

**CITY OF WOODINVILLE**  
**COMMUNITY OPINION SURVEY**  
**2004**

**FINAL REPORT**

**Prepared for**

**WOODINVILLE CITY COUNCIL**  
**and**  
**PETE ROSE, CITY MANAGER**

**Prepared by**

**Dr. Gary L. Peterson**  
**Sound Communication**

**July 7, 2004**

July 7, 2004

Mr. Pete Rose, City Manager, and  
Woodinville City Council  
17301 133<sup>rd</sup> Ave. N.E.,  
Woodinville, WA 98072

Dear Manager Rose and Council members:

Attached you will find my report of the Community Opinion Survey conducted for the City of Woodinville during the month of May 2004. The survey addressed questions in several primary areas desired by the City.

The report is structured so that you might see the Background, Purpose, and Methodology of the study, and locate readily the Conclusions, Recommendations, and Findings. Raw data in the form of statistical tables and citizen verbatim comments are included in Appendix materials.

You should find much in the report to identify those areas where residents of the City of Woodinville provide their expressions of City government effectiveness as well as areas of concern. The survey offered an avenue of expression of opinion which many took advantage of. They voiced criticisms, they identified areas of dissatisfaction, and they expressed their concerns. These concerns along with the strengths have been highlighted for you in the report format. It is my hope and my recommendation that you will make this report and its results widely available to the residents whose opinions were asked—who made responses in good faith that their input was valuable and would command attention.

My appreciation is extended to City Manager Rose, to your Communications Coordinator Marie Stake, and to other city staff members who may have assisted in providing information needed for the study. My survey team members provided insight into the survey operations as well as doing the extensive phone calling. In addition, I express appreciation to Mr. Bradford Peterson of Redmond, WA for the management of quantitative data entry and analysis.

It is my hope that this report will provide ample data and insight to assist you in setting policy and in implementing improvements which will help make governance in the City of Woodinville ever better.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary L. Peterson, project director  
Sound Communication

City of Woodinville Final Report

## Table of Contents

---

	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	
<b>Background, Purpose, and Methodology</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Scope and Limitations</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Findings</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Demographics</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Appendix A: Survey Questions Script</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Appendix B: Survey Answer Sheet</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Appendix C: Survey Comments</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>Appendix D: Charts / Tables</b>	<b>62</b>

# **CITY OF WOODINVILLE COMMUNITY SURVEY 2004**

## **FINAL REPORT**

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

#### **Background, Purpose, and Methodology**

In 2004, a request was made by the City of Woodinville to conduct an opinion survey of residents. Proposed questions for a phone survey were reviewed and approved by City Council and city administrators. The phone survey was to be conducted by Sound Communication during the spring of 2004.

Using a 2004 publication reverse directory of the region, a pool of 2218 phone numbers was drawn to constitute the survey sample. The list was sorted into regions corresponding to sectors of the City to identify the Leota, The Wedge, West Ridge, and Town Center areas. This process guaranteed that the survey would make phone calls to every neighborhood in the city. Total completed survey responses produced fifty-three percent male and forty-seven percent female respondents, a variance of less than one percent in the Woodinville census ratios of male and female. In the data gathering, if the person whose name appeared in the directory did not answer or was not present, another adult respondent was asked to complete the survey.

The response rate for this phone survey was lower than the recent phone survey experience of the consultant contractor. Over 1900 phone calls were logged, which included busy signals, no answer, disconnected phone, wrong number, message recorder, refusals, call-backs, and answered surveys. Many phone numbers where the initial call produced a busy signal, or a no answer, or even a message recorder, were called repeatedly. Those repeated calls yielded few additional completed surveys. The total number of completed and valid surveys was 281. The response rate for those persons who actually answered the phone was 41%. The final ratio of all calls made to completed surveys was approximately 6.85: 1, or nearly seven total calls to produce one valid survey. A decrease in response rate is attributed primarily to increases in the use of Caller ID and message recorders to screen calls, and to greater reluctance to respond to surveys in a "Do Not Call" atmosphere which is of recent origin.

The target goal for this survey was to obtain a sample sufficient in size to warrant a confidence level of plus or minus 5% (+/-5%). Using the Woodinville census data of available telephones in occupied households, the sample necessary to provide the desired confidence level was 278 responses. The final sample obtained provides an overall confidence level of +/-5%. Statistical significance of results are reported in the findings of this research based on that confidence level, where a difference, for instance, of .05 means that there is a 95% likelihood that the difference is in fact attributable to the variable examined. Many specific statistical measures did provide confidence levels greater than the .05 goal. Those results will be documented in the survey findings and in the electronic spreadsheet document. It is important to recognize that although statistical comparisons do not always produce a result that allows a reliable or confident interpretation of relationships or effects, even so an examination of the data can show trends and patterns that may be of value for the City to evaluate further.

The telephone survey was conducted during the evenings of May 18, 19 and 20, 2004, using phone lines provided by the City of Woodinville. Additional follow-up calls were placed both daytime and evenings for a short period beyond the evening calls. Phone survey team members were provided calling phone lists, with survey questions and answer sheets for the responses (samples attached as Appendix A and Appendix B). A standard survey identification procedure was used for all calls. Information sheets were available so survey team members could answer salient questions about who was conducting the survey, survey purposes, how a respondent could verify authenticity of the survey, etc. Respondents were all asked the same questions, in the same order or pattern. Several questions consisted of statements that called for a choice of responses on a ten-point rating scale. Some questions offered forced-choice responses, with some open-ended in design, asking the respondent to provide an answer that was not given in any list or prompting. To facilitate recording of those open-end questions, the answer sheets contained lists of what were expected to be possible or probable responses. Survey team members were thus required to do a minimum of writing out of volunteered answers. Volunteered comments, however, were written as near verbatim as the survey caller could do within the context of the overall call.

Completed survey forms were coded for computer data entry, and all items capable of objective, mathematical analysis were entered and then analyzed using a Microsoft Excel

statistical package instrument. The statistical analysis provided percentages, means, analysis of variance (ANOVA) of desired variables, and distribution of responses. Statistical analysis results are reported in **Table** format in the text, and in **Chart** form as Appendix materials. Computer printouts are also provided in a separate **Appendix -- Tables**. Respondent comments were also compiled for open-end questions or where other comments were made. These additional comments entered onto the answer sheets by the survey team also have been analyzed for themes and patterns, and those are included in the text of the report. The total list of comments is provided in the report, by appropriate Question Number, as **Appendix C** material.

### **Scope and Limitations of the Study**

Telephone surveys ask respondents to share attitudes, opinions, perceptions, and limited personal information that would help obtain a profile of those who participated. There was no additional effort to verify the accuracy of such self-reported data. Although the research survey team used names and telephone numbers, names were not recorded in data gathering, and respondents were clearly informed of the confidentiality of their answers. Once the Answer Sheets were completed, they were separated from the calling list, so answers cannot be traced to a particular individual or phone number. This entire process helped assure honesty and accuracy. Overall the number of calls reaching a message recorder, a disconnected or wrong number message, no answer at all, and outright refusals to participate were at a higher rate than other recent telephone surveys conducted by Sound Communication. Much was openly provided, however, and citizens who agreed to take the survey volunteered useful opinions and comments.

Sound Communication's primary duty for this project was to serve as data gatherer and compiler, and then to identify and describe themes, patterns, highlights, relationships, correlations, and particularly significant issues arising from the data. Where the questions and responses were identical or similar to questions included in the 2002 survey, comparisons have been made in the final report. Conclusions have been drawn and recommendations made when the findings of the study have appeared, in the consultant's judgment, to warrant attention. The **Appendix – Tables** section of the report covers information pertaining to every question in either numerical or textual form. The electronic version of the spreadsheet of answers and charts provides additional details beyond the scope of the primary variables examined for this study.

Finally, conclusions and recommendations made herein are the educated and considered opinions of this analyst. The City Council and city administrators and staff have full right and responsibility to review the results of the survey and to make decisions about accepting, rejecting, or implementing any recommendations. The report is submitted in confidence that the data will clearly indicate and warrant the conclusions made, and that suggested action steps might be appropriate.

## II. CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions provided here have been reached after analysis of the survey data. In some instances, a conclusion will refer to data essentially from a single survey question. More often, the conclusions will be made after examining interactions and relationships across several survey questions and respondent comments. It is important to recognize that the conclusions contained herein, and the recommendations that follow are based on the perceptions and opinions of those who responded to the survey. What respondents gave when they were asked the questions are just that -- their *perceptions*--their versions of reality about the workings of the City of Woodinville. The reader will need to refer to report "Findings," below--which are a summary--and to Tables and Appendix comments in order to locate all the details from which the conclusions have been generated.

1. There is an overall positive attitude toward the quality of life in Woodinville. Over 95% of the respondents in this survey rated Woodinville's quality of life as 6 or higher. Residents see the city as a great place to raise children, a safe place, with beauty in the natural environment. They enjoy the parks and open spaces, and feel positive about city government services.

2. Residents describe Woodinville primarily in positive terms. The use of terms such as "friendly," "pleasant," "nice place to live," "comfortable," are consistent with their overall rating of quality of life and satisfaction with government services.

3. Residents have an overall favorable opinion of city government. Over 77% of the respondents in the survey gave satisfaction ratings of 6 or higher for government services. There

are particularly high satisfaction marks for police services, communications, and for a helpful, friendly atmosphere in dealing with city staff members.

4. There appears to be a solid level of support for downtown public investments to add grid roads, parks, and pedestrian connections. These items are among those things Woodinville residents say would make downtown more appealing.

5. Residents express strong support of capital improvements which will improve the roadways, fix intersections and other congestion points, and provide new roadways into the important central areas of town. They support as well local parks and trails as improved connections to neighborhoods.

6. Woodinville residents desire recreation services, programs, and facilities that will focus primarily on youth and teens. Four of the top five recommendations for important needs in the city were directed to youth. A swimming pool is a much-needed recommendation. Residents also want additional and improved parking at Gateway Park as well as other downtown areas where programs are regularly held.

7. While a significant portion of the residents expressed the attitude that they are unwilling to add any funding burden through bonds or other taxes, still there were many who affirmed the certain projects should have a priority for completion.

8. Traffic congestion and related problems with parking remain the major concern of Woodinville residents. Comments about the traffic and roads surfaced across many of the questions asked in the survey.

9. While satisfaction with city government services is generally positive, there are areas where residents feel they are not listened to, where the city has seemingly made up its mind about a priority, where paper work and flow is unwieldy. These comments did not surface often, but they do represent issues seen by some citizens.

10. While residents give high marks for the quality of life in Woodinville, they often also point out the things that signal danger to that satisfaction. Congestion and traffic have been

clearly signaled, but concerns also appear about growth management, about the rural, small town atmosphere being threatened, about lack of variety in shopping, and about planning or lack of planning that seems to push Woodinville in the direction of “every other city in the U.S.” These concerns appear to be the very things most likely to infringe upon those qualities citizens most appreciate about living in Woodinville.

11. When Woodinville citizens were asked to compare their quality of life with two years earlier, there were mixed reviews. Only 5% felt considerable improvement, and 28% saw some improvement. Twenty percent reported decreased quality of life, and nearly half saw no real change.

12. There remains reluctance of Woodinville residents to consider increasing their funding support for city projects. When asked to rate priority for funding options for even desired capital improvements, the NIMP! (Not in My Pocketbook!) factor clearly surfaced. Residents do not want property tax increases nor do they favor utility tax increases. While there are indeed improvements that are desired and much needed in the city, these positions about funding improvements in the City of Woodinville must be a concern.

### **III. RECOMMENDATIONS**

The following recommendations are based strictly upon what has come from the findings of this survey. No claims are made about special knowledge of City of Woodinville policies, of programs, or efforts currently being made. Some of the suggestions may already be operating to some degree. There is no special knowledge either about existing constraints under which the city operates. It is the writer's judgment that recommendations provided here are warranted by the data and by the conclusions drawn.

1. The City of Woodinville should acknowledge the nature of the very positive findings of this survey and as well the critical responses received through this research. Disseminate the conclusions and findings widely, and invite additional response. While many individuals and households were called and asked to respond, most other residents were not reached via phone calls and messages. They may well wish to add their input. That input can serve to confirm, or to strengthen or challenge results obtained from the sample responses obtained during the survey.

2. The City should take advantage of this excellent opportunity to promote the positive features of The City of Woodinville. What comes from this research is what the residents have contributed. These are not manufactured “Good News” stories by a self-serving municipality. The people who live here have spoken these positive findings. Their credibility should not be underestimated.

3. The City should continue to explore ways to engage in communication and contact with those who rent—a substantial proportion of the residents of the City of Woodinville, but who are under-represented in this form of survey. Renters have indicated with their survey responses that they may well possess a strong base of support and potential support for city actions. Renters traditionally do not identify closely with governing entities. They tend not to be as knowledgeable or involved. Much happens in municipal decisions that affect renters, but possible interactions are usually indirect or totally unknown. Perhaps many of the findings of this survey coming from renters were in fact given without a strong base of personal knowledge. Many of the opinions reported, however, were positive in nature, and this important part of the city’s residents should be urged and assisted in becoming more directly involved.

4. The City should make certain that there is both public and private recognition given to groups, agencies, departments, services, or programs that have received generally positive public expressions. If there are still improvements needed in customer satisfaction, those improvements are more likely to occur if there has been acclaim for what was done well.

5. The City should continue to emphasize customer satisfaction in all City interactions with Woodinville citizens. The City’s reputation for good or ill is determined not just by the aggregate of all responses gathered, for instance, by research such as this survey. That reputation is established one interaction at a time, and is then magnified and multiplied by whatever that one individual’s experience might be. One “unhappy customer” [read citizen] is likely to become a household or neighborhood or workplace negative feeling about whatever agency or department was involved in the initial incident. The simple fact that the City is willing to be accountable for its policies and actions will speak volumes to the residents.

6. The City should explore how to balance what appears to be a significant base of citizen support for needed City improvement initiatives with the reluctance to face funding to accomplish good things. Campaigns to fund and achieve needed / desired projects can be successful, if 1) supportive and credible community opinion leaders can be identified and brought on board as citizen steering committees or project members; 2) every avenue to get citizen input and review is used and re-used; 3) standard and new approaches are used to notify, clarify, and explain proposals up-front; 4) citizen advocates are marshaled to broaden the base of understanding and support.

#### **IV. FINDINGS**

The survey findings listed below summarize the results of the telephone survey interviews conducted with residents of Woodinville, on May 18-20, 2004, with follow-up calls made over the next two days as well. Findings are arranged in the order of the questions on the survey form. Results will discuss both the overall question responses, usually expressed as an overall mean or average of responses to the questions using a rating scale. In addition, the significant findings of the cross-tabulations or analysis of variance (ANOVA) made for other variables in the survey will be presented. Where feasible, information will be placed in **Table** format in the text of this section. More extensive data may be placed in the Appendices and will be so noted by Appendix designation, by **Chart** number or **Table** number. A copy of the survey questions is found in **Appendix A**; the answer sheet used is **Appendix B**. Open-end comments or answers have been compiled and are included, by question number, in **Appendix C**. Fully detailed materials for every question—in electronic form—are also available and provided to the City.

##### **I. THE MASTER PLAN FOR THE CIVIC CENTER, INCLUDING PARKS AND RECREATION**

*Question 1: In keeping with the vision of the 2001 Civic Center Master Plan, which of the following components is most important to you and your family?*

Respondents were read components of the Civic Center Master Plan, and were asked to select the most important item to them. This forced-choice scale provides a sense of collective priority but does not require each respondent to rank order all the items together. Over eighty-six percent of the respondents answered this question. There was no overwhelming choice of the residents;

however, “Additional parking for Wilmot Park and the ball fields” was most frequently chosen (28.7% of the responses). “Upgrade the existing interim Community Recreation Center” had 23.4% of the responses, and “Renovating the Old Woodinville School on NE 175<sup>th</sup> Street for community use” received an additional 20.5%. **Table 1** below shows the full frequency counts and percentages for each option, and includes the number of “Other” responses received as well as the number of “Missing” or not responding to this particular question.

**Table 1: In keeping with the vision of the 2001 Civic Center Master Plan, which of the following components is most important to you and your family?**

Q1 Table In Civic Center Master Plan, which is most important to you?							
Q1							
	Value	Frequ.	%	Valid %	Cumulative %	2002 Survey	
Valid	244	A Upgrade ball fields	36	12.8	14.8	14.8	28.2
		B Add parking at Wilmot	70	24.9	28.7	43.4	
		C Renovate Old Wdvl. Sch.	50	17.8	20.5	63.9	* 6.3
		D Build new Comm. Center.	24	8.5	9.8	73.8	17.6
		E Upgrade interim C.Center	57	20.3	23.4	97.1	20.8
		Other	7	2.5	2.9	100.0	
Missing	37	NR	37	13.2	100.0		
Total	281		281	100.0		* Wording changed	

**2002 Survey Comparisons:**

This initial survey question framed options slightly different than a related question in the 2002 Woodinville Opinion Survey. The 2002 survey combined the options included in the table above as A and B. Separated, the two choices received 43.4% of the responses from citizens in this 2004 question. Response numbers for options D and E, above, show variations in choices, particularly with fewer respondents preferring to build a new community center in 2004. Option C above was also framed differently in 2002, where it asked about the preference for “retrofitting the Old School House on NE 175<sup>th</sup> Street to be earthquake safe.” More residents in 2004 appear to consider “renovating” a reasonable action.

**Question 2: What are the 3 most important recreation program services needed in Woodinville?**

Ninety-one percent (91.1%) of the respondents answered this question. A list of possible answers was read to the respondent, and they were instructed they could select up to three of the options. There was no ranking indicated. There were 558 total responses made by the 256 citizens who answered the question, so the respondents averaged 2.18 choices each. The “Chosen %” in **Table 2** below represents the percentage of 256 respondents. The most frequently preferred choices (over ¼ of the respondents each) were, in order: “after school programs for youth,” “teen events and programs,” “special events,” and “sports for youth during the school year.” “Summer camps for Teens/Youth” and “Adult Sports Leagues” were also commonly selected (22.7% each). Programs for teens and youth were particularly singled out for respondent recommendation.

**Table 2: What are the 3 most important recreation program services needed in Woodinville?**

Q2 Table		What are the 3 Most Important Recreation Program Services Needed in Woodinville?		
Q2				
		Value	Frequency	%
Valid	256	A Special Events (Concerts, July 4)	72	28.1
		B Adult Sports Leagues	58	22.7
		C After School Programs for Youth	104	40.6
		D Teen Events/Programs	84	32.8
		E Programs for Special Need Youth	41	16.0
		F Parent Educ/Toddler Programs	32	12.5
		G Summer Camps for Teen/Youth	58	22.7
		H Perf/Fine Arts Programs--All ages	43	16.8
		I Sports for Youth during School yr.	66	25.8
Missing	25	NR	25	
Total	281			

**Question 3: What are the three most important recreation facilities needed in Woodinville?**

This question was an “Open-End” question, with no lists read or promptings made to the respondents. Over eighty percent (80.8%) of the respondents answered this question, with the

total number of items mentioned being 396, or 1.74 responses per individual. Possible or probable responses were pre-printed on the answer sheet to simplify recording of the answers, and nearly three-quarters of the responses made fell into one of those categories. The other quarter (28.5%) mentioned something not included in the pre-printed answer list. Of all responses the foremost recommendation was for a “swimming pool (an answer for 32.8% of the respondents. Second most frequent response was “Other,” meaning something other than the printed possible answers. Second single-most response was “sports fields,” followed by “additional parks,” “open space and trails,” “a community recreation center,” and “a teen center.” The most often-mentioned “other” recreation facility suggested was “tennis courts.”

Table 3 portrays the frequency of items mentioned and the percentage of respondents who selected each item. All “Other” references are listed in **Appendix C**, under **Other Suggestions --Question 3**.

**Table 3: What are the three most important recreation facilities needed in Woodinville?**

Q3 Table				
What are the three most important recreation facilities needed in Woodinville?				
Q3				
	Value	Frequency	Chosen %	
Valid	227	A. Open space and trails	41	16.0
		B. Sports fields	71	27.7
		C. Community Recreation Center	30	11.7
		D. Teen Center	37	14.5
		E. Additional Parks	42	16.4
		F. Swimming Pool	84	32.8
		G. Gymnasium	14	5.5
		H. Weight Room / weight training area	4	1.6
		Other	73	28.5
Missing	54	NR	54	
Total	281			

***Question 4: How often do you currently participate in recreation or sport programs offered by the City of Woodinville?***

This survey question sought to identify the range of citizen participation in City-sponsored or promoted recreation programs. All but eleven participants in the survey (97.2%)

responded to the question. A strong majority (60.4%) reported they never participate in such programs. Another twenty percent indicated occasional participation, leaving less than one-fifth who reported participation 3 or 4 or more times a year. **Table 4** shows the distribution of responses for the question.

**Table 4: How often do you currently participate in recreation or sport programs offered by the City of Woodinville?**

Q4 Table						
How often do you currently participate in recreation or sport programs offered by the City of Woodinville?						
Q4						
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	275	A. At least monthly	35	12.5	12.7	12.7
		B. 5-6 times a year	8	2.8	2.9	15.6
		C. 3-4 times a year	11	3.9	4.0	19.6
		D. Occasionally, but less than three times a year	55	19.6	20.0	39.6
		E. Never	166	59.1	60.4	100.0
Missing	6	NR	6	2.1	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0		

***Question 5: What is your reason for not participating in recreation programs offered by the city?***

This question was intended as a follow-up to the preceding one, to identify what reasons non-participants in City-sponsored recreation or sports gave for not being involved. This was an open-end question, and survey team members were instructed to record up to three volunteered comments by the respondents. Ninety-seven percent (97.7%) of those who said “Never” to Question 4 provided their reasons for not participating. There were four major reasons listed, although none of those reasons consisted of as much as 15% of all answers. The four primary reasons were: “not aware,” “not interested,” “no time,” and “use programs elsewhere.” **Table 5** displays the distribution of responses across the projected answers. The most common “other” references were: “children are grown,” “I do my own stuff,” “limited choices for seniors,” and “illness/injury.” Others who provided differing comments are listed in **Appendix C. Question 5 Comments.**

**Table 5: What is your reason for not participating in recreation programs offered by the city?**

Q5 Table What is your reason for not participating in recreation programs offered by the city?						
Q5						
	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	155	A. Not aware of the programs offered	24	14.5	15.5	15.5
		B. Use programs or services elsewhere	21	12.7	13.5	29.0
		C. Not interested in the activities offered	23	13.9	14.8	43.9
		D. Too expensive	5	3.0	3.2	47.1
		E. Need child care in order to participate	1	0.6	0.6	47.7
		F. Classes or programs always seem full	0	0.0	0.0	47.7
		G. Lack of transportation to locations	0	0.0	0.0	47.7
		H. Not offered at useful locations/times	8	4.8	5.2	52.9
		I. No time/too busy	23	13.9	14.8	67.7
		J. Too old	15	9.0	9.7	77.4
		Other	35	21.1	22.6	100.0
	Missing	11	NR	11	6.6	100.0
Total	166		166	100.0		

**Question 6: If the city were to place a recreation-oriented bond measure before the voters, which project of the six I will read should have the highest priority? Use a 0-10 point scale to rate each.**

This last question about recreation was also the first in a series of scaled-item questions used in the survey and is capable of serving as a baseline question - to be asked in the same way across subsequent surveys and across time. These questions using a scaled response will all be reported with a Table in the text showing data from this survey. In addition, the “mean” or average rating, the “median” or numeric middle of all ratings, and the “mode,” or most frequent number given in the ratings, will be provided in the findings for each question. Where a question has already been asked in a previous survey, this report will provide those numbers for comparison. In some cases, data will be reported in extended table form in the **Appendix D—Charts and Tables** showing full distribution of the responses.

*Demographic Comparisons: Unusually high or low ratings within a variable category will be listed after a frequency table for most questions using a rating or ranking scale. Major variances or patterns of responses will be mentioned, and those that are statistically significant will be especially noted, with indication of degree of confidence or range for error. It is important to note that because the number of responses in some category sub-groups may be rather small, achieving statistical significance will be more difficult.*

Survey respondents were given six potential recreation-oriented projects and asked to rate each of the six on a priority scale. Each project has a separate table provided, detailing the frequency of responses for all points of the 0-10 scale.

**Question 6a** asked specifically what kind of priority should be given to “Facility Improvements at Woodinville Community Center.” Mean response for this question was 5.72, with 22% below the median 5, and 54% above. The modal score, the most frequently marked score, was 5. **Table 6a** shows full distribution.

**Table 6a: Facility Improvements at Woodinville Community Center**

Facility improvements at Woodinville Community Center						
Q6a Table						
Q6a						
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	216	0	11	3.9	5.1	5.1
		1	4	1.4	1.9	6.9
		2	6	2.1	2.8	9.7
		3	12	4.3	5.6	15.3
		4	14	5.0	6.5	21.8
		5	53	18.9	24.5	46.3
		6	30	10.7	13.9	60.2
		7	38	13.5	17.6	77.8
		8	29	10.3	13.4	91.2
		9	6	2.1	2.8	94.0
		10	13	4.6	6.0	100.0
Missing	65	NR	65	23.1	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean: 5.72	

*Demographic Comparisons: There were no significant differences between the groups that rated this question.*

**Question 6b** asked for a priority rating for “Parking improvements at City Sports Fields and Wilmot Gateway Park.” Mean rating for this option was 6.34, second highest in the list of possible improvements. Of the responses, 22% were below the median and 66% above the median. The mode was 7. **Table 6b** shows full distribution of all responses.

**Table 6b: Parking improvements at City Sports Fields and Wilmot Gateway Park**

Parking improvements at City sports fields and Wilmot Gateway Park						
Q6b Table						
Q6b						
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	226	0	9	3.2	4.0	4.0
		1	3	1.1	1.3	5.3
		2	10	3.6	4.4	9.7
		3	12	4.3	5.3	15.0
		4	16	5.7	7.1	22.1
		5	27	9.6	11.9	34.1
		6	25	8.9	11.1	45.1
		7	42	14.9	18.6	63.7
		8	35	12.5	15.5	79.2
		9	19	6.8	8.4	87.6
				10	28	10.0
Missing	55	NR	55	19.6	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean: 6.34	

*Demographic Comparisons: While there were moderate differences in the way this question was answered across all demographic variables, the only statistically significant difference was between neighborhood areas. That difference was as follows:*

- Residents from The Wedge had a mean rating of 7.19; residents from Leota: 5.49. This difference was significant at the .017 level of confidence. [Note: Leota neighborhood residents consistently rated issues examined in this survey lower than other neighborhoods]*

**Question 6c:** New Gym and Fitness Building at Community Center. Mean rating overall for this facility was 5.50, with 21% the ratings below the median and 53% above. Rating mode was 5.

**Table 6c** below illustrates the range of ratings.

**Table6c: New Gym and Fitness Building at Community Center**

New Gym and fitness building at Community Center						
Q6c Table						
Q6c						
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	222	0	13	4.6	5.9	5.9
		1	6	2.1	2.7	8.6
		2	12	4.3	5.4	14.0
		3	16	5.7	7.2	21.2
		4	11	3.9	5.0	26.1
		5	48	17.1	21.6	47.7
		6	37	13.2	16.7	64.4
		7	29	10.3	13.1	77.5
		8	27	9.6	12.2	89.6
		9	12	4.3	5.4	95.0
		10	11	3.9	5.0	100.0
Missing	59	NR	59	21.0	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean: 5.50	

*Demographic Comparisons: There were no statistically significant differences between the demographic variable groups for this measure.*

**Question 6d** asked respondents to indicate where New Neighborhood Parks would be in their priority list. Overall mean rating for this question was 6.13, with 25% below the median point, and 60% above. The rating mode was 8. **Table 6d** shows the distribution of responses.

**Table 6d: New Neighborhood Parks**

New Neighborhood parks						
Q6d						
	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	228	0	10	3.6	4.4	4.4
		1	6	2.1	2.6	7.0
		2	12	4.3	5.3	12.3
		3	16	5.7	7.0	19.3
		4	14	5.0	6.1	25.4
		5	32	11.4	14.0	39.5
		6	18	6.4	7.9	47.4
		7	36	12.8	15.8	63.2
		8	38	13.5	16.7	79.8
		9	21	7.5	9.2	89.0
		10	25	8.9	11.0	100.0
Missing	53	NR	53	18.9	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean: 6.13	

*Demographic Comparisons: There were several differences in the way respondents rated this facility. There were differences in the demographic variables of Age, Income, Length of Residency, Home Ownership, and Neighborhood. Those differences were as follows:*

- Residents of Woodinville for 1-5 years had a mean rating of 6.95; those with 20+ years of residence had a mean of 5.10, significant at .02 level.
- Residents ages 26-35 had a mean rating of 8.08; those 65+ years of age, 4.64, significant beyond the .000 level.
- Renters had a mean rating of 7.28; homeowners a rating of 5.94, significant beyond the .000 level.
- Residents earning less than \$30,000 had a mean rating of 7.13; those earning \$125,000+ a mean rating of 4.42, those earning \$100,000-\$125,000 a 4.4 mean, significant at .015 level.
- Residents from West Ridge had a mean rating of 6.72; those from Leota a 4.95 mean, significant at the .000 level.

**Question 6e** asked for priorities on Improvements to the old Woodinville School. The overall mean rating for this question was 5.14, the lowest of the options in this section. Forty-one percent of those responding rated below the 5 point median, with 41% also rating over the median. Modal score was 5. **Table 6e** displays the frequency distribution.

**Table 6e: Improvements to the old Woodinville School**

Improvements to the old Woodinville school						
Q6e						
	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	217	0	14	5.0	6.5	6.5
		1	5	1.8	2.3	8.8
		2	18	6.4	8.3	17.1
		3	26	9.3	12.0	29.0
		4	26	9.3	12.0	41.0
		5	39	13.9	18.0	59.0
		6	21	7.5	9.7	68.7
		7	15	5.3	6.9	75.6
		8	24	8.5	11.1	86.6
		9	16	5.7	7.4	94.0
		10	13	4.6	6.0	100.0
Missing	64	NR	64	22.8	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean: 5.14	

*Demographic Comparisons: The only demographic variable analysis of variance that showed significant difference was for Age, as follows:*

- *Residents ages 26-35 had a mean rating of 6.75; those less than 25 years of age, had a mean rating of 3.71, and those 46-55 a rating of 4.68, significant at .037 level.*

**Question 6f** examined opinions about the priority of Bike/Pedestrian Trails Connecting neighborhoods to Downtown. This question elicited the strongest support of the options in this rating section. Overall mean rating was 6.73, with 20% rating below the median and 71% rating above. The most common rating was a 10. **Table 6f** shows the distribution of responses.

**Table 6f: Bike/Pedestrian Trails Connecting Neighborhoods to Downtown**

Bike/pedestrian trails connecting neighborhoods to downtown						
Q6f						
	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	231	0	10	3.6	4.3	4.3
		1	6	2.1	2.6	6.9
		2	11	3.9	4.8	11.7
		3	13	4.6	5.6	17.3
		4	6	2.1	2.6	19.9
		5	20	7.1	8.7	28.6
		6	21	7.5	9.1	37.7
		7	32	11.4	13.9	51.5
		8	38	13.5	16.5	68.0
		9	30	10.7	13.0	81.0
		10	44	15.7	19.0	100.0
Missing	50	NR	50	17.8	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean: 6.73	

*Demographic Comparisons: Age was the only factor wherein a significant difference emerged in Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) comparisons. That difference is as follows:*

- *Residents ages 26-35 had mean rating of 8.22; those 65+ years of age a 4.88 mean, significant at the .002 level.*

**II. THE DOWNTOWN MASTER PLAN:**

The City’s Master Plan for Downtown and the Little Bear Creek Corridor proposes changes in regulations that would encourage a “pedestrian-friendly” development. This means Downtown would be a safe and inviting place to be and walk, with wide sidewalks and shade trees, benches, attractive shops, convenient parking, small offices or housing units on upper floors, and public art and parks.

The proposed plan includes public investment in parks, grid roads, pedestrian connections from neighborhoods to downtown and other enhancements to reinvigorate downtown. These types of public investment may require delaying or new priorities for capital investment in other areas of the city.

**Question 7: How essential are parks, grid roads, and pedestrian connections from neighborhoods, as public investments downtown?**

The rating scale used for this question was again a 0-10 scale, but where the lower end referred to “not at all essential” to the upper end signifying “highly essential.” Ninety-five percent (95.7%) of the respondents answered this question. The mean rating was 6.89, a very positive overall response. Only 14.5% rated below the median 5 point, and 75% above. The mode was 8 (26.8% on this number alone). **Table 7** shows the nature of the positive distribution of responses.

**Table 7: How essential are parks, grid roads, and pedestrian connections from neighborhoods, as public investments downtown?**

How essential are parks, grid roads, and pedestrian connections from neighborhoods, as public investments downtown?						
Q7 Table						
Q7						
	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	269	0	11	3.9	4.1	4.1
		1	2	0.7	0.7	4.8
		2	10	3.6	3.7	8.6
		3	8	2.8	3.0	11.5
		4	8	2.8	3.0	14.5
		5	26	9.3	9.7	24.2
		6	29	10.3	10.8	34.9
		7	35	12.5	13.0	48.0
		8	72	25.6	26.8	74.7
		9	30	10.7	11.2	85.9
	10	38	13.5	14.1	100.0	
Missing	12	NR	12	4.3	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean: 6.89	

*Demographic Comparisons: Age was also the only factor where ANOVA comparisons showed significance. That difference was as shown below:*

- Residents age 36-45 had a mean rating of 7.46; those 65+ years of age a mean of 5.91, significant at the .052 level of confidence.

**Question 8: Many of the qualities mentioned can be done without significant changes in regulation. If encouraging this development also means allowing taller buildings (up to 5 stories max) and more housing density in limited downtown areas, how willing are you to accept changes to building height and density?**

On this question, residents were asked to rate their willingness on a different scale—a forced-choice, one option response. Over ninety-eight percent (98.2%) of the respondents had an opinion on this important issue. Overall responses were very evenly split across the four choices: “very willing,” and “somewhat willing,” received 50% of the choices, versus “not very willing,” and “totally against” receiving 45.6% of the choices. The few remaining expressed “no opinion” on the issue. **Table 8** illustrates the distribution.

**Table 8: How Willing are You to Accept Changes to Building Height and Density?**

If encouraging this development also means allowing taller buildings (4-5 stories maximum) and more housing density in limited downtown areas, how willing are you to accept changes to building height and density?						
Q8 Table						
Q8						
	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	276	A. Very willing	62	22.1	22.5	22.5
		B. Somewhat willing	76	27.0	27.5	50.0
		C. Not very willing	60	21.4	21.7	71.7
		D. Totally against	66	23.5	23.9	95.7
		E. No Opinion	12	4.3	4.3	100.0
Missing	5	NR	5	1.8	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0		

**Question 9: What do you think would make the downtown area more appealing so that you would want to visit and spend time there?**

Question 9 was a base-line question, asked essentially the same way in the recent 2002 survey of resident opinions. Responses to the question in this survey yielded few changes in general opinion about what residents believe would make the downtown area a more appealing place to be. Eighty-seven percent (87.2) of the respondents answered this question, and offered a total of 432 suggestions. The major suggestions in 2004 are “reduce traffic congestion” (52.3%),

“make more pedestrian-friendly” (18.4%), and “bring in new retail business (16.8%). These were the same top recommendations in 2002, and remain so today. Many suggestions were given that were not listed in the pre-printed “likely” or “probable” responses. Of these “other” suggestions, the most common were “improved parking” and “more restaurants.” Table 9 shows the frequency and the percentage of 2004 responses and shows comparable 2002 responses also. In the case of the 2002 survey, some of their choices were mentioned—although not often—in the “Other” comment category of the 2004 survey. Those current survey suggestions in total are provided in **Appendix C: Question 9 Comments**.

**Table 9: What do you think would make the downtown area more appealing so that you would want to visit and spend time there?**

Q9 Table What do you think would make the downtown area more appealing so that you would want to visit and spend time there?					
Q9					
		Value	Frequ.	Chosen %	2002 Survey %
<b>Valid</b>	<b>245</b>	A. reduce traffic, congestion	134	52.3	<b>42.4</b>
		H. make more pedestrian--friendly	47	18.4	<b>11.2</b>
		J/L. bring in new retail business	43	16.8	<b>11.2</b>
		B. build/expand more parks	22	8.6	<b>8.1</b>
		C. make more attractive	21	8.2	<b>8.1</b>
		Other: more, better parking	17	6.6	<b>2.1</b>
		E. maintain/preserve natural environment	13	5.1	<b>3.6</b>
		G. expand public transit service.	12	4.7	<b>1.6</b>
		Other: more, better restaurants	10	3.9	<b>2.9</b>
		M. bring in new larger businesses	8	3.1	<b>0.5</b>
		Other: more small shops	8	3.1	
		I. improve public safety	8	3.1	<b>0.0</b>
		D. reduce local taxes	6	2.3	<b>0.3</b>
		Other: widen main roads	5	2.0	
		Other: more stores	5	2.0	
		Other: centrally located walking/shopping	4	1.6	
		N. renovate Community Recreation Center, classes, fitness, gym availability	2	0.8	
		K. increase supply of affordable housing	1	0.4	<b>0.3</b>
		F. bring in personal services businesses	1	0.4	
		Other	114	44.5	
<b>Missing</b>	<b>36</b>	NR	36		
<b>Total</b>	<b>281</b>				

**III. GOVERNMENT SERVICES: *Please rate how satisfied you are with the following services provided by city government:***

The sub-set of thirteen items under Question 10 employed a 0 “not at all satisfied” to 10 “highly satisfied” scale to measure residents’ satisfaction with City of Woodinville services. A Summary Table will show the overall results for all of the sub-sets, including reference to 2002 Survey results where comparable. Individual tables for each sub-set are placed in **Appendix D** of this report, with frequencies and significant differences in comparisons.

**Question 10 Summary Table**

<b>Question Number</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>	<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>2002 Mean</b>	<b>% Below Median</b>	<b>% Above Median</b>	<b>Mode</b>
<b>10 a</b> <i>Transit</i>	<b>203</b>	<b>5.06</b>	<b>5.22</b>	<b>35.5</b>	<b>37.4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>10 b</b> <i>Roads</i>	<b>263</b>	<b>5.44</b>	<b>5.15</b>	<b>32.7</b>	<b>49.4</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>10 c</b> <i>Tax \$</i>	<b>223</b>	<b>5.57</b>	<b>*5.16</b>	<b>28.7</b>	<b>49.3</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>10 d</b> <i>Parks-Rec</i>	<b>262</b>	<b>6.15</b>	<b>7.03</b>	<b>17.6</b>	<b>66.0</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>10 e</b> <i>Afford Hsg</i>	<b>198</b>	<b>5.16</b>	<b>5.12</b>	<b>30.8</b>	<b>39.4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>10 f</b> <i>Nice staff</i>	<b>216</b>	<b>6.92</b>	<b>7.08</b>	<b>14.4</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>10 g</b> <i>Public Info</i>	<b>262</b>	<b>7.13</b>	<b>7.34</b>	<b>9.2</b>	<b>80.5</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>10 h</b> <i>Involved</i>	<b>244</b>	<b>6.43</b>	<b>6.51</b>	<b>15.2</b>	<b>68.4</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>10 i</b> <i>Permit Process</i>	<b>117</b>	<b>5.73</b>	<b>*5.11</b>	<b>20.5</b>	<b>51.3</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>10 j</b> <i>Rec Programs</i>	<b>231</b>	<b>6.35</b>	<b>6.88</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>68.2</b>	<b>7</b>

<b>10 k</b> <i>Police</i>	<b>245</b>	<b>7.25</b>	<b>*NA</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>84.1</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>10 l</b> <i>Planning</i>	<b>224</b>	<b>6.37</b>	<b>*NA</b>	<b>18.3</b>	<b>67.4</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>10 m</b> <i>Env. Protect.</i>	<b>221</b>	<b>6.31</b>	<b>*NA</b>	<b>15.8</b>	<b>66.5</b>	<b>8</b>

**\* denotes wording change from 2002 survey      \*NA not asked in 2002 survey**

### **Question 10a: Helping improve public transit**

Many respondents reported they did not know enough to rate this question, and the response rate of 72.2% was one of the lower in this set of questions. Mean rating of those who did respond was 5.06, somewhat lower than the 2002 survey mean of 5.22 for the same question. Thirty five percent (35.5%) rated below the median rating, with 37.4% rating above. The mode for this question was 5. **Table 10a** in **Appendix D** shows the full distribution of frequencies and percentages.

*Demographic Comparisons: Two areas of variance were statistically significant:*

- *Renters had a mean rating of 7.24; homeowners had a mean rating of 5.94, significant at greater than .000.*
- *Residents of The Wedge had a mean rating of 5.58; residents of Leota a mean rating of 4.28, significant at the .025 level.*

### **10b: Road Maintenance and Expansion**

Over ninety-three percent (93.7%) of the respondents answered this question. The overall mean for this question was 5.44, a higher rating than the 2002 survey mean of 5.15. Nearly a third of the respondents (32.7) rated below the median, while 49.4% rated above. Modal rating was 7. **Table 10b** showing full range of the ratings is found in **Appendix D**.

*Demographic Comparisons: Differences were identified in the same two demographic variables shown in the ratings for Question 10a. The differences discovered in the ANOVA tests were as follows:*

- *Renters had a mean rating for this question of 6.91; homeowners rated the same question with a mean of 5.39, significant at the .006 level.*
- *Residents from Town Center had a mean rating of 6.22; residents from The Wedge had a mean rating of 4.38, significant at the .000 level.*

### **10c: Making Wise Use of Tax Money**

Response rate for this question was just under eighty percent (79.4%). Again, a number of respondents indicated they were not well versed enough to give meaningful judgment about “wise use” of tax dollars. Mean rating was 5.57, also higher than the 5.16 mean from the 2002 survey question which was related and similar, but sufficiently different to make precise comparison unlikely. Slightly more than a quarter (28.7%) of the respondents rated lower than the median; 49.3% rated higher than the median. Mode for the question was 5. **Table 10c** in **Appendix D** gives full distribution numbers and percentages.

*Demographic Comparisons: Only one area of differences was sufficient to demonstrate statistical significance.*

- *Residents of Town Center had a mean rating of 6.11; residents from Leota had a mean rating of 4.88, significant at the .027 level.*

### **10d: Maintaining Adequate Parks and Recreational Facilities**

Ninety-three percent (93.2%) of respondents answered this question, producing an overall mean of 6.15, compared to a mean of 7.03 for the identical question in the 2002 survey. Only 17.6% of the respondents, however, rated this issue lower than the median, and 66% rated higher than the median. Modal rating was a 7. Full distribution of the ratings is displayed in **Table 10d** in **Appendix D**.

*Demographic Comparisons: Only one area of significant differences between groups was determined for this question as well. That variation is described below:*

- *Renters had a mean rating of 7.09; homeowners had a mean rating of 6.12, significant at the .033 level.*

### **10e: City Regulation to Make Affordable Housing Available**

Only 70.5% of the respondents answered this question, also understandable given the knowledge level some of them expressed. Mean rating for the questions was 5.16, marginally higher than the 2002 survey mean of 5.12. Thirty percent (30.8%) of the respondents rated lower than the median, with 39.4% rating higher. A large percentage (29.8%) gave a 5 rating, another indication of uncertain or unset opinions on an issue. **Table 10e** in **Appendix D** displays the full frequency distribution for the question.

*Demographic Comparisons: There were no significant differences in the ratings for this question across demographic variables.*

### **10f: Helpfulness, Friendliness, Responsiveness, and Availability of City Staff**

The ratings for this question were among the most positive about City services. There were still considerable numbers of people who did not feel they had experience sufficient to make a judgment (response rate of 76.9%). Overall mean rating was 6.92, third highest in this group of questions, and only slightly below the 2002 survey mean rating of 7.08. Less than fifteen percent of the respondents (14.4%) rated lower than the median point of the scale, with 75% rating higher than the median. The mode rating was 8. **Table 10f** in **Appendix D** provides all details of distribution.

*Demographic Comparisons: Once again, there were significant differences between residents of Woodinville neighborhoods. That difference is described, with appropriate numbers, in the comparison below:*

- *Residents from Town Center had a mean rating of 7.67; residents from Leota had a mean rating of 6.20, significant at the .003 level.*

### **10g: Keeping You Informed Via City Newsletter, Website, Legal Notices, and Local Advertising**

As in 2002, this aspect of City Government services received positive satisfaction ratings. Ninety-three percent (93.2%) of the respondents answered this question, with a mean rating of 7.13, compared to the 7.34 of the 2002 survey. Less than ten percent (9.2%) of the ratings were

lower than the median, with 81.5% above the median, leaving few people in the middle. Modal rating was 8. **Table 10g** in **Appendix D** shows the distribution of the responses.

*Demographic Comparisons: There was also a significant variance between residents of the neighborhoods on this topic:*

- *Residents of Town Center had a mean rating of 7.50; residents from Leota gave a mean rating of 4.76, significant at the .019 level.*

### **10h: Opportunity for Involvement in Public Decision Making**

Most residents (86.8%) also answered this question. A number of the respondents indicated that they had not personally participated in decision-oriented situations, but that their perception was that the opportunities were well advertised and made available. The overall satisfaction ratings for the question were very positive, with a mean rating of 6.43. This compares favorably to the 2002 survey mean of 6.51. Only 15.2% of the ratings were lower than the median point, and 68.4% above the median. The mode for the question was 8. **Table 10h** in **Appendix D** provides the distribution frequencies and percentages.

*Demographic Comparisons: There were no significant differences identified between demographic groups.*

### **10i: Customer-oriented Permit Process**

Only 41.6% of the respondents expressed opinions about the permit processes of city government, again with expressions that many had no direct or indirect information or experience. The overall mean rating of those who rated the service was positive at 5.73. This compares to a 5.11 mean rating on the 2002 survey, but with differing wording in the question. There were not large numbers who rated lower than the median (20.5%), and 51.3% who rated higher than the median; more than a quarter of the respondents, however, opted for the neutral position (28.2%). The mode for the question was 5. **Table 10i** in **Appendix D** displays the numbers and percentages.

*Demographic Comparisons: Only one difference was evident in the demographic variables:*

- *Residents of Town Center had a mean rating of 6.23; residents of Leota had a mean rating of 4.76, significant at the .037 level.*

### **10j: Providing Recreation Programs, Classes, Special Events**

Eighty-two percent (82.2%) of the respondents answered this question about recreation programs. The overall mean rating was positive, at 6.35, lower than the 6.88 mean for the same question in the 2002 survey. Only 12.1% of the respondents rated lower than the median point, with 68.8% rating over the median. Modal rating for the question was 7. **Table 10j** shows satisfaction responses, with full distribution across the scale.

*Demographic Comparisons: There were no significant differences identified through the ANOVA measurements.*

### **10k: Providing Adequate Police Services**

This City government service was not examined by the 2002 survey. Eighty-seven percent (87.2%) of the respondents answered this question, and gave police services the highest rating in the government services set. Overall mean rating was 7.25, with only 9% of the respondents rating lower than the median, 6.9% opting for the neutral “5”, and 84.1% rating above the median. Mode for the question was 8. A close look at the frequency distributions in **Table 10k** in **Appendix D** shows how few residents gave low ratings to police services.

*Demographic Comparisons: Important variable differences are outlined below:*

- *Residents who have lived in Woodinville 20+ years had a mean rating of 7.64; residents of less than one year [relatively few in number] had a mean rating of 5.25, significant at the .036 level.*
- *Residents ages less than 25, and 65+ both had mean ratings of 8.0; residents of Woodinville for 26-35 years had a mean rating of 6.54, significant at the .044 level.*

### **10l. Providing Appropriate Long-range Planning for the City**

Less than eighty percent (79.7%) of the respondents answered this question. Overall satisfaction ratings were among the more positive for this set of government services, with a

mean rating of 6.37. This question also was not asked in the 2002 survey. Only 18.7% of the respondents rated lower than the median point, and 67.4% rated above the median. The modal rating was 8. Comments about City long-range planning will be found in the discussion of other questions in the survey, and in the comments provided in **Appendix C. Table 10l** in **Appendix D** shows full distribution of responses.

*Demographic Comparisons: Again, only one set of demographic variables showed statistically significant differences, as follows:*

- *Residents of Town Center had a mean rating of 6.72; residents from Leota had a mean rating of 5.71, significant at the .032 level of confidence.*

### **10m: Environmental Protections**

This question about city government providing environmental protections was likewise a question new to the 2004 survey. Seventy-eight percent (78.6%) of the respondents answered the question. Mean rating overall was relatively positive, at 6.31. Only 15.3% of the ratings were lower than the median, and 66.5% were above the median. Mode for this question was also 8. **Table 10m** in **Appendix D** gives the distribution of frequencies.

*Demographic Comparisons: There were three separate demographic variables where significant differences were discovered. These are explained below:*

- *Single residents without dependents had a mean rating of 7.24; married residents with dependents at home had a mean rating of 5.96, significant at the .022 level.*
- *Renters had a mean rating of 7.29; homeowners had a mean rating of 6.23, significant at the .043 level.*
- *Residents from West Ridge had a mean rating of 6.89; residents from The Wedge had a mean rating of 5.22, significant at greater than .000 level.*

### ***Question 11: How satisfied are you overall with the City of Woodinville as a city government?***

Question 10 deliberately covered a wide range of government services so that respondents might have a better perception of specifics engaged in by city government. This following question then asked an overall satisfaction question. Ninety-four percent (94.7%) of the respondents answered the question. The overall mean rating was 6.68, a more positive rating

than most of the individual services elicited, and higher than the 2002 survey mean of 6.35. Only 9.8% of the ratings were below the median point, and 77.8% above the median. The mode was 7. **Table 11** in **Appendix D** shows the frequency distributions for this question.

**Table 11: How satisfied are you overall with the City of Woodinville as a city government?**

How satisfied are you overall with the City of Woodinville as a city government?						
Q11 Table						
Q11						
	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	2002 Survey Mean
Valid	266	0	2	0.7	0.8	0.8
		1	1	0.4	0.4	1.1
		2	5	1.8	1.9	3.0
		3	11	3.9	4.1	7.1
		4	7	2.5	2.6	9.8
		5	33	11.7	12.4	22.2
		6	42	14.9	15.8	38.0
		7	71	25.3	26.7	64.7
		8	66	23.5	24.8	89.5
		9	17	6.0	6.4	95.9
	10	11	3.9	4.1	100.0	
Missing	15	NR	15	5.3	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean: 6.68	6.35

*Demographic Comparisons: Several variables showed significant differences.*

- *Residents ages less than 25, and 65+ had mean ratings of 7.4 and 7.42 respectively; residents ages 46-55 had mean ratings of 6.39, significant at .02 level.*
- *Single residents without dependents had a mean rating of 7.8; married residents without dependents at home had a mean rating of 6.51, significant at the .039 level.*
- *Renters had a mean rating of 7.70; homeowners a mean rating of 6.63, significant at .008.*
- *Residents from Town Center had a mean rating of 7.24; residents from Leota had a mean rating of 5.63, significant at greater than .000 level.*

**Question 12: What city services or programs have you used or participated in during the last 12 months?**

City residents were also asked to indicate what city programs or services they had used over the past year. Ninety-three percent (93.6%) of the respondents answered this question. The most frequently mentioned services in order were 1) parks, trails, pedestrian paths; 2) special events; 3) “other;” 4) community center/sports fields; and 5) police. The most commonly

mentioned “other” programs were Farmers Market, City Council meetings, Permits, and Parades. A complete list of all “Other” references will be found in **Appendix C, Question 12 Comments**. **Table 12** below lists results, and includes reference to 2002 Survey results by comparison.

**Table 12: What city services or programs have you used or participated in during the last 12 months?**

Q12 Table What City services or programs have you used or participated in during the past 12 months?					
Q12		Value	Frequ.	%	2002
Valid	263	A. Police services	22	8.6	4.8
		B. Parks, trails, pedestrian paths	115	44.9	38.9
		C. Special events / concerts (4th of July, Light Fest, etc.)	91	35.5	20.5
		D. Community center / sports fields	36	14.1	8.2
		E. Building or land use development review	14	5.5	5.1
		F. Recreation programs and courses	19	7.4	7.2
		G. Neighborhood traffic safety	3	1.2	1.0
		H. Volunteer projects	17	6.6	2.7
		I. Customer service request at city offices	11	4.3	3.1
		Other	46	18.0	
		Farmers Market	9	3.4	1.4
		None	80	31.3	
Missing	18	NR	18		
Total	281				

**Question 13: Were there problems with any of your experiences just listed?**

Respondents identified few problems associated with their participation in city government activities and events. The primary difficulty encountered was parking, both from a general standpoint and also for parks and concerts. Congested traffic was also singled out. A full list of all comments can be found in **Appendix C, Question 13 Comments**.

**Question 14: Many components or features may contribute to your quality of life in Woodinville. Please rate how satisfied you are with the City on these features.**

This question asked residents to rate their satisfaction with the City of Woodinville on a series of nine features associated with Quality of Life. The ten-point scale of satisfaction was also used for this question. Responses to this set of question are also compiled in a **Summary**

**Table** below, which includes references to the same set of questions asked in the 2002 survey. Individual sub-question data are included in separate Tables in **Appendix D**.

**Question 14 Summary Table**

<b>Question Number</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>	<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>2002 Mean</b>	<b>% Below Median</b>	<b>% Above Median</b>	<b>Mode</b>
<b>14 a</b> <i>Job Opp</i>	<b>203</b>	<b>5.87</b>	<b>5.61</b>	<b>19.7</b>	<b>54.7</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>14 b</b> <i>Raise Kids</i>	<b>250</b>	<b>8.05</b>	<b>7.84</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>93.6</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>14 c</b> <i>Traffic Access</i>	<b>267</b>	<b>4.42</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>52.8</b>	<b>31.8</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>14 d</b> <i>Afford Hsg</i>	<b>237</b>	<b>4.81</b>	<b>4.83</b>	<b>44.3</b>	<b>37.1</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>14 e</b> <i>Environmt</i>	<b>260</b>	<b>7.10</b>	<b>7.00</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>82.7</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>14 f</b> <i>Crime/Safety</i>	<b>262</b>	<b>7.50</b>	<b>7.29</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>89.3</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>14 g</b> <i>Parks, Rec</i>	<b>258</b>	<b>6.83</b>	<b>6.81</b>	<b>10.1</b>	<b>79.8</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>14 h</b> <i>Regulations</i>	<b>192</b>	<b>5.79</b>	<b>5.45</b>	<b>20.8</b>	<b>55.2</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>14 i</b> <i>Govt Svcs</i>	<b>215</b>	<b>6.60</b>	<b>6.53</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>72.6</b>	<b>7</b>

**14 a: Job and Economic Opportunities**

Many respondents opted not to answer this question, feeling they did not have appropriate understanding of the issue. Response rate was 72.2%. Of those residents who did respond their mean rating was 5.87, with relatively few (19.7%) rating below the median point, but only 54.7% over, leaving a full quarter of the respondents making the mid range choice. Modal choice was the 5.

*Demographic Comparisons: There were no statistically significant differences for this measure.*

#### **14 b: A Place to Raise Children**

This was the most positive element in the quality of life features. Eighty-nine percent of the respondents answered the question, with a mean rating of 8.05. Only 2.0% rated below the median point; 93.6% were above. Modal rating was an 8.

*Demographic Comparisons: One area of differences was significant.*

- *Residents from Town Center had a mean rating of 8.32; residents from West Ridge had a mean rating of 7.73, significant at the .058 level.*

#### **14 c: Traffic Access and Circulation**

If Woodinville is a great place to raise children, it is also a place where residents are very displeased with traffic access and circulation. This feature received the lowest ratings of the quality of life measures, with a mean rating of 4.42. With 95% of the respondents answering the question, that rating pattern held true across virtually all demographic variables. Over half (52.8%) of the respondents rated below the median; 31.8% were over the median. A 4 was the modal rating.

*Demographic Comparisons: There were no significant differences across the variables.*

#### **14 d: Affordability of Housing in the City**

This feature was another that drew mostly unfavorable responses. With 84.3% of the respondents answering, the overall mean rating was 4.81, with 44% rating below the median point on the scale, and 37.1% rating above the median. Modal rating was a 5.

*Demographic Comparisons: One demographic variable showed a statistically significant difference:*

- *Residents of Woodinville who have been here less than a year had a mean rating of 3.37; those living here 6-10 years had a mean rating of 5.25, significant at the .009 level.*

#### **14 e: Woodinville's Natural Environment**

As might be expected, Woodinville's natural environment is regarded as a positive quality of life feature. Most (92.5%) of the survey participants answered this question. The overall mean rating was 7.10, with 10% rating below the median and 82.7% rating above the median point. A rating of 8 was the mode.

*Demographic Comparisons: There were significant differences in two of the demographic variables:*

- *Newer residents, those here less than a year, had a mean rating of 6.25; those here 1-5 years had a mean rating of 7.79, significant at the .007 level.*
- *Residents from Town Center had a mean rating of 7.68; residents from The Wedge had a mean rating of 5.79, significant at greater than .000.*

#### **14 f: Crime and Safety**

The crime and safety feature of Woodinville's quality of life also receives very positive marks. With 93.2% of the respondents answering this question, the mean rating was 7.50. Only 2.7% of the respondents rated below the median, with 89.3% rating above the 5 median point. Modal rating was 8.

*Demographic Comparisons: Two areas of significant differences were identified through the ANOVA treatment:*

- *Residents of less than a year in Woodinville had a mean rating of 6.55; those living here 1-5 years had mean rating of 7.88, significant at the .038 level.*
- *Residents less than 25 years of age had a mean rating of 8.6; residents ages 46-55 had a mean rating of 7.19, significant at the .057 level.*

#### **14 g: Parks, Open Space, Recreational Opportunities**

Woodinville residents are also primarily positive about their parks and recreation opportunities. Nearly 92 percent (91.8%) responded to this question. Mean rating was 6.83, with 10.1% rating below the median on the scale, and 79.8% rating above the median. Modal rating was 7.

*Demographic Comparisons: There were no significant differences identified for this measure.*

#### **14 h: Building and Design Regulations**

Many residents also chose not to provide a rating for this feature, expressing lack of information on which to base a judgment. Mean rating was 5.79, with only 20.8% rating below the median, and 55.2% rating above the median, leaving a large block of votes on the neutral median. Mode was 5.

*Demographic Comparisons: Several differences surfaced in the analysis of variances between groups:*

- *Renters had a mean rating of 7.29; homeowners had a mean rating of 5.74, significant at the .009 level.*
- *Females had a mean rating of 6.26; males had a mean rating of 5.39, significant at .005.*
- *Residents of Town Center had a mean rating of 6.50; residents of The Wedge had a mean rating of 4.83, significant at the .005 level.*

#### **14 i: Government Services**

This question in the quality of life section offered an additional opportunity for residents to express how important they view government services [see Q. 10, 11]. With nearly a quarter of the respondents not answering (response rate 76.5%), the mean rating was 6.60, or moderately positive. Only 8.4% of the respondents rated below the median point, while 72.6% rated above the median. Modal rating was 7.

*Demographic Comparisons: Analysis of variance measures produced two areas where differences were significant:*

- *Residents 65+ years of age had a mean rating of 7.42; residents 36-45 had a mean rating of 6.07, significant at the .027 level.*
- *Females had a mean rating of 6.93; males had a mean rating of 6.31, significant at .008.*

**Question 15: How would you rate the quality of life overall in the City of Woodinville?**

Having rated individual features pertaining to quality of life, residents then rated overall quality of life in Woodinville, using a 0-10 satisfaction scale. Over ninety-five percent (95.7%) of the respondents answered this question. Overall satisfaction was relatively high, with the mean rating of 7.90. This rating compares favorably to the 2002 survey results of a 7.74 mean for the same question. Only two persons, 1.1%, rated Woodinville quality of life below the median point in the satisfaction scale. By contrast, 95.5% of respondents rated satisfaction above the median point, with 93.4 rating 7 or higher. Mode for the question was 8. **Table 15** below provides the full frequency distribution.

**Table 15: How would you rate the quality of life overall in the City of Woodinville?**

Q15 Table							2002 Survey Mean
How would you rate the quality of life overall in the City of Woodinville?							
Q15							
	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		
Valid	269	0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
		1	0	0.0	0.0		
		2	0	0.0	0.0		
		3	1	0.4	0.4	0.4	
		4	2	0.7	0.7	1.1	
		5	9	3.2	3.3	4.5	
		6	6	2.1	2.2	6.7	
		7	72	25.6	26.8	33.5	
		8	110	39.1	40.9	74.3	
		9	40	14.2	14.9	89.2	
	10	29	10.3	10.8	100.0		
Missing	12	NR	4.3	100.0			
Total	281	281	100.0	Mean: 7.90		7.74	

*Demographic Comparisons: There was only one indication of significant differences across the demographic variables examined:*

- *Residents ages less than 25, and 65+ years of age had mean ratings of 8.5 and 8.42 respectively; residents ages 36-45 had a mean rating of 7.75, significant at .058.*

**Question 16: Compared to two years ago, do you think the quality of life in Woodinville has [improved or decreased]?**

Residents were asked also to indicate whether they felt the quality of life in Woodinville has improved, stayed about the same, or decreased over the past two years. The largest percentage of respondents (46.3%) felt their quality of life stayed about the same. More residents felt it had improved than decreased (33.2% to 20.5%). Only 5% felt it had increased considerably; only 3.1% felt it had decreased considerably. **Table 16** below shows the frequency distribution, and also shows the 2002 survey results which asked the same question, but over the previous five year span.

**Table 16: Compared to two years ago, do you think the quality of life in Woodinville has [improved or decreased]?**

Q16 Table Compared to two years ago, do you think the quality of life in Woodinville has...							
Q16							
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	2002 %
Valid	259	A. improved considerably	13	4.6	5.0	5.0	21.0
		B. improved somewhat	73	26.0	28.2	33.2	34.2
		C. stayed about the same	120	42.7	46.3	79.5	19.8
		D. decreased somewhat	45	16.0	17.4	96.9	18.9
		E. decreased considerably	8	2.8	3.1	100.0	6.2
		Other	0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Missing	22	NR	22	7.8	100.0		
Total	281		281	100.0			

**Question 17: If you could describe the Woodinville community with one word or phrase, what would it be?**

Residents were once again asked to describe Woodinville briefly, in one word or phrase. The 2002 Resident Opinion Survey asked the question as well, with the limitation of “one word.” Eighty-eight percent (88.3%) of the respondents volunteered their words and phrases. The results had some commonalities among themselves –as with the 2002 survey—but comments varied widely. The one word or phrase used most often was “friendly,” with 30 references, or

12.1% of the total responses. Other frequently mentioned terms were “nice, or nice place to live,” rural, “country-like,” “congested,” “pleasant,” “great family place,” and “comfortable.” The most frequently mentioned choices are listed in **Table 17** below, with comparable numbers from the 2002 survey listed where there were common references. The full list is contained in **Appendix C, Question 17 Choices**.

**Table 17: If you could describe the Woodinville community with one word or phrase, what would it be?**

<b>Response</b>	<b>No. of References</b>	<b>No. of 2002 References</b>
Friendly	30	<b>29</b>
Nice, Nice Place to Live	20	<b>11</b>
Rural, Country-Like	12	<b>NR</b>
Congested, crowded	10	<b>5</b>
Pleasant	10	<b>16</b>
Great Family Place	9	<b>9</b>
Comfortable	9	<b>10</b>
Small town, small town feel	7	<b>NR</b>
Quaint	7	<b>3</b>
Convenient	7	<b>6</b>
Good, Good Place to Live	6	<b>7</b>
Home, Homey	5	<b>5</b>
Growing	5	<b>9</b>
Great, Great Place	5	<b>9</b>
Suburban	5	<b>3</b>
Enjoyable	5	<b>6</b>

## IV. FUNDING AND BUDGET CHOICES

***Question 18: The City has limited funds to invest in capital improvements, such as roads, parks, and public facilities. As I read the following, please rate each item on a 0-10 scale, where 0 = low priority and 10 = high priority for funding.***

The sub-set of nine items under Question 18 employed a 0 “low priority” to 10 “high priority” scale to measure residents’ about funding City of Woodinville capital improvements. A Summary Table will show the overall results for all of the sub-sets, with references also to 2002 survey data. In that latter case, residents were asked to indicate first, second, and third choices, so mean scores are not available for comparison. Individual tables for each sub-set are placed in **Appendix D** of this report, with full frequency distribution.

**Question 18 Summary Table**

<b>Question Number</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>	<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>* 2002 1<sup>st</sup> Choices</b>	<b>% Below Median</b>	<b>% Above Median</b>	<b>Mode</b>
<b>18 a</b> <i>Habitat</i>	<b>264</b>	<b>5.68</b>	<b>12.5%</b>	<b>27.7%</b>	<b>50.8</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>18 b</b> <i>Parks/own</i>	<b>267</b>	<b>6.84</b>	<b>11.%</b>	<b>10.1</b>	<b>76.4</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>18 c</b> <i>New parks</i>	<b>264</b>	<b>6.05</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>24.2</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>18 d</b> <i>Adult Fields</i>	<b>252</b>	<b>4.60</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>44.8</b>	<b>36.9</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>18 e</b> <i>Upgrade WCC</i>	<b>256</b>	<b>5.75</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>23.4</b>	<b>55.9</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>18 f</b> <i>New Streets</i>	<b>267</b>	<b>7.24</b>	<b>19.4%</b>	<b>10.1</b>	<b>78.3</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>18 g</b> <i>Fix Traffic</i>	<b>266</b>	<b>8.02</b>	<b>42.6%</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>88.0</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>18 h</b> <i>Trails</i>	<b>266</b>	<b>6.72</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>16.2</b>	<b>74.4</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>18 i</b> <i>Neighborhood Improvements</i>	<b>224</b>	<b>6.04</b>	<b>NR</b>	<b>19.2</b>	<b>63.8</b>	<b>7</b>

**\* 2002 survey designated a first, second, and third choice for respondents**

### **18a: Habitat for Salmon Recovery and Preservation**

Respondents' ratings placed this as low priority overall, being eighth of the nine items rated. Over 40% of the respondents, however, did give ratings of 7 or higher.

*Demographic Comparisons: There were no significant differences identified.*

### **18b: Develop Local Parks from Open Space Already Owned**

This option for capital improvement was the third highest overall, with over 65% giving ratings of 7 or higher.

*Demographic Comparisons: The following significant difference was noted:*

- *Residents of the Town Center had a mean rating of 7.27; residents of Leota had a mean rating of 6.05, significant at the .003 level.*

### **18c: Buy Open Spaces for Future Parks**

The overall rating of this item placed it fifth in the list of nine being considered. Still, nearly half of the respondents give ratings of 7 or higher.

*Demographic Comparisons: The following significant difference was identified:*

- *Residents of less than one year in Woodinville had a mean rating of 7.87; residents here 11-15 years had a mean rating of 5.45, significant at .052 level.*

### **18d: Provide More Adult Ball Fields**

This item was clearly the lowest priority judged. Almost half (44.8%) rated in the lower portion of the scale. Only 10% of the respondents gave ratings of 8 or higher.

*Demographic Comparisons: Two areas of significant difference were found in the comparisons:*

- *Males had a mean rating of 4.85; females had a mean rating of 4.30; significant at .05.*
- *Residents of West Ridge had a mean rating of 4.94; residents from Leota had a mean rating of 3.71, significant at the .008 level.*

### **18e: Renovate Woodinville Community Center to Add Programming and Recreation Space**

This item also received a relatively low ranking, being seventh on the list of nine capital projects considered. Again, however, 40% rated 7 or higher for this item.

*Demographic Comparisons: One area of the demographic variables showed a significant difference:*

- *Residents of Town Center had a mean rating of 6.11; residents of Leota had a mean rating of 4.97, significant at the .011 level.*
- *Renters had a mean rating of 6.95; homeowners had a mean rating of 5.74, significant at the .011 level*

### **18f: Develop New Streets to Improve Current Connections**

No surprises here., and not much disagreement across any of the demographic variables. This was the second highest priority assigned to the items being considered.

*Demographic Comparisons: No significant differences.*

### **18g: Widen Existing Roadways, Fix Congestion Points, Improve Access to Freeways**

The priority rating of this item is consistent with messages in several places across the survey. The overall mean rating is the highest ranked of the nine potential capital improvement areas, with nearly a third (32.2%) assigning the highest rating possible: 10.

*Demographic Comparisons: No significant differences identified.*

### **18h: Develop Non-motorized Trails to Connect Neighborhoods**

This potential capital project received relatively positive ratings, being fourth of the nine capital items reviewed. With three quarters of the ratings in the upper half of the scale, there are many who appear to support this option.

*Demographic Comparisons: No significant differences were identified.*

### **18i: Neighborhood Improvements**

This item was not unpopular, but most ratings appeared in the mid-range of choices, and few who apparently felt strongly. Some residents commented that “neighborhood improvements” was too vague to make clear judgments.

*Demographic Comparisons: There were two significant differences identified:*

- *Residents of less than one year had a mean rating of 7.28; residents 16-20 years had a mean rating of 4.76, significant at .021.*
- *Residents from The Wedge had a mean rating of 6.65; residents of Leota had a mean rating of 5.07, significant at the .012 level.*

***Question 19: If additional resources are needed to fund projects such as those you just rated, please rate your priority for the funding options I will read***

Respondents were asked to rate on a 0-10 priority scale which funding options they would choose if additional resources were needed for desired capital improvements. Most respondents answered this important question (all options over 90% response rate). Increasing developer fees from new development was the preferred choice among those provided in the statements read to respondents (mean rating of 6.88). Next most popular option was the non-funding or “no new taxes or additional funds to be used,” (mean rating of 5.70). Using bond measures paid by increased property taxes was not popular (mean of 4.12), and “raising the utility tax” was even less popular (mean of 3.91). **Table 19 Summary** shows the ratings together, with 2002 survey data showing how many persons mentioned a particular option (with multiple choices allowed). Individual tables for each option are available in **Appendix D**.

**Table 19: If additional resources are needed to fund projects such as those you just rated, please rate your priority for the funding options I will read  
Summary Table**

<b>Question Number</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>	<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>* 2002 Choices</b>	<b>% Below Median</b>	<b>% Above Median</b>	<b>Mode</b>
<b>19 a</b> <i>Increase Dev Fees</i>	<b>258</b>	<b>6.88</b>	<b>36.8%</b>	<b>11.6</b>	<b>75.6</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>19 b</b> <i>Bond Measure</i>	<b>264</b>	<b>4.12</b>	<b>22.6%</b>	<b>50.4</b>	<b>31.8</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>19 c</b> <i>Increase Util Tax</i>	<b>262</b>	<b>3.91</b>	<b>6.0%</b>	<b>56.9</b>	<b>28.6</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>19 d</b> <i>No New Tax</i>	<b>258</b>	<b>5.70</b>	<b>*50.8%</b>	<b>19.2</b>	<b>48.8</b>	<b>10</b>

**\* Choices and options given differently in 2002 survey; \*19d Not listed as option in 2002**

### **19a: Increase Developer Fees from New Development**

This was perhaps a predictable first choice for many. Respondent comments during the survey suggested it was a popular option because it would not directly affect the pocketbook of many of those voting for it (primarily homeowners already). Others cautioned that there were potential pitfalls or tradeoffs, so they were reluctant to rate it too highly. Overall, however, with 75.6% of the ratings over the median, this was a clear option.

*Demographic Comparisons: There were no identified significant differences.*

### **19b: Use a Bond Measure that would be Paid from Increases in Property Taxes**

Perhaps, predictably, this was not a popular funding option for respondents to identify—tapping into their own financial resources with property tax increases. Accordingly, the low rating was built on low to middle of the range ratings.

*Demographic Comparisons: Two areas of significant differences were identified:*

- *Males had a mean rating of 4.53; females had a mean rating of 3.64, significant at .007.*
- *Residents from Town Center had a mean rating of 4.61; residents from Leota had a mean rating of 3.29, significant at .021.*

### **19c: Raise the Current Utility Tax to Fund Additional Projects**

This was another unpopular idea. A frequent comment was “it is a tax, right?” There were no ratings on the upper two levels of the priority scale. The mean rating of 3.91 was the lowest in the overall survey.

*Demographic Comparisons: Two areas of significant difference were identified here as well:*

- *Males had a mean rating of 4.19; females had a mean rating of 3.58, significant at .032.*
- *Residents of Town Center had a mean rating of 4.40; residents of Leota had a mean rating of 3.19, significant at the .006 level.*

### **19d: No New Taxes or Additional Funds to be Used**

While some respondents commented that here was “an obvious choice,” for many it was not that apparent. Half of the responses are at the median point or below, suggesting many see that no new taxes or additional funds would be short-sighted of the city’s residents.

*Demographic Comparisons: There were no significant differences identified.*

## **V. DEMOGRAPHICS**

Several demographic variables were obtained from the participants in this research to allow a profile of the sample of residents who responded. With the exception of the gender of respondents and the neighborhoods in which they lived, other items were volunteered, and participants were told clearly that their answers were optional and confidential. No answers or sets of answers are linked or identified to the persons providing information.

### ***20. How long have you lived in Woodinville?***

Length of residence was obtained for 94% of the survey respondents. Because calling lists were determined by neighborhood and street addresses, there is no expectation that statistics of length of residence are representative of the community. However, because of the nature of that sample selection, apartment dwellers/renters were certain to be represented, with the expectation that they would be more apt to be newer to the city. The 2002 survey used slightly different numbers in the categories, but essentially the same groupings. The overall breakdown by length of residence is in **Table 20**.

**Table 20: Length of Residence in Woodinville**

Q20 Table Residency							
Q20							
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	* 2002 Compared
Valid	264	0-1	10	3.6	3.8	3.8	5.6
		1-5	77	27.4	29.2	33.0	29.2
		6-10	54	19.2	20.5	53.4	18.4
		11-15	46	16.4	17.4	70.8	17.3
		16-20	25	8.9	9.5	80.3	13.9
		20+	52	18.5	19.7	100.0	22.2
Missing	17	NR	17	6.0	100.0		
Total	281	Totals	281	100.0			

**21. What is your age?**

Age groupings were also determined for 94.3% of the respondents. There was no effort made to seek any type of ratio on age of respondents, but final results showed a fairly balanced sample among the pre-determined age categories. The single largest groups were residents 36-45 and 46-55. **Table 21** shows the breakdown of respondents by age.

**Table 21: Age of Respondents**

Q21 Table Age							
Q21							
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	2002 Compared
Valid	265	19-25	10	3.6	3.8	3.8	4.2
		26-35	27	9.6	10.2	14.0	12.3
		36-45	75	26.7	28.3	42.3	21.2
		46-55	73	26.0	27.5	69.8	32.7
		56-65	44	15.7	16.6	86.4	18.4
		65+	36	12.8	13.6	100.0	11.2
Missing	16	NR	16	5.7	100.0		
Total	281	Totals	281	100.0			

**Question 22: (Marital Status) Are you. .**

Marital status and whether or not dependents lived in the household were determined for respondents to the survey. Such status was provided by 93.2% of the respondents.

Q22 Table Marital Status							
Q22							
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	2002 Compared
Valid	262	Married, dependents	120	42.7	45.8	45.8	42.7
		Married, no dependents	86	30.6	32.8	78.6	33.6
		Single, dependents	9	3.2	3.4	82.1	5.8
		Single, no dependents	47	16.7	17.9	100.0	17.9
Missing	19	NR	19	6.8	100.0		
Total	281	Totals	281	100.0			

**Question 23: Do you own or rent your home?**

Nearly ninety-five percent (94.7%) of the respondents shared whether or not they were homeowners or renters. Woodinville residents who are renters did not participate in the survey in comparable proportions to the homeowners. There was a concerted effort to include those known to be in multi-residence locations in the calling lists.

**Table 23: Home Ownership or Renters**

Q23 Table Homeownership							
Q23							
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	2002 Compared
Valid	266	Homeowner	242	86.1	91.0	91.0	88.2
		Renter	24	8.5	9.0	100.0	11.8
Missing	15	NR	15	5.3	100.0		
Total	281	Totals	281	100.0			

**Question 24: What is your household income before taxes?**

Just fewer than seventy percent (69.8%) of the survey respondents agreed to answer this optional question, allowing a profile of an income factor-although leaving out some 30% of the sample. Breakdown by reported household income is shown in **Table 24**.

**Table 24: Annual Household Income**

Q24 Table Income							
Q24							
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	2002 Compared
Valid	196	Less than 30K	16	5.7	8.2	8.2	
		30K to 49K	19	6.8	9.7	17.9	
		50K to 74K	51	18.1	26.0	43.9	38.2
		75K to 99K	43	15.3	21.9	65.8	
		100K to 124K	39	13.9	19.9	85.7	
		125K +	28	10.0	14.3	100.0	61.8
Missing	85	NR	85	30.2	100.0		
Total	281	Totals	281	100.0			

**Question 25: Gender (NOT ASKED, BUT MARKED ON ANSWER SHEET):**

Overall gender distribution of those answering the survey showed slightly more males than females (53% to 47%). **Table 25** shows that distribution.

**Table 25: Gender**

Q25 Table Gender						
Q25						
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	281	Male	149	53.0	53.0	53.0
		Female	132	47.0	47.0	100.0
Missing	0	NR	0	0.0	100.0	
Total	281	Totals	281	100.0		

**26. Areas or Neighborhoods of the City:**

Neighborhoods of the city were not marked on the Answer Sheets for survey takers, but were identified in the selection of phone numbers to call. The number of responses from the various neighborhoods corresponds –within one percentage point--to the percentage of valid phone numbers available to call in that neighborhood. Calls to city sectors were further identified by color codes on the calling lists, with corresponding color-coded answer forms. **Table 26** shows achieved numbers by city sector.

**Table 26: Responses by Neighborhoods of the City**

Area Table							
		Area	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Valid</b>	<b>281</b>	The Wedge		31	11.0	11.0	11.0
		Leota		66	23.5	23.5	34.5
		West Ridge		73	26.0	26.0	60.5
		Town Center		111	39.5	39.5	100.0
<b>Missing</b>	<b>0</b>	NR		0	0.0	100.0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>281</b>	Totals		281	100.0		

# APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A

### Woodinville Community Opinion Survey Master Question List

Hello. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ with Sound Communication. I am calling on behalf of the City of Woodinville. We are conducting a survey to obtain residents' opinions about Woodinville and the City's needs for the future. This is strictly a research call and involves absolutely no sales appeals. Your answers remain strictly confidential. The survey will take a few minutes. Your opinions are important to the city. Are you one of the heads of the household? (IF NO, ASK TO SPEAK TO APPROPRIATE PERSON OR ARRANGE A CALL BACK TIME) May we ask your opinions? Thank you.

First, I need to be sure you live within the Woodinville city limits? (IF NO, THANK YOU, TERMINATE)

#### **THE FIRST QUESTIONS DEAL WITH THE MASTER PLAN FOR THE CIVIC CENTER, INCLUDING PARKS AND RECREATION**

Question 1: In keeping with the vision of the 2001 Civic Center Master Plan, which of the following components is most important to you and your family? (READ. SELECT ONE ONLY)

Question 2: What are the 3 most important recreation program services needed in Woodinville? (READ)

Question 3: What are the three most important recreation facilities needed in Woodinville?  
(OPEN END QUESTION –DO NOT READ—MARK UP TO THREE MENTIONED)

Question 4: How often do you currently participate in recreation or sport programs offered by the city of Woodinville? (READ) (If answer is "Never," GO TO QUESTION 5)

↳ Question 5: What is your reason for not participating in recreation programs offered by the city? (DO NOT READ—TAKE UP TO THREE ITEMS OFFERED)

Question 6: If the city were to place a recreation-oriented bond measure before the voters, which project of the seven I will read should have the highest priority? Use a 0-10 point scale to rate each.

**THE NEXT QUESTIONS DEAL WITH THE DOWNTOWN MASTER PLAN:** (READ CLEARLY) The City's Master Plan for Downtown and the Little Bear Creek Corridor proposes changes in regulations that would encourage a "pedestrian-friendly" development. This means Downtown would be a safe and inviting place to be and walk, with wide sidewalks and shade trees, benches, attractive shops, convenient parking, small offices or housing units on upper floors, and public art and parks.

Question 7: The proposed plan includes public investment in parks, grid roads, pedestrian connections from neighborhoods to downtown and other enhancements to reinvigorate downtown. These types of public investment may require delaying or new priorities for capital investment in other areas of the city. How essential are parks, grid roads, and pedestrian connections from neighborhoods, as public investments downtown? Rate using a 0-10 point scale, "0" mean "not at all essential," and "10" means "highly essential."

Question 8: Many of the qualities mentioned can be done without significant changes in regulation. If encouraging this development also means allowing taller buildings (up to 5 stories max) and more housing density in limited downtown areas, how willing are you to accept changes to building height and density? (READ. MARK ONE RESPONSE ONLY)

Question 9: What do you think would make the downtown area more appealing so that you would want to visit and spend time there? (DO NOT READ.—MARK OR WRITE FIRST 3 SUGGESTIONS)

**THIS NEXT SECTION ASKS ABOUT GOVERNMENT SERVICES**

Question 10: Using a 0 to 10 point rating scale, where 0 means “not at all satisfied” and 10 means “highly satisfied,” please rate how satisfied you are with the following services provided by city government: (READ the list, asking for a rating on each item)

Question 11: Using that same scale, how satisfied would you say you are overall with the City of Woodinville as a city government?

Question 12: What city services or programs have you used or participated in during the last 12 months? (DO NOT READ—MARK OR WRITE THE ITEMS PROVIDED—UP TO 4)

Question 13: Were there problems with any of your experiences just listed? (SKIP IF “NONE” OR “NO ANSWER” TO QUESTION #11 ABOVE)

Question 14: Many components or features may contribute to your quality of life in Woodinville. Please rate how satisfied you are with the City on these features. We will again use a rating scale of 0-10, with 0 meaning “not at all satisfied” and 10 meaning “highly satisfied.”

Question 15: Using the same 0 to 10 scale, but with 0 meaning “very low” and 10 meaning “very high,” how would you rate the quality of life overall in the City of Woodinville?

Question 16: Compared to two years ago, do you think the quality of life in Woodinville has: (READ)

Question 17: If you could describe the Woodinville community with one word or phrase, what would it be?

**(JUST TWO QUESTIONS REMAIN, ABOUT FUNDING AND BUDGET CHOICES)**

Question 18: The City has limited funds to invest in capital improvements, such as roads, parks, and public facilities. As I read the following, please rate each item on a 0-10 scale, where 0 = low priority and 10 = high priority for funding.

Question 19: If additional resources are needed to fund projects such as those you just rated, please rate your priority for the funding options I will read. Use the same 0-10 scale on low to high priority.

THAT COMPLETES THE SURVEY QUESTIONS. WE HAVE A FEW ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS THAT WILL GIVE A PROFILE OF OUR RESPONDENTS. I REPEAT THAT YOUR RESPONSES ARE CONFIDENTIAL, AND ARE OPTIONAL ON THESE QUESTIONS)

Question 20: How long have you lived in Woodinville?

Question 21: What is your age?

Question 22: Are you. . .(READ)

Question 23: Do you own or rent your home?

Question 24: What is your household income before taxes?

Question 25: (DO NOT ASK, BUT MARK on Answer Sheet) Gender: Male Female

## APPENDIX B ANSWER SHEET

<b>1</b>	<b>In keeping with the vision of the 2001 Civic Center Master Plan, which of the following is most important to you? (READ. SELECT ONE ONLY)</b>
	a. Upgrading existing ball fields,
	b. Additional parking for Wilmot Park and the ball fields.
	c. Renovating the Old Woodinville School on NE 175 <sup>th</sup> Street for community use.
	d. Build a new Community Center building
	e. Upgrade the existing interim Community Recreation Center
	f. Other:
	g. No Answer

<b>2</b>	<b>What are the 3 most important recreation <u>program services</u> needed in Woodinville? (READ)</b>
	a. Special events (Concerts, 4 <sup>th</sup> of July, Festivals, Art )
	b. Sport league and drop-in fitness programs for adults
	c. After school programs for youth
	d. Teen events and programs
	e. Social and recreation programs for special needs youth and adults
	f. Parent education and toddler programs
	g. Summer activities and camps for youth and teens
	h. Art programs (performance & fine arts) for all ages
	i. Sport programs for youth during school year
	Other:
	No Answer

<b>3</b>	<b>What are the three most important recreation <u>facilities</u> needed in Woodinville? (DO NOT READ)</b>
	a. Open space and trails
	b. Sports fields
	c. Community Recreation Center
	d. Teen Center
	e. Additional Parks
	f. Swimming Pool
	g. Gymnasium
	h. Weight Room / weight training area
	i. Other:
	j. Other:
	k. No Answer

<b>4</b>	<b>How often do you currently participate in recreation or sport programs offered by the City of Woodinville?</b>
	a. At least monthly
	b. 5-6 times a year

	c. 3-4 times a year
	d. Occasionally, but less than three times a year
	e. Never ( <b>GO TO QUESTION 5</b> )
	f. No Answer

**Note:**

**ASK Q. # 5 ONLY IF ANSWER TO #4 IS “NEVER”**

<b>5</b>	<b>What is your reason for not participating in recreation programs offered by the city? Do not read</b>
	a. Not aware of the programs offered
	b. Use programs or services elsewhere
	c. Not interested in the activities offered
	d. Too expensive
	e. Need child care in order to participate
	f. Classes or programs always seem full
	g. Lack of transportation to locations
	h. Not offered at useful locations/times
	i. Other:
	j. No Answer

<b>6</b>	<b>If the city were to place a recreation-oriented bond measure before the voters, which of the seven I will read should have the highest priority? Use a 0 to 10 rating for each (0 is lowest and 10 is highest priority)</b>
	a. Facility improvement at Woodinville Community Ctr.
	b. Parking improvements at City sports fields and Wilmot Gateway Park
	c. New Gym and fitness building at Community Center
	d. New Neighborhood parks
	e. Improvements to the old Woodinville school
	f. Bike/pedestrian trails connecting neighborhoods to downtown
	g. None of the above/ Would not support
	h. No Answer

<b>7</b>	<b>How essential are parks, grid roads, and pedestrian connections from neighborhoods, as public investments downtown? (Scale of 0-10)</b>
	a.
	b. No Answer

<b>8</b>	<b>If encouraging this development also means allowing taller buildings (up to 5 stories maximum) and more housing density in limited downtown areas, how willing are you to accept changes to building height and density?</b>
	a. Very willing
	b. Somewhat willing
	c. Not very willing
	d. Totally against
	d. No Opinion
	e. No Answer

<b>9</b>	<b>What do you think would make the downtown area more appealing so that you would want to visit and spend time there?</b>
	a. reduce traffic, congestion
	b. build/expand more parks
	c. make more attractive
	d. reduce local taxes
	e. maintain/preserve natural environment
	f. bring in personal services businesses
	g. expand public transit service.
	h. make more pedestrian--friendly
	i. improve public safety—police services
	j. bring in new retail businesses
	k. increase supply of affordable housing
	l. bring in new retail business
	m. bring in new larger businesses
	n. renovate Community Recreation Center, classes, fitness, gym availability
	o. Other:
	p. Other:
	q. No Answer

<b>10</b>	<b>How satisfied are you with the following services provided by city government? (Scale of 0-10)</b>
	a. Helping improve public transit
	b. Road maintenance and expansion
	c. Making wise use of tax money
	d. Maintaining adequate parks and recreational facilities
	e. City regulation to make affordable housing available
	f. Helpfulness, friendliness, responsiveness, and availability of city staff
	g. Keeping you informed via city newsletter, website, legal notices, and local advertising
	h. Opportunity for involvement in public decision making
	i. Customer- oriented permit processes
	j. Providing recreation programs, classes, special events
	k. Providing adequate police services
	l. Providing appropriate long-range planning for the city
	m. Environmental protections
	n. Other, if mentioned:
	o. No answer

<b>11</b>	<b>Using that same scale, how satisfied are you overall with the City of Woodinville as a city government?</b>
	a.
	b. No Answer

<b>12</b>	<b>What City services or programs have you used or participated in during the past 12 months? (DO NOT READ! MARK OR WRITE ITEMS MENTIONED)</b>
	a. Police services
	b. Parks, trails, pedestrian paths
	c. Special events / concerts (4 <sup>th</sup> of July, Light Fest, etc.)
	d. Community center / sports fields
	e. Building or land use development review
	f. Recreation programs and courses
	g. Neighborhood traffic safety
	h. Volunteer projects
	i. Customer service request at city offices
	j. Other:
	k. None
	L. No Answer

<b>13</b>	<b>Were there problems with any of your experiences just listed?</b>
	b. No Answer

<b>14</b>	<b>Many features may contribute to your quality of life in Woodinville. How satisfied are you with the City on these features? READ (0=not at all satisfied; 10=highly satisfied.)</b>
	a. Job and economic opportunities
	b. A place to raise children
	c. Traffic access and circulation
	d. Affordability of housing in the city
	e. Woodinville's natural environment
	f. Crime and Safety
	g. Parks, open space, recreational opportunities
	h. Building and design regulations
	i. Government services
	j. Other:
	k. No Answer

<b>15</b>	<b>How would you rate the quality of life <u>overall</u> in the City of Woodinville?</b>
	a.
	b. No answer

<b>16</b>	<b>Compared to two years ago, do you think the quality of life in Woodinville has</b>
	a. improved considerably
	b/ improved somewhat

	c. stayed about the same
	d. decreased somewhat
	e. decreased considerably
	f. No Answer

<b>17</b>	<b>If you could describe the Woodinville community with one word or phrase, what would that be?</b>
	b. No Answer

<b>18</b>	<b>The city has limited funds to invest in capital improvements, such as roads, parks, and public facilities. As I read the following, please rate each item on a 0-10 scale, where 0=low priority and 10=high priority for funding. READ</b>
	a. habitat for salmon recovery and preservation
	b. develop local parks from open space already owned
	c. buy open space for future parks
	d. provide more adult sports fields
	e. Renovate Woodinville Community Center to add programming and recreation space
	f. develop new streets to improve current connections
	g. Widen existing roadways, fix congestion points, improve access to freeways
	h. develop non-motorized trails to connect neighborhoods
	i. Neighborhood improvements
	j. Other (+rating number):
	k. No Answer

<b>19</b>	<b>If additional resources are needed to fund projects such as those you just rated, please rate your priority for the funding options I will read. Use the same 0-10 scale on low to high priority.</b>
	a. increase developer fees from new development
	b. use a bond measure that would be paid from increases in property taxes
	c. raise the current utility tax to fund additional projects
	d. no new taxes or additional funds to be used
	e. Other? (+rating number):
	f. No Answer

**Demographics**

<b>20</b>	<b>Length of Residence</b>						
	<1 yr	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	20+	NR

<b>21</b>	<b>Age</b>						
	<b>&lt;25</b>	<b>26-35</b>	<b>36-45</b>	<b>46-55</b>	<b>56-65</b>	<b>65+</b>	<b>NR</b>

<b>22</b>	<b>Are you. . .</b>
	a. married with dependent children
	b. married without dependent children
	c. single with dependent children
	d. single without dependent children
	e. No Answer

<b>23</b>	<b>Renter</b>	<b>Homeowner</b>	<b>NR</b>
-----------	---------------	------------------	-----------

<b>24</b>	<b>Annual Household Income</b>						
	<b>&lt;30</b>	<b>33-49</b>	<b>50-74</b>	<b>75-100</b>	<b>100-125</b>	<b>&gt;125</b>	<b>NR</b>

<b>25</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>
-----------	---------------	-------------

# **APPENDIX C –**

# **RESPONDENT COMMENTS AND LISTS**

### **Question 3i -- Other Suggestions for Recreation Facilities**

- Tennis courts (11)
- Senior center (5)
- Dog park (5)
- Skate park (4)
- Golf course (3)
- Performing Arts center (3)
  
- Running track (3)
- Indoor Skate Rink (2)
- Parks with Parking (2)
  
- Bicycling lanes (2)
- YMCA (2)
- Hiking trails (2)
- Parks (2)
- Meeting space, 4H Club
  
- Bear Creek
- Park with Forest Access
- Adult softball, lights for fields
- Basketball courts; indoor basketball
- Youth directed activities
- Coed sports teams (Bball, T-ball), family oriented activities,
- Park area; dedicated area for Farmers Market
- Preserved wooded areas with trails
- walking trails
- Sport courts, with parking
- Park with facilities for small children
- Horseback riding
- Bike riding
- Bike trails near roads
- Playground
- Indoor sports for kids
- Outdoor activities
- More trails - expand north
  
- Theater
- Bigger park
- Improve ball fields (Sorenson)
- All recreation
- Yoga
- Baseball team
- Restrictions on adult activities in town, Hours in parks for adults
- Maintain Burke/Gilman trail
- More stuff for seniors
- Return to original plan - Zoning stay the same
- Drop-in fields
- Adult programs, Cultural arts center
- More activities for children
- Bowling alley
- Reopen pool

### **Question 5: Other Comments for Not Participating in City Recreation Programs**

- Children are grown (7)
- I do my own stuff (5)
- Illness/injury (5)
- Limited choices for seniors (4)
- Children are too young (3)
- No Need (3)
- Go to Kirkland (2)
- I don't expect the government to entertain
- No pool
- Need more advertising
- Go elsewhere as family
- Need baseball/soccer
- Just lazy
- I have other priorities
- Traffic
- Don't care for the way city money is spent
- Track would be nice
- Skiing?
- Disappointed in teacher for child's program
- Walk 2 miles on my own
- Only been a resident for 3 months

## **Question 9 -- Other Suggestions for Making Downtown More Appealing**

- (20) Parking
- (11) Small shops, locally owned shops
- (7) Crosswalks, traffic coordination
- (7) No more shops; too many shops; don't build anything more; leave alone
- (6) Restaurants
- (6) More diversity in shopping/unique stores
- (5) More centralized; like RTC
- (4) Widen main road
- (4) Bike trail to downtown,
- (4) A central park
- (4) Galleries/museum (similar to Kirkland)
- (4) Flowers/foilage, and upkeep
- (4) Make it easier to walk around
- (3) Concerts/Concert Hall/Outdoor Performances
- (3) Improve connections from neighborhoods to downtown
  
- (3) Costco
- (3) Tree line streets
- (3) Trails, sidewalks
  
- (3) Less fast food
  
- (3) More housing downtown
- (2) Less Chain Stores
- (2) Sidewalk Dining
- (2) Open space
- (2) More sidewalks
- (2) Classes to learn English
  
- 171ST Garden good, 171st too fast
- Coffee shop where you can smoke
- More roads
  
- Great rec. center, Non retail jobs
- The master plan
  
- Better bike access
- Roads before business
- Fabric Store
- No Master Plan
- Noisy
  
- Very Crowded
- Style of Buildings
- Everything is everywhere else
  
- Less shopping sprawl
  
- Took small town, made what?
- Shopping mall has small openings, bottlenecks, gridlock
- More tourist areas downtown
- More upgrading
- Architecture/Banners for City Events
- Higher buildings to make it feel like a city
- Less traffic, please
- Leave south alone
- Playgrounds needed
- Keep kids out of downtown at night
- After-hour evening events
- Stores you want to visit—like an ice cream shop!

**Question 12 J --Other City Activities or Programs You've Participated  
In the Last 12 Months**

- Farmers Market (9)
- Permits (3)
- Hard to find parking at Wilmot Park/worn with traffic (3)
- City council (2)
- Heritage Society (2)
- City council meetings (2)
- Parades (2)
- 911 program
- Magic in the Park
- Roads
- Festival of Lights
- Hazardous waste pickup
- School reunion
- Civics Course
- Meetings
- Planning
- Licensing
- Hospitals
- Arts in the park
- Web site
- Public transportation, court system
- Often ride bike paths - need more
- Shopping
- Parks
- Flea market
- Paying taxes - getting nothing
- Emergency
- Gold at Gold Creek
- Garbage collection

### **Question 13 -- Comments on Problems on City Services**

- Parking (9)
- Things not being done
- No parking at Wilmot (3)
- Congested traffic/especially on 175<sup>th</sup> (2)
- Police - Didn't respond to noise problem when called
- Upset about potential new development in Wellington Hills
- Some days kids aren't allowed to play at Sorensen Field
- Don't like annual backflow water certification
- Trash
- Customer service request took too long
- Police don't listen
- Maybe trim bushes around trails
- Parking and road problems
- Traffic
- Parking at concerts was bad
- Paperwork at court was too slow
- Transportation issues in neighborhoods
- Officers not available, Only time we saw police officers was at the basset hound parade
- Too many speeders
- Police not very responsive (took a while to get to their house)
- Planning and permit department are very tunnel-vision oriented –they are more interested in their own interest and not in the residents'; also slow as snails

## **Question 17 -- Woodinville in One Word or Phrase**

- Friendly (30)
- Nice: nice place to live (20)
- Somewhat Rural, country-like (formerly rural) (12)
- Congested/about to bust at the seams/"10 lbs. in a 5 ob. Bag" (10)
- Pleasant (10)
- Great Family Place (9)
- Comfortable (9)
- Small town/small town feeling (7)
- Quaint (7)
- Convenient (7)
- Good place to live (6)
- Home/Homey (5)
- Growing (5)
  
- Great Place (5)
- Suburban (5)
- Enjoyable (5)
- Beautiful (4)
- Quiet (4)
- Like it the way it is (not like Bellevue!) (4)
- Good (4)
- Overdeveloped (3)
- Clean (3)
- Very Good (3)
- Peaceful (3)
- Awesome (2)
- Livable (2)
- Changing (2)
- Unique (2)
- Progressive (2)
- Increasingly Urban/rural threatened (2)
- Community Involvement/sense of community(2)
- Nice Community (2)
- Laid Back (2)
- Very Nice (2)
- Traffic
  
- Superficial
- Needs work done
  
- Inviting
- Quasi-Country
  
- Yuppieville
  
- Going downhill
- Nice little town
- Traffic snarl
- Rural
- Very good
- A city on the brink of change
- Adequate
- Low key, sleepy
- Desirable
- Excellent
- Hometown feel in suburban setting
- OK
- Used to be nice
- Traffic, Fun
- Safe
  
- Green
- Podunk
- Satellite community
- Shopping
- Moving forward
- Paradise
- Relaxed
- Happy
- Quality of life is very good
- Close-knit
- Best of both worlds (city/country)
- Balanced
  
- Nice atmosphere
- Neighborhood
- Quality over quantity
- Forward-looking
- Nice and calm
- Small city - Very tranquil and pretty
- Poorly planned

- Pretentious
- Redmond Vacation
- Educated class of people, are civic minded because of its appeal and hope to maintain here
  
- Splendid
- Nature
- Good life
- Connected
- Rentwood = Renton+Lynnwood
- Available options
- Buildings
- Lovely town
- Ambience plus urban amenities
- Helpful
- Busy
- Small town feeling near big city
- Confusion
- Participatory
- Growing, but still has a small town feel
- Involved
- Favorable
  
- Warm community
- Good community
- City living, country style - Has advantage of rural and urban facilities
- Rural, but urban enough to make it enjoyable to live here
- Does not feel like a community
- Cohesive
- A little big town

# **APPENDIX D:**

# **TABLES AND CHARTS**

## Question 10: Rate Government Services

### Table 10a: Helping Improve Public Transit

Q10a Table Helping improve public transit							
Q10a							
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	2002 Survey Mean
<b>Valid</b>	<b>203</b>	0	17	6.0	8.4	8.4	
		1	2	0.7	1.0	9.4	
		2	14	5.0	6.9	16.3	
		3	14	5.0	6.9	23.2	
		4	25	8.9	12.3	35.5	
		5	51	18.1	25.1	60.6	
		6	21	7.5	10.3	70.9	
		7	23	8.2	11.3	82.3	
		8	20	7.1	9.9	92.1	
		9	7	2.5	3.4	95.6	
		10	9	3.2	4.4	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	<b>78</b>	NR	78	27.8	100.0		
<b>Total</b>	<b>281</b>		281	100.0	Mean: 5.06	<b>5.22</b>	

### Table 10b: Road Maintenance and Expansion

Q10b Table Road maintenance and expansion							
Q10b							
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	2002 Survey Mean
<b>Valid</b>	<b>263</b>	0	12	4.3	4.6	4.6	
		1	6	2.1	2.3	6.8	
		2	15	5.3	5.7	12.5	
		3	26	9.3	9.9	22.4	
		4	27	9.6	10.3	32.7	
		5	47	16.7	17.9	50.6	
		6	26	9.3	9.9	60.5	
		7	49	17.4	18.6	79.1	
		8	34	12.1	12.9	92.0	
		9	7	2.5	2.7	94.7	
		10	14	5.0	5.3	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	<b>18</b>	NR	18	6.4	100.0		
<b>Total</b>	<b>281</b>		281	100.0	Mean: 5.44	<b>5.15</b>	

**Table 10c: Making Wise Use of Tax Money**

Q10c Table Making wise use of tax money							
Q10c							
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	2002 Survey Mean
Valid	223	0	9	3.2	4.0	4.0	
		1	10	3.6	4.5	8.5	
		2	9	3.2	4.0	12.6	
		3	16	5.7	7.2	19.7	
		4	20	7.1	9.0	28.7	
		5	49	17.4	22.0	50.7	
		6	24	8.5	10.8	61.4	
		7	33	11.7	14.8	76.2	
		8	29	10.3	13.0	89.2	
		9	5	1.8	2.2	91.5	
		10	19	6.8	8.5	100.0	
Missing	58	NR	58	20.6	100.0		
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean: 5.57		

**\*5.16**  
**\*changed ?**

**Table 10d: Maintaining Adequate Parks and Recreational Facilities**

Q10d Table Maintaining adequate parks and recreational facilities							
Q10d							
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	2002 Survey Mean
Valid	262	0	7	2.5	2.7	2.7	
		1	2	0.7	0.8	3.4	
		2	3	1.1	1.1	4.6	
		3	13	4.6	5.0	9.5	
		4	21	7.5	8.0	17.6	
		5	43	15.3	16.4	34.0	
		6	47	16.7	17.9	51.9	
		7	60	21.4	22.9	74.8	
		8	42	14.9	16.0	90.8	
		9	12	4.3	4.6	95.4	
		10	12	4.3	4.6	100.0	
Missing	19	NR	19	6.8	100.0		
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean: 6.15		

**7.03**

**Table 10e: City Regulation to Make Affordable Housing Available**

Q10e Table City regulation to make affordable housing available							
Q10e							
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	2002 Survey Mean
Valid	198	0	8	2.8	4.0	4.0	
		1	8	2.8	4.0	8.1	
		2	16	5.7	8.1	16.2	
		3	13	4.6	6.6	22.7	
		4	16	5.7	8.1	30.8	
		5	59	21.0	29.8	60.6	
		6	19	6.8	9.6	70.2	
		7	21	7.5	10.6	80.8	
		8	25	8.9	12.6	93.4	
		9	7	2.5	3.5	97.0	
		10	6	2.1	3.0	100.0	
Missing	83	NR	83	29.5	100.0		
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean: 5.16		5.12

**Table 10f: Helpfulness, Friendliness, Responsiveness, and Availability of City Staff**

Q10f Table Helpfulness, friendliness, responsiveness, and availability of city staff							
Q10f							
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	2002 Survey Mean
Valid	216	0	6	2.1	2.8	2.8	
		1	3	1.1	1.4	4.2	
		2	7	2.5	3.2	7.4	
		3	12	4.3	5.6	13.0	
		4	3	1.1	1.4	14.4	
		5	23	8.2	10.6	25.0	
		6	19	6.8	8.8	33.8	
		7	36	12.8	16.7	50.5	
		8	51	18.1	23.6	74.1	
		9	19	6.8	8.8	82.9	
		10	37	13.2	17.1	100.0	
Missing	65	NR	65	23.1	100.0		
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean: 6.92		7.08

**Table 10g: Keeping You Informed Via City Newsletter, Website, Legal Notices, and Local Advertising**

Keeping you informed via city newsletter, website, legal notices, and local advertising						
Q10g Table						
Q10g						
	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	2002 Survey Mean
Valid	262	0	2	0.7	0.8	0.8
		1	2	0.7	0.8	1.5
		2	6	2.1	2.3	3.8
		3	6	2.1	2.3	6.1
		4	8	2.8	3.1	9.2
		5	27	9.6	10.3	19.5
		6	27	9.6	10.3	29.8
		7	59	21.0	22.5	52.3
		8	60	21.4	22.9	75.2
		9	35	12.5	13.4	88.5
		10	30	10.7	11.5	100.0
Missing	19	NR	19	6.8	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean: 7.13	7.34

**Table 10h: Opportunity for Involvement in Public Decision Making**

Opportunity for involvement in public decision making						
Q10h Table						
Q10h						
	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	2002 Survey Mean
Valid	244	0	6	2.1	2.5	2.5
		1	0	0.0	0.0	2.5
		2	8	2.8	3.3	5.7
		3	11	3.9	4.5	10.2
		4	12	4.3	4.9	15.2
		5	40	14.2	16.4	31.6
		6	29	10.3	11.9	43.4
		7	48	17.1	19.7	63.1
		8	61	21.7	25.0	88.1
		9	16	5.7	6.6	94.7
		10	13	4.6	5.3	100.0
Missing	37	NR	37	13.2	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean: 6.43	6.51

**Table 10i: Customer-oriented Permit Process**

Customer-oriented permit processes							2002 Survey Mean
Q10i							
	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		
Valid	117	0	6	2.1	5.1	5.1	
		1	2	0.7	1.7	6.8	
		2	2	0.7	1.7	8.5	
		3	5	1.8	4.3	12.8	
		4	9	3.2	7.7	20.5	
		5	33	11.7	28.2	48.7	
		6	16	5.7	13.7	62.4	
		7	20	7.1	17.1	79.5	
		8	11	3.9	9.4	88.9	
		9	6	2.1	5.1	94.0	
	10	7	2.5	6.0	100.0		
Missing	164	NR	164	58.4	100.0		
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean: 5.73		*5.11

**Table 10j: Providing Recreation Programs, Classes, Special Events**

Providing recreation programs, classes, special events							2002 Survey Mean
Q10j							
	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		
Valid	231	0	1	0.4	0.4	0.4	
		1	2	0.7	0.9	1.3	
		2	6	2.1	2.6	3.9	
		3	9	3.2	3.9	7.8	
		4	10	3.6	4.3	12.1	
		5	44	15.7	19.0	31.2	
		6	41	14.6	17.7	48.9	
		7	53	18.9	22.9	71.9	
		8	46	16.4	19.9	91.8	
		9	9	3.2	3.9	95.7	
	10	10	3.6	4.3	100.0		
Missing	50	NR	50	17.8	100.0		
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean: 6.35		6.88

**Table 10k: Providing Adequate Police Services**

Q10k Table Providing adequate police services							
Q10k							
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	2002 Survey Mean
Valid	245	0	2	0.7	0.8	0.8	
		1	1	0.4	0.4	1.2	
		2	5	1.8	2.0	3.3	
		3	6	2.1	2.4	5.7	
		4	8	2.8	3.3	9.0	
		5	17	6.0	6.9	15.9	
		6	24	8.5	9.8	25.7	
		7	57	20.3	23.3	49.0	
		8	68	24.2	27.8	76.7	
		9	27	9.6	11.0	87.8	
		10	30	10.7	12.2	100.0	
Missing	36	NR	36	12.8	100.0		
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean: 7.25		*NA

**Table 10l: Providing Appropriate Long-range Planning for the City**

Q10l Table Providing appropriate long-range planning for the city							
Q10l							
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	2002 Survey Mean
Valid	224	0	5	1.8	2.2	2.2	
		1	1	0.4	0.4	2.7	
		2	8	2.8	3.6	6.3	
		3	9	3.2	4.0	10.3	
		4	18	6.4	8.0	18.3	
		5	32	11.4	14.3	32.6	
		6	29	10.3	12.9	45.5	
		7	46	16.4	20.5	66.1	
		8	48	17.1	21.4	87.5	
		9	10	3.6	4.5	92.0	
		10	18	6.4	8.0	100.0	
Missing	57	NR	57	20.3	100.0		
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean: 6.37		*NA

**Table 10m: Environmental Protections**

Environmental protections							2002 Survey Mean
Q10m Table	Q10m						
	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		
Valid	221	0	9	3.2	4.1	4.1	
		1	1	0.4	0.5	4.5	
		2	3	1.1	1.4	5.9	
		3	8	2.8	3.6	9.5	
		4	14	5.0	6.3	15.8	
		5	39	13.9	17.6	33.5	
		6	32	11.4	14.5	48.0	
		7	41	14.6	18.6	66.5	
		8	48	17.1	21.7	88.2	
		9	11	3.9	5.0	93.2	
		10	15	5.3	6.8	100.0	
Missing	60	NR	60	21.4	100.0		
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean: 6.31		*NA

**Question 14: QUALITY OF LIFE CONTRIBUTORS**  
**Question 14 Tables**

**Table 14a: Job and Economic Opportunities**

Q14a		Job and economic opportunities				
Q14a		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	203	0	2	0.7	1.0	1.0
		1	3	1.1	1.5	2.5
		2	7	2.5	3.4	5.9
		3	12	4.3	5.9	11.8
		4	16	5.7	7.9	19.7
		5	52	18.5	25.6	45.3
		6	28	10.0	13.8	59.1
		7	40	14.2	19.7	78.8
		8	30	10.7	14.8	93.6
		9	4	1.4	2.0	95.6
		10	9	3.2	4.4	100.0
Missing	78	NR	78	27.8	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean 5.87	

**Table: 14b: A Place to Raise Children**

Q14b		A place to raise children				
Q14b		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	250	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2	1	0.4	0.4	0.4
		3	0	0.0	0.0	0.4
		4	4	1.4	1.6	2.0
		5	11	3.9	4.4	6.4
		6	12	4.3	4.8	11.2
		7	46	16.4	18.4	29.6
		8	90	32.0	36.0	65.6
		9	35	12.5	14.0	79.6
		10	51	18.1	20.4	100.0
Missing	31	NR	31	11.0	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean 8.05	

**Table 14c: Traffic Access and Circulation**

Q14c		Traffic access and circulation				
Table						
Q14c						
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	267	0	14	5.0	5.2	5.2
		1	11	3.9	4.1	9.4
		2	33	11.7	12.4	21.7
		3	38	13.5	14.2	36.0
		4	45	16.0	16.9	52.8
		5	41	14.6	15.4	68.2
		6	32	11.4	12.0	80.1
		7	25	8.9	9.4	89.5
		8	19	6.8	7.1	96.6
		9	5	1.8	1.9	98.5
		10	4	1.4	1.5	100.0
Missing	14	NR	14	5.0	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean 4.42	

**Table 14d: Affordability of Housing in the City**

Q14d		Affordability of housing in the city				
Table						
Q14d						
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	237	0	5	1.8	2.1	2.1
		1	7	2.5	3.0	5.1
		2	19	6.8	8.0	13.1
		3	39	13.9	16.5	29.5
		4	35	12.5	14.8	44.3
		5	44	15.7	18.6	62.9
		6	34	12.1	14.3	77.2
		7	30	10.7	12.7	89.9
		8	14	5.0	5.9	95.8
		9	8	2.8	3.4	99.2
		10	2	0.7	0.8	100.0
Missing	44	NR	44	15.7	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean 4.81	

**Table 14e: Woodinville’s Natural Environment**

Q14e		Woodinville's natural environment				
Q14e		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	260	0	2	0.7	0.8	0.8
		1	2	0.7	0.8	1.5
		2	9	3.2	3.5	5.0
		3	4	1.4	1.5	6.5
		4	9	3.2	3.5	10.0
		5	19	6.8	7.3	17.3
		6	27	9.6	10.4	27.7
		7	60	21.4	23.1	50.8
		8	74	26.3	28.5	79.2
		9	30	10.7	11.5	90.8
		10	24	8.5	9.2	100.0
Missing	21	NR	21	7.5	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean 7.10	

**Table 14f: Crime and Safety**

Q14f		Crime and Safety				
Q14f		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	262	0	1	0.4	0.4	0.4
		1	1	0.4	0.4	0.8
		2	0	0.0	0.0	0.8
		3	1	0.4	0.4	1.1
		4	4	1.4	1.5	2.7
		5	21	7.5	8.0	10.7
		6	23	8.2	8.8	19.5
		7	67	23.8	25.6	45.0
		8	87	31.0	33.2	78.2
		9	34	12.1	13.0	91.2
		10	23	8.2	8.8	100.0
Missing	19	NR	19	6.8	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean 7.50	

**Table 14g: Parks, Open Space, Recreational Opportunities**

Q14g Table		Parks, open space, recreational opportunities				
Q14g		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	258	0	3	1.1	1.2	1.2
		1	0	0.0	0.0	1.2
		2	3	1.1	1.2	2.3
		3	9	3.2	3.5	5.8
		4	11	3.9	4.3	10.1
		5	26	9.3	10.1	20.2
		6	35	12.5	13.6	33.7
		7	79	28.1	30.6	64.3
		8	54	19.2	20.9	85.3
		9	19	6.8	7.4	92.6
		10	19	6.8	7.4	100.0
Missing	23	NR	23	8.2	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean 6.83	

**Table 14h: Building and Design Regulations**

Q14h Table		Building and design regulations				
Q14h		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	192	0	4	1.4	2.1	2.1
		1	4	1.4	2.1	4.2
		2	10	3.6	5.2	9.4
		3	8	2.8	4.2	13.5
		4	14	5.0	7.3	20.8
		5	46	16.4	24.0	44.8
		6	26	9.3	13.5	58.3
		7	36	12.8	18.8	77.1
		8	33	11.7	17.2	94.3
		9	4	1.4	2.1	96.4
		10	7	2.5	3.6	100.0
Missing	89	NR	89	31.7	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean 5.79	

**Table 14i: Government Services**

Q14i		Government services				
Table		Q14i				
	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	215	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		1	0.4	0.5	0.5	
		2	4	1.4	1.9	2.3
		3	5	1.8	2.3	4.7
		4	8	2.8	3.7	8.4
		5	41	14.6	19.1	27.4
		6	33	11.7	15.3	42.8
		7	60	21.4	27.9	70.7
		8	41	14.6	19.1	89.8
		9	8	2.8	3.7	93.5
		10	14	5.0	6.5	100.0
Missing	66	NR	66	23.5	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean 6.60	

**QUESTION 18: PRIORITY FOR FUNDING CAPITAL PROJECTS**  
**Question 18 Tables**

**Table 18a: Habitat for Salmon Recovery and Preservation**

Q18a		Habitat for salmon recovery and preservation				
Table						
Q18a		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	264	0	10	3.6	3.8	3.8
		1	5	1.8	1.9	5.7
		2	20	7.1	7.6	13.3
		3	22	7.8	8.3	21.6
		4	16	5.7	6.1	27.7
		5	57	20.3	21.6	49.2
		6	22	7.8	8.3	57.6
		7	43	15.3	16.3	73.9
		8	37	13.2	14.0	87.9
		9	9	3.2	3.4	91.3
		10	23	8.2	8.7	100.0
Missing	17	NR	17	6.0	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean 5.68	

**Table 18b: Develop Local Parks from Open Space Already Owned**

Q18b		Develop local parks from open space already owned				
Table						
Q18b		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	267	0	7	2.5	2.6	2.6
		1	0	0.0	0.0	2.6
		2	4	1.4	1.5	4.1
		3	8	2.8	3.0	7.1
		4	8	2.8	3.0	10.1
		5	36	12.8	13.5	23.6
		6	28	10.0	10.5	34.1
		7	68	24.2	25.5	59.6
		8	59	21.0	22.1	81.6
		9	23	8.2	8.6	90.3
		10	26	9.3	9.7	100.0
Missing	14	NR	14	5.0	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean 6.84	

**Table 18c: Buy Open Space for Future Parks**

Q18c Buy open space for future parks						
Q18c						
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	264	0	12	4.3	4.5	4.5
		1	4	1.4	1.5	6.1
		2	13	4.6	4.9	11.0
		3	13	4.6	4.9	15.9
		4	22	7.8	8.3	24.2
		5	35	12.5	13.3	37.5
		6	36	12.8	13.6	51.1
		7	45	16.0	17.0	68.2
		8	44	15.7	16.7	84.8
		9	17	6.0	6.4	91.3
		10	23	8.2	8.7	100.0
Missing	17	NR	17	6.0	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean 6.05	

**Table 18d: Provide More Adult Sports Fields**

Q18d Provide more adult sports fields						
Q18d						
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	252	0	16	5.7	6.3	6.3
		1	7	2.5	2.8	9.1
		2	33	11.7	13.1	22.2
		3	17	6.0	6.7	29.0
		4	40	14.2	15.9	44.8
		5	46	16.4	18.3	63.1
		6	38	13.5	15.1	78.2
		7	29	10.3	11.5	89.7
		8	22	7.8	8.7	98.4
		9	1	0.4	0.4	98.8
		10	3	1.1	1.2	100.0
Missing	29	NR	29	10.3	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean 4.60	

**Table 18e: Renovate Woodinville Community Center to Add Programming and Recreation Space**

Renovate Woodinville Community Center to add programming and recreation space						
Q18e Table						
Q18e						
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Valid</b>	<b>256</b>	0	6	2.1	2.3	2.3
		1	7	2.5	2.7	5.1
		2	5	1.8	2.0	7.0
		3	20	7.1	7.8	14.8
		4	22	7.8	8.6	23.4
		5	53	18.9	20.7	44.1
		6	42	14.9	16.4	60.5
		7	49	17.4	19.1	79.7
		8	31	11.0	12.1	91.8
		9	10	3.6	3.9	95.7
		10	11	3.9	4.3	100.0
<b>Missing</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>NR</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>281</b>		<b>281</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Mean 5.75</b>	

**Table 18f: Develop New Streets to Improve Current Connections**

Develop new streets to improve current connections						
Q18f Table						
Q18f						
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Valid</b>	<b>267</b>	0	2	0.7	0.7	0.7
		1	3	1.1	1.1	1.9
		2	8	2.8	3.0	4.9
		3	7	2.5	2.6	7.5
		4	7	2.5	2.6	10.1
		5	31	11.0	11.6	21.7
		6	29	10.3	10.9	32.6
		7	41	14.6	15.4	47.9
		8	56	19.9	21.0	68.9
		9	30	10.7	11.2	80.1
		10	53	18.9	19.9	100.0
<b>Missing</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>NR</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>281</b>		<b>281</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Mean 7.24</b>	

**Table 18g: Widen Existing Roadways, Fix Congestion Points, Improve Access to Freeways**

Q18g Table Widen existing roadways, fix congestion points, improve access to freeways						
Q18g						
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	266	0	1	0.4	0.4	0.4
		1	1	0.4	0.4	0.8
		2	7	2.5	2.6	3.4
		3	4	1.4	1.5	4.9
		4	5	1.8	1.9	6.8
		5	14	5.0	5.3	12.0
		6	19	6.8	7.1	19.2
		7	33	11.7	12.4	31.6
		8	53	18.9	19.9	51.5
		9	43	15.3	16.2	67.7
		10	86	30.6	32.3	100.0
Missing	15	NR	15	5.3	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean 8.02	

**Table 18h: Develop Non-motorized Trails to Connect Neighborhoods**

Q18h Table Develop non-motorized trails to connect neighborhoods						
Q18h						
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	266	0	11	3.9	4.1	4.1
		1	4	1.4	1.5	5.6
		2	8	2.8	3.0	8.6
		3	10	3.6	3.8	12.4
		4	10	3.6	3.8	16.2
		5	25	8.9	9.4	25.6
		6	31	11.0	11.7	37.2
		7	44	15.7	16.5	53.8
		8	58	20.6	21.8	75.6
		9	35	12.5	13.2	88.7
		10	30	10.7	11.3	100.0
Missing	15	NR	15	5.3	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean 6.72	

**Table 18i: Neighborhood Improvements**

Q18i Table		Neighborhood improvements				
Q18i		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	224	0	5	1.8	2.2	2.2
		1	6	2.1	2.7	4.9
		2	9	3.2	4.0	8.9
		3	10	3.6	4.5	13.4
		4	13	4.6	5.8	19.2
		5	38	13.5	17.0	36.2
		6	39	13.9	17.4	53.6
		7	53	18.9	23.7	77.2
		8	21	7.5	9.4	86.6
		9	17	6.0	7.6	94.2
	10	13	4.6	5.8	100.0	
Missing	57	NR	57	20.3	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean 6.04	

**QUESTION 19: IF ADDITIONAL RESOURCES NEEDED**  
**Question 19 Tables**

**Table 19a: Increase Developer Fees from New Development**

Q19a Table Increase developer fees from new development						
Q19a						
	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
<b>Valid</b>	258	0	10	3.6	3.9	3.9
		1	3	1.1	1.2	5.0
		2	5	1.8	1.9	7.0
		3	5	1.8	1.9	8.9
		4	7	2.5	2.7	11.6
		5	33	11.7	12.8	24.4
		6	28	10.0	10.9	35.3
		7	50	17.8	19.4	54.7
		8	57	20.3	22.1	76.7
		9	19	6.8	7.4	84.1
		10	41	14.6	15.9	100.0
<b>Missing</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>NR</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>281</b>		<b>281</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Mean 6.88</b>	

**Table 19b: Use a Bond Measure that would be Paid from Increases in Property Taxes**

Q19b Table Use a bond measure that would be paid from increases in property taxes						
Q19b						
	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
<b>Valid</b>	264	0	39	13.9	14.8	14.8
		1	17	6.0	6.4	21.2
		2	25	8.9	9.5	30.7
		3	24	8.5	9.1	39.8
		4	28	10.0	10.6	50.4
		5	47	16.7	17.8	68.2
		6	27	9.6	10.2	78.4
		7	31	11.0	11.7	90.2
		8	17	6.0	6.4	96.6
		9	3	1.1	1.1	97.7
		10	6	2.1	2.3	100.0
<b>Missing</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>NR</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>281</b>		<b>281</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Mean 4.12</b>	

**Table 19c: Raise the Current Utility Tax to Fund Additional Projects**

Q19c Table						
Raise the current utility tax to fund additional projects						
Q19c						
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	262	0	30	10.7	11.5	11.5
		1	16	5.7	6.1	17.6
		2	28	10.0	10.7	28.2
		3	34	12.1	13.0	41.2
		4	41	14.6	15.6	56.9
		5	38	13.5	14.5	71.4
		6	38	13.5	14.5	85.9
		7	27	9.6	10.3	96.2
		8	10	3.6	3.8	100.0
		9	0	0.0	0.0	100.0
		10	0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Missing	19	NR	19	6.8	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean 3.91	

**Table 19d: No New Taxes or Additional Funds to be Used**

Q19d Table						
No new taxes or additional funds to be used						
Q19d						
		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	258	0	20	7.1	7.8	7.8
		1	14	5.0	5.4	13.2
		2	18	6.4	7.0	20.2
		3	23	8.2	8.9	29.1
		4	14	5.0	5.4	34.5
		5	43	15.3	16.7	51.2
		6	16	5.7	6.2	57.4
		7	24	8.5	9.3	66.7
		8	15	5.3	5.8	72.5
		9	13	4.6	5.0	77.5
		10	58	20.6	22.5	100.0
Missing	23	NR	23	8.2	100.0	
Total	281		281	100.0	Mean 5.70	

