

*The **Morris** Leatherman Company*

Report of Findings 2021 City of Fridley

City Demographics:

Fridley remains a demographically balanced first-ring suburban community. The median longevity of adult residents is 13.4 years. Twenty-four percent of the sample report moving to the city during the past five years, while 35% were there for over three decades. Only nine percent report they will move in the next five years; in contrast, 82% have no plans to leave during the next ten years, with 46% sure to spend the “rest of their lives” in the city.

Twenty-five percent of Fridley households are completely composed of seniors. Single adults under 65 years old compose 16% of the households, while 59% report the presence of two adults under 65. Thirty-one percent of the households contain school-aged children or preschoolers. Forty-five percent reside in detached single-family homes, while 26% live in apartments, and 24%, in condominiums or townhouses.

Using standard U.S. Census categories, 59% self-report they are White, 11% are Hispanic-Latino, 10% are African American, six percent are mixed or bi-racial, six percent are also Asian or Pacific Islander, and two percent are Native American. English is the primary language spoken in 87% of Fridley homes, eight percent speak Spanish, and two percent each report their primary home language is either Somali or Hmong.

The typical Fridley resident reports a formal education level of some college, albeit short of graduation. Twenty-eight percent report high school graduation or less, 16% went to vo-techs or technical colleges, 18% report some college, 28% are college graduates, and 10% undertook post-graduate coursework. Fifty-two percent of the sample is working full-time, 19% are part-time employed, eight percent are not working, and 21% are retired. Fifty percent report they are fiscally stressed – either their monthly expenses exceed current income or monthly expenses are met but little or no savings are put aside. Fifty percent report no fiscal stress – either managing comfortably and putting some money aside or managing very well.

The average age of respondents is 47.5 years old. Thirty-six percent of the sample fall into the over 55 years age range, while 22% are less than 35 years old. Women outnumber men by four percent in the sample. The Ward of residence of each respondent was noted: Ward One contains 35% of the sample; Ward Two, 32%; and Ward Three contains 33% of the sample. Fifty-eight percent report living in the Fridley School District, 20% reside in the Columbia Heights School

District, 17% reside in the Spring Lake Park School District, and five percent, in the Anoka-Hennepin School District.

Quality of Life Issues:

Ninety-seven percent, a nine percent increase in seven years, rate their quality of life as either “excellent” or “good.” In fact, 22%, a seven percent increase, deem it “excellent.” Only three percent rate the quality of life lower. While the overall positive rating is in the top decile of suburban communities, the “excellent” rating is just below the suburban norm.

Interviewees were asked what they like most about living in Fridley. The table below shows their open-ended responses in rank-order. If a number in parentheses is shown, it indicates the change since the previous study in 2014.

	Percentage (Change)
Closeness to family	20% (+3%)
Closeness to job site	14% (+2%)
Safety	14% (+9%)
Small town ambience	13% (-5%)
Neighborhood/Housing	13% (+11%)
Convenient location	11% (-14%)
Parks and trails	9% (+7%)
Schools	3% (+1%)
Scattered	2%
Nothing	1% (-1%)
Unsure	1%

The shaded blue boxes form the statistically significant cluster of highly valued attributes of Fridley. They cover proximity to key places, safety, small town feel, neighborhood and housing, and parks and trails. The greatest changes are found in “convenient location,” down 14%, “neighborhood and housing,” up 11%, and “safety,” up nine percent.

Next, Fridley respondents were asked what they thought is the most serious issue facing Fridley today. Again, the table below shows their open-ended responses in rank-order. If a number in parentheses is shown, it indicates the change since the previous study in 2014.

	Percentage (Change)
High taxes	17% (+13%)
Rising crime rate	17% (-4%)
Street maintenance	8% (+6%)

	Percentage (Change)
Property maintenance	7% (+2%)
Aging infrastructure	6% (-1%)
Too much growth	2%
Snow plowing	2%
Scattered	2% (-3%)
Unsure	12% (+3%)
Nothing	27% (-14%)

The shaded orange boxes form the statistically significant issues residents consider to be serious; they range across high taxes, rising crime, street and property maintenance, to aging infrastructure. The most statistically significant increase since the 2014 study is “high taxes.” Also, the “booster group” – those who believe the City faces no serious issues – is at 27%, down 14% in seven years. Even so, the booster core is in the top quartile in Metropolitan Area suburbs,

Sixty-four percent of the sample, a seven percent increase in seven years, offers no suggestions for anything currently missing from the community which could greatly improve the quality of life. Thirteen percent, an increase of nine percent, would like to see “more jobs,” while six percent each suggest “more retail and shopping opportunities” or “a community center.”

Eighty-eight percent of the sample rate the strength of community identity in Fridley as “excellent” or “good,” an extremely high rating; only 12% rate it lower. Sixty-six percent call Fridley “home,” while 17% see it as “just a place to live and I’d be just as happy elsewhere,” and 16% agree with both statements. Thirty-five percent, an 11% increase since the prior study, report a closer connection to the City of Fridley “as a whole,” while 56% have a closer connection to their “neighborhood.” Seven percent report a closer connection to the “School District,” and three percent have “no connections” at all. Sixty-seven percent have “daily” or “few times a week” contact with their neighbors, 28% report “once a week” or “few times a month” contact, and six percent report less than “once a month” contact with their neighbors. Ninety-two percent, a seven percent increase since 2014, think “all in all things in Fridley are generally headed in the right direction;” only two percent think things are “off on the wrong track,” and six percent are “unsure.”

Ninety-five percent of the sample thinks the City of Fridley is doing an “excellent” or “good” job in making all residents feel welcome and that they belong; only six percent rate the City lower. Similarly, 87% rate the City highly in openness and acceptance of the community toward people of diverse backgrounds; eleven percent rate these efforts lower. An exceptional 95% would recommend living in the City of Fridley to others; only two percent would not do so, and six percent are unsure.

Economic Development and Redevelopment:

Respondents were asked if there are any types of development or redevelopment they would like to see in the City of Fridley. The table below rank-orders their suggestions:

	Percentage
Retail opportunities	6%
Senior housing	4%
Recreational amenities	4%
Job opportunities	3%
Entertainment offerings	3%
Streetlights	2%
Youth recreational opportunities	2%
Unsure	9%
None	61%

Only “retail opportunities” is posted by a statistically significant group, at six percent. A large 61% say there are “none” they would like to see, while another nine percent are “unsure.”

Ninety-one percent rate the general appearance of their neighborhood as either “excellent” or “good;” nine percent are more critical in their evaluations. Similarly, 85% rate the general appearance of business and commercial areas in the city as either “excellent” or “good;” but 15% rate their general appearance lower.

Interviewees were asked to rate the City’s enforcement efforts on nine codes in their neighborhood. They could rate the efforts as “too tough,” “about right,” or “not tough enough.” The table below first lists the type of code violation, then the percent rating enforcement as “about right” follows. The final column, labeled “Difference” shows the difference between the percent feeling enforcement is “too tough” and the percent feeling it is “not tough enough.” If the “Difference” is positive more residents see it as “too tough,” while if it is negative, more see it as “not tough enough.” The table is rank ordered by the percent who view enforcement as “about right.”

	About Right	Difference
Storage of garbage and recycling cans	89%	-7%
Storage of lawn mowers and tools outside	84%	-9%
Storage of boats, trailers, and non-motorized campers outside	69%	-14%
Junk vehicles	67%	-16%
Long grass and harmful weeds	67%	-26%
Winter parking on city streets between 2:00 AM and 6:00 AM	56%	-14%

	About Right	Difference
Loud noise after 9:00 PM	55%	-31%
Deteriorating siding, foundation, doors, windows, roofing, painting, gutters, and downspouts	52%	-39%
Junk and debris in yards	49%	-28%

In each code violation but one – “junk and debris in yards” – a majority rates code enforcement as “about right;” in the sole exception, 49% do so. Large groups of residents are most concerned about lax enforcement of “deteriorating siding, foundation, doors, windows, gutters, roofing, painting and downspouts,” “loud noise after 9:00 PM,” “junk and debris in yards,” and “long grass and harmful weeds.”

Next, respondents were asked to prioritize the nine code violations. The table below shows the violation, the percent who gave it a top priority or second priority, and the percent who reported they were least concerned about that violation:

	1st or 2nd Priority	Least Concerned
Junk and debris in yards	31%	6%
Loud noise after 9:00 PM	28%	10%
Deteriorating siding, foundation, doors, windows, gutters, roofing, painting, and downspouts	27%	4%
Winter parking on city streets	22%	4%
Junk vehicles	21%	5%
Long grass and harmful weeds	16%	4%
Storage of boats, trailers, and non-motorized campers outside	14%	11%
Storage of lawnmowers and tools outside	10%	8%
Storage of garbage and recycling cans	8%	17%
None/Unsure	23%	30%

The stronger enforcement of three code violations is prioritized by at least 25% of the sample: “junk and debris in yards,” “loud noise after 9:00 PM,” and “deteriorating siding, foundation, doors, windows, gutters, roofing, painting, and downspouts.”

City Services:

In evaluating specific city services, the mean quality rating is 81.1%, within the top quartile of summary ratings in Metropolitan Area suburbs. The table below lists each city service, followed by its positive rating – “excellent” or “good” – and its negative rating – “only fair” or “poor.” The percent in parentheses provides the change from the 2014 positive rating, when applicable.

The table is rank ordered by the positive rating of each service:

	Positive	Negative
Recycling	96% (0%)	4%
Fire services	95% (-3%)	1%
Police services	94% (0%)	5%
Park maintenance	91% (-2%)	9%
Animal control and wildlife management	88% (+10%)	8%
City recreational programs	85% (+4%)	8%
Street lighting	84% (+5%)	16%
Code enforcement	83% (+10%)	12%
Utility billing	81%	18%
Snow plowing of sidewalks and trails	77%	21%
Fridley liquor stores	75%	18%
Storm drainage	75% (-10%)	23%
Sidewalk and trail repair and maintenance	75%	25%
Building inspections and permits	72%	12%
Flood control	71% (-13%)	25%
City street repair and maintenance	69% (-7%)	31%
Snow plowing of city streets	67% (-8%)	24%

The four cells shaded in blue are city services positively rated by at least 90% of the sample: “recycling,” “fire services,” “police services,” and “park maintenance.” The two cells shaded in green are city services whose positive ratings most improved since the 2014 study; likewise, the two cells shaded orange are services whose positive rating declined the most. Ratings improved significantly on “animal control and wildlife management” and “code enforcement.” Ratings dropped significantly on “storm drainage” and “flood control.”

Eighty-five percent, a 15% increase since the previous study, rate the quality of drinking water in the City of Fridley as either “excellent” or “good;” fifteen percent are more critical in their evaluations. Among those critical of the quality, 58% believe the drinking water is “not safe.”

Property Taxes:

Fridley residents can again be classified as fiscal moderates. Forty-three percent, a 15% increase since 2014, think their property taxes are “high” in comparison with neighboring suburban communities, while 47% see them as “about average. Eighty-one percent of the residents view city services as either an “excellent” or a “good” value for the property taxes paid; this endorsement level again 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 16.9%, well below the actual

30%. Fifty-eight percent thought it was less than 20%, while another 32% thought the share was over 20%. This misinformation needs to be both clarified and justified before any property tax increase referendum goes before the public.

By a 53%-37% margin, residents support an increase in city property taxes if it were needed to maintain city services at their current level. By a larger 56%-33% margin, residents would support an increase in city property taxes if it were used to improve and enhance city services.

In a similar vein, customers were asked to rate their satisfaction with utilities and services in Fridley provided by private companies. Six utilities or services are shown in the table below, followed by the percent who are “satisfied” and the percent who are “dissatisfied” with each.

	Satisfied	Dissatisfied
Electricity and natural gas	95%	5%
Garbage collection service	93%	7%
Cell phone service	92%	8%
Internet service	86%	14%
Cable television service	82%	18%
Landline telephone service	79%	21%

The four cells shaded blue denote services where the satisfaction rating exceeds generally accepted thresholds of high-quality customer service: “electricity and natural gas,” “garbage collection service,” “cell phone service,” and “Internet service.” The two cells shaded orange are services with higher than acceptable dissatisfaction ratings: “cable television service” and “landline telephone service.”

Public Safety:

A uniquely high 98% feel safe in the City of Fridley. A comparative high 92%, up seven percent since the 2014 study, feel safe walking alone at night in their immediate neighborhood; only eight percent disagree and about one-third of this group would suggest additional police patrols. Ninety-three percent feel safe using both city parks and city trails; four percent feel safe in city parks only, while two percent feel safe in neither place.

Eighty-six percent rate the amount of police patrolling in their neighborhood as “about the right amount,” while 85% also feel the same way about the amount of traffic enforcement by the police in their neighborhood. The two levels are nine percent and eight percent, respectively, above the 2014 levels. In both cases, about 23% think the amounts are “not enough.”

Respondents were read a list of neighborhood concerns and asked to rate the seriousness of each

one. The table below shows the neighborhood concern with the percent of resident who are “very concerned” and the percent who are “somewhat concerned” about it. The table is ranked according to the percent of residents reporting they are “very concerned:”

	Very Concerned	Somewhat Concerned
Distracted driving	43%	33%
Traffic speeding	29%	42%
Stop sign violations	22%	28%
Cars cutting through your neighborhood	4%	23%
Number of garbage trucks	2%	9%
Number of delivery trucks	1%	10%

Three neighborhood concerns are highly ranked by interviewees: “distracted driving,” “traffic speeding,” and “stop sign violations.”

In rating the seriousness of public safety concerns in the City of Fridley, 44% point to “distracted driving” and 39% cite “traffic speeding:”

	Most Serious	Second Most
Traffic speeding	33%	6%
Distracted driving	26%	18%
Drugs	9%	7%
Stop sign violations	6%	11%
Residential crimes, such as burglary and theft	5%	11%
Violent crime	4%	0%
Phone scams	3%	12%
Youth crimes	3%	10%
Business crimes, such as shoplifting and credit card fraud	3%	5%
Domestic abuse	2%	4%
Digital and cyber scams	2%	2%
Vandalism	2%	1%
Identity theft	0%	2%
All equally	1%	1%
None of the above	2%	3%
Do not know/Refused	0%	8%

These two choices are also the main concerns in their neighborhoods.

Twenty-three percent have contacted the Police Department in the past year. Ninety-two percent rate the contact as “excellent” or “good,” while nine percent rate it as “only fair.” During the past year, ten percent of sampled households report an emergency requiring the Fridley Fire

Department to respond. Ninety-five percent rate the service as “excellent” or “good,” while five percent view it as “only fair.”

Respondents were asked to rate the accuracy of three descriptions of Fridley Public Safety, including both Police and Fire. The table below shows each description followed by the percent labelling it as “accurate” and the percent viewing it as “inaccurate.”

	Accurate	Inaccurate
Respectful to residents of all backgrounds	94%	2%
Fair to residents of all backgrounds	92%	3%
Trustworthy to residents of all backgrounds	88%	5%

Accuracy rates were comparatively high, and inaccuracy rates were minimal. An exceedingly small percent of residents seeing at least one description as “inaccurate” point to a lack of trust among minorities.

Parks and Recreation:

Ninety-four percent rate the park and recreation facilities and amenities in Fridley as either “excellent” or “good.” Seven percent are more critical.” When considering their quality of life in the community, 87%, a 12% increase since the prior study, rate park and recreational facilities as either “very important” or “somewhat important;” thirteen percent rate them as “not too important” or “not at all important.” When considering the value of their homes, 91% rate the appearance of their neighborhood park as either “very important” or “somewhat important;” in fact, 60% see their neighborhood park’s appearance as “very important” to their home value.

The most popular park and recreational opportunities are “trails,” used by 88% of city’s households, “neighborhood parks,” used by 81% of the city’s households, and “natural water areas,” enjoyed by 75%, and “Anoka County Parks in Fridley,” visited by 74% of city households.

	Usage	User Evaluations	
		Positive	Negative
Trails	88%	91%	9%
Neighborhood parks	81%	91%	9%
Natural water areas, such as Moore Lake, Locke Lake, Rice Creek, and the Mississippi River	75%	95%	5%
Anoka County Parks in Fridley, including Riverfront Regional Park, Island of Peace County Park, Locke	74%	93%	7%

	Usage	User Evaluations	
		Positive	Negative
County Park and Manomin County Park			
Community Park	70%	86%	14%
Springbrook Nature Center	68%	94%	6%
Green spaces and natural areas	66%	86%	14%
Picnic shelters	63%	92%	8%
Playgrounds	62%	87%	13%
Moore Lake Park	60%	92%	8%
Commons Park	60%	90%	10%
Ballfields for softball and baseball	47%	77%	23%
Tennis and Pickleball courts	43%	77%	23%
Basketball courts	43%	74%	26%
Skating rinks	41%	71%	29%
Athletic fields for soccer, la crosse and football	40%	75%	25%

Among users of each city park and recreation offering, eight are rated positive – either “excellent” or “good” – by at least 90% of the sample: “natural water areas,” “Springbrook Nature Center,” “Anoka County Parks in Fridley,” “picnic shelters,” “Moore Lake Park,” “trails,” “neighborhood parks,” and “Commons Park.” Three opportunities score negative ratings of at least 25% by their users: “skating rinks,” “basketball courts,” and “athletic fields for soccer, la crosse and football.”

A solid 94% feel existing recreational facilities offered by the City of Fridley meet the needs of their households. Twenty-two percent of Fridley households participated in City park and recreation programs. Among participants, “youth sports” and “park programs” are the most popular. Ninety-four percent rate their experience favorably, while seven percent are more critical.

Parks Master Plan:

Prior to this study, 36% of city residents were aware of these deliberations. Initially, respondents were asked how important each of four park and recreational facilities and amenities were most important to them. The table below indicates the percent who indicated “very important” or “somewhat important” in rating each one:

	Very Important	Somewhat Important
Natural resources management to control invasive species and pollinator habitats, and improve water quality	63%	34%

	Very Important	Somewhat Important
Smaller neighborhood parks	58%	37%
Trails at natural parks, such as West Moore Lake, Sand Dunes, and Innsbruck Nature Center	56%	37%
Larger community parks, such as Commons, Moore Lake and Community Parks	54%	36%

Across-the-board, at least 90% saw each one as either “very important” or “somewhat important;” surprisingly, majorities also considered each one to be “very important.”

Residents were asked if they would support a property tax increase for each of 14 purposes. The table below shows each purpose followed by its support of a tax increase and its opposition to a tax increase. The purposes are listed from highest to lowest levels of support:

	Support	Oppose
Improve walking paths and trails in parks	89%	10%
Improve the condition of existing parks	89%	10%
Improve playgrounds	83%	15%
Add inclusive playground equipment, such as adult/child swings, or challenge playground equipment, such as fitness stations	81%	17%
Restore natural areas and improve natural resource management	81%	18%
Add community gardens and demonstration gardens to the parks	80%	17%
Add a splash pad to Commons Park	76%	21%
Improve park buildings and community gathering places	73%	11%
Improve water-related recreation facilities, such as beaches and swimming	71%	26%
Improve access to waterways for water-related recreation, such as canoeing, kayaking and paddle boarding	70%	26%
Improve ballfields for softball and baseball	68%	27%
Improve athletic fields for soccer, la crosse and football	65%	31%
Improve courts for tennis, pickleball and basketball	61%	36%
Improve facilities for skating, cross-country skiing, and other winter activities	60%	36%

Eight purposes, shaded blue, are supported by at least 70% and support to opposition is at least 3-to-1 – these purposes have strong drawing power in a referendum election. Indicative of heightened opposition, three purposes, shaded orange, register negative judgments of at least 30%. The strategy will be to include the most highly supported purposes and then prudent add the less attractive ones, bearing in mind that most of the latter will provide volunteers for any grassroots campaign effort.

Only 14% report they would oppose **any** tax increase to fund a park and recreational facilities bond referendum. A majority would support a park bond referendum which increased property taxes by \$6.50 per month on the median-valued home in the community.

City Government and Staff:

Fifty-six percent, an increase of 13% since the last study, 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 86% and a disapproval rating of six percent. The over 14-to-1 approval-to-disapproval rating of the Mayor and City Council is among the top ratings in the Metropolitan Area suburbs.

A comparatively high 89% believe they have adequate opportunities to provide input and feedback about city issues; only five percent disagree – most feeling they would not be listened to by decision-makers.

Twenty-six percent interacted with Fridley City Staff during the past year. Eighty-three percent of the interactions were with five departments or services: “Police Department,” at 26%; “General Information,” at 24%; “Parks and Recreation Department,” at 20%; “Rental Unit Inspections,” at seven percent; and “Community Development,” at six percent.

Residents interacting with City Staff were asked to rate the interaction on four customer service dimensions. Each dimension is listed followed by positive ratings – “excellent” or “good” – and negative ratings – “only fair” or “poor:”

	Positive	Negative
Courtesy of staff	93%	7%
Responsiveness of staff	88%	13%
Knowledge of staff	86%	15%
Follow-up by staff	77%	23%

The threshold signifying high-quality customer service in the public sector is a positive rating of at least 80%. Three dimensions exceed that threshold: courtesy of staff, at 93%; responsiveness of staff, at 88%; and knowledge of staff, at 86%. One dimension fails to meet that standard: follow-up by staff, at 77%.

Communications Issues:

“Mail” is the most often indicated preferred source of information about city government and its activities, at 35%. The “City website” ranks second, at 27%. The “City newsletter” is preferred

by 15%, followed by “e-mail,” at 11%. “Social media” is favored by four percent, and two percent prefer the “grapevine.”

The chart below summarizes the impact and reach of 12 potential sources of information for news about the City of Fridley. “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.”

<i>Source of Information</i>	<i>Impact</i>	<i>Reach</i>
The City publication, the “Community Connection”	52%	85%
Family and friends	44%	91%
Direct mail updates	43%	75%
The City’s Park and Recreation Brochure	42%	84%
The City’s website, “FridleyMN.gov”	38%	71%
The City’s e-mailed newsletter, “Fridley for You”	33%	61%
The City’s website, e-mail, or texting subscription, such as alerts, news flashes and calendar updates	28%	57%
The “Life” newspaper	21%	50%
The “Star Tribune” newspaper	14%	40%
The City of Fridley’s official social media sites	13%	35%
Community and other groups’ social media sites	5%	27%
City employees	4%	27%

The five main sources of information are “City Connections,” “family and friends,” “direct mail updates,” the “Park and Recreation brochure,” and “FridleyMN.gov.”

Eighty-five percent received “Community Connection” last year, while 86% of receivers regularly read it. The newsletter’s effectiveness as an information channel is highly regarded: ninety-eight percent rate the content favorably. If given the choice, 46% would prefer to receive the newsletter “only in print,” 25% would prefer “only electronically,” and 29% would like it “both ways.”

Thirty-nine percent, a 21% decrease in seven years, subscribe to Comcast cable television. Thirty-six percent of the subscribers watch Fridley Municipal TV Channel 17. Twenty-eight percent prefer to watch City of Fridley content on a “website,” 27% prefer to view it on “television,” 14% prefer “on-line,” and 22% are simply “uninterested.”

Seventy-three percent of the sample accessed the City’s website. Eighty-seven percent rate the website favorably – “excellent” or “good” – and 13% percent rate it as “only fair.” A solid 93% of visitors were able to find what they sought; only five percent did not.

Conclusions:

Fridley residents are very content with their community, and comparatively high ratings on most aspects of city operations are abundant. The key issues facing decision-makers in the future are addressing perceptions about “rising crime,” “property and street maintenance” and “aging infrastructure.” Enhanced enforcement of city codes will be necessary in the short run particularly with respect to deteriorating housing, late loud nighttime noise, and cluttered yards.

The proposal of a park bond referendum will require careful planning. Property tax hostility has abated in a curious fashion – while the tax climate is benign, most residents significantly underestimate the portion funding City enterprises. Communications in this situation should emphasize dollar costs rather than percentage rates. Voters will support a park bond referendum, if it includes not only maintenance and updating projects, but also provides a “value-added” array of new additions to the system. There are also clear constraints on the amount of the property tax increase to ensure passage. In the end, the proposal will need to balance widely popular projects with enhancements aimed at more limited, although critical, constituencies.

In comparison with neighboring communities, Fridley Public Safety services and personnel score remarkably high positive ratings. Trustworthiness and community connection are not problems in the city. To enhance these ratings further, police services will need to concentrate more activity on traffic issues – speeding, distracted driving, and stop sign violations. Racial and/or ethnic profiling in police stops is not an issue in the community.

Information levels about City Government activities are uniformly high in comparison with neighboring communities. Positive ratings of both the Mayor and City Council and City Staff remain in the top decile of Metropolitan Area communities. “Community Connection,” the City’s bi-monthly newsletter, is exceptionally well regarded: it possesses one of the highest readerships and effectiveness ratings in the Metropolitan Area suburbs.

The “City Booster” core is 27%, about four times the suburban norm and assuredly in the top decile of Metropolitan Area suburbs. It represents a significant reservoir of goodwill. This core already dampened the trust issues found in many communities, and it will serve decision-makers very well as new issues are encountered and relatively tough decisions must be made.

Methodology:

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 February 25th and March 30th, 2021. The average interview took 30 minutes. The non-response rate was 5.5%. All respondents interviewed in this study were part of a randomly generated sample of adult residents of the City of Fridley. In general, random samples such as this yield results projectable to their respective universe within ± 5.0 percent in 95 out of 100 cases.