THE COUNCIL’S PRIMARY INTEREST IN THE 2017 SUMMIT:

The City Council is primarily interested in discussing in depth four big issues facing the City this year: public safety, transportation, Town Center, and community events. As a result of these discussions, we will have defined the problems that need to be addressed, articulated our mutual interests, and identified the range of solutions the City should consider.

NOTE: Refreshments will be served at 7:45. Please arrive early to enjoy them so that we can convene the meeting precisely at 8:00.

8:00  Welcome! Review Today’s Purpose
      MAYOR JEFF WAGNER

8:05  Review Agenda and Ground Rules
      FACILITATOR JIM REID

8:10  Identify Major Accomplishments of 2016
      COUNCIL AND LEADERSHIP TEAM

  ▪  What was an accomplishment of the Council and/or staff in 2016 that will have positive, long-term benefits for Covington?
8:35 Review Vision, Mission, Goals
COUNCIL

- Are the vision and mission statements still taking the City in the right direction? If not, how should we revise them?
- Are our current Council goals still valid as tools to achieve our vision? If not, how should we revise them?

8:45 Discuss Community Survey Findings
COUNCIL and COMMUNICATIONS AND MARKETING MANAGER KARLA SLATE

- What are the most important findings from the community survey conducted in 2016, particularly given the major issues on today’s agenda?
- What are the Councilmembers’ reactions and responses to these findings?

9:10 Public Safety
COUNCIL and CHIEF OF POLICE ANDY MCCURDY

In 2016 the number of calls for service continued to increase and the crimes became more complicated and violent. The Council is interested in learning why, and discussing what the City might do to stop this trend and reduce the crime rate.

- What do the crime statistics and data indicate about the rate and nature of crimes in 2016?
- What appear to be the causes of crime? Are we witnessing the beginning of new trends?
- What might the City do to combat crime, both violent and non-violent? Should the City sponsor community conversations or implement a regional approach or pursue both strategies?
- What resources would be needed? From where would funding come?
- Would the addition of resources or changes in how they are deployed have any impacts on our contract with King County?
- What is our current thinking about fireworks? Should the City ban their sale and/or use in Covington, as Kent and Maple Valley have?

10:00 Break
10:10 Town Center
COUNCIL, CITY MANAGER REGAN BOLLI, FINANCE DIRECTOR ROB HENDRICKSON, AND PRINCIPAL PLANNER SALINA LYONS

The Council is interested in maintaining momentum for its vision of developing Town Center. With the passage of the School Bond, the Kent School District appears ready to sell the parcel of land it owns that could become Town Center. Thus, 2017 and ‘18 may be crucial years for advancing the Council’s vision.

- What is the status of the City’s engagement with the developer to assist us in achieving the Council’s vision for Town Center?
- What are the estimated costs of purchasing the land and developing Town Center?
- How do we make it happen? From where will the funding come? Are there strategies, such as phasing the facilities that are envisioned as part of Town Center, that would make developing Town Center more affordable?

12:15 Lunch

- Lunch will be provided.

12:45 Transportation
COUNCIL, PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR DON VONDRA, AND SALINA

The City’s transportation system is a key contributor to the quality of life in Covington and the success of economic development efforts, such as the development of the Town Center. The Council is interested in improving the system for both residents and businesses, and seeks to identify revenue options and the pros and cons of each.

- Is the current plan meeting the Council’s expectations? Will it advance the Council’s vision for the future of the City’s transportation system?
- What resources are we currently relying on to fund them? Are there other resources we should consider?
  a. Would joining the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA, i.e., Sound Transit) provide additional funding for transportation improvements?
  b. Should the City consider raising the car tab fee?
  c. Are there other options?

1:30 For the Love of Covington
COUNCIL AND REGAN

The leadership team is interested in making sure that there is an element of fun in everything we do.

- View “For the Love of Cities,” the video produced by the Association of Washington Cities (AWC).
- What potential fun ideas could Council and staff incorporate into our work?
- What are the Council’s reactions and thoughts?
1:55 **Community Events and Appreciating Volunteers**  
**COUNCIL, KARLA, PERSONNEL MANAGER NOREEN BEAUFREERE, AND PARKS AND RECREATION DIRECTOR ETHAN NEWTON**

2017 is a celebratory year for Covington as it commemorates twenty years of cityhood and the fortieth anniversary of the Aquatics Center.

The Council has three primary interests in events: a) engage enough people to make them worthwhile and cost-effective; b) volunteers participate in the events honoring them; and c) staff has sufficient support to produce events and do not become “burned out.”

- What is planned to celebrate the City’s 20th anniversary?
- Is anything planned to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the Aquatics Center?
- What are our interests in honoring volunteers?
- Based on our current experiences, how do volunteers appear to feel about the events that are held to recognize them?
- If they are not fulfilling the Council’s expectations or the volunteers’ needs, what other ways could appropriately and sufficiently honor and celebrate volunteers?
- What resources would staff need to produce events, celebrations, or other means of recognizing them?

2:40 **Break**

2:50 **Communitywide Strategic Plan**  
**COUNCIL, REGAN, AND LEADERSHIP TEAM**

One of the major discussions at last year’s summit was the communitywide strategic plan. The development of the plan is underway. Some Councilmembers are interested in briefly reviewing the timeline and process to ensure that the full Council and leadership team are on the same page in terms of the plan’s importance to both the community and City government.

- What is the schedule for finishing and adopting the strategic plan?
- How does the Council intend to use it once it has been adopted?
- What lessons have we already learned while developing the plan?

3:10 **Community and Regional Relationships**  
**COUNCIL**

- What are our interests and expectations as we work with community and regional partners in 2017?
3:30  Other Issues on the Horizon
      COUNCIL
      ▪  What are other issues of interest for possible future Council discussions?

3:40  Wrap-up: Final Thoughts
      COUNCIL AND LEADERSHIP TEAM
      ▪  What are we taking away from today’s meeting?

3:45  Adjourn
Welcome!
Review Today’s Purpose
(no attachments)
Review Agenda and Ground Rules

(no attachments)
Identify Major Accomplishments of 2016
### 2016 Summit Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Person(s) Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Vision, Mission, Goals | 1. Retitle “Youth and Families” - change language to read “Provide city services, programs, and facilities that emphasize and meet the needs of Covington’s...” Propose a word for the ending of the sentence that is inclusive, welcoming, and personable.  
2. Council asked the staff to use a better word than “residents” or “citizens.”  
3. Once they have reached consensus on the new goal statement, the vision, mission, and goals should be given to the Commissions with a request that their members react to and, if interested, comment on these items. | All identified changes made and approved by council. The edited version has been sent to commissions. New posters to be printed after any final edits are made. | Karla |
| Strategic Plan     | 1. Identify more specific strategies to achieve the goals (a “road map”); b) identifying and ranking priority actions or projects to advance the goals and strategies; and c) more clearly directing resources to those actions or projects.  
2. Present a proposed process, including a timeline for producing the initial plan and efficient means for obtaining input from the Commissions and public. | Met with Jim Reid and developed a task plan, timeline and budget, worked on survey to tie into plan. Jim met with Management Team on 7/26/16. Leadership Team created goal objectives. Jim facilitated a discussion on 10/29 with the council. Have met several times with council working on the creation of action items. Put on hold for council to discuss the process at the 2017 summit. | Regan |
| Biennial Budget    | Initiate a biennial budget process beginning on 1 January 2017. The first biennial budget will be for 2017-’18 and needs to be adopted by resolution no later than June of this year | Brought to council and passed an ordinance to start the budget process for a Jan 1, 2019 implementation date. | Rob |
| Public Safety      | 1. reach out to and educate business owners and neighbors; b) encourage them to voluntarily take more responsibility for crime prevention; and c) encourage the use of building design | Have visited nearly 30 different organizations including service organizations, HOA’s, businesses, radio station, commissions, RFA, schools and more. Discussed public safety related issues and how we can all be involved. | Andy, Karla, Sharon, Regan |
| Public Safety Cont. | features that help prevent such crimes as vandalism, burglaries, and shoplifting.  
2. Help establish more block watch groups. Work with neighborhood organizations, including Home Owners’ Associations (HOAs). The City may also work with schools to educate administrators, parents, and students about what they can do to help prevent crimes.  
3. Increase participation in the City’s Volunteers in Police Service program.  
4. Discuss with Lakepointe Developers about a storefront.  
5. Work for a substance abuse treatment facility in the Covington area. | Been heavily involved in the opening of the Kent substance abuse Treatment Center.  
Discussed a police storefront at the Lakepointe Development with the developers but have been turned down.  
Used an intern to develop a manual that volunteers can use as a guide when they start manning the office when we expand to have a public entrance. |
| 20th Anniversary | 1. Begin with a “soft” opening on 31 August 2016, the 19th anniversary, and ends with a celebration on 31 August 2017.  
2. Develop a proposal, including options and a budget. | A plan was developed and approved by council. The plan was kicked off at the Dec. 3 tree lighting event and will continue throughout 2017. It will culminate with an event on the city's official birthday - August 31.  
Karla |
| Homelessness | Get this item on the agenda and discuss and present on this topic at the 2016 annual tri-cities meeting. | Done  
Regan, Sharon, Noreen |
| Town Center | 1. Determine if and when the School District will put the property on the market;  
2. Prepare a resolution for the City Council to endorse the bond measure that the School District will place on the ballot;  
3. Prepare a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Panattoni to purchase the school property when it comes available;  
4. Organize a Council “listening session” at Kentwood High School | 1. KSD indicated that the property would be available 2 years from the time the bond passes.  
2. Resolution was prepared and passed and sent to KSD. Did this a second time for the Nov. Ballot.  
3. Researched our RFP with the other final consultant for our town center development and met to discuss this project with them.  
4. Held listening session at Kentwood.  
5. Working on short plat with KSD.  
Town Center Team |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Signatures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Survey</td>
<td>Conduct a citizen survey including a few questions regarding town center.</td>
<td>Developed questions, presented to council and submitted to survey firm. Survey conducted Dec. 1-20 and final report received from consultant. Results to be discussed at council summit.</td>
<td>Karla, Regan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Appreciation</td>
<td>Combine the volunteer appreciation dinner with a summer concert and have a volunteer night.</td>
<td>A catered appreciation dinner was held at CCP in conjunction with the last Concert of the Summer Concert Series. There were around 100 RSVPs and roughly 65 people actually attended. Of those 65, about 20 were volunteers and the rest were their family members.</td>
<td>Noreen, Karla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of the City</td>
<td>Combine the “State of the City Address” with the event at which the “Commissioner of the Year” Award is given. This event would most likely be held in January or November.</td>
<td>Event was held on January 10, 2017. Commissioner and volunteer nominations have been received and voted on. Email invitations have been sent to all commissions. Was a very successful event.</td>
<td>Sharon, Noreen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Youth City Council                         | 1. Draft a youth city council/board ordinance  
2. Recruit adult leaders | Met with and gathered numerous bylaws and ordinances from other jurisdictions. Presented a resolution to council for adoption. Currently recruiting adult leaders/mentors. | Regan, Sharon |
| Illegal Dumping                            | 1. Work with HOA’s to help prevent illegal dumping.  
2. Council agreed to work closely with the business community to help prevent or reduce illegal dumping and to ensure that commercial areas are well maintained.  
2. Since the adoption of mandatory garbage there has been no significant decrease or increase of illegal dumping. The trend seems to be steady at around three incidents per month. | Richard, Regan |
| Council Policies and Operations            | 1. Amend current polices and operations to reflect the changes agreed to at the council summit.  
2. Draft a code of ethics.  
3. Discussion with commissions on how the Council and Commissions interact. The purpose of these discussions will be to elicit from Commission members any ideas for improving communications and interactions, including the | 1. Policies amended and approved by council.  
2. Code of ethics drafted and approved by council.  
3. Spoke with each commission and presented findings to council. | Sara, Sharon, LT |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Current Monthly Report</strong></th>
<th><strong>Commission Chairs give at a council meeting.</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Letter from Mayor</strong></td>
<td>Letter of gratitude sent to Commission members when they step down, and urge them to complete the survey. The Mayor would also like the letter to include an offer for departing Commission members to meet with him to discuss their experience serving the City on a Commission.</td>
<td>Converting the current email to letter form for Mayors signature and it will include invitation to meet with the Mayor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sister City</strong></td>
<td>Facilitate the cultural exchange program and recruit host families.</td>
<td>Developed a recruitment packet, visited high schools and other organizations to recruit host families and coordinated travel plans with Tatsuno. Hosted ten students and three chaperones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legislative</strong></td>
<td>Legislative Agenda and lobbying efforts</td>
<td>Met numerous times with our legislators throughout the session and after the session. Continually work with our city lobbyist. Invited legislators to council meeting to recognize them for their service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review Vision, Mission, Goals
→ **Vision**

Covington: Unmatched quality of life

→ **Mission**

Covington is a destination community where neighbors, businesses and civic leaders collaborate to preserve and foster a strong sense of unity.

→ **Goals**

**Economic Development:** Encourage and support a business community that is committed to Covington for the long-term and offers diverse products and services, family wage jobs, and a healthy tax base to support public services.

**Town Center:** Establish Covington Town Center as a vibrant residential, commercial, educational, social, and cultural gathering place that is safe, pedestrian-friendly, well-designed, and well-maintained.

**Community:** Provide city services, programs, and facilities that emphasize and meet the needs of our Covington Community.

**Neighborhoods:** Foster community cohesiveness, communications, and cooperation, and maintain neighborhoods that offer a variety of housing options that are diverse, safe, accessible, and well-designed.

**Municipal Services:** Plan, develop, implement, and maintain high quality capital infrastructure and services that reflect the needs of a growing community.

**Customer Service:** Recruit, support, and retain a professional team of employees, volunteers, and stakeholders who offer outstanding customer service, ensure stewardship of the public’s money, and promote the City.
Discuss Community Survey Findings
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INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the results of a survey of residents of Covington, Washington about their city and city government. The survey, conducted on behalf of the City of Covington, sought to assess residents’ priorities and their evaluation of city government performance across a range of programs and services.

A total of 488 residents were interviewed by telephone and online between December 1 - 20, 2016. Building on similar surveys in 2009 and 2013, respondents were asked about:

- The importance of a range of city government programs and services;
- City government performance on the same list of programs and services;
- Opinions about various proposals for new programs and services; and
- Sources of information about city issues and government.

Data for this year’s survey was collected predominantly online. A total of 403 questionnaires were completed online versus 89 via telephone interview. The 2013 survey was evenly divided with 226 interviews via telephone and 222 online.

This difference in data collection mode may contribute to somewhat lower evaluations for city services in this survey compared to previous years. Research indicates that telephone respondents tend to give more positive responses than online respondents, particularly to rating scale items where on-line respondents are typically less likely to give the highest rating than are telephone respondents. The preponderance of online respondents in this survey compared to 2013 would therefore be expected to depress the rating scores slightly.

The survey was designed and conducted by Elway Research, Inc. The questionnaire was developed in collaboration with city staff.

The report includes Key Findings, followed by annotated graphs summarizing the results of each question. The full questionnaire and a complete set of cross-tabulation tables is presented in the appendix.
METHODS

SAMPLE: 488 Covington Adults (age 18+).

FIELD DATES: December 1-20, 2016.

TECHNIQUE: Mixed mode:
403 completed the survey online;
50 were interviewed by landline telephone.
39 on cell phones.

MARGIN OF ERROR: ±4.5% at the 95% confidence interval. That is, in theory, had all households been interviewed, there is a 95% chance the results would be within ±4.5% of the results in this survey.

DATA COLLECTION: Calls for the telephone survey were made during weekday evenings and weekend days by trained, professional interviewers under supervision. Up to six attempts were made to contact each number in the sample before a substitute number was called. Questionnaires were edited for completeness, and a percentage of each interviewer’s calls were re-called for verification.

Households for which no telephone number was available, or which we were unable to contact via telephone, were invited by mail to take the survey online.

It must be kept in mind that survey research cannot predict the future. Although great care and the most rigorous methods available were employed in the design, execution and analysis of this survey, these results should be interpreted as representing the answers given by these respondents to these questions at the time they were interviewed.
Mixed-Mode Survey Method

This survey was conducted using a mixed-mode sample design that combined telephone and online data collection.

The most recent data indicates 6,212 voter households in the City of Covington (at least one person in the household is registered to vote). We obtained 3129 telephone numbers and 3083 addresses without telephone numbers for those households.

All 3129 telephone numbers were called up to six times each or until someone answered and either agreed or refused to be interviewed. The 3083 households for which we had no telephone number were mailed a letter from the mayor asking a designated adult\(^1\) in the household to log on to our survey website and complete the questionnaire online. They were sent a thank you/reminder post card one week after the initial mailing.

The telephone survey resulted in 89 interviews, for a completion rate\(^2\) of 3%, and a cooperation rate\(^3\) of 13%. Households which we were unable to contact via telephone (N=1360) were mailed a postcard asking them to go online and complete the survey.

The online survey resulted in 403 completed questionnaires for a completion rate of 9%. These numbers include those originally in the telephone sample who were invited to take the survey online.

The data from both modes were combined into a single data set.

The literature cited earlier about differences between online and telephone respondents and rating scales was borne out in these results:

- The telephone respondents gave a higher performance grade for 16 of the 17 programs and services tested in this survey.

- However, online respondents were less likely to give a grade to each of the 17 services, indicating less familiarity with the service.

- At the same time, for 16 of the 17 services, online respondents were more likely than telephone respondents to rate the service as “essential.”

Because of this mode differential, it is argued that mixed-mode data collection produces a more representative result than either a telephone or online sample alone would have produced.

\(^1\) Instructions were that the survey be completed by the adult (18+) in the household with the most recent birthday. This is a common practice to randomize respondents.

\(^2\) The completion rate is the percentage of completed interviews by the total number of telephone numbers dialed. It includes numbers where no one answered the call.

\(^3\) The cooperation rate is the percentage of completed interviews by the number of qualified respondents contacted.
In interpreting these findings, it is important to keep in mind the characteristics of the people interviewed. This table presents a profile of the respondents in the survey.

NOTE: Here and throughout this report, percentages may not add to 100%, due to rounding or missing data (question not answered).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOME OWNER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSEHOLD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple with children</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple with no children</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single with children</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single with no children</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 or less</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35 to $50,000</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50 to $75,000</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75 to 100,000</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $100,000</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100 to 125,000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Different brackets used

- Compared the 2013 sample, this sample was:
  - More balanced between men and women;
  - Slightly more inclusive of renters;
  - More affluent (45% earned over $100,000 per year)
- The household make up / family structure was the same as in 2013.
KEY FINDINGS

♦ Covington residents rate the overall quality of life in Covington consistently high.
  ● The average rating was 7.1 on a 0-10 scale – consistent with the ratings in 2013 (7.2) and 2009 (7.3).

♦ Nearly all services were rated as high priority for city government.
  ● Majorities rated 13 of 17 services were rated as a “high priority” or “essential service of city government.”

♦ Most city services were graded “satisfactory” or better by strong majorities.
  ● For 12 of the 17 services and programs tested, at least 57% of respondents graded it a “C” (Satisfactory) or better.
  ● There was a relatively large percentage of respondents who declined to give grades, indicating a high level of unfamiliarity with several city services.
  ● The average performance grades declined for 13 of the 17 programs and services compared to 2013. Only 7 were statistically significant differences.

♦ For 15 of 17 services, its importance was rated higher than the city’s performance in delivering that service.
  ● For all but 2 services, the gap was less than 1 point on the scale, indicating relative concurrence between expectations and performance.

♦ There was considerable latent support for tax increases to enhance specific city services.
  ● Majorities were at least “inclined to support” a tax increase to “maintain, improve or provide” 8 of the 10 services tested, including a new Town Center.

♦ Citizens are feeling less informed about city government.
  ● The grade for “keeping citizens informed about city government” declined from 74% satisfactory or better to 55%.

♦ Satisfaction that city tax dollars are being well spent has shown a steady decline since 2009.
  ● It is not that more people think that city funds are not being well spent. The shift has been to “no opinion,” suggesting less attention to city government.
FINDINGS

This section presents the survey findings in the form of annotated graphs.
Quality of Life Rating Remains High

The rating for the overall quality of life in Covington has remained steady and high for the past seven years.

- The average score was also consistent across the population. Every demographic category in this survey averaged between 7.0 and 7.2.

- While the average has remained steady, there has been some variation in the scale:
  - There were fewer 10s this year than in previous years, but almost no 0s, 1s or 2s.
  - The proportion of respondents scoring 8 or higher has declined from 53% in 2009 to 50% in 2013 to 45% this year.

Q3: I am going to read a list of services and programs currently provided by city government. As I read each one, tell me how important it is to you. In your opinion, is this an Essential service of City Government… a High Priority … a Medium Priority … a Low Priority … or should this Not be a City Government program.

- Asked to rate city services and programs for their importance, majorities of respondents rated 13 of 17 services as an “essential city service” or a “high priority” for city government.
  - Only one – police services – was rated by a majority (65%) as “essential.”
  - Even the lowest-rated item – planning festivals and community events – had only 33% who said it was a low or non-priority.
  - More than 1 in 3 respondents rated 4 other services as “essential”: Emergency preparedness (44%); Street maintenance (40%); Street construction (36%); and Communicating with the public (36%).
### Nearly Every City Service Graded “Satisfactory” or Better by Strong Majorities

#### Table: GPA Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>No Opin</th>
<th>GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivals &amp; events</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buisness attraction</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater mgmt</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks maintenance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow removal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation &amp; aquatics</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency preparedness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk maintenance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street maintenance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks construction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public outreach</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk construction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning and land use</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code enforcement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street construction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4: I am going to read through that list again. This time, I would like you to tell me how well you think the city is doing in that area. As I read each service, I’d like you to give it a letter grade, as we have been using: A for Excellent, B for Good, C for Satisfactory, D for Unsatisfactory, F for Poor.

- For **16 of the 17 services and programs tested**, at least **6 in 10 respondents graded it a “C” (Satisfactory) or better**.
  - The only exception was Permitting, with **49% giving it a “C” or better**, while **43% did not offer an opinion**.
There was a relatively large percentage of respondents who declined to give grades, indicating a high level of unfamiliarity with specific services. By this measure, services with which residents were least familiar were:

- Permitting (43% no opinion);
- Emergency preparedness (36%);
- Zoning and land use (27%);
- Code enforcement (25%);
- Parks Construction (24%);
- Recreation and aquatics (24%);
- Snow removal (22%).

Overall, 36% were familiar enough with all 17 services to give them a grade;
- 87% could give grades to 10 or more of the services.

As a percentage of those with an opinion, every program had more than 67% grading it as “satisfactory” or better.
# Average Grades: 2009 - 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivals &amp; events</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>*2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business attraction</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow removal</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks maintenance</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency preparedness</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation &amp; aquatics</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater management</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>*2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitting</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk maintenance</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>*2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street maintenance</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>*2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks construction</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public outreach</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk construction</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>*2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning and land use</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>*2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code enforcement</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>*1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street construction</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>*1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL AVERAGE</strong></td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* question wording changed slightly from year to year
* statistically significant difference (p.<.05)

- The overall average grade for performance across city programs and services declined compared to 2013 and 2009.
  - The combined “grade point average” was 2.33 this year; compared to 2.43 in 2013; and 2.55 in 2009.

- The average performance grades declined for 13 of the 17 programs and services compared to 2013. Only 7 of the differences were statistically significant. The exceptions were:
  - Planning for festivals and community events went up (2.71 from 2.45);
  - Recreation and aquatics programs rose slightly (2.48 from 2.45);
  - Police services remained steady at 2.85 – the highest grade given.

- The greatest decline was for street construction (1.82 from 2.34).
Gap Analysis: Importance – Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Gap Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Festivals &amp; events</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation &amp; aquatics</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks construction</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks maintenance</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business attraction</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitting</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater mgmt</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow removal</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk maintenance</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk construction</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency preparedness</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning and land use</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public outreach</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code enforcement</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street maintenance</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street construction</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GAP SCORE: Performance rating minus importance rating. The score is computed by subtracting the importance rating from the performance rating for each respondent, then averaging the differences.

- This graph indicates the gap between respondent ratings of importance and performance for each program.
  - A minus score means that performance was rated lower than importance, indicating that government performance was lagging citizen expectations for that service or program.

- 15 of the 17 services had negative Gap Scores.
  - Festival and community events planning (+0.68) and Recreation/Aquatics (+0.12) were the exceptions.
  - Both were at the top of this list in 2013 as well.

- For all but 2 services, the gap was less than 1 point on the scale, indicating relative concurrence between expectations and performance.
### Gap Scores: 2013-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Festivals &amp; events</td>
<td>+0.43</td>
<td>+0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation &amp; aquatics</td>
<td>+0.22</td>
<td>+0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks construction</td>
<td>+0.09</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks maintenance</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitting</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business attraction</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater mgt.</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow removal</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk maintenance</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk construction</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning &amp; land use</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency prepare</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public outreach</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code enforcement</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street maintenance</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street construction</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **15 of the 17 gaps widened compared to the 2013 survey results.**
  - The largest difference was for the lowest-rated service – street construction – where the gap widened by -0.52 between 2013 and 2016.
  - Most of the changes were less than a quarter point.

- **The 2 services for which the gap decreased were:**
  - Festival and community event planning (+0.25).
  - Business attraction and retention which gained (+0.06), but remained in negative territory (-0.25).
Quadrant Analysis: Importance by Performance

Quadrant analysis presents another view of citizen evaluation of city programs and services. Whereas Gap Analysis indicates the extent to which the city may be meeting expectations for each service, Quadrant Analysis illustrates the relationship between expectations and performance for city services in relation to the other services. This comparative view thus informs prioritizing decisions by focusing attention on services that are most important to city residents.

Note for example, that the two services with positive Gap Scores -- Festival & Events Planning and Recreation & Aquatics -- were two of the three least important city services. Thus, while city performance on these services is exceeding expectations, they are likely to have less influence on citizens’ overall evaluation of city government than other services considered more vital.

Quadrant Analysis gets its name from dividing the combined importance-performance scores into four quadrants. In the graph on the top of the next page, the quadrants are formed by dividing each scale at its mid-point. This array illustrates the “Lake Woebegone Effect” seen earlier in which almost all city services are rated as high priority and city performance is satisfactory or better for almost all of them. This finding should not be discounted, but it is not too useful for setting city priorities, which necessitates distinguishing between services.

The bottom graph dissects the axes at the average score for importance and performance. This “grading on the curve” array more clearly distinguishes the services.

Quadrant Analysis allows the services to be grouped into categories useful for prioritizing.

I. STELLAR SERVICES. Services that scored above average in both importance and in city performance.

II. IMPERATIVES. Services rated as highly important, but the city’s performance was rated below average. These are services which may merit extra attention.

III. SUCCESSES. Services rated above average for city performance but below average for importance. The city is seen as doing well with these services but they are probably less influential in the overall evaluation of city government.

IV. LOWER PRIORITY. Services rated below average in both importance and city performance. They are less central to overall citizen evaluation of city government.

The diagonal line through the top graph indicates optimal performance – where importance and performance scores aligned.
Quadrant Analysis: Importance by Performance

Scales Dissected by Average Score
Categories of Services

Only one service – Business Attraction and Retention – moved quadrants since the 2013 survey. It remained above average on Performance but slipped to below average on Importance this year.

I. STELLAR SERVICES. Services in the upper right quadrant scored above average in both importance and in city performance.
   - Police Services
   - Emergency Preparedness
   - Stormwater & Flood Management
   - Snow & Ice Removal

   *All four of these services were in this quadrant in 2013 as well.*

II. IMPERATIVES. Services in the upper left quadrant were rated as highly important, but the city’s performance was rated below average.
   - Street Maintenance
   - Communicating with the Public
   - Street Construction
   - Code Enforcement (bldg. & zoning codes; junk cars; yard debris; etc.)
   - Zoning and Land Use Planning

   *All five of these services were in this quadrant in 2013.*

III. SUCCESSES. Services in the lower right quadrant scored above average for city performance but below average for importance. The city is seen as doing well with these services but they are not as important as other services.
   - Business Attraction and Retention
   - Parks Maintenance
   - Recreation and Aquatics Programs
   - Festival and Community Event Planning

   *Three of these services were in this same quadrant in 2013. Business Attraction and Retention was in category I: Stellar Services In 2013.*

IV. LOWER PRIORITY. Services in the lower left quadrant were rated below average in both importance and city performance.
   - Sidewalk & Trail Maintenance
   - Sidewalk & Trail Construction
   - Permitting Services
   - Parks Construction

   *These are the same four services that were in this category in 2013.*

It is important to reiterate that this graph indicates the position of the services in relation to each other. Almost all the services were above the midpoint of both the importance and performance scales. This analysis is designed to make the distance between the scores more apparent.
Q6: Now I am going to list some things that some people have said they would like Covington city government to do. Of course, all city services cost money. So as I read each item, tell me if you would Strongly support raising taxes for that, Inclined to Support, Inclined to Oppose or Strongly Opposed to an increase in city taxes to maintain, improve or provide this service in Covington. The first one is…

Another way to assess citizen priorities is to ask what services they are willing to pay for. Survey respondents were asked whether they would support or oppose a tax increase to enhance 9 services.

- Majorities were at least “inclined to support” a tax increase to “maintain, improve or provide” 7 of the 9 services tested.  
  - Improved streets and traffic flow (88% inclined to support, including 58% “strongly support”);  
  - More police officers (81% support, including 39% “strongly”);  
  - Sidewalks (75% support, including 30% “strongly”);  
  - Parks, trails and open space (67% support, including 23% “strongly”);  
  - Transit services (57% support, including 22% “strongly”);  
  - A community center (57% support, including 19% “strongly”);  
  - More recreation such as health & fitness classes, kid, adult or senior activities, etc. (52% support, including 16% “strongly”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Strong Support</th>
<th>Inclined to Support</th>
<th>Inclined to Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community center</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal control</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONTINUED
• It is important to note that for only one proposal was there majority “strong support.” Given the real-world difficulty of raising taxes it is prudent to interpret these findings as a measure of “latent support.” Those who said they are “inclined to support” will still need to be convinced.

• There is also a commonly assumed bias on the part of survey respondents toward more positive answers. Thus the “inclined to support” percentages should be noted but not be relied upon. By the same reasoning, the opposition numbers can be combined, since the presumed bias runs toward the positive and it is much easier to convince voters to vote against tax increases than for them.

• A realpolitik indicator of community attitudes therefore would count only the “strong support” and subtract all the opposition. The resulting scores indicate only 3 of the services with a net positive score.

### Net Support for Taxes to Enhance Services
(Strong Support minus Opposition)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>+48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>+26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>+11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community center</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal control</td>
<td>-40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• It is notable that the service with the highest net support – street construction – was also the service with the highest Gap Score between importance and city performance.

• Police Services and Sidewalks also had negative Gap Scores.

• Police services was rated as the most essential city service and had the highest performance grade.

• Support for sidewalks is an interesting case here, since it scored below average in both importance and performance.
Q7: After extensive public input, the City Council approved plans for Town Center, in the area around Covington Elementary School. The school will be relocated, and the land will be redeveloped into a town center similar to Kent Station, including a municipal building, public plaza, park, small retail shops and possibly an office building. Would you support or oppose a tax increase to pay for the Town Center project?

- A 53% majority said they would “probably” (32%) or ‘definitely support” (21%) a tax increase to pay for the Town Center project.
  - Strong supporters and strong opponents were equally divided with a 57% majority in the middle as soft supporters, soft opponents or undecided.
  - Using the same formula used on the previous question, the Net Support for the Town Center project is –19 points.

- Support for the Town Center was related to opinions of the city:
  - 65% of those who rated Covington 9 or 10 on the 10-point “quality of life” scale were supportive of the Town Center; compared to 34% of those who rated it 0-5.
  - 67% were supportive among those who said their tax money was being well-spent, vs. 31% of those who did not think their city taxes were well-spent.
Q8: In terms of keeping citizens informed about what is happening in city government -- What grade would you give the City of Covington does at that?

- Ratings for keeping citizens informed about city government declined compared to 2013.
  - 55% rated the city as “satisfactory” or better this year, compared to 74% three years ago.
  - The average rating dropped to 1.55 from 2.07 on the 0-4 scale. The difference is statistically significant.
Q9: We are interested in how people get information about City Government here in Covington. Which of the following have been useful to you to learn about city government?

> Which of these is are the most useful for you to receive information about the city? [RANKED TOP 3].

CONTINUED
Covington residents continue to employ a variety of sources of information to learn about city government.
- 14 different sources of information were cited by these respondents;
- 95% named at least one source of information;
- 68% named more than one source;
- 29% named 3 or more.

*The Covington Reporter* was named most frequently as a source of city hall information.
- 56% said it was one of the sources they used; and
- 21% named it as their most useful source.

The city website was cited as the second most-useful source:
- 38% cited it as a source;
- 21% named it as their most useful source.
- It is notable that the same proportion of respondents named the website as named the *Reporter* as their most useful source (21%), even though 20% fewer respondents had cited the website as one of their sources.

City sponsored outreach efforts were named by significant numbers of respondents:
- 41% mentioned getting information from city mailings;
- 38% cited the city website;
- 23% cited the city’s Facebook page;
- 22% mentioned flyers and posters;
- 20% mentioned city events; and
- 16% mentioned city emails.

The most useful city-sponsored sources were:
- City website (21%);
- Emails (14%);
- Facebook page (12%); and
- Mailings (12%).
Satisfaction with Use of Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Well spent</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Not well spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11: Finally, thinking now about all the things we have talked about, as a citizen of Covington do you think that your tax dollars are being well spent here? Or not?

- **Satisfaction that city tax dollars are being well spent has declined since 2009.**
- **It is not that more people think that city funds are not being well spent.**
  - The shift has been to "no opinion."
  - Belief that funds are well-spent declined from 68% in 2009 to 35% this year.
  - At the same time, the belief that the funds are not well-spent increased insignificantly from 21% to 26%, while
  - The proportion with no opinion has increased from 10% to 39%.
- **This is a case where the survey mode was significant:**
  - 51% of telephone respondents answered “well spent” compared to 33% of online respondents.
  - 43% of online respondents had no opinion, compared to 18% of telephone respondents.
- **Not surprisingly, those who believed that city tax dollars were well-spent were more supportive of city government services than those who disagreed:**
  - They registered more positive gap scores between performance and importance for 16 of the 17 services.
  - They were more likely to support tax increases to enhance 9 of the 10 services tested, including the new Town Center.
Covington residents have been consistently positive in their evaluation of the quality of life in their city. Nearly half of these respondents rated the quality of life 8 or higher on the 0-10 scale where 10 = “excellent.” These numbers have not changed significantly since 2009.

Residents continue to have high expectations for their city government, and generally believe that the city is doing a good job on those priorities. Some 13 of 17 city services were rated a high priority – indicating high expectations. For 12 of those services, most respondents rated the city performance as “satisfactory” or better – indicating general approval of city government.

City performance ratings are down from three years ago, and attention to city government seems to be lower as well. The average performance grade declined for 13 of the 17 programs. The difference is not statistically significant for 6 of those, but certainly not in the direction one would like to see. These results cannot be ignored and it is natural to view these findings with some concern. There are mitigating findings, however, which point to strategically useful information for the way forward.

Some of the difference may be due to the change in survey mode to predominantly online data collection. As discussed earlier, online respondents generally tend to be less positive in their evaluations than telephone respondents, and that was the case here.

As in the past, a relatively large proportion of respondents declined to give any rating to several city services, indicating unfamiliarity with those services. For those services with the highest levels of “no opinion” answers (e.g., permitting, zoning, code enforcement) it is understandable that most citizens would not feel able to give a grade, since most would not come into contact with those services in their daily lives.

For other, more visible programs (e.g., emergency preparedness, parks construction, recreation and aquatics), there is an opportunity for the city to raise its visibility.

The findings suggest a need for more attention in just that area: ratings for “keeping citizens informed” have declined since 2013. City outreach efforts – from mailings to Facebook to events – were named by significant numbers of respondents as useful sources of information. These sources clearly have potential for further development and utilization.
On the overall evaluation of city government’s overall effectiveness and efficiency, there is somewhat conflicting evidence. On the one hand, the proportion of respondents who say their tax dollars are being “well spent” by city government has declined rather dramatically since 2009. On the other hand, majorities were inclined to support tax increases to enhance 8 of 10 programs tested, including a new Town Center.

Citizens who did not think their taxes were being well-spent would be expected to support increasing those taxes. What is going on?

One potential explanation is the survey mode effect, discussed at length here. Telephone respondents were 1½ times more likely than online respondents to say their tax dollars were well spent. Online respondents were more than twice as likely to have no opinion on this question. This does not imply that one method or the other is more accurate. It does suggest that the blended method probably provides the best estimate of public attitudes.

Another likely explanation is the difference between a general question about “taxes” and a question about a specific, popular program or service. No one wants to pay taxes in the abstract. And “anti-tax” sentiment has been running high of late. But residents will vote to increase their taxes for programs they deem valuable.

Support for new taxes for enhanced programs would seem to carry more weight as an expression of confidence in city government than an answer to a single generic question about city spending.
## TOPLINE DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SAMPLE:</strong></th>
<th>488 Covington Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATA COLLECTION:</strong></td>
<td>89 interviews by telephone with Live Interviewers (including 39 (46%) via cell phone) 403 completed the survey online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARGIN OF SAMPLING ERROR:</strong></td>
<td>±4.5% at the 95% level of confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIELD DATES:</strong></td>
<td>December 1 - 20, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOME OWNERSHIP:</strong></td>
<td>Own 86% Rent 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER:</strong></td>
<td>MALE...51% FEMALE...49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The questions are presented here as they were asked in the interview
- The figures in bold type are percentages of respondents who gave each answer.
- Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.
1. SCREENING QUESTIONS

2. Overall, how would you rate the quality of life in Covington? Please give a rating on a scale of zero to 10, where 10 means you think the city has an “excellent” quality of life, a “0” means it has a “poor” quality of life. A rating of 5 is in the middle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCALE</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. I am going to read a list of services and programs currently provided by city government. As I read each one, tell me how important it is to you. In your opinion, is this an Essential service of City Government... a High Priority ... a Medium Priority ... a Low Priority ... or should this Not be a City Government program. The first one is....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROTATE</th>
<th>ESNTL</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>MED</th>
<th>LO</th>
<th>NOT</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Street Construction ................................................</td>
<td>36......36......22......4......1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Street Maintenance ...............................................</td>
<td>40......43......14......1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. New Parks Construction ........................................</td>
<td>13......20......39......23......3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Parks Maintenance ................................................</td>
<td>17......40......29......11......1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Sidewalk &amp; trail Construction ................................</td>
<td>19......33......34......12......2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Sidewalk &amp; trail Maintenance ................................</td>
<td>18......37......33......11......*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Zoning and Land Use Planning .....................................</td>
<td>25......32......30......8......1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Permitting Services, for buildings, remodels, tenant improvements, and so on</td>
<td>17......29......35......13......1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Enforcing the city codes, such as building and zoning codes, junk cars, yard debris, home business violations, and so on</td>
<td>29......35......26......7......1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Stormwater &amp; Flood Management .....................................</td>
<td>28......37......26......6......2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Snow &amp; Ice Removal ..................................................</td>
<td>28......34......25......10......1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Emergency Preparedness .............................................</td>
<td>44......33......18......3......1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Communicating with the public. ....................................</td>
<td>36......38......20......4......*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Planning community festivals and events .......................</td>
<td>6......18......42......28......5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Recreation and Aquatics programs .................................</td>
<td>12......24......40......17......4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Attracting &amp; Keeping Businesses ...................................</td>
<td>23......40......26......8......3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Police Services ........................................................</td>
<td>65......28......5......<em>......</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. I am going to read through that list again. This time, I would like you to tell me how well you think the city is doing in that area. As I read each service, I’d like you to give it a letter grade, as we have been using: A for Excellent, B for Good, C for Satisfactory, D for Unsatisfactory, F for Poor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROTATE</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Street Construction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Street Maintenance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. New Parks Construction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Parks Maintenance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Sidewalk &amp; trail Construction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Sidewalk &amp; trail Maintenance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Zoning and Land Use Planning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Permitting Services, for buildings, remodels, tenant improvements, etc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Enforcing the city codes, such as building and zoning codes, junk cars, yard debris, home business violations, and so on</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Stormwater &amp; Flood Management</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Snow &amp; Ice Removal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Emergency Preparedness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Communicating with the public</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Planning community festivals and events</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Recreation and Aquatics programs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Attracting &amp; Keeping Businesses</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Police Services</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. In your opinion, what is the single most important issue you think Covington city government should pay more attention to?

[OPEN ENDED / TELEPHONE RESPONDENTS ONLY. N=86]

22% Traffic...13% Public Safety...9% Street maintenance...7% Street Construction...
5% Land Use
6. Now I am going to list some things that some people have said they would like Covington city government to do. Of course, all city services cost money. So as I read each item, tell me if you would Strongly support raising taxes for that, Inclined to Support, Inclined to Oppose or Strongly Opposed to an increase in city taxes to maintain, improve or provide this service in Covington. The first one is...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRG</th>
<th>INCLINE</th>
<th>INCLINE</th>
<th>STRG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROTATE</td>
<td>OPPOSE</td>
<td>OPP</td>
<td>SUPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Sidewalks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Parks, trails and open space</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. More recreation such as health &amp; fitness classes, kid, adult or senior activities, etc.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. More community events</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Improved streets and traffic flow</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Animal control services, like pet licensing, shelter services and pet locator services</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. More police officers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. A community center</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Transit services</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. After extensive public input, the City Council approved plans for Town Center, in the area around Covington Elementary School. The school will be relocated, and the land will be redeveloped into a town center similar to Kent Station, including a municipal building, public plaza, park, small retail shops and possibly an office building.

Would you support or oppose a tax increase to pay for the Town Center project? Would you...

- 22 Definitely Oppose
- 18 Probably Oppose
- 32 Probably Support
- 21 Definitely Support
- 6 [UNDEC]

8. In terms of keeping citizens informed about what is happening in city government -- What grade would you give the City of Covington does at that?

- 2 A for Excellent
- 24 B for Good
- 30 C for Satisfactory
- 18 D for Unsatisfactory
- 9 F for Poor
- 17 [DK/NA]
9. We are interested in how people get information about City Government here in Covington. Which of the following have been useful to you to learn about city government? **READ & ROTATE LIST: RECORD ALL THAT APPLY**

- 56 Covington Reporter newspaper
- 38 City website
- 41 Mailings from city (bill inserts, brochures, postcards, etc)
- 30 Friends, family, neighbors
- 20 At city events - like Covington days, tree lighting event
- 22 Flyers and posters around the city
- 23 City's Facebook page
- 20 Calling or visiting city hall
- 18 Attending city meetings
- 21 Talking to a city council member or advisory commission member
- 17 Neighborhood meetings or organizations
- 4 [OTHER]>
- 5 [DK/NA]

10. Which of these is are the most useful for you to receive information about the city? [RANKED TOP 3].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>TOP 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>24 Covington reporter newspaper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>24 City website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>17 Mailings from city (bill inserts, brochures, postcards, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8 Friends, family, neighbors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 At city events - like Covington days, tree lighting event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 Flyers and posters around the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>16 City e-mails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14 City's Facebook page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 Calling or visiting city hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 Attending city meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Talking to a city council member or advisory commission member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 Neighborhood meetings or organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Finally, thinking now about all the things we have talked about, as a citizen of Covington do you think that your tax dollars are being well spent here? Or not?

- 35 WELL SPENT
- 26 NOT
- 39 No Opinion
12. Which of the following best describes your household:
   - 39 Couple with children at home
   - 37 Couple with no children at home
   - 6 Single with children at home
   - 16 Single with no children at home
   - 2 [NA]

13. Do you own or rent the place in which you live?
   - 86 OWN
   - 12 RENT
   - 2 DK/NA

14. Next, I am going to list some broad categories. Just stop me when I get to the category that best describes your approximate household income - before taxes - for this year.
   - 15 $50,000 or less
   - 15 $50,000 to $74,000
   - 17 $75,000 to $99,000
   - 18 $100 to 124,000
   - 27 $125,000 or more
   - 8 [NO ANSWER]

15. Finally, how old are you? (telephone respondents only)
   - 6 18-34
   - 28 35-49
   - 33 50-64
   - 27 65+
   - 6 No Answer

Thank you very much. You have been very helpful.
Public Safety
CURRENT TRENDS

- Covington Dispatched Calls for Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Calls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2010 population- 17,575
2015 population- 18,520

INCREASE IN VIOLENCE/COMPLEXITY

- January- Fred Meyer Strong-Armed Shoplift
- February- Key Bank Armed Robbery
- May- Road Rage turned Robbery with Taser
- May- Bepharong Thai Restaurant Armed Robbery
- June- Arrest of Washington’s Most Wanted
- August- My Goods Market Armed Robbery (#1)
- October- Kent-Kangley Rd Strong-Armed Highway Robbery
- November- Home Invasion Robbery
- November- Kohl’s Strong-Armed Jewelry Robbery
- November- Safeway Shoplift turned Stabbing
- November- Bank of America Robbery
- November- My Goods Market Armed Robbery (#2)
CAR PROWL/BURGLARY

• Wallet or purse left unprotected
• Discovers wallet or purse missing
• Reports Theft
• Discovers numerous unauthorized purchases
• Discovers identity stolen
• Purchases and ID Theft not investigated

CAUSES

• "Destination"/Larger City
• Heroin Epidemic
• High Density Housing
• Retail Development

HIGH DENSITY HOUSING

• Mental Complaint
• Family Disturbance
• Burglary
• Theft
• Child Neglect
• Assault
• Auto Theft
• Threats
• Threats

• Runaway Juvenile
• Sex Offense
• Sexual Assault
• Juvenile Disturbance
• Welfare Status
• Narcotics Activity
• Prostitution
• USMS Bank Robbery
• Warrant Suspect
RESPONSE

- Added Officer 2016
- SET Task Force
- 4/10 Schedule Late- 2016
- Call Response vs. Crime Prevention
  - Split city- retail/residential
  - Emphasis patrols
  - Alternative call handling for retail crimes
  - Addition training for LPO's

RESPONSE

- Investigative Support
- Community Meetings
- Neighborhood Watch Groups
- Train/Collaborate with businesses
- Victim Support/Advocacy
- Volunteer Support/Supervision
- Accessibility (Storefront)

ADDS

- 2018- Police Community Liaison & DAWN
- 2019- Storefront Officer/Detective
- 2021- Lakepoint Officer/Sgt (1 or 2)
- 2022- SET Detective
SOURCES OF FUNDING

OCVA Grants
Fingerprinting
Passport Processing
Levy Lid Lift (Tumwater Prop 1)
Fines/Fees for Defendants
Town Center
OBJECTIVE

ASSESS MAJOR KNOWN PROJECTS AND OTHER BUDEGETARY IMPACTS FOR SUSTAINABILITY WHILE WEIGHING FUNDING OPTIONS

WHAT ARE WE REVIEWING?

- TRANSPORTATION AND PARKS CAPITAL PROJECTS OVER TIME
- OTHER PROPOSED PROJECTS NOT IN THE CIP BUT ON THE RADAR
- STAFF INCREASE IMPACTS FOR POLICE SERVICES
- EXPANSION OF CURRENT STAFF NOT QUANTIFIED BUT NOTED
- THE LAKEPOINTE FACTOR
ASSUMPTIONS

- Inflation
  - 2-3% per year ongoing (eroses purchasing power) not applicable to construction costs - climbed fastest in last 5 years
- $3 per square foot in retail sales tax
- Lakepointe impact timeframe - includes both revenue and costs
- Population increasing - more demand for services
- Economic cycles - since WWII they occur on average about every 5 years

POTENTIAL PROJECTS & RELATED COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECTS</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COSTS</th>
<th>FUNDING SOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New City Hall</td>
<td>$25 - $10 million</td>
<td>Grants/Issued Bond Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>$1 - $5.5 million</td>
<td>General Fund - underwritten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Garage</td>
<td>$1 - $2.5 million</td>
<td>Grants &amp; City Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Fire</td>
<td>$3.75 million - underwritten</td>
<td>Grants &amp; City Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Needs</td>
<td>$2.5 million - unfunded</td>
<td>Grants &amp; City Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>$5 - $50 million</td>
<td>Voted Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins Creek Reserv</td>
<td>$6 million</td>
<td>Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Facility</td>
<td>$10 million (over 3 years)</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POTENTIAL FUNDING OPTIONS

- Voted Bonds - Excess Levy
- Neighbors/owners non-core services
- Increase vehicle tax fees
- Revisit sales tax proposal for streets
- B&O Tax
- Ballot Issue Development Services to the General Fund at Judgement
- Local Improvement Districts (LIDs)
- Bond Anticipation Notes (BANs) and/or Grant Anticipation Notes (GABANs)
- Private activity bonds
- Utility taxes - revenue issues abound
- Bring contracted services in-house? Risk could cost many local residents
- REET
- Impact fees - fire and transportation. Police impact fees are an option
- Admissions tax - currently 25c, 95% copped at 15c per state law
- Metropolitan Park District or something similar
- 52-20 Financing
VOTED BOND ISSUE PROS & CONS

PROS
- Refunded bonds paid off in 2027
- Does not impact prop tax levy
- Costs spread over time
- Survey results:
  - 53% would probably (32%) or definitely (21%) support a tax for TC

CONS
- High per thousand cost
- City council decided action on mandatory garages
- Utility tax
  - Implementation with a vote
  - Track record of vote failures
  - Vote timing & competition
- Survey results:
  - 22% would probably oppose while 22% would actively support if TC
-Requires 60% approval of voters with a 40% turnout from absent general election
- Used only for capital purposes

ROADBLOCKS, CHALLENGES & OPPORTUNITIES

Roadblocks and Challenges
- Unfunded mandates
- Legislative interference
- Inflation
- Contract cost increases
- Disasters
- Economic downturns
- The need for internal growth
- Opportunity costs
- Current building lease

Opportunities
- New opportunity reserve account
- Potential legislative support for the Town Center
- TIF
- Dollars
- PDD type legislation
- Lakefront
- Covington Connector
- Up to 3 million sq. ft. of retail space
- Covington Way Shopping Center
- Higher education
- Short platting

THE BOTTOM LINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2031</th>
<th>2032</th>
<th>2033</th>
<th>2034</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2036</th>
<th>2037</th>
<th>2038</th>
<th>2039</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2041</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Improvement</td>
<td>$3,645,205</td>
<td>$4,606,000</td>
<td>$1,844,000</td>
<td>$2,995,000</td>
<td>$2,331,000</td>
<td>$925,000</td>
<td>$925,000</td>
<td>$925,000</td>
<td>$925,000</td>
<td>$925,000</td>
<td>$925,000</td>
<td>$925,000</td>
<td>$925,000</td>
<td>$925,000</td>
<td>$925,000</td>
<td>$925,000</td>
<td>$925,000</td>
<td>$925,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation Improvement</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront Development</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Environment Management</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$10,200,000</td>
<td>$15,606,000</td>
<td>$15,606,000</td>
<td>$15,606,000</td>
<td>$15,606,000</td>
<td>$15,606,000</td>
<td>$15,606,000</td>
<td>$15,606,000</td>
<td>$15,606,000</td>
<td>$15,606,000</td>
<td>$15,606,000</td>
<td>$15,606,000</td>
<td>$15,606,000</td>
<td>$15,606,000</td>
<td>$15,606,000</td>
<td>$15,606,000</td>
<td>$15,606,000</td>
<td>$15,606,000</td>
<td>$15,606,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEXT STEPS

- REVIEW TIMELINE AND LONG-RANGE FORECAST (separate handouts)

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

- PROVIDE SPECIFIC DIRECTION TO STAFF IN THE FORM OF:
  - PRIORITIZING PROJECTS
  - ASSIGNING REALISTIC REVENUE OPTIONS AND TIMELINES
  - ESTABLISHING REALISTIC & SUSTAINABLE GOALS FOR COMPLETION

- TOWN CENTER APPROACH – DO WE:
  - PHASE IN TOWN CENTER?
  - RENT & HOLD LAND?
  - BANK EARNINGS FROM LAKEPOINTE?
  - HIRE A FINANCIAL ADVISOR TO ASSIST IN PLOTTING A COURSE OF ACTION?
2018-2030 PROJECT TIMELINE

FORECAST START

POLICE RECEPTIONIST ($100K)

SOCO 2 $1M ($175K CITY)

CIP 1128 $10.9M ($1.3M CITY)

MTCE FACILITY

CIP 1145 ($500K)

POLICE OFFICER ($215K)

TC LAND ($1-$1.5 MILLION)

JENKINS CREEK IMPR ($3M UNFUNDED) ($65K CITY)

CIP 1063 $13M ($1M CITY)

OTHER PARKS PROJECTS ($1.8M)

CIP 1056/1149 $6M ($500K CITY)

PARKING STRUCTURE ($6M)

CIP 1056/1149 PH 2 ($1M)

CIP 1056/1149 PH 3 ($1M)

CIP 1063/1149 PH 1 ($1M)

CIP 1063/1149 PH 2 ($1M)

CIP 1063/1149 PH 3 ($1M)

CIP 1124 ($1.6M)

CIP 1124 $18M ($1.1M CITY)

SOCO 3 ($2.5M UNFUNDED)

CCP 3 ($1.5M)

POLICE OFFICER/SARGENT ($226K)

SET DETECTIVE

TC INFRASTRUCTURE ($1M - CITY MATCH)

CIP 1128 PH 3 ($1M)

CCP 3 ($1.5M)

CIP 1130 ($13M)

CIP 1130 ($9M)

CIP 1131 ($6M)

AQUATICS CENTER RENO/REPL ($5-$55M)

TC GOVT OFFICES ($17-$29M)

FORECAST END

2018 2019 2020 2021 2022
Transportation
SUMMARY OF TRANSPORTATION ISSUES AND TRENDS FROM THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

- The majority of travel in Covington occurs by automobile, but residents and employees also walk, bike, telecommute and use the public transit service that is available in the city limits. Arterial streets also support freight movement to and through Covington.
  - Although almost 90% of Covington residents commute via automobile, the capital plan includes the building of non-motorized and transit elements so in the future there will be connected facilities that will give residents and employees more flexibility.

- In addition to accommodating vehicle travel, Covington streets are integral to the City’s pedestrian and bicycle network. The City has adopted a layered network approach that focuses on how the City’s transportation network can function as a system to meet the needs of all users.
  - Our typical roadway sections include sidewalks on both sides of the roadway that are buffered from the motorists with landscaping. They also include designated bike lanes on both sides of the street.

- The existing street network meets the City’s operational standards for vehicle travel. However, the operational standards for City streets designate segments of SE 272nd Street (SR 516) that have been widened to five lanes (plus sidewalks on both sides) to be at ultimate capacity, at which point higher levels of vehicle congestion are considered acceptable.
  - When the Comprehensive Plan was updated in 2015 it evaluated and modeled the growth that is planned and expected over the next 20 years. It also took into account the Hawk Property EIS that identified mitigation that would be required to support the development. From this information, a table and map (see attached) was created to identify projects that were needed and a general timeline of when the projects were expected/needed.
  - The Comprehensive Plan also identifies the SR 516 corridor to be at ultimate capacity if it has 5 lanes with sidewalks on both sides. The designation recognizes the physical constraints to further widening of the corridor, and indicates that expenditure of public funds for additional large-scale capacity increase is not feasible. However, that does not prevent us from requiring localized improvements to improve efficiency, transit, safety or non-motorized improvements.

- There are gaps in Covington’s pedestrian and bicycle networks. The City continuously seeks to address pedestrian and bicycle facility needs as funding opportunities arise, either as part of development agreements, as part of larger multi-modal street improvement projects, or as stand-alone projects.
  - An example of a stand-alone project is the 164th pedestrian project that will add a walkway/sidewalk on the eastside of 164th that will connect the sidewalks from Kentwood High School to the Covington Library. We received a grant in the amount of $676,279 from FHWA/PSRC.

- As a relatively small community that is not designated as an urban or regional center, Covington has limited existing bus service and has not been a regional priority for improved transit service. The City’s recent planning efforts establish a strong policy framework for development patterns that would be more supportive of future transit service, and provide a means to facilitate communication with King County Metro regarding potential future transit priorities, and with the PSRC regarding urban travel trends and multi-modal transportation priorities.
  - Over the last couple of years, Staff has worked with King County as they developed their long range transit plan (Metro Connects). Within that plan it includes routes that would serve the LakePointe development.
  - Also, recently we were informed that King County will be conducting a feasibility study to place transit facilities in the vicinity of SR 18 and SE 256th. Staff will also be participating in that study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2016-21</th>
<th>2022-35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE 272nd Street (SR 516) and Jenkins Creek to 185th Place SE</td>
<td>Widen to 5 lanes &amp; reconstruct, sidewalks, and new stream crossing.</td>
<td>CIP 1127</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204th Avenue SE and SE 272nd Street to SE 256th Street</td>
<td>Widen to full City Standard, sidewalks, bicycle lanes, planted medians.</td>
<td>CIP 1201</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164th Avenue SE and SE 264th Street to SE 256th Street</td>
<td>Pedestrian improvements, 5-foot asphalt walkway, drainage swale.</td>
<td>CIP 1086</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 272nd Street (SR 516) and 185th Place SE to 192nd Avenue SE</td>
<td>Widen to 5 lanes &amp; reconstruct, sidewalks, new signal.</td>
<td>CIP 1128</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 272nd Street (SR 516) and 160th Avenue SE to 164th Avenue SE</td>
<td>Signal modifications, add turn lanes, and stream crossing.</td>
<td>CIP 1063</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 256th Street and 180th Avenue SE to SE Wax Road</td>
<td>Signal modifications, add right turn lane.</td>
<td>CIP 1056 and 1149 and 2035 Concurrency</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 276th Street and 168th Place SE to SE Wax Road</td>
<td>New route, new alignment, Type II Roadway.</td>
<td>CIP Town Center 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172nd Avenue SE and SE 275th Street to SE 276th Street</td>
<td>New route, new alignment, Type I Roadway.</td>
<td>CIP Town Center 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185th Place Extension and SE 272nd Street</td>
<td>New route, new alignment, access management.</td>
<td>CIP 1124</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 272nd Street (SR 516); 192nd Ave SE to 204th Ave SE</td>
<td>Widen to 5 lanes &amp; reconstruct, sidewalks</td>
<td>CIP 1130 Hawk Planned Action</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 272nd Street (SR 516); 204th Ave SE to East City Limits</td>
<td>Widen to 5 lanes &amp; reconstruct, sidewalks</td>
<td>CIP 1131 Hawk Planned Action</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 256th Street, from 148th Avenue SE to 160th Avenue SE</td>
<td>Create cross section that allows intersection improvements to function. Add 2 Through Lanes, LTL Median, and Bike Lanes.</td>
<td>A. DEA Rate Study 2010</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191st Avenue SE</td>
<td>Local roadway connection and traffic calming, to be built as part of the Lakepointe Urban Village.</td>
<td>B. Hawk Property Planned Action</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 272nd Street/204th Avenue SE</td>
<td>Signalize and extend planned three-lane section to this intersection, providing a southbound left-turn lane.</td>
<td>C. Hawk Property Planned Action</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* SE 256th Street/State Route 18 Westbound Ramps</td>
<td>Signal or Roundabout</td>
<td>D. Hawk Property Planned Action</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* SE 256th Street/State Route 18 Eastbound Ramps</td>
<td>Signal or Roundabout</td>
<td>E. Hawk Property Planned Action</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 240th Street/196th Avenue SE</td>
<td>Add eastbound left-turn lane.</td>
<td>F. 2035 Concurrency</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Wax Road/180th Avenue SE</td>
<td>Add northbound right-turn lane or signalize.</td>
<td>G. 2035 Concurrency</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington Way/SE Wax Road</td>
<td>Add southbound left turn lane</td>
<td>H. 2035</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* WSDOT Jurisdiction
## CITY OF COVINGTON
### 2017 to 2022 Transportation Improvement Program Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>City CIP #, Project Name, Termini, Major Class of Work</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Funded</th>
<th>Funds</th>
<th>Expenditure Schedule in Thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1127, SE 272nd Street (SR 516) Jenkins Creek to 185th Place SE</td>
<td>Dgn</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widen to 5 lanes &amp; reconstruct, Sidewalks, New stream crossing</td>
<td>Const</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>11,691</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1201, 204th Avenue SE SE 272nd Street to SE 256th Street</td>
<td>Dgn</td>
<td>3,590</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>Schedule driven by development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widen to full City Standard, Sidewalks, Bicycle Lanes, Planted Medians</td>
<td>Const</td>
<td>22,861</td>
<td>(May be built in portions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1086, 164th Avenue SE SE 264th Street to SE 269th Street</td>
<td>Dgn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements, 5' asphalt walkway, drainage swale</td>
<td>R-o-W</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Const</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1128, SE 272nd Street (SR 516)</td>
<td>Dgn</td>
<td>1,299</td>
<td>1,299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>185th Place SE to 192nd Avenue SE</td>
<td>R-o-W</td>
<td>1,708</td>
<td>1,708</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widen to 5 lanes &amp; reconstruct, Sidewalks, New signal.</td>
<td>Const</td>
<td>7,920</td>
<td>7,920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>10,927</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,299</td>
<td>1,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1063, SE 272nd Street (State Route 516)</td>
<td>Dgn</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>160th Avenue SE to 164th Avenue SE</td>
<td>R-o-W</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widen &amp; reconstruct, Sidewalks, New stream crossing.</td>
<td>Const</td>
<td>10,650</td>
<td>10,650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>13,098</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1145, SE 256th Street</td>
<td>Dgn</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>168th Avenue SE to 173rd Avenue SE</td>
<td>R-o-W</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widen &amp; reconstruct, Sidewalks, New stream crossing.</td>
<td>Const</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>5,794</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Portions of 1056 and 1149</td>
<td>Dgn</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE 256th Street and 180th Avenue SE</td>
<td>R-o-W</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety improvements,Sidewalks</td>
<td>Const</td>
<td>5,316</td>
<td>5,316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>6,056</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,316</td>
<td>5,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Town Center 1</td>
<td>Dgn</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE 276th Street</td>
<td>R-o-W</td>
<td>6,981</td>
<td>Schedule driven by development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Route, New Alignment, Type II Roadway</td>
<td>Const</td>
<td>4,650</td>
<td>(May be built in portions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>13,181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Town Center 2</td>
<td>Dgn</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>579</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>172nd Avenue SE</td>
<td>R-o-W</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>Schedule driven by development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Route, New Alignment, Type I Roadway</td>
<td>Const</td>
<td>1,737</td>
<td>(May be built in portions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>3,305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1124, 185th Place SE Extension</td>
<td>Dgn</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wax Road/180th Avenue SE Roundabout to SE 272nd Street</td>
<td>R-o-W</td>
<td>5,339</td>
<td>5,339</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Route, New Alignment, Access management.</td>
<td>Const</td>
<td>11,617</td>
<td>11,617</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>18,087</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>5,339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.0% Annual Construction Cost Increase

TOTAL 111,085 7,304 9,348 8,596 19,943 10,655 11,617
For the Love of Covington
AWC for the Love of Cities

growing toward greatness.

This is all in an effort to get us to start asking these questions:

DO YOU LOVE YOUR CITY?
IN WHAT FUN WAYS DO YOU SHOW IT?
Our citizens want something more than fixing potholes:

They want their city to be **FUN!**

*How?*

We need to do small things that have outsized impacts.

---

**For example:** As part of the 212th widening project we will be constructing a small bridge over Jackson Creek. How could we make that project fun?

---

**WHAT OTHERS HAVE DONE**

Rain works - Superhydrophobic Spray
WHAT OTHERS HAVE DONE
Mice on Main!

Growing toward greatness

WHAT OTHERS HAVE DONE
Muskatine River Monster

Growing toward greatness

SO WHAT CAN WE DO?

Remember we need small things that have outsized impacts:

- Create a city T-shirt
- Paint the alley by Office Depot
- Create "Covington Squatch" — He could show up at festivals, on signs and at parks
- Hold a "scale-in" at the state park
- Community cultural events including the trikes
- Sidewalk chalk art competition
- Potluck picnic at the park
- Encouraging signs as people go through the "Covington Crush"
- Utility box covers
- Fire hydrant painting contest
- Catered dinner on the COP trail
- Watermelon fest
- $200 challenge
- Seek ideas from the CYC
Any Fun Thoughts?
Community Events and Appreciating Volunteers
Memo

To: Regan Bolli, City Manager
From: Noreen Beaufreire, Personnel Manager
For: City Council Summit on January 28, 2017
CC: Ethan Newton, Parks & Recreation Director
    Pat Patterson, Recreation Manager
    Karla Slate, Communications & Marketing Manager

Date: January 23, 2017

Re: Volunteer Appreciation

The following information is being provided to support the City Council’s discussion on “Community Events and Appreciating Volunteers” at the 2017 Council Summit being held on Saturday, January 28, 2017.

VOLUNTEER APPRECIATION DINNER

Location and Format: For the first time in 2016, the venue for the annual Volunteer Appreciation Dinner was the Covington Community Park instead of the City Hall Community Room. As in the past, a full catered dinner was provided. However, instead of hiring entertainment specific to the event, the city scheduled the event on an evening when one of the city’s summer concerts was scheduled (and which commenced immediately following the dinner).

Invitation, RSVP and Attendance Statistics for 2016:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volunteer Group</th>
<th># Invites Sent</th>
<th>Expected Attendees Per RSVP’s</th>
<th>Actual Attendance People</th>
<th>Actual Attendance Parties</th>
<th>Total No-Shows People</th>
<th>Total No-Shows Parties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commissioners</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington DVTF</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PrePac</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Parks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In essence therefore, assuming one volunteer represents a “party” or family, a total of 38 of 227 volunteers RSVP’d that they would be attending, or 16.7% of the city’s total volunteers at that point in time. In actuality, however, only 28 of 227 volunteers attended, or 12.3% of the city’s total volunteers. Eight (8) of the 28 volunteers in attendance were commission members; those 8 represent 22.2% of the 36 commission positions that were staffed at that time. Over 29% of the number of people RSVP’d did not show, making up 26% of the “parties” that did not show.
Cost of the Volunteer Appreciation Dinner:
The total cost of the 2016 Volunteer Appreciation Dinner was just under $4,000, not including staff time. This amount, however, did not include rental and setup of large tents, which would definitely be recommended for the next event, due to the possibility of extreme heat or rain. That would add at least another $700 to the total cost, which covers rental and set up by the vendor. Therefore, the total estimated cost to do a similar Volunteer Appreciation Dinner for 2017 would be close to $5,000.

When the Volunteer Appreciation Dinner was first undertaken, the total cost of putting on the event was estimated to be approximately $1,500. As the event evolved into a higher quality event in terms of entertainment, food, and decorations, costs gradually rose. While holding the event at the CCP and teaming it up with a concert cut the costs of entertainment, having to rent tables, chairs, and a porta-potty presented an additional cost, not to mention the future need for tent rental. Staff in addition to the Personnel Division staff were now also affected, including Recreation Division staff, Maintenance Division staff, and the Communications & Marketing Manager.

OTHER CURRENT FORMS OF VOLUNTEER RECOGNITION
Besides the annual Volunteer Appreciation Dinner, below are other ways the city’s volunteers are recognized:

- **Commission members** are invited to the annual **State of the City Address**. This is celebrated with a variety of appetizers and includes the following recognition:
  - **Volunteer of the Year** (any type of volunteer is eligible) and **Commissioner of the Year Awards** (both receive a personal plaque and names on city plaque).
  - This event could also be used to present **annual Presidential Awards** to any type of volunteers that have achieved hourly thresholds of volunteer service. Since there are only a few volunteers receiving these awards and since this event occurs at the beginning of the calendar year instead of the middle, this would be an opportune time to present the Presidential Awards (they are currently being presented at the annual Volunteer Appreciation Dinner).

- **All volunteers** receive a specially-ordered greeting card during National Volunteer Appreciation Week in April of every year that has been customized for their particular volunteer responsibility and is personalized with their name and the Mayor’s signature.

- **Aquatics volunteers** receive the following:
  - Free admission to any “swims” (lap, family, public, waterX, and special events).
  - Free Lifeguard Course if at least 15 years of age with at least 150 hours of volunteer service. (Value is $210 to $260.)

In addition to the immediate benefits noted above, the exposure to the aquatics field creates a foundation for possible future employment. Even if not geared to employment in aquatics, volunteers learn to function as part of a team and learn key skills that will be valuable for their first job in any field.

- **Athletics volunteers** (coaches) receive the following:
  - 50% registration discount
  - Coaches’ T-shirt
  - Team photo plaque

The above provides a complete summary of the city’s current efforts to recognize its volunteers.
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