



City of Edmonton Service Satisfaction Survey

Services Subgroup Analysis

Prepared by



September 2022



Table of Contents

1. Report Overview	1
• Project Background	2
• Report Objectives	2
• How to Read this Report	2
2. Online Panel Subgroup Analysis	3
3. Additional Engagement Subgroup Analysis	21
• 2SLGBTQIA+	22
• Indigenous Peoples	31
• Low Income Households	40
• Parents With Children	49
• People With Disabilities	58
• Racialized Groups	67



Report Overview

Project Background


The City of Edmonton (the City) commissioned this survey to capture Edmontonians' perceptions relating to quality of life and service satisfaction.

Report Objectives

- Share Edmontonians perceptions related to experiences with City services.
- Support evidence based decision making.
- The need to hear from diverse Edmontonians was a crucial component of this survey. To obtain results that are representative of Edmontonians while also inviting as many respondents as possible, a multitude of survey mechanisms were utilized.

How to Read this Report

- The report is broken into two sections: **Online Panel (n=800) Subgroup Analysis** and **Additional Engagement (n=4,306) Subgroup Analysis**
- The **Online Panel** was able to provide results that are reflective of age, income, gender, and regional distribution of Edmontonians based on the 2016 census data.
- The **Additional Engagement** received 4,306 responses, which provided large enough sub-samples to relay what we heard from racialized individuals, Indigenous peoples, people with disabilities, members of the 2SLGBTQIA+ community, younger Edmontonians and parents with children.
- On each page of the report, "n" denotes the sample size that provided responses to particular questions.





Online Panel Subgroup Analysis

Satisfaction by Age Group

	18 to 24 years (n=98)	25 to 34 years (n=153)	35 to 44 years (n=198)	45 to 54 years (n=143)	55 to 64 years (n=118)	65 years or older (n=90)
Affordable housing for low-income households	49%↑	31%	31%	31%	21%↓	24%
Animal control and pet licenses	59%↑	47%	48%	50%	34%↓	35%↓
Building and Development permits and inspections	54%↑	39%	38%	34%	31%	28%
Business licensing	54%↑	48%	41%	30%↓	35%	21%↓
Bylaw enforcement	61%↑	48%↑	46%	45%	36%	37%
City-owned-and-operated attractions	64%	65%	62%	64%	65%	54%
City-owned-and-operated recreational facilities	80%↑	72%	68%	60%	58%	53%↓
Community safety	56%↑	49%	45%	43%	41%	36%
Fire rescue	71%	62%	70%	72%	77%	67%
Homelessness response and support	46%↑	21%	24%	24%	24%	19%
Infrastructure delivery	57%	51%	49%	47%	48%	36%↓
Land-use planning	60%↑	49%	45%	44%	39%	31%↓
Parks, sports fields, and green spaces	77%	76%	68%	76%	71%	60%↓
Property assessment and tax collection	47%	44%	36%	38%	35%	30%
Public transit	61%↑	37%	46%	41%	37%	41%
Spring/ summer road maintenance	52%↑	40%	39%	43%	36%	30%
Spring/ summer sidewalks	71%	64%	68%	68%	61%	49%↓
Traffic safety, flow and controls	62%	46%	57%	47%	52%	52%
Waste collection	71%	63%	61%	63%	77%↑	67%
Winter road maintenance	52%↑	34%	39%	34%	24%↓	30%
Winter sidewalks	49%	40%	46%	36%	32%	40%

Percentages indicate satisfaction scores (very satisfied/somewhat satisfied).

↑↓ indicate that a result is statistically higher or lower compared to all Edmontonians.

Satisfaction by Income

	Under \$30,000 (n=109)	\$30,000 to \$59,999 (n=143)	\$60,000 to \$99,999 (n=199)	\$100,000 to \$149,999 (n=140)	\$150,000 and above (n=151)	Prefer not to answer (n=58)
Affordable housing for low-income households	32%	25%	32%	35%	29%	38%
Animal control and pet licenses	46%	50%	47%	47%	42%	46%
Building and Development permits and inspections	33%	36%	39%	39%	36%	41%
Business licensing	39%	36%	40%	42%	35%	41%
Bylaw enforcement	38%	44%	50%	45%	44%	49%
City-owned-and-operated attractions	58%	59%	66%	65%	64%	59%
City-owned-and-operated recreational facilities	57%	58%	76% ↑	71%	60%	67%
Community safety	43%	43%	44%	54% ↑	41%	47%
Fire rescue	70%	74%	73%	67%	64%	66%
Homelessness response and support	24%	24%	27%	28%	22%	33%
Infrastructure delivery	44%	46%	49%	48%	53%	56%
Land-use planning	43%	40%	49%	47%	45%	41%
Parks, sports fields, and green spaces	64%	68%	79% ↑	74%	66%	78%
Property assessment and tax collection	33%	37%	41%	39%	41%	36%
Public transit	41%	49%	45%	46%	33% ↓	55%
Spring/ summer road maintenance	40%	37%	40%	45%	35%	45%
Spring/ summer sidewalks	59%	59%	71%	67%	63%	69%
Traffic safety, flow and controls	50%	58%	60%	51%	41% ↓	50%
Waste collection	60%	71%	67%	63%	70%	61%
Winter road maintenance	38%	34%	33%	44%	29%	41%
Winter sidewalks	44%	39%	40%	46%	34%	50%

Percentages indicate satisfaction scores (very satisfied/somewhat satisfied).

↑ ↓ indicate that a result is statistically higher or lower compared to all Edmontonians.

Satisfaction by Region

	Central (n=119)	Northeast (n=136)	Northwest (n=131)	Southeast (n=156)	Southwest (n=258)
Affordable housing for low-income households	38%	29%	35%	32%	26%
Animal control and pet licenses	48%	46%	50%	48%	42%
Building and Development permits and inspections	37%	40%	40%	40%	34%
Business licensing	43%	40%	41%	41%	33%
Bylaw enforcement	42%	46%	45%	47%	46%
City-owned-and-operated attractions	58%	65%	66%	65%	60%
City-owned-and-operated recreational facilities	63%	70%	66%	70%	62%
Community safety	43%	45%	42%	51%	44%
Fire rescue	73%	63%	72%	73%	68%
Homelessness response and support	25%	26%	30%	27%	23%
Infrastructure delivery	59% ↑	51%	48%	53%	41%
Land-use planning	47%	45%	45%	46%	44%
Parks, sports fields, and green spaces	68%	76%	70%	74%	70%
Property assessment and tax collection	42%	39%	44%	34%	37%
Public transit	47%	42%	47%	42%	42%
Spring/ summer road maintenance	47%	38%	43%	51% ↑	30% ↓
Spring/ summer sidewalks	66%	57%	68%	69%	63%
Traffic safety, flow and controls	56%	53%	52%	53%	51%
Waste collection	67%	63%	67%	73%	63%
Winter road maintenance	42%	34%	38%	41%	29% ↓
Winter sidewalks	47%	38%	44%	44%	36%

Percentages indicate satisfaction scores (very satisfied/somewhat satisfied).

↑ ↓ indicate that a result is statistically higher or lower compared to all Edmontonians.

Satisfaction by Owner/Renter

	I own my home (n=483)	I rent (n=259)
Affordable housing for low-income households	31%	30%
Animal control and pet licenses	49%	45%
Building and Development permits and inspections	38%	38%
Business licensing	37%	43%
Bylaw enforcement	46%	45%
City-owned-and-operated attractions	64%	61%
City-owned-and-operated recreational facilities	66%	66%
Community safety	44%	46%
Fire rescue	71%	71%
Homelessness response and support	23%	29%
Infrastructure delivery	49%	49%
Land-use planning	45%	48%
Parks, sports fields, and green spaces	70%	74%
Property assessment and tax collection	41%	34%
Public transit	42%	48%
Spring/ summer road maintenance	38%	43%
Spring/ summer sidewalks	64%	67%
Traffic safety, flow and controls	52%	55%
Waste collection	69%	62%
Winter road maintenance	35%	38%
Winter sidewalks	39%	45%

Satisfaction by Gender

	Man (n=387)	Woman (n=398)
Affordable housing for low-income households	33%	29%
Animal control and pet licenses	49%	44%
Building and Development permits and inspections	42%	32%
Business licensing	43%	34%
Bylaw enforcement	47%	43%
City-owned-and-operated attractions	64%	61%
City-owned-and-operated recreational facilities	69%	62%
Community safety	50%	39%
Fire rescue	75%	64%
Homelessness response and support	29%	21%
Infrastructure delivery	54%	43%
Land-use planning	48%	42%
Parks, sports fields, and green spaces	74%	70%
Property assessment and tax collection	40%	36%
Public transit	47%	39%
Spring/ summer road maintenance	43%	36%
Spring/ summer sidewalks	67%	61%
Traffic safety, flow and controls	54%	51%
Waste collection	69%	63%
Winter road maintenance	37%	33%
Winter sidewalks	43%	38%

Percentages indicate satisfaction scores (very satisfied/somewhat satisfied).
 †‡ indicate that a result is statistically higher or lower compared to all Edmontonians.

Importance by Age Group

	18 to 24 years (n=98)	25 to 34 years (n=153)	35 to 44 years (n=198)	45 to 54 years (n=143)	55 to 64 years (n=118)	65 years or older (n=90)
Affordable housing for low-income households	85%	86% ↑	73%	80%	81%	73%
Animal control and pet licenses	61%	62%	55%	64%	64%	56%
Building and Development permits and inspections	72%	66%	67%	69%	72%	68%
Business licensing	75% ↑	64%	60%	59%	70%	61%
Bylaw enforcement	72%	79%	71% ↓	79%	91% ↑	79%
City-owned-and-operated attractions	73%	74%	74%	83% ↑	76%	77%
City-owned-and-operated recreational facilities	79%	86% ↑	74%	79%	70%	79%
Community safety	82%	84%	84%	91%	91%	89%
Fire rescue	84%	89%	87%	96% ↑	94%	93%
Homelessness response and support	82%	84%	78%	80%	74%	75%
Infrastructure delivery	81%	78%	80%	87%	92% ↑	79%
Land-use planning	74%	69%	67%	78%	76%	71%
Parks, sports fields, and green spaces	81%	87%	80%	81%	90% ↑	75%
Property assessment and tax collection	72%	63%	66%	66%	74%	62%
Public transit	85%	82%	73% ↓	87%	88% ↑	84%
Spring/ summer road maintenance	84%	90%	88%	95% ↑	94%	89%
Spring/ summer sidewalks	78%	77%	70%	80%	78%	71%
Traffic safety, flow and controls	79%	86%	82%	94% ↑	92% ↑	86%
Waste collection	84%	86%	79% ↓	97% ↑	95% ↑	88%
Winter road maintenance	87%	90%	89%	97% ↑	97% ↑	95%
Winter sidewalks	77%	69% ↓	78%	81%	82%	82%

Percentages indicate importance scores (very important/somewhat important).
↑ ↓ indicate that a result is statistically higher or lower compared to all Edmontonians.

Importance by Income

	Under \$30,000 (n=109)	\$30,000 to \$59,999 (n=143)	\$60,000 to \$99,999 (n=199)	\$100,000 to \$149,999 (n=140)	\$150,000 and above (n=151)	Prefer not to answer (n=58)
Affordable housing for low-income households	83%	82%	84%	78%	69% ↓	79%
Animal control and pet licenses	61%	66%	61%	58%	52%	68%
Building and Development permits and inspections	61%	71%	71%	67%	72%	64%
Business licensing	55%	58%	70%	62%	66%	69%
Bylaw enforcement	77%	75%	80%	73%	86% ↑	72%
City-owned-and-operated attractions	72%	75%	75%	78%	81%	68%
City-owned-and-operated recreational facilities	72%	76%	82%	80%	73%	85%
Community safety	85%	85%	89%	84%	89%	83%
Fire rescue	93%	92%	92%	85%	92%	85%
Homelessness response and support	82%	78%	84%	76%	73%	78%
Infrastructure delivery	77%	77%	90% ↑	79%	87%	78%
Land-use planning	64%	71%	78%	70%	75%	67%
Parks, sports fields, and green spaces	77%	79%	90% ↑	83%	79%	83%
Property assessment and tax collection	62%	63%	71%	65%	71%	64%
Public transit	81%	87%	86%	81%	74%	79%
Spring/ summer road maintenance	87%	90%	93%	86%	94%	86%
Spring/ summer sidewalks	71%	77%	84% ↑	67% ↓	72%	76%
Traffic safety, flow and controls	81%	85%	92% ↑	79%	93% ↑	88%
Waste collection	89%	89%	89%	85%	89%	81%
Winter road maintenance	91%	92%	94%	86%	97% ↑	91%
Winter sidewalks	77%	80%	86% ↑	68% ↓	74%	78%

Percentages indicate importance scores (very important/somewhat important).
 ↑ ↓ indicate that a result is statistically higher or lower compared to all Edmontonians.

Importance by Region

	Central (n=119)	Northeast (n=136)	Northwest (n=131)	Southeast (n=156)	Southwest (n=258)
Affordable housing for low-income households	80%	77%	77%	82%	79%
Animal control and pet licenses	64%	60%	65%	63%	54%
Building and Development permits and inspections	66%	69%	63%	76% ↑	67%
Business licensing	67%	64%	56%	73% ↑	61%
Bylaw enforcement	76%	77%	70%	82%	81%
City-owned-and-operated attractions	79%	74%	79%	77%	73%
City-owned-and-operated recreational facilities	76%	79%	77%	79%	77%
Community safety	85%	87%	84%	87%	87%
Fire rescue	90%	88%	86%	92%	93%
Homelessness response and support	84%	74%	76%	76%	81%
Infrastructure delivery	78%	82%	80%	84%	86%
Land-use planning	71%	68%	74%	71%	74%
Parks, sports fields, and green spaces	74%	88%	83%	85%	81%
Property assessment and tax collection	66%	65%	63%	74%	66%
Public transit	84%	81%	81%	80%	82%
Spring/ summer road maintenance	86%	93%	88%	94%	90%
Spring/ summer sidewalks	75%	76%	72%	79%	73%
Traffic safety, flow and controls	80%	87%	86%	92% ↑	86%
Waste collection	85%	88%	86%	88%	89%
Winter road maintenance	89%	95%	88%	94%	94%
Winter sidewalks	79%	77%	77%	81%	76%

Percentages indicate importance scores (very important/somewhat important).
 ↑ ↓ indicate that a result is statistically higher or lower compared to all Edmontonians.

Importance by Owner/Renter

	I own my home (n=483)	I rent (n=259)
Affordable housing for low-income households	76%	86% ↑
Animal control and pet licenses	59%	62%
Building and Development permits and inspections	71%	66%
Business licensing	63%	62%
Bylaw enforcement	80%	75%
City-owned-and-operated attractions	79%	70%
City-owned-and-operated recreational facilities	77%	77%
Community safety	87%	86%
Fire rescue	92%	89%
Homelessness response and support	76%	85% ↑
Infrastructure delivery	85%	79%
Land-use planning	73%	71%
Parks, sports fields, and green spaces	82%	85%
Property assessment and tax collection	69%	63%
Public transit	81%	85%
Spring/ summer road maintenance	93%	87%
Spring/ summer sidewalks	75%	77%
Traffic safety, flow and controls	89%	83%
Waste collection	88%	91%
Winter road maintenance	94%	91%
Winter sidewalks	77%	79%

Importance by Gender

	Man (n=387)	Woman (n=398)
Affordable housing for low-income households	81%	78%
Animal control and pet licenses	61%	59%
Building and Development permits and inspections	69%	68%
Business licensing	65%	62%
Bylaw enforcement	77%	79%
City-owned-and-operated attractions	74%	78%
City-owned-and-operated recreational facilities	77%	78%
Community safety	86%	88%
Fire rescue	90%	91%
Homelessness response and support	81%	76%
Infrastructure delivery	83%	83%
Land-use planning	74%	70%
Parks, sports fields, and green spaces	83%	82%
Property assessment and tax collection	66%	67%
Public transit	82%	82%
Spring/ summer road maintenance	90%	91%
Spring/ summer sidewalks	74%	76%
Traffic safety, flow and controls	86%	87%
Waste collection	87%	88%
Winter road maintenance	93%	92%
Winter sidewalks	80%	75%

Percentages indicate importance scores (very important/somewhat important).
 ↑ ↓ indicate that a result is statistically higher or lower compared to all Edmontonians.

Financial Investment by Age Group

	18 to 24 years (n=98)	25 to 34 years (n=153)	35 to 44 years (n=198)	45 to 54 years (n=143)	55 to 64 years (n=118)	65 years or older (n=90)
Affordable housing for low-income households	71%	73% ↑	60%	68%	54% ↓	59%
Animal control and pet licenses	35% ↑	28%	22%	24%	17%	17%
Building and Development permits and inspections	36%	37%	30%	37%	18% ↓	14% ↓
Business licensing	33% ↑	29%	23%	24%	14% ↓	15% ↓
Bylaw enforcement	47%	44%	35%	43%	40%	36%
City-owned-and-operated attractions	39%	43%	40%	34%	29%	26% ↓
City-owned-and-operated recreational facilities	45%	48% ↑	39%	38%	28% ↓	21% ↓
Community safety	58%	72% ↑	62%	69%	62%	59%
Fire rescue	44%	46%	47%	63% ↑	64% ↑	45%
Homelessness response and support	71%	78% ↑	66%	70%	58%	60%
Infrastructure delivery	45%	63% ↑	47%	51%	46%	42%
Land-use planning	34%	35%	29%	25%	20%	18% ↓
Parks, sports fields, and green spaces	47%	49% ↑	37%	38%	29% ↓	24% ↓
Property assessment and tax collection	28%	27%	23%	24%	14% ↓	11% ↓
Public transit	51%	65%	58%	65%	48%	44% ↓
Spring/ summer road maintenance	52%	64%	58%	64%	53%	60%
Spring/ summer sidewalks	40%	44% ↑	27%	37%	26%	21% ↓
Traffic safety, flow and controls	41%	52% ↑	43%	42%	36%	30% ↓
Waste collection	48%	49% ↑	32% ↓	47%	39%	28% ↓
Winter road maintenance	65%	72%	68%	87% ↑	75%	64%
Winter sidewalks	55%	53%	42% ↓	63% ↑	48%	45%

Percentages indicate financial investment scores (much more financial investment /more financial investment).

↑ ↓ indicate that a result is statistically higher or lower compared to all Edmontonians.

Financial Investment by Income

	Under \$30,000 (n=109)	\$30,000 to \$59,999 (n=143)	\$60,000 to \$99,999 (n=199)	\$100,000 to \$149,999 (n=140)	\$150,000 and above (n=151)	Prefer not to answer (n=58)
Affordable housing for low-income households	75% ↑	68%	68%	64%	50% ↓	59%
Animal control and pet licenses	32%	25%	24%	24%	18%	22%
Building and Development permits and inspections	30%	27%	30%	33%	30%	25%
Business licensing	25%	19%	25%	28%	19%	26%
Bylaw enforcement	50% ↑	44%	35%	33%	46%	38%
City-owned-and-operated attractions	42%	31%	30%	43%	40%	36%
City-owned-and-operated recreational facilities	44%	27% ↓	35%	40%	48%	31%
Community safety	68%	63%	66%	59%	68%	59%
Fire rescue	62% ↑	54%	46%	42% ↓	62% ↑	42%
Homelessness response and support	73%	68%	68%	70%	63%	62%
Infrastructure delivery	47%	51%	46%	49%	64% ↑	33% ↓
Land-use planning	32%	29%	25%	27%	27%	22%
Parks, sports fields, and green spaces	42%	30%	36%	42%	43%	32%
Property assessment and tax collection	23%	20%	22%	24%	26%	10% ↓
Public transit	62%	59%	61%	56%	48%	50%
Spring/ summer road maintenance	65%	54%	59%	58%	68% ↑	47%
Spring/ summer sidewalks	39%	30%	29%	38%	34%	25%
Traffic safety, flow and controls	46%	40%	40%	40%	48%	31% ↓
Waste collection	45%	44%	33%	43%	45%	37%
Winter road maintenance	76%	74%	70%	73%	76%	57% ↓
Winter sidewalks	54%	54%	58% ↑	38% ↓	51%	45%

Percentages indicate financial investment scores (much more financial investment /more financial investment).

↑ ↓ indicate that a result is statistically higher or lower compared to all Edmontonians.

Financial Investment by Region

	Central (n=119)	Northeast (n=136)	Northwest (n=131)	Southeast (n=156)	Southwest (n=258)
Affordable housing for low-income households	68%	59%	62%	65%	67%
Animal control and pet licenses	32%	23%	22%	26%	19%
Building and Development permits and inspections	35%	26%	34%	33%	25%
Business licensing	28%	23%	21%	28%	20%
Bylaw enforcement	52% ↑	43%	35%	41%	36%
City-owned-and-operated attractions	41%	31%	38%	44%	31%
City-owned-and-operated recreational facilities	42%	36%	40%	44%	31% ↓
Community safety	66%	57%	66%	66%	65%
Fire rescue	60%	53%	53%	46%	50%
Homelessness response and support	71%	62%	67%	65%	71%
Infrastructure delivery	59% ↑	42%	52%	52%	47%
Land-use planning	33%	29%	31%	29%	21%
Parks, sports fields, and green spaces	36%	36%	35%	47% ↑	36%
Property assessment and tax collection	30%	19%	23%	29%	16%
Public transit	63%	57%	58%	56%	54%
Spring/ summer road maintenance	55%	57%	59%	65%	59%
Spring/ summer sidewalks	41%	27%	36%	43% ↑	25%
Traffic safety, flow and controls	48%	40%	44%	42%	39%
Waste collection	57% ↑	43%	40%	37%	34%
Winter road maintenance	61% ↓	70%	73%	78%	77%
Winter sidewalks	46%	51%	48%	57%	50%

Percentages indicate financial investment scores (much more financial investment /more financial investment).

↑ ↓ indicate that a result is statistically higher or lower compared to all Edmontonians.

Financial Investment by Owner/Renter

	I own my home (n=483)	I rent (n=259)
Affordable housing for low-income households	56%	77% ↑
Animal control and pet licenses	22%	24%
Building and Development permits and inspections	28%	32%
Business licensing	24%	22%
Bylaw enforcement	40%	40%
City-owned-and-operated attractions	37%	34%
City-owned-and-operated recreational facilities	37%	40%
Community safety	63%	65%
Fire rescue	50%	56%
Homelessness response and support	62%	76% ↑
Infrastructure delivery	50%	49%
Land-use planning	28%	28%
Parks, sports fields, and green spaces	36%	40%
Property assessment and tax collection	23%	20%
Public transit	57%	56%
Spring/ summer road maintenance	60%	58%
Spring/ summer sidewalks	30%	37%
Traffic safety, flow and controls	42%	42%
Waste collection	40%	42%
Winter road maintenance	71%	75%
Winter sidewalks	50%	53%

Financial Investment by Gender

	Man (n=387)	Woman (n=398)
Affordable housing for low-income households	65%	64%
Animal control and pet licenses	24%	23%
Building and Development permits and inspections	33%	25%
Business licensing	25%	20%
Bylaw enforcement	44%	36%
City-owned-and-operated attractions	36%	35%
City-owned-and-operated recreational facilities	41%	34%
Community safety	64%	64%
Fire rescue	53%	50%
Homelessness response and support	70%	64%
Infrastructure delivery	53%	45%
Land-use planning	30%	24%
Parks, sports fields, and green spaces	40%	36%
Property assessment and tax collection	24%	18%
Public transit	59%	55%
Spring/ summer road maintenance	59%	60%
Spring/ summer sidewalks	38%	28%
Traffic safety, flow and controls	45%	38%
Waste collection	41%	39%
Winter road maintenance	72%	72%
Winter sidewalks	53%	48%

Percentages indicate financial investment scores (much more financial investment /more financial investment).
 ↑ ↓ indicate that a result is statistically higher or lower compared to all Edmontonians.

Online Panel Methodology

Respondent Profile:

n = 800 Edmontonians aged 18 years or older

Research Design and Respondent Selection:

- Survey participants were screened to ensure that they met the minimum participation criteria i.e., being a current resident of Edmonton and at least aged 18 years.
- The first 3 digits of postal codes were used to classify respondents into specific regions i.e., central, northeast, northwest, southeast and southwest regions.
- The results are reflective of age, gender, and regional distribution of Edmontonians based on the 2016 census data. The following techniques were used to ensure demographic representation in the survey data:
 1. Fieldwork was momentarily paused at the 75% threshold to ensure demographic representation
 2. Weighting factors were also applied based on age, geographic region, and income to ensure representation
- The survey results also represent voices of Edmontonians based on diverse identity factors such as visible minorities, persons with disabilities, 2SLGBTQIA+ and new to Canada. We acknowledge that the survey results do not/can not include data from all intersectional identity factors.

Data Collection:

- Responses were collected using Dynata, an online sampling and data collection company.
- The online survey had a response rate of 81%. 990 people opted into the survey and 190 people got terminated/dropped off. Hence, the response rate was calculated as $(800/990) \times 100$.

**Data
Collection
Timeline**

June 30 to
July 17, 2022

**Average
Length of
Interview**

12.3 mins

**Response
Rate**

81%

Online Panel Methodology (cont'd)

Sampling and Sample Size:

n = A sample of 800 Edmontonians aged 18 years or older

The sample size is calculated according to the following formula:

$$n = \frac{t^2 \times p(1 - p)}{m^2}$$

Where:

n= the required sample size

t= confidence level at 99% (standard value of 2.575)

p= estimated prevalence. In this case Edmonton residents aged 18 years+ i.e. 78% (0.78)

m= margin of error at 5% (standard value of 0.05)

$$n = \frac{2.575^2 \times 0.78(1 - 0.78)}{0.05^2}$$

This calculation gives a sample size of **455**.

This is considered to be the minimum acceptable sample size but adjusted to **800** because of the need to have sufficient base for subgroup analysis.



Online Panel Demographics

Age Group	
n=800	
18 to 24 years	12%
25 to 34 years	19%
35 to 44 years	25%
45 to 54 years	18%
55 to 64 years	15%
65 years or older	11%
Total	100%

Region	
n=800	
Central	15%
Northeast	17%
Northwest	17%
Southeast	20%
Southwest	31%
Total	100%

Identity/Group	
n=800	
Racialized group/ visible minority	26%
People with disabilities	10%
Indigenous peoples	5%
New to Canada (less than 3 years)	6%
2SLGBTQIA+	6%
None of the above	53%
Prefer not to answer	3%

Gender	
n=800	
Woman	50%
Man	49%
Non-binary	1%
Transgender	1%
Two-spirit	0%
Another gender not listed above	0%
Prefer not to answer	0%

*Percentages may not sum to 100 since multiple responses could be selected.

Online Panel Demographics (cont'd)

Education Level

	n=800
Elementary/primary school graduate	1%
High/secondary school diploma	21%
College/technical school graduate	28%
University undergraduate degree	28%
Graduate university degree (masters and/or doctorate)	14%
Professional degree (e.g., medicine, dentistry)	5%
Prefer not to answer	3%
Total	100%

Employment Status

	n=800
Working full-time	56%
Working part-time	10%
Homemaker	3%
Student	5%
Unemployed	8%
Permanently unable to work	3%
Retired	13%
Other (specify:)	1%
Don't know / prefer not to answer	1%
Total	100%

Income Level

	n=800
Under \$30,000	14%
\$30,000 to \$59,999	18%
\$60,000 to \$99,999	25%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	17%
\$150,000 and above	19%
Prefer not to answer	7%
Total	100%

Online Panel Demographics (cont'd)

Are there children (younger than 18 years) living in your home?

n=800

Yes	36%
No	62%
Prefer not to answer	2%
Total	100%

Do you currently rent or own your home?

n=800

I own my home	61%
I rent	32%
Other	4%
Prefer not to answer	3%
Total	100%



Additional Engagement Subgroup Analysis

2SLGBTQIA+



Services

- 62%** Are satisfied with the overall quality of programs and services
- 52%** Are satisfied with the quality of customer service
- 59%** Are satisfied with ease of access to services
- 50%** Are satisfied with how the city informs Edmontonians about the services they provide

Persons in 2SLGBTQIA+ groups (n) = 271 respondents



2SLGBTQIA+ – Reasons for Ratings on Overall Quality of Services

Positives

Theme	Percent	Sample Comments
Recreation, Art and Culture	9%	The library and its av series kept us thriving during COVID. I so appreciate the Bonnie Doon rec ctr renovations. It is so close to us!
Affordable to access amenities and services	6%	Good options for many.
Others	3%	COVID limited programs and services.

Negatives


Theme	Percent	Sample Comments
Unaffordable to access amenities and services	24%	The only parks within easy walking distance around most places are usually part of a school, or playground. They're not really communal space.
City Management	15%	Always room for improvement. Some city staff need proper customer service training so they are not so rude / abrupt.
Public Transit	12%	Not easy to get to events. Usually parking is difficult, driving inconvenient and public transit is even less convenient.
Information	9%	3-1-1 could be drastically improved by adding better online support.
Cost	9%	Costs are too high and unfortunately households falls in the gap where they say we make enough but don't qualify for assistance, when we do not have the extra funds.
Homelessness	6%	Homelessness and transient populations are very high in my neighbourhood, what city programs that already exist are clearly insufficient to help these people.
Road Maintenance	3%	I think some areas (transit, safety, construction, etc) need more attention.
Crime	3%	Edmonton has been putting small interest groups before the overall benefit of society which has caused a huge increase in drug use openly at parks, DT and in public spaces.

Q: What is the reason for your overall quality of programs and services rating?

n = 34 respondents


This was an optional question and 'n' indicates the number of those who provided responses. The theme analysis of comments is based on n < 50, and as such, these results are considered directional in nature.

2SLGBTQIA+ - Importance (1/2)




Q: How important is the following program or service on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Very Important' and 1 is 'Not at all Important'. (n=271)

2SLGBTQIA+ - Importance (2/2)




Q: How important is the following program or service on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Very Important' and 1 is 'Not at all Important'. (n=271)

2SLGBTQIA+ - Satisfaction (1/2)




Q: How satisfied are you with the City's job in providing the following program or service, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Very Satisfied' and 1 is 'Very Dissatisfied'.
(n=271)

2SLGBTQIA+ - Satisfaction (2/2)




Q: How satisfied are you with the City's job in providing the following program or service, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Very Satisfied' and 1 is 'Very Dissatisfied'.
(n=271)

2SLGBTQIA+ - Level of Financial Investment (1/2)



Q: What level of financial investment do you think the City should make for the following program or service on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Much more Financial Investment' and 1 is 'Much less Financial Investment'. (n=271)

2SLGBTQIA+ - Level of Financial Investment (2/2)



Q: What level of financial investment do you think the City should make for the following program or service on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Much more Financial Investment' and 1 is 'Much less Financial Investment'. (n=271)

2SLGBTQIA+ - General Comments

Comments for the City		
Theme	Percent	Sample Comments
City management needs to improve	38%	Council should focus on providing necessary services, not building legacy projects.
Homelessness should be addressed	28%	Many homeless people come to Edmonton from surrounding communities. The federal government got out of nationalized housing supports many years ago and is only just re-entering.
Crime should be decreased	21%	I am afraid to be outside alone. I have to now walk 15 minutes to and from my bus stop and I AM AFRAID TO DO SO
Improve law enforcement practices and investments	15%	Hire more bylaw officers. Also start enforcing the 30k speed limits i school zones.
Better city aesthetics/ infrastructure is needed	15%	I miss the green spaces being neat and tidy, when traveling in and around the City this has been forgotten. Leaving the City, looks less attractive.
Better road maintenance practices should be put in place	13%	Repairing alleys should come from garbage collection budget. More focus on improving vehicular mobility and less on bike lanes.
Public transit should be safer and efficient	10%	Correcting the mistakes made in the transit system re-routing and ensuring downtown is a safe place. Make sure downtown streets are free of drug use and abuse.
Bike lanes should be well managed	5%	These bike lanes impede traffic, increase pollution by congesting traffic, eliminate numerous parking spaces, reduce transit ridership.
Proper waste management is needed	5%	In addition to the big bin events, I'd love to see the city offer shredding events or even shredding services at a big bin event (secure document shredding).

Q: Based on your personal situation and what you're seeing in your community, is there anything else that you want to share with the City of Edmonton?

n = 39 respondents

This was an optional question and 'n' indicates the number of those who provided responses. The theme analysis of comments is based on n <50, and as such, these results are considered directional in nature.

October 31, 2022 - City Council | FCS01414 - Attachment 2


Indigenous Peoples



Services

- 51%** Are satisfied with the overall quality of programs and services
- 48%** Are satisfied with the quality of customer service
- 49%** Are satisfied with ease of access to services
- 40%** Are satisfied with how the city informs Edmontonians about the services they provide

Indigenous Peoples (n) = 102 respondents



Indigenous Peoples – Reasons for Ratings on Overall Quality of Services

Positives

Theme	Percent	Sample Comments
Recreation, Art and Culture	6%	I have literally been to every city attraction numerous times. I worked at the valley zoo prior to its renovation. It is quite lovely now. I enjoy or river trail pathways.

Negatives

Theme	Percent	Sample Comments
City Management	39%	I feel that there could be more volunteer engagement opportunities to get people involved and invested in city life.
Unaffordable to access amenities and services	22%	Accessibility has no priority at all in this City. It's abysmal.
Road Maintenance	17%	City management is extremely inefficient in term of the quality of the services and infrastructure provided (e.g., road maintenance, snow removal, [etc.]).
Cost	17%	Costs are too high and unfortunately households falls in the gap where they say we make enough but don't qualify for assistance, when we do not have the extra funds.
Public Transit	17%	I find our public transport is trash and vision zero is an absolute joke. I have found though more money has been put to new services things that I expect from the city have been ignored.


Q: What is the reason for your overall quality of programs and services rating?

n = 18 respondents

This was an optional question and 'n' indicates the number of those who provided responses. The theme analysis of comments is based on n <50, and as such, these results are considered directional in nature.


October 31, 2022 - City Council | FCS01414 - Attachment 2

Indigenous Peoples - Importance (1/2)




Q: How important is the following program or service on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Very Important' and 1 is 'Not at all Important'. (n=102)

Indigenous Peoples - Importance (2/2)




Q: How important is the following program or service on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Very Important' and 1 is 'Not at all Important'. (n=102)

Indigenous Peoples - Satisfaction (1/2)




Q: How satisfied are you with the City's job in providing the following program or service, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Very Satisfied' and 1 is 'Very Dissatisfied'.
(n=102)

Indigenous Peoples - Satisfaction (2/2)




Q: How satisfied are you with the City's job in providing the following program or service, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Very Satisfied' and 1 is 'Very Dissatisfied'.
(n=102)

Indigenous Peoples - Level of Financial Investment (1/2)



Q: What level of financial investment do you think the City should make for the following program or service on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Much more Financial Investment' and 1 is 'Much less Financial Investment'. (n=102)

Indigenous Peoples - Level of Financial Investment (2/2)



Q: What level of financial investment do you think the City should make for the following program or service on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Much more Financial Investment' and 1 is 'Much less Financial Investment'. (n=102)

Indigenous Peoples – General Comments

Comments for the City		
Theme	Percent	Sample Comments
City management needs to improve	52%	Trying to live within a budget is getting harder each year with a higher cost of living and property taxes being increased because the city cannot live within their budget.
Homelessness should be addressed	31%	A better plan for low income and homeless people that reside in the city of Edmonton. People do not feel safe walking downtown.
Improve law enforcement practices and investments	28%	Break ins and crimes are more and moreneed response from police otherwise they know they can get away with it because police don't respond anymore.
Crime should be decreased	24%	I think more of a public Indigenous presence would be welcomed, particularly in helping to steer municipal responses to poverty, homeless, safety, and incarceration.... Bring us into the conversation more.
Public transit should be safer and efficient	21%	I own a condo downtown...I have a hard time getting renters.. I bought it because it was close to the LRT. The LRT is no longer safe to travel on.
Bike lanes should be well managed	10%	Education for cyclists using joint use paths on respecting walkers using paths is needed including use of bells, slowing down and allowing space.
Better road maintenance practices should be put in place	10%	Fixed the potholes; It's wrecking our vehicles.
Proper waste management is needed	7%	Waste collection oh gosh what an abysmal failure. Charge pay per use not this joke of a system.

Q: Based on your personal situation and what you're seeing in your community, is there anything else that you want to share with the City of Edmonton?

n = 29 respondents

This was an optional question and 'n' indicates the number of those who provided responses. The theme analysis of comments is based on n <50, and as such, these results are considered directional in nature.

October 31, 2022 - City Council | FCS01414 - Attachment 2

Low Income* Households




Services

- 48%** Are satisfied with the overall quality of programs and services
- 49%** Are satisfied with the quality of customer service
- 51%** Are satisfied with ease of access to services
- 42%** Are satisfied with how the city informs Edmontonians about the services they provide

*This survey considered low income to be any household with income less than 30,000 dollars a year

Low income households (n) = 173 respondents



Low Income Households – Reasons for Ratings on Overall Quality of Services

Positives

Theme	Percent	Sample Comments
Recreation, Art and Culture	9%	Good rec programs and concerts and plays.
Affordable to access amenities and services	4%	Edmonton Public Library is my absolute favorite part of the city. I also really appreciate having access to a lot of city services and attractions through the leisure access program.
Others	7%	I am satisfied with the program.

Negatives


Theme	Percent	Sample Comments
Unaffordable to access amenities and services	28%	Good services remain inaccessible to low-income people (everything from expensive transit to recreational programs).
City Management	17%	A majority of the funding goes to the south side. The north, especially NW, feels ignored. Transit was severely cut, no new schools, high school has been promised for decades.
Public Transit	11%	I do not drive and so I am a regular transit user. ETS has so many issues, ranging from security to reliability, to its inordinate cost, to the way bus lines keep being cut and the Lrt delayed.
Information	9%	Finding out information can be a bit of a challenge, as the CofE call center doesn't seem too interested in helping.
Cost	9%	I also cannot afford the costs of travel or events as 90% of my income goes towards rent, bills and medical needs.
Road Maintenance	4%	Road clearing, maintenance and infrastructure seems to be ignored or done poorly and even when these things are done, they are poorly thought through.
Homelessness	4%	As I stated before, Edmonton is doing next to nothing to help people experiencing homelessness, addictions, and mental health crises...The city has the power to end homelessness immediately.

Q: What is the reason for your overall quality of programs and services rating?

n = 46 respondents


This was an optional question and 'n' indicates the number of those who provided responses. The theme analysis of comments is based on n < 50, and as such, these results are considered directional in nature.

Low Income Households - Importance (1/2)




Q: How important is the following program or service on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Very Important' and 1 is 'Not at all Important'. (n=173)

Low Income Households - Importance (2/2)




Q: How important is the following program or service on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Very Important' and 1 is 'Not at all Important'. (n=173)

Low Income Households - Satisfaction (1/2)




Q: How satisfied are you with the City's job in providing the following program or service, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Very Satisfied' and 1 is 'Very Dissatisfied'.
(n=173)

Low Income Households - Satisfaction (2/2)




Q: How satisfied are you with the City's job in providing the following program or service, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Very Satisfied' and 1 is 'Very Dissatisfied'.
(n=173)

Low Income Households - Level of Financial Investment (1/2)



Q: What level of financial investment do you think the City should make for the following program or service on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Much more Financial Investment' and 1 is 'Much less Financial Investment'. (n=173)

Low Income Households - Level of Financial Investment (2/2)



Q: What level of financial investment do you think the City should make for the following program or service on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Much more Financial Investment' and 1 is 'Much less Financial Investment'. (n=173)

Low Income Households - General Comments

Comments for the City		
Theme	Percent	Sample Comments
City management needs to improve	39%	I believe the mandate of the city is to properly maintain the city and pursue an organized plan to maintain its resources.
Crime should be decreased	30%	I don't feel safe on the LRT or walking in downtown Edmonton.
Public transit should be safer and efficient	27%	Fix the bus routes.
Homelessness should be addressed	21%	Downtown has a lot of trouble with homelessness and drug use. I've lived downtown the last 7 years and never have I seen the drug use so in the open.
Better city aesthetics/ infrastructure is needed	15%	As a senior without a car, walking on the sidewalks and trying to get bus connections has been a challenge this last year.
Improve law enforcement practices and investments	12%	For community safety, I am disappointed that a high profile tragedy and sense of crisis was used to hurriedly reverse incremental progress on police funding.
Bike lanes should be well managed	3%	I am not happy when people riding bikes are on the sidewalk and don't give you warning they are behind you and whip past.
Better road maintenance practices should be put in place	3%	I want my commute to be safe, stress-free, and simple.
Proper waste management is needed	3%	Return weekly garbage collection. Provide a recycle bin instead of forcing us to buy bags. Waste collection is costing us more with less pickup/service.

Q: Based on your personal situation and what you're seeing in your community, is there anything else that you want to share with the City of Edmonton?

n = 33 respondents

This was an optional question and 'n' indicates the number of those who provided responses. The theme analysis of comments is based on n <50, and as such, these results are considered directional in nature.

October 31, 2022 - City Council | FCS01414 - Attachment 2

Parents With Children



Services

- 59%** Are satisfied with the overall quality of programs and services
- 58%** Are satisfied with the quality of customer service
- 60%** Are satisfied with ease of access to services
- 48%** Are satisfied with how the city informs Edmontonians about the services they provide

Parents with children (n) = 936 respondents



Parents With Children – Reasons for Ratings on Overall Quality of Services

Positives

Theme	Percent	Sample Comments
Affordable to access amenities and services	3%	I have a family and I feel that there are lots of events for my kids to enjoy.
Recreation, Art and Culture	2%	Again, the libraries, rec centers, and so on are great.
Others	11%	I feel choices are available , I just choose not to use them.

Negatives


Theme	Percent	Sample Comments
City Management	21%	I am not convinced that all of the services COE provides are as effective as they could be.
Unaffordable to access amenities and services	19%	City programs seem to fill up extremely fast (swimming lessons within 15 minutes) so it's hard to access programs.
Cost	15%	I have continually found the same or better quality of instruction either privately, or in nearby communities for cheaper than the programs the COE offer.
Road Maintenance	8%	Edmonton is home to a million potholes but money is being spent on frivolous areas such as new curbs in industrial areas and snow removal is a serious problem. Snow melts, waters sits, pavement cracks.
Public Transit	7%	Transit has an issue to where I no longer take my family on it although I still use it to commute.
Information	5%	311 complaints for infill take too long.
Crime	2%	LRT had angry guy with a knife on there the last time I rode it.
Homelessness	1%	Homelessness is up, hunger is up, people are spending what little they have on necessities and as far as I can tell the city has done nothing about it.

Q: What is the reason for your overall quality of programs and services rating?

n = 130 respondents


This was an optional question and 'n' indicates the number of those who provided responses

Parents With Children - Importance (1/2)




Q: How important is the following program or service on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Very Important' and 1 is 'Not at all Important'. (n=936)

Parents With Children - Importance (2/2)




Q: How important is the following program or service on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Very Important' and 1 is 'Not at all Important'. (n=936)

Parents With Children - Satisfaction (1/2)




Q: How satisfied are you with the City's job in providing the following program or service, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Very Satisfied' and 1 is 'Very Dissatisfied'.
(n=936)

Parents With Children - Satisfaction (2/2)




Q: How satisfied are you with the City's job in providing the following program or service, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Very Satisfied' and 1 is 'Very Dissatisfied'.
(n=936)

Parents With Children - Level of Financial Investment (1/2)



Q: What level of financial investment do you think the City should make for the following program or service on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Much more Financial Investment' and 1 is 'Much less Financial Investment'. (n=936)

Parents With Children - Level of Financial Investment (2/2)



Q: What level of financial investment do you think the City should make for the following program or service on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Much more Financial Investment' and 1 is 'Much less Financial Investment'. (n=936)

Parents With Children - General Comments

Comments for the City		
Theme	Percent	Sample Comments
City management needs to improve	41%	I am dissatisfied with the dandelions and weeds in the city and would like the cities policy revisited.
Homelessness should be addressed	22%	Clean up the people living in tents, and stop giving out drugs to make safe drug use. Remove drugs from the streets
Crime should be decreased	19%	Crime is way up and I do not feel safe. My home is not safe and my children are not safe. We are in an upper-middle-class area and it is still a huge problem.
Improve law enforcement practices and investments	16%	Crime is up in my neighborhood. We need more police presence or something. Our car was vandalized in our driveway at night!
Public transit should be safer and efficient	10%	City needs supervised injection areas to help clean up the LRT. I don't feel safe using public transit.
Better city aesthetics/ infrastructure is needed	8%	Continued development and more importantly maintenance on all parks and green spaces. Many of the green spaces are not mowed nearly enough for
Better road maintenance practices should be put in place	8%	Commit more resources to repair roads within the city.
Bike lanes should be well managed	6%	Because we are a winter city, I think there is way too much focus on bike lanes and not enough focus on making vehicle traffic easier.
Proper waste management is needed	3%	Garbage bins need to be picked up every week.

Q: Based on your personal situation and what you're seeing in your community, is there anything else that you want to share with the City of Edmonton?

n = 156 respondents

This was an optional question and 'n' indicates the number of those who provided responses

People with Disabilities



Services

- 47%** Are satisfied with the overall quality of programs and services
- 52%** Are satisfied with the quality of customer service
- 47%** Are satisfied with ease of access to services
- 41%** Are satisfied with how the city informs Edmontonians about the services they provide

People with Disabilities(n) = 355 respondents



People with Disabilities – Reasons for Ratings on Overall Quality of Services

Positives

Theme	Percent	Sample Comments
Recreation, Art and Culture	9%	Edmonton puts effort into creating cultural activities.
Affordable to access amenities and services	8%	I also really appreciate having access to a lot of city services and attractions through the leisure access program.
Others	5%	I just feel that Edmonton has many things a person can join or enjoy in Edmonton.

Negatives


Theme	Percent	Sample Comments
Unaffordable to access amenities and services	22%	Any service I tried to access or rely on are slow and delayed.
City Management	18%	Edmonton programs show promise but they are grossly under promoted and under utilized.
Road Maintenance	11%	.. roads. I hit a pothole after avoiding a bigger pothole and now I have to get new tire, rim and possibly alignment done.
Information	10%	More needs to be done to communicate opportunities to low income and immigrant populations.
Cost	9%	[The city imposed] fees on things that were once free.
Public Transit	6%	As with a lot of people, I have had some bad experiences while using the transit system.
Homelessness	5%	I worry about the homeless as their wellbeing makes my wellbeing possible.
Crime	4%	I am uncomfortable with my safety in some areas of Edmonton.

Q: What is the reason for your overall quality of programs and services rating?

n = 93 respondents


This was an optional question and 'n' indicates the number of those who provided responses

People with Disabilities - Importance (1/2)




Q: How important is the following program or service on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Very Important' and 1 is 'Not at all Important'. (n=355)

People with Disabilities - Importance (2/2)




Q: How important is the following program or service on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Very Important' and 1 is 'Not at all Important'. (n=355)

People with Disabilities - Satisfaction (1/2)




Q: How satisfied are you with the City's job in providing the following program or service, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Very Satisfied' and 1 is 'Very Dissatisfied'.
(n=355)

People with Disabilities - Satisfaction (2/2)




Q: How satisfied are you with the City's job in providing the following program or service, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Very Satisfied' and 1 is 'Very Dissatisfied'.
(n=355)

People with Disabilities - Level of Financial Investment (1/2)



Q: What level of financial investment do you think the City should make for the following program or service on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Much more Financial Investment' and 1 is 'Much less Financial Investment'. (n=355)

People with Disabilities - Level of Financial Investment (2/2)



Q: What level of financial investment do you think the City should make for the following program or service on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Much more Financial Investment' and 1 is 'Much less Financial Investment'. (n=355)

People with Disabilities - General Comments

Comments for the City

Theme	Percent	Sample Comments
City management needs to improve	46%	Better management of current budgets.
Public transit should be safer and efficient	20%	I need Edmonton Transit Service to be safer. I refuse to take transit after dark.
Homelessness should be addressed	14%	Homelessness needs to be addressed more in Edmonton in general.
Crime should be decreased	12%	I live in the West End and I am unsafe walking in my neighborhood due to the amount of drug users who verbally harass us.
Improve law enforcement practices and investments	13%	Put more cash into the police.
Better city aesthetics/ infrastructure is needed	11%	I am dissatisfied with the dandelions and weeds in the city and would like the cities policy revisited.
Bike lanes should be well managed	9%	Don't spend any more money for bike lanes. Bicycle infrastructure needs to be improved.
Better road maintenance practices should be put in place	4%	Better lane and pothole maintenance.
Proper waste management is needed	3%	There should be no excuses for overflowing garbage cans and gravel from the winter at bus stops in July.

Q: Based on your personal situation and what you're seeing in your community, is there anything else that you want to share with the City of Edmonton?

n = 70 respondents

This was an optional question and 'n' indicates the number of those who provided responses

Racialized Groups



Services

- 54%** Are satisfied with the overall quality of programs and services
- 58%** Are satisfied with the quality of customer service
- 60%** Are satisfied with ease of access to services
- 46%** Are satisfied with how the city informs Edmontonians about the services they provide

Persons in racialized groups (n) = 319 respondents



Racialized Groups – Reasons for Ratings on Overall Quality of Services

Positives

Theme	Percent	Sample Comments
Recreation, Art and Culture	6%	Good rec centres, good facilities for families. Great libraries too.
Affordable to access amenities and services	6%	All the programs and services that I am interested in are readily available and at a reasonable cost.
City Management	2%	I enjoy public art installations, and the city provides these.

Negatives


Theme	Percent	Sample Comments
Unaffordable to access amenities and services	16%	Difficult to access, no recreational facility on the west end, long wait times, long commute via ETS, no playgrounds within walking distance.
Cost	14%	I enjoy the festivals, but paid events and concerts are getting very expensive.
City Management	12%	City needs to focus on core services and follow a clear long term plan and vision. Current plans and visions are not being followed.
Road Maintenance	10%	Better frequency on core services needed: snow removal and grass cutting.
Information	10%	Calling phone numbers provided in City literature with questions result in multiple transferred calls and questions not answered.
Crime	8%	It seems as though the police isn't being strict with dangerous people surrounding downtown and transit.
Public Transit	8%	Great events, but lose major points for anything that requires public transit or being downtown since both are brutal in Edmonton (everything else is great).
Homelessness	4%	Homelessness and panhandling, security and safety in downtown especially Chinatown will need to be addressed seriously.

Q: What is the reason for your overall quality of programs and services rating?

n = 49 respondents


This was an optional question and 'n' indicates the number of those who provided responses. The theme analysis of comments is based on n < 50, and as such, these results are considered directional in nature.

Racialized Groups - Importance (1/2)




Q: How important is the following program or service on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Very Important' and 1 is 'Not at all Important'. (n=319)

Racialized Groups - Importance (2/2)




Q: How important is the following program or service on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Very Important' and 1 is 'Not at all Important'. (n=319)

Racialized Groups - Satisfaction (1/2)




Q: How satisfied are you with the City's job in providing the following program or service, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Very Satisfied' and 1 is 'Very Dissatisfied'. (n=319)

Racialized Groups - Satisfaction (2/2)




Q: How satisfied are you with the City's job in providing the following program or service, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Very Satisfied' and 1 is 'Very Dissatisfied'. (n=319)

Racialized Groups - Level of Financial Investment (1/2)



Q: What level of financial investment do you think the City should make for the following program or service on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Much more Financial Investment' and 1 is 'Much less Financial Investment'. (n=319)

Racialized Groups - Level of Financial Investment (2/2)



Q: What level of financial investment do you think the City should make for the following program or service on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is 'Much more Financial Investment' and 1 is 'Much less Financial Investment'. (n=319)

Racialized Groups - General Comments

Comments for the City		
Theme	Percent	Sample Comments
Bike lanes should be well managed	47%	Control of speeding cyclists is very important - they are out of control or may be there are no regulations for them. Perhaps they should be licensed.
City management needs to improve	45%	City services are not easy to get a hold of let alone find the proper channels to contact. In terms of bylaw, animal control, and animal rescue.
Improve law enforcement practices and investments	19%	Law Enforcement/Security Must Be See In Public Transit And Neighbourhood Within City Of Edmonton.
Public transit should be safer and efficient	17%	Active and public transportation options for people living in the outskirts and suburbs of the city. It's very difficult to get from my home to downtown..the bus situation is less than ideal.
Better road maintenance practices should be put in place	17%	Winter Roads cleaning in the intersections where loads of removed snow (windrows) should be removed to a landfill area to provide safe sidewalks.
Better city aesthetics/ infrastructure is needed	11%	Edmonton should be a destination for people to want to come to live, work and play. Make it easy for people to experience and enjoy the city's unique beauty and attractions.
Homelessness should be addressed	9%	Help the homeless problem - provide housing and greater social services to them and make it accessible for them! Ask leaders of those communities for better ideas.
Crime should be decreased	9%	Resolve the homeless issues that is causing safety issues and crime all over the city.
Proper waste management is needed	5%	Fund blue bins for recycling pickup.

Q: Based on your personal situation and what you're seeing in your community, is there anything else that you want to share with the City of Edmonton?

n = 64 respondents

This was an optional question and 'n' indicates the number of those who provided responses

Additional Engagement

Methodology

Respondent Profile:

n = 4306 Edmontonians aged 13 years or older

Research Design and Respondent Selection:

- The online survey was sent to the members of the Edmonton Insight Community and it was also sent to 70+ community organizations who asked their members to fill out the survey.
- Panelists were screened to ensure that they met the minimum participation i.e., being a current resident of Edmonton and at least aged 13 years (Edmonton Insight Community) or 18 years (Online Panel).
- The first 3 digits of postal codes were used to classify respondents into specific regions i.e., central, northeast, northwest, southeast and southwest regions.



**Data
Collection
Timeline**
July 4 to July
14, 2022

**Average
Length of
Interview**
13.59 mins

**Response
Rate**
21%



Thank You
