

**HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY
CITIZEN SATISFACTION SURVEY
2008**

Telephone Survey of 805 Hillsborough County Respondents

Conducted by:



OPPENHEIM RESEARCH

T 850 201 0480 | F 850 386-4397
1640 Metropolitan Circle | Tallahassee | FL 32308
www.oppenheimresearch.com
aro@oppenheimresearch.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION..... 3

SURVEY PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY 4

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 7

QUALITY OF LIFE..... 7

FAMILIARITY WITH COUNTY SERVICES 8

USE OF SERVICES IN LAST 12 MONTHS 9

PERCEIVED VALUE OF SERVICES COMPARED TO COST 17

DEMOGRAPHICS..... 20

APPENDIX.....24

FREQUENCIES.....25

QUESTIONNAIRE.....82

DISPOSITION COUNTS.....105

MEAN COMPARISONS OF PREVIOUS YEARS.....106

**CROSSTABULATIONS BY
MUNICIPALITY/UNINCORPORATED.....111**

CROSSTABULATIONS BY CITY174

**CROSSTABULATIONS BY GENDER AND LENGTH OF TIME IN
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY.....264**

**CROSSTABULATON BY MUNICIPALITIES AND
UNINCORPORATED MEAN.....357**

CROSSTABULATIONS BY AGE AND RACE.....415

INTRODUCTION

The following report is based upon a Hillsborough County (HC) telephone survey of 805 residents 18 years or older. The survey was conducted for HC under the supervision of Mary Mahoney of Hillsborough County's Management and Budget Department. Mrs. Mahoney served as primary contact for Hillsborough County. Any questionnaire changes were discussed and ultimately approved by her (and her committee).

This report presents the findings of the HC telephone survey conducted between November 5th and 24, 2008. The survey was administered via Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) system which yielded a cooperation rate of 55 percent.

The survey questions were initially developed by the HC Staff. When Oppenheim Research (OR) received the HC Citizen Opinion Survey project, it consulted with HC to modify several questions, pre-tested the questionnaire, revised additional questions, and conducted the final survey upon County approval of the all changes.

The 2008 Hillsborough Citizen Satisfaction Survey focuses primarily on general evaluation questions and questions ascertaining attitudes toward County services.

The survey included questions on:

- Evaluations of Hillsborough County overall
- Evaluations of respondents' neighborhoods
- Rating job opportunities in Hillsborough County
- Rating the affordability of housing
- Finding and receiving information about County Government
- Familiarity with 22 services offered by Hillsborough County
- Use of the 22 County services
- Performance Rating the 22 County services
- Rating the value of six County services and citizen recommendations for increased or decreased spending for the services
- Demographics

Findings are presented in descriptive format accompanied by tables. A separate volume presents all questions cross-tabulated by selected demographic variables.

Format of the Report

This report is divided into several sections that correspond to several key survey questions. The report attempts to enhance the understanding of the survey results by first providing an executive summary. This summary permits a brief review of the results. More detailed information can be obtained from a close reading of the tables in the sections that follow. Each section presents the results of individual survey questions.

SURVEY PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY

The 2008 HC Citizen Survey is based on a random telephone survey sample of the HC adult population, aged 18 years or older. The selection of telephone numbers (households with telephones) was based on a simple random sample of all telephone numbers in HC supplemented by a sample of wireless telephone numbers for HC.

The survey of Hillsborough County residents regarding their attitudes and experiences with Hillsborough County Government Services and other County issues was conducted by telephone from the survey facilities of Oppenheim Research in Tallahassee, Florida. The universe of the study consisted of current Hillsborough County residents (18 years of age or older) who had working telephone numbers (landlines and wireless).

RDD Sample Description

The sample of Hillsborough County residents was generated as an “RDD,” random-digit dialing, sample – ensuring that all households with landline telephone numbers in the County were available for inclusion. The sampling company matched the area code (813) and possible prefix digits (all available three digit prefixes) for the County. The suffix (last four digits) of the phone number was then classified into 100-blocks based on the identified working blocks provided by the database for the County. At least three (3) listed phone numbers needed to be available in the 100-block for the block to be included in the RDD sample. A computer then generated the last two digits to create telephone numbers. This method guarantees that households with both listed and unlisted telephone numbers are represented in the sample. Because wireless prefixes are identified in a separate data file, no wireless phone numbers were included in the RDD sample.

Wireless RDD Sample Description

In today’s changing society, with rapid advancements in technology, cell phones are presenting a new challenge to telephone sampling. Wireless household demographics tend to represent individuals aged 35 or younger who are known to have different attitudes compared to older age cohorts with landlines. Therefore, the younger generations are often under-represented in RDD only sample surveys.

Fourteen percent of households today either have no telephone service or have only wireless telephone service such as internet provided telephone service or cell phones. Nationally, 12.5 percent are cell phone only households. Oppenheim Research supplemented the HC Citizen RDD survey sample with 2,000 random wireless telephone numbers to include populations with wireless phones.

Since there are no sources for assigned wireless telephone numbers a Wireless Sampling Frame has been added to the Random Digit Dialing sampling frame. Wireless prefixes were provided by the Telcordia TPM (Terminating Point Master) Data File, which was produced monthly. Known wireless prefixes associated with a wireless carrier for the target area were included and almost 80 percent of the records had an activation date on or before the release date associated with the TPM data file. The suffix (last four digits) of the phone number was then classified into

100-blocks based on the identified working blocks provided by Telcordia. A computer then generated the last two digits to create wireless telephone numbers. These prefixes were not included in the RDD sample as they were identified as Wireless prefixes.

Ultimately, a computer randomly generated 8,000 telephone numbers (6,000 RDD and 2000 Wireless RDD), and interviewers called and screened all of the numbers to complete the desired number of questionnaires (805). A total of approximately 22,800 telephone calls were attempted.

The sampling procedures used for this survey produced a representative sample of the HC adult population who were accessible by telephone.

See appendix for detailed analysis of all final call outcomes.

Interviewing Procedures

Callback arrangements were made for all households not able to respond at the initial contact. Spanish-speaking households were called by bilingual interviewers to conduct the survey in Spanish. Refusals were called back a second time to increase the response rate. Generally, refusal conversion techniques yield a 5 percent increase in response rates and eliminate some response bias seen in surveys with low response rates.

Non-response error results in a bias because those individuals who either refuse to participate or cannot be reached to participate may be systematically different from those individuals who complete the survey. Our efforts to reduce non-response bias began with thoughtful preparation of both the introductory statement and the survey instrument in a format that promoted participation and full response to all questions. In addition, we trained our interviewers extensively to ensure that they understood the survey instrument, the content of the questions and the importance of proper completion of the survey itself.

Interviewers screened respondents in the introduction as to their permanent county residence status to ensure eligibility. Respondents (or zip codes) not exclusively falling into HC were cross-referenced and removed from the database.

Oppenheim Research relies exclusively on trained and paid interviewers for survey research projects. All interviewers receive special training on project specifics.

Professionally trained and experienced supervisors oversee all interviewing. Supervisors monitor survey implementation via a telephone and computer monitoring system that permits them to listen to interviewers and watch computer entry of responses as surveys are being completed.

The research facility utilized a CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing) system. The software has an interactive front-end computer system that aids interviewers in asking questions over the telephone and manages the sample. The CATI system helps prevent errors as it prompts the interviewers to ask correct questions based upon built-in skip patterns and eliminates out of range responses. The answers to the survey are keyed into the computer system immediately by

the interviewers and result codes are coded as to their disposition. Data are automatically recorded into a database. The data files are then analyzed using the CATI system and SPSS, a comprehensive statistical analysis package.

Fieldwork dates for this survey began on November 5 and ended on November 24, 2008. Most of the interviewing for this survey was done Monday through Saturdays, between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m. and between 6 p.m. and 9:00 p.m.

A total of 805 HC residents completed the entire survey, which lasted on average 20 minutes. Partial completions were removed from the data file. The response rate for the HC survey was 55 percent

Fieldwork for the study was conducted under the professional supervision of Anneliese R. Oppenheim, research director, from the phone bank at Oppenheim Research.

All surveys are subject to sampling error, which refers to the extent to which sample results differ from what would be obtained if the entire population had been interviewed. The survey has a margin of error of plus or minus 3.5 percentage points. If the sampling was repeated in the same time period, results could vary by plus or minus 3.5 percentage points 95 percent of the time. Thus, the study's confidence level is 95 percent.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

QUALITY OF LIFE

When asked to rate, on a scale from one to 10, seven aspects of life in Hillsborough County, respondents gave the highest mean score to their own neighborhood (mean 7.7) followed by the ease of obtaining information from the Hillsborough County website (mean 7.3) and Hillsborough County overall (mean 7.2). Ease of acquiring information via the County cable television received a mean score of 7.0 followed by cultural opportunities (mean 6.7) and affordability of housing (mean 5.5) while job opportunities trailed (mean 4.8).

No significant statistical differences were found between respondents in the unincorporated area compared to those in municipalities.

**Mean Ratings for Aspects of Life Items by all Respondents
Unincorporated/Municipalities**

<u>Quality</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Unincorporated</u>	<u>Municipalities</u>
My neighborhood	7.7	7.7	7.4
Ease of information on County website	7.3	7.3	7.3
Hillsborough Co. overall	7.2	7.2	7.3
Ease of information on County cable television	7.0	7.0	7.0
Cultural opportunities	6.7	6.7	6.7
Affordability of housing	5.5	5.5	5.2
Job opportunities	4.8	4.8	4.7

FAMILIARITY WITH COUNTY SERVICES

Next, respondents were asked to rate their familiarity with 22 County services.

Respondents were mostly familiar with Public Library Services (mean 7.1) followed by Vehicle Travel and Safety (mean 6.9) and Ease of Vehicle Travel (mean 6.6). Other highly recognized services included Emergency Rescue and Ambulance Services (mean 6.5), Hillsborough County Sheriff Services (mean 6.4), Fire Services (mean 6.1) and County Parks Facilities (mean 6.0). All other County services received a mean score of 5.8 or lower with Affordable Housing registering the lowest mean score of 3.1.

Respondents in municipalities, compared to those in unincorporated areas, were slightly more likely to give higher ratings for most of the services especially for Low Income Health Care (mean 4.8 versus 3.7) and Affordable Housing (mean 3.7 versus 2.9).

Mean Familiarity Rating of all Services by all Respondents and Unincorporated/Incorporated Area

<u>Service</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Unincorporated</u>	<u>Municipalities</u>
Public Library	7.1	7.1	7.3
Vehicle Travel and Safety	6.9	6.9	6.9
Ease of Vehicle Travel	6.6	6.5	7.0
Emergency Rescue/Ambulance	6.5	6.4	6.8
Sheriff	6.4	6.4	6.3
Fire	6.1	6.0	6.3
County Parks Facilities	6.0	6.0	6.2
Street Repairs/Resurfacing	5.8	5.9	5.8
Ditch/Right-of-Way Cleaning	5.0	5.0	4.8
Bicycle Travel	4.9	4.8	5.0
Street Sign Repairs	4.9	4.8	5.1
Tree Trimming/Removal	4.6	4.6	4.6
Storm Water Drainage	4.6	4.5	4.9
Animal Control	4.6	4.7	4.5
Mosquito Control	4.1	4.0	4.3
Building Code Enforcement	4.1	4.0	4.5
After School Programs	3.9	3.7	4.3
Growth Management	3.9	3.9	3.9
Low Income Health Care	3.7	3.4	4.8
Senior Services	3.6	3.5	4.0
Affordable Housing	3.1	2.9	3.7

USE OF SERVICES IN LAST 12 MONTHS

Respondents were also asked whether or not they used or received the services in the last 12 months and how they would rate the County on providing those services. Again, a scale of one to 10 was used for the performance ratings. For two of the services (Ease of Vehicle Travel and Ease and Safety of Walking) respondents were only asked to rate the services overall.

Services which received mean scores of over 8.0 included Emergency Rescue and Ambulance Services (mean 8.3), the Public Library (mean 8.3) and Fire Services (mean 8.2). The Sheriff and County Park Facilities Services received a slightly lower score (mean 7.4).

The next range of high mean scores (6.0 to 6.7) were attributed to After School Programs (mean 6.7), Vehicle Travel and Safety (6.6), Storm Water Drainage (mean 6.6), Street Repairs/Resurfacing (mean 6.4), Street Sign Repairs (mean 6.4), Tree Trimming/Removal (Mean 6.3), Animal Control (mean 6.3), Ditch/Right-of-Way Cleaning (mean 6.1), Senior Services (mean 6.1) and Ease of Vehicle Travel (6.0).

The lowest mean scores ranging between 5.8 and 5.0 were given to Low Income Health Care (mean 5.8), Building Code Enforcement (mean 5.7), Ease and Safety of Walking (mean 5.5), Affordable Housing (mean 5.3), Bicycle Travel (mean 5.2), Growth Management (mean 5.2) and Mosquito Control (mean 5.0).

Users of the services were slightly more likely to rate the services higher than respondents overall. However, the ratings provided by the individuals in unincorporated areas of the County versus those in municipalities varied only slightly.

**Performance Rating and Use of all Services by
all Respondents**

<u>Service</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>% Used</u>	<u>User Rating</u>
Emergency Rescue/Ambulance	8.3	24.7	8.8
Public Library	8.3	64.1	8.8
Fire	8.2	14.0	8.8
Sheriff	7.4	28.6	7.5
County Parks Facilities	7.4	57.5	8.0
After School Programs	6.7	14.4	8.0
Vehicle Travel and Safety	6.6	89.1	6.6
Storm Water Drainage	6.6	26.5	6.8
Street Repairs/Resurfacing	6.4	62.1	6.9
Street Sign Repairs	6.4	36.3	7.5
Tree Trimming/Removal	6.3	39.5	7.1
Animal Control	6.3	20.1	7.1
Ditch/Right-of-Way Cleaning	6.1	43.2	7.0
Senior Services	6.1	13.3	7.8
Ease of Vehicle Travel	6.0	----	----
Low Income Health Care	5.8	15.8	6.9
Building Code Enforcement	5.7	15.7	6.3
Ease and Safety of Walking	5.5	----	----
Affordable Housing	5.3	5.7	7.6
Bicycle Travel	5.2	31.1	5.5
Growth Management	5.2	7.7	6.3
Mosquito Control	5.0	27.0	6.6

**Performance Rating and Use of all Services by
all Respondents**

<u>Service</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>% Used</u>	<u>User Rating</u>
Vehicle Travel and Safety	6.6	89.1	6.6
Public Library	8.3	64.1	8.8
Street Repairs/Resurfacing	6.4	62.1	6.9
County Parks Facilities	7.4	57.5	8.0
Ditch/Right-of-Way Cleaning	6.1	43.2	7.0
Tree Trimming/Removal	6.3	39.5	7.1
Street Sign Repairs	6.4	36.3	7.5
Bicycle Travel	5.2	31.1	5.5
Sheriff	7.4	28.6	7.5
Mosquito Control	5.0	27.0	6.6
Storm Water Drainage	6.6	26.5	6.8
Emergency Rescue/Ambulance	8.3	24.7	8.8
Animal Control	6.3	20.1	7.1
Low Income Health Care	5.8	15.8	6.9
Building Code Enforcement	5.7	15.7	6.3
After School Programs	6.7	14.4	8.0
Fire	8.2	14.0	8.8
Senior Services	6.1	13.3	7.8
Growth Management	5.2	7.7	6.3
Affordable Housing	5.3	5.7	7.6
Ease of Vehicle Travel	6.0	----	----
Ease and Safety of Walking	5.5	----	----

**Rating and Use of all Services by Respondents in
Unincorporated Areas**

<u>Service</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>% Used</u>	<u>User Rating</u>
Emergency Rescue/Ambulance	8.2	25.3	8.9
Public Library	8.2	63.2	8.8
Fire	8.1	13.3	8.8
Sheriff	7.4	28.8	7.3
County Parks Facilities	7.4	57.7	8.1
Vehicle Travel and Safety	6.6	89.5	6.6
Street Sign Repairs	6.6	35.1	7.5
After School Programs	6.6	13.0	7.7
Street Repairs/Resurfacing	6.4	62.4	7.0
Tree Trimming/Removal	6.3	40.6	7.1
Animal Control	6.3	21.3	7.2
Ditch/Right-of-Way Cleaning	6.1	45.3	6.7
Senior Services	6.0	12.1	7.5
Storm Water Drainage	5.9	25.6	6.7
Ease of Vehicle Travel	5.8	----	----
Building Code Enforcement	5.6	14.8	6.2
Low Income Health Care	5.5	13.5	6.7
Ease and Safety of Walking	5.4	----	----
Affordable Housing	5.2	4.7	7.6
Bicycle Travel	5.1	30.3	5.5
Mosquito Control	5.0	25.5	6.5
Growth Management	5.0	7.5	6.0

**Rating and Use of all Services by Respondents in
Unincorporated Areas**

<u>Service</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>% Used</u>	<u>User Rating</u>
Vehicle Travel and Safety	6.6	89.5	6.6
Public Library	8.2	63.2	8.8
Street Repairs/Resurfacing	6.4	62.4	7.0
County Parks Facilities	7.4	57.7	8.1
Ditch/Right-of-Way Cleaning	6.1	45.3	6.7
Tree Trimming/Removal	6.3	40.6	7.1
Street Sign Repairs	6.6	35.1	7.5
Bicycle Travel	5.1	30.3	5.5
Sheriff	7.4	28.8	7.3
Storm Water Drainage	5.9	25.6	6.7
Mosquito Control	5.0	25.5	6.5
Emergency Rescue/Ambulance	8.2	25.3	8.9
Animal Control	6.3	21.3	7.2
Building Code Enforcement	5.6	14.8	6.2
Low Income Health Care	5.5	13.5	6.7
Fire	8.1	13.3	8.8
After School Programs	6.6	13.0	7.7
Senior Services	6.0	12.1	7.5
Growth Management	5.0	7.5	6.0
Affordable Housing	5.2	4.7	7.6
Ease of Vehicle Travel	5.8	----	----
Ease and Safety of Walking	5.4	----	----

**Rating and Use of all Services by Respondents in
Municipality Areas**

<u>Service</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>% Used</u>	<u>User Rating</u>
Public Library	8.6	66.7	9.0
Fire	8.4	16.2	8.6
Emergency Rescue/Ambulance	8.3	23.0	8.7
Sheriff	7.5	27.9	8.0
County Parks Facilities	7.4	56.9	8.0
After School Programs	7.2	18.6	8.8
Street Sign Repairs	6.6	39.7	7.7
Low Income Health Care	6.6	22.5	7.2
Ease of Vehicle Travel	6.6	----	----
Vehicle Travel and Safety	6.5	87.7	6.6
Street Repairs/Resurfacing	6.4	61.3	6.7
Animal Control	6.3	16.7	6.6
Senior Services	6.3	16.7	8.3
Tree Trimming/Removal	6.2	36.3	7.2
Ditch/Right-of-Way Cleaning	6.2	37.3	7.7
Storm Water Drainage	6.0	28.9	7.3
Building Code Enforcement	5.9	18.1	6.6
Affordable Housing	5.7	8.8	7.7
Ease and Safety of Walking	5.7	----	----
Growth Management	5.6	8.3	7.4
Bicycle Travel	5.4	33.3	5.5
Mosquito Control	5.0	31.4	6.6

**Rating and Use of all Services by Respondents in
Municipality Areas**

<u>Service</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>% Used</u>	<u>User Rating</u>
Vehicle Travel and Safety	6.5	87.7	6.6
Public Library	8.6	66.7	9.0
Street Repairs/Resurfacing	6.4	61.3	6.7
County Parks Facilities	7.4	56.9	8.0
Street Sign Repairs	6.6	39.7	7.7
Ditch/Right-of-Way Cleaning	6.2	37.3	7.7
Tree Trimming/Removal	6.2	36.3	7.2
Bicycle Travel	5.4	33.3	5.5
Mosquito Control	5.0	31.4	6.6
Storm Water Drainage	6.0	28.9	7.3
Sheriff	7.5	27.9	8.0
Emergency Rescue/Ambulance	8.3	23.0	8.7
Low Income Health Care	6.6	22.5	7.2
After School Programs	7.2	18.6	8.8
Building Code Enforcement	5.9	18.1	6.6
Animal Control	6.3	16.7	6.6
Senior Services	6.3	16.7	8.3
Fire	8.4	16.2	8.6
Affordable Housing	5.7	8.8	7.7
Growth Management	5.6	8.3	7.4
Ease of Vehicle Travel	6.6	----	----
Ease and Safety of Walking	5.7	----	----

**Hillsborough County
Citizen Survey Comparison
Mean Ratings for Aspects of Life Items by all Respondents**

	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
<u>Quality</u>				
My neighborhood	7.7	7.1	7.2	7.7
Ease of information on County website	---	---	---	7.3
Hillsborough Co. overall	7.0	6.8	6.9	7.2
Ease of information on County cable television	---	---	---	7.0
Cultural opportunities	6.9	6.5	6.7	6.7
Affordability of housing	5.8	5.7	4.9	5.5
Job opportunities	6.8	6.3	6.5	4.8
Retirement	6.8	6.7	6.2	---
County Information	6.2	6.5	5.9	---
Raise Children	6.9	6.7	6.8	---
Ethnic Diversity	6.8	6.4	6.7	---

**Hillsborough County
Citizen Survey Comparison
Performance Ratings by All Respondents**

	2005	2006	2007	2008
<u>Service</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Rating</u>
Emergency Rescue/Ambulance	8.4	7.5	8.3	8.3
Public Library	8.1	7.3	8.1	8.3
Fire	8.3	7.6	8.3	8.2
Sheriff	7.6	7.5	7.6	7.4
County Parks Facilities	7.7	7.0	7.5	7.4
After School Programs	7.3	6.9	7.3	6.7
Vehicle Travel and Safety	5.7	6.3	6.2	6.6
Storm Water Drainage	6.2	6.5	6.2	6.6
Street Repairs/Resurfacing	5.6	6.5	5.7	6.4
Street Sign Repairs	6.8	6.8	6.8	6.4
Tree Trimming/Removal	6.6	6.8	6.4	6.3
Animal Control	7.0	6.9	6.9	6.3
Ditch/Right-of-Way Cleaning	6.5	6.8	6.4	6.1
Senior Services	6.5	6.7	6.4	6.1
Ease of Vehicle Travel	5.5	6.3	5.9	6.0
Low Income Health Care	5.4	6.4	5.4	5.8
Building Code Enforcement	6.1	6.8	6.5	5.7
Ease and Safety of Walking	---	---	---	5.5
Affordable Housing	5.3	6.4	5.4	5.3
Bicycle Travel	5.1	6.0	5.2	5.2
Growth Management	5.3	6.5	5.8	5.2
Mosquito Control	5.9	6.5	5.8	5.0
Convenience-safety of Pedestrian Facilities	5.4	6.1	5.7	---
Yard Waste Pick Up	7.3	7.2	7.4	---
Garbage/Recycling Collection	7.5	7.2	7.5	---
Public Drinking Water Services	6.5	6.5	6.5	---
Public Sewer Services	7.0	6.8	6.9	---
Child Care Services	6.2	6.7	6.3	---
Library Programs for Children	7.6	7.3	7.8	---

**Hillsborough County
Citizen Survey Comparison
Performance Ratings by Respondents in Municipalities**

	2006	2007	2008
<u>Service</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Rating</u>
Public Library	7.4	8.0	8.6
Fire	7.6	8.3	8.4
Emergency Rescue/Ambulance	7.5	8.3	8.3
Sheriff	7.5	7.6	7.5
County Parks Facilities	7.1	7.5	7.4
After School Programs	7.0	7.3	7.2
Street Sign Repairs	6.6	6.8	6.6
Low Income Health Care	6.4	5.4	6.6
Ease of Vehicle Travel	6.3	5.7	6.6
Vehicle Travel and Safety	6.4	6.4	6.5
Street Repairs/Resurfacing	6.5	5.6	6.4
Animal Control	7.1	6.9	6.3
Senior Services	6.7	6.3	6.3
Tree Trimming/Removal	6.8	6.3	6.2
Ditch/Right-of-Way Cleaning	6.8	6.4	6.2
Storm Water Drainage	6.5	6.1	6.0
Building Code Enforcement	6.9	6.0	5.9
Affordable Housing	6.5	5.4	5.7
Ease and Safety of Walking	---	---	5.7
Growth Management	6.5	6.0	5.6
Bicycle Travel	6.0	5.5	5.4
Mosquito Control	6.5	5.7	5.0
Convenience-safety of Pedestrian Facilities	6.2	5.8	---
Yard Waste Pick Up	7.2	7.3	---
Garbage/Recycling Collection	7.2	7.4	---
Public Drinking Water Services	6.6	6.5	---
Public Sewer Services	6.8	6.8	---
Child Care Services	6.7	6.3	---
Library Programs for Children	7.4	7.8	---

**Hillsborough County
Citizen Survey Comparison
Performance Ratings by Unincorporated Respondents**

	2006	2007	2008
<u>Service</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Rating</u>
Emergency Rescue/Ambulance	7.4	8.5	8.2
Public Library	7.2	8.2	8.2
Fire	7.4	8.4	8.1
Sheriff	7.4	7.7	7.4
County Parks Facilities	6.7	7.6	7.4
Vehicle Travel and Safety	6.2	6.0	6.6
Street Sign Repairs	6.6	6.9	6.6
After School Programs	6.7	7.3	6.6
Street Repairs/Resurfacing	6.5	6.1	6.4
Tree Trimming/Removal	6.8	6.7	6.3
Animal Control	6.7	6.8	6.3
Ditch/Right-of-Way Cleaning	6.8	6.4	6.1
Senior Services	6.7	6.6	6.0
Storm Water Drainage	6.5	6.5	5.9
Ease of Vehicle Travel	6.3	5.6	5.8
Building Code Enforcement	6.6	6.3	5.6
Low Income Health Care	6.6	5.6	5.5
Ease and Safety of Walking	---	---	5.4
Affordable Housing	6.2	5.2	5.2
Bicycle Travel	6.0	4.9	5.1
Mosquito Control	6.4	6.1	5.0
Growth Management	6.4	5.4	5.0
Convenience-safety of Pedestrian Facilities	6.1	5.6	---
Yard Waste Pick Up	7.1	7.7	---
Garbage/Recycling Collection	7.1	7.7	---
Public Drinking Water Services	6.3	6.7	---
Public Sewer Services	6.8	7.0	---
Child Care Services	6.6	6.4	---
Library Programs for Children	7.2	7.8	---

PERCEIVED VALUE OF SERVICES COMPARED TO COST

Amid the next six questions, all respondents answered the first four (Mosquito Control, Animal Control, Senior Services and Public Library Services) and only respondents in unincorporated areas replied to the last two (Fire/ Emergency Rescue/Ambulance Services and Code Enforcement).

For this set of questions, respondents were provided with the annual cost per household for each service. Upon this piece of information, respondents had to rate the value of the service compared to its cost. Lastly, they were asked to indicate if the County should spend less, the same or more for each service.

The most highly valued service by all respondents included the Public Library Services (mean 6.6) and Senior Services (mean 5.6) followed by Mosquito Control (mean 5.4) and the Animal Control Services (mean 5.3). However, respondents in the unincorporated areas of the County rated Fire/Emergency/Ambulance/Rescue Services the highest with a mean score of 7.5.

While respondents indicated that spending for the majority of County services should be maintained at the current level, they suggested that spending for Senior Services should be increased. Approximately 46.6 percent of respondents recommended such an increase.

Question:

Next, I am going to read you a list of services and how much Hillsborough County spends annually per household for that service according to the 2009 budget. After each service I would like you to tell me, on a scale of one to ten, where one means the service is a poor value, and ten means it is an excellent value, how you would rate that service compared to the cost.

Example of question wording:

How would you rate the value of **Mosquito Control** services compared to its annual cost of **\$6.45** per household?

If you knew Hillsborough County could improve **Mosquito Control** services, even though other services may be reduced or cut, would you recommend the County spend less, the same or more annually (than **\$6.45**) per household for **Mosquito Control** service?

Perceived Value of Selected Services Compared to its Cost by all Respondents

Service	Rating	Recommended Spending	
Public library	6.6		
Annual cost \$92.39		Less	30.8%
		Same	52.4
		More	16.8
Seniors services	5.6		
Annual cost \$43.46		Less	15.4%
		Same	38.0
		More	46.6
Mosquito control	5.4		
Annual cost \$6.45		Less	21.6%
		Same	48.0
		More	30.4
Animal control	5.3		
Annual cost \$18.62		Less	40.7%
		Same	44.6
		More	14.7

Unincorporated respondents chose Fire/Emergency/Ambulance and Rescue Services as the most valued service (mean 7.5) followed by Library Services (mean 6.5).

Perceived Value of Selected Services Compared to its Cost by Respondents in Unincorporated Areas

Service	Rating	Recommended Spending	
Public library	6.5		
Annual cost \$92.39		Less	31.7%
		Same	52.0
		More	16.4
Seniors services	5.5		
Annual cost \$43.46		Less	16.2%
		Same	39.2
		More	44.7
Mosquito control	5.4		
Annual cost \$6.45		Less	22.2%
		Same	46.9
		More	30.8
Animal control	5.2		
Annual cost \$18.62		Less	42.1%
		Same	43.8
		More	14.1
<i>Asked of respondents in unincorporated areas only</i>			
Fire/Emergency/Ambulance/Rescue	7.5		
(N=573)		Less	17.8%
Annual cost \$470.40		Same	57.7
		More	24.5
Code enforcement	5.2		
(N=543)		Less	30.0%
Annual cost \$27.25		Same	53.9
		More	16.1

DEMOGRAPHICS

Overall, about seventy-five percent of the respondents live in the unincorporated Hillsborough County area and 25 percent live in municipalities. A complete list of zip codes may be found in the appendix.

98: City Recode

		Municipality and Unincorporated	
		Municipality	Unincorporated
	805	204	601
Tampa	161 20.0%	161 78.9%	0 0.0%
Temple Terrace	14 1.7%	14 6.9%	0 0.0%
Plant City	29 3.6%	29 14.2%	0 0.0%
Unincorporated	601 74.7%	0 0.0%	601 100.0%

GENDER

Of the 805 sample respondents, 45.2 percent were males and 54.8 percent were females.

1: Gender (RECORDED BY INTERVIEWER)

		Municipality and Unincorporated	
		Municipality	Unincorporated
	805	204	601
Male	364 45.2%	91 44.6%	273 45.4%
Female	441 54.8%	113 55.4%	328 54.6%
DK/NA	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%

LENGTH OF RESIDENCY

When asked how long they had lived in Hillsborough County, the majority (51.7 percent) lived in HC for over ten years, 28.9 percent lived there for one to ten years, 15.8 percent lived there all their lives and 3.2 percent lived there for less than a year.

81: How long have you lived in Hillsborough County?

		Municipality and Unincorporated	
		Municipality	Unincorporated
	805	204	601
Less than one (1) year	26 3.2%	6 2.9%	20 3.3%
1 to 10 years	233 28.9%	50 24.5%	183 30.4%
Over 10 years, but not all of your life	416 51.7%	112 54.9%	304 50.6%
All of your life	127 15.8%	36 17.6%	91 15.1%
DK/NA/Refused	3 0.4%	0 0.0%	3 0.5%

AGE

Age falls well within the margin of error for this survey when compared to the 2000 Census data with the exception of the 18 to 24 year old cohort. This group is somewhat under-represented primarily due to the increasing number of wireless or cell phone only household penetration.

82: What is your age?

		Municipality and Unincorporated	
		Municipality	Unincorporated
	805	204	601
2000 Census			
18-24 12%	45 5.6%	15 7.4%	30 5.0%
25-34 20%	137 17.0%	44 21.6%	93 15.5%
35-44 22%	185 23.0%	51 25.0%	134 22.3%
45-54 18%	165 20.5%	38 18.6%	127 21.1%
55-64 11%	127 15.8%	27 13.2%	100 16.6%
65 or older 16%	142 17.6%	28 13.7%	114 19.0%
Refused	4 0.5%	1 0.5%	3 0.5%

RACE

Among the sample respondents, 17.5 percent were of Hispanic Heritage and 82.4 percent were not.

When asked what best described their race, 15.2 percent of respondents indicated Hispanic, 2.6 percent said they were bi-racial or multi-racial, 2 percent said they were Asian or Pacific Islander, and 0.5 percent indicated American Indian.

Overall, the majority (64.6 percent) of the sample was Caucasian and 13.7 percent was African-American.

85: Are you of Hispanic Heritage?

		Municipality and Unincorporated	
		Municipality	Unincorporated
	805	204	601
Yes	141 17.5%	42 20.6%	99 16.5%
No	663 82.4%	161 78.9%	502 83.5%
DK/NA/Refused	1 0.1%	1 0.5%	0 0.0%

86: Which of the following best describes your racial/ethnic origin?

		Municipality and Unincorporated	
		Municipality	Unincorporated
	805	204	601
White	520 64.6%	101 49.5%	419 69.7%
African-American or Black	110 13.7%	48 23.5%	62 10.3%
American Indian/Native American	4 0.5%	1 0.5%	3 0.5%
Asian/Pacific Islander	16 2.0%	4 2.0%	12 2.0%
Hispanic	122 15.2%	38 18.6%	84 14.0%
Bi-Racial/Multi-Racial	21 2.6%	6 2.9%	15 2.5%
DK/NA/Refused	6 0.7%	3 1.5%	3 0.5%
Other	6 0.7%	3 1.5%	3 0.5%