

---

## Survey Overview

---

Decision Resources, Ltd., is pleased to present the results of this study to the City of Little Canada. 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 Ms. Diane Traxler.

---

## Research Design

---

This study contains the results of a telephone survey of 400 randomly selected residents of the City of Little Canada. Survey responses were gathered by professional interviewers across the community between May 19<sup>th</sup> and June 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2011.

The average interview took twenty-six minutes.

All respondents interviewed in this study were part of a randomly generated sample of the City of Little Canada. 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 19.0 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 Ms. Traxler.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Chapter One: Residential Demographics.</b> .....	<b>6</b>
Residential Demographics. ....	7
Residential Longevity. ....	7
Age of Respondent. ....	8
Household Composition. ....	8
Home Ownership. ....	9
Formal Education. ....	10
Business in Little Canada. ....	10
Financial Situation. ....	11
Gender. ....	11
Area of City. ....	12
Summary and Conclusions. ....	12
<b>Chapter Two: Quality of Life.</b> .....	<b>13</b>
Quality of Life. ....	14
Plans to Move. ....	14
Quality of Life. ....	14
Like Most. ....	15
Most Serious Issue. ....	16
Direction of City. ....	17
Sense of Community. ....	17
Closest Connection. ....	18
Summary and Conclusions. ....	18
<b>Chapter Three: City Services.</b> .....	<b>20</b>
City Services. ....	21
Ratings of City Services. ....	21
Importance of City Services. ....	30
Funding of City Services. ....	38
Property Tax Increases. ....	46
Cuts in Services. ....	49
Perception of Property Taxes. ....	50
General Value of Services. ....	51
Partnerships. ....	51
City Projects. ....	52
Summary and Conclusions. ....	57
<b>Chapter Four: Public Safety.</b> .....	<b>62</b>
Public Safety. ....	63
Walk Alone at Night. ....	63
Public Safety Concerns. ....	64
Increase in Crime. ....	65
Amount of Patrolling. ....	66
Public Safety Programs. ....	66
Summary and Conclusions. ....	69

<b>Chapter Five: Parks and Recreation.</b> .....	<b>70</b>
Parks and Recreation. ....	71
Mix of Facilities.....	71
Mix of Programs. ....	71
Use of Trails.....	72
Summary and Conclusions.....	73
<b>Chapter Six: Communications.</b> .....	<b>74</b>
Communications. ....	75
Internet Access.....	75
Social Media Sources.....	75
Summary and Conclusions.....	78
<b>Chapter Eight: Concluding Thoughts.</b> .....	<b>79</b>
Concluding Thoughts.....	80



Decision  
Resources Ltd.

**Analysis**

# **Chapter One: Residential Demographics**

# Residential Demographics

Residents of the City of Little Canada 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 the City of Little Canada?*

The typical adult longevity in the community is 13.3 years:

LESS THAN TWO YEARS. ....	7%
TWO TO FIVE YEARS. ....	16%
SIX TO TEN YEARS. ....	20%
ELEVEN - TWENTY YEARS. ....	27%
OVER TWENTY YEARS. ....	30%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	0%

Twenty-three percent resided in Little Canada for less than five years, while 30% lived in the city for over 20 years.

“Two to five years” is posted at a higher rate by:

- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- Northwest Quadrant residents

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

- those planning to move in six to ten years

“Eleven to twenty years” is cited most frequently by:

- those thinking the city is off on the wrong track
- forty-five to fifty-four year olds

“Over twenty years” is indicated more frequently by:

- over fifty-four year olds
- households with seniors
- Southeast Quadrant residents

---

## Age of Respondent

---

Little Canada residents were queried:

*What is your age, please?*

The median adult age is 52.5 years old:

18-24	.....	3%
25-34	.....	12%
35-44	.....	18%
45-54	.....	22%
55-64	.....	25%
65 AND OVER.	.....	20%
REFUSED.	.....	1%

Fifteen percent post ages under 35 years old, while 20% post ages of 65 years old and older.

---

## Household Composition

---

Respondents were instructed:

*Could you tell me how many people in each of the following age groups live in your household. Let's start oldest to youngest...*

Three age ranges were then read:

*First, persons over 65?*

Twenty-five percent of the households contain seniors:

NONE.	.....	75%
ONE	.....	15%
TWO OR MORE.	.....	10%

Single seniors are more prevalent than senior couples.



***Other adults, ages 18 to 64?***

Nineteen percent of the households in the community are exclusively composed of seniors:

NONE. ....	19%
ONE .....	24%
TWO .....	51%
THREE OR MORE.....	6%

“Boomerang” households containing at least one adult child are twelve percent of the sample.

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

Twenty-eight percent of the households in Little Canada contain school-aged children and pre-schoolers:

NONE. ....	73%
ONE .....	11%
TWO .....	13%
THREE OR MORE.....	4%

Most households containing children have more than one at home.

---

**Home Ownership**

---

Little Canada residents were asked:

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

Sixty-one percent own their present residences:

OWN .....	61%
RENT .....	39%
REFUSED.....	0%

Thirty-nine percent rent their current homes.

---

## Formal Education

---

Respondents were asked:

*What is the highest level of formal education you completed?*

The typical Little Canada resident completed some college, albeit short of graduation:

LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE. . . . .	3%
HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE. . . . .	21%
VO-TECH/TECH COLLEGE. . . . .	11%
SOME COLLEGE. . . . .	20%
COLLEGE GRADUATE. . . . .	35%
POST GRADUATE. . . . .	10%
REFUSED. . . . .	1%

Twenty-four percent have high school educations or less, 31% report post-secondary educational experience, and 45% are college graduates.

---

## Business in Little Canada

---

Residents of Little Canada were asked:

*Do you or any member of this household own or manage a business in the City of Little Canada?*

Five percent report owning or managing a business in Little Canada:

YES . . . . .	5%
NO . . . . .	95%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	0%

Next, they were asked:

*Do you or any member of this household work at a job located in Little Canada?*

Thirteen percent of the households report household members working at a job in Little Canada:

YES . . . . .	13%
NO . . . . .	86%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	1%

In both cases, these levels are at the norm for the Greater Metropolitan Area.

---

## Financial Situation

---

Respondents were queried:

*Finally, thinking about your household finances, how would you describe your financial situation, would you say that*

- A) Your monthly expenses are exceeding your income;*
- B) You are meeting your monthly expenses but are putting aside little or no savings;*
- C) You are managing comfortably while putting some money aside;*
- D) Managing very well?*

Fifty-two percent of the households in the community are “fiscally stressed:”

STATEMENT A. ....	1%
STATEMENT B. ....	51%
STATEMENT C. ....	37%
STATEMENT D. ....	10%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	1%

Forty-seven percent are “fiscally unstressed.”

---

## Gender

---

The gender of each respondent was noted:

MALE. ....	50%
FEMALE. ....	50%

Men and women are equally represented in the sample.

---

## Area of City

---

The residence of each respondent was also noted, according to their location in relation to I-35E and Little Canada Road:

QUADRANT NE.....	37%
QUADRANT NW.....	15%
QUADRANT SE.....	14%
QUADRANT SW.....	34%

The Northeast and Southwest Quadrants contain 71% of the sample.

---

## Summary and Conclusions

---

The typical adult resident has lived in the city for 13.3 years. Twenty-three percent moved there during the past five years, while 30% resided there for more than twenty years. Twenty-five percent of the households contain seniors; in fact, 19% of the households are composed exclusively of senior citizens. Twenty-eight percent of the households contain school-aged children or pre-schoolers. The typical Little Canada adult resident is 52.5 years old. Fifteen percent are under 35, while 20% are 65 years old or older. The typical adult resident has post-secondary educational experience, albeit short of college graduation. While 24% report high school education or less, 45% graduated from college.

Five percent of the residents own or manage a business in Little Canada, and 13% report household members employed in Little Canada. Women and men are equally balanced in the sample.

Sixty-one percent own their present residences. Thirty-seven percent live in the Northeast Quadrant of the City of Little Canada, while 34% percent reside in the Southwest Quadrant. Fifteen percent reside in the Northwest Quadrant of the community, and 14% live in the Southeast Quadrant.

# **Chapter Two: Quality of Life**

# Quality of Life

Little Canada residents were asked a short series of questions about their quality of life in the community. First, any plans to move in the near future were ascertained. Then, a summary quality of life rating was obtained. Both the most valued characteristic of the city and the most serious issue facing the community were discussed. The general direction of the city was evaluated, followed by a short discussion of the sense of community identity and the connectedness within the city.

## Plans to Move

Residents were asked:

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

Eighty-seven percent of the sample have no plans to leave the city within the next ten years:

LESS THAN TWO YEARS. . . . .	3%
TWO TO FIVE YEARS. . . . .	4%
SIX TO TEN YEARS. . . . .	7%
OVER TEN YEARS. . . . .	67%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	20%

Seven percent see a move within the next five years, and another seven percent see a change in the next six-to-ten years.

“Over ten years” is cited at a higher rate by:

- those rating the quality of life as excellent
- those thinking the city is off on the wrong track
- over sixty-four year olds
- households with seniors
- Northeast Quadrant residents

## Quality of Life

Little Canada respondents were queried:

*How would you rate the quality of life in Little Canada -- excellent, good, only fair, or poor?*

A very solid 94% rate the quality of life favorably:

EXCELLENT.....	38%
GOOD. ....	56%
ONLY FAIR.....	4%
POOR .....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Only five percent are more critical in their evaluations. “Excellent” ratings at 38% place Little Canada within the top quartile of Metropolitan Area suburbs and also represent a six percent increase since the 2006 study.

Unfavorable ratings are posted at a higher rate by:

- those thinking the city is off on the wrong track

---

---

### **Like Most**

---

---

Residents were asked:

*What do you like most about living in Little Canada?*

Four aspects of the community are focused on by at least ten percent: “convenient location,” “quiet and peaceful,” “small town feel,” and “close to shopping.”

UNSURE. ....	1%
CONVENIENT LOCATION.....	15%
GOOD SCHOOLS.....	3%
HOUSING. ....	4%
NEIGHBORHOOD.....	8%
SAFE .....	2%
SMALL TOWN FEEL.....	11%
CLOSE TO FAMILY AND FRIENDS.....	6%
CLOSE TO WORK.....	6%
QUIET AND PEACEFUL.....	12%
GOOD CITY SERVICES. ....	3%
SENSE OF COMMUNITY.....	8%
PARKS AND TRAILS. ....	5%
OPEN SPACES.....	7%
CLOSE TO SHOPPING. ....	10%

“Strong neighborhoods” and “sense of community” are each mentioned by eight percent.

“Quiet and peaceful” is key to:

- those planning to move in six to ten years

- forty-five to fifty-four year olds
- Northwest Quadrant residents

“Small town feel” is important to:

- residents for more than twenty years

## **Most Serious Issue**

Little Canada residents were queried:

*In general, what do you think is the most serious issue facing the community today?*

Two issues are mentioned by a moderate segment of the sample: “high taxes,” at 13%, and “rising crime,” at 10%:

UNSURE. . . . .	20%
NOTHING. . . . .	18%
HIGH TAXES. . . . .	13%
RISING CRIME. . . . .	10%
GROWTH. . . . .	2%
TRAFFIC CONGESTION. . . . .	2%
STREET REPAIR. . . . .	7%
LACK OF JOBS. . . . .	5%
HOME FORECLOSURES. . . . .	3%
NOISE. . . . .	2%
LACK OF RETAIL. . . . .	3%
AGING POPULATION. . . . .	2%
POOR CITY SPENDING. . . . .	5%
ROAD CONSTRUCTION. . . . .	2%
TOO MUCH LOW INCOME HOUSING. . . . .	4%
SCATTERED. . . . .	3%

In both cases, the level of these concerns is well below the Metropolitan Area suburban norm. “Boosters” – residents who think there are no serious issues facing the city – are 18% of the sample, three times the suburban norm.

“Nothing” is posted at a higher rate by:

- those planning to move in six to ten years
- renters

“High taxes” troubled:

- residents for eleven to twenty years



“Rising crime” is cited more often by:

- residents for six to ten years

---

## Direction of City

---

Little Canada residents were queried:

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

Eighty-eight percent, one of the highest levels in the Metropolitan Area, think Little Canada is moving in the “right direction:”

RIGHT DIRECTION.....	88%
WRONG TRACK. ....	8%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	4%

A very small eight percent see it as “off on the wrong track.”

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

---

## Sense of Community

---

Respondents were asked:

*How would you rate the sense of community identity among residents in Little Canada -- would you say it is very strong, somewhat strong, not too strong, or not at all strong?*

A very solid 81% rate the sense of community identity as either “very strong” or “somewhat strong:”

VERY STRONG. ....	12%
SOMEWHAT STRONG.....	69%
NOT TOO STRONG.....	17%
NOT AT ALL STRONG.....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	2%

Eighteen percent rate it lower.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

---

## Closest Connection

---

Next, respondents were queried:

*Please tell me which of the following do you feel the closest connection to -- the City of Little Canada as a whole, your neighborhood, your School District or something else? What would that be?*

Sixty-five percent feel their closest connection is to their “neighborhood:”

CITY OF LITTLE CANADA. ....	22%
NEIGHBORHOOD. ....	65%
SCHOOL DISTRICT.....	5%
SOMETHING ELSE. ....	6%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	2%

Twenty-two percent think it is to “the City of Little Canada as a whole.” These results are relatively unchanged from the 2006 study.

“City of Little Canada” is cited more often by:

- fifty-five to sixty-four year olds

“Neighborhood” is posted more frequently by:

- those planning to move in six to ten years
- Northwest Quadrant residents

“School District” is mentioned more often by:

- households with children

“Something else” is stated more often by:

- residents for five years or less

---

## Summary and Conclusions

---

Eighty-seven percent of the residents have no intention to move from Little Canada within the next ten years. Only three percent intend to leave during the next two years, while four percent think they will move in the next two-to-five years, and seven percent, in the next six-to-ten years.

Thirty-eight percent of the City rate their quality of life as “excellent,” while another 56% rate it as “good.” Only five percent rate their quality of life lower. The 38% “excellent” rating places the community within the top quartile of Metropolitan Areas suburbs, and reflects a six percent increase in five years.

“Convenient location” is the most liked aspect of living in Little Canada, at 15%, down by almost one-half in five years. “Quiet and peacefulness,” at 12%, “small town feel,” at 11%, and “closeness to shopping,” at 10%, place next. Rounding out the list, “strong neighborhoods,” “closeness to family and friends,” “closeness to work,” “sense of community,” and “parks and trails,” each between five percent and eight percent, form the next tier.

In assessing the most serious issue facing the community, 13% point to “high taxes” and 10% cite “rising crime.” No problem is mentioned by more than 20%, the cut-line indicating a “serious issue.” Boosters – residents who feel there is no serious issues facing the community – are 18%, three times the suburban norm.

A very high 88% think things in Little Canada are generally headed in the right direction. A solid 81% view the sense of community among residents in Little Canada as at least “somewhat strong;” twelve percent see it as “very strong.” When asked what they feel the closest connection to, 65% point to their “neighborhood.” Twenty-two percent cite the “City of Little Canada as a whole,” and five percent feel closest to the “School District.” An additional six percent volunteer their closest connection is to their “church.”

# **Chapter Three: City Services**

# City Services

Little Canada residents were asked to consider city services in great detail. First, a rating of each service was requested. Next, the importance of each service was requested. Then, the funding level of each service was evaluated. Then, the focus changed to revenues. Tax increases for either maintaining or augmenting city services were plumbed. Property tax hostility was quantified, openness to service partnerships was examined, and potential future city projects were evaluated.

## Ratings of City Services

Little Canada respondents 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 twenty services was then read:

### *Traffic enforcement?*

Eighty-nine percent rate traffic enforcement highly:

EXCELLENT.....	19%
GOOD.....	70%
ONLY FAIR.....	9%
POOR.....	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Eleven percent, though, are more critical.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

***Police protection?***

Ninety-two percent rate police protection favorably:

EXCELLENT.....	30%
GOOD. ....	62%
ONLY FAIR.....	6%
POOR .....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	2%

Seven percent view police protection unfavorably.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

***Fire response?***

Eighty-seven percent rate fire responses as either “excellent” or “good:”

EXCELLENT.....	33%
GOOD. ....	54%
ONLY FAIR.....	2%
POOR .....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	11%

Only three percent rate it lower.

Ratings peak among:

- those rating the quality of life as excellent
- over sixty-four year olds

***Wildlife management of deer and geese?***

Eighty-eight percent rate wildlife management of deer and geese highly:

EXCELLENT.....	9%
GOOD. ....	59%
ONLY FAIR.....	21%
POOR .....	5%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	8%

Twenty-six percent rate wildlife management lower.

Ratings are higher among:

- those planning to move in the next five years
- those rating the quality of life as excellent
- those thinking the City should consider both when looking at partnerships
- Northwest Quadrant residents

They are lower among:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- those thinking the city is off on the wrong track
- Southeast Quadrant residents

***Domestic animal control?***

Seventy-nine percent rate domestic animal control favorably:

EXCELLENT.....	8%
GOOD. ....	71%
ONLY FAIR.. ....	14%
POOR .....	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	5%

Sixteen percent are more unfavorable in their evaluations.

Ratings peak among:

- Northwest Quadrant residents

***Maintenance and upkeep of parks and trails?***

Ninety-three percent rate the maintenance and upkeep of parks and trails highly:

EXCELLENT.....	24%
GOOD. ....	69%
ONLY FAIR.. ....	2%
POOR .....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	4%

Only three percent offer criticism.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

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

Eighty-six percent rate storm water drainage and flood control as either “excellent” or “good:”

EXCELLENT.....	10%
GOOD. ....	76%
ONLY FAIR.....	6%
POOR .....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	8%

Seven percent rate it lower.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

***Street lighting?***

Eighty-six percent rate street lighting favorably:

EXCELLENT.....	9%
GOOD. ....	77%
ONLY FAIR.....	9%
POOR .....	4%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Thirteen percent rate street lighting unfavorably.

Favorable ratings are given more often by:

- Northwest Quadrant residents

***Recreation programs for children?***

Sixty-eight percent rate recreation programs for children as either “excellent” or “good:”

EXCELLENT.....	10%
GOOD. ....	58%
ONLY FAIR.....	7%



POOR .....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	25%

Only seven percent rate them as “only fair.” But, 25% are unable to rate this service.

Favorable ratings are encountered more frequently among:

- Southwest Quadrant residents

***Recreation programs for adults?***

Sixty-one percent rate recreation programs for adults favorably:

EXCELLENT.....	4%
GOOD. ....	57%
ONLY FAIR.. ....	9%
POOR .....	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	30%

Eleven percent rate them unfavorably. However, 30% are unable to rate this service.

Favorable ratings are cited at a higher rate by:

- those rating the quality of life as excellent
- over sixty-four year olds
- Southwest Quadrant residents

***Garbage and recycling collection?***

A solid 92% rate garbage and recycling collection as either “excellent” or “good.”

EXCELLENT.....	18%
GOOD. ....	74%
ONLY FAIR.. ....	3%
POOR .....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	5%

Four percent are more critical in their judgments.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

***Building Inspections?***

Sixty-three percent rate building inspections favorably:

EXCELLENT.....	4%
GOOD. ....	59%
ONLY FAIR.....	4%
POOR .....	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	32%

Only six percent rate building inspections unfavorably. But, 32% are unable to evaluate this city service.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

***Code enforcement?***

Sixty-six percent rate code enforcement highly:

EXCELLENT.....	3%
GOOD. ....	63%
ONLY FAIR.....	5%
POOR .....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	29%

Only six percent rate it more critically. However, 29% are not able to rate this city service.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

***Property maintenance?***

Seventy-eight percent rate property maintenance as either “excellent” or “good:”

EXCELLENT.....	5%
GOOD. ....	73%
ONLY FAIR.....	8%
POOR .....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	14%

Only eight percent rate property maintenance lower; fourteen percent, though, are uncertain.

Unfavorable ratings are mentioned more often by:

- home owners
- women

***Canadian Days celebration?***

Eighty-six percent rate the Canadian Days celebration favorably:

EXCELLENT.....	27%
GOOD. ....	59%
ONLY FAIR.....	3%
POOR .....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	12%

Only four percent dissent; twelve percent, though, are uncertain.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

Respondents were further instructed:

***For the next three services, please consider only city streets, not county roads, state highways, nor freeways.***

Five more city services were then read:

***City street repair and maintenance, such as seal coating and crack filling?***

A comparatively high 76% rate city street repair and maintenance highly:

EXCELLENT.....	7%
GOOD. ....	69%
ONLY FAIR.....	20%
POOR .....	4%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Twenty-four percent are more critical.

Ratings increase among:

- residents for six to ten years
- those thinking the City should consider both when looking at partnerships
- Northwest Quadrant residents

They decrease among:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- those thinking the city is off on the wrong track

***Street sweeping?***

Ninety percent rate street sweeping favorably:

EXCELLENT.....	10%
GOOD. ....	80%
ONLY FAIR.....	7%
POOR .....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	2%

Only eight percent are more critical.

Ratings are higher among:

- residents for five years or less

They are lower among:

- Southeast Quadrant residents

***Snow plowing of streets?***

Ninety-three percent rate snow plowing of streets as either “excellent” or “good:”

EXCELLENT.....	16%
GOOD. ....	77%
ONLY FAIR.....	4%
POOR .....	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	2%

Only six percent post negative ratings.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

***Snow plowing of sidewalks?***

Seventy-seven percent rate snow plowing of sidewalks highly:

EXCELLENT.....	9%
GOOD. ....	68%
ONLY FAIR.....	5%
POOR .....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	18%

Only six percent rate it lower, while 18% are uncertain.

Ratings peak among:

- Northwest Quadrant residents

***Snow plowing of trails?***

Seventy-two percent rate snow plowing of trails favorably:

EXCELLENT.....	9%
GOOD. ....	63%
ONLY FAIR.....	6%
POOR .....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	22%

Seventeen percent rate it unfavorably, and 22% are unsure.

Ratings are higher among:

- residents for five years or less

They are lower among:

- those thinking the City should consider both when looking at partnerships
- households with children
- men

---

## Importance of City Services

---

Little Canada residents were then told:

*Now, I would like to re-read you that list of city services. For each one, please tell me if you consider it be an essential city service, a very important city service, a somewhat important city service, or not a very important service at all.*

The same list of twenty services was read:

### *Traffic enforcement?*

Forty-four percent view traffic enforcement as an “essential service:”

ESSENTIAL SERVICE.....	44%
VERY IMPORTANT. ....	48%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	6%
NOT AL ALL IMPORTANT. ....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Forty-eight percent see it as a “very important” service.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

### *Police protection?*

Sixty-three percent see police protection as an “essential service:”

ESSENTIAL SERVICE.....	63%
VERY IMPORTANT. ....	37%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	1%
NOT AL ALL IMPORTANT. ....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Thirty-seven percent rate it as a “very important” service.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

***Fire response?***

Sixty-three percent think fire response is an “essential service:”

ESSENTIAL SERVICE.....	63%
VERY IMPORTANT. ....	35%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	2%
NOT AL ALL IMPORTANT. ....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Thirty-five percent rate it as “very important.”

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

***Wildlife management of deer and geese?***

Nine percent see wildlife management of deer and geese as an “essential service:”

ESSENTIAL SERVICE.....	9%
VERY IMPORTANT. ....	50%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	31%
NOT AL ALL IMPORTANT. ....	9%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Fifty percent see it as a “very important” service.

Greater importance is cited more often by:

- those who work in the City of Little Canada

Lesser importance is mentioned more frequently by:

- those thinking the City should consider both when looking at partnerships
- Northwest Quadrant residents

***Domestic animal control?***

Only five percent regard domestic animal control as an “essential service:”

ESSENTIAL SERVICE.....	5%
VERY IMPORTANT. ....	62%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	28%

NOT AL ALL IMPORTANT. ....	4%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	1%

Sixty-two percent rate it as a “very important” service.

Lesser importance is posted at a higher rate by:

- residents for six to ten years

***Maintenance and upkeep of parks and trails?***

Ten percent think maintenance and upkeep of parks and trails is an “essential service:”

ESSENTIAL SERVICE.....	10%
VERY IMPORTANT. ....	71%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	19%
NOT AL ALL IMPORTANT. ....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	1%

Eighty-one percent view it as a “very important” service.

Greater importance is indicated more frequently by:

- Northwest Quadrant residents

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

Storm water drainage and flood control is considered an “essential service” by 24% of the sample:

ESSENTIAL SERVICE.....	24%
VERY IMPORTANT. ....	62%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	14%
NOT AL ALL IMPORTANT. ....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	1%

Sixty-two percent view it as a “very important” service.

Greater importance is stated more often by:

- Northeast Quadrant residents



***Street lighting?***

Twenty-six percent think street lighting is an “essential service:”

ESSENTIAL SERVICE.....	26%
VERY IMPORTANT. ....	58%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	16%
NOT AL ALL IMPORTANT. ....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Fifty-eight percent view it as a “very important” service.

Lesser importance is reported most frequently by:

- Southeast Quadrant residents

***Recreation programs for children?***

Nine percent of the sample see recreation programs for children as an “essential service:”

ESSENTIAL SERVICE.....	9%
VERY IMPORTANT. ....	65%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	23%
NOT AL ALL IMPORTANT. ....	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	2%

Sixty-five percent think it is a “very important” service.

Greater importance is stated more often by:

- Northwest Quadrant residents

Lesser importance is indicated most frequently by:

- Southeast Quadrant residents

***Recreation programs for adults?***

Only six percent see recreation programs for adults as an “essential service:”

ESSENTIAL SERVICE.....	6%
VERY IMPORTANT. ....	46%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	35%
NOT AL ALL IMPORTANT. ....	8%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	4%

Forty-six percent rate recreation programs for adults as “very important.”

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

***Garbage and recycling collection?***

Thirty-five percent think garbage and recycling collection is an “essential service:”

ESSENTIAL SERVICE.....	35%
VERY IMPORTANT. ....	59%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	4%
NOT AL ALL IMPORTANT. ....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Fifty-nine percent see it as a “very important” service.

Greater importance is indicated most frequently by:

- those thinking the City should consider both when looking at partnerships

Lesser importance is posted at a higher rate by:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- those planning to move in six to ten years

***Building Inspections?***

Eleven percent think building inspections is an “essential service:”

ESSENTIAL SERVICE.....	11%
VERY IMPORTANT. ....	62%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	24%

NOT AL ALL IMPORTANT. ....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	3%

Sixty-two percent see it as a “very important” service.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

***Code enforcement?***

Eleven percent also think code enforcement is an “essential service:”

ESSENTIAL SERVICE.....	11%
VERY IMPORTANT. ....	64%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	22%
NOT AL ALL IMPORTANT. ....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	3%

Sixty-four percent regard code enforcement as a “very important” service.

Greater importance is cited more often by:

- those thinking the City should consider both when looking at partnerships

Lesser importance is indicated more frequently by:

- those thinking the City should prioritize cost savings when looking at partnerships
- men
- Southeast Quadrant residents

***Property maintenance?***

Thirteen percent deem property maintenance as an “essential service:”

ESSENTIAL SERVICE.....	13%
VERY IMPORTANT. ....	68%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	16%
NOT AL ALL IMPORTANT. ....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	2%

Sixty-eight percent see property maintenance as a “very important” service.

Lesser importance is posted more frequently by:

- those who work in the City of Little Canada

***Canadian Days celebration?***

Twelve percent think the Canadian Days celebration is an “essential service:”

ESSENTIAL SERVICE.....	12%
VERY IMPORTANT. ....	64%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	20%
NOT AL ALL IMPORTANT. ....	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	2%

Sixty-four percent view the celebration as a “very importance” service.

Ratings are higher among:

- Northwest Quadrant residents

They are lower among:

- those planning to move in six to ten years

***City street repair and maintenance, such as seal coating and crack filling?***

Forty percent view city street repair and maintenance as an “essential service:”

ESSENTIAL SERVICE.....	40%
VERY IMPORTANT. ....	57%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	3%
NOT AL ALL IMPORTANT. ....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Fifty-seven percent think it is a “very important” service.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

***Street sweeping?***

Nineteen percent see street sweeping as an “essential service:”

ESSENTIAL SERVICE.....	19%
VERY IMPORTANT. ....	63%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	16%
NOT AL ALL IMPORTANT. ....	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Sixty-three percent think street sweeping is a “very important” service.

Greater importance is posted at a higher rate by:

- those planning to move in the next five years

***Snow plowing of streets?***

Thirty-five percent view snow plowing of streets as an “essential service:”

ESSENTIAL SERVICE.....	35%
VERY IMPORTANT. ....	63%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	2%
NOT AL ALL IMPORTANT. ....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Sixty-three percent rate snow plowing of streets as a “very important” service.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

***Snow plowing of sidewalks?***

Nineteen percent think snow plowing of sidewalks is an “essential service:”

ESSENTIAL SERVICE.....	19%
VERY IMPORTANT. ....	64%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	13%
NOT AL ALL IMPORTANT. ....	4%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	2%

Sixty-four percent rate it as a “very important” service.

Lesser importance is mentioned more often by:

- households with children
- Southeast Quadrant residents

***Snow plowing of trails?***

Ten percent think snow plowing of trails as an “essential service:”

ESSENTIAL SERVICE.....	10%
VERY IMPORTANT. ....	60%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	22%
NOT AL ALL IMPORTANT. ....	6%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	3%

Sixty percent see it as a “very important” service.

Lesser importance is cited more frequently by:

- Southeast Quadrant residents

---

## **Funding of City Services**

---

Little Canada residents were next instructed:

*Now, for the final time I am going to read the list of city services. Given the current economic and financial environment, the city may have to make some additional tough choices in the next couple of years with respect to scaling back or eliminating certain city services. For each of the following please tell me if you would support an increase in funding for the service, keep the funding for the service at its current level, make cuts in the funding for the service, or eliminate funding for the service.*

The list of twenty services was re-read for a second time:

***Traffic enforcement?***

Ninety-five percent would at least keep spending at its current level:

INCREASE FUNDING.....	4%
CURRENT LEVEL.....	91%
CUT FUNDING.....	4%
ELIMINATE FUNDING.....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Only four percent would make cuts.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

***Police protection?***

Ninety-nine percent would at least keep spending at its current level:

INCREASE FUNDING.....	5%
CURRENT LEVEL.....	94%
CUT FUNDING.....	1%
ELIMINATE FUNDING.....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Only one percent would make cuts.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

***Fire response?***

Ninety-eight percent would at least keep spending at its current level:

INCREASE FUNDING.....	5%
CURRENT LEVEL.....	93%
CUT FUNDING.....	2%
ELIMINATE FUNDING.....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Only two percent would make cuts.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

***Wildlife management of deer and geese?***

Seventy-eight percent would at least keep spending at its current level:

INCREASE FUNDING.....	4%
CURRENT LEVEL.....	74%
CUT FUNDING.....	17%
ELIMINATE FUNDING.....	4%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	2%

Twenty-one percent would make cuts.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

***Domestic animal control?***

Eighty-three percent would at least keep spending at its current level:

INCREASE FUNDING.....	1%
CURRENT LEVEL.....	82%
CUT FUNDING.....	14%
ELIMINATE FUNDING.....	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Sixteen percent would make cuts.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

***Maintenance and upkeep of parks and trails?***

Eighty-seven percent would at least keep spending at its current level:

INCREASE FUNDING.....	1%
CURRENT LEVEL.....	86%
CUT FUNDING.....	12%
ELIMINATE FUNDING.....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Twelve percent would make cuts.

“Current level” is posted at a higher rate by:

- those planning to move in the next five years



“Cut funding” is indicated more frequently by:

- those planning to move in six to ten years

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

Eighty-seven percent would at least keep spending at its current level:

INCREASE FUNDING.....	1%
CURRENT LEVEL.....	86%
CUT FUNDING.....	13%
ELIMINATE FUNDING.....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Thirteen percent would make cuts.

“Current level” is cited more often by:

- those thinking the City should consider both when looking at partnerships

***Street lighting?***

Ninety-one percent would at least keep spending at its current level:

INCREASE FUNDING.....	5%
CURRENT LEVEL.....	86%
CUT FUNDING.....	8%
ELIMINATE FUNDING.....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Eight percent would make cuts.

“Current level” is stated most frequently by:

- those planning to move in the next five years
- those thinking the City should consider both when looking at partnerships
- Northeast Quadrant residents

“Cut funding” is selected at a higher rate by:

- residents for eleven to twenty years

***Recreation programs for children?***

Ninety percent would at least keep spending at its current level:

INCREASE FUNDING.....	3%
CURRENT LEVEL.....	87%
CUT FUNDING.....	7%
ELIMINATE FUNDING.....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	3%

Eight percent would make cuts.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

***Recreation programs for adults?***

Sixty-six percent would at least keep spending at its current level:

INCREASE FUNDING.....	3%
CURRENT LEVEL.....	63%
CUT FUNDING.....	25%
ELIMINATE FUNDING.....	6%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	4%

Thirty-one percent would make cuts.

“Cut funding” is reported most often by:

- those thinking the city is off on the wrong track

***Garbage and recycling collection?***

Ninety-four percent would at least keep spending at its current level:

INCREASE FUNDING.....	1%
CURRENT LEVEL.....	93%
CUT FUNDING.....	4%
ELIMINATE FUNDING.....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	2%

Only four percent would make cuts.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

***Building Inspections?***

Eighty-three percent would at least keep spending at its current level:

INCREASE FUNDING.....	0%
CURRENT LEVEL.....	83%
CUT FUNDING.....	14%
ELIMINATE FUNDING.....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	4%

Fourteen percent would make cuts.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

***Code enforcement?***

Eighty-four percent would at least keep spending at its current level:

INCREASE FUNDING.....	1%
CURRENT LEVEL.....	83%
CUT FUNDING.....	12%
ELIMINATE FUNDING.....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	4%

Twelve percent would make cuts.

“Current level” is cited most frequently by:

- those thinking the City should consider both when looking at partnerships

“Cut funding” is stated more often by:

- Northwest Quadrant residents

***Property maintenance?***

Eighty-six percent would at least keep spending at its current level:

INCREASE FUNDING.....	1%
CURRENT LEVEL.....	85%
CUT FUNDING.....	12%
ELIMINATE FUNDING.....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	3%

Twelve percent would make cuts.

“Current level” is cited more often by:

- those thinking the City should consider both when looking at partnerships
- Northeast Quadrant residents

“Cut funding” is posted at a higher rate by:

- Northwest Quadrant residents

***Canadian Days celebration?***

Eighty-six percent would at least keep spending at its current level:

INCREASE FUNDING.....	2%
CURRENT LEVEL.....	84%
CUT FUNDING.....	14%
ELIMINATE FUNDING.....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Fourteen percent would make cuts.

“Current level” is mentioned at a higher rate by:

- those thinking the City should consider both when looking at partnerships

“Cut funding” is reported most frequently by:

- those planning to move in six to ten years

***City street repair and maintenance, such as seal coating and crack filling?***

Ninety-eight percent would at least keep spending at its current level:

INCREASE FUNDING.....	11%
CURRENT LEVEL.....	87%
CUT FUNDING.....	2%
ELIMINATE FUNDING.....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Only three percent would make cuts.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

***Street sweeping?***

Ninety-one percent would at least keep spending at its current level:

INCREASE FUNDING.....	2%
CURRENT LEVEL.....	89%
CUT FUNDING.....	7%
ELIMINATE FUNDING.....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Eight percent would make cuts.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

***Snow plowing of streets?***

Ninety-eight percent would at least keep spending at its current level:

INCREASE FUNDING.....	3%
CURRENT LEVEL.....	95%
CUT FUNDING.....	2%
ELIMINATE FUNDING.....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Only two percent would make cuts.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

***Snow plowing of sidewalks?***

Ninety-one percent would at least keep spending at its current level:

INCREASE FUNDING.....	2%
CURRENT LEVEL.....	89%
CUT FUNDING.....	6%
ELIMINATE FUNDING.....	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Eight percent would make cuts.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

***Snow plowing of trails?***

Seventy-eight percent would at least keep spending at its current level:

INCREASE FUNDING.....	1%
CURRENT LEVEL.....	77%
CUT FUNDING.....	16%
ELIMINATE FUNDING.....	5%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Twenty-one percent would make cuts.

“Cut funding” is posted at a higher rate by:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- those thinking the city is off on the wrong track

---

**Property Tax Increases**

---

Respondents indicating they would provide additional funding to any city service were asked:

***You stated you wanted to see (a/some) city service(s) receive additional funding....***

***Would you favor or oppose an increase in city property taxes to provide that additional funding?***

By a narrow 48-44 margin, they would oppose an increase in city property taxes to provide that additional revenue:

FAVOR. ....	44%
OPPOSE.. ....	48%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	9%

Support is higher among:

- those thinking city property taxes are about average
- those thinking the City should prioritize community identity when looking at partnerships
- households with seniors
- Southeast Quadrant residents

It is lower among:

- residents for five years or less
- eighteen to forty-four year olds

Respondents favoring a property tax increase were then asked:

***By what percentage would you be willing to increase your city property taxes to provide funding for services you mentioned?***

The median increase supported is 2.5 percent:

UNSURE. ....	13%
ONE PERCENT.. ....	30%
TWO PERCENT. ....	15%
THREE PERCENT. ....	9%
FOUR PERCENT. ....	2%
FIVE PERCENT. ....	21%
TEN PERCENT.. ....	11%

Thirty percent would support a one percent increase, while 32% would support at least a five percent increase.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

Respondents who supported current funding levels for any city service were asked a follow-up question:

***You stated you wanted to see (a/some) city service(s) receive funding at the current level....***

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

By a 57%-30% majority, these residents reject a property tax increase to maintain city service levels at their current levels:

FAVOR. ....	30%
OPPOSE.. ....	57%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	14%

“Favor” is stated more often by:

- those thinking city property taxes are about average
- those thinking the City should prioritize community identity when looking at partnerships

“Oppose” is posted at a higher rate by:

- those thinking city property taxes are high

Supporters of a property tax increase were then asked:

***By what percentage would you be willing to increase your property taxes to maintain funding for services you mentioned?***

The median increase supported by these residents is 1.8 percent:

UNSURE. ....	8%
ONE PERCENT.. ....	41%
TWO PERCENT. ....	23%
THREE PERCENT. ....	7%
FOUR PERCENT. ....	2%
FIVE PERCENT. ....	17%
SEVEN PERCENT. ....	1%
TEN PERCENT. ....	3%



“One percent” is cited more often by:

- residents for five years or less
- households with seniors

“Two percent” is indicated more frequently by:

- residents for six to ten years
- those thinking city property taxes are about average
- those thinking the City should consider both when looking at partnerships
- men

“Five percent” is stated more often by:

- those thinking the City should prioritize community identity when looking at partnerships

---

## Cuts in Services

---

Little Canada residents were queried:

*Would you favor or oppose cuts in city services if they would reduce your current CITY property taxes Do you feel strongly that way?*

By a 65%-22% margin, residents oppose cuts in city service for reduction in their current property taxes:

STRONGLY FAVOR. ....	4%
FAVOR. ....	18%
OPPOSE. ....	48%
STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	17%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	14%

Supporters tend to be:

- those thinking the city is off on the wrong track
- those thinking city property taxes are high
- those thinking the City should prioritize cost savings when looking at partnerships
- over sixty-four year olds

Opponents are typically:

- those thinking city property taxes are about average
- those thinking the City should consider both when looking at partnerships
- Northwest Quadrant residents

---

## Perception of Property Taxes

---

Respondents were asked:

*In comparison with nearby areas, do you feel that the property taxes in Little Canada are very high, somewhat high, about average, somewhat low, or very low?*

Forty-three percent view their property taxes as “high.”

VERY HIGH. . . . .	6%
SOMEWHAT HIGH. . . . .	37%
ABOUT AVERAGE. . . . .	38%
SOMEWHAT LOW. . . . .	2%
VERY LOW. . . . .	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	18%

But, 38% see their property taxes as “about average.” Only two percent think they are “low.”

“High” is posted more often by:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- fifty-five to sixty-four year olds

“About average” is indicated more often by:

- over sixty-four year olds
- households with seniors
- Northeast Quadrant residents

---

## General Value of Services

---

Respondents were queried:

*When you consider the city 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?*

Eighty percent rate their city property taxes as either an “excellent” or “good” value:

EXCELLENT.....	7%
GOOD. ....	73%
ONLY FAIR.....	10%
POOR .....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	9%

Only 11% see them as an “only fair” or “poor” value.

Ratings are higher among:

- Northwest Quadrant residents

They are lower among:

- those thinking the city is off on the wrong track

---

## Partnerships

---

Little Canada residents were asked:

*In these difficult times, cities are exploring options to save money, while protecting community identity and pride. As the City of Little Canada continues developing partnerships with school districts, nearby cities, Ramsey County and private business....*

*Please tell me which statement is closer to your opinion?*

*A) The City's priority with partnerships should be to provide cost savings to taxpayers; OR*

*B) The City's priority should be to maintain community identity and pride? Do you feel strongly that way?*

Thirty-nine percent think the “City’s priority with partnerships should be to provide cost savings to taxpayers:”

STATEMENT A/STRONGLY.....	13%
STATEMENT A. ....	26%
STATEMENT B. ....	14%
STATEMENT B/STRONGLY. ....	10%
NEITHER.. ....	1%
BOTH .....	33%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	3%

Twenty-four percent see the priority as “maintain[ing] community identity and pride. But, 33% want a balance between these two priorities.

“Statement A” is indicated at a higher rate by:

- those thinking the city is off on the wrong track
- forty-five to fifty-four year olds
- those who work in the City of Little Canada

“Statement B” is cited more frequently by:

- those planning to move in six to ten years
- Southeast Quadrant residents

---

## **City Projects**

---

Little Canada respondents were instructed:

*I would now like to read you a list of projects the City of Little Canada could undertake. For each one, please tell me if you strongly support the use of city funds for it, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose the use of city funds.*

A list of six potential projects was then read:

***Narrow Little Canada Road east of Interstate 35E to provide room for sidewalks and landscaping?***

By a 57%-34% majority, residents oppose using city funds to “narrow Little Canada Road east of Interstate 35E to provide room for sidewalks and landscaping:”

STRONGLY SUPPORT. ....	6%
SUPPORT. ....	28%
OPPOSE.. ....	32%
STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	25%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	10%

Intense opposition outdistances intense support by over four-to-one.

Support is higher among:

- those thinking city property taxes are about average
- those thinking the City should prioritize community identity when looking at partnerships
- Northwest Quadrant residents

It is lower among:

- those planning to move in the next five years
- those thinking city property taxes are high
- those thinking the City should prioritize cost savings when looking at partnerships

***Bury powerlines in the city along major roads, such as Rice Street and Little Canada Road?***

By a 59%-34% majority, residents support the use of city funds to “bury powerlines in the city along major roads:”

STRONGLY SUPPORT. ....	13%
SUPPORT. ....	46%
OPPOSE.. ....	27%
STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	7%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	7%

Intense support is twice as high as intense opposition.

Supporters tend to be:

- eighteen to forty-four year olds

Opponents are more likely to be:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- those thinking the city is off on the wrong track
- those thinking city property taxes are high
- fifty-five to sixty-four year olds

***Complete connections between existing trails throughout the city?***

By a 62%-35% majority, residents support the use of city funds to “complete connections between existing trails throughout the city:”

STRONGLY SUPPORT. ....	15%
SUPPORT. ....	47%
OPPOSE.. ....	28%
STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	7%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	4%

Intense support is almost double the level of intense opposition.

Support increases among:

- residents for five years or less
- those planning to move in the next five years
- those thinking city property taxes are about average
- those thinking the City should consider both when looking at partnerships
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- households with children
- Northwest Quadrant residents

It decreases among:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- those thinking the city is off on the wrong track
- those thinking city property taxes are high

- fifty-five to sixty-four year olds
- Southeast Quadrant residents

***Replace aging, but functional, playground equipment in parks throughout the city with more modern playground equipment options?***

By a 64%-31% margin, residents support the use of state funds to “replace aging, but functional, playground equipment in parks throughout the city:”

STRONGLY SUPPORT. ....	11%
SUPPORT. ....	53%
OPPOSE.. ....	27%
STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	4%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	6%

Intense support is almost three times higher than intense opposition.

Supporters are more apt to be:

- Northwest Quadrant residents

Opponents are typically:

- those thinking the city is off on the wrong track
- Southeast Quadrant residents

***Re-open Demont outdoor skating rink?***

By a 53%-31% margin, residents support the use of city funds to re-open Demont outdoor skating arena:

STRONGLY SUPPORT. ....	10%
SUPPORT. ....	43%
OPPOSE.. ....	28%
STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	3%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	17%

Intense support is over three times higher than the insignificant level of intense opposition.

Support is higher among:

- those planning to move in the next five years
- those thinking city property taxes are about average
- those thinking the City should consider both when looking at partnerships

It is lower among:

- those thinking the city is off on the wrong track
- those thinking city property taxes are high
- fifty-five to sixty-four year olds
- Southeast Quadrant residents

***Provide lighting along bicycle and pedestrian trails?***

By a 62%-34% majority, residents support the use of city funds to “provide lighting along bicycle and pedestrian trails.”

STRONGLY SUPPORT. ....	15%
SUPPORT. ....	47%
OPPOSE. ....	29%
STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	5%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	4%

Intense supporters outnumber intense opponents by three-to-one.

Supporters tend to be:

- residents for five years or less
- those planning to move in the next five years
- households with children

Opponents are typically:

- those thinking the city is off on the wrong track
- forty-five to fifty-four year olds



## Summary and Conclusions

When asked about property taxes in Little Canada compared with nearby areas, 43% feel they were “high,” while 38% reported they were “about average.” Even so, by a 65%-22% majority, residents oppose cutting city services if it would result in a reduction in current property taxes. And, by a very high seven-to-one margin, residents rate the value of city services as favorable by an 80%-11% judgment. The 11% unfavorable rating is about one-half the Metropolitan Area suburban norm. When only the opinions of residents providing ratings of a service are considered, the percentage of favorable ratings ranges between 72% and 97%. The table below arrays each service with the percentage of informed respondents who rate it as either “excellent” or “good.”

City Service	Favorable Rating
Fire response	97%
Maintenance and upkeep of parks and trails	97%
Wildlife management of deer and geese	97%
Garbage and recycling collection	96%
Canadian Days celebration	96%
Snow plowing of streets	94%
Police protection	93%
Snow plowing of sidewalks	93%
Storm water drainage and flood control	92%
Code enforcement	92%
Street sweeping	92%
Property maintenance	91%
Recreational programs for children	91%
Building inspections	91%
Snow plowing of trails	91%
Traffic enforcement	89%
Street lighting	87%

<b>City Service</b>	<b>Favorable Rating</b>
Recreation programs for adults	85%
Domestic animal control	83%
City street repair and maintenance	76%

The mean favorable percentage for all city services is 91.2% about six percent higher than the Metropolitan Area suburban norm.

The table below shows each service with the percentage of respondents who consider it to be “essential” and a score, which is its rank among all twenty services.

<b>City Service</b>	<b>Essential Rating</b>	<b>Importance Score</b>
Police protection	63%	1
Fire response	62%	2
Traffic enforcement	44%	3
City street repair and maintenance	40%	4
Snow plowing of streets	35%	5
Garbage and recycling collection	35%	6
Street lighting	26%	7
Storm water drainage and flood control	24%	8
Snow plowing of sidewalks	19%	9
Street sweeping	19%	10
Property maintenance	13%	11
Canadian Days celebration	12%	12
Code enforcement	11%	13
Building inspections	11%	14
Maintenance and upkeep of parks and trails	10%	15
Snow plowing of trails	10%	16
Recreation programs for children	9%	17

<b>City Service</b>	<b>Essential Rating</b>	<b>Importance Score</b>
Wildlife management of deer and geese	9%	18
Recreation programs for adults	6%	19
Domestic animal control	5%	20

The average essential rating given to the nine city services is 48.1%.

The table below shows each service with the percentage of respondents who consider it to be “essential” and a score, which is its rank among all twenty services.

<b>City Service</b>	<b>Cut/Eliminate Percentage</b>	<b>Funding Priority</b>
Police protection	1%	1
Fire response	2%	2
Snow plowing of streets	2%	3
City street repair and maintenance	3%	4
Traffic enforcement	4%	5
Garbage and recycling collection	4%	6
Street lighting	8%	7
Street sweeping	8%	8
Recreation programs for children	8%	9
Snow plowing of sidewalks	8%	10
Maintenance and upkeep of parks and trails	12%	11
Property maintenance	12%	12
Code enforcement	12%	13
Storm water drainage and flood control	13%	14
Canadian Days celebration	14%	15
Building inspection	14%	16
Domestic animal control	16%	17

<b>City Service</b>	<b>Cut/Eliminate Percentage</b>	<b>Funding Priority</b>
Wildlife management of deer and geese	21%	18
Snow plowing of trails	21%	19
Recreation programs for adults	31%	20

The average “cut/eliminate” percentage given to the nine city services is 10.7%. The bottom three ranked services have “cut/eliminate” percentages almost or over double the norm.

To form a guide for potential budget reductions, a composite score combines the ranking of essentialness and ranking of budget preservation, shown in the prior two tables. Each city service is arrayed with its budget reduction priority score. A low score means the city service should be at least kept at current funding levels; a higher score indicates a candidate for cut-backs.

<b>City Service</b>	<b>Budget Reduction Priority Score</b>
Police protection	2
Fire response	4
Traffic enforcement	8
City street repair and maintenance	8
Snow plowing of streets	8
Garbage and recycling collection	12
Property maintenance	13
Street lighting	14
Street sweeping	18
Snow plowing of sidewalks	19
Storm water drainage and flood control	22
Code enforcement	26
Recreational programs for children	26
Maintenance and upkeep of parks and trails	26

City Service	Budget Reduction Priority Score
Canadian Days celebration	27
Building inspections	30
Snow plowing of trails	35
Wildlife management of deer and geese	36
Domestic animal control	37
Recreation programs for adults	39

Candidates for budget cuts and efficiency reform include five services: building inspections, snow plowing of trails, wildlife management of deer and geese, domestic animal control, and recreational programs for adults. Basic city services – police protection, fire response, traffic enforcement, city street repair and maintenance, and snow plowing of streets – should be thoroughly protected. Respondents who want to increase funding for any service were asked if they would support a property tax increase for that purpose. By a 48%-44% narrow plurality, residents oppose a property tax increase for this purpose. Among supporters of a property tax increase, the typical respondent would accept a 2.5% increase in their city property tax.

Residents wanting to continue current funding levels for any city service were asked if they would support a property tax increase for this purpose. By a 57%-30% majority, residents solidly oppose a property tax increase for this purpose. Among supporters of a property tax increase, the typical respondent would accept a 1.8% increase in their city property tax.

By a 39%-24% margin, residents would prioritize “cost savings to taxpayers” over “maintaining community identity and pride” in developing partnerships with other entities. Thirty-three percent would equally balance these priorities.

Respondents took differing positions on the use of city funds for six projects. By a 57%-34% majority, residents oppose the use of city funds for narrowing Little Canada Road east of Interstate 35E to provide room for sidewalks and landscaping. By a 59%-34% majority, residents support the use of city funds to bury powerlines in the city along major roads. By a 62%-35% majority, residents support the completion of connections between existing trails throughout the city. By a 64%-31% majority, residents support replacing aging, but functional, playground equipment in parks throughout the city with more modern playground equipment options. By a narrower 53%-31% margin, residents support the re-opening Demont outdoor skating rink. And, by a 62%-34% majority, residents support the use of city funds to provide lighting along bicycle and pedestrian trails.

# **Chapter Four: Public Safety**

# Public Safety

Little Canada residents were asked series of questions about public safety issues. First, unsafe areas in the city were identified. The most serious public safety concerns were identified. Perceived changes in the city’s crime rate and the adequacy of police patrolling were discussed. Finally, support for a property tax increase for various public safety programs was determined.

## Walk Alone at Night

Respondents were asked:

*Turning to the issue of public safety in the community....*  
*Are there any areas in Little Canada where you would be afraid to walk alone at night?*

Forty-six percent report there are areas in Little Canada where they would be afraid to walk alone at night:

YES	.....	46%
NO	.....	52%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.	.....	2%

“Yes” is posted at a higher rate by:

- those thinking the city is off on the wrong track
- over sixty-four year olds
- women

“No” is cited at a higher rate by:

- residents for six to ten years
- those planning to move in the next five years
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- men

Residents indicating there are unsafe areas were next asked:

*What area particularly concerns you?*

Forty-seven percent think that everywhere in the community is unsafe at night:

EVERYWHERE. . . . .	47%
PARKS. . . . .	9%
TRAILS. . . . .	10%
ALONG RICE STREET. . . . .	8%
MONTREAL COURT APARTMENTS. . . . .	17%
ALONG LABORE ROAD. . . . .	3%
ALL APARTMENTS. . . . .	2%
SCATTERED. . . . .	4%

Seventeen percent specifically cite the “Montreal Courts Apartments.”

“Everywhere” is posted at a higher rate by:

- those thinking the City should consider both when looking at partnerships
- over sixty-four year olds
- households with seniors
- renters
- Northwest Quadrant residents

---

## **Public Safety Concerns**

---

Little Canada residents were queried:

*I would like to read you a short list of public safety concerns.*

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

Twenty-two percent see “residential crimes” as the greatest concern in Little Canada:

Violent crime. . . . .	2%
Traffic speeding. . . . .	4%
Drugs . . . . .	11%
Youth crimes and vandalism. . . . .	15%
Identity theft. . . . .	1%
Business crimes, such as shoplifting and check fraud. . . . .	1%
Residential crimes, such as burglary, and theft. . . . .	22%



ALL EQUALLY. ....	9%
NONE OF THE ABOVE.....	34%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	2%

Fifteen percent think it is “youth crimes and vandalism,” while 11% believe it is “drugs.” But, 34% do not see any of these issues as serious concerns.

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

- those planning to move in the next five years
- those thinking the City should consider both when looking at partnerships

---

### **Increase in Crime**

---

Little Canada residents were asked:

*Do you feel crime in Little Canada has increased, decreased, or remained about the same during the past five years?*

Sixty percent think crime in Little Canada has “remained about the same” during the past five years:

INCREASED.....	34%
DECREASED. ....	3%
REMAINED ABOUT SAME. ....	60%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	3%

But, 34% see an “increase.”

“Increased” is posted more often by:

- those saying there are unsafe areas in the city
- households with children

“About the same” is cited more frequently by:

- Northeast Quadrant residents

---

## Amount of Patrolling

---

Respondents were queried:

*How would you rate the amount of patrolling the Sheriff's Department does in your neighborhood would you say they do too much, about the right amount, or not enough?*

Seventy-four percent rate the amount of neighborhood patrolling as “about the right amount:”

TOO MUCH. . . . .	0%
ABOUT RIGHT AMOUNT. . . . .	74%
NOT ENOUGH. . . . .	25%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	1%

Twenty-five percent think it is “not enough.”

“About right amount” is indicated more often by:

- those planning to move in six to ten years
- Northwest Quadrant residents

“Not enough” is reported more often by:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- those planning to move in the next five years
- those thinking the city is off on the wrong track
- Southeast Quadrant residents

---

## Public Safety Programs

---

Little Canada residents were instructed:

*I would like to read you a list of public safety programs. For each one, please tell me if you would support a property tax increase for that purpose. Would you strongly support it, somewhat support it, somewhat oppose it, or strongly oppose a property tax for that purpose.*

A list of five programs was then read:

***Greater enforcement of speed limits through increased police patrolling?***

By a 58%-37% majority, residents **oppose** a property tax increase for greater enforcement of speed limits through increased police patrolling:

STRONGLY SUPPORT. ....	7%
SUPPORT. ....	30%
OPPOSE.. ....	50%
STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	8%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	5%

Support peaks among:

- households with children

***Greater crime prevention efforts through neighborhood awareness programs and police-school relations?***

By a 55%-41% margin, respondents **support** a property tax increase for greater crime prevention efforts through neighborhood awareness programs and police-school relations:

STRONGLY SUPPORT. ....	9%
SUPPORT. ....	46%
OPPOSE.. ....	37%
STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	4%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	4%

Opposition rises among:

- those thinking the city is off on the wrong track
- fifty-five to sixty-four year olds

***Greater number of police on patrol in residential neighborhoods?***

By a 57%-39% margin, residents **support** a property tax increase for a greater number of police on patrol in residential neighborhoods:

STRONGLY SUPPORT. ....	16%
SUPPORT. ....	41%
OPPOSE.. ....	35%
STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	4%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	4%

Support increases among:

- those planning to move in the next five years
- households with children
- Northwest Quadrant residents

It decreases among:

- those planning to move in six to ten years
- those thinking the city is off on the wrong track

***Maintain the current police presence at apartment buildings, such as Montreal Courts?***

By a 74%-19% majority, respondents **support** maintaining the current police presence at apartment buildings, such as Montreal Courts:

STRONGLY SUPPORT. ....	14%
SUPPORT. ....	60%
OPPOSE5.. ....	17%
STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	7%

Supporters tend to be:

- those planning to move in the next five years
- those thinking the City should consider both when looking at partnerships

***Increase the police presence at apartment buildings, such as Montreal Courts?***

By a 50%-41% plurality, respondents **support** a property tax increase to increase the police presence at apartment buildings, such as Montreal Courts:

STRONGLY SUPPORT. ....	20%
SUPPORT. ....	30%

OPPOSE.....	38%
STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	3%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	9%

Support is higher among:

- residents for five years or less
- those planning to move in the next five years
- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- households with children

It is lower among:

- those thinking the city is off on the wrong track

---

## **Summary and Conclusions**

---

Forty-six percent believe there are unsafe areas in Little Canada where they would be afraid to walk alone at night. Of those who feel they are not safe, seventeen percent specifically point to the Montreal Courts Apartments. Another forty-seven percent think that all areas of the city are unsafe.

The most often cited public safety concern is residential crime, cited by 22%. Fifteen percent point to “youth crime and vandalism,” while 11% cite “drugs.” Thirty-four percent, though, think there are no public safety concerns.

Sixty percent think crime in Little Canada has “remained about the same” during the past five years; but, 34% think it “increased.” Seventy-four percent think the amount of patrolling the Sheriff’s Department in their neighborhood is “about right.” But, 25% think there is not enough patrolling in their neighborhood.

By a 58%-37% majority, residents oppose a property tax increase for greater enforcement of speed limits through increases police patrolling. But, by a 55%-41% margin, residents support a property tax increase for greater crime prevention efforts through neighborhood awareness programs and police-school relations. By a 57%-39% majority, Little Canada residents favor a property tax increase for a greater number of police on patrol in residential neighborhoods. pr By a 74%-19% super-majority, respondents favor a property tax increase to maintain the current police presence at apartment buildings, such as Montreal Courts. But, by a narrower 50%-41% plurality, residents support a property tax increase to increase the police presence at apartment buildings, such as Montreal Courts.

# **Chapter Five: Parks and Recreation**

# Parks and Recreation

Little Canada residents were asked a short series of questions about recreation opportunities in the city. Residents were asked about the current mix of recreational or sports facilities and city-sponsored recreational programs. Then, use of the city trails was estimated.

## Mix of Facilities

Respondents were queried:

*Let's discuss recreational opportunities in the community....*

*Do you feel that the current mix of recreational or sports facilities meets the needs of members of your household?*

Ninety-four percent think the current mix of recreational or sports facilities meets the needs of members of their household:

YES	.....	94%
NO	.....	3%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.	.....	4%

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

## Mix of Programs

Respondents were asked:

*Does the current mix of city-sponsored recreational programs meet the needs of members of your household?*

Ninety-four percent believe the current mix of city-sponsored recreational programs meet the needs of members of their household:

YES .....	94%
NO .....	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	4%

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

The very small sub-sample of respondents feeling the current mix does not meet their needs were asked a follow-up query:

***What type of recreational programs are missing?***

“Senior programs” and “youth sports opportunities” were the two major missing types of programs:

SENIOR PROGRAMS. ....	44%
YOUTH SPORTS. ....	33%
FAMILY SPORTS.....	11%
ADULT FITNESS.....	11%

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

---

**Use of Trails**

---

Respondents were asked:

***How often do you or members of your household use trails in the City -- frequently, occasionally, rarely or never?***

Forty-nine percent report household members use the trails at least “occasionally:”

FREQUENTLY.....	19%
OCCASIONALLY.....	30%
RARELY.....	24%
NEVER.....	27%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

But, 19% report household members use them “occasionally.”

Use increases among:

- those planning to move in the next ten years
- those rating the quality of life as good



- forty-five to fifty-four year olds
- households with children
- those who work in the City of Little Canada
- Northeast Quadrant residents

It decreases among:

- those thinking the city is off on the wrong track
- fifty-five to sixty-four year olds
- households with seniors
- Northwest Quadrant residents

---

## **Summary and Conclusions**

---

Very few residents express dissatisfaction with the current mix of recreational or sports facilities and city-sponsored recreational programs. In fact, only three percent disagree about the mix of recreational or sports facilities, and only two percent disagree about the mix of city-sponsored recreational programs.

Forty-nine percent report household members either “frequently” or “occasionally” use city trails. In fact, 19% of the household members use the trails “frequently.”

# **Chapter Six: Communications**

# Communications

Little Canada residents were asked a small number of questions about their use of the Internet. Access to the Internet was determined. Then, the use of social media was discussed.

## Internet Access

Respondents were asked:

*Do you have access to the Internet from your home?*

Seventy-two percent report access to the Internet from their home:

YES	72%
NO	28%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED	0%

Access increases among:

- those planning to move in the next ten years
- forty-five to fifty-four year olds
- households with children

It decreases among:

- over sixty-four year olds
- households with seniors
- Northwest Quadrant residents

## Social Media Sources

Little Canada residents with access to the Internet were instructed:

*I would like to ask you about social media sources. For each one, tell me if you currently use that source of informaion; then, whether you do or not, tell me if you would be likely or unlikely to use it IN THE FUTURE to communicate with the City of Little Canada.*

Four social media sources were then listed:

***Podcasts?***

Sixteen percent currently use podcasts as a source of information:

NOT USED/LIKELY IN FUTURE.....	3%
NOT USED/NOT LIKELY.....	79%
NOT USED/DON'T KNOW.....	3%
USED/LIKELY IN FUTURE.....	11%
USED/NOT LIKELY.....	5%
USED/DON'T KNOW.....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Fourteen percent are likely to use podcasts in the future to communicate with the city.

“Not used/not likely” is cited most often by:

- those thinking the city is off on the wrong track
- those thinking city property taxes are about average
- Northwest Quadrant residents

“Used/likely” is mentioned more frequently by:

- those planning to move in six to ten years
- over sixty-four year olds
- Northeast Quadrant residents

***Blogs?***

Eighteen percent currently access blogs as a source of information:

NOT USED/LIKELY IN FUTURE.....	1%
NOT USED/NOT LIKELY.....	78%
NOT USED/DON'T KNOW.....	2%
USED/LIKELY IN FUTURE.....	13%
USED/NOT LIKELY.....	5%
USED/DON'T KNOW.....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Fourteen percent are likely to use blogs as a way to communicate with the City of Little Canada.

“Not used/not likely” is cited most often by:

- those thinking the city is off on the wrong track
- those thinking city property taxes are about average
- Northwest Quadrant residents

“Used/likely” is mentioned more frequently by:

- those planning to move in six to ten years

***Facebook?***

Forty-five percent are currently using Facebook as an information source:

NOT USED/LIKELY IN FUTURE.....	0%
NOT USED/NOT LIKELY.....	53%
NOT USED/DON'T NOW. ....	1%
USED/LIKELY IN FUTURE .....	33%
USED/NOT LIKELY.....	12%
USED/DON'T KNOW.....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Thirty-three percent are likely to use Facebook to communicate with the City of Little Canada.

“Not used/not likely” is cited most often by:

- those thinking city property taxes are about average
- over fifty-four year olds

“Used/likely” is mentioned more frequently by:

- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- empty nesters

***Twitter?***

Twenty-one percent currently use Twitter as a source of information:

NOT USED/LIKELY IN FUTURE.....	0%
NOT USED/NOT LIKELY.....	76%
NOT USED/DON'T NOW. ....	2%

USED/LIKELY IN FUTURE. ....	15%
USED/NOT LIKELY.....	6%
USED/DON'T KNOW.....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Fifteen percent are likely to use Twitter in future to communicate with the City of Little Canada.

“Not used/not likely” is cited most often by:

- those thinking the city is off on the wrong track
- over sixty-four year olds
- Northwest Quadrant residents

“Used/likely” is mentioned more frequently by:

- those planning to move in six to ten years
- Southeast Quadrant residents

---

## **Summary and Conclusions**

---

Seventy-two percent of the households in Little Canada have access to the Internet from their homes. Social media was evaluated as a means of communicating with the City of Little Canada. Facebook is the single social media promising use by a large percentage, 33%, of Internet users.

# **Chapter Eight: Concluding Thoughts**

## Concluding Thoughts

Little Canada residents are in a very optimistic and satisfied mood. This mood is linked to three widespread perceptions: high quality city services, extensive support for the direction of the city, and prudent concerns about taxes. These issues have positively impacted the quality of life ratings, strengthened the sense of community, and growing stability of residents within the community.

At the present time, residents are very satisfied with city services and city tax levels. In addition, they strongly support property tax increases for a number of projects: maintaining the current police presence at apartment buildings, replacing aging, but functional, playground equipment, completing city trail connections, and providing lighting along bicycle and pedestrian trails are supported by solid majorities of the residents. The current priorities appear to be directed toward public safety and enhancement of current recreation facilities.

Perspectives on city taxes are moderately conservative, but somewhat less conservative than suburban communities across the area. But, a majority of residents oppose a tax increase to maintain city services, if it were required to do so. This result is consistent with the general hostility toward taxes generated during the past year.

The summary phrase reflecting the current mode of residents is “affordable quality.” In other words, policies should reflect maintaining and improving upon the key values which define Little Canada, but should also address one growing need: a growing senior population that wants to remain in the community. Overall, though, Little Canada is among the best run and smoothly functioning suburbs within the Metropolitan Area. And, the City has one key advantage many other suburbs do not possess: a large reservoir of good will from past actions, as well as, solid confidence in the way present issues are being addressed.





Decision  
Resources Ltd.

**Survey**





Decision  
Resources Ltd.

**Graphics**

