74%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Yes” is cited more often by:

- those planning to move in the next six to ten years
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- Community Center opponents
- homeowners
- women

“No” is mentioned more frequently by:

- those with no plans to move
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- Community Center supporters
- renters
- men

Respondents who identified areas were asked two follow-up queries. First, the areas of chief concern were discussed:

*In which areas do you not feel safe?*

Thirty-three percent point to “University Avenue,” while 17% cite “apartments” and 11% point to the “parks:”

APARTMENTS.....	17%
UNIVERSITY AVENUE. ....	33%
PARKS.....	11%
TRAILS. ....	2%
EVERYWHERE. ....	18%
RETAIL. ....	3%
LOW INCOME AREAS. ....	5%
PARKING LOTS.....	2%
TRAILER COURT. ....	2%
SCATTERED AREAS. ....	8%

Eighteen percent thought “everywhere” was unsafe in the community.

“University Avenue” is stated more often by:

- residents for ten years or less
- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- households with children
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- Ward One residents

“Everywhere” is cited more frequently by:

- residents for over thirty years
- empty nesters
- women

“Apartments” is mentioned more often by:

- men

Next, they were asked:

***What would make you feel more safe?***

Sixty-seven percent urged “more police patrolling:”

UNSURE. ....	5%
MORE POLICE PATROLLING.....	67%
MORE STREET LIGHTS.....	16%
LESS LOW INCOME HOUSING.....	3%
LESS LOITERING. ....	3%
NOTHING/NO WHERE IS SAFE. ....	7%

Sixteen percent want to see “more street lights.”

“More police patrolling” is posted at a higher rate by:

- residents for ten years or less
- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- Ward One residents

---

## **Safe Walking Alone**

---

Interviewees were queried:

*Do you feel safe in your immediate neighborhood walking alone at night?*

Eighty-five percent felt safe in their immediate neighborhood walking alone at night:

YES .....	85%
NO .....	15%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Yes” is stated more often by:

- residents for thirty years or less
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered
- members of over \$50,000 annual income households
- men

“No” is selected more frequently by:

- residents for over thirty years
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center opponents
- those not feeling empowered
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households
- women
- Ward One residents

---

## Safe in Home

---

Fridley respondents were asked:

*Do you generally feel safe in your home?*

An almost unanimous 99% generally felt safe in their home:

YES	99%
NO	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED	0%

Agreement peaks among:

- those rating the value of city services positively
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley

---

## Police Patrolling

---

Respondents were asked:

*How would you rate the amount of police patrolling in your neighborhood – too much, about the right amount or not enough?*

Seventy-seven percent thought police patrolling was “about the right amount:”

TOO MUCH	0%
ABOUT THE RIGHT AMOUNT	77%
NOT ENOUGH	23%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED	0%

Twenty-three percent, though, thought it was “not enough.”

“About the right amount” is posted most frequently by:

- those with no plans to move
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley

“Not enough” is cited more often by:

- those planning to move in the next six to ten years
- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services negatively

- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center opponents

---

## Traffic Enforcement

---

Interviewees were asked:

*How would you rate the amount of traffic enforcement by the police in your neighborhood – too much, about right amount or not enough?*

Seventy-seven percent rated traffic enforcement by the police in their neighborhood as “about the right amount:”

TOO MUCH. ....	0%
ABOUT THE RIGHT AMOUNT.....	77%
NOT ENOUGH. ....	22%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Twenty-two percent regarded it as “not enough.”

“About the right amount” is posted more often by:

- those with no plans to move
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center supporters

“Not enough” is indicated more frequently by:

- those planning to move in the next six to ten years
- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center opponents

---

## Traffic Speeding

---

Respondents were asked:

*How serious of a problem is traffic speeding in your neighborhood – very serious, somewhat serious, not too serious or not at all serious?*

Thirty-one percent thought the problem of traffic speeding in their neighborhood was either “very serious” or “somewhat serious:”

VERY SERIOUS.....	5%
SOMEWHAT SERIOUS.....	26%
NOT TOO SERIOUS.....	40%
NOT AT ALL SERIOUS.....	29%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Sixty-nine percent saw it as “not too serious” or “not at all serious.”

“Serious” is stated more often by:

- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center opponents

“Not serious” is posted more frequently by:

- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center supporters

---

## **Stop Sign Violations**

---

Residents were next asked:

*How serious of a problem are stop sign violations in your neighborhood – very serious, somewhat serious, not too serious or not at all serious?*

Twenty-three percent saw stop sign violations in their neighborhood as either “very serious” or “somewhat serious:”

VERY SERIOUS.....	6%
SOMEWHAT SERIOUS.....	17%
NOT TOO SERIOUS.....	42%
NOT AT ALL SERIOUS.....	35%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Seventy-seven percent thought it was either “not too serious” or “not at all serious.”

“Serious” is cited more often by:

- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center opponents
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households

“Not too serious” is mentioned at a higher rate by:

- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center supporters

---

## Greatest Public Safety Concern

---

Respondents were asked:

*Please tell me which one you consider to be the greatest concern in Fridley? If you feel that none of these problems are serious in Fridley, just say so.*

Twenty-five percent pointed to “residential crimes,” while 20% picked “youth crime and vandalism:”

Violent crime. . . . .	3%
Traffic speeding. . . . .	9%
Drugs . . . . .	15%
Youth crimes and vandalism... . . . .	20%
Identity theft. . . . .	0%
Business crimes, such as shoplifting and check fraud. . . . .	10%
Residential crimes, such as burglary, and theft. . . . .	25%
ALL EQUALLY. . . . .	6%
NONE OF THE ABOVE. . . . .	10%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	2%

Fifteen percent chose “drugs” and ten percent pointed to “business crimes.”

“Youth crimes and vandalism” is posted more often by:

- those thinking there are not unsafe areas in Fridley

- Community Center supporters
- households with children
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- Ward One residents

“Business crimes” is cited at a higher rate by:

- those planning to move in the next six to ten years
- Community Center supporters
- over sixty-four year olds

“Residential crime” is indicated more often by:

- those rating the value of city services negatively
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- homeowners
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

---

## Summary and Conclusions

---

A comparatively high 85% feel safe walking alone at night in their neighborhood. In considering the entire city, 26% think there are areas where they do not feel safe, especially University Avenue and apartment complexes. Not feeling safe is generally caused by one of two factors: “not enough police patrols” or “not enough lights.” An almost unanimous 99% do feel safe in their homes.

In rating the seriousness of public safety concerns in the City of Fridley, 25% feel “residential crime, such as burglary and theft” is the greatest issue. Twenty percent feel similarly about “youth crimes and vandalism.” And, 15% point to “drugs.”

Seventy-seven percent rate the amount of police patrolling in their neighborhood as “about the right amount,” while 77% also feel the same way amount the amount of traffic enforcement by the police in their neighborhood. In both cases, about 23% think the amounts are “not enough.”

Thirty-one percent rated traffic speeding in their neighborhood as either “very serious” or “somewhat serious.” Twenty-three percent similarly rated stop sign violations in their neighborhood.

# **Chapter Five: Park and Recreation Issues**

# Park and Recreation Issues

Fridley park and recreational facilities were rated in general, as well as their impact on the quality of life and home values. Each type of facility was examined for use and condition. Next, recreational facilities were evaluated for their usefulness. City park and recreation programs were then evaluated. Recreational leakage was estimated. Finally, a new community center was discussed in detail. Then, the willingness to raise property taxes for either a general park improvement bond or a community center construction bond were measured.

---

## Park and Recreational Facility Rating

---

Respondents were initially asked:

*How would you rate park and recreational facilities in  
Fridley – excellent, good, only fair or poor?*

Ninety-five percent rated park and recreational facilities in Fridley as either “excellent” or “good:”

EXCELLENT.....	21%
GOOD. ....	74%
ONLY FAIR.....	3%
POOR .....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	3%

Only three percent rated them lower.

Ratings peak among:

- those rating the value of city services positively
- those feeling empowered

---

## Importance of Park and Recreational Facilities

---

Fridley residents were queried:

*When you consider your quality of life in the city....*

***How important are park and recreational facilities to you – very important, somewhat important, not too important or not at all important?***

Seventy-five percent considered park and recreational facilities as either “very important” or “somewhat important:

VERY IMPORTANT. ....	31%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	44%
NOT TOO IMPORTANT. ....	16%
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT. ....	8%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Twenty-four percent rated their importance lower.

“Important” is posted more often by:

- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered
- households with children
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households

“Not important” is cited more frequently by:

- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- Community Center opponents
- empty nesters

---

**Importance of  
Neighborhood Park**

---

Next, respondents were asked:

***When you consider the value of your home....***

***How important is the appearance of your neighborhood park – very important, somewhat important, not too important or not at all important?***

A very high 89% thought the appearance of their neighborhood park was at least “somewhat important” to their home value:

VERY IMPORTANT. ....	41%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	48%
NOT TOO IMPORTANT. ....	8%
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT. ....	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Only ten percent rated it lower.

“Important” is cited more often by:

- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered
- households with children
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households
- women

“Not important” is mentioned most often by:

- empty nesters
- men

---

## **Usage and Rating of Park and Recreational Facilities**

---

Fridley residents were instructed:

*I will now read you a short list of park and recreational opportunities within the City. First, for each one, please tell me if you or members of your household have used it during the past year. Then, for those you have used, please rate it as excellent, good, only fair or poor....*

A list of four park and recreational opportunities were then read:

### *Large community parks?*

Sixty-seven percent of the households in the community used the large community parks during the past year:

NOT USED. ....	32%
USED/EXCELLENT.....	26%
USED/GOOD. ....	40%
USED/ONLY FAIR.....	1%

USED/POOR. ....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Ninety-nine percent of large community park users rate them favorably.

“Not used” is stated more often by:

- residents for over thirty years
- those with no plans to move
- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- Community Center opponents
- households with seniors
- empty nesters
- homeowners
- over sixty-four year olds
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households

“Used/Favorable” is indicated most frequently by:

- residents for ten years or less
- those planning to move in the next six to ten years
- Community Center supporters
- households with children
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households

***Smaller neighborhood parks?***

Seventy of the households in the community used smaller neighborhood parks last year:

NOT USED. ....	30%
USED/EXCELLENT.....	26%
USED/GOOD. ....	42%
USED/ONLY FAIR.....	2%
USED/POOR. ....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Ninety-seven percent of smaller neighborhood park users rate them positively.

“Not used” is stated more often by:

- residents for over thirty years
- Community Center opponents
- households with seniors
- empty nesters

- over sixty-four year olds
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households

“Used/Favorable” is indicated most frequently by:

- residents for ten years or less
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered
- households with children
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households

***Trails?***

Fifty-nine percent of the households in the community used city trails during the past year:

NOT USED. ....	39%
USED/EXCELLENT.....	25%
USED/GOOD. ....	31%
USED/ONLY FAIR.....	3%
USED/POOR.....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Ninety-five percent of trail users rate them highly.

“Not used” is stated more often by:

- residents for over thirty years
- those not feeling empowered
- households with seniors
- empty nesters
- over sixty-four year olds
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households

“Used/Favorable” is indicated most frequently by:

- residents for eleven to thirty years
- those planning to move in the next six to ten years
- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered
- households with children
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households

### *Community ballfields?*

Thirty-eight percent of the households in the community used community ballfields during the past year:

NOT USED. ....	60%
USED/EXCELLENT.....	14%
USED/GOOD. ....	23%
USED/ONLY FAIR.....	1%
USED/POOR.....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	2%

Ninety-eight percent of community ballfield users rated these facilities as either “excellent” or “good.”

“Not used” is stated more often by:

- residents for over thirty years
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center opponents
- households with seniors
- empty nesters
- homeowners
- over sixty-four year olds

“Used/Favorable” is indicated most frequently by:

- residents for ten years or less
- Community Center supporters
- households with children
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households
- Ward Two residents

---

### **Facilities Meet Household Needs**

---

Fridley interviewees were asked:

*In general, do you feel that existing recreational facilities offered by the City meet the needs of you and members of your household?*

A nearly unanimous 99% felt that existing recreational facilities met the needs of their households:

YES .....	99%
NO .....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

The very small sub-sample of the discontented were asked a follow-up query:

*What additional recreational facilities would you like to see the City offer its residents?*

“More trails” and an “indoor pool” led their list of wanted facilities:

MORE TRAILS.....	40%
INDOOR POOL.....	60%

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

---

## **Property Tax Increase for Referendum**

---

Respondents were instructed:

*Suppose the City of Fridley proposed a parks and recreational facilities referendum which you considered to be a reasonable approach. The proposal would be placed on a referendum ballot for approval by the voters. In order to fund construction, residents would be asked to approve a property tax increase for a twenty year period.*

They were then asked:

*How much would you be willing to see your monthly property taxes increase to fund these improvements? Let's say, would you be willing to see your monthly property taxes increase by \$\_\_\_? How about \$\_\_\_ per month?*

A majority of residents would oppose any tax increase for this purpose:

NOTHING.....	55%
\$3.00 .....	16%

\$6.00 .....	11%
\$9.00 .....	8%
\$12.00 .....	2%
\$15.00 .....	1%
\$18.00 .....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	7%

“Nothing” is posted more often by:

- those planning to move in the next five years
- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- Community Center opponents
- those not feeling empowered
- empty nesters
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households
- Ward Two residents

“\$3.00” is posted more often by:

- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered
- households with children

“\$6.00” is indicated more frequently by:

- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered
- households with children
- homeowners
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households

---

## Park and Recreation Programs

---

Fridley residents were asked:

*Have you or members of your household participated in any City park and recreation programs?*

Twenty-four percent of the city’s household reported members participated in park and recreational programs:

YES .....	24%
NO .....	76%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Participation increases among:

- residents for ten years or less
- Community Center supporters
- households with children
- eighteen to forty-four year olds

It decreases among:

- residents for over thirty years
- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- Community Center opponents
- households with seniors
- empty nesters
- over sixty-four year olds
- Ward One residents

Participating household were next asked:

***Which ones?***

“Youth sports” programs, at 34% proved the most popular, followed by “Summer Programs,” at 21%:

UNSURE.....	1%
PARK PROGRAMS.....	11%
SWIMMING LESSONS.....	11%
SUMMER PROGRAMS.....	21%
BASEBALL/SOFTBALL.....	17%
YOUTH SPORTS.....	34%
FITNESS PROGRAMS.....	4%
SENIOR PROGRAMS.....	1%

“Youth sports” is cited more often by:

- those with no plans to move
- households with children

“Baseball or softball” is posted more frequently by:

- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- renters

Then participants were asked:

*Were you satisfied or dissatisfied with your experience?*

Satisfaction was unanimous:

SATISFIED. ....	100%
DISSATISFIED. ....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	0%

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

---

### **Programs Meet Needs of Household**

---

City respondents were asked:

*Does the current mix of City park and recreation programming meet the needs of your household?*

Ninety-nine percent reported the current mix met the needs of their household:

YES .....	99%
NO .....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	1%

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

---

### **Recreational Leakage**

---

Respondents were queried:

*Do you or members of your household currently leave the city for park and recreation facilities or activities? What would that be?*

Sixty-four percent did not leave the City of Fridley to recreate elsewhere:

NO .....	64%
----------	-----

POOL .....	3%
GOLF .....	4%
LAKES/BOATING. ....	16%
SPORTS LEAGUES. ....	6%
TRAILS. ....	2%
FITNESS CENTER. ....	2%
SCATTERED. ....	4%

Sixteen percent leave to go “boating or for lake activities.” Six percent participated in “sports leagues” elsewhere, while four percent used out-of-city “golf course.”

“No” is reported most frequently by:

- residents for over thirty years
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center opponents
- households with seniors
- empty nesters
- over sixty-four year olds
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households

“Lakes and boating” is posted more often by:

- residents for eleven to thirty years
- homeowners
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

**Community Center**

Residents were initially told:

*There have been on-going discussions in the community about the need for a Community Center that would provide community gathering space for recreation, programs and meetings.*

They were then asked:

*Do you support or oppose the construction of a Community Center by the City of Fridley? Do you feel strongly that way?*

By a 55%-38% margin, residents support in concept the construction of a Community Center:

STRONGLY SUPPORT. ....	12%
------------------------	-----

SUPPORT. ....	43%
OPPOSE.. ....	28%
STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	10%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.. ....	8%

Since the support percentage is below 60% at this point, a referendum-required Community Center would not survive at the polls.

Supporters tend to be:

- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- those feeling empowered
- households with children
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds

Opponents are typically:

- residents for over thirty years
- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- those not feeling empowered
- households with seniors
- empty nesters
- homeowners
- over forty-four year olds

Next, respondents were asked:

***If a Community Center were built, how likely would you or members of your household be to use the facility – very likely, somewhat likely, not too likely or not at all likely?***

Forty-nine percent reported household members would be at least “somewhat likely” to use this facility:

VERY LIKELY. ....	23%
SOMEWHAT LIKELY.....	26%
NOT TOO LIKELY.....	16%
NOT AT ALL LIKELY.....	30%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	5%

Using standard market projection techniques, 18% would be expected to actually use the new Community Center.

Use increases among:

- residents for ten years or less
- those planning to move in the next six to ten years
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered
- households with children
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds

It decreases among:

- residents for over thirty years
- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center opponents
- those not feeling empowered
- households with seniors
- empty nesters
- homeowners
- over forty-four year olds

Finally, residents were asked to consider a property tax increase to fund construction of a new Community Center facility:

***The construction of the Community Center would use property taxes. Suppose the City of Fridley proposed a Community Center development which you considered to be a reasonable approach.***

***How much would you be willing to see your property taxes increase to fund this construction? Let's say, would you be willing to see your monthly property taxes increase by \$\_\_\_? How about \$\_\_\_ per month?***

Forty-five percent would oppose any property tax increase for this purpose:

NOTHING. . . . .	45%
\$3.00 . . . . .	19%
\$6.00 . . . . .	11%
\$9.00 . . . . .	10%
\$12.00 . . . . .	4%
\$15.00 . . . . .	4%

\$18.00 .....	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	6%

The typical resident would only support a \$2.00 per month property tax increase.

“Nothing” is posted more often by:

- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- Community Center opponents
- those not feeling empowered
- empty nesters
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households

“\$3.00” is cited more often by:

- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered

“\$6.00” is mentioned most frequently by:

- residents for eleven to thirty years
- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered

“\$9.00” is indicated more frequently by:

- those with no plans to move
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered
- households with children
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households

---

## Summary and Conclusions

---

Ninety-five percent rate the park and recreation facilities in Fridley as either “excellent” or “good.” Only three percent are more critical, while two percent are “unsure.” When considering the quality of life in the community, 75% rate park and recreational facilities as either “very important” or “somewhat important;” twenty-four percent rate them as “not too important” or “not at all important.” When considering the value of their homes, 89% rate the appearance of their neighborhood park as either “very important” or “somewhat important;” in fact, 41% see

their neighborhood park's appearance as "very important" to their home value.

The most popular park and recreational opportunities are "smaller neighborhood parks," used by 70% of the city's households, and "larger community parks," used by 67%. Fifty-nine percent report their household uses the city's "trails." And, "community ballfields" draw 38%. Among users, positive ratings of each opportunity remain between a very high 95% and 98%.

A nearly unanimous 99% feel existing recreational facilities offered by the City of Fridley meet the needs of their households. Similarly, 99% view the current mix of City park and recreational programming meets the needs of their households. Eighty-one percent believes the City has enough community meeting spaces; only eight percent disagree.

Fifty-five percent report they would oppose **any** tax increase to fund a park and recreational facilities bond referendum. But, 39% would be likely to vote in favor of a bond referendum which increased property taxes by \$3.00 per month.

Twenty-four percent report household members have participated in City park and recreation programs. Among participating households, 34% have enrolled in "youth sports." Twenty-one percent participated in "summer programs." Seventeen percent engaged in "baseball or softball," and 11% each, in "swimming lessons" or "park programs." One hundred percent are "satisfied" with the experience.

Sixty-four percent do not leave the city for park and recreation facilities or activities elsewhere. Sixteen percent go to "use lakes or for boating." Six percent leave to play in "sports leagues" and four percent leave to "golf" elsewhere.

By a 55%-38% majority, residents support *in concept* the construction of a Community Center by the City of Fridley. Forty-nine percent of the sample indicate that a member of their household would be at least "somewhat likely" to use the facility if it were built; using standard market projection techniques, though, the expected user level would be 18% of the city's households. The typical resident would be willing to increase their property taxes by \$2.00 per month to fund the construction of the Community Center; however, 45% of the sample would support *no* tax increase for this purpose.

# **Chapter Six: City Government**

# City Government

Fridley residents were asked a short series of questions about City Government. First, empowerment was considered. Job ratings were ascertained for both the City Council and City Staff. Finally, interactions between the public and City Hall were considered in more detail.

## Have a Say

Respondents were asked:

*Other than voting, do you feel that if you wanted to, you could have a say about the way the City of Fridley runs things?*

Sixty-four percent felt empowered in the City of Fridley:

YES .....	64%
NO .....	34%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	3%

But, 34% did not feel they could have a say about the way the City of Fridley ran things.

“Yes” is posted more often by:

- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center supporters
- homeowners

“No” is mentioned more often by:

- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- Community Center opponents
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households

## **Mayor and City Council**

Residents were initially asked:

*How much do you feel you know about the work of the Mayor and City Council – a great deal, a fair amount, very little, or none at all?*

Forty-three percent, somewhat higher than the suburban norm, felt they knew at least “a fair amount” about the work of the Mayor and City Council:

A GREAT DEAL.....	5%
A FAIR AMOUNT. ....	38%
VERY LITTLE. ....	42%
NONE AT ALL. ....	15%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“A lot” is cited more often by:

- residents for eleven to thirty years
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center opponents
- those feeling empowered
- homeowners
- forty-five to sixty-four year olds
- members of over \$50,000 annual income households
- Ward One residents

“Not a lot” is posted more frequently by:

- residents for ten years or less
- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- those not feeling empowered
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households
- Ward Two residents

Next, residents were queried:

*From what you know, do you approve or disapprove of the job of the Mayor and City Council are doing? And do you feel strongly that way?*

A very high 85% “approve” of the job of the Mayor and City Council:

STRONGLY APPROVE.....	8%
APPROVE.....	77%
DISAPPROVE.....	4%
STRONGLY DISAPPROVE.....	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	10%

Only six percent “disapprove.”

Ratings peak among:

- residents for eleven to thirty years
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered
- households with seniors
- homeowners
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households

---

## City Staff

---

Respondents were first asked about their level of contact with City Staff:

*How much first hand contact have you had with the  
Fridley City staff – quite a lot, some, very little, or none?*

Thirty-five percent, about seven percent higher than the suburban norm, had “quite a lot” or “some” contact:

QUITE A LOT.....	3%
SOME. ....	32%
VERY LITTLE. ....	40%
NONE. ....	25%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“A lot” is cited most frequently by:

- residents for eleven to thirty years
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively

- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered
- homeowners
- forty-five to sixty-four year olds
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households

“Not a lot” is indicated more frequently by:

- residents for ten years or less
- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- those not feeling empowered
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households

Next, residents were queried:

***From what you have heard or seen, how would you rate the job performance of the Fridley City staff – excellent, good, only fair or poor?***

A comparative high 81% rated City Staff highly, while only nine percent were more critical in their judgment:

EXCELLENT.....	7%
GOOD. ....	74%
ONLY FAIR.....	9%
POOR .....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	9%

Favorable ratings are given more often by:

- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered
- homeowners

---

## City Hall

---

Fridley residents were asked:

***During the past year, have you contacted Fridley City Hall?***

Thirty percent reported contact with City Hall during the past year:

YES .....	30%
NO .....	70%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Yes” is cited more often by:

- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- those feeling empowered
- homeowners
- over sixty-four year olds
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

“No” is mentioned more frequently by:

- those thinking there are not unsafe areas in Fridley
- those not feeling empowered
- renters
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households

Those reporting contact were next asked:

***On your last telephone call or visit, which Department did you contact – the Police Department, Fire Department, Public Works, Community Development, HRA, Parks and Recreation, Building Inspections, Engineering, Administration, the Assessor’s Office, the Finance Department, or the General Information Desk receptionist?***

The major contacts included the “Police Department,” “Public Works” and “Building Inspections,” together accounting for 61% of the inquiries: .....

POLICE DEPARTMENT. ....	25%
FIRE DEPARTMENT.....	1%
PUBLIC WORKS. ....	20%
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT. ....	4%
HRA .....	2%
PARKS AND RECREATION.....	11%
BUILDING INSPECTIONS. ....	16%
ENGINEERING.....	2%
ADMINISTRATION.....	3%
ASSESSOR’S OFFICE.....	5%
FINANCE DEPARTMENT. ....	0%

GENERAL INFORMATION. ....	9%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

“Police Department” is stated more often by:

- empty nesters

“Parks and recreation” is indicated more frequently by:

- those thinking there are not unsafe areas in Fridley
- households with children
- eighteen to forty-four year olds

“Building inspections” is cited at a higher rate by:

- homeowners
- over sixty-four year olds

Then residents who contacted City Hall were told:

*Thinking about your last contact with the City, for each of the following characteristics, please rate the service as excellent, good, only fair or poor....*

A list of the customer service dimensions was then read:

***Waiting time for the receptionist to help you?***

Eighty-eight percent rated the waiting time as either “excellent” or “good:”

EXCELLENT.....	39%
GOOD. ....	49%
ONLY FAIR.....	10%
POOR .....	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Ratings are higher among:

- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center supporters

They are lower among:

- those rating the value of city services negatively
- Community Center opponents

*Courtesy of city staff?*

Ninety-four percent rated the courtesy of city staff as either “excellent” or “good:”

EXCELLENT.....	48%
GOOD. ....	46%
ONLY FAIR.....	4%
POOR .....	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Ratings peak among:

- those with no plans to move
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center supporters

*Ease of obtaining the service you needed?*

Eighty-eight percent rated the ease of obtaining the needed service as either “excellent” or “good:”

EXCELLENT.....	36%
GOOD. ....	52%
ONLY FAIR.....	8%
POOR .....	4%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Favorable ratings are given more often by:

- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

---

**Summary and  
Conclusions**

---

Forty-three percent think they know “a great deal” or “a fair amount” about the work of the Mayor and City Council. Respondents give the Mayor and Council a job approval rating of 85% and a disapproval rating of six percent. The almost fourteen-to-one approval-to-disapproval rating of the Mayor and City Council is among the top ratings in the Metropolitan Area suburbs.

An average number of residents -- 34% -- feel they could not have a say about the way the City of Fridley runs things, if they want. Most communities score between 30% and 45% on this query. Overall, the ability to influence decision-makers is not a major issue.

Residents award the City Staff a job approval rating of 81% and a disapproval rating of only nine percent. Both the absolute level of approval and the nine-to-one ratio of approval-to-disapproval are within the top 10% of Metropolitan Area suburbs.

Thirty percent of the sample contacted Fridley City Hall during the past twelve months. Most of the contacts involved the Police Department, Public Works, Parks and Recreation, Building Inspection, and General Information. On three aspects of customer service, staff members are rated as either "excellent" or "good" by at least 88% of those who contacted City Hall: "waiting time for the receptionist to help you," "courtesy of City staff," and "ease of obtaining the service you needed." In general, residents are very satisfied with their contacts with City Hall.

# **Chapter Seven: Communications Issues**

# Communications Issues

Fridley residents were asked a series of questions about the ways in which they obtain information about City Government and its activities. Both the principal source and preferred sources of information were discussed. Specific possible sources were then considered. “Community Report,” cable television, and the Internet were evaluated. Finally, the potential of Social Media was considered.

## Principal Source of Information

Fridley residents were asked:

*What is your principal source of information about  
Fridley City Government and its activities?*

Forty-nine percent pointed to the “City newsletter” and 32% cited the “local newspaper:”

NONE. . . . .	1%
CITY NEWSLETTER. . . . .	49%
LOCAL NEWSPAPER. . . . .	32%
STAR TRIBUNE. . . . .	2%
CITY WEBSITE. . . . .	7%
CABLE TELEVISION. . . . .	4%
WORD OF MOUTH. . . . .	5%
SCATTERED. . . . .	1%

“City newsletter” is key to:

- those not feeling empowered
- Ward Two residents

“Local newspaper” is posted more often by:

- residents for eleven to thirty years
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those feeling empowered

---

## Preferred Source of Information

---

Next, residents were asked:

*How would you prefer to receive information about  
Fridley City Government and its activities?*

Fifty-four percent preferred the “City newsletter” and 25% indicated the “local newspaper:”

NONE. ....	1%
CITY NEWSLETTER.....	54%
LOCAL NEWSPAPER.....	25%
STAR TRIBUNE.....	1%
CITY WEBSITE. ....	6%
CABLE TELEVISION. ....	3%
WORD OF MOUTH. ....	4%
MAILINGS. ....	3%
E-MAIL. ....	2%
SCATTERED. ....	1%

“City newsletter” is indicated more often by:

- those not feeling empowered
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households

“Local newspaper” is cited more frequently by:

- residents for eleven to thirty years
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those feeling empowered

---

## Sources of Information

---

Respondents were instructed::

*For each of the following, please tell me whether you  
consider it to be a major source of information for  
news about the city, a minor source, or not a source at  
all.*

A list of nine sources was then read:

*The City publication, the “Community Report?”*

The “reach” – combined “major source” and “minor source” – of the “Community Report” was 82%:

MAJOR SOURCE.....	63%
MINOR SOURCE.....	19%
NOT A SOURCE.....	18%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

The “impact” – “major source” only – was a comparative high 63%.

“Major source” is cited more often by:

- empty nesters
- homeowners
- Ward Two residents

“Minor source” is indicated more frequently by:

- those with no plans to move
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- those feeling empowered
- households with children
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- Ward One residents

“Not a source” is stated at a higher rate by:

- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- renters

***The “Sun Focus” newspaper?***

The reach of the “Sun Focus” newspaper was 71%:

MAJOR SOURCE.....	42%
MINOR SOURCE.....	29%
NOT A SOURCE.....	30%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

The “impact” was also a high 42%.

“Major source” is cited more often by:

- those rating the value of city services positively
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

“Minor source” is indicated more frequently by:

- those feeling empowered
- homeowners

“Not a source” is stated at a higher rate by:

- those not feeling empowered
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households

***The “Anoka County Record” newspaper?***

The reach of the “Anoka County Record” was 29%:

MAJOR SOURCE.....	11%
MINOR SOURCE.....	18%
NOT A SOURCE.....	72%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

The impact of the newspaper was 11%.

“Major source” is cited more often by:

- those planning to move in the next five years
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

“Minor source” is indicated more frequently by:

- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services

“Not a source” is stated at a higher rate by:

- members of over \$75,000 annual income households

***The Star Tribune?***

The “reach” of the “Star Tribune” was 50% in Fridley:

MAJOR SOURCE.....	8%
MINOR SOURCE.....	42%
NOT A SOURCE.....	50%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

The “impact” of the daily newspaper was eight percent.

“Minor source” is indicated more frequently by:

- those feeling empowered

***The City’s website?***

The “reach” of the City’s website was 40%:

MAJOR SOURCE.....	18%
MINOR SOURCE.....	22%
NOT A SOURCE.....	60%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

The “impact” of the website was 18%.. . . . .

“Major source” is cited more often by:

- residents for ten years or less
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered
- households with children

“Minor source” is indicated more frequently by:

- those rating the value of city services positively
- those feeling empowered
- homeowners
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households

“Not a source” is stated at a higher rate by:

- residents for over thirty years
- Community Center opponents
- those not feeling empowered
- empty nesters
- renters
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households
- Ward Three residents

***Community Channel 17?***

The “reach” of Community Channel 17 was a comparatively high 33%:

MAJOR SOURCE.....	14%
MINOR SOURCE.....	19%
NOT A SOURCE.....	67%

DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... 0%

The “impact” was also much higher than the suburban norm, at 14%.

“Major source” is cited more often by:

- residents for over thirty years
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those feeling empowered
- empty nesters

“Minor source” is indicated more frequently by:

- those rating the value of city services positively
- homeowners
- over sixty-four year olds
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- Ward Two residents

“Not a source” is stated at a higher rate by:

- residents for ten years or less
- those not feeling empowered
- households with children
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households
- Ward One residents

***City employees?***

City employees possessed a “reach” of 29% among city households:

MAJOR SOURCE.....	4%
MINOR SOURCE.....	25%
NOT A SOURCE.....	71%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

It had, however, a much lower “impact” at four percent.

“Minor source” is indicated more frequently by:

- residents for eleven to thirty years
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those feeling empowered
- empty nesters
- homeowners

- forty-five to sixty-four year olds

“Not a source” is stated at a higher rate by:

- those not feeling empowered
- households with children
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households

***Direct mail updates?***

The “reach” of direct mail updates was 51% of the community’s households:

MAJOR SOURCE.....	13%
MINOR SOURCE. ....	38%
NOT A SOURCE.. ....	50%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

The “reach” was 13%.

“Major source” is cited more often by:

- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- Community Center supporters

“Minor source” is indicated more frequently by:

- Ward Two residents

“Not a source” is stated at a higher rate by:

- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- Community Center opponents
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- Ward One residents

***Social media, such as Facebook or Twitter?***

Social media possessed a total “reach” of 15% of Fridley households:

MAJOR SOURCE.....	1%
MINOR SOURCE. ....	14%
NOT A SOURCE.. ....	85%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Its impact was an almost non-existent one percent.

“Minor source” is indicated more frequently by:

- residents for ten years or less
- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services

***Friends and family?***

Friends and family – the “Grapevine” – posted a “reach” of 73% of the city’s households:

MAJOR SOURCE.....	16%
MINOR SOURCE.....	57%
NOT A SOURCE.....	27%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

It’s impact was lower, at 16%.

“Major source” is cited more often by:

- those planning to move in the next six to ten years
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley

“Minor source” is indicated more frequently by:

- those with no plans to move
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- those feeling empowered
- forty-five to sixty-four year olds
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

“Not a source” is stated at a higher rate by:

- those planning to move in the next five years
- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- those not feeling empowered
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households

---

**City Newsletter**

---

Respondents were first asked:

***During the past year, did you receive the “Community***

***Report,” the City’s bi-monthly newsletter?***

Eighty-one percent received the “Community Report” during the past year:

YES .....	81%
NO .....	19%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Yes” is cited more often by:

- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- homeowners
- forty-five to sixty-four year olds
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

“No” is posted more frequently by:

- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds

Residents reporting receiving the city newsletter were next asked:

***Do you or any members of your household regularly read it?***

Ninety-four percent reported household members regularly read it:

YES .....	94%
NO .....	7%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Readership peaks among:

- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center opponents
- homeowners
- over sixty-four year olds

The total readership of “Community Report” was 76% of the community’s households.

Readers were asked two questions. First, content was considered:

***How would you rate the content of the newsletter – excellent, good, only fair or poor?***

Ninety-two percent rate the content of the newsletter highly:

EXCELLENT.....	17%
GOOD. ....	75%
ONLY FAIR.....	8%
POOR . ....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Only eight percent were more critical.

Favorable ratings are posted more often by:

- residents for over thirty years
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley

Next, format and appearance were discussed:

*How would you rate the format and appearance of the newsletter – excellent, good, only fair or poor?*

Ninety-two percent rated the format and appearance favorably:

EXCELLENT.....	16%
GOOD. ....	76%
ONLY FAIR.....	8%
POOR . ....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Eight percent were more negative.

Favorable ratings are cited more frequently by:

- empty nesters

---

## **Cable Television**

---

Respondents were asked:

*Does your household currently subscribe to cable television, satellite television or neither?*

Sixty percent subscribed to cable television:

CABLE.....	60%
SATELLITE.....	24%

NEITHER... 16%  
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED... 0%

Twenty four percent subscribed to a satellite system, and 16% subscribed to neither type of service.

“Cable” is stated more often by:

- those planning to move in the next five years
- households with seniors
- empty nesters
- over sixty-four year olds

“Satellite” is cited more frequently by:

- Community Center supporters
- households with children
- homeowners
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households

“Neither” is posted more often by:

- renters
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households
- women

Cable television subscribers were instructed:

*I would like to read you a short list of programs shown on Fridley Government Channels. For each one, please tell me if you frequently watch it, occasionally watch it, or do not watch it.*

Four types of programs were then read:

*Bulletin Board listing of meetings, events and information?*

Forty percent at least “occasionally” view the Bullet Board:

FREQUENTLY... 10%  
 OCCASIONALLY... 30%  
 DO NOT WATCH... 61%  
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED... 0%

“Frequently” is cited more often by:

- Community Center opponents
- those feeling empowered

“Occasionally” is mentioned most frequently by:

- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those feeling empowered
- households with seniors
- homeowners
- over sixty-four year olds
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

“Do not watch” is indicated most often by:

- those not feeling empowered
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households

***Live or taped re-broadcasts of City Council meetings?***

Forty percent either “frequently” or “occasionally” watched live or taped re-broadcasts of City Council meetings:

FREQUENTLY.....	12%
OCCASIONALLY.....	28%
DO NOT WATCH.....	60%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Frequently” is cited more often by:

- residents for over thirty years
- Community Center opponents
- those feeling empowered
- empty nesters
- homeowners
- forty-five to sixty-four year olds

“Occasionally” is mentioned most frequently by:

- residents for over thirty years
- those with no plans to move
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- households with seniors
- homeowners
- over sixty-four year olds

- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

“Do not watch” is indicated most often by:

- residents for ten years or less
- those not feeling empowered
- households with children
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households

***City programming, such as “Call on the Council?”***

Thirty-four percent at least “occasionally” view City programming:

FREQUENTLY.....	10%
OCCASIONALLY.....	24%
DO NOT WATCH.....	66%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Frequently” is cited more often by:

- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center opponents
- those feeling empowered

“Occasionally” is mentioned most frequently by:

- those with no plans to move
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- those feeling empowered

“Do not watch” is indicated most often by:

- those not feeling empowered
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds

---

**Internet Access**

---

Fridley residents were asked:

***Do you have access to the Internet at home only, at work only, at both home and work, or at neither place?***

Eighty-four percent have access to the Internet, and 82% report access from home:

HOME ONLY. ....	46%
WORK ONLY.....	2%
BOTH HOME AND WORK.....	36%
NEITHER PLACE.....	16%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Home only” is stated more often by:

- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center opponents
- households with seniors
- empty nesters

“Both” is cited most frequently by:

- residents for ten years or less
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered
- households with children
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households
- men

“Neither place” is indicated more often by:

- residents for over thirty years
- those thinking there are not unsafe areas in Fridley
- households with seniors
- empty nesters
- over sixty-four year olds
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households
- women

Residents reporting Internet access at home were queried:

***How do you connect to the internet at home – on a dial-up modem, DSL, T-1 line, Comcast High Speed Internet, wireless, or some other way? How?***

The majority of households, at 60%, connect through “Comcast High Speed Internet:”

DIAL-UP MODEM.....	1%
DSL .....	17%
T-1 .....	0%
COMCAST HIGH SPEED INTERNET.....	60%
WIRELESS. ....	17%

OTHER. ....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	3%

Seventeen percent each connect by “DSL” or on a “wireless system.”

“DSL” is posted more often by:

- residents for over thirty years
- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center supporters
- homeowners
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households

“Comcast High Speed” is indicated more frequently by:

- those not feeling empowered
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households

“Wireless” is posted more frequently by:

- residents for eleven to thirty years
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- homeowners
- forty-five to sixty-four year olds
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

---

## City Website

---

Residents with Internet access were first asked:

*Have you accessed the City’s website?*

Fifty-three percent have visited the City’s website:

YES .....	53%
NO .....	47%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Yes” is posted more often by:

- residents for eleven to thirty years
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center supporters

- those feeling empowered
- households with children
- homeowners
- forty-five to sixty-four year olds
- members of over \$50,000 annual income households

“No” is indicated more frequently by:

- those planning to move in the next five years
- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- those not feeling empowered
- households with seniors
- empty nesters
- renters
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households

Across the community, 45% of the households have accessed the Fridley Website.

Visitors were next asked:

***How would you rate the city’s website – excellent, good, only fair or poor?***

A solid 90% rate the website as either “excellent” or “good:”

EXCELLENT.....	10%
GOOD. ....	80%
ONLY FAIR.. ....	9%
POOR .....	2%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Eleven percent are more critical in their evaluations.

Ratings are higher among:

- those with no plans to move
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered

They are lower among:

- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- Community Center opponents
- those not feeling empowered

Next, site visitors were asked:

***Were you able to find what you were looking for?***

Ninety-three percent were able to find what they sought:

YES .....	93%
NO .....	7%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Only seven percent encountered problems.

“Yes” is posted more often by:

- those with no plans to move
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services positively
- Community Center supporters
- those feeling empowered

---

---

**Social Media**

---

---

Fridley residents were instructed:

***I would like to ask you about social media sources. For each one, tell me if you currently use that source of information; then, for each you currently use, tell me if you would be likely or unlikely to use it to obtain information about the City of Fridley.***

Five types of social media were then read:

***Facebook?***

Sixty-six percent used Facebook:

NOT USED. ....	34%
USED/LIKELY. ....	27%
USED/NOT LIKELY.....	39%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Twenty-seven percent were likely to use it to obtain information about the City of Fridley:

“Not used” is stated more often by:

- residents for over thirty years
- those with no plans to move
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- Community Center opponents
- households with seniors
- empty nesters
- homeowners
- over forty-four year olds
- Ward Two residents

“Used/Likely” is posted more frequently by:

- residents for ten years or less
- those planning to move in the next six to ten years
- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- those opposing a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- Ward One residents

“Used/Not likely” is indicated most often by:

- residents for ten years or less
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center supporters
- households with children
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds

***Twitter?***

Forty-two percent “tweeted:”

NOT USED. . . . .	59%
USED/LIKELY. . . . .	14%
USED/NOT LIKELY. . . . .	28%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	0%

Fourteen percent were likely to use it to obtain information about the City of Fridley:

“Not used” is stated more often by:

- residents for over thirty years
- those with no plans to move
- those thinking Fridley is “home”

- Community Center opponents
- households with seniors
- empty nesters
- homeowners
- forty-five to sixty-four year olds
- over sixty-four year olds
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

“Used/Likely” is posted more frequently by:

- residents for ten years or less
- those planning to move in the next ten years
- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- households with children
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds

“Used/Not likely” is indicated most often by:

- residents for ten years or less
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- Community Center supporters
- households with children
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households

***YouTube?***

Thirty-seven percent used YouTube:

NOT USED. . . . .	63%
USED/LIKELY. . . . .	11%
USED/NOT LIKELY. . . . .	26%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	0%

Eleven percent were likely to use it to obtain information about the City of Fridley:

“Not used” is stated more often by:

- residents for over ten years
- those with no plans to move
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those favoring a property tax increase to enhance city services
- those rating the value of city services negatively
- Community Center opponents
- households with seniors

- empty nesters
- homeowners
- over forty-four year olds
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- women

“Used/Likely” is posted more frequently by:

- residents for ten years or less
- those planning to move in the next ten years
- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- households with children
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households

“Used/Not likely” is indicated most often by:

- residents for ten years or less
- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households
- men

### ***Blogs?***

Twenty-two percent read blogs:

NOT USED. . . . .	78%
USED/LIKELY. . . . .	6%
USED/NOT LIKELY.. . . . .	16%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.. . . . .	0%

Only six percent were likely to use it to obtain information about the City of Fridley:

“Not used” is stated more often by:

- residents for over thirty years
- Community Center opponents
- households with seniors
- empty nesters
- homeowners
- over sixty-four year olds
- members of \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

“Used/Not likely” is indicated most often by:

- residents for ten years or less
- those thinking there are not unsafe areas in Fridley
- households with children
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- members of over \$75,000 annual income households

***Podcasts?***

Thirteen percent listened to podcasts:

NOT USED. ....	88%
USED/LIKELY. ....	2%
USED/NOT LIKELY.....	11%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Only two percent were likely to use it to obtain information about the City of Fridley:

“Not used” is stated more often by:

- residents for over thirty years
- those with no plans to move
- those thinking Fridley is “home”
- those thinking there are unsafe areas in Fridley
- homeowners
- over sixty-four year olds

“Used/Not likely” is indicated most often by:

- residents for ten years or less
- those thinking Fridley is just a place to live
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- renters
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households
- Ward Three residents

Respondents who used any of these social media were asked

***What do you typically use social media for?***

The predominant use was to “connect with friends:”

CONNECT WITH FRIENDS. ....	88%
WORK. ....	2%
GET NEWS. ....	7%

SCATTERED. .... 3%

Only seven percent used social media to “obtain news.”

“Connect with friends” is mentioned most frequently by:

- residents for ten years or less
- those thinking there are no unsafe areas in Fridley
- those not feeling empowered
- renters
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- members of under \$50,000 annual income households
- women

---

## Summary and Conclusions

---

The City Newsletter is the most often indicated primary source of information about city government and its activities, at 49%. The local newspaper and the city website rank second and third, at 32% and seven percent, respectively. Five percent rely upon the “grapevine.” Preferred sources of information mirror the existing communications pattern; so, residents are satisfied with how they receive city information.

Eighty-one percent receive the “Community Report,” while 94% regularly read it. The newsletter’s effectiveness as an information channel is highly regarded: ninety-two percent rate the content favorably, while 92% also rate the format and appearance favorably.

The chart below summarizes the impact and reach of ten potential sources of information for news about the City of Fridley.

<i>Source of Information</i>	<i>Impact</i>	<i>Reach</i>
The City publication, the “Community Report”	63%	82%
The “Sun Focus” newspaper	42%	71%
The City website	18%	40%
Friends and family	16%	73%
Community Channel 17	14%	33%
Direct mail updates	13%	51%
The “Anoka County Record” newspaper	11%	29%
The “Star Tribune”	8%	50%
City employees	4%	29%
Social media	1%	15%

“Impact” refers to the percentage of respondents who see the venue as a “major source of information.” “Reach” is the percentage of respondents who view the venue as either a “major

source” or a “minor source of information.” The two main sources of information are the City Newsletter and the “Sun Focus” newspaper. Ranking third is the “grapevine.”

Sixty percent of the respondents subscribe to cable television. Forty percent of the subscribers at least “occasionally” watch City Council broadcasts. Similarly, 40% tune to the Bulletin Board at least “occasionally,” while 34% watch City programming at least as often.

Internet use is also assessed thoroughly in this study. Eighty-four percent of the households in the community have access to the Internet. Sixty percent subscribe to Comcast High Speed Internet, and 17% each use DSL or another wireless system. Among those on-line households, 53% accessed the city’s website. Ninety percent of website visitors rate its content highly and 93% report the website is easy to navigate.

With the exception of Facebook, social media usage among Fridley residents is limited. Thirteen percent listen to podcasts and 22% read blogs. Forty-two percent tweet and 37% visit YouTube. A much larger 66% access Facebook. As a result, the one social medium which could be used effectively by the City of Fridley to communicate with residents is Facebook; twenty-seven percent of city residents indicated their likelihood to communicate with the City this way.

# **Chapter Eight: Concluding Thoughts**

## **Concluding Thoughts**

In general, Fridley citizens are very satisfied with their community, and high ratings on most aspects of city operations are commonplace. The key issues facing decision-makers in the future are addressing perceptions about “rising crime” and “aging infrastructure.” In addition, community development efforts should focus on attracting more retail, entertainment, and restaurant options.

Information levels about City Government activities are very high in comparison with neighboring communities. Positive ratings of both the Mayor and City Council and City Staff are among the top decile of Metropolitan Area communities. “Community Report,” the city’s quarterly newsletter, is exceptionally well regarded: it possesses a higher readership and effectiveness rating than those of most peer communities.

More citizens now are enthusiastic about their City. With the “City Booster” percentage at 41%, or almost seven times the suburban norm, a large reservoir of goodwill has been established; this will serve decision-makers, in particular, very well as new issues are encountered and relatively tough decisions must be made.

# Survey



**Graphics**

