

San José, CA

Trends over Time

2015



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



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

Summary

The National Citizen Survey™ (The NCS™) is a collaborative effort between National Research Center, Inc. (NRC) and the International City/County Management Association (ICMA). The survey and its administration are standardized to assure high quality research methods and directly comparable results across The NCS communities. The NCS captures residents' opinions within the three pillars of a community (Community Characteristics, Governance and Participation) across eight central facets of community (Safety, Mobility, Natural Environment, Built Environment, Economy, Recreation and Wellness, Education and Enrichment and Community Engagement). This report discusses trends over time, comparing the 2015 ratings for the City of San José to its previous survey results in 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014. Additional reports and technical appendices are available under separate cover.

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

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

Overall, ratings in San José for 2015 generally remained stable. Of the 129 items for which comparisons were available, 85 items were rated similarly in 2014 and 2015, 43 items showed a decrease in ratings and one showed an increase. Notable trends over time included the following:

- Overall quality of life, overall appearance of San José and overall image or reputation of San José received lower ratings in 2015 when compared to 2014.
- Within the facet of Safety, ratings decreased for feelings of safety downtown, fire prevention services, crime prevention and emergency preparedness while the rating for ambulance/EMS increased in 2015 compared to 2014. All other Safety ratings remained similar in 2015 compared to 2014.
- Fewer residents reported walking or biking instead of driving, being in very good to excellent health, volunteering and voting in local elections in 2015 compared to 2014.
- Within Community Characteristics, four Mobility ratings decreased including traffic flow, ease of travel by car, public parking and paths and walking trails. One Mobility rating within Governance decreased (traffic enforcement).
- Six of the seven aspects of Recreation and Wellness within Community Characteristics decreased in 2015 compared to 2014. These included fitness opportunities, recreational opportunities, healthcare, availability of affordable quality food, mental healthcare and preventative health services.

Table 1: Community Characteristics General

	Percen	t rating pos	sitively (e.g	., excellent	t/good)			Comp	oarison to bench	mark	
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2015 rating compared to 2014	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Overall quality of life	62%	60%	57%	59%	51%	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower
Overall image	51%	46%	43%	51%	41%	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower
Place to live	73%	64%	65%	71%	67%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower
Neighborhood	67%	64%	61%	67%	63%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower
Place to raise children	53%	63%	63%	53%	54%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower
Place to retire	26%	28%	28%	28%	20%	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
Overall appearance	54%	48%	43%	45%	34%	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower

Table 2: Community Characteristics by Facet

		Percen	٠.	sitively (e.g /somewhat		t/good,			Compa	rison to ben	chmark	
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2015 rating compared to 2014	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
	Overall feeling of safety	NA	NA	NA	46%	40%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower
	Safe in neighborhood	87%	84%	82%	83%	78%	Similar	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Lower
Safety	Safe downtown	71%	62%	58%	64%	57%	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower
	Overall ease of travel	NA	NA	NA	53%	48%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower
	Paths and walking trails	45%	45%	50%	56%	44%	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Lower
	Ease of walking	46%	53%	43%	52%	47%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Lower
	Travel by bicycle	37%	40%	34%	44%	39%	Similar	Lower	Lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar
	Travel by public transportation	48%	41%	42%	38%	34%	Similar	Similar	Lower	Lower	Similar	Similar
	Travel by car	40%	50%	40%	48%	40%	Lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Similar	Lower
	Public parking	NA	NA	NA	38%	27%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower
Mobility	Traffic flow	23%	26%	23%	32%	23%	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower
	Overall natural environment	43%	48%	44%	50%	43%	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower
	Cleanliness	52%	41%	40%	34%	25%	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
Natural Environment	Air quality	43%	48%	42%	41%	37%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower

		Percen		sitively (e.g somewhat		t/good,			Compa	rison to bend	hmark	
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2015 rating compared to 2014	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
	Overall built environment	NA	NA	NA	46%	41%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower
	New development in San José	58%	53%	49%	46%	44%	Similar	Similar	Lower	Lower	Similar	Similar
	Affordable quality housing	20%	21%	22%	15%	10%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Housing options	50%	39%	37%	34%	19%	Lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower
Built Environment	Public places	NA	NA	NA	50%	40%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower
	Overall economic health	NA	NA	NA	54%	52%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Vibrant downtown/commercial area	NA	NA	NA	40%	33%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Business and services	59%	66%	57%	58%	43%	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Cost of living	NA	NA	NA	11%	10%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower
	Shopping opportunities	76%	77%	75%	75%	70%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar
	Employment opportunities	46%	51%	45%	61%	53%	Lower	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Place to visit	NA	NA	NA	49%	43%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower
Economy	Place to work	66%	74%	68%	73%	71%	Similar	Higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Health and wellness	NA	NA	NA	61%	56%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower
	Mental health care	NA	NA	NA	42%	35%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Preventive health services	NA	NA	NA	55%	47%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Health care	28%	44%	32%	49%	42%	Lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Similar	Lower
	Food	52%	57%	50%	60%	49%	Lower	Lower	Similar	Much lower	Similar	Lower
	Recreational opportunities	53%	55%	57%	54%	39%	Lower	Lower	Lower	Lower	Similar	Lower
Recreation and Wellness	Fitness opportunities	NA	NA	NA	57%	47%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower
	Religious or spiritual events and activities	68%	60%	60%	69%	64%	Similar	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Lower
	Cultural/arts/music activities	64%	60%	53%	60%	52%	Lower	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Adult education	NA	NA	NA	53%	54%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	K-12 education	NA	NA	NA	48%	39%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower
Education and Enrichment	Child care/preschool	16%	27%	20%	45%	37%	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Lower

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

		Percen	٠.	sitively (e.g somewhat		t/good,			Compa	rison to bend	chmark	
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2015 rating compared to 2014	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
	Social events and activities	57%	46%	50%	56%	45%	Lower	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Similar
	Neighborliness	NA	NA	NA	41%	36%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower
	Openness and acceptance	67%	71%	60%	65%	60%	Similar	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Opportunities to participate in community matters	55%	53%	42%	53%	47%	Similar	Lower	Lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar
Community Engagement	Opportunities to volunteer	70%	61%	57%	62%	59%	Similar	Similar	Lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar

Table 3: Governance General

			nting posit cellent/go		,	2015 rating compared to		Compar	ison to bench	mark	
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2014	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Services provided by San José	46%	42%	45%	54%	48%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower
Customer service	57%	53%	64%	46%	39%	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Much lower
Value of services for taxes paid	26%	28%	32%	29%	25%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower
Overall direction	31%	35%	37%	41%	37%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower
Welcoming citizen involvement	38%	37%	26%	37%	31%	Lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Lower
Confidence in City government	NA	NA	NA	32%	30%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower
Acting in the best interest of San José	NA	NA	NA	40%	31%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower
Being honest	NA	NA	NA	38%	30%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower
Treating all residents fairly	NA	NA	NA	38%	31%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower
Services provided by the Federal Government	33%	32%	34%	40%	34%	Lower	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar

Table 4: Governance by Facet

		F	Percent ra	ting posit cellent/go		٠,	2015 11		Comp	arison to bend	shmark	
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2015 rating compared to 2014	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
		2011	2012	2013	2017	2013	10 2014	Much	Much	Much	Much	Much
	Police	61%	54%	51%	46%	44%	Similar	lower	lower	lower	lower	lower
	T Glice	0170	3170	3170	1070	1170	Olithia	101161	Much	Much	101161	10110
	Fire	84%	80%	81%	75%	74%	Similar	Lower	lower	lower	Lower	Lowe
									Much	Much		
	Ambulance/EMS	83%	73%	73%	68%	76%	Higher	Lower	lower	lower	Lower	Lowe
								Much	Much	Much	Much	Mucl
	Crime prevention	38%	28%	33%	31%	25%	Lower	lower	lower	lower	lower	lowe
								Much	Much	Much		
	Fire prevention	58%	56%	52%	54%	46%	Lower	lower	lower	lower	Lower	Lowe
		460/	450/	460/	400/	4.407	C: 'I		Much	Much	6: "	6: "
	Animal control	46%	45%	46%	49%	44%	Similar	Lower	lower	lower	Similar	Simil
Safety	Emergency preparedness	37%	37%	29%	46%	37%	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lowe
Salety	Efficiency preparedness	37 70	3770	2570	7070	37 70	LOWEI	Much	Much	Much	Lowei	Muc
	Traffic enforcement	57%	37%	43%	40%	29%	Lower	lower	lower	lower	Lower	lowe
	Traine emoreement	37 70	37 70	13 70	1070	2570	Lower	Much	Much	Much	LOVVCI	10110
	Street repair	21%	15%	29%	28%	24%	Similar	lower	lower	lower	Lower	Lowe
								Much	Much	Much		
	Street cleaning	42%	32%	45%	34%	35%	Similar	lower	lower	lower	Lower	Lowe
								Much	Much	Much		
	Street lighting	42%	35%	46%	40%	45%	Similar	lower	lower	lower	Lower	Simil
								Much	Much	Much		
	Sidewalk maintenance	35%	30%	43%	35%	30%	Similar	lower	lower	lower	Lower	Lowe
	Traffic signal timing	34%	37%	42%	43%	37%	Similar	Lower	Lower	Lower	Similar	Simila
Mobility	Bus or transit services	50%	43%	55%	46%	52%	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Simil
	Garbage collection	74%	77%	77%	71%	72%	Similar	Lower	Lower	Lower	Similar	Simil
	Recycling	74%	78%	79%	71%	72%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Simil
	Yard waste pick-up	76%	72%	68%	70%	66%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar	Simil
								Much	Much	Much		
	Drinking water	51%	53%	53%	52%	52%	Similar	lower	lower	lower	Lower	Lowe
	Natural areas							Much	Much	Much		
Natural Environment	preservation	38%	35%	41%	40%	38%	Similar	lower	lower	lower	Lower	Lowe
	Storm drainage	55%	54%	59%	53%	48%	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Simil
		F00/	F00/	650/	F00/	F00/	C: 'I	Much	Much	Much	6: "	6: "
	Sewer services	58%	59%	65%	59%	59%	Similar	lower	lower	lower	Similar	Simil
	Utility billing	NA	NA	NA	50%	53%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Simil
Built Environment	Land use, planning and zoning	32%	34%	34%	34%	34%	Similar	Lower	Lower	Much lower	Similar	Simil

		F		ting posit cellent/go	cively (e.g od)	.,	2015 rating compared		Compa	arison to bend	chmark	
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	to 2014	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
	Code enforcement	28%	25%	37%	32%	22%	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Cable television	NA	NA	NA	41%	42%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
Economy	Economic development	32%	34%	28%	48%	42%	Similar	Lower	Lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar
	City parks	68%	55%	64%	61%	56%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower
	Recreation programs	52%	43%	44%	56%	50%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower
Recreation and Wellness	Recreation centers	54%	43%	48%	55%	48%	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower
Education and Enrichment	Public libraries	68%	62%	62%	66%	69%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower
Community Engagement	Public information	43%	44%	40%	51%	47%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Lower

Table 5: Participation General

Tubic 3: Turticipation	Certeral										
	Percent rati	ng positively (e	.g., always/sor month, yes)	metimes, more	than once a	2015 rating compared to		Compar	ison to bench	ımark	
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2014	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Sense of community	36%	42%	37%	36%	32%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower
Recommend San José	80%	75%	78%	71%	66%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower
Remain in San José	83%	81%	80%	82%	77%	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
Contacted San José employees	32%	30%	45%	44%	40%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Similar

Table 6: Participation by Facet

		Percen	t rating posi	tively (e.g., n once a mo		etimes,	2015		Compar	ison to bend	hmark	
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2015 rating compared to 2014	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
	Stocked supplies for an emergency	NA	NA	NA	49%	51%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Higher
	Did NOT report a crime	NA	NA	NA	69%	65%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower
Safety	Was NOT the victim of a crime	88%	88%	73%	81%	79%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Much lower	Similar	Similar
	Used public transportation instead of driving	NA	NA	NA	48%	48%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Much higher
	Carpooled instead of driving alone	NA	NA	NA	60%	63%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Higher
Mobility	Walked or biked instead of driving	NA	NA	NA	65%	57%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Conserved water	NA	NA	NA	97%	98%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Higher
	Made home more energy efficient	NA	NA	NA	85%	81%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
Natural Environment	Recycled at home	96%	93%	95%	96%	95%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar
	Did NOT observe a code violation	NA	NA	NA	45%	43%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower
Built Environment	NOT under housing cost stress	41%	48%	37%	49%	51%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower
	Purchased goods or services in San José	NA	NA	NA	98%	96%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Economy will have positive impact on income	16%	26%	29%	37%	37%	Similar	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar
Economy	Work in San José	NA	NA	NA	55%	52%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar
	Used San José recreation centers	49%	42%	44%	51%	51%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar
	Visited a City park	86%	89%	92%	87%	87%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar
	Ate 5 portions of fruits and vegetables	NA	NA	NA	88%	84%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Participated in moderate or vigorous physical activity	NA	NA	NA	89%	87%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
Recreation and Wellness	In very good to excellent health	NA	NA	NA	64%	56%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Used San José public libraries	74%	70%	68%	63%	64%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Participated in religious or spiritual activities	49%	50%	48%	50%	48%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Education and Enrichment	Attended a City-sponsored event	NA	NA	NA	40%	39%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower

		Percen	t rating posi more tha	itively (e.g., in once a mo		netimes,	2015 rating		Compar	ison to bend	hmark	
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	compared to 2014	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
	Campaigned for an issue, cause or candidate	NA	NA	NA	27%	22%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Contacted San José elected officials	NA	NA	NA	19%	18%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Volunteered	37%	43%	43%	46%	39%	Lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Participated in a club	27%	26%	28%	29%	33%	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Talked to or visited with neighbors	NA	NA	NA	84%	82%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Done a favor for a neighbor	NA	NA	NA	71%	75%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Similar
	Attended a local public meeting	18%	15%	19%	19%	18%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Similar
	Watched a local public meeting	27%	25%	28%	20%	19%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower
	Read or watched local news	NA	NA	NA	87%	86%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
Community Engagement	Voted in local elections	66%	66%	66%	82%	74%	Lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar

Table 7: Safety after Dark

	Percent "Very safe"	or "Somewhat safe"
Please rate how safe or unsafe you feel:	2014	2015
In San José's downtown after dark	27%	21%
In your neighborhood after dark	66%	55%

Table 8: Safe from Violent or Property Crimes

	Percent "Very safe"	or "Somewhat safe"
Please rate how safe or unsafe you feel from the following:	2014	2015
Property crimes	41%	35%
Violent crime (e.g. rape, assault, robbery)	53%	49%

Table 9: City Website Use

	Percent "At least once a month"	
In the last 12 months, about how many times, if at all, have you or other household members done each of the following in San José:	2014	2015
Used the City's website to conduct business or pay bills	35%	38%
Visited the City of San José website (at www.sanjoseca.gov)	50%	52%

Table 10: Additional City Services

	Percent "Excel	Percent "Excellent" or "Good"	
Please rate the quality of each of the following services in San José:	2014	2015	
Graffiti removal	30%	25%	
Gang prevention efforts	30%	25%	
Services to low-income people	32%	37%	
Street tree maintenance	34%	33%	
Building permit services	43%	38%	
Services to youth	45%	41%	
Services to seniors	50%	46%	
Availability of flights at Mineta San José International Airport	70%	65%	
Overall ease of using Mineta San José International Airport	74%	73%	

Table 11: State and County Government

Overall, how would you rate the quality of the services provided by each of the following?	Percent "Exce	Percent "Excellent" or "Good"	
	2014	2015	
The State Government	38%	35%	
Santa Clara County Government	47%	44%	