

City Survey 2009 Summary Document February 2010

Preamble

Dr. Shannon Wagner replaced Dr. Alex Michalos as the Director for the Institute of Social Research and Evaluation as of July 1, 2009 and the 2009 survey was the first of the City Surveys completed by the new Director. As a result, this year's survey was very similar to previous surveys with some revisions. Specifically, the team working on the 2009 survey felt reformatting of the survey, reduction in question complexity for some items, and a reduction in the number of survey questions was necessary. In addition, the survey was revised such that all items were scored on a seven point scale in order to provide consistency in interpretation. In order to reduce the length of the survey, team members from the city provided feedback on questions of importance and questions that could be removed without losing imperative information.

Other changes to the structure of the 2009 survey included printing 50% of the surveys in color in place of the normal black-and-white. In addition, 50% of the surveys were provided with a draw sheet that could be sent back separately and would be entered into a draw for tickets to City events and/or services. Of the questionnaires returned, 57% were color and 42% were black and white. Only 56% of respondents who had the option of returning an incentive draw sheet chose to return the sheet for a chance at the City service draw. From these results, it seems that printing in color increased rates of response over black-and-white, but the inclusion of an incentive draw did not predict higher response rates. Overall, the 2009 survey response rate was 9%, not unlike other years where the response rate has ranged between 9 and 12%.

Demographics

The 2009 survey respondents were similar to those from previous samples. The sample was primarily Caucasian (95.8%) and male (64.3%) with an average age of 50.8 years, ranging from 22 to 91 years of age. Most respondents were married (64.6%) or living in a common-law relationship (10.8%). The participants indicated being of higher than average income with 27.7% of individuals reporting a household income "more than 100,000 per year"; the remaining categories were about equally distributed according to \$20,000 increments (~16% per category). As in previous years, our sample was highly educated with more than 80% of the respondents having some type of post-secondary education. The majority of respondents were full-time employees (41.1%), were retired (32.3%) or were self-employed (12.9%). For those employed, most worked as non-union employees (63.9%), union members (38.8%) or managers/supervisors (14.7%). For those that held a job, nearly all had maintained their

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

position for more than 2 years (90.4%) with the years of services (from 2 years to +20 years) about equally distributed.

		2004	2005	2007	2008	2009
Demographics	Sample Size	385	516	411	657	272
	Gender	Female (57.4%); Male (42.6%)	Female (54.1%); Male (45.3%)	Female (44.0%); Male (56.0%)	Female (53.9%); Male (46.1%)	Female (35.7%); Male (64.3%)
	Ethnicity	Primarily Caucasian (qualitative only)	Primarily Caucasian (96.3%)	Primarily Caucasian (94.8%)	Primarily Caucasian (95.4%)	Primarily Caucasian (95.8%)
	Average age	50.93	51.22	51.6	53.1	51.8
	>highschool education	76.7%	76.0 %	82.1%	66.1%	80.3%
	Employment status	Retired (26.6%); Employed full-time (45.2%)	Retired (24.9%); Employed full-time (42.5%)	Retired (23.3%); Employed full-time (51.2%)	Retired (28.2%); Employed full-time (45.8%)	Retired (32.3%); Employed full-time (41.4%)
	Marital status	Married (61.8%); Common law (6.5%)	Married (62.6%); Common law (14.0%)	Married (65.4%); Common law (12.3%)	Married (60.1%); Common law (12.0%)	Married (64.6%); Common law (10.8%)
	Average income	\$100,682	\$76,576	\$95,774	\$82,145	More than 100,000 per year (27.7%) – other 20,000 categories each at about 16%

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

Satisfaction with city services

Satisfaction with city services was evaluated using the question "how satisfied are you with the current level of the following City of Prince George services?" Respondents were asked to rank their satisfaction on a seven-point scale from "very dissatisfied" to "very satisfied".

The responses in this section were subsequently compiled and evaluated for a general level of satisfaction with the service according to the following categories:

- High Range - this category implied that most responses to the city service fell into the "somewhat satisfied" or "very satisfied" categories
- Mid Range - this category implied that most responses to the city service fell within the "about evenly balanced", "a little satisfied" and/or "very satisfied" categories
- Variable Range - this category described city services in which the responses were basically equally distributed across the positive and negative responses, usually with the highest rate of response in the "about evenly balanced" category.
- Low Range - this category described city services in which the responses to the city service fell mostly into the "a little dissatisfied", "somewhat dissatisfied" and/or "very dissatisfied" categories.

Results for satisfaction

City services in the high range included:

- fire protection (6.1)
- library services (5.9)
- water supply (5.6)
- aquatic centers (5.6)
- arenas (5.6)
- sewer operation (5.5)
- sewer treatment (5.3)
- police protection (5.3)
- garbage collection (5.2)
- ice rinks (5.2)
- park maintenance (5.1)
- community recreation (5.0)

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

City services in the mid range included:

- traffic signs/signals (4.8)
- public transit (4.8)
- street lighting (4.8)
- parking control (4.7)
- cemetery (4.7)
- storm drain maintenance (4.6)
- boulevard maintenance (4.5)
- pest control (4.5)
- street cleaning (4.4)
- sidewalk maintenance (4.3)

City services in the variable range included:

- Snow control (4.4)
- building permits (4.3)
- weed control (4.2)
- dust control (4.0)
- social planning (3.9)

City services in the low range included:

- by law enforcement (3.9)
- land-use zoning (3.8)
- land-use planning (3.7)
- economic development (3.6)
- road/street maintenance (2.6)

Topic	Priority	2004	2005	2007	2008	2009
Satisfaction with City Services	High 1	Fire protection		Fire protection/garbage collection	Fire protection	Fire protection
	High 2	Library services		Civic Center	Library services	Library services

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

High 3	Civic Center		Water supply/aquatic centers/arenas	Arenas	Water supply/aquatic centers/arenas *Civic Center not evaluated in 2009
High 4	Arenas		Transfer station operation and maintenance	Civic Center	Sewer operations
High 5	Aquatic centers		Sewers	Aquatic centers/water supply	Sewer treatment
Low 1	Road and street maintenance		Road and street maintenance	Road and street maintenance	Road and street maintenance
Low 2	Pest and weed control		Pest and weed control	Sidewalk maintenance	Economic development
Low 3	By law enforcement		Street cleaning and dust control/Bylaw maintenance	Pest and weed control	Land-use planning and zoning
Low 4	Land-use planning and zoning		Land-use planning and zoning/on and off street parking control/sidewalk maintenance/boulevard maintenance	Land-use planning and zoning	By-law enforcement
Low 5	Sidewalk maintenance		Building permits and licensing	Public Transit	Social planning

Taxation Priorities

Payment for city services was evaluated using the question "local government has two primary ways of paying for the services it provides to the community; taxes and user fees. For each of the following services, please rate your level of priority with respect to your tax dollars." Respondents were asked to rank their satisfaction on a seven-point scale from "very low priority for my tax dollars" to

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

"very high priority for my tax dollars". The responses in this section were subsequently compiled and evaluated for a general level of satisfaction with the service according to the following categories:

- High Range - this category implied that most responses to the city service fell into the "high priority for my tax dollars" or "very high priority for my tax dollars" categories
- Mid Range - this category implied that most responses to the city service fell within the "mid priority for my tax dollars", "a bit of a priority for my tax dollars" and/or "high priority for my tax dollars" categories
- Variable Range - this category described city services in which the responses were basically equally distributed across the positive and negative responses, usually with the highest rate of response in the "mid priority for my tax dollars" category.
- Low Range - this category described city services in which the responses to the city service fell mostly into the "not really a priority for my tax dollars", "low priority for my tax dollars" and/or "very low priority for my tax dollars" categories.

Results for taxation priority

City services in the high range included:

- fire protection (6.1)
- police protection (6.0)
- road/street maintenance (5.9)
- snow control (5.7)
- water supply (5.7)
- sewer operation (5.4)
- sewer treatment systems (5.4)

City services in the mid range included:

- storm drain maintenance (4.9)
- street cleaning (4.9)
- garbage collection (4.8)
- library services (4.8)
- dust control (4.6)
- sidewalk maintenance (4.6)

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

- street lighting (4.6)
- traffic signs/signals (4.6)
- park maintenance (4.6)
- aquatic centers (4.4)
- arenas (4.2)
- ice rinks (4.1)
- community recreation programs (4.1)

City services in the variable range included:

- public transit (4.2)
- boulevard maintenance (4.1)
- by law enforcement (4.0)
- land-use planning (4.0)
- cemetery (3.8)

City services in the low range included:

- land-use zoning (3.9)
- pest control (3.7)
- economic development (3.7)
- weed control (3.7)
- building permits (3.6)
- parking control (3.3)
- social planning (3.3)

Topic	Priority	2004	2005	2007	2008	2009
Taxation priority	High 1					Fire protection
	High 2					Police protection
	High 3					Road and street maintenance

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

	High 4					Snow control/water supply
	High 5					Sewer operations and systems
	Low 1					Social planning/parking
	Low 2					Building permits
	Low 3					Weed control/economic development/pest control
	Low 4					Cemetery
	Low 5					Land-use zoning

Access to City of PG information

Respondent were first asked whether they had access to the Internet and a large majority of the residents indicated having access (87%). Subsequently, respondents were asked to indicate whether they had accessed the City of Prince George and/or "my PG" website and whether or not the websites provided the information they were seeking. Most respondents (64.8%) reported having accessed the general city website but few participants indicated having accessed the "my PG" website. Overall, most respondents (75.7%) felt that they had been able to find the information they were seeking.

Topic	Priority	2004	2005	2007	2008	2009
Website	Access to Internet	82.3%			86.7%	87%
	Visited website	48.5%			54.1%	64.8%

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

Found needed information	81.1%	87.7%	75.7%
--------------------------------	-------	-------	-------

In terms of accessing information, the most commonly reported methods of receiving City of PG information included (respondents were able to choose more than one answer so that percentage may total more than 100):

- Prince George Citizen (76.1%)
- Prince George Free Press (65.4%)
- Word of Mouth (65.4%)
- PGTV (52.9%)
- CBC Radio (40.4%)
- Information leaflets delivered to residents (16.5%)

Less commonly reported methods of receiving City of PG information included:

- The Wolf (26.1%)
- The Drive (22.4%)
- City of PG website (21.7%)
- Televised Council meetings on Cable 10 (21.7%)

Least commonly reported methods of receiving City of PG information included:

- 94X FM Radio (15.1%)
- Directly from City Councillors (14.2%)
- Information leaflets available at city hall (12.1%)
- Information leaflets available at city facilities (12.1%)

Topic	Priority	2004	2005	2007	2008	2009
Information	High 1	Newspaper			Prince George Citizen	Prince George Citizen
	High 2	Leisure guide/word-of-			Prince George Free Press	Prince George Free Press

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

mouth			
High 3	Radio	Prince George television	Word-of-mouth
High 4	Community Association flyers	Word-of-mouth	Prince George television
High 5	N/A	CBC Radio	CBC Radio
Low 1	City of Prince George website	Information leaflets available at other city facilities	Information leaflets available at other city facilities
Low 2	Recreation displays at malls	Information leaflets available at City Hall	Information leaflets available at City Hall
Low 3	Television	Directly from city councillors	Directly from city councillors
Low 4	N/A	94X FM Radio	94X FM Radio
Low 5	N/A	The Drive	Televised council meetings on Cable 10

Interest financing

In response to the items asking for consultation regarding debt financing, a majority of respondents suggested a desire for the city to maintain debt financing at less than 10% of the annual budget (55.2%). An additional 33% indicated a desire for debt financing between 11 and 15% suggesting that approximately 88% of respondents desired debt financing lower than 15%. Also with respect to debt financing, about three quarters of respondents indicated a lack of willingness for increased taxes in order to pay for big projects without borrowing money (72%) or to pay for interest

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

payments (76.8%). Most respondents felt that the city should "stop building new projects and maintain what we have" (70.2%).

Topic	Priority	2004	2005	2007	2008	2009
Debt servicing	Less than 10%				22.6%	55.2%
	11 to 15%				34.9%	33%
	16 to 20%				36.4%	6.8%
	More than 20%				6.1%	5.0%

Sustainability

Sustainability was evaluated using the question "Thinking of sustainability as the long-term wellness of our community for multiple generations, how important are the following sustainability goals to you?" Participants were asked to rate their response to the items on a seven-point scale from "very low importance" to "very high importance". Participants tended to feel that all sustainability issues were important; consequently, for this section, responses were only designated as "high" or "mid" range – "low" and "variable" ranges were not used:

- High Range - this category implied that most responses to the sustainability item fell into the "high importance" or "very high importance" categories
- Mid Range - this category implied that most responses to the city service fell within the "about evenly balanced", "somewhat important" and/or "high importance" categories

Sustainability Results

Items ranked in the High Range included:

- Good quality drinking water (6.4)
- Fiscal responsibility in government (6.3)

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

- Air quality (6.1)
- Public safety (6.1)
- Healthy citizens (6.0)
- Economic stability(5.8)
- Business that supports the community and local economy (5.8)
- Business that enhances the environment (5.8)
- Healthy local forest and aquatic ecosystems (5.7)
- Energy efficiency (5.6)
- Reduced consumption and waste production (5.6)
- Economic diversification (5.5)

Items ranked in the Mid Range included:

- Economic growth (5.4)
- Protection from floods and wildfires (5.3)
- Elimination of soil contamination (5.3)
- Housing affordability (5.3)
- Access for all ages and abilities (5.2)
- Labor pool matched to business needs (5.2)
- Reliance on renewable energy (5.1)
- Housing that meets the needs of all residents (5.1)
- Global transportation and communications connections (5.0)
- Good knowledge and skills in the community (4.9)
- A reduced gap between rich and poor (4.8)
- Engaged citizens (4.7)
- Limited global impacts on climate change (4.6)
- Strong sense of identity (4.3)

Topic	Priority	2004	2005	2007	2008	2009
Sustainability	High 1					Good quality drinking water
	High 2					Fiscal responsibility in

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

						Government
	High 3					Air Quality
	High 4					Public Safety
	High 5					Healthy Citizens
	Low 1					Strong sense of identity
	Low 2					Limited global impacts on climate change
	Low 3					Engaged Citizens
	Low 4					A reduced gap between rich and poor
	Low 5					Good knowledge and skills in the community

Environment

Perceptions about environmental behaviours were evaluated using the question “how much do you think the following behaviours affect the environment?” Participants were asked to rank their responses on a 7-point scale from “strong negative impact” to “strong positive” impact. Similar to the results for sustainability, respondents felt that all suggested environmental behaviours would be helpful. Consequently, this section was group according to “high”, “less” and “least” degree of impact.

- High Impact Range - this category implied that most environmental behaviour responses fell into the "positive impact" or "strong positive impact" categories
- Less Impact Range - this category implied that most environmental behaviour responses fell within the "a little positive impact" or "positive impact" category

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

- Least Impact Range - this category implied that most environmental behaviour responses fell within the “equally balanced” or “a little positive impact” category.

Environmental behaviours seen as having the most impact included:

- Recycle and compost (6.0)
- Conserve energy (5.9)
- Use renewable energy sources (5.8)
- Increase the energy efficiency of your home (5.8)
- Reduce your consumption of goods (5.7)

Environmental behaviours seen as having less impact included:

- Conserve water (5.6)
- Buy local (5.6)
- Drive less (5.5)

Environmental behaviours seen as having the least impact included:

- Use green products (5.4)
- Use green landscaping (5.2)
- Volunteer for environmental activities (4.9)

Topic	Priority	2004	2005	2007	2008	2009
Environment	High 1					Recycle and compost
	High 2					Conserve energy
	High 3					Use renewable energy resources
	High 4					Increase the energy efficiency of your home
	High 5					Reduce your consumption of

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

						goods
	Low 1					Volunteer for environmental activities
	Low 2					Use green landscaping
	Low 3					Use green products
	Low 4					Drive less
	Low 5					Buy local

Quality of Life

Quality of life was evaluated using Dr. Michalos' standard QOL questions including "here are some features of people's lives affecting them today. Please indicate how satisfied you are with each of them" evaluated on a 7-point scale from "very dissatisfied" to "very satisfied". As well, several specific questions reflecting perceptions of happiness were included.

Quality of Life tended to be ranked using the full length of the scale. Consequently, this section was group according to "high", "mid", "variable" and "low" degrees of positivity.

- High Range - this category implied that most quality of life responses were endorsed in the "somewhat satisfied" or "very satisfied" categories
- Mid Range - this category implied that most quality of life responses were endorsed in the "about evenly balance", "a little satisfied" or "somewhat satisfied" category
- Variable Range – this category implied that quality of life responses were endorsed across the scale with approximately equal spread of positive and negative responses.
- Low Range – this category implied that most quality of life responses were endorsed in the "a little dissatisfied", "somewhat dissatisfied" and "very dissatisfied".

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

Quality of Life Results

Overall, residents felt overwhelming satisfied with the conditions of their lives although many indicated that they had not achieved all their aspirations and that they would do some things differently if given a second chance. Similarly, residents reported being very happy, having a life that measured up to similar others and having a life that met their needs. However, many respondents felt that there had been a time in their life that was “better” than current times.

QOL items endorsed in the high range included:

- Living partner (6.3)
- Neighborhood (6.0)
- Family relations, generally (6.0)
- Life as a whole (6.0)
- Friendships (5.9)
- Overall standard of living (5.9)
- Self esteem (5.9)
- Sense of meaning in life (5.8)
- Overall quality of life (5.8)
- Job (5.8)
- Housing situation (5.7)
- Drinking-water quality (5.7)
- Community friendliness (5.6)
- Spiritual fulfillment (5.5)
- Life achievement (5.5)
- Local primary and secondary schools (5.5)

QOL items endorsed with mid range positivity included

- Physical health (5.4)
- City, town or rural area (5.3)
- Financial security (5.3)
- Recreation activities (5.3)
- Amount of free time (5.2)

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

- Level of physical activity (5.1)
- Level of social activity (5.1)
- Community belonging (5.1)
- Access to healthcare (5.0)

QOL items endorsed with the lowest positivity ratings included

- Future security (3.5)
- Local government officials (3.4)
- Federal government officials (3.4)
- Provincial government officials (3.3)
- Air quality (3.2)

Topic	Priority	2004	2005	2007	2008	2009
Quality of Life	High 1	Living partner	Living partner	Living partner	Living partner	Living partner
	High 2	Family relations	Family relations	Family relations	Financial security	Neighborhood/family relations/life as a whole
	High 3	House apartment or mobile home	Neighborhood	Life as a whole/friendships	Family relations	Friendships/overall standard of living/self-esteem
	High 4	Friendships	House, apartment or mobile home	Self-esteem/overall quality of life/how local people treat you/standard of living/house apartment or mobile home	Neighborhood	Sense of meaning in life/overall quality of life/job
	High 5	Life as a whole	Life as a whole	Neighborhood	Life as a whole	Housing situation
	Low 1	Provincial	Provincial	Provincial officials/federal	Provincial	Air quality

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

		officials	officials	officials	officials	
	Low 2	Federal officials	Federal officials	Local officials/air-quality	Federal officials	Provincial Officials
	Low 3	Air-quality	Local officials	Appearance of commercial development in city/quality of commercial development in city	Local officials	Federal Officials
	Low 4	Local officials	Air-quality	Location of commercial development	Air quality	Local Officials
	Low 5	Level of physical activity	City's recycling system	Access to health care/land pollution	Social activity	Future security

Observations

Responses on the 2009 survey were generally consistent with those from surveys of previous years; responding residents of Prince George reported being satisfied with many City services as well as experiencing quality of life in many domains. However, some 2009 specific observations worth mentioning include:

- Economic climate appeared to be reflected, to some degree, in the 2009 responses
- Debt servicing
 - In 2008 22.6% thought interest payment should be less than 10% of annual budget. In 2009, this increased to 55.2%
- In 2009, we see “air quality” as lowest ranked item for quality of life; has been in bottom 5 for previous 5 years but not this low
- In 2009, we see “future security” newly entering into the bottom five ranked items for quality of life

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

- Ongoing lack of agreement between satisfaction and taxation priority for “road and street maintenance”

A further observation relates to the composition of the 2009, as well as previous, samples. Specifically, our respondent sample has traditionally been primarily composed of older, higher SES individuals. Consequently, it is recommended that future efforts be focused on collecting opinions from less represented residents (e.g., youth, lower SES).

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

Appendix 1 – Comments on City services.

- If you answered “very dissatisfied” with the current level of any of the City of PG services listed above, please indicate which ones(s) and why.
- **Boulevard maintenance and weed control:**
 - Ospika is an eyesore. It’s either over run by weeds or all dead because of lack of water.
 - Receive minimal care
 - No such thing on North Ospika
- **Traffic signs:**
 - need lights at Ospika & Ferry Ave, need left turn signals at Westwood & Ferry Ave
- **Bylaw Enforcement:**
 - Animal control bylaw is prejudiced based on opinion or false data
 - We don’t need more laws we need better enforcement
 - Nothing is done about barking dogs or complaints about neighbours junkie yards
 - In many instances the bylaw office is ignoring the issue
 - Residential business for automobile body repair shop
 - Too many un-muzzled dogs on the streets
 - Too many cases to list
 - You don’t enforce the bylaws
 - I have never seen anyone answer and /or enforce a bylaw i.e water sprinklers in the summer
 - Cancel requirement to identify self when reporting infractions. This city hall will disclose your id to friends.
 - Phone by law with an issue and nothing is ever resolved. No power to enforce by laws given to employees or no accountability
 - Get a backbone

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

- Unable to contact after hours. Complaint generated not prevention oriented.
 - **Road & Street Maintenance**
 - More bike lanes/trails/sidewalks
 - Horrible
 - Every year the road maintenance is getting worse
 - Fix the pothole. They are axle breakers.
 - Very poor taxes for pot holes. Don't fix them, need to spend less on travel to get Chinese money & more on local maintenance
 - Too many rough spots, damage to vehicles
 - Marking direction on the asphalt for turning lanes makes no sense in a winter city
 - Many roads should have been repaved years ago and there are enough car eating potholes.
 - Our streets are the worst I have ever seen. We need to put more money towards street repairs.
 - Very poor potholes and broken road patching
 - Need better paving
 - Potholes are killing my car
 - Cracks are terrible. Maintenance crews should be fired. Called re: specific bad areas, they fixed 3 out of 5 potholes. What do your road crews hire? Blind people. This is a real joke.
 - Potholes are a major issue and should be addressed as soon as possible rather than waiting for it to become a liability to vehicles, as well as for wheelchair users.
 - Potholes that damage the front end
 - Potholes everywhere for long periods of time, poorly patched, wasted of effort
 - Potholes not completely patched
 - The quality of neighbourhood streets is an embarrassment when guests come to visit. Patch jobs don't work and are a waste of resources
 - Deplorable. Potholes everywhere. If potholes were repaired in 2009... where?
-

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

- Do we have any?
 - In some streets we still have potholes from last winter—not acceptable.
 - Potholes dirty after the rain at construction entries i.e. Foothills and Nechako
 - Require major upgrades, potholes never permanently fixed
 - Terrible priorities? Allowing only 10% per annum for maintenance is a joke. No new projects until roads are fixed.
 - Too many potholes left unfixed, not clearing sidewalks in the winter for pedestrians, not handicapped friendly
 - City streets are riddled with potholes and need repaving
 - If roads had been built with better foundation they wouldn't go to pot every year. City expects us to recycle but when I have to constantly dodge potholes that will and have cost me a lot of money I drive as little as possible.
 - Always a challenge. Money should be redirected from non-effectual programs such as the downtown business improvement program and use to maintain roads. I used to actively develop and build in PG but have stopped due to restrictive and onerous city regulations and an anti business climate.
 - When roads are being paved don't choose the cheap way the 1st time and it will last longer and save money in the long run. Only lasts one year. Do the job properly the 1st time and it will last longer and save money in the long run. Don't do during rush hour.
 - Bad car ruining potholes all summer
 - Seriously? Look at the potholes/craters in road
 - Some potholes on Domano were just filled December 2009 and they were from last winter
 - Because we have terrible roads
 - Too many potholes in paved streets that are not repaired properly. The repairs don't last and end up in gobs of rubber stuff all over the road.
 - I find roads really icy. I live on a main road and it can be 2 days after a snowfall before they are plowed which is too long
 - Way underfunded as well as our water and sewer lines.
-

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

- Money for arts & travel but not for road maintenance and city appears to be oblivious. Cost taxpayers millions in repairs. Money is not spent wisely.
 - When the weather is nice we see no road repairs to frost cracks/potholes. Many potholes are left to grow too big before they are fixed. When it is cold and rainy a stab is made at the last minute to fix. Current city planner is unfriendly and won't take any suggestions
 - Having a front end loader clean out private paths/driveways is a total waste of money
 - Too many pot holes that are rarely or poorly fixed and very cheap
 - Back alleys need more attention with regards to snow plowing and also more maintenance like tree pruning and clean up in some cases
 - Potholes that are craters and fixing time is slow
 - City was too busy pissing our tax money away to fix potholes
 - Roads are often in terrible condition. Way too many cheap quick fixes for potholes instead of proper site preparation and drainage to begin with.
 - Potholes need major work. Too many temporary fixes.
 - Too many potholes
 - We have lived here since 1963 and this is the worst I have seen the roads
 - Potholes last year's paving a good start
 - In 40 years the worst condition ever
 - A laugh. We've been here 5 years and still have the same potholes along Cowart Rd. City patches with something that lasts maybe a few fays at the most.
 - A joke, huge pothole crew awful result
 - **Garbage Collection**
 - Should have alternate collection and recycle
 - Lower costs by only picking up garbage every 10 to 14 days and get a recycle program going
 - Need recycling
 - Garbage collection was revamped supposedly for a savings, now they want more. Poor planning and bad math
-

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

- No recycling
 - **Land Use Planning**
 - In many instances city council ignores the issues
 - If you want the downtown in college heights you should keep doing what you're doing
 - Why allowed to create subdivisions when older areas should be re-developed. Not using space wisely
 - No imagination, still allowing low-density suburban sprawl
 - Seem stuck in the twilight zone. Have talked to developers who have had dealings with city hall and 100% of them wouldn't come back if given a choice. Administrative nightmare.
 - Green belts being developed
 - I find the planning department is very obstructive and they annoy people so much they don't carry forward with their development
 - City has not followed OCP. Strip and satellite development disaster of downtown
 - **Land Use Zoning**
 - Takes too long & is narrow minded
 - Dissatisfied with zoning & community planning process because of inconsistencies and how it has destroyed downtown
 - City zones to the detriment of other commercial areas within the city
 - This city continues to use poor quality builders to build homes. The materials are of low quality, I believe the building inspectors aren't doing their jobs.
 - Why do we allow big house to be built on small lots when we have lots of land. Is it due to developer greed?
 - Blackburn area is zoned for urban development. Areas such as the Nechako and parts of the Hart are zoned rural doesn't make sense. Lots of opportunity for infill in the gravel pits.
 - **Weed control**
 - Dandelions everywhere in the spring & fall
-

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

- We need to use weed control like Edmonton
 - This city is full of weeds. The Hart Highway which shills has ditches are so full of weeds it makes the city look very untidy.
 - **Sewer operation**
 - Hook ups are too expensive because of high administrative costs
 - **Parking control**
 - A joke
 - Not enough parking discourages people from using the downtown. Price for parking is ridiculous. City towing companies are not properly trained.
 - Poor enforcement of no parking
 - **Cemetery**
 - Weed control is poor. Should be a pretty & peaceful place; part of the problem is the poor planning in the past
 - A place of respect & memory & not being able to place anything next to the grave of family members is very upsetting
 - Taking away of lanterns. Cost more for plots even though I pay taxes but live outside city
 - Removal of personal items at grave sites, poor maintenance and security
 - Loved ones should be able to place whatever they like on graves
 - I could go on and on. It's a disgrace that people who look after plot with whatever can't do so because of a damn lawnmower
 - Looks terrible, never mowed and not well done
 - **Dust control**
 - In new developments is poor, no requirements not to track onto streets
 - Allergic to dust so it's an issue as well as pollution in general
 - Poor, more frequent sweeping and washing required
 - Is there any?
-

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

- Not done effectively and at the right time
 - On gravel roads had to phone for dust control
 - Cleaning sand in the spring done very slowly
 - **Economic development**
 - Poor planning, waste of taxpayer's dollars
 - You have been arguing about the downtown area for the last 30 years. Just do something about it and quit debating
 - Waste of tax money
 - Would like to see more initiatives/incentives to encourage industry here
 - Terrible waste of taxpayer money. A no brain trust.
 - **Social planning**
 - Total random action by city. Not structure to social programs at any level of government
 - Having social agencies downtown only promotes homeless people downtown which is a poor environment for them
 - Very dissatisfied with the needle exchange and the mobile drug van. Let's emphasize rehab and not harm reduction.
 - **Arenas**
 - Elimination of hockey rink at the ice oval is a big disappointment. City won't flood and maintain any outdoor rinks in the city so there is nowhere to play hockey outside. Organized, expensive association putting up boards at parks and leaving users to flood and maintain doesn't work. Ice oval is ruined and nobody uses it.
 - **Snow control**
 - Too slow
 - Meridians of snow should not be left blocking lanes of traffic for days and it shouldn't take over 2 weeks to plow side streets. The wait unit lit melts method of snow removal doesn't make for safe streets in late or early winter.
 - No enforcement against people pushing/blowing on roadway
-

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

- The mixture of gravel/dirt/salt is eroding pavement, gravel breaks windshields and makes a big clean up in yard in the spring
 - A bit better this year than last although lots of intersections with no dirt very icy
 - Four days wait in heavy snow/thin sand/plow and re-sand when unnecessary
 - Too long to wait for streets to be plowed
 - Quicker on side streets around senior complexes.
 - From the highways is unacceptable. When it snows the main roads are not plowed and sanded. Intersections are very slippery and dangerous. I have a logging truck when it snows it's usually the next day it's plowed and sanded
 - Plow the alleys
 - Takes too long to clear side roads
 - Terrible compared to other places in BC and Canada
 - Was a joke last year budget more for that fact
 - If in any year there is a surplus don't cut the budget the following year because of the climate of the north we do get some extreme snowfall levels
 - Incredibly slow removing snow especially downtown, hart college heights
 - Live in the hart. Most snow in PG, lowest # of snow removal, downtown = low snow = 1st priority.
 - Seems to be a double standard we all pay the same taxes. We get plowed in on a regular basis and it can take up to 2 weeks before the burm is removed. This has happened many times when you couldn't get a car out of the driveway.
 - Too slow
 - Atrocious
 - Very disorganized, no ready plan to hear residential, need parking restriction when clearing
 - **Street Lighting**
 - No lighting in our area
 - East of Fraser River bridge past eh new jail is lacking
-

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

- Our street only has 2 lights on our entire street. So it is very dark at night which is not good for downtown Prince George.
 - **Building permits**
 - Far too slowly processed
 - **Police Protection**
 - Not enough officers and need better training and more community interactions
 - Heavy handed do not listen to people
 - Seem more interested in seat belt checks than criminal activity
 - They waste time collecting revenue by ticketing speeders instead of using the manpower to stop the real criminals and drug dealers
 - **Water supply**
 - No more fluoride poisoning our children
 - North Nechako area has no services west of Foothills yet areas like Blackburn get services.
 - **Park maintenance**
 - Is less than minimum, broken play equipment
 - 2 years after ice jam still no bridge to island in Cottonwood. Deputy Dan unable to make a local decision without a committee and studies
 - **Public transit**
 - With very few exceptions I notice big buses driving around empty, these routes should have mini buses to save on fuel
 - Need buses to Blackburn and airport
 - **Traffic lights**
 - Constantly lights blinking red in four way light intersection
 - **Sidewalks maintenance**
 - Cracked, sloped, new brick paths not maintained
-

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

- I often work in the ER. Many people fall. A lot are not only not kept up but are slanted.
- In the Hart is miserable, existing pay is not fully cleared
- In front of our home, not maintained at all. A tree has raised up to sidewalk so that people are always tripping and has caused a low spot at the bottom of the 2 steps to our property so water collects there. I contacted the city and they would do nothing to correct this.
- My mother visits from another part of the province and has difficulty walking with all the holes and uneven surface it is almost impossible to take her anywhere other than the Walmart parking lot
- **Sewer treatment**
 - There is way too much sewage entering the Fraser River
- **Social Planning**
 - Effort has been totally misaligned. We have been celebrating failure downtown has become one huge social plan

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

Appendix 2 – Comments on Information Availability

Indication of other kinds of information residents were looking for:

- Building permit information is circular
- General information
- City/landfill hours very difficult to find
- Community event
- Garbage days/holidays re-scheduling
- General information but website is a little disorganized
- Old age income. What happens to RIF after 90
- Recycling information
- Rules for cemetery
- Specific bylaw and zoning information
- To pay utility bill. View cemetery plots
- Watering restrictions are unclear. Didn't match newspaper, too subject to interpretation, map of PG is not easy to use
- Website could be made more user-friendly. Hard to find what I'm looking for sometimes.
- Where is the city budgets and actual expenditures?

Other sources of information:

- 93.1
- 93.1 and opinion250.com
- Local business
- Community volunteers
- Community involvement
- Internet

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

- Meisner
- Opinion 250
- Opinion/editorials by respected people
- PG Citizen online

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

Appendix 3 – Comments on Sustainability

Thinking of sustainability as the long-term wellness of our community for multiple generations, how important are the following sustainability goals to you? Is there anything missing from the above list? If so, please list the thing that is missing.

- A City Hall that supports all of the above in their actions and results.
- A Council that does not want to study the study.
- A sense of future and pride in what we do to increase it
- Access to health care
- Accountability of all personnel with the municipal work force
- Accountability
- Accountability from City Hall
- Accountability of all City employees including mayor and councilors
- Affordability of food services
- Air quality is something that is talked about all over BC. We need to clean it up
- Amenities available to all residents and visitors such as grocery shopping on East side of town and 1st Ave.
- Arts and cultural centre
- Bring the Lord's prayer back into the schools
- City and community engaged in more accountability
- Common sense governing. Political correctness is killing us. Just do the job, make the decisions.
- Curb side recycling
- Education! The drug problem is due to lack of education
- Food security. Promote and support local agriculture
- Good quality locally grown food
- Higher tax on big box retailers

City Survey 2009 Summary Document
February 2010

- I'm surprised you didn't have world peace as a category
- Knowledgeable staff for treating seniors' medical issues
- Less bureaucracy more motivation/incentive for small business
- Minimum wage needs to be very high importance
- More bike trails that connect the communities
- Multicultural diversification and respect
- Opportunity for poor to work
- Political processes that are transparent, honest and represent the electorate. Out with party politics
- Proper maintenance of physical infrastructure
- Rapid transit
- Recycling and locally produced food
- Reliance on renewable energy. If "local" is inefficient or too much pollutant should not be used
- Strong churches/better shopping options
- Sustainable business and social plan for the downtown. Has been in decay for decades and is an embarrassment
- Teach sustainability skills in elementary schools
- Visual aesthetics of the community and buildings. An environment that supports physical activity.
- Common sense. These are motherhood questions—why would anyone not think they were important?