

NOTICE OF WORK SESSION BY THE CITY COUNCIL  
OF THE CITY OF CEDAR HILLS, UTAH

*This meeting may be held electronically via telephone  
to permit one or more of the council members to participate.*

Notice is hereby given that the City Council of the City of Cedar Hills, Utah, will hold a Work Session prior to their regularly scheduled meeting on **Tuesday, August 7, 2012, at 6:00 p.m.**, at the Community Recreation Center, 10640 N Club House Drive, Cedar Hills, Utah. The City Council will be discussing the following items:

- Noticed Agenda Items for the Regular Council Meeting
- Motion to go into Executive Session, Pursuant to Utah State Code 52-4-204 and 52-4-205

\* \* \* EXECUTIVE SESSION \* \* \*

- Motion to Adjourn Executive Session and Reconvene Work Session

THE PUBLIC IS INVITED TO ATTEND.

Dated this 3rd day of August, 2012.

---

Gretchen F. Gordon, Deputy City Recorder

- Supporting documentation is posted on the City's Web site at [www.cedarhills.org](http://www.cedarhills.org).
- In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Cedar Hills will make reasonable accommodations to participate in the meeting. Request for assistance can be made by contacting the City Recorder at 801-785-9668 at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting to be held.
- The order of items listed may change due to the needs of the City Council, the staff, and the public.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARINGS**  
**Tuesday, August 7, 2012 7:00 p.m.**  
**Community Recreation Center**  
**10640 N Club House Drive, Cedar Hills, Utah**

*This meeting may be held electronically via telephone to permit one or more of the council members to participate.*

NOTICE is hereby given that the City Council of the City of Cedar Hills, Utah, will hold public hearings in connection with their Regular City Council Meeting on Tuesday, August 7, 2012, beginning at 7:00 p.m.

**COUNCIL MEETING**

1. Call to Order, Invocation and Pledge
2. Public Comment: Time has been set aside for the public to express their ideas, concerns, and comments (comments limited to 3 minutes per person with a total of 30 minutes for this item)

**CONSENT AGENDA**

3. Minutes from the June 5, 2012 City Council Meeting and Public Hearing; June 19, 2012 City Council Meeting and Public Hearing;

**CITY REPORTS**

4. City Manager
5. Mayor and Council

**SCHEDULED ITEMS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS**

6. Review/Action on Appointment of City Recorder
7. Public Hearing on Adjusting the Common Boundary between City of Cedar Hills and Pleasant Grove City (Earl Property)
8. Review/Action on Adoption of Ordinance Adjusting the Common Boundary between City of Cedar Hills and Pleasant Grove City (Earl Property)
9. Review/Action on Resolution Recognizing Arielle Martin
10. Discussion on Vision and Goals for City Council and Staff

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

11. Motion to go into Executive Session, Pursuant to Utah State Code 52-4-204 and 52-4-205  
\* \* \* EXECUTIVE SESSION \* \* \*
12. Motion to Adjourn Executive Session and Reconvene City Council Meeting

**ADJOURNMENT**

13. Adjourn

Posted this 3rd day of August, 2012.

---

Gretchen F. Gordon, Deputy City Recorder

- Supporting documentation for this agenda is posted on the City's Web Site at [www.cedarhills.org](http://www.cedarhills.org).
- In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Cedar Hills will make reasonable accommodations to participate in the meeting. Requests for assistance can be made by contacting the City Recorder at 801-785-9668 at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting to be held.
- The order of agenda items may change to accommodate the needs of the City Council, the staff, and the public.



# CITY OF CEDAR HILLS

<b>TO:</b>	City Council
<b>FROM:</b>	Mayor Gary R. Gygi
<b>DATE:</b>	7/31/2012

City Council  
**Agenda Item**

<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Appointment of City Recorder
<b>APPLICANT PRESENTATION:</b>	N/A
<b>STAFF PRESENTATION:</b>	N/A

**BACKGROUND AND FINDINGS:**

As per City Code, 1-6A-6F: POWERS AND DUTIES:

The city manager shall be responsible, under the supervision of the mayor and in accordance with policies established by the city council, for the proper administration of all affairs of the city placed in his charge. To that end, he shall have the following powers, duties and obligations:

F. Appoint, remove, promote and/or demote, with the advice and consent of the city council, a qualified person to each of the offices of city engineer/public works director, city recorder, chief building official/zoning administrator, city accountant and community services director; (Ord. 11-20-2001A, 11-20-2001; amd. 2004 Code)

**PREVIOUS LEGISLATIVE ACTION:**

N/A

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

N/A

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:**

N/A

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The City Manager and Mayor recommend that the City Council act to sustain the appointment of Colleen Mulvey, a qualified person, to the office of City Recorder.

**MOTION:**

To consent and approve the appointment of Colleen Mulvey, to the office of City Recorder.

## OATH OF OFFICE

**Name:** Colleen Mulvey  
**Office:** City Recorder  
**Appointment:** August 7, 2012

I do solemnly swear that I will support, obey and defend the Constitution of the United States, the Constitution of this state, and the laws and ordinances of the City of Cedar Hills, and that I will discharge the duties of my office with fidelity.

Dated this 7th day of August, 2012.

---

Colleen Mulvey

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2012.

---

Gretchen Gordon, Deputy City Recorder



# CITY OF CEDAR HILLS

<b>TO:</b>	Mayor and City Council
<b>FROM:</b>	Gretchen Gordon, Deputy City Recorder
<b>DATE:</b>	8/3/2012

## City Council Agenda Item

<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Boundary Adjustment – Earl Property
<b>APPLICANT PRESENTATION:</b>	N/A
<b>STAFF PRESENTATION:</b>	Gretchen Gordon

**BACKGROUND AND FINDINGS:**

We received a Request to Initiate An Adjustment for a Common Municipal Boundary from Alycia and Justin Earl. Their address is 9540 N Canyon Road. They have also completed a request through Pleasant Grove City.

**PREVIOUS LEGISLATIVE ACTION:**

The City Council of Pleasant Grove City took action on May 1, 2012 by adopting a Resolution indicating their intent. They have also held their required Public Hearing on July 3, 2012 and adopted the appropriate ordinance.

The Cedar Hills Council took action on May 15, 2012 and re-affirmed the Resolution on June 5, 2012. We have completed the appropriate publication, but additional notifications must be completed to "effected entities."

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

N/A

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:****RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends tabling action on this item until all effected entities have an opportunity to review and comment on the proposed boundary adjustment. A full 30 day Protest Period will be given.

**MOTION:**



# CITY OF CEDAR HILLS

<b>TO:</b>	Mayor and City Council
<b>FROM:</b>	Gretchen Gordon, Deputy City Recorder
<b>DATE:</b>	8/3/2012

## City Council Agenda Item

<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Resolution recognizing Arielle Martin
<b>APPLICANT PRESENTATION:</b>	N/A
<b>STAFF PRESENTATION:</b>	Councilman Augustus
<b>BACKGROUND AND FINDINGS:</b> Councilman Augustus will discuss recognition suggestions for Arielle Martin.	
<b>PREVIOUS LEGISLATIVE ACTION:</b>	
<b>FISCAL IMPACT:</b>	
<b>SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:</b>	
<b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>	
<b>MOTION:</b> To approve/not approve Resolution _____, A Resolution Recognizing Arielle Martin for her Outstanding Commitment to Cedar Hills, her Dedication to the Sport of Womens BMX and her Pursuit of Olympic Gold.	

RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

**A RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING ARIELLE MARTIN FOR HER OUTSTANDING COMMITMENT TO CEDAR HILLS, HER DEDICATION TO THE SPORT OF WOMENS BMX AND HER PURSUIT OF OLYPMIC GOLD.**

**WHEREAS**, on July 31, 2012, Arielle Martin's dreams of competing in the 2012 London Olympics came to an abrupt end when she was injured during a training session prior to leaving for the London Olympics; and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Cedar Hills wishes to fully recognize the dedication and effort that Arielle Martin has given in pursuit of dreams to compete in the last two Olympics; and

**WHEREAS**, Arielle Martin exemplifies the traits, abilities and drive that inspires others in our community to pursue their own personal goals and dreams.

**NOW THEREFORE**, be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Cedar Hills, Utah, and on behalf of the residents, hereby proclaims that August 8, 2012 be recognized as "Arielle Martin Day". With this the City of Cedar Hills wishes to recognize and sincerely thank Arielle Martin for her dedication and inspiration that she has provided to our community.

**PASSED AND ORDERED RECORDED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CEDAR HILLS, UTAH, THIS 7TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2012.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gary R. Gygi, Mayor

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gretchen Gordon, Deputy City Recorder



# CITY OF CEDAR HILLS

<b>TO:</b>	Mayor and City Council
<b>FROM:</b>	David Bunker, City Manager
<b>DATE:</b>	8/7/2012

## City Council Agenda Item

<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Cedar Hills Vision and Goals
<b>APPLICANT PRESENTATION:</b>	N/A
<b>STAFF PRESENTATION:</b>	David Bunker

**BACKGROUND AND FINDINGS:**

In preparation for defining the vision and goals for the City, staff has submitted copies of the Decisions 2011 executive summary and the departmental 2012 goals. Typically the Decisions process was completed every other year with this winter being the time frame the City would complete Decisions 2013. However, the funding for Decisions 2013 was removed from the 2013 budget. The Decisions project typically had funding in the range of \$8,000 to \$10,000.

It would be appropriate for Council to establish a City Vision Statement and City wide Goals. With the vision and goals established, departments can refine their individual goal statements to be congruent with and help sustain the overall goals of the City.

Also, a discussion on an appropriate timeline to complete this process would be beneficial.

**PREVIOUS LEGISLATIVE ACTION:**

N/A

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

N/A

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:**

Decisions 2011 executive summary and 2012 Departmental goals.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends the City Council continue to define the City visions and goals as established by Council and Staff.

**MOTION:**

This item is a discussion item only. No motion is necessary at this time.

# City of Cedar Hills, Utah

## Fiscal Year 2012 Goals

### Finance

1. Receive the GFOA Distinguished Budget Award
2. Participate in the GFOA's Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting Program.
3. Submit four (4) Better Ways of Doing Things each month
4. Redesign the City's website by October 1, 2011
5. Hold Budget reviews with department heads and present financial statements to the City Council each quarter.

### Golf

1. Complete 12 Monthly Management Reports submitted on time
2. Turn in 48 Better Ways of Doing Things for the fiscal year
3. Maintain an operating budget below that which was approved by the City Council
4. Plant 15 New trees and place them in locations to live
5. Beautify the community by improving two public facing areas.
6. Improve morale by closing the gap between grounds and Pro Shop.
7. Improve the City's firecracker open by increasing sponsorships and tams sold
8. Improve the quality of the playing surfaces by grooming new areas
9. Increase the pace of play and thus increase capacity of the course.
10. Lengthen the life of our equipment, cover every piece and maintain all equipment in working order.
11. Improve the condition of the bunker system on the front 9 holes
12. Improve relationships with vendors, create new relationships and partners.
13. Improve professionalism of the Pro Shop staff improve appearance and uniform adherence.
14. Improve concessions reach by cross training and reactive management techniques.

### Public Works

1. Manilla Water System integration. Complete the integration of the Manilla Water system to Cedar Hills. Budget for new ECRs for auto read, maintenance of old system, etc. Dissolution: by December 31. Meter conversion: by June 30.
2. Complete/review 5 SOP's for each utility system. (Standard operating procedures)
3. SOP's to be completed by February 28.
4. Implementation of GIS system for Storm Drain and Culinary Water. Digitize system and create map books for system operators. To be completed by May 31.

5. Completion of capital projects and re-occurring projects. Develop timeline forecast and manpower allocation. Timeline by August 31. All projects complete by June 30.
6. Emergency preparedness. Develop scenario analysis for water and sewer disruption with resulting Emergency Action Plan for each. To be completed by March 31.

### **Administration**

#### **IT Installations:**

To successfully install the listed software and hardware and to create training opportunities for staff

- Microsoft Exchange
- Cedar Hills Website
- GIS
- Parent Link Finish
- Phone System Upgrades
- Server and Workstation Upgrades
- Copier Installation

#### **Community Recreation Center:**

- To develop five (5) written procedures for the management and running of the Cedar Hills Grill.
- Hold five (5) community recreation events (i.e. classes, dances, sports) before the end of the FY 2012.
- Hold a minimum of two (2) revenue generating events a month once the center opens.

#### **Commercial Development:**

- Have the Planning Commission and City Council include the new commercial master plan into the commercial guidelines.
- Focus attention on and find ways to increase the speed of the development of the commercial sector. (not measureable)

#### **Community Services:**

##### **Family Festival**

- Add two (2) carnival rides that will attract more of the teenage age group.
- Increase parade entries by 10%.
- Add a show or attraction prior to the fireworks show.

##### **Sports Programs**

- Create Parentlink list for automated calls for upcoming league offerings and deadlines.
- Find ways to encourage Highland and Alpine participation in Cedar Hills programs through advertising. (not measureable)
- Conduct referee trainings to improve quality of officiating in all recreation programs.
- Expand the "Tot" sports program to include basketball, and possibly baseball.

#### **Emergency Management:**

- Improve my emergency management delegation efforts. (not measureable)
- Schedule and plan a trip for the city council to attend training in Emmitsburg, VA.

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## INTRODUCTION

Insight Research, Inc., a Utah public opinion and marketing research firm located in Salt Lake City was retained by the City of Cedar Hills to conduct and compile a public opinion survey of Cedar Hills residents.

### Objectives

The primary objective of the survey was to determine how city residents feel about their City and to begin the process of Decisions 2011. The questionnaire contained similar questions from previous Decisions surveys and added a few questions regarding communication with residents and commercial development. Comparative data from the Decisions 2009 and 2006 surveys are provided in this report for each question that was measured in those surveys.

### Procedures

Raymond Briscoe and David Spatafore of Insight Research drafted the questionnaire in conjunction with Konrad Hildebrand of Cedar Hills. The initial draft was written and emailed to Mr. Hildebrand who in turn provided copies to members of the municipal Council. Suggestions were offered and changes were made and the final version of the questionnaire was approved by Konrad and the City Council.

In order to meet the objectives of the research, Insight Research interviewed 403 Cedar Hills City residents during early January 2011. This sample size of residents yields a tolerated error of +/-5% at the 95% confidence level. It should be noted that this tolerated error applies only to the total data and not any of the cross-tabulated data.

After the questionnaire was approved and before any fieldwork began, the survey instrument was pre-tested on individuals selected at random from the sample universe. The purpose of the pre-test was to detect any discrepancies which might have existed in the instrument in terms of completeness, level of shared language, and appropriateness of the questions. The pre-test was successful and therefore no changes were made.

### Sample and Data Collection

All data was collected using face-to-face collection procedures. Insight Research plotted on a city map using a random systematic sampling procedure with random start, giving each resident in the sample universe an equal opportunity of being selected to participate. The sample included an over sample adjustment for refusals and unavailable respondents.

To assist in interpreting results, all questions on the survey that used a rating scale were scored so that a higher rating was a more positive response. Where comparable questions were asked in the 2009 and 2006 studies, those scores have been recalculated on the same scale for consistency and to aid in trend analysis.

## SURVEY ANALYSIS

### Quality of Life in Cedar Hills

We provided residents with a list of reasons why they live in Cedar Hills and asked them to list the top three as to why they live in Cedar Hills.

More than half (55%) reported that the high quality of life was one of their top three reasons for living in Cedar Hills. Nearly one in four respondents (23%) listed quality of life as their top reason for living in Cedar Hills.

Good schools also ranked in the top three reasons for living in Cedar Hills for more than half of all residents (52%). Good schools was rated as the second highest reason for living in Cedar Hills by 24% of all respondents.

The third highest rated reason (42%) for living in Cedar Hills was the small city atmosphere. This was the number one reason in the 2009 survey. The low crime rate was the fourth rated reason for living in Cedar Hills with 40% of respondents putting this reason in their top three.

These findings are consistent with those of the Decisions 2009 and 2006 studies. High quality of life, good schools and small city atmosphere have each been the top ranked reason in one of the three studies and have constituted the top three in each survey although their relative ranking within the top three has varied. Also consistent with the previous surveys, proximity to cultural activities was chosen least frequently as a “top three” reason for living in Cedar Hills. “Near recreation and “other” reasons were also chosen as a top three reason by less than one-fifth of all respondents. In the middle, between nearly one quarter and one-third of respondents listed “Near friends or relatives” (33%), “Affordable housing” (28%), and “Near job” (22%). None of these responses varied by more than three percentage points from their rankings in the studies conducted in 2006 and 2009.

The importance of quality of life varied by demographic characteristics:

By location	East (51%), North (53%), South (55%) versus West (62%)
Renters vs home-owners	Renters (44%) and Home-owners (57%)
By length of residence	< 5 yrs (47%) 5-10yrs (59%) and > 10 yrs (64%)
By income	Upward trend from 42% for under \$40,000 to 69% for over \$140,000 although respondents in the \$70K-\$100K rated this factor higher (58%) than those in the next lower (52%) and next higher (53%) income brackets.

## City Communications

The overwhelming choice by residents for receiving communications from or about the City was from the city newsletter. Over nine of ten respondents (92%) placed this method of communication in their top three, with 63% overall mentioning the newsletter as their most preferred method of communication. This method of communication was uniformly selected as the top method of communication throughout the city geographically as well as through all of the demographic groups.

The second most preferred method of communication was the use of the Cedar Hills website. Seventy-three percent of the survey's respondents listed the City's website as one of their top three communication methods. Email continued to gain in popularity with 62% compared to 2009 - 56%, and 2006 - 41% listing it in their top three. As might be expected, older residents are less likely to use the website or Email, although around half of those over 65 now include both of these methods within their top three choices.

When communicating concerns about operations or services to the City, respondents prefer individual contact in person or by phone (74%). More than half of almost every demographic group rated this as their first choice, the exceptions being those in the East portion of town (48%), those who rent their home (46%), those with four or five persons in the home (45% and 49% respectively, those under 45 (ranging from 44-47%) and those with income over \$140,000 (46%). Within those groups individual contact was rated within the top three choices by a minimum of 67% of respondents. Second choice was email at 54% in the top three methods of choice and the City website at 38%. A significant variation is that 67% of those aged 18-24 chose the City website as the number one way to address a concern with the City while the only other demographic groups that rated this method as the top choice by a majority were renters (56%) and those aged 25-34 at 52%.

We then asked the respondents how well they feel the City is hearing them when they have a concern. When asked this question, only 5% responded by saying they feel the City is really listening to them. Twenty-one percent gave the City the next highest rating for listening, fifty-six percent rated the City in the middle, 13% gave the next rating below mid-level and 8% reported they are least heard. The mean score continues a trend of slight improvement from 2.7 in 2006, 2.9 in 2009 and 3.0 this time around. Although 3.0 is the mid point of the scale, there is still an indication that many respondents believe communication can be improved. This response is fairly consistent throughout each of the demographic groups.

A similar question was introduced in the 2011 study. It asked how the respondent would rate the City as far as attempting to communicate with residents. This question received a more favorable response (mean score of 3.4) with 45% of all respondents indicating efforts above the mid-point "3" rating and only 15% indicating that little or no effort is being put forth by the City to communicate. Thirty-seven percent of respondents selected a midpoint rating and again the results were consistent throughout the demographic groups.

Overall, social networking sites for the City were not encouraged by respondents with 37% for and 59% against the City providing such communication methods as Twitter or Facebook. A significant demographic trend in responses to this question was found in the age of respondents.

Those aged 18-24 rated the addition of social networking communication with 56% in favor, trending downward consistently to only 7% of those aged 65 and older favoring such additions.

### **City Services, Satisfaction and Improvements**

Using a five-point scale, we asked respondents to rate a list of city services. A mean score of more than 4 would indicate a service that is being very well received by the residents while a mean score of between 4 and 3.5 would indicate the service is being well received and perhaps could be improved slightly, while a service between 3.5 and 3 would indicate the service is okay, but could be better. Anything lower than a three would indicate the service would need significant improvement. At this time, no city service received a lower mean score than a 3.0.

#### Top rated City Services in Resident Satisfaction

Six provided services received a mean score higher than 3.5, while another eight received scores between 3.3 and 3.5. The best:

- Garbage collection – 4.1 overall (4.2 in 2009 and 4.1 in 2006)
  - No significant variations
- Parks – 3.9 overall (3.8 in 2009 and 3.6 in 2006)
  - Age 35-44 - 4.1 versus Age 65+ - 3.5
  - East and South - 3.8 versus West - 4.2
- Pressurized irrigation – 3.7 overall (3.5 in 2009 and 3.2 in 2006)
  - Ages 65+ – 3.4 versus Age 18-24 - 3.9
  - Two in home - 3.4 versus Five in home - 3.9
- Storm drainage - 3.6 overall (3.7 in 2009 and 3.4 in 2006)
  - No significant variations
- City management staff - 3.6 overall (3.6 in 2009 and 3.4 in 2006)
  - No significant variations
- Utility / Billing department - 3.6 overall (3.6 in 2009 and 3.5 in 2006)
  - One in home - 3.2 versus Five in home - 3.8
  - Age 18 - 24 - 3.1 versus Age 35-44 - 3.7

Only one provided service had a mean score at the midline of 3. Recreation services had an overall mean of 3.0 compared to 2.9 in 2009 and 3.1 in 2006.

- Four in home - 2.6 and Six in home - 2.8 versus One in home - 3.6
- Age 18 - 24 - 2.6 versus Age 55-64 - 3.4

### Support for Improvement to City Services

We then asked using a similar one to five scale if the respondent was strongly opposed (one) to strongly in favor (five) of improvements in various city services. Utilizing the same analysis on this scale as above, no city service received a mean score of less than 3, four services, community pool (3.5), other (3.6), children's library (3.6), and community recreation (3.7) earned a mean score at or above 3.5.

- Community recreation - 3.7
  - Two in home – 3.0 versus Six in home – 4.0
  - Age 55-64 and Age 65+ - 2.9 versus Age 25-34 - 4.1
  - Income < \$39K - 3.2 versus Income > \$69K (all above this bracket) – 3.8
- Children's Library – 3.6
  - One in home - 3.0 versus Seven or more in home 4.0
  - Age 65+ 3.0 and Age 18 - 24 - 3.1 versus Age 25-34 - 4.2
- Other – 3.6
  - North and East - 3.4 versus West 4.0
  - One in home - 3.0 versus Seven in home - 4.2
  - Age 18-24 - 3.0 versus Age 25-34 - 4.8
  - Income > \$140,000 - 2.7 versus Income \$40K - \$69K – 4.0
- Community pool – 3.5
  - Two in home – 2.8 versus Six in home – 4.0
  - Age 55-64 and Age 65+ - 2.7 versus Age 25-34 - 4.2
  - Income < \$39K - 3.2 versus Income > \$139,999 – 3.8

Again only one service had a mean score at or below midline of 3. Animal Control services received the lowest level of support for increased city funding at 3.0.

- Seven or more in home - 2.7 versus One in home - 3.2
- Age 65+ - 2.8 versus Age 55-64 - 3.3
- Income \$100K to \$140K - 2.8 versus Income < \$39K - 3.3

### Support for Increased Taxes to Fund Services

The respondents were asked on a three point scale, with one for “no”, two for “maybe”, and three for “yes”, if they would support increasing taxes for construction and/or operations and maintenance of facilities and services. For this question, a mean of more than 2 would indicate support for increased taxes for that facility or service, while anything lower than two would not. The highest three ratings with a mean response of 2.0 were community recreation, children's library and community pool. Two services (other and animal control) received a mean score below 1.5, with the remainder falling between 1.5 and 1.9. In the 2009 survey a five point scale was used for questions in this group so no direct comparison of data is shown although increasing taxes for a library, community pool, and community recreation also received the highest levels of support on both the 2006 and 2009 surveys.

The following are the top three services according to willingness to increase taxes for construction and operations/maintenance. Demographic group variances are shown.

- Community Recreation – 2.0
  - One in home - 1.3 versus Six in home - 2.3
  - Age 55-64 - 1.3 versus Age 25-34 and Age 35-44 - 2.3
  - Income < \$39K - 1.8 versus Income > \$140K - 2.3
- Children’s Library - 2.0
  - > 10 yrs resident – 1.7 versus < 5 yrs resident - 2.2
  - One in home - 1.5 and Two in home - 1.6 versus Six/Seven or more in home - 2.3
  - Age 55 – 64 and Age 65+ - 1.6 versus Age 25-34 - 2.4
- Community Pool - 2.0
  - Two in home - 1.6 and One in home 1.7 versus Seven or more in home - 2.2, and Six in home - 2.3
  - Age 55 – 64 – 1.4, Age 65+ - 1.6 versus Age 25-34 and Age 35-44 - 2.2
  - Income < \$39K - 1.7 versus Income > \$140K - 2.3

#### Interest in Recreational Programs

Using a five-point scale, we asked respondents to rate a list of recreational programs they might have an interest in. A mean score of more than 3.5 would indicate a program of great interest, while a mean score of between 3 and 3.5 would indicate significant interest; while a recreation program scoring between 2.5 and 3 would indicate some interest. Any program lower than 2.5 would indicate marginal interest. Only three programs received rating higher than 3.0, swimming(3.4), basketball (3.2), and soccer (3.1). “Other” programs received a 3.0 rating which might be expected since respondents would not likely fill in the “other” response unless they had an interest in that program. In previous studies, swimming had not been mentioned as a possible choice and many of the “other” responses indicated swimming as the “other” interest. This difference makes comparisons between the 2006, 2009 and 2011 ratings less meaningful. The 2011 study is the first time that basketball outscored soccer as a program of interest, however the ratings are close enough that the difference is probably not of significance.

- Swimming - 3.6
  - > 10 yrs resident - 3.1 versus < 5 yrs resident - 3.9
  - Male - 3.1 versus Female - 3.9
  - Age 65+ - 1.9 versus Age 25-34 - 4.1 and Age 35-44 - 4.0
  - Income < \$39,999 - 3.1 versus Income > \$140K - 4.0 and Income > \$100K - 3.9
- Basketball – 3.2
  - > 10 yrs resident - 2.9 versus < 5 yrs resident - 3.4
  - Two in home - 2.0 versus Seven or more in home - 3.8
  - Male - 2.9 versus Female 3.5
  - Age 65+ - 1.7 versus Age 25-34 - 3.9
  - Income < \$39,999 - 2.6 versus Income > \$100K and Income > \$140K - 3.5

- Soccer – 3.1
  - > 10 yrs resident - 2.8 versus < 5 yrs resident - 3.3
  - One in home - 1.3 versus Six in home - 3.6 and Seven in home - 3.8
  - Age 65+ - 1.6 versus Age 25-34 - 3.8 and Age 35-44 - 3.6
  - Income < \$39K - 2.2 versus Income > \$140K - 3.6

Following this question regarding recreational programs, the survey asked two follow-up questions regarding adult recreational programs. The first was if the City should provide adult recreation programs. The overall response was 35% in favor and 60% against. The follow-up question, if adult programs were provided, would you participate had a similar response with 29% indicating they would not participate while 65% responded that they would.

Should the City provide adult recreation programs - Yes 35%

Would you participate? - Yes 29%

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• West - 20% vs North, East - 38%</li> <li>• &gt; 10 yrs resident - 19% vs &lt; 5 yrs - 43%</li> <li>• One in home - 11% vs Four in home - 46% and Seven or more - 43%</li> <li>• Own home - 32% vs Rent home - 58%</li> <li>• Male - 31% vs. Female - 40%</li> <li>• Age 55-64 - 13% and Age 65+ - 14% vs. Age 18-24 - 56% and Age 25-34 - 60%</li> <li>• Income \$100K-\$139K - 34% vs. Income &lt; \$39K - 50%</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• West - 16% vs East - 33%, South - 31%</li> <li>• &gt; 10 yrs resident - 17% vs &lt; 5 yrs - 37%</li> <li>• One in home - 11% vs Four in home - 37% and Seven or more - 35%</li> <li>• Own home - 28% vs Rent home - 44%</li> <li>• Age 55-64 - 15% and Age 65+ - 5% vs. Age 25-34 - 52% and Age 18-24 - 44%</li> <li>• Income \$100K-\$140K - 28% vs. Income &lt; \$40K-\$69K and Income &gt; \$140K - 35%</li> </ul> |
|---|--|

**Aquatic and Recreation/Community Center**

Five questions were included in this survey which addressed preferences and options regarding development of a community center with aquatic and recreational facilities. The first four were yes/no questions asking in turn whether the City should build an Aquatic Center, whether the respondent would support a tax increase for the project and whether the City should build a Recreation Center and whether the respondent would vote for a tax increase for that project. The final question asked if a choice had to be made, should the Aquatic Center or Recreation Center be built. Choices were also provided for building both or neither. While questions regarding these proposed projects have been included in previous studies, the 2011 survey took a different approach and so there is no comparative data from previous surveys.

Should the City build an Aquatic Center? -  
Yes 61%

- South - 55% vs North - 66%
- > 10 yrs resident - 47% vs < 5 yrs - 66%  
and 5-10 yrs - 67%
- Two in home - 31% vs Four in home - 78%  
and Six in home - 72%
- Own home - 60% vs Rent home - 75%
- Male - 50% vs. Female - 71%
- Age 65+ - 23% vs. Age 25-34 - 81% and  
Age 35-44 - 71%
- Income < \$39K - 50% vs. Income > \$140K  
- 73%

Should the City build a Recreation Center? -  
Yes 65%

- East, West - 62% vs North - 70%
- > 10 yrs resident - 51% vs < 5 yrs - 72%
- Two in home - 41% vs Six in home - 79%
- Own home - 63% vs Rent home - 75%
- Male - 59% vs. Female - 70%
- Age 55-64 - 26% and Age 65+ - 42% vs.  
Age 25-34 - 78% and Age 35-44 - 75%
- Income \$40K-\$69K - 56% vs. Income >  
\$140K - 77%

Would you vote for a tax increase of \$5-\$10/  
month for an Aquatic Center? - Yes 57%

- South - 52% vs North - 60%
- > 10 yrs resident - 43% vs < 5 yrs - 62%  
and 5-10 yrs - 63%
- Two in home - 31% vs Four in home and  
Six in home - 69% - 7 or more - 72%
- Own home - 57% vs Rent home - 67%
- Male - 47% vs. Female - 65%
- Age 65+ - 23% vs. Age 25-34 - 73% and  
Age 35-44 - 72%
- Income < \$39K - 38% vs. Income > \$140K  
- 75%

Would you vote for a tax increase of \$5-  
\$10/month for a Recreation Center? -  
Yes 58%

- South - 55% vs North - 62%
- > 10 yrs resident - 46% vs < 5 yrs - 65%
- Two in home - 35% vs Six or 7+ in home -  
72%
- Own home - 57% vs Rent home - 65%
- Male - 53% vs. Female - 63%
- Age 55-64 - 21% and Age 65+ - 37% vs.  
Age 25-34 - 70% and Age 35-44 - 71%
- Income < \$39K - 42% vs. Income > \$140K  
- 73%

When asked to make a choice on which Center the City should build, the overall responses were nearly evenly split between the various options. The Aquatic Center was favored by 23%, and the Recreation Center by 28%. Twenty-five (25%) of all respondents thought both should be built and the remaining 21% thought the City should not build either facility. The demographic groups with notable variances are shown below.

#### Build the Aquatic Center - 23%

- South - 19% versus East 27%
- One in home - 11% and Seven+ in home - 13% versus Five in home - 36%
- Age 45-54 - 17% and Age 65+ 19% versus Age 35-44 - 26% and Age 25-34 - 25%
- Income < \$39K - 13% versus Income > \$140K - 27%

#### Build the Recreation Center - 28%

- West - 20% versus North - 34% and South - 36%
- Seven+ in home - 24% versus One in home - 33%
- Age 55-64 - 18% versus Age 45-54 - 38%
- Income > \$140K - 17% versus Income \$40K-\$69K - 32%

#### Build Both - 25%

- South - 21% versus West 30%
- > 10 yrs resident - 17% versus < 5 yrs - 30%
- One in home - 0% versus Seven+ in home - 44%
- Own home - 24% versus Rent home - 35%
- Male - 17% versus Female - 30%
- Age 65+ - 7% versus Age 25-34 - 35% and Age 35-44 - 33%
- Income \$40K-\$69K - 23% versus Income > \$140K - 38%

#### Build Neither - 21%

- North - 18% versus West 27%
- < 5 yrs resident - 17% versus > 10 yrs - 33%
- Six in home - 11% versus One in home - 44%
- Rent home - 12% versus Own home - 23%
- Female - 15% versus Male - 29%
- Age 25-34 - 10% versus Age 55-64 - 46%

### **Family Festival Days**

This section of the survey solicited input from residents about the Cedar Hills Family Festival Days activities.

Eight possible activities were listed and respondents were asked to indicate their interest level on a one to five scale, one being not at all interested and five being very interested. Consistent with the 2009 study, the clear leader was again fireworks which scored 4.4 and was the only rating above a 3.5. The other activities above the 3.0 midpoint were the Parade and the 5K and One-mile Fun Run with Kids games at 3.0. The lowest interest was shown for the golf tournament and Cedar Hills night with the Orem Owlz at 2.1 each.

## Commercial Development

Residents were asked how they would rate the development by the City of the north portion of the commercial area where the Walmart, ChaseBank, and McDonalds are. The rating was on a five point scale with one being “done very poorly” and five being “done great”. A mean score of 4.2 indicates a high level of satisfaction with the development in this area. There were not significant differences in demographic groups on this question.

The next question listed nine choices for development of the south side of the commercial area and asked residents to select their top three choices. Restaurants came out on top with 81% including it in their top three; 33% selected it as their number one choice and another 37% selected it as number two. Gas station/Convenience store was actually picked more often as the number one choice with 44% of respondents making that selection. It was in the top three for 73% of all respondents. Strip Mall retail rounded out the top three choices; only 7% picked it as their number one choice and 18% as number two, but 26% selected it as their third choice which brought the total percent in top three to 51%. From there the choice drops down to 25% for a mixed use “Gateway style” development and 20% for professional offices. “Other” types of development received the least votes at 4% in the top three with single family residential at 10%, Big Box development at 12%, and “No more development” appearing in the top three for 14% of respondents.

## Emergency Preparedness

Two survey questions addressed preparedness for a natural emergency such as an earthquake or landslide. Both utilized a four point scale with 1 meaning not at all and 4 meaning very prepared.

The first question asked how much emphasis the City should put on or pay for preparing for a natural emergency. With no variances of any significance by demographic group, the average result was 3.4 or midway between “somewhat” and “very”. The question was phrased differently than in the 2009 study and the response was considerably stronger than it was in that study but the results cannot be directly compared unless the question is exactly the same.

The second question asked how prepared the respondent was personally for a natural emergency. The mean score was 3.0 which is right at the midpoint between very and not at all prepared. This question is an exact repeat of the 2009 phrasing and shows a slight improvement from a 2.8 mean measured in that study. As in the previous question, there were no significant variances based on demographics.

A third question regarding emergency preparedness asked about the residents’ expectations regarding City response to a major natural or man-made disaster. The question asked how quickly the resident expected the City to respond to such a situation. More than one-third (35%) of respondents expect immediate help from emergency personnel with another 34% expecting help within 24-48 hours. Fifteen percent expect help to take 72 hours and only ten percent expect the City to respond with help when able. There is somewhat significant variation among demographic groups although the variation appears somewhat random rather than indicating a particular trend within demographic boundaries.

## **New City Hall/Community Center**

The next three questions measured support for building a new City Hall to replace the current converted public safety building. The new City Hall would also be used as a community center.

The first of these questions utilized a four point scale with one being “definitely oppose” and four “definitely support” the building of a new City Hall/Community Center. The mean score of 2.3 is closest to “probably oppose”. There were not any statistically significant variances from the mean within demographic groups.

The second question asked if support were more likely when the existing building was converted into a new police and fire station. The scale was from 1 (much less likely) to 4 (much more likely). The resulting mean score of 2.8 most closely corresponds to “somewhat more likely”. When somewhat and much more likely are combined and the same is done with the somewhat and much less likely, the result is 67% more likely to 24% less likely. Although both of these questions are worded slightly differently than in 2009, the results are very similar. There are no significant differences in opinion among any of the demographic groups.

The third question asked for a simple “Yes/No” answer to the question of willingness to vote for a bond resulting in a tax increase of \$5/month to build the new City Hall / Community Center. The result was 36% for and 55% against with the remainder not voting either way. The South portion of the City shows significantly less support (25%) for the bond than the East side at 46% with the West and North in between at 38% and 38% respectively. Those who have been resident <5 years are significantly more supportive at 43% than the over ten year residents who show only 27% support. Variances in family size do not follow any trend. As might be expected, renters show more support at 44% than home owners at 36%. Those who are Age 55-64 have the lowest level of support at 26% and those Age 65+ support the bond at 47%. Support also follows income level to some extent with 25% support from those in the lowest income bracket up to 58% from those making \$140,000 or more. Those in the highest income bracket and households with only one person are the only groups that show a majority on favor of the bond, although the number of persons living in one-person households is too small to be significant.

## **City Improvement**

The final survey question before open ended and demographic questions asked the respondents whether the City has improved, remained the same or become worse since they have lived in Cedar Hills. Nearly one-third (32%) reported the City has improved since they have moved into Cedar Hills. Only four percent indicated the City has become worse; while over half (54%) indicated the City has remained the same. This is a considerably more favorable response than the 2009 survey where 18% showed improvement. The 2006 survey showed results similar to 2009.

Those in the West part of town indicated improvement 34% of the time versus 28% in the East. Residents that have been in Cedar Hills < 5 years voted “Improved” less often than those who had been there longer with 19% compared to 38% for those in town 5-10 years and 48% of the

residents who had been there for more than 10 years. Home owners saw more improvement at 34% than those who rent (23%). Those Age 25-34 and Age 55-64 selected "Improved" only 26% and 28% of the time, while Age 45-54 and Age 65+ were more positive with 40% and 42% respectively. Those in the lowest income bracket, < \$39K indicated improvement 42% of the time while in the next income bracket only 25% thought that improvements had taken place. Those with income between \$40K and \$140K indicated improvement 36% of the time and of those in the highest income bracket only 29% selected "Improved".

## OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

Three open ended questions were included in the 2011 survey. All comments were read twice to categorize them into units of similar statements. Then all comments were transcribed for inclusion in the report. The comments were categorized into groups. The percentages shown are a percentage of the comments, not the percentage of all respondents who completed a questionnaire. The complete transcription of comments is found in Appendix C.

### If you were Mayor for a day, what issue or item would you address?

Number of Comments	% of Comments	Category of Comments
56	20%	Expanding recreation and/or community facilities
54	19%	City services, street, safety concerns
53	19%	Revenues/Taxes
39	14%	Miscellaneous comments
31	11%	Golf
25	9%	Commercial development
21	7%	Library
3	1%	Positive comments

### Other Activities to be Included in the Family Festival Days Events

Number of Comments	% of Comments	Category of Comments
19	26%	Miscellaneous comments
11	15%	Food
9	13%	Crafts/Arts/Fair
7	10%	Sports
7	10%	Music
7	10%	Positive comments
6	8%	Comments about cost
4	6%	Community service
2	3%	Games

## Most Important Issue Facing Cedar Hills

Number of Comments	% of Comments	Category of Comments
50	24%	Taxes/Fiscal issues/Cost
30	14%	Miscellaneous comments
28	13%	Commercial development
26	12%	City services/Safety concerns
20	10%	Negative comments
19	9%	Recreation/Services/Community Center
19	9%	Golf course issues
9	4%	Library
9	4%	Positive comments

# CITY OF CEDAR HILLS - COMMUNITY SURVEY

Conducted by Insight Research

n = 403

**1. Quality of life:** For the following, please prioritize the top three reasons you live in Cedar Hills.

Please place a 1 next to your top priority, a 2 in front of your second priority and a 3 in front of your third priority.

	<u>2006 Top 3</u>	<u>2009 Top 3</u>	<u>2011 Top 3</u>	<u>1st</u>	<u>2nd</u>	<u>3rd</u>
High quality of life	53%	49%	55%	23%	16%	15%
Good schools	46	48	52	15	24	12
Small city atmosphere	49	51	42	13	13	16
Low crime rate	42	42	40	9	15	16
Near friends or relatives	34	33	33	16	7	10
Affordable housing	23	25	25	10	9	6
Near job	19	19	22	6	6	9
Near recreation	21	20	18	4	6	8
Other	8	8	8	5	1	2
Near cultural activities	7	6	4	1	1	1

**2. If you were Mayor for a day, what would be the top issue/item that you would address to make the City a better place to live, work, play? (Open-Ended)**

Expanding recreation and/or community facilities	20%
City services, street, safety concerns	19%
Revenues/taxes	19%
Miscellaneous comments	14%
Golf	11%
Commercial development	9%
Library	7%
Positive comments	1%

**3. Communications:** For the following, please prioritize the top three ways you prefer to receive communication from or about the City. Again, place a 1 in front of your top priority a 2 in front of your second priority and a 3 in front of your third priority.

	<u>2006 Top 3</u>	<u>2009 Top 3</u>	<u>Top 3</u>	<u>1st</u>	<u>2nd</u>	<u>3rd</u>
City Newsletter	88%	91%	92%	63%	19%	10%
City website	60	66	73	8	39	26
E-mail	41	56	62	24	20	19
Public Meetings			17	0	5	12
Newspaper			14	3	5	6
Word of mouth	25	26	9	1	1	6
Public forum			9	0	2	7
Other	2	2	3	1	0	1
City office postings	13	10	3	0	1	2

4. When you have a question or concern about City operations or services, how do you prefer to address this with the City?

	<u>Top 3</u>	<u>1st</u>	<u>2nd</u>	<u>3rd</u>
Individual contact with city - phone/in person	74	53	13	9
E-mail	54	23	25	6
City website	38	13	10	15
Council meetings - public comment	25	8	6	10
Periodic public block meetings	9	2	2	5
Other	1	0	0	1

3. On a scale of 1 to 5, one being the least and five being the greatest, how well do you feel that your voice is heard by the City when you have a concern?

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
	2.7	2.9	3.0	8%	13%	46%	21%	5%

6. On a scale of 1 to 5, five being "tries very hard" and one being "doesn't try at all", how would you rate the City in attempting to communicate with its residents?

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
	3.4	2%	13%	37%	35%	10%

7. Do you think the City should provide additional 'social networking' communication sites - ie. Twitter, Facebook, etc.?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
	37%	59%

**8. Current City Services:** On a scale of 1 to 5, one being the best and five being the poorest, how would you rate each of the following services in Cedar Hills?

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Garbage collection / disposal	4.1	4.2	4.1	2%	3%	13%	40%	37%
Parks	3.6	3.8	3.9	4	5	15	45	26
Pressurized Irrigation	3.2	3.5	3.7	4	5	24	40	16
Storm drainage	3.4	3.7	3.6	3	6	30	39	15
City Mgmt Staff	3.4	3.6	3.6	2	6	33	36	12
Utility/Billing Dept	3.5	3.6	3.6	3	6	33	35	15
Animal Control	3.2	3.4	3.4	3	10	34	30	13
Street lighting	3.3	3.4	3.4	5	13	30	33	13
Law enforcement	3.6	3.6	3.4	5	11	31	31	13
Enforcement of Nuisance Ordinance	3.2	3.4	3.4	3	8	35	30	7
Fire and ambulance protection	3.8	3.9	3.3	9	11	28	31	12
Zoning/Bldg Dept	3.1	3.2	3.3	2	9	40	28	7
City Council/Mayor	3.1	3.3	3.3	3	9	40	29	7
Sidewalk Maintenance	3.3	3.4	3.3	7	9	37	32	9
Street construction & maintenance	3.3	3.2	3.2	7	14	36	28	9
Snow removal	3.0	3.2	3.1	9	19	31	31	8
Recreation services	3.1	2.9	3.0	11	20	27	26	8

**9. Public Safety, Public Works and Recreational Services:** On a scale of 1 to 5, five being strongly favor improvement and one being strongly oppose improvement, please rate the following:

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Community Recreation	3.7	9%	8%	20%	20%	33%
Children's Library	3.6	13	8	17	13	40
Other	3.6	2	1	5	1	7
Community Pool	3.5	15	9	15	13	38
Fire Service	3.4	6	12	33	20	20
Ambulance Service	3.4	5	13	35	19	18
Street Maintenance	3.4	6	10	34	25	15
Park Facilities	3.3	8	12	34	23	15
Police	3.3	7	13	33	22	17
Trail Facilities	3.2	9	14	31	23	15
Street Lighting	3.2	8	14	36	20	15
Sidewalks	3.2	7	13	41	21	11
Animal Control	3.0	9	18	40	16	8

**10. Are you willing to increase taxes for the construction and/or increase in operations and maintenance of these facilities and services?**

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>1-No</u>	<u>2-Maybe</u>	<u>3-Yes</u>
Community Recreation	2.0	35%	20%	39%
Community Pool	2.0	36	20	38
Children's Library	2.0	36	18	40
Fire service	1.9	40	27	28
Ambulance Service	1.8	45	25	23
Police	1.8	44	26	23
Street Maintenance	1.7	48	25	20
Park facilities	1.7	51	20	22
Trail facilities	1.7	53	19	22
Street Lighting	1.6	59	19	16
Sidewalks	1.5	59	20	14
Other	1.4	15	3	2
Animal Control	1.3	72	14	7

11. On a scale of 1 to 5, five being very interested and one being the least interested, please indicate which, if any, of the following recreational programs and facilities you and your family are interested in.

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Swimming			3.6	19%	5%	10%	18%	39%
Basketball	3.4	3.2	3.2	22	8	15	17	28
Soccer	3.6	3.3	3.1	25	8	14	15	27
Other____	3.0	3.8	3.0	5	3	1	1	6
Tennis	3.0	3.0	2.9	25	12	16	14	21
Football	3.2	2.9	2.7	31	10	14	10	20
Skiing	2.5	2.9	2.7	33	12	14	10	19
Golf			2.7	33	10	17	11	18
Baseball	3.1	2.9	2.6	35	9	16	11	16
Volleyball	2.5	2.7	2.4	35	14	17	9	11
Softball	2.7	2.6	2.3	38	12	15	11	10
Lacrosse			2.1	43	13	16	6	9
Skateboarding	2.1	2.1	2.0	46	13	16	4	7

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
12. Do you think that the City should provide Adult recreation programs such as football, softball, basketball or volleyball?	35%	60%
13. If adult programs were provided, would you participate?	29%	65%
14. Should the City of Cedar Hills build an Aquatic Center?	61%	35%
15. Costs for building a new aquatic center and some of the costs for operating the center may need to be funded through property taxes. Knowing that, would you vote in support of paying some increase (\$5-\$10 per month) in property taxes to build and operate an aquatic center?	57%	38%
16. Should the City of Cedar Hills build a Recreation Center?	65%	31%
17. Costs for building a new recreation center and some of the costs for operating the center may need to be funded through property taxes. Knowing that, would you vote in support of paying some increase (\$5-\$10 per month) in property taxes to build and operate an recreation center?	58%	35%
18. If you could only choose one Center, would you build an aquatic center or a recreation center or neither?		
Aquatic center .....	23%	
Recreation center .....	28	
Build both .....	25	
Neither .....	21	

**19. Cedar Hills Family Festival Days** On a scale of 1 to 5, five being very interested and one being the least interested, please indicate which, if any, of the following Cedar Hills Family Festival Days activities you and your family are interested in?

	<u>2009</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Fireworks	2.4	4.4	6%	1%	8%	17%	64%
Parade	3.2	3.1	23	11	22	13	25
5K and Mile Fun Run	2.8	3.1	20	10	22	21	19
Kids Games	3.2	3.0	22	10	22	20	17
Dinner and Movie	2.9	2.8	27	12	21	18	13
Junior Kids - Big blow up toys	2.8	2.7	31	13	18	16	14
Cedar Hills Night with Orem Owlz	2.4	2.1	42	16	17	9	6
Golf Tournament	2.3	2.1	47	16	14	9	7

20. Can you think of any other activities you would like to see included during this week-long event?  
(Open-ended)

Miscellaneous comments	26%
Food	15%
Crafts/Arts/Fair	13%
Sports	10%
Music	10%
Positive comments	10%
Comments about cost	8%
Community service	6%
Games	3%

21. **Commercial Development** How would you rate (5 being 'done great' and 1 being 'done very poorly') how the City has developed the north side of the commercial area with the Walmart, Chase Bank and McDonalds developments?

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
	4.2	1%	3%	11%	41%	40%

22. List the top three types of commercial development you favor on the south side of the commercial sector (approximately 30 acres) with 1 being top priority and 2 next priority and 3 next priority:

	<u>Top 3</u>	<u>1st</u>	<u>2nd</u>	<u>3rd</u>
Restaurants	81.1	33	37	11
Gas station/Convenience store	72.7	44	16	12
Strip Mall retail	50.9	7	18	26
Mixed use housing - Gateway style	24.6	6	8	11
Professional office	19.6	3	5	12
No more development	14.4	4	2	8
Big Box development	12.4	2	3	7
Single Family residential	10.2	3	4	3
Other	4.0	1	0	2

<p><b>23. Emergency Preparedness</b> How prepared (meaning expenditure of funding) should the City of Cedar Hills be for a natural emergency such as an earthquake or landslide? Please circle the number of your answer</p>	<p>Not at all ..... 2%  A little ..... 9%  Somewhat ..... 34%  Very ..... 52%</p>
<p>24. How prepared are you for a natural emergency such as an earthquake or landslide?</p>	<p>Not at all ..... 2%  A little ..... 17%  Somewhat ..... 61%  Very ..... 17%</p>
<p>25. What are your overall expectations of the City after a major natural or man-made disaster?</p>	<p>Help when able ..... 10%  Help within 72 hours ..... 15%  Help within 24-48 hours ..... 34%  Immediate help from emergency personnel ..... 35%</p>
<p><b>26. Community Development</b> Would you support or oppose Cedar Hills building a new City Hall/Community center?</p>	<p>Definitely oppose ..... 24%  Probably oppose ..... 29%  Probably support ..... 30%  Definitely support ..... 12%</p>
<p>27. When the existing City building is converted to a Public Safety (police/fire) building would you be more likely to support building a new City Hall/community center?</p>	<p>Much less likely ..... 13%  Somewhat less likely ..... 11%  Somewhat more likely ..... 48%  Much more likely ..... 19%</p>
<p>28. Would you be willing to bond (pay property taxes) \$5 extra per month to build a City Hall/Community Center?</p>	<p>Yes ..... 36%  No ..... 55%</p>
<p><b>29. Overall</b> During your residency, has the City improved, remained the same, or become worse in providing services?</p>	<p>Worse ..... 4%  Same ..... 54%  Improved ..... 32%  Don't Know ..... 6%</p>

30. What do you feel is the most important issue facing Cedar Hills? How would you like to see this addressed?  
(Open-ended)

Taxes/Fiscal issues/Cost ..... 24%  
 Miscellaneous comments ..... 14%  
 Commercial development ..... 13%  
 City services/Safety concerns .... 12%  
 Negative comments ..... 10%  
 Recreation/Services/Community  
     Center ..... 9%  
 Golf course issues ..... 9%  
 Library ..... 4%  
 Positive comments ..... 4%

**Demographics:**

31. How many years have you lived in Cedar Hills?

Less than 3 years ..... 40%  
 3 -7 years ..... 38%  
 More than 7 years ..... 23%

32. Do you rent or own your home?

Rent ..... 13%  
 Own ..... 87%

33. How many family members reside in your home?

One ..... 2%  
 Two ..... 18%  
 Three ..... 9%  
 Four ..... 18%  
 Five ..... 21%  
 Six ..... 20%  
 Seven or more ..... 13%

34. What is your age?

18-24 ..... 2 %  
 25-34 ..... 20 %  
 35-44 ..... 35 %  
 45-54 ..... 21 %  
 55-64 ..... 10 %  
 65 or older ..... 11 %

35. Are you:

Male ..... 36%  
 Female ..... 64%

36. Which of the following ranges best describes your household income?

Less than \$39,999 ..... 7%  
 \$40,000 to \$69,999 ..... 22%  
 \$70,000 to \$99,999 ..... 29%  
 \$100,000 to \$139,999 ..... 27%  
 \$140,000 + ..... 15%