

**Hillsborough County, Florida
Board of County Commissioners**

**Hillsborough County
Citizen Satisfaction Survey 2006**

**Interviews by Telephone
840 Respondents**

Bamberg-Handley, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENT

Executive Summary	1
Summary Changes 2005 to 2006	2
Citizen Satisfaction Highlights	3
Reported Users	6
Comparison of Major Survey Categories	8
Geographic and Respondent Selection	8
Primary Survey Description	9
Respondent Interviews	9
Completed Survey Data Processing	9
Respondent Demographics and Census 2000	9
Municipalities Combined	11
Unincorporated	13
African American or Black	15
Tampa Only	18

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Randomly, 840 respondents at listed and unlisted telephone numbers in Hillsborough County, Florida, were queried regarding County governmental services and quality of life in a broader sense. While a larger sample was used in 2006 compared to 2005, absolutely no change was made to content except the addition of a single question. The overall maximum sampling error at a 95 percent confidence level is ± 3.38 percent.

After respondents were asked to provide assessments of 28 individual services of the County and had clearly contemplated each, interviewers said this:

“Thank you for these detailed answers. Now, comparing cost to benefit, would you please give me just one rating for the value of all County services together. Again ‘1’ is a poor value and ‘10’ is an excellent value. What is your value rating for county services overall?”

Almost everyone answered... 95.4 percent. In summary form, considering answers only, the results of the additional question are as follows:

Below Average -----	Average -----	Above Average -----	Ratio -----
6.7%	8.1%	85.2%	12.7

The ratio is Above Average / Below Average. It shows that 12.7 as many respondents judged the aggregate of County services to be an above average value as compared to those saying that the aggregate is a below average value. There is no close comparable in last year’s survey; however, by itself, the ratio is very unusually high for surveys of this type. It is likely meaningful since each respondent had necessarily considered every underlying service when the question was asked.

It may be useful to note that the average answered ‘worth’ attributed to all 28 individual services combined in 2006 is 77.0%. This is higher than the 67.9% of 2005 but it is still less than the 2006 answers to the added question obtained after requiring firm consideration of each service.

In terms of performance, instead of worth or value, 23 of the 28 services included in both the 2005 and 2006 surveys have shown gains in perception, sometimes quite substantial. The other five, even though slightly reduced from 2005, were perceived as above average in performance by over 80 percent of residents in 2006.

Methodology remained essentially the same except for intentional over sampling in Temple Terrace and Plant City and geographical dispersion was increased to include more small neighborhoods.

The survey was conducted between November 11 and December 3, 2006.

SUMMARY CHANGES 2005 TO 2006

Considering only answers, and changes in the above average ratings, the total of various aspects of life in Hillsborough shows a total positive change from 2005 to 2006 of about 4.1 percent. Six of the nine elements rated by citizens of the County moved up. There was a reported and somewhat unexpected increase in above average satisfaction of nearly 6.1 percent in the affordability of housing and even larger increases in the rating of the County as a place to retire and in the availability of information from County government. There was no decrease of more than 1.9 percent.

	2005			2006			Change
	Below	Avg	Above	Below	Avg	Above	
COUNTY OVERALL	9.3	12.9	77.8	13.1	8.5	78.4	0.8%
NEIGHBORHOOD	8.9	6.9	84.1	11.6	5.7	82.7	-1.7%
RAISE CHILDREN	13.1	13.8	73.2	12.3	11.6	76.1	4.0%
CULTURAL	12.3	13.4	74.3	12.9	13.5	73.6	-0.9%
DIVERSITY	13.8	13.5	72.6	14.2	11.3	74.6	2.8%
JOB OPPORTUNITY	11.2	15.6	73.3	16.3	11.9	71.9	-1.9%
AFFORD.HOUSING	27.4	18.1	54.5	28.8	13.4	57.8	6.1%
RETIREMENT	16.9	13.6	69.4	15.0	7.8	77.2	11.2%
COUNTY INFO.	3.4	15.6	61.0	15.8	10.2	74.1	21.5%
TOTAL	15.1	13.7	71.1	15.6	10.4	74.0	4.1%

Considering above average perceptions, the following table shows the changes that have occurred between 2005 and 2006 in terms of specific services provided by the County. Both performance and worth are considered. A summary covering all services combined is also included.

Of the 28 services, positive changes were reported in performance in 24 categories, or 85.7 percent. In terms of worth, 22 of the 28 services showed a gain compared to 2005.

Services	Perform 2005	Perform 2006	%Change	Worth 2005	Worth 2006	%Change
All Services	68.1	77.6	14.0%	67.9	77.0	13.4%
1 SHERIFF	84.1	86.7	3.1%	84.5	87.1	3.1%
2 FIRE	94.1	86.8	-7.8%	88.1	87.6	-0.6%
3 EMERGENCY	93.9	85.1	-9.4%	89.0	86.1	-3.3%
4 VEHICLE SAFETY	56.3	69.8	24.0%	58.1	69.2	19.1%
5 EASE OF TRAVEL	51.0	70.2	37.6%	51.7	67.8	31.1%
6 BICYCLE LANES	43.8	63.6	45.2%	50.8	68.8	35.4%
7 PEDESTRIAN	48.8	66.4	36.1%	54.0	67.3	24.6%
8 YARD WASTE PICKUP	76.6	85.0	11.0%	78.2	81.1	3.7%
9 GARBAGE PICKUP	80.3	82.5	2.7%	81.0	81.8	1.0%
10 TREE TRIMMING	69.9	79.2	13.3%	68.4	75.8	10.8%
11 DITCH	66.4	79.0	19.0%	69.0	74.6	8.1%
12 STREET REPAIR	51.8	74.1	43.1%	50.2	76.3	52.0%
13 STREET SIGN REPAIR	71.2	77.1	8.3%	70.3	77.3	10.0%
14 STORM-WATER DRAINAGE	63.1	74.3	17.7%	57.3	72.9	27.2%
15 MOSQUITO CONTROL	56.2	71.7	27.6%	54.4	74.0	36.0%
16 DRINKING WATER	66.9	74.8	11.8%	64.7	75.0	15.9%
17 SEWER	76.9	80.5	4.7%	79.4	76.6	-3.5%
18 PARKS	87.7	82.0	-6.5%	85.4	80.1	-6.2%

Services	Perform 2005	Perform 2006	%Change	Worth 2005	Worth 2006	%Change
19 RECREATION	79.2	81.1	2.4%	79.4	79.3	-0.1%
20 GROWTH MANAGEMENT	48.0	73.0	52.1%	49.7	72.2	45.3%
21 CODE ENFORCEMENT	59.7	79.3	32.8%	58.1	78.3	34.8%
22 ANIMAL CONTROL	75.5	81.6	8.1%	72.3	80.9	11.9%
23 HEALTH CARE FOR POOR	49.1	70.5	43.6%	49.9	73.4	47.1%
24 SENIOR SERVICES	67.2	76.0	13.1%	67.9	76.6	12.8%
25 CHILD CARE	61.5	75.4	22.6%	59.7	71.8	20.3%
26 AFFORDABLE HOUSING	44.7	71.6	60.2%	47.5	72.3	52.2%
27 LIBRARY	91.1	86.8	-4.7%	91.0	84.6	-7.0%
28 LIBRARY CHILDREN	84.8	86.7	2.2%	81.5	85.5	4.9%

The citizens' ratings of services remain well above the national average of 190 other political jurisdictions conducting comparable surveys.

2006 CITIZEN SATISFACTION HIGHLIGHTS

In the tabulations contained in this section, no change in format has been made since last year, permitting convenient comparison with 2005 results.

The following table summarizes the percentage results for various aspects of life in Hillsborough. The columns headed ALL RESPONSES include those who did not have or provide opinions. The ANSWERS ONLY columns only include those who did provide judgments. The RATIO consists of *above average* answers divided by *below average* answers. Rankings of 1 to 10 were requested for these items, but only below average, average, and above average are shown here.

	ALL RESPONSES			ANSWERS ONLY			RATIO
	BELOW AVERAGE	ABOVE		BELOW AVERAGE	ABOVE		
1. COUNTY OVERALL	13.1	8.5	78.1	13.1	8.5	78.4	6.0
2. NEIGHBORHOOD	11.5	5.7	82.5	11.6	5.7	82.7	7.1
3. RAISE CHILDREN	11.8	11.1	72.7	12.3	11.6	76.1	6.2
4. CULTURAL	12.4	13.0	70.8	12.9	13.5	73.6	5.7
5. DIVERSITY.	13.3	10.6	70.1	14.2	11.3	74.6	5.3
6. JOB OPPOR.	15.4	11.2	67.9	16.3	11.9	71.9	4.4
7. AFFRD.HOUSING	28.2	13.1	56.7	28.8	13.4	57.8	2.0
8. RETIREMENT	14.5	7.6	75.0	15.0	7.8	77.2	5.2
9. CULTURAL	15.1	9.8	71.1	15.8	10.2	74.1	4.7
AVERAGES OF ABOVE	13.1	8.5	78.1	15.6	10.4	74.0	4.7

The descriptions below are expansions of the numbered items above.

1. Hillsborough County overall
2. Your own neighborhood
3. Hillsborough as a place to raise children
4. Cultural opportunities in the County
5. A County where racial & ethnic diversity is appreciated
6. Hillsborough job opportunities
7. The affordability of housing
8. Hillsborough as a place to retire
9. The ease of knowing what's going on in County government

Among notable findings in the preceding table is that for one respondent viewing an item as below average, about five respondents rated the same item as above average. While showing a

substantial increase in above average ratings, it may be worth noting that the availability of affordable housing is considered below average by over 28 percent of residents.

The following table consists of citizen ratings regarding specific County services. The label PRFMC = performance. The label WORTH = value versus cost. Overall, considering an aggregate of 28 services, 77.6% of those who answered found performance of the services to be *above average* (6-10 on the scale of 1 to 10). Among the respondents who provided ratings, 13.3% found them *below average*. Perceived value was near perceived performance in all cases. For 12 services, perceived value outranked perceived performance.

The N near the lower left of each individual service refers to the number of households providing answers. The numbers following USED represent the households using the services during the past 12 months, according to respondents.

		ALL RESPONSES			ANSWERS ONLY			RATIO	
		BLW	AVG	ABV	BLW	AVG	ABV		

COMBINATION OF ALL COUNTY SERVICES		PRFMC	12.5	8.6	73.1	13.3	9.1	77.6	5.8
		WORTH	12.6	8.9	71.7	13.5	9.5	77.0	5.7

----- 1									
SHERIFF SERVICES		PRFMC	7.1	5.8	84.6	7.3	6.0	86.7	11.9
		WORTH	8.1	4.3	83.6	8.4	4.5	87.1	10.3
	N= 820	*** USED= 244 29.0% OF THOSE WHO ANSWERED ***							
----- 2									
FIRE SERVICES		PRFMC	7.4	5.5	84.4	7.6	5.6	86.8	11.4
		WORTH	5.8	6.1	84.2	6.1	6.3	87.6	14.4
	N= 817	*** USED= 134 16.0% OF THOSE WHO ANSWERED ***							
----- 3									
EMERGENCY RESCUE		PRFMC	8.2	6.3	83.1	8.4	6.5	85.1	10.1
AMBULANCE SERVICES		WORTH	6.0	7.5	83.3	6.2	7.7	86.1	14.0
	N= 820	*** USED= 209 24.9% OF THOSE WHO ANSWERED ***							
----- 4									
SAFETY OF VEHICLE TRAFFIC WITHIN THE COUNTY		PRFMC	18.1	11.8	69.0	18.3	11.9	69.8	3.8
	N= 831	WORTH	19.6	10.2	67.0	20.3	10.6	69.2	3.4
		*** USED= 547 65.1% OF THOSE WHO ANSWERED ***							
----- 5									
EASE OF VEHICLE TRAFFIC WITHIN THE COUNTY		PRFMC	16.5	12.9	69.3	16.8	13.0	70.2	4.2
	N= 829	WORTH	18.8	12.4	65.7	19.4	12.8	67.8	3.5
		*** USED= 558 66.4% OF THOSE WHO ANSWERED ***							
----- 6									
CONVENIENCE - SAFETY OF BICYCLE LANES AND TRAILS		PRFMC	22.7	11.2	59.4	24.4	12.0	63.6	2.6
	N= 784	WORTH	19.8	8.9	63.3	21.5	9.7	68.8	3.2
		*** USED= 250 29.8% OF THOSE WHO ANSWERED ***							
----- 7									
CONVENIENCE - SAFETY OF PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES		PRFMC	19.3	12.5	62.7	20.4	13.2	66.4	3.3
	N= 794	WORTH	19.9	10.6	62.7	21.3	11.4	67.3	3.2
		*** USED= 260 31.0% OF THOSE WHO ANSWERED ***							
----- 8									
YARD WASTE PICK UP		PRFMC	8.8	6.0	83.5	9.0	6.1	85.0	9.5
	N= 825	WORTH	10.8	7.3	77.9	11.3	7.6	81.1	7.2
		*** USED= 466 55.5% OF THOSE WHO ANSWERED ***							
----- 9									
GARBAGE/RECYCLING COLLECTION		PRFMC	8.8	8.5	81.4	8.9	8.6	82.5	9.2
	N= 829	WORTH	9.2	8.5	79.3	9.5	8.7	81.8	8.6
		*** USED= 532 63.3% OF THOSE WHO ANSWERED ***							

		ALL RESPONSES			ANSWERS ONLY			RATIO
		BLW	AVG	ABV	BLW	AVG	ABV	
-----	10							
TREE TRIMMING/REMOVAL	PRFMC	11.2	8.9	76.8	11.5	9.2	79.2	6.9
	WORTH	12.9	10.1	71.8	13.6	10.7	75.8	5.6
N= 814	*** USED=	192	22.9%	OF THOSE	WHO ANSWERED	***		
-----	11							
DITCH/RIGHT-OF-WAY	PRFMC	11.7	8.7	76.4	12.1	9.0	79.0	6.6
CLEANING AND MOWING	WORTH	13.0	11.2	71.0	13.6	11.8	74.6	5.5
N= 813	*** USED=	134	16.0%	OF THOSE	WHO ANSWERED	***		
-----	12							
STREET REPAIRS	PRFMC	14.9	10.4	72.3	15.3	10.6	74.1	4.9
	WORTH	13.2	9.5	73.2	13.8	9.9	76.3	5.5
N= 819	*** USED=	187	22.3%	OF THOSE	WHO ANSWERED	***		
-----	13							
STREET SIGN REPAIR	PRFMC	11.5	10.4	73.9	12.0	10.8	77.1	6.4
	WORTH	10.8	10.7	73.2	11.4	11.3	77.3	6.8
N= 805	*** USED=	180	21.4%	OF THOSE	WHO ANSWERED	***		
-----	14							
PUBLIC STORMWATER	PRFMC	14.5	10.5	72.3	14.9	10.8	74.3	5.0
DRAINAGE	WORTH	15.2	10.8	70.0	15.9	11.3	72.9	4.6
N= 817	*** USED=	282	33.6%	OF THOSE	WHO ANSWERED	***		
-----	15							
MOSQUITO CONTROL	PRFMC	15.5	12.1	70.0	15.9	12.4	71.7	4.5
	WORTH	14.6	10.4	71.2	15.2	10.8	74.0	4.9
N= 820	*** USED=	299	35.6%	OF THOSE	WHO ANSWERED	***		
-----	16							
PUBLIC DRINKING WATER	PRFMC	14.8	9.3	71.4	15.5	9.7	74.8	4.8
SERVICES	WORTH	13.8	9.9	71.0	14.6	10.4	75.0	5.1
N= 802	*** USED=	395	47.0%	OF THOSE	WHO ANSWERED	***		
-----	17							
PUBLIC SEWER SERVICES	PRFMC	10.0	8.7	77.1	10.4	9.1	80.5	7.7
	WORTH	11.8	10.2	72.0	12.5	10.9	76.6	6.1
N= 805	*** USED=	372	44.3%	OF THOSE	WHO ANSWERED	***		
-----	18							
COUNTY PARKS	PRFMC	10.4	6.7	77.7	10.9	7.0	82.0	7.5
FACILITIES	WORTH	10.0	8.8	75.5	10.6	9.3	80.1	7.5
N= 796	*** USED=	334	39.8%	OF THOSE	WHO ANSWERED	***		
-----	19							
COUNTY RECREATION	PRFMC	11.5	5.6	73.7	12.7	6.2	81.1	6.4
PROGRAMS	WORTH	9.9	9.0	72.4	10.8	9.9	79.3	7.3
N= 763	*** USED=	216	25.7%	OF THOSE	WHO ANSWERED	***		
-----	20							
MANAGEMENT OF GROWTH	PRFMC	15.5	9.9	68.6	16.5	10.5	73.0	4.4
AND DEVELOPMENT	WORTH	15.1	10.7	67.1	16.3	11.5	72.2	4.4
N= 789	*** USED=	141	16.8%	OF THOSE	WHO ANSWERED	***		
-----	21							
CODE ENFORCEMENT	PRFMC	11.7	7.9	75.0	12.3	8.3	79.3	6.4
	WORTH	10.2	10.0	72.9	11.0	10.7	78.3	7.1
N= 794	*** USED=	180	21.4%	OF THOSE	WHO ANSWERED	***		
-----	22							
ANIMAL CONTROL	PRFMC	9.8	8.0	78.7	10.1	8.3	81.6	8.1
	WORTH	9.9	8.2	76.7	10.4	8.7	80.9	7.8
N= 810	*** USED=	161	19.2%	OF THOSE	WHO ANSWERED	***		
-----	23							
HEALTH CARE FOR THE	PRFMC	15.5	9.5	59.6	18.3	11.3	70.5	3.9
POOR	WORTH	14.3	8.2	62.1	16.9	9.7	73.4	4.3
N= 711	*** USED=	88	10.5%	OF THOSE	WHO ANSWERED	***		

		ALL RESPONSES			ANSWERS ONLY			RATIO
		BLW	AVG	ABV	BLW	AVG	ABV	
-----	24							
SERVICES FOR SENIORS	PRFMC	12.6	8.5	66.8	14.4	9.6	76.0	5.3
	WORTH	12.9	8.0	68.1	14.5	9.0	76.6	5.3
	N= 738	*** USED= 141 16.8% OF THOSE WHO ANSWERED ***						
-----	25							
CHILD CARE SERVICES	PRFMC	12.1	8.5	63.0	14.5	10.1	75.4	5.2
	WORTH	15.4	8.2	60.1	18.3	9.8	71.8	3.9
	N= 702	*** USED= 126 15.0% OF THOSE WHO ANSWERED ***						
-----	26							
AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR LOW-INCOME PEOPLE	PRFMC	14.9	9.2	60.7	17.6	10.8	71.6	4.1
	WORTH	14.3	8.9	60.7	17.0	10.6	72.3	4.3
	N= 712	*** USED= 110 13.1% OF THOSE WHO ANSWERED ***						
-----	27							
PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES	PRFMC	8.3	4.0	81.1	8.9	4.3	86.8	9.7
	WORTH	8.6	5.6	77.9	9.3	6.1	84.6	9.1
	N= 785	*** USED= 333 39.6% OF THOSE WHO ANSWERED ***						
-----	28							
LIBRARY PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN	PRFMC	6.9	4.5	74.4	8.0	5.3	86.7	10.8
	WORTH	8.1	4.3	72.9	9.5	5.0	85.5	9.0
	N= 721	*** USED= 333 39.6% OF THOSE WHO ANSWERED ***						

Considering answers only, performance within 11 services was rated above average by over 80% of respondents. In 14 services, performance was rated between 70.1 and 80.0%. In three cases, perceived performance was between 63 and 70%. On the average, the number was 77.6%, well above the most similar known national average of less than 67%.

Reported Users

The following tables are compiled only from those respondents who said at least some of the 28 services had been *used*. On the average, each of the services had been *used* by 31.5 percent of respondents, ranging from 13.1 percent to 66.4 percent. Some services had been *used* by almost all respondents. Performance among users is perceived to be above average by 79.3 percent of users, compared to 77.6 percent of all responses, *users* or not.

SERVICE	USERS	PCT	AVG	PERFORMANCE RATINGS BY USERS			RATIO
				BELOW	AVERAGE	ABOVE	
1 Sheriff	244	29.0		7.9	4.5	87.6	11.2
2 Fire	134	16.0		3.8	3.8	92.5	24.6
3 Emergency	209	24.9		8.7	6.3	85.0	9.8
4 Vehicle Safety	547	65.1		20.1	16.3	63.6	3.2
5 Ease of Travel	558	66.4		17.9	15.6	66.5	3.7
6 Bicycle Lanes	250	29.8		20.6	16.2	63.2	3.1
7 Pedestrian	260	31.0		17.8	13.1	69.1	3.9
8 Yard Waste Pick.	466	55.5		8.0	3.9	88.1	11.1
9 Garbage Pickup	532	63.3		7.7	7.3	84.9	11.0
10 Tree Trimming	192	22.9		10.9	10.9	78.1	7.1
11 Ditch	134	16.0		13.4	9.7	76.9	5.7
12 Street repair	187	22.3		15.6	12.4	72.0	4.6
13 Street Sign Rep.	180	21.4		11.7	8.9	79.4	6.8
14 Stormwater drain	282	33.6		12.8	12.8	74.4	5.8
15 Mosquito Control	299	35.6		19.7	13.0	67.2	3.4

SERVICE	USERS	PCT	AVG	PERFORMANCE RATINGS BY USERS			RATIO
				BELOW	AVERAGE	ABOVE	
16 Drinking Water	395	47.0		22.3	14.4	63.3	2.8
17 Sewers	372	44.3		9.5	13.0	77.5	8.2
18 Parks	334	39.8		6.4	8.2	85.4	13.3
19 Recreation	216	25.7		6.5	4.7	88.8	13.6
20 Growth Mgmt	141	16.8		12.9	8.6	78.4	6.1
21 Code Enforcement	180	21.4		7.3	4.0	88.7	12.1
22 Animal Control	161	19.2		8.1	3.8	88.1	10.8
23 Healthcare Poor	88	10.5		15.3	9.4	75.3	4.9
24 Seniors Services	141	16.8		11.5	6.5	82.0	7.1
25 Child Care	126	15.0		5.8	5.8	88.3	15.1
26 Afford. Housing	110	13.1		14.0	11.2	74.8	5.3
27 Library	333	39.6		4.3	3.3	92.4	21.7
28 Children Library	333	39.6		5.6	4.5	89.9	16.1
AVERAGE ALL 28	264	31.5		11.7	9.0	79.3	9.0

In terms of worth compared to cost, *users* only provided above average ratings in 79.5 percent of the cases. All respondents said the above average rating applied in 77.0 percent of the instances.

SERVICE	USERS	PCT	AVG	WORTH RATINGS BY USERS			RATIO
				BELOW	AVERAGE	ABOVE	
1 Sheriff	244	29.0		8.3	3.7	88.0	10.7
2 Fire	134	16.0		1.5	3.7	94.8	63.5
3 Emergency	209	24.9		6.3	5.8	87.9	14.0
4 Vehicle Safety	547	65.1		22.0	15.5	62.5	2.8
5 Ease of Travel	558	66.4		18.8	14.6	66.5	3.5
6 Bicycle Lanes	250	29.8		20.0	14.3	65.7	3.3
7 Pedestrian	260	31.0		17.8	12.8	69.4	3.9
8 Yard waste Pickup	466	55.5		8.7	6.6	84.7	9.7
9 Garbage Pickup	532	63.3		9.0	7.6	83.4	9.3
10 Tree Trimming	192	22.9		12.7	9.0	78.3	6.2
11 Ditch	134	16.0		11.5	10.8	77.7	6.7
12 Street Repair	187	22.3		18.1	9.9	72.0	4.0
13 Street Sign Repair	180	21.4		10.2	13.6	76.3	7.5
14 Storm-Water Drain	282	33.6		14.1	9.7	76.2	5.4
15 Mosquito Control	299	35.6		17.3	12.2	70.4	4.1
16 Drinking Water	395	47.0		20.9	15.1	64.0	3.1
17 Sewers	372	44.3		12.1	12.4	75.5	6.2
18 Parks	334	39.8		7.0	7.9	85.1	12.2
19 Recreation	216	25.7		3.8	7.6	88.6	23.4
20 Growth Mgmt	141	16.8		12.6	9.6	77.8	6.2
21 Code Enforcement	180	21.4		8.9	5.0	86.0	9.6
22 Animal Control	161	19.2		5.1	6.4	88.5	17.4
23 Healthcare Poor	88	10.5		12.9	9.4	77.6	6.0
24 Seniors Services	141	16.8		7.1	7.1	85.7	12.0
25 Child Care	126	15.0		6.8	5.9	87.3	12.9
26 Afford. Housing	110	13.1		13.8	10.1	76.1	5.5
27 Library	333	39.6		4.6	4.3	91.1	19.8
28 Children Library	333	39.6		6.9	3.8	89.3	12.9
AVERAGE ALL 28	264	31.5		11.4	9.1	79.5	10.8

Comparison of Major Survey Categories (Includes 2005 Overall)

COMBINATION OF ALL COUNTY SERVICES FOR:	PERFORMANCE			WORTH			RATIO
	BLW	AVG	ABV	BLW	AVG	ABV	
2005 County Overall	19.0	12.9	68.1	19.0	13.1	67.9	3.6
2006 County Overall	13.3	9.1	77.6	13.5	9.5	77.0	5.7
Municipalities Combined	13.1	9.1	77.7	13.7	10.0	76.3	5.5
Unincorporated	13.5	9.3	77.3	13.0	8.6	78.5	6.1
Tampa Only	12.8	8.9	78.2	13.5	9.7	76.8	5.7
African American/Black	13.9	10.8	75.3	14.1	10.8	75.1	5.3
Users Only	11.7	9.0	79.3	11.4	9.1	79.5	10.8

GEOGRAPHIC AND RESPONDENT SELECTION

The 2005 sample frame was selected from all possible telephone numbers throughout the County. To assure inclusion of unlisted households, many numbers were selected in small neighborhoods likely to contain numerous unlisted numbers based on the telephone number assignments only. No demographics were considered. In neighborhoods with many telephones assigned according to Census data but with few listed numbers, the presence of unlisted numbers is almost certain. Selection from such areas is part of the methodology approved for federal survey use by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget. Many large survey firms use the methodology to assure efficient inclusion of unlisted numbers. Numerous trials have confirmed the methodological soundness of the approach. In other words, this method produces the same results as a random selection of all telephone households. That was the case in last year's survey for Hillsborough County.

While the 2005 results were not biased, the geographic distribution of the sample frame was not as dispersed as possible. The federal standard is not inadequate for sizeable areas such as ZIP Codes, counties, and standard metropolitan areas; however, the dual sample selection technique gives us better coverage of a larger number of small areas.

In 2006, two samples were drawn to assure greater inclusion of a large number of more widely dispersed small neighborhoods. The first (A) is a set of approximately 6,000 telephone households was randomly selected from the Equifax database for Hillsborough County. The second (B) is a set of 2,000 possible computer-generated telephone numbers that are not in the first set. The second set reaches widely dispersed neighborhoods with a known large percentage of unlisted telephone numbers.

To achieve pseudo-randomness, set (A) was sorted by first name and then by last name without regard for location within the County. To produce an unbiased and unpredictable selection within set (B), a computer randomly selected 9 digits with the rules that telephone number digits

1 and 4 must be at least 2 and that no selected digit had been selected previously. If the number selected were “825713649”, then all likely unlisted numbers previously chosen would be sorted:
 first by telephone number digit 8,
 followed by telephone number digit 2,
 followed by telephone number digit 5,
 etc.

This produces an order for set (B) that has no easily discernable pattern and is always geographically diverse.

PRIMARY SURVEY DESCRIPTION

Cooperating households in Hillsborough County, Florida, from both sample frames described above were polled in between November 11, 2006 and December 3, 2006. The purpose was to help determine the degree of satisfaction with aspects of life in Hillsborough and 28 specific County government services. Respondents were also asked to state whether or not each service had been used during the past year. A total of 840 interviews provided the basis for this report. This produces an overall likely maximum sampling error rate of ± 3.38 percent.

RESPONDENT INTERVIEWS

All personnel making calls are full-time, experienced telephone interviewers. When preferred by the respondents, interviews were conducted in Spanish. Calls were primarily made weekday evenings; however, a significant number occurred on weekends, afternoon or evening.

COMPLETED SURVEY DATA PROCESSING

Processing of the responses has been provided using proprietary programs developed by Bamberg-Handley, Inc., using algorithms and techniques applied to hundreds of past surveys.

RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS AND CENSUS 2000

One measure within the satisfaction survey concerns the length of residency in Hillsborough County. Please note the question about the length of residency in Hillsborough County has no real equivalent in the Census and the Census data is not shown in this section.

The table, which follows, shows answers to the survey question: “How long have you lived in Hillsborough County?” Percentages are of those who answered.

<u>TIME IN COUNTY</u>					
Less than one year	54	6.5%	Over 10 years	315	38.0%
1 to 10 years	304	36.7%	Always	145	17.5%
Don't Know/No Answer	11	1.3%			

The following Hillsborough County measurements can be compared to the Census.

<u>AGE</u>	ADULTS		
	CENSUS PERCENT	RESPONDENT COUNT	RESPONDENT PERCENT
18-24	12.5	40	4.9
25-34	20.2	139	17.1
35-49	31.6	293	35.9
50-64	19.6	191	23.4
65+	16.1	152	18.6

As is usual in surveys, the number of very young adult respondents is less than the population percentage and the percentage of respondents compared to the population percentage is higher among those in the older age ranges.

<u>AGES AND COUNTS OF OCCUPANTS OF RESPONDENT HOUSEHOLDS</u>	CENSUS PERCENT	OCCUPANT COUNT	OCCUPANT PERCENT
	0- 5	8.3	185
6-13	11.5	257	11.4
14-18	6.9	163	7.2
19-45	39.8	880	38.9
46-65	20.5	521	23.0
66-80	9.0	218	9.6
81+	0.5	38	1.7

This distribution of respondents closely reflects the distribution of population by age.

<u>HISPANIC HERITAGE</u>	CENSUS PERCENT	RESPONDENT COUNT	RESPONDENT PERCENT ADJUSTED
HISPANIC	21.4	214	26.9

This is an unusually high response rate for Hispanics within U.S. surveys.

<u>RACE/ETHNICITY (PRIMARY ONLY)</u>	CENSUS PERCENT	RESPONDENT COUNT	RESPONDENT PERCENT ADJUSTED
WHITE	79.1	374	68.9
AFRICAN AMERICAN/BLACK	17.2	132	24.3
AMER.IND./NATIVE AMERICAN	0.5	13	2.4
ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER	3.3	24	4.4

Please note that there is a strong possibility that available race categories are often misunderstood.

It is clear that survey results are approximately consistent across all demographic dimensions of respondents. Differences with the Census findings apparently had no meaningful affect on survey results.

<u>GENDER</u>	CENSUS PERCENT	RESPONDENT COUNT	RESPONDENT PERCENT ADJUSTED
MALE	48.9	407	50.3
FEMALE	51.1	403	49.7

This is not within the usual range for percentage response by gender, but differs from the norm by only 2% or so.

MUNICIPALITIES COMBINED (TAMPA, TEMPLE TERRACE, PLANT CITY)

The following table duplicates that shown for all of Hillsborough County, beginning on page 4, except that only those respondents within Tampa, Temple Terrace and Plant City are included. There are 518 respondents within the corporate limits of one of these three municipalities.

The following table consists of citizen ratings regarding specific County services. The label PRFMC = performance. The label WORTH = value versus cost.

		ALL RESPONSES			ANSWERS ONLY			RATIO	
		BLW	AVG	ABV	BLW	AVG	ABV		
COMBINATION OF ALL COUNTY SERVICES	PRFMC	12.4	8.6	73.4	13.1	9.1	77.7	5.9	
	WORTH	12.9	9.4	71.7	13.7	10.0	76.3	5.5	

1	SHERIFF SERVICES	PRFMC	7.1	6.2	84.4	7.3	6.3	86.4	11.9
		WORTH	8.3	5.6	82.3	8.6	5.8	85.6	10.0
	N= 508								

2	FIRE SERVICES	PRFMC	6.9	5.8	84.8	7.1	5.9	87.0	12.3
		WORTH	4.6	6.7	85.0	4.8	7.0	88.2	18.4
	N= 507								

3	EMERGENCY RESCUE AMBULANCE SERVICES	PRFMC	7.7	6.5	83.3	7.9	6.7	85.4	10.8
		WORTH	6.0	8.7	82.7	6.1	8.9	85.0	13.9
	N= 507								

4	SAFETY OF VEHICLE TRAFFIC WITHIN THE COUNTY	PRFMC	18.3	12.3	68.3	18.5	12.5	69.1	3.7
		WORTH	20.6	11.9	65.6	21.0	12.2	66.9	3.2
	N= 514								

5	EASE OF VEHICLE TRAFFIC WITHIN THE COUNTY	PRFMC	16.9	14.2	67.5	17.2	14.4	68.4	4.0
		WORTH	21.0	12.7	64.2	21.4	13.0	65.6	3.1
	N= 513								

6	CONVENIENCE - SAFETY OF BICYCLE LANES AND TRAILS	PRFMC	22.7	12.1	58.1	24.4	13.0	62.5	2.6
		WORTH	21.7	8.5	62.3	23.5	9.1	67.4	2.9
	N= 483								

7	CONVENIENCE - SAFETY OF PEDESTRIAN FACILI- TIES	PRFMC	19.2	12.9	61.7	20.5	13.7	65.8	3.2
		WORTH	21.3	10.6	62.5	22.6	11.2	66.2	2.9
	N= 488								

8	YARD WASTE PICK UP	PRFMC	8.3	6.9	82.3	8.5	7.1	84.4	10.0
		WORTH	11.9	7.7	76.7	12.4	8.0	79.6	6.4
	N= 507								

9	GARBAGE/RECYCLING COLLECTION	PRFMC	8.5	7.9	81.9	8.6	8.0	83.4	9.7
		WORTH	8.8	8.7	80.4	9.0	8.8	82.1	9.1
	N= 511								

		ALL RESPONSES			ANSWERS ONLY			RATIO
		BLW	AVG	ABV	BLW	AVG	ABV	
-----	10							
TREE TRIMMING/REMOVAL	PRFMC	10.6	9.4	76.9	10.9	9.7	79.4	7.3
	WORTH	12.5	11.2	71.7	13.1	11.7	75.2	5.7
	N= 504							
-----	11							
DITCH/RIGHT-OF-WAY	PRFMC	12.7	8.8	75.2	13.1	9.1	77.7	5.9
CLEANING AND MOWING	WORTH	13.1	11.5	71.3	13.6	12.0	74.3	5.5
	N= 503							
-----	12							
STREET REPAIRS	PRFMC	14.4	9.8	73.5	14.8	10.0	75.2	5.1
	WORTH	12.7	9.6	73.8	13.2	10.0	76.8	5.8
	N= 508							
-----	13							
STREET SIGN REPAIR	PRFMC	11.3	10.2	74.2	11.8	10.6	77.5	6.5
	WORTH	10.4	10.8	74.4	10.9	11.3	77.9	7.2
	N= 498							
-----	14							
PUBLIC STORMWATER	PRFMC	15.4	8.8	73.3	15.8	9.1	75.1	4.8
DRAINAGE	WORTH	14.6	11.3	71.0	15.1	11.7	73.2	4.9
	N= 507							
-----	15							
MOSQUITO CONTROL	PRFMC	15.0	11.0	71.9	15.3	11.2	73.5	4.8
	WORTH	16.3	10.0	70.4	16.9	10.3	72.8	4.3
	N= 509							
-----	16							
PUBLIC DRINKING WATER	PRFMC	14.0	8.5	73.8	14.6	8.8	76.6	5.3
SERVICES	WORTH	14.4	9.6	72.5	14.9	10.0	75.1	5.0
	N= 501							
-----	17							
PUBLIC SEWER SERVICES	PRFMC	10.4	9.0	76.3	10.8	9.4	79.7	7.4
	WORTH	12.3	10.4	72.9	12.9	10.9	76.3	5.9
	N= 498							
-----	18							
COUNTY PARKS	PRFMC	9.2	6.9	78.8	9.7	7.3	83.0	8.5
FACILITIES	WORTH	10.8	9.0	75.6	11.3	9.5	79.2	7.0
	N= 494							
-----	19							
COUNTY RECREATION	PRFMC	11.2	6.3	73.7	12.2	7.0	80.8	6.6
PROGRAMS	WORTH	8.8	10.4	72.9	9.6	11.3	79.1	8.2
	N= 474							
-----	20							
MANAGEMENT OF GROWTH	PRFMC	16.0	10.4	67.3	17.0	11.1	71.9	4.2
AND DEVELOPMENT	WORTH	15.0	11.9	66.2	16.1	12.8	71.1	4.4
	N= 487							
-----	21							
CODE ENFORCEMENT	PRFMC	11.2	6.2	76.3	11.9	6.6	81.5	6.8
	WORTH	10.4	9.8	72.9	11.2	10.5	78.3	7.0
	N= 487							
-----	22							
ANIMAL CONTROL	PRFMC	9.0	6.5	81.7	9.3	6.7	84.0	9.0
	WORTH	9.8	8.1	78.3	10.2	8.4	81.4	8.0
	N= 506							
-----	23							
HEALTH CARE FOR THE	PRFMC	17.1	9.4	59.0	20.0	11.0	69.0	3.4
POOR	WORTH	15.4	8.7	61.5	18.0	10.1	71.9	4.0
	N= 445							

		ALL RESPONSES			ANSWERS ONLY			RATIO
		BLW	AVG	ABV	BLW	AVG	ABV	
-----	24							
SERVICES FOR SENIORS	PRFMC	12.7	8.8	66.5	14.4	10.0	75.5	5.2
	WORTH	13.5	9.0	67.3	15.0	10.1	74.9	5.0
	N= 458							
-----	25							
CHILD CARE SERVICES	PRFMC	12.1	8.1	64.2	14.4	9.6	76.1	5.3
	WORTH	16.5	8.7	60.4	19.3	10.1	70.6	3.7
	N= 439							
-----	26							
AFFORDABLE HOUSING	PRFMC	14.4	10.0	61.3	16.8	11.7	71.5	4.3
FOR LOW-INCOME PEOPLE	WORTH	14.6	10.0	61.5	17.0	11.6	71.4	4.2
	N= 446							
-----	27							
PUBLIC LIBRARY	PRFMC	8.5	3.5	83.1	8.9	3.6	87.4	9.8
SERVICES	WORTH	8.1	7.3	79.2	8.5	7.7	83.7	9.8
	N= 494							
-----	28							
LIBRARY PROGRAMS FOR	PRFMC	6.5	4.8	74.8	7.6	5.6	86.8	11.4
CHILDREN	WORTH	8.5	4.4	72.9	9.9	5.2	85.0	8.6
	N= 448							

SPECIAL QUESTION	WORTH	6.9	8.7	80.4	7.2	9.0	83.8	11.6

UNINCORPORATED (OUTSIDE TAMPA, TEMPLE TERRACE, PLANT CITY)

The following table duplicates that shown for all of Hillsborough County, beginning on page 4, except that only those respondents living outside Tampa, Temple Terrace and Plant City but inside Hillsborough County are included. The total number of respondents from which this table is constructed is 297.

The following table consists of citizen ratings regarding specific County services. The label PRFMC = performance. The label WORTH = value versus cost.

		ALL RESPONSES			ANSWERS ONLY			RATIO
		BLW	AVG	ABV	BLW	AVG	ABV	
COMBINATION OF ALL	PRFMC	12.7	8.7	72.8	13.5	9.3	77.3	5.7
COUNTY SERVICES	WORTH	12.0	7.9	72.6	13.0	8.6	78.5	6.1

-----	1							
SHERIFF SERVICES	PRFMC	7.0	5.4	84.9	7.2	5.5	87.3	12.1
	WORTH	7.7	2.3	86.3	8.0	2.4	89.6	11.2
	N= 291							
-----	2							
FIRE SERVICES	PRFMC	7.7	5.4	83.6	8.0	5.5	86.5	10.9
	WORTH	7.7	5.4	83.3	8.0	5.6	86.5	10.8
	N= 289							
-----	3							
EMERGENCY RESCUE	PRFMC	9.0	6.0	82.9	9.2	6.1	84.6	9.2
AMBULANCE SERVICES	WORTH	5.7	6.0	85.3	5.9	6.2	87.9	15.0
	N= 293							

		ALL RESPONSES			ANSWERS ONLY			RATIO
		BLW	AVG	ABV	BLW	AVG	ABV	
-----	4							
SAFETY OF VEHICLE	PRFMC	17.7	11.4	69.9	17.9	11.5	70.6	3.9
TRAFFIC WITHIN THE COUNTY	WORTH	17.7	7.7	70.2	18.5	8.0	73.4	4.0
	N= 296							
-----	5							
EASE OF VEHICLE	PRFMC	16.4	11.0	71.2	16.6	11.2	72.2	4.3
TRAFFIC WITHIN THE COUNTY	WORTH	15.4	12.4	68.2	16.0	12.9	71.1	4.4
	N= 295							
-----	6							
CONVENIENCE - SAFETY OF BICYCLE LANES AND TRAILS	PRFMC	22.4	10.4	62.2	23.6	10.9	65.5	2.8
	WORTH	16.4	9.4	66.6	17.8	10.1	72.1	4.1
	N= 284							
-----	7							
CONVENIENCE - SAFETY OF PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES	PRFMC	19.4	11.7	65.2	20.1	12.2	67.7	3.4
	WORTH	17.4	10.0	65.2	18.8	10.8	70.4	3.8
	N= 288							
-----	8							
YARD WASTE PICK UP	PRFMC	10.0	4.3	84.9	10.1	4.4	85.5	8.5
	WORTH	8.7	6.4	80.9	9.1	6.6	84.3	9.3
	N= 297							
-----	9							
GARBAGE/RECYCLING COLLECTION	PRFMC	9.7	9.7	79.9	9.8	9.8	80.5	8.2
	WORTH	9.7	7.7	78.6	10.1	8.0	81.9	8.1
	N= 297							
-----	10							
TREE TRIMMING/REMOVAL	PRFMC	12.7	8.0	76.3	13.1	8.3	78.6	6.0
	WORTH	13.4	8.4	72.9	14.1	8.8	77.0	5.4
	N= 290							
-----	11							
DITCH/RIGHT-OF-WAY CLEANING AND MOWING	PRFMC	10.0	8.4	78.3	10.4	8.7	81.0	7.8
	WORTH	12.7	10.7	70.9	13.5	11.3	75.2	5.6
	N= 289							
-----	12							
STREET REPAIRS	PRFMC	15.7	11.4	70.9	16.0	11.6	72.4	4.5
	WORTH	14.4	9.0	72.9	14.9	9.4	75.7	5.1
	N= 293							
-----	13							
STREET SIGN REPAIR	PRFMC	11.7	11.0	72.9	12.2	11.5	76.2	6.2
	WORTH	11.7	10.4	71.9	12.5	11.0	76.5	6.1
	N= 286							
-----	14							
PUBLIC STORMWATER DRAINAGE	PRFMC	13.0	13.0	70.9	13.4	13.4	73.1	5.4
	WORTH	17.1	10.0	68.9	17.8	10.5	71.8	4.0
	N= 290							
-----	15							
MOSQUITO CONTROL	PRFMC	17.1	12.7	67.9	17.5	13.0	69.5	4.0
	WORTH	12.0	10.7	73.9	12.5	11.1	76.5	6.1
	N= 292							
-----	16							
PUBLIC DRINKING WATER SERVICES	PRFMC	16.4	10.7	66.6	17.5	11.4	71.1	4.1
	WORTH	13.0	9.7	69.6	14.1	10.5	75.4	5.3
	N= 280							
-----	17							
PUBLIC SEWER SERVICES	PRFMC	9.0	8.4	78.6	9.4	8.7	81.9	8.7
	WORTH	11.0	10.0	71.2	12.0	10.9	77.2	6.5
	N= 287							

		ALL RESPONSES			ANSWERS ONLY			RATIO
		BLW	AVG	ABV	BLW	AVG	ABV	
-----	18							
COUNTY PARKS	PRFMC	12.4	6.7	75.3	13.1	7.1	79.8	6.1
FACILITIES	WORTH	8.7	8.7	75.9	9.3	9.3	81.4	8.7
	N= 282							
-----	19							
COUNTY RECREATION	PRFMC	12.4	4.3	74.2	13.6	4.8	81.6	6.0
PROGRAMS	WORTH	11.7	6.7	72.9	12.8	7.3	79.9	6.2
	N= 272							
-----	20							
MANAGEMENT OF GROWTH	PRFMC	14.4	9.4	70.6	15.2	9.9	74.8	4.9
AND DEVELOPMENT	WORTH	15.4	8.0	70.2	16.4	8.6	75.0	4.6
	N= 282							
-----	21							
CODE ENFORCEMENT	PRFMC	11.7	10.4	73.6	12.2	10.8	76.9	6.3
	WORTH	10.0	10.4	73.2	10.7	11.1	78.2	7.3
	N= 286							
-----	22							
ANIMAL CONTROL	PRFMC	11.0	9.7	74.6	11.6	10.2	78.2	6.8
	WORTH	10.4	8.0	75.3	11.1	8.6	80.4	7.3
	N= 285							
-----	23							
HEALTH CARE FOR THE	PRFMC	12.4	10.0	61.9	14.7	11.9	73.4	5.0
POOR	WORTH	12.0	7.0	65.9	14.2	8.3	77.6	5.5
	N= 252							
-----	24							
SERVICES FOR SENIORS	PRFMC	11.7	8.0	69.2	13.2	9.0	77.8	5.9
	WORTH	12.0	6.4	71.2	13.4	7.1	79.5	5.9
	N= 266							
-----	25							
CHILD CARE SERVICES	PRFMC	12.4	9.4	61.5	14.9	11.2	73.9	5.0
	WORTH	13.4	7.7	60.9	16.3	9.4	74.3	4.6
	N= 249							
-----	26							
AFFORDABLE HOUSING	FORPRFMC	16.1	8.4	60.2	19.0	9.9	71.1	3.8
LOW-INCOME PEOPLE	WORTH	13.7	6.7	61.5	16.7	8.2	75.1	4.5
	N= 253							
-----	27							
PUBLIC LIBRARY	PRFMC	8.0	5.4	77.6	8.8	5.9	85.3	9.7
SERVICES	WORTH	9.0	3.0	76.6	10.2	3.4	86.4	8.5
	N= 272							
-----	28							
LIBRARY PROGRAMS FOR	PRFMC	7.7	4.3	73.6	9.0	5.1	85.9	9.6
CHILDREN	WORTH	7.7	3.7	73.6	9.1	4.3	86.6	9.6
	N= 256							

SPECIAL QUESTION	WORTH	5.0	6.7	83.6	5.3	7.0	87.7	16.7

AFRICAN AMERICAN OR BLACK

The following table duplicates that shown for all of Hillsborough County, beginning on page 4, except that only those respondents who identify themselves as African American or Black are included. The total number of respondents from which this table is constructed is 132.

The following table consists of citizen ratings regarding specific County services. The label PRFMC = performance. The label WORTH = value versus cost.

		ALL RESPONSES			ANSWERS ONLY			RATIO
		BLW	AVG	ABV	BLW	AVG	ABV	
COMBINATION OF ALL COUNTY SERVICES	PRFMC	13.3	10.3	71.6	13.9	10.8	75.3	5.4
	WORTH	13.3	10.2	70.9	14.1	10.8	75.1	5.3

	1							
SHERIFF SERVICES	PRFMC	12.9	9.1	75.8	13.2	9.3	77.5	5.9
	WORTH	15.9	6.8	75.8	16.2	6.9	76.9	4.8
	N= 129							

	2							
FIRE SERVICES	PRFMC	9.8	9.8	78.0	10.1	10.1	79.8	7.9
	WORTH	9.1	9.8	78.8	9.3	10.1	80.6	8.7
	N= 129							

	3							
EMERGENCY RESCUE	PRFMC	9.8	8.3	81.1	9.9	8.4	81.7	8.2
AMBULANCE SERVICES	WORTH	6.1	12.1	79.5	6.2	12.4	81.4	13.1
	N= 131							

	4							
SAFETY OF VEHICLE	PRFMC	18.2	12.1	68.9	18.3	12.2	69.5	3.8
TRAFFIC WITHIN THE	WORTH	21.2	12.1	64.4	21.7	12.4	65.9	3.0
COUNTY	N= 131							

	5							
EASE OF VEHICLE	PRFMC	17.4	10.6	71.2	17.6	10.7	71.8	4.1
TRAFFIC WITHIN THE	WORTH	17.4	15.9	65.2	17.7	16.2	66.2	3.7
COUNTY	N= 131							

	6							
CONVENIENCE - SAFETY	PRFMC	24.2	12.1	57.6	25.8	12.9	61.3	2.4
OF BICYCLE LANES AND	WORTH	21.2	9.8	62.1	22.8	10.6	66.7	2.9
TRAILS	N= 124							

	7							
CONVENIENCE - SAFETY	PRFMC	21.2	14.4	59.1	22.4	15.2	62.4	2.8
OF PEDESTRIAN FACILI-	WORTH	24.2	10.6	59.1	25.8	11.3	62.9	2.4
TIES	N= 125							

	8							
YARD WASTE PICK UP	PRFMC	9.1	5.3	84.1	9.2	5.4	85.4	9.3
	WORTH	9.1	10.6	75.0	9.6	11.2	79.2	8.3
	N= 130							

	9							
GARBAGE/RECYCLING	PRFMC	12.1	5.3	81.8	12.2	5.3	82.4	6.8
COLLECTION	WORTH	6.1	12.1	79.5	6.2	12.4	81.4	13.1
	N= 131							

	10							
TREE TRIMMING/REMOVAL	PRFMC	10.6	8.3	78.8	10.9	8.5	80.6	7.4
	WORTH	11.4	11.4	72.0	12.0	12.0	76.0	6.3
	N= 129							

	11							
DITCH/RIGHT-OF-WAY	PRFMC	8.3	7.6	80.3	8.7	7.9	83.5	9.6
CLEANING AND MOWING	WORTH	9.1	13.6	72.7	9.5	14.3	76.2	8.0
	N= 127							

	12							
STREET REPAIRS	PRFMC	12.1	10.6	74.2	12.5	10.9	76.6	6.1
	WORTH	9.8	7.6	79.5	10.2	7.8	82.0	8.1
	N= 128							

		ALL RESPONSES			ANSWERS ONLY			RATIO
		BLW	AVG	ABV	BLW	AVG	ABV	
-----	13							
STREET SIGN REPAIR	PRFMC	13.6	13.6	70.5	14.0	14.0	72.1	5.2
	WORTH	10.6	15.2	71.2	10.9	15.6	73.4	6.7
	N= 129							
-----	14							
PUBLIC STORMWATER	PRFMC	17.4	12.9	66.7	18.0	13.3	68.8	3.8
DRAINAGE	WORTH	16.7	6.8	73.5	17.2	7.0	75.8	4.4
	N= 128							
-----	15							
MOSQUITO CONTROL	PRFMC	17.4	13.6	66.7	17.8	14.0	68.2	3.8
	WORTH	14.4	12.9	69.7	14.8	13.3	71.9	4.8
	N= 129							
-----	16							
PUBLIC DRINKING WATER	PRFMC	20.5	12.1	62.9	21.4	12.7	65.9	3.1
SERVICES	WORTH	19.7	8.3	68.2	20.5	8.7	70.9	3.5
	N= 126							
-----	17							
PUBLIC SEWER SERVICES	PRFMC	9.1	14.4	74.2	9.3	14.7	76.0	8.2
	WORTH	11.4	11.4	74.2	11.7	11.7	76.6	6.5
	N= 129							
-----	18							
COUNTY PARKS	PRFMC	6.1	10.6	78.8	6.3	11.1	82.5	13.0
FACILITIES	WORTH	9.8	8.3	77.3	10.3	8.7	81.0	7.8
	N= 126							
-----	19							
COUNTY RECREATION	PRFMC	11.4	6.8	76.5	12.0	7.2	80.8	6.7
PROGRAMS	WORTH	7.6	6.8	80.3	8.0	7.2	84.8	10.6
	N= 125							
-----	20							
MANAGEMENT OF GROWTH	PRFMC	14.4	14.4	62.9	15.7	15.7	68.6	4.4
AND DEVELOPMENT	WORTH	15.2	12.1	64.4	16.5	13.2	70.2	4.3
	N= 121							
-----	21							
CODE ENFORCEMENT	PRFMC	12.9	12.1	73.5	13.1	12.3	74.6	5.7
	WORTH	8.3	11.4	74.2	8.9	12.1	79.0	8.9
	N= 130							
-----	22							
ANIMAL CONTROL	PRFMC	9.8	11.4	77.3	10.0	11.5	78.5	7.8
	WORTH	12.1	8.3	76.5	12.5	8.6	78.9	6.3
	N= 130							
-----	23							
HEALTH CARE FOR THE	PRFMC	19.7	11.4	58.3	22.0	12.7	65.3	3.0
POOR	WORTH	15.9	10.6	62.9	17.8	11.9	70.3	4.0
	N= 118							
-----	24							
SERVICES FOR SENIORS	PRFMC	12.1	9.8	66.7	13.7	11.1	75.2	5.5
	WORTH	12.9	13.6	64.4	14.2	15.0	70.8	5.0
	N= 117							
-----	25							
CHILD CARE SERVICES	PRFMC	13.6	7.6	62.1	16.4	9.1	74.5	4.6
	WORTH	19.7	10.6	54.5	23.2	12.5	64.3	2.8
	N= 110							
-----	26							
AFFORDABLE HOUSING	FORPRFMC	16.7	14.4	59.1	18.5	16.0	65.5	3.5
LOW-INCOME PEOPLE	WORTH	20.5	10.6	58.3	22.9	11.9	65.3	2.9
	N= 119							

		ALL RESPONSES			ANSWERS ONLY			RATIO
		BLW	AVG	ABV	BLW	AVG	ABV	
-----	27							
PUBLIC LIBRARY	PRFMC	5.3	3.0	84.8	5.7	3.3	91.1	16.0
SERVICES	WORTH	9.1	5.3	78.8	9.8	5.7	84.6	8.7
	N= 123							
-----	28							
LIBRARY PROGRAMS FOR	PRFMC	5.3	5.3	72.0	6.4	6.4	87.2	13.6
CHILDREN	WORTH	7.6	0.8	73.5	9.3	0.9	89.8	9.7
	N= 109							

SPECIAL QUESTION	WORTH	9.8	10.6	76.5	10.2	10.9	78.9	7.8

TAMPA ONLY

The following table duplicates that shown for all of Hillsborough County, beginning on page 4, except that only those respondents within the corporate limits of Tampa only are included. The total number of respondents from which this table is constructed is 425.

The following table consists of citizen ratings regarding specific County services. The label PRFMC = performance. The label WORTH = value versus cost.

		ALL RESPONSES			ANSWERS ONLY			RATIO
		BLW	AVG	ABV	BLW	AVG	ABV	
COMBINATION OF ALL	PRFMC	12.2	8.5	74.3	12.8	8.9	78.2	6.1
COUNTY SERVICES	WORTH	12.8	9.2	72.8	13.5	9.7	76.8	5.7

-----	1							
SHERIFF SERVICES	PRFMC	7.3	5.9	84.5	7.5	6.0	86.5	11.6
	WORTH	8.0	5.4	82.9	8.3	5.6	86.1	10.4
	N= 416							
-----	2							
FIRE SERVICES	PRFMC	7.3	5.6	84.5	7.5	5.8	86.7	11.6
	WORTH	4.7	5.9	85.9	4.9	6.1	89.1	18.3
	N= 415							
-----	3							
EMERGENCY RESCUE	PRFMC	7.7	5.9	83.8	8.0	6.0	86.0	10.8
AMBULANCE SERVICES	WORTH	6.1	8.0	83.6	6.3	8.2	85.6	13.7
	N= 415							
-----	4							
SAFETY OF VEHICLE	PRFMC	18.3	12.4	68.1	18.5	12.6	68.9	3.7
TRAFFIC WITHIN THE	WORTH	20.7	12.4	65.3	21.0	12.6	66.3	3.2
COUNTY	N= 421							
-----	5							
EASE OF VEHICLE	PRFMC	16.9	14.1	67.6	17.1	14.3	68.6	4.0
TRAFFIC WITHIN THE	WORTH	20.9	12.7	64.3	21.3	12.9	65.7	3.1
COUNTY	N= 420							
-----	6							
CONVENIENCE - SAFETY	PRFMC	22.3	12.4	58.2	24.0	13.4	62.6	2.6
OF BICYCLE LANES AND	WORTH	21.6	7.5	63.4	23.4	8.1	68.5	2.9
TRAILS	N= 396							

		ALL RESPONSES			ANSWERS ONLY			RATIO
		BLW	AVG	ABV	BLW	AVG	ABV	
-----	7							
CONVENIENCE - SAFETY	PRFMC	19.0	12.4	63.4	20.0	13.1	66.8	3.3
OF PEDESTRIAN FACILI-	WORTH	20.7	9.6	64.8	21.7	10.1	68.1	3.1
TIES								
N= 404								
-----	8							
YARD WASTE PICK UP	PRFMC	8.0	7.0	83.3	8.1	7.2	84.7	10.4
	WORTH	11.5	7.7	77.7	11.9	8.0	80.1	6.8
N= 419								
-----	9							
GARBAGE/RECYCLING	PRFMC	7.5	8.2	82.6	7.6	8.4	84.0	11.0
COLLECTION	WORTH	8.9	9.2	80.0	9.1	9.3	81.6	9.0
N= 419								
-----	10							
TREE TRIMMING/REMOVAL	PRFMC	10.6	8.9	78.6	10.8	9.1	80.1	7.4
	WORTH	12.7	10.6	73.0	13.2	11.0	75.9	5.8
N= 418								
-----	11							
DITCH/RIGHT-OF-WAY	PRFMC	12.4	8.5	77.0	12.7	8.6	78.7	6.2
CLEANING AND MOWING	WORTH	13.4	11.7	72.1	13.8	12.1	74.2	5.4
N= 417								
-----	12							
STREET REPAIRS	PRFMC	13.4	10.1	74.2	13.7	10.3	76.0	5.5
	WORTH	12.7	9.4	74.6	13.1	9.7	77.2	5.9
N= 416								
-----	13							
STREET SIGN REPAIR	PRFMC	11.0	10.6	75.1	11.4	10.9	77.7	6.8
	WORTH	10.6	11.0	74.6	11.0	11.5	77.6	7.1
N= 412								
-----	14							
PUBLIC STORMWATER	PRFMC	16.0	8.5	73.7	16.3	8.6	75.1	4.6
DRAINAGE	WORTH	15.0	11.0	72.3	15.3	11.2	73.5	4.8
N= 418								
-----	15							
MOSQUITO CONTROL	PRFMC	12.7	11.3	74.2	12.9	11.5	75.6	5.9
	WORTH	15.3	9.6	72.5	15.7	9.9	74.5	4.8
N= 418								
-----	16							
PUBLIC DRINKING WATER	PRFMC	12.9	8.2	75.6	13.3	8.5	78.2	5.9
SERVICES	WORTH	14.1	8.7	74.2	14.5	9.0	76.5	5.3
N= 412								
-----	17							
PUBLIC SEWER SERVICES	PRFMC	10.6	8.2	78.2	10.9	8.5	80.6	7.4
	WORTH	12.0	10.3	73.9	12.4	10.7	76.8	6.2
N= 413								
-----	18							
COUNTY PARKS	PRFMC	9.2	5.9	80.0	9.6	6.2	84.2	8.7
FACILITIES	WORTH	10.1	9.4	76.5	10.5	9.8	79.7	7.6
N= 405								
-----	19							
COUNTY RECREATION	PRFMC	10.8	6.6	73.9	11.8	7.2	81.0	6.8
PROGRAMS	WORTH	8.5	10.6	73.5	9.1	11.4	79.4	8.7
N= 389								
-----	20							
MANAGEMENT OF GROWTH	PRFMC	16.9	10.6	66.7	18.0	11.2	70.8	3.9
AND DEVELOPMENT	WORTH	15.5	12.9	65.7	16.5	13.7	69.8	4.2
N= 401								

		ALL RESPONSES			ANSWERS ONLY			RATIO
		BLW	AVG	ABV	BLW	AVG	ABV	
-----	21							
CODE ENFORCEMENT	PRFMC	11.5	5.9	77.0	12.2	6.2	81.6	6.7
	WORTH	10.3	9.2	74.2	11.0	9.8	79.2	7.2
	N= 402							
-----	22							
ANIMAL CONTROL	PRFMC	7.3	6.3	83.8	7.5	6.5	86.0	11.5
	WORTH	8.9	7.3	80.3	9.2	7.5	83.2	9.0
	N= 415							
-----	23							
HEALTH CARE FOR THE POOR	PRFMC	17.6	8.7	60.8	20.2	10.0	69.8	3.5
	WORTH	15.5	7.3	63.8	17.9	8.4	73.7	4.1
	N= 371							
-----	24							
SERVICES FOR SENIORS	PRFMC	13.1	8.5	67.6	14.7	9.5	75.8	5.1
	WORTH	13.8	8.2	68.8	15.2	9.0	75.7	5.0
	N= 380							
-----	25							
CHILD CARE SERVICES	PRFMC	12.7	8.0	64.8	14.8	9.3	75.8	5.1
	WORTH	16.2	9.4	61.5	18.6	10.8	70.6	3.8
	N= 364							
-----	26							
AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR LOW-INCOME PEOPLE	FORPRFMC	14.1	10.1	63.8	16.0	11.5	72.5	4.5
	WORTH	15.0	10.1	62.9	17.1	11.5	71.5	4.2
	N= 375							
-----	27							
PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES	PRFMC	8.2	3.8	83.6	8.6	3.9	87.5	10.2
	WORTH	7.5	7.3	80.0	7.9	7.7	84.4	10.7
	N= 407							
-----	28							
LIBRARY PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN	PRFMC	6.3	4.7	75.6	7.3	5.4	87.3	11.9
	WORTH	7.5	4.2	74.6	8.7	4.9	86.4	9.9
	N= 369							

SPECIAL QUESTION	WORTH	6.1	8.7	80.5	6.4	9.1	84.5	13.2
