## Special Work Session

Attend: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86988086395?
pwd=T1FTa0EwUOVoa0R0UVpUWi85dnRkZz09

## 1. ROLL CALL

## 2. BUSINESS ITEM

2.A $\underline{21-0604} 2022$ Budget Priorities

Attachments: 2021 Community Engagement and Public Opinion Survey
DRAFT 2021-2022 City of Olympia Work Plan

## 3. ADJOURNMENT

The City of Olympia is committed to the non-discriminatory treatment of all persons in employment and the delivery of services and resources. If you require accommodation for your attendance at the City Council meeting, please contact the Council's Executive Assistant at 360.753 .8244 at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting. For hearing impaired, please contact us by dialing the Washington State Relay Service at 7-1-1 or 1.800.833.6384.

## City Council

## 2022 Budget Priorities

Agenda Date: 6/15/2021
Agenda Item Number: 2.A
File Number:21-0604
Type: discussion Version: 1 Status: Other Business

## Title

2022 Budget Priorities

## Recommended Action

## Committee Recommendation:

Not referred to a committee.

## City Manager Recommendation:

Engage in a discussion on 2022 Budget Priorities.

## Report

Issue:
Whether to engage in a discussion on 2022 Budget Priorities

## Staff Contact:

Jay Burney, City Manager, 360.753.8740
Debbie Sullivan, Assistant City Manager - Strategic Initiatives, 360.753.8499

## Presenter(s):

Jay Burney, City Manager
Debbie Sullivan, Assistant City Manager - Strategic Initiatives

## Background and Analysis:

The City of Olympia's annual budget is one of the most visible and significant ways we demonstrate how the City is advancing the Community's vision and priorities as articulated in the Comprehensive Plan's Action Plan.

To ensure we are on track to achieving the community's vision, the City uses a framework called the annual Priorities, Performance, and Investment (PPI) cycle to prepare the City's annual budget. It includes three main phases: learning, engaging, and investing. First, we look at how well we are achieving our community vision based on data, we then listen to community members to affirm priorities, and then invest resources through our budget process that align with and carry out the community vision.

To prepare for the 2022 budget process, the City launched the PPI cycle of learning and engaging by

Type: discussion Version: 1 Status: Other Business
commissioning a statistically valid community engagement and public opinion survey. The City contracted with Change Research to conduct the survey in mid-March. The purpose of the survey was to assess satisfaction regarding quality of life; perception of progress on the City's Comprehensive Plan's Focus Areas; assess performance and priorities regarding City Services; opinions regarding public safety, policing, and communication.

Council received a briefing on the 2021 Community Engagement and Public Opinion Survey at their retreat on June 12. Staff also shared a draft 2021-2022 workplan for their consideration. The draft work plan is based on existing strategic plans, master plans, key council priorities, and the community's feedback through the 2021 survey.

Staff will facilitate a conversation with Council to discuss 2022 budget priorities.

## Neighborhood/Community Interest:

Opportunities for citizens to engage with the City on budget priorities are of high community interest.

## Options:

1. Hold the Work Session.
2. Do not hold the Work Session.
3. Hold the Work Session at another time.

## Attachments:

2021 Community Engagement and Public Opinion Survey DRAFT 2021-2022 City of Olympia Work Plan

## City of Olympia

## Community

engagement and public opinion survey

## June 2021



## Overview

The City of Olympia seeks to measure public opinion around quality of life, issues of interest, delivery of city services, and community priorities, in order to better evaluate potential policies and plans and guide strategic decisions. On behalf of the City, Change Research designed and administered two online surveys of residents of Olympia to measure public opinion among the city's diverse population.

The surveys were designed primarily to assess residents' quality of life and satisfaction with public services. This included a detailed view of Olympians' perception of progress on the priorities set forth in the City's 2014 Comprehensive Plan's Action Plan-public health and safety, community, livability, downtown, the economy, environment, and neighborhoods-as well as their priorities for city services, priorities for downtown, and opinions on addressing homelessness.

In addition, the surveys were developed in conjunction with specific planning processes. In early 2021, the City launched a 3-5 year strategic communications planning process, which the communications and engagement section of the survey was designed to support. Separately, a public engagement process was launched the summer of 2020 to both form a Social Justice and Equity Commission and the Reimagine Public Safety process, in response to the City Council's direction to address systemic racism, bias, and inequities. To complement that process, a section of the survey was designed to measure residents' perceptions of public safety, the criminal justice system, and policing in Olympia.
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## Methodology and sample

Change Research surveyed 515 adults living in Olympia, WA from March 16-23, 2021, and 400 adults living in Olympia, WA from May 8-17, 2021. We used some or all of the following sources to recruit respondents:

- targeted advertisements on Facebook
- targeted advertisements on Instagram
- targeted advertisements on individual websites via Google and/or Facebook's ad platform
- text messages sent, via the echo19 platform, to cell phone numbers listed on the WA voter file for individuals who qualified for the survey's sample universe

Regardless of which of these sources a respondent came from, they were directed to a survey hosted on SurveyMonkey's website.

Ads placed targeted adults living in the city of Olympia. As the survey fielded, Change Research used dynamic online sampling: lowering budgets for ads targeting groups that were overrepresented and raising budgets for ads targeting groups that were underrepresented, to maximize the representativeness of the final sample across different groups.

The surveys were conducted on behalf of the City of Olympia and conducted online by Change Research. Post-stratification was performed on age, gender, education, race/ethnicity, housing tenure, and self-reported 2020 vote among those who reported voting. Weighting parameters were based on the demographic composition of adults living within city boundaries, based on 2015-2019 American Community Survey estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. That is, if a given age bracket or gender group represented $x \%$ of adults based on ACS estimates, then that same group would be weighted to about $\mathrm{x} \%$ in this survey.

The modeled margin of error ${ }^{1}$ is $4.8 \%$ for the first survey and $5.8 \%$ for the second, which uses the effective sample size ${ }^{2}$ that adjusts for the design effect of weighting. The design effect, which can roughly be interpreted as the effect of sample weights set on respondents such that a completely unweighted survey would have a design effect of 1 , is $1.24^{3}$ for the first survey and 1.40 for the second.

[^0]The samples are composed as follows, shown next to comparable American Community Survey five-year estimates from 2015-2019 for Olympia demographics.

| Demographics of sample, compared to demographics of Olympia |  | Respondents (survey 1) | Respondents (survey 2) | \% of respondents (weighted) | Census Bureau estimates for Olympia, ACS 15-19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Women | 276 | 214 | 51\% | 53\% |
|  | Men | 213 | 167 | 45\% | 47\% |
|  | Other | 26 | 19 | 4\% |  |
| Age range | 18-34 | 123 | 99 | 32\% | 32\% |
|  | 35-49 | 144 | 108 | 25\% | 25\% |
|  | 50-64 | 117 | 101 | 21\% | 21\% |
|  | 65 or older | 121 | 85 | 21\% | 21\% |
|  | Refused | 10 | 7 | 1\% |  |
| Race/ethnicity | White (non-Hispanic) | 429 | 338 | 78\% | 79\% |
|  | Hispanic or Latino/a | 31 | 20 | 7\% | 7\% |
|  | Asian / Pacific Islander | 15 | 11 | 8\% | 8\% |
|  | Black or African American | 14 | 10 | 3\% |  |
|  | Other | 26 | 21 | 4\% |  |
| Education | Bachelor's or higher | 265 | 199 | 45\% | 44\% |
|  | Some college or less | 245 | 197 | 55\% | 56\% |
|  | Refused | 5 | 4 | 1\% |  |
| Tenure | Homeowner | 256 | 199 | 45\% | $51 \%^{4}$ |
|  | Tenant | 198 | 157 | 42\% | 49\% ${ }^{5}$ |
|  | Unit owned/rented by friend or family | 45 | 34 | 10\% |  |
|  | Refused | 16 | 10 | 3\% |  |

[^1]Change Research's sampling methodology is well-equipped to ensure that responses accurately reflect the opinion of Olympia residents and not those who may work in or visit Olympia, whose opinion may still be of value to the City but is out of scope for this research.

In past public opinion research where we have asked respondents for enough identifying information to match them to public records, such as state records of registered voters, our own testing has confirmed that it is extremely uncommon for us to get responses from people outside the targeted geographic population. This includes research in small, gerrymandered electoral districts as well as municipalities bordering on unincorporated areas or containing enclaves.

In addition, although this research was conducted for entirely non-political purposes, electoral outcomes provide a uniquely objective benchmark to assess our technology's ability to deliver accurate results in very specific geographies. In 2020, our private and public polling was nearly $25 \%$ more accurate than other polls in presidential battleground states. For more on this topic, please see our 2020 accuracy report.

Additional measures to ensure accurate representation of Olympia's population include:

- Using advertising platforms' accurate geolocation of respondents. That is, Change Research does not have direct access to personally identifiable information but is able to provide granular geographic targeting specifications to advertising platforms. Platforms such as Google or Facebook can accurately derive location at given times from sources including GPS-based locations, past activity on search or social media, IP address, or nearby Wi-Fi or mobile network signals.
- Filtering based on details provided directly on the survey instrument, such as volunteered zip code.
- Generally not relying on incentivizing respondents, as online panel providers tend to do, meaning that we do not need to worry about people speeding through surveys to earn rewards.
- Using proprietary technology that tests for anomalies in both individual responses and patterns of responses to find and remove suspicious responses.

For more information, please contact Alex Chen at alexchen [at] changeresearch.com.

## Key findings at a glance

Residents are deeply concerned about homelessness, housing, and related issues.

- Open-ends consistently tie homelessness to a web of other topics, including crime and public safety or mental health or substance abuse resources.
- The vast majority of respondents include housing and homelessness services in their top three priorities for city government, and the vast majority say they are dissatisfied with the city's housing and homelessness services.
- Residents support multiple different approaches to addressing homelessness by wide margins, but think the most important ways are expanding access to mental health treatment, preventing and removing new homeless encampments, and building more supportive housing.
- When asked about strategies to increase the stock of affordable housing, residents support a number of general approaches by wide margins, including encouraging "lowand moderate-income housing" and "allowing...smaller, more affordable units in all areas of the city."


## Olympians see the city doing well on many of its strategic goals and see room for improvement on housing, economy, and downtown.

- When presented with six categories of City-defined strategic goals, more residents agree than disagree that the city is meeting goals relating to the environment, livability, neighborhoods, and public health and safety.
- Residents disagree more than agree that the city is meeting goals relating to downtown and the economy.
- Thinking about downtown, residents believe that there are not enough city staff of all kinds-including police foot patrols, unarmed crisis responders, Clean Team staff, and downtown ambassadors. Residents are most pessimistic about homelessness and public safety downtown.
- Despite concerns, residents are generally optimistic about the direction of shops and restaurants downtown, as well as events, arts, and culture downtown.


## Olympians are satisfied with many core city services but dissatisfied with those they consider most important.

- The most salient city services in residents' eyes are housing and homelessness services by a large margin, followed by police, economic development, climate change, and street repair and maintenance. Most residents are dissatisfied with the services that residents consider most important, on average.
- High-satisfaction, lower-salience services include drinking water ( $10 \%$ dissatisfied), emergency medical response ( $8 \%$ dissatisfied), fire services ( $3 \%$ dissatisfied), parks and recreation facilities ( $17 \%$ dissatisfied), and stormwater and sewer services (14\% dissatisfied).


## Feelings of safety are lower than in previous research, particularly around downtown.

- Broadly, $79 \%$ of residents think downtown is on the wrong track, $59 \%$ feel safe downtown during the day, and $24 \%$ feel safe downtown at night.
- While feelings of safety in residents' neighborhoods during the day are stable relative to research conducted by the CIty in 2017, feelings of safety in downtown are lower.

Trust in local law enforcement is paired with significant appetite for reforms.

- $42 \%$ of residents are satisfied with police services and $32 \%$ are dissatisfied.
- $31 \%$ say they trust the criminal justice system, $46 \%$ say they trust Olympia police, and $50 \%$ agree that police treat people with dignity and respect.
- $54 \%$ agree that there are many things about the police that need to be changed, and $49 \%$ agree that the police are not consistent in applying the rules.


## Residents see many opportunities for the City to engage more fully with people and neighborhoods, particularly through digital and online channels.

- $28 \%$ agree that neighborhoods are engaged in decision making, and 40\% disagree. 29\% agree that residents can be involved in City decision-making, and $16 \%$ feel confident that the City listens to resident feedback.
- In a top-three closed-ended question, $52 \%$ say they prefer to hear about what is happening via social media, $40 \%$ say the City website, and $36 \%$ say email. For most current or potential official communication channels tested, at least one in ten says they prefer that channel, suggesting a long tail of modes of communication to coordinate.
- Social media, word of mouth are common sources of information about what is happening in Olympia, suggesting a strong social fabric tying residents together.


## General outlook

After over a year in the shadow of the COVID-19 pandemic, Olympians are split between optimism and pessimism. 49\% of respondents say that things in Olympia in general are going in the right direction and $51 \%$ say that things are off on the wrong track. Residents are much more optimistic, relatively, when asked about their own neighborhoods ( $71 \%$ right direction, $29 \%$ wrong track), and much more pessimistic about downtown ( $21 \%$ right direction, $79 \%$ wrong track).


A later section covers residents' opinions about downtown in more detail..

## Olympians satisfied with the city as a place to live, work, play

When asked about general satisfaction with Olympia as a place to live, $38 \%$ of residents rate the city excellent or very good, $32 \%$ rate it poor or only fair, and $30 \%$ rate it satisfactory. Average satisfaction with neighborhoods as places to live is much higher: $58 \%$ of residents rate their neighborhoods excellent or very good, $14 \%$ rate them poor or only fair, and $28 \%$ rate them satisfactory. The response scale here was chosen for direct comparison to previous research; compared to a 2017 survey of residents, ratings for overall satisfaction as a place to live have generally declined: while just over 2 in 3 residents rated the city satisfactory or better in this survey, 9 in 10 rated it satisfactory or better in 2017.

Although residents of color ${ }^{6}$, on average, offer poorer ratings of the city as a place to live (28\% excellent or very good) than white residents do ( $40 \%$ excellent or very good), there is not enough

[^2]evidence to suggest that race alone is a factor when holding other demographic factors constant. Rather, age and education, which vary considerably by race in the city, stand out-on average, holding other factors constant, an increase in age by a decade is associated with a slight increase on this poor-to-excellent scale, and having a college education is associated with a moderate increase on the scale. ${ }^{7}$ Obtaining these differences by chance is unlikely in a model where age and educational attainment are not associated with differences in satisfaction with the city.

Respondents are most satisfied with Olympia as a place to experience nature and the outdoors ( $80 \%$ satisfied, $12 \%$ unsatisfied) and least satisfied with the city as a place to retire ( $41 \%$ satisfied, $33 \%$ unsatisfied, $26 \%$ neutral). Majorities are also satisfied with Olympia as a place to raise a family ( $52 \%$ satisfied), as a place to work ( $50 \%$ satisfied), and as a place to experience arts and culture (55\% satisfied).

Satisfaction with Olympia as a potential retirement destination tends to increase as age increases: of Olympians 65 and older, $62 \%$ say they are satisfied with Olympia as a place to retire, compared to $26 \%$ satisfied / 39\% dissatisfied among those younger than 35.

[^3]
## Most residents agree that Olympia is a welcoming community

Respondents were asked to agree or disagree with a few statements about belonging, acceptance, and respect in Olympia. Overall, $61 \%$ agreed with the statement "I feel like a real part of Olympia," $32 \%$ agreed that "It is hard for people like me to be accepted in Olympia," and 63\% agreed that "People in Olympia respect different perspectives and backgrounds." Responses to each of these are correlated, suggesting that they are measuring at least in part common things. ${ }^{8}$


Residents of color are more likely than white residents to agree that it is hard for people like them to be accepted in the city: $46 \%$ of POC agree, while $32 \%$ of white residents agree. This difference holds when holding other demographic factors constant. In the same regression, holding all else constant, men ( $37 \%$ agree) are also much more likely than women ( $28 \%$ agree) to agree with this statement, as are residents without a bachelor's degree or higher ( $38 \%$ agree) compared to those with one ( $25 \%$ agree). While not conclusive, the data suggest that the effects of race are not necessarily consistent across all residents: for example, white non-college men ( $42 \%$ agree, $n=93$ ) are particularly likely to agree that it is hard for people like them to be accepted. ${ }^{9}$

Response patterns also vary by education and gender for the other two statements about Olympia being inclusive or welcoming. Although on average, residents of color are still more negative than white residents, e.g. 52\% of POC agree with "People in Olympia respect different perspectives and backgrounds" when $66 \%$ of white residents agree, there is not enough evidence to suggest that this difference holds when other demographic factors are held constant.

[^4]
## Strategic goals and city services

Respondents were asked whether the City is meeting its strategic goals. On 17 out of 24 goals, residents agree more than disagree that the city is meeting them. Out of six categories of goals, residents agree more than disagree on goals for the environment, livability, neighborhoods, and public health and safety; more disagree than agree that the city is meeting goals for downtown and the economy. Highlighted cells indicate a majority or plurality of responses.

| "Do you agree or disagree with each of the following?" | Agree | Disagree | Neutral |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Olympians have opportunities for a daily connection to nature | 80\% | 8\% | 12\% |
| Olympians have opportunities for recreation | 71\% | 14\% | 15\% |
| Neighborhoods have nearby access to goods and services | 69\% | 11\% | 21\% |
| Olympia's water supply is safe and reliable | 68\% | 10\% | 22\% |
| Olympia has protected water resources and natural areas | 61\% | 19\% | 20\% |
| Olympians value diversity | 57\% | 23\% | 20\% |
| Downtown has engaging arts and entertainment | 52\% | 29\% | 19\% |
| Olympia's transportation system has safe transportation options for everyone | 51\% | 24\% | 25\% |
| The city responds to emergencies quickly | 49\% | 24\% | 27\% |
| Neighborhoods are safe and welcoming places to live | 46\% | 31\% | 23\% |
| Olympia has thriving, independent, and locally owned businesses | 46\% | 37\% | 17\% |
| Neighborhoods have distinctive places and gathering spaces | 41\% | 27\% | 32\% |
| Olympia keeps its connections to our culture and history | 41\% | 30\% | 29\% |
| Public infrastructure in the city is well-maintained | 41\% | 39\% | 20\% |
| Olympia is prepared for emergencies | 38\% | 29\% | 32\% |
| Olympia embraces a waste-free culture | 38\% | 36\% | 26\% |
| Olympia is a leader on climate action | 33\% | 27\% | 40\% |
| Olympia has a stable and resilient economy | 33\% | 38\% | 29\% |
| Residents have adequate food and shelter | 32\% | 50\% | 19\% |
| Neighborhoods are engaged in community decision making | 28\% | 40\% | 32\% |
| Downtown is a vibrant urban destination | 22\% | 61\% | 16\% |
| Residents are economically secure with opportunities to prosper | 21\% | 54\% | 26\% |
| Residents can access affordable and stable housing | 18\% | 69\% | 13\% |
| Downtown has a mix of housing for all income levels | 16\% | 64\% | 21\% |

Statements were designed to evaluate residents' perceptions of how well the city is meeting strategic goals and to understand areas where residents think the city is doing well or not. In most cases, they should not be taken as direct measurements of 'performance' on goals, in part due to ambiguity. The same statement can mean very different things to different residents: e.g. when agreeing or disagreeing with "The city responds to emergencies quickly," respondents may differ in what they think the acceptable threshold is for emergency response times; may differ in whether they are thinking about fire, EMS, or police; and may differ in what kind of response times they themselves have witnessed, if they have dialed 911 at all.

Residents were also asked to rate their level of satisfaction with city services. Again, in most cases, these ratings should not be understood as 'performance' but rather as important reflections of how residents think about services. Highlighted cells indicate a majority or a plurality of responses:

| "How satisfied are you with how the city is doing on each of the following?" | Satisfied | Dissatisfied | Neither |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fire services | 64\% | 3\% | 33\% |
| Drinking water | 66\% | 10\% | 24\% |
| Emergency medical response | 57\% | 8\% | 36\% |
| Garbage, recycling, and organics collection | 57\% | 24\% | 19\% |
| Parks and recreation facilities | 60\% | 17\% | 24\% |
| Stormwater and sewer services | 46\% | 14\% | 40\% |
| Arts and community events | 49\% | 21\% | 31\% |
| Recreation programs and classes | 42\% | 18\% | 40\% |
| Police services | 42\% | 32\% | 26\% |
| Climate change mitigation and adaptation | 30\% | 25\% | 45\% |
| Building permits and inspections | 18\% | 22\% | 59\% |
| Code enforcement | 19\% | 34\% | 47\% |
| Street repair and maintenance | 35\% | 42\% | 23\% |
| Sidewalk repair and maintenance | 33\% | 40\% | 27\% |
| Parking services | 29\% | 40\% | 30\% |
| Economic development | 26\% | 42\% | 33\% |
| Housing and homelessness services | 6\% | 87\% | 7\% |

In a top-three closed-ended question, residents were asked to choose up to three items in the list of city services as priorities for city government in the next year. $83 \%$ of respondents selected "housing and homelessness services" as one of their top three, trailed by police services at $33 \%$,
economic development at $33 \%$, climate change mitigation and adaptation at $26 \%$, and street repair and maintenance at $22 \%$.

When residents think about what kinds of city services are important, the data suggest they respond with city services they think should be most improved. Among residents who selected these issues in their top three, satisfaction is as follows:

|  |  | Among all respondents |  | Among respondents who prioritize this service |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Satisfaction for most common priorities | \% top <br> three | Satisfied | Dissatisfied | Satisfied | Dissatisfied |
| Housing and homelessness services | 83\% | 6\% | 87\% | 4\% | 90\% |
| Police services | 33\% | 42\% | 32\% | 40\% | 47\% |
| Economic development | 33\% | 26\% | 42\% | 26\% | 49\% |
| Climate change mitigation and adaptation | 26\% | 30\% | 25\% | 39\% | 31\% |
| Street repair and maintenance | 22\% | 35\% | 42\% | 17\% | 72\% |

For all of these top priorities except climate change mitigation and adaptation, dissatisfaction among residents who put these services in their top three for the city to prioritize tends to be higher than among residents who do not think these are top-three priorities. That is, those who think each of these services are important for the city tend to be more dissatisfied with how things are going.

## Olympians deeply concerned about homelessness

In a city where homelessness has been front and center in previous public opinion research, and in a county where the unhoused population has risen sharply in recent years, ${ }^{10}$ response patterns suggest deep concern among Olympians about housing and homelessness, among other interrelated issues, and broad support for the city to address these issues in a number of ways.

Respondents used every opportunity throughout the surveys to express concern about unhoused Olympians. The vast majority of respondents-in every major demographic group-named

[^5]housing and homelessness services among their top three priorities among city services, and out of the seven strategic goals that more respondents disagreed than agreed that the city is meeting, six can be reasonably interpreted as relating in some way to basic needs and opportunity.

- $18 \%$ of respondents agree and $69 \%$ disagree that "Residents can access affordable and stable housing." Strong disagreement with this statement (42\%) considerably outpaces strong agreement (5\%).
- Separately, just $16 \%$ agree that "Downtown has a mix of housing for all income levels" and $64 \%$ disagree. Again, strong disagreement (42\%) is much higher than strong agreement (5\%).
- Half of respondents disagree with "Residents have adequate food and shelter," and 32\% agree.
- $54 \%$ disagree that "Residents are economically secure with opportunities to prosper," and 21\% agree.
- $61 \%$ of respondents disagree that "Downtown is a vibrant urban destination," and $22 \%$ agree.
- $38 \%$ disagree that "Olympia has a stable and resilient economy," while $33 \%$ agree. This is a much smaller gap than for statements above.

Both access to shelter and services and managing the impacts of encampments on the surrounding area are important to residents. In a top-two closed-ended question in a second survey, $39 \%$ of residents say that expanding access to mental health treatment is among the most important ways to address homelessness in Olympia, $38 \%$ include preventing and removing new homeless encampments, $30 \%$ say building more supportive housing, $20 \%$ say expanding access to substance abuse treatment, and $18 \%$ say prohibiting and responding to open fires, pollution, and waste accumulation.

## Which of the following do you think are the most important ways to address homelessness in Olympia? Please select up to two.

| Category | \% top two |
| :--- | ---: |
| Expanding access to mental health treatment | 39 |
| Preventing and removing new homeless encampments | 38 |
| Building more supportive housing | 30 |
| Expanding access to substance abuse treatment | 20 |
| Prohibiting and responding to open fires, pollution, and waste accumulation | 18 |
| Identifying appropriate locations for homeless services outside downtown |  |
| Olympia | 15 |


| Increasing presence of law enforcement | 12 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Increasing presence of unarmed crisis responders | 11 |
| Other | 8 |
| None of the above | 0 |

Residents 50 to 64 years old are among the most likely to prioritize preventing and removing new encampments; prohibiting and responding to open fires, pollution, and waste accumulation; and identifying appropriate locations for homeless services outside downtown Olympia. Women are more likely to prioritize expanding access to mental health treatment and building more supportive housing than men, on average.

While specific priorities for addressing homelessness may differ, residents support all of the items tested by wide margins. Increasing presence of law enforcement, while receiving the most opposition of any items tested ( $27 \%$ oppose), still has the support of $70 \%$ of residents as a way to address homelessness. At the other end, expanding access to mental health treatment at the other end receives nearly unanimous support ( $97 \%$ support, $2 \%$ oppose).

When it comes to addressing homelessness in Olympia, do you support or oppose each of the following?


## Smaller segment concerned about housing burden and economic insecurity

While most Olympians are concerned about homelessness, a significantly smaller but still sizable group is personally concerned about economic or housing insecurity, particularly in the wake of COVID-19. Most respondents-over two thirds-say they feel safe from losing their job or income, and $70 \%$ say they feel safe from losing their housing.

Younger residents and residents of color feel more risk of housing and economic insecurity. Residents under 35 are among the least likely to feel safe from losing their housing: 34\% say they feel unsafe about this, compared to $18 \%$ of those 65 or older. When controlling for housing tenure (owner or renter), age is no longer significantly associated with different responses, but the fact that the typical tenant is younger than the typical homeowner still means younger residents feel more housing insecurity. Residents of color are also much less likely than white residents to feel safe from losing their housing ( $57 \%$ safe among POC, $74 \%$ safe among white residents), even when homeownership and other factors are held constant.

To a lesser degree, younger residents and residents of color are more likely to express worry about economic insecurity than older residents and white residents, respectively. The effect is not significant when housing tenure is accounted for, but $57 \%$ of residents of color feel unsafe from losing their job or income, while $69 \%$ of white residents say so. Those with lower than a bachelor's degree are also much more likely, other factors held constant, than those with a bachelor's or higher to feel unsafe from losing job or income.

Concretely, when asked about their experiences last year, $12 \%$ of residents recall being late on a rent or mortgage payment, $14 \%$ recall being late on a utility payment, and $23 \%$ recall having difficulty paying for food, groceries, or essential expenses. These experiences are more heavily concentrated among renters than owners, and significantly more among residents under 50 than those 50 or older. Contrary to the pattern in feelings of housing insecurity, these experiences appear to be more prevalent among white residents than POC.

In the last year, have you or your household experienced any of the following? Please
check all that apply or indicate if none do.

| Category | $\%$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Lost your job or business | 19 |
| Lost income or hours | 35 |
| Moved in with family or friends | 6 |
| Moved to a less expensive neighborhood | 3 |
| Had difficulty paying for food, groceries, or essential expenses | 23 |


| Been late on a rent or mortgage payment | 12 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Been late on a utility payment | 14 |
| Been evicted | 1 |
| Become homeless | 1 |
| None of the above | 49 |

Looking ahead to the next year, more Olympians feel confident and optimistic about their own household income and their personal finances than not-but more are worried than confident about their housing costs and about the local economy in Olympia.


## Broad support for some increased density and incentivizing affordable housing

Asked about different strategies for addressing affordable housing across the city, residents support encouraging low- and moderate-income housing and some forms of greater density, with $70 \%-80 \%$ support. Out of all items tested, residents are least in support of "reducing regulations and restrictions on private housing development," but a majority of 53\% still support and 30\% oppose this. There is markedly lower support for "using taxpayer dollars to encourage building
low- and moderate-income housing" (70\% support) than "incentivizing developers who build lowand moderate-income housing" ( $80 \%$ support). This gap points to some sensitivity around directly allocating city funds to support housing construction.


These questions were asked about Olympia in general, and residents may feel differently about specific projects proposed in their own neighborhoods.

## Downtown attitudes linked to homelessness, public safety

As we saw above when discussing residents' overall outlook, feelings about downtown are significantly more pessimistic than feelings about the city as a whole. In a second survey, while residents are pessimistic about homelessness and public safety downtown, they are much more optimistic about the direction of arts, culture, and commerce downtown-64\% say that shops and restaurants downtown are going in the right direction and 62\% say events, arts, and culture downtown are heading in the right direction. Homelessness downtown (14\% right direction, 86\% wrong track) and public safety downtown ( $27 \%$ right direction, $73 \%$ wrong track) are on the other end of the spectrum.


In a closed-ended, top-three question, 61\% say that "people having mental health crises" are among their top three concerns downtown; 52\% say trash, litter, graffiti, and hygiene; $49 \%$ say people not having access to permanent shelter, and $47 \%$ say public drug use. Of less relative concern are lack of lighting at night (4\%), traffic (2\%), and parking (12\%).

Which of the following most concern you about downtown Olympia? Please select up to three.

| Category | \% top three |
| :--- | ---: |
| People having mental health crises | 61 |
| Trash, litter, graffiti, and hygiene | 52 |


| People not having access to permanent shelter | 49 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Public drug use | 47 |
| Public demonstrations by armed protestors | 21 |
| Lack of visible law enforcement | 17 |
| Parking availability and pricing | 12 |
| Lack of lighting at night | 4 |
| Traffic | 2 |
| Other | 13 |

Asked about the pace of developing housing, office space, shops, and restaurants downtown, $20 \%$ of residents say that there is too much new development downtown, $43 \%$ say that there is about the right amount, and $37 \%$ say there is not enough new development downtown.

Residents generally say that there are not enough city employees downtown of all kinds: 71\% say that there are not enough city staff removing garbage and graffiti, $70 \%$ say that there are not enough unarmed crisis responders, $62 \%$ say there are not enough police foot patrols, and $58 \%$ say that there are not enough downtown ambassadors.


## Downtown residents more optimistic about downtown

Mood about downtown tends to differ by area of residence, with respondents who identified themselves as living in downtown Olympia more positive about the area compared to residents of other neighborhoods: over a third of downtown residents say that downtown is going in the right direction, compared to under one in five residents of other neighborhoods. This noticeable difference between the responses of downtown residents and those of other residents persists after holding gender, age, and race/ethnicity constant. ${ }^{11}$


At the same time, downtown residents, on average, are more negative when asked about their own neighborhoods than residents of other neighborhoods: 48\% of downtown residents and 75\% of residents in other neighborhoods say that things in their neighborhoods are on the right track. The effect of self-identified neighborhood of residency persists after controlling for the same demographic factors. ${ }^{12}$

This dynamic suggests differences in public opinion about downtown between Olympians who live downtown and Olympians who do not. That is, residents who live there tend to be rosier about the area's prospects than residents who do not live there; at the same time, downtown

[^6]residents do perceive their neighborhoods more negatively than residents in other neighborhoods perceive their own surroundings.

## Olympians see the city doing well across many other areas

More residents agree than disagree "the city responds to emergencies quickly" (49\% agree, 24\% disagree), and that "Olympia is prepared for emergencies" (38\% agree, 29\% disagree), covering important goals for the city's public safety departments. Specifically, more residents are satisfied than dissatisfied with fire services (64\% satisfied), emergency medical response (57\% satisfied), and police services ( $42 \%$ satisfied, $32 \%$ dissatisfied).

When it comes to the wide range of public works responsibilities, more residents agree than disagree that "Olympia's water supply is safe and reliable" (68\% agree, 10\% disagree) and residents are split evenly on "public infrastructure in the city is well-maintained," (41\% agree, 39\% disagree). Residents are net satisfied with drinking water (66\% satisfied); stormwater and sewer services ( $46 \%$ satisfied, $14 \%$ dissatisfied); and garbage, recycling, and organics collection (57\% satisfied). Residents are net dissatisfied with street repair and maintenance (35\% satisfied, 42\% dissatisfied) and sidewalk repair and maintenance (33\% satisfied, 40\% dissatisfied).

Conservation, recreation, and culture are seen as strong points of life in the city. Olympians agree most strongly that "Olympians have opportunities for a daily connection to nature" ( $80 \%$ agree) and that "Olympians have opportunities for recreation" ( $71 \%$ agree). Majorities also agree that "Olympia has protected water resources and natural areas" ( $61 \%$ agree, 19\% disagree) and that "Downtown has engaging arts and entertainment" (52\% agree, 29\% disagree).

Neighborhoods are also generally perceived well: a 69\% majority agrees that "neighborhoods have nearby access to goods and services," a $46 \%$ plurality agrees that "neighborhoods are safe and welcoming places to live," and a $41 \%$ plurality agrees that "neighborhoods have distinctive places and gathering spaces."

## Residents split on climate, sustainability

When asked about goals related to climate and sustainability, residents are divided. 33\% agree that "Olympia is a leader on climate action," $27 \%$ agree, and a plurality of $40 \%$ is neutral. Similarly, $38 \%$ agree that "Olympia embraces a waste-free culture," $36 \%$ disagree, and $26 \%$ are neutral. These results could suggest a wide variety of interpretations among residents of the question, including what it means to have a waste-free culture or to be a leader on climate action, as well as uncertainty about what progress is being made on these.

Among those who consider climate change mitigation and adaptation among their top three priorities for the city, a slim plurality (39\%) says it is satisfied with how the city is doing on this. This
stands out among top issues-for nearly every other top-tier priority, those who say it is a priority also tend to be more dissatisfied with the service than other residents. More than for other priorities, this result suggests more uncertainty about the current state of climate action among residents who think this is a priority and perhaps more positive perceptions of actions.

Data suggest that younger residents are more likely than older residents to put climate change mitigation and adaptation in their top three priorities for the city ( $33 \%$ top three among 18-34, 19\% top three among 65 or older), but more variation is explained by educational attainment (34\% top three among all those with a bachelor's or higher, 19\% top three among those with some college or less).

## Plurality of Olympians do not believe neighborhoods are engaged in decision making

Asked about the statement, "Neighborhoods are engaged in community decision making," 40\% of residents disagreed and $28 \%$ agreed. There appear to be rather non-linear differences in age, with nearly half of 18-34 year olds and over half of 50-64 year olds in disagreement, while other age groups are split relatively evenly on this statement. Beyond age, education also appears to play a key role: $35 \%$ of those with a bachelor's degree or higher agree that neighborhoods are engaged, while just $21 \%$ of those with some college or less agree.

Just under a third of respondents selected 'Neutral' in response to this statement, a somewhat larger proportion than we see for other statements tested. These midpoint responses could be interpreted in a variety of ways, including "it depends," "don't care," "don't know", "unsure," or "neither agree nor disagree."

## Public safety

In 2020, the Olympia City Council directed city staff to address systemic racism, bias, and inequities. In early 2021, staff launched a public engagement process to form a Social Justice and Equity Commission and reimagine public safety, and part of this survey was designed to begin to assess residents' perceptions of public safety in service of that engagement.

While a majority (53\%) of residents surveyed say they felt very safe or somewhat safe in Olympia, this represents a much lower proportion of respondents than in a 2017 survey, in which $92 \%$ said they felt safe in general. When asked about individual categories of safety, residents feel most unsafe from harassment ( $54 \%$ somewhat unsafe or very unsafe), violence ( $53 \%$ somewhat unsafe or very unsafe), and theft (56\% somewhat unsafe or very unsafe).

## Feelings of safety in Olympia

In general, how safe do you feel in Olympia? / How safe do you feel from...


This survey also tracked past survey questions asking about perceived safety in neighborhoods and downtown, during the day and at night. Overall patterns are similar to those in previous research: residents feel safest in their neighborhoods during the day and least safe downtown at night. Compared to previous research, feelings of safety have decreased in all except neighborhoods during the day, most steeply for downtown: 61\% felt unsafe downtown at night in 2017, while $76 \%$ feel unsafe today; $78 \%$ felt safe downtown during the day in 2017, while $59 \%$ feel safe today; $86 \%$ felt safe in their neighborhoods at night in 2017, while $75 \%$ feel unsafe today.

## Feelings of safety in different neighborhoods

How safe do you feel in [downtown Olympia / your neighborhood] [during the day / at night]?


In response to a separate set of questions about Olympia police, residents express both positive views of police behavior and a desire for change.

That is, $50 \%$ of respondents agree that "the police treat people with dignity and respect," while $54 \%$ separately agree that "there are many things about the police and their policies that need to be changed." These are not mutually exclusive-among respondents who agree with the statement about dignity and respect, $36 \%$ also agree that many things need change; looked at another way, among those who agree that many things need change, $34 \%$ also agree that the police treat people with dignity and respect. That is, in a national environment that has seen increased discussion about local law enforcement in the last year, residents hold nuanced views about both the current state of policing in Olympia and the path forward:

- $31 \%$ of residents strongly trust or somewhat trust the criminal justice system in Olympia to act in the best interest of Olympia residents; $47 \%$ distrust; and $23 \%$ say neither
- $46 \%$ agree that "I trust the police to make decisions that are good for everyone in the city"; $33 \%$ disagree; and $20 \%$ are neutral
- $49 \%$ agree that "the police are not consistent in how they apply the rules to people;" $24 \%$ disagree, and $27 \%$ are neutral

Taken together, responses to the five statements specifically relating to police are all highly intercorrelated. ${ }^{13}$

In an open-ended question about what makes them feel most unsafe in the city, over a third of residents volunteer an answer about homelessness. The next most common categories are drug use, policing, and crime. Residents think about policing in disparate ways: some naming issues with police conduct and protests in 2020, e.g. "Copious amounts of teargas applied to the general public", and other naming issues with not enough patrols, e.g. "Homeless harassment and lack of police patrols." In general, many verbatims mention homelessness, drug use, mental health / crisis resources, police, or crime together in the same response.
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## Many things need to be changed

Do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about Olympia police?
There are many things about police and their policies that need to be changed.


## Dignity and respect

Do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about Olympia police?
The police treat people with dignity and respect.


## Downtown residents feel safer downtown than others

Safety in different areas, by neighborhood of residence
How safe do you feel in [downtown Olympia / your neighborhood] [during the day / at night]?


Perceptions of downtown have worsened compared to prior research across the board, but just as downtown residents differ from other residents in their overall assessment of downtown, they differ on safety as well.

- While $21 \%$ of other residents feel safe downtown at night, $37 \%$ of downtown residents feel safe downtown at night
- While $57 \%$ of other residents feel safe downtown during the day, $68 \%$ of downtown residents feel safe downtown during the day.

Downtown residents' perceived safety in their own neighborhoods, whether during the day or at night, is markedly worse, on average, than other residents' perceived safety in their own neighborhoods. These differences between downtown residents and other residents persist when controlling for other demographic factors.

## Younger residents, non-college educated, and POC feel less safety

Younger residents tend to feel less safe in Olympia in general than older ones do: (38\% of 18-34 feel safe in Olympia in general, compared to $65 \%$ of 65 or older). This effect persists even after controlling for housing tenure-in fact, homeownership is associated with lower feelings of safety in general, all else held constant. Having a bachelor's degree or higher and being older are also associated with significantly higher feelings of safety from violence, harassment, and theft when controlling for other demographic factors. Results also suggest that people of color feel much less safe from harassment ( $64 \%$ unsafe, $48 \%$ very unsafe) than white residents do ( $51 \%$ unsafe, $21 \%$ very unsafe), though there does not appear to be a significant effect associated with race/ethnicity when age and educational attainment are held constant.

## Consistent demographic variations in attitudes about policing

Throughout most questions around policing and the criminal justice system, older residents consistently express more positive attitudes about Olympia police than younger residents, men are more positive than women, non-college-educated residents are more positive than college-educated residents, and white residents are more positive than residents of color. While demographics by no means explain all the variation between respondents, these are consistent, visible patterns. As an illustrative example, below are response frequencies for "There are many things about the police and their policies that need to be changed".

Many things need to be changed, by key demographics
Do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about Olympia police? There are many things about the police and their policies that need to be changed.


## Communications

This section of the survey was designed to guide the development and recommendations of a $3-5$ year strategic communications planning process launched in early 2021 and listen to residents' preferences for City communications.

On the whole, residents tend to feel more negatively than positively about how the City currently communicates with residents. Respondents were asked to agree or disagree with a series of statements about information, communication, and engagement, shown below:

## Communications views

Do you agree or disagree with each of the following?


Overall, responses to all of these questions are intercorrelated. ${ }^{14}$ These statements can be roughly grouped into statements about personal knowledge, ("I know where to go...", "I know how

[^8]to provide...", "I am well informed...") and statements covering the perceived quality of city communications ("The City keeps residents informed...", "The City is open and transparent").

On personal knowledge, respondents agree most with "I know where to go to get information about the City when I need it," which earns $44 \%$ agreement and $29 \%$ disagreement. Much fewer rate themselves as well-informed about the actions of Council: $26 \%$ agree and $46 \%$ disagree.

When it comes to the perceived frequency, accuracy, or transparency of City communications and resident engagement, residents see room for improvement. Residents agree more than disagree that "information provided by the City is current and up-to-date," $30 \%$ agree to $24 \%$ disagree, though responses to this statement include the higher proportion of neutral/unsure answers in the battery. Other statements in this category earn more disagreement than agreement-at the most extreme, $16 \%$ agree that "I feel confident that the City listens to the feedback it receives from residents" and 59\% disagree.

## Residents think the City needs to communicate more

Beyond general disagreement that the City is keeping residents informed or that the City is open and transparent, the second most frequent category of response in an open-ended suggestion question, making up 10-20\% of responses, was general improvements-suggesting that the city be more transparent, communicate more frequently, or increase communications in general without necessarily being specific about content. A few sample responses follow:

- "Lots more of it [communication], more frequent, more targeted, more responsive."
- "Be more creative; require departments (OPD, Planning, others) to report to the public more and to be more disclosure about internal mattters. [sic]"
- "Be more visible- remind citizens of the need for and value of their input"
- "More openness about what is going on in the background"


## Many prefer digital communication, but long tail of preferences

In a closed-ended question (see table), residents express the most preference for hearing about what is happening in the City of Olympia via social media ( $52 \%$ top three), the City website (40\%), email (36\%), and postcard/direct mail (27\%). Residents who may not prefer one digital mode often prefer another one: $45 \%$ of those who did not select social media as one of their top three, for instance, selected the website as a preferred source of information. Many residents prefer other modes as well, such as radio (10\%) or Cable Channel 3 - TCTV (6\%), suggesting a continued need for coordinated communications across different channels even as the City may ramp up its online presence.
How do you prefer to hear about what is happening in the City of Olympia? Please select up to three.

| Category | Top three |
| :--- | ---: |
| Social media | 52 |
| The City website | 40 |
| Email | 36 |
| Postcard/direct mail | 27 |
| Newspaper | 19 |
| Council meetings/public meetings | 17 |
| Utility bill insert | 17 |
| Text message | 11 |
| Radio | 10 |
| Notice or hanger on the door of your residence | 7 |
| Friends and family | 7 |
| Cable Channel 3 - TCTV | 6 |
| Other (specified) | 3 |

Although preferences do appear to vary by age, social media is still a top preference for even residents 65 and older ( $44 \%$ social media, $44 \%$ email, $26 \%$ City website), and over a quarter of respondents under 35 say they prefer postcards or direct mail.

Below are some verbatim responses to a question asking for recommendations to the City about how to communicate better mentioning digital:

- "More activate [sic] and frequent use of social media. As a young renter, I don't get utility bill inserts, have cable tv, or a local newspaper subscription."
- "Unified social media presence across all departments"
- "Put things on Facebook. Even things like parades and fireworks. I never know when these are."
- "Having an updated website or Social media is fine and good, but I'm on my computer all day and don't take the time looking there. I'd rather have direct mail, such as via post
card, letter, or a complete newsletter. I can always go to the website for additional information."
- "Text messages to link the website for vital information. Also more zoom meeting type situations not all can make it to town meetings and such"

Overall, between 10-20\% of all responses to this open-ended question mentioned social media specifically, out of 40-50\% of responses that made a specific recommendation about mode of communication. Often, residents suggested increased social media usage in general, with Facebook being the most common platform named.

Separately, respondents were asked about how effective different modes were, with strong majorities (over three-quarters) saying that TV or radio; online (website, email); social media; printed communication (mailers, utility bill insert, etc.); and meetings (council meetings/public meetings) were somewhat effective or very effective ways to get information about what is going on in the city. That is, residents appear to separate their own personal preferences with what they perceive to be effective communication channels: even among residents who do not prefer social media, nearly two-thirds still say it is somewhat effective or very effective, and even among those who prefer social media, over four in five still rate printed communication somewhat effective or very effective.

## Residents want many different types of information from City communications

Residents are nearly united in wanting information about issues of public concern, such as homelessness, public safety, or climate change (79\% put this in their top-five), but every other category of information tested is a top-five category for at least one in ten residents. On the lower end of importance, fewer residents say that information about development, permits, or zoning issues (14\%) or parking rates, policies, and enforcement (13\%) is important to them. At least a third say they want information about projects in their neighborhoods (40\%), emergency information (39\%), and police department information (34\%).

## Olympia Survey

## Core demographics and screening

1. Are you:

- A man
- A woman
- Non-binary
- Something else (please specify)
- Prefer not to say

2. In what year were you born?
3. In what ZIP code do you currently live?

3b. Do you live in:

- Downtown Olympia
- Northwest Olympia
- Northeast Olympia
- Southwest Olympia
- Southeast Olympia
- None of these

4. What is your race/ethnicity? [multi-select]

- White/Caucasian
- Hispanic or Latino/a
- Asian / Pacific Islander
- Black or African American
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Something else (please specify)

5. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- High school diploma or less
- Some college, but no degree
- Associate's degree or a technical / vocational degree
- Bachelor's degree, or four-year college degree
- Graduate degree

6*. For how many years have you lived in Olympia?

## General outlook and quality of life

7. How would you say things in the following areas are going? Are they going in the right direction, or are they off on the wrong track? [Right direction I Wrong track]

- Olympia in general
- Downtown Olympia
- Your neighborhood

8*. How would you rate Olympia as a place to live? [Rotate]

- Poor
- Only Fair
- Satisfactory
- Very good
- Excellent

9*. How would you rate your neighborhood as a place to live? [Rotate]

- Poor
- Only Fair
- Satisfactory
- Very good
- Excellent

10. How satisfied are you with Olympia as a: [Very satisfied I Somewhat satisfied I Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied I Somewhat dissatisfied I Very dissatisfied] [Rotate]

- Place to raise a family
- Place to work
- Place to retire
- Place to experience arts and culture
- Place to experience nature and the outdoors

11. Do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? [Strongly agree I Somewhat agree | Somewhat disagree I Strongly disagree] [Randomize]

- I feel like a real part of Olympia
- It is hard for people like me to be accepted in Olympia
- People in Olympia respect different perspectives and backgrounds


## Satisfaction on priorities

12. In a few words, what is the most important issue to you for Olympia to address? [Open-end]
13. The following statements reflect general impressions of Olympia and living in Olympia. Do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? [Strongly agree I Somewhat agree I Neutral I Somewhat disagree I Strongly disagree] [Randomize]
[Public Health \& Safety]

- Olympia is prepared for emergencies
- The city responds to emergencies quickly
- Olympia's water supply is safe and reliable
- Public infrastructure in the city is well-maintained
- Residents have adequate food and shelter

14. [Livability]

- Olympians value diversity
- Olympians have opportunities for recreation
- Olympia's transportation system has safe transportation options for everyone
- Residents can access affordable and stable housing
- Olympia keeps its connections to our culture and history

15. [Downtown]

- Downtown is a vibrant urban destination
- Downtown has a mix of housing for all income levels
- Downtown has engaging arts and entertainment

16. [Economy]

- Olympia has a stable and resilient economy
- Olympia has thriving, independent, and locally owned businesses
- Residents are economically secure with opportunities to prosper


## 17. [Environment]

- Olympia is a leader on climate action
- Olympians have opportunities for a daily connection to nature
- Olympia has protected water resources and natural areas
- Olympia embraces a waste-free culture

18. [Neighborhoods]

- Neighborhoods have distinctive places and gathering spaces
- Neighborhoods have nearby access to goods and services
- Neighborhoods are engaged in community decision making
- Neighborhoods are safe and welcoming places to live

19-23. How satisfied are you with how the city is doing on each of the following? [Very satisfied | Somewhat satisfied I Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied I Somewhat dissatisfied I Very dissatisfied]
[Randomize]

- Arts and community events
- Building permits and inspections
- Climate change mitigation and adaptation
- Code enforcement
- Drinking water
- Economic development
- Emergency medical response
- Fire services
- Garbage, recycling, and organics collection
- Housing and homelessness services
- Parking services
- Parks and recreation facilities
- Police services
- Recreation programs and classes
- Sidewalk repair and maintenance
- Stormwater and sewer services
- Street repair and maintenance

24. Which THREE of the following do you think should be the most important priorities for Olympia city government in the next year?

- [Repeat list of services above]


## Public safety and policing

25*. In general, how safe do you feel in Olympia?

- Very safe
- Somewhat safe
- Somewhat unsafe
- Very unsafe
- Not sure

26. What would you say makes you feel the most unsafe in Olympia?
27. What would you say makes you feel the most safe in Olympia?
28. How safe do you feel: [Very safe I Somewhat safe I Somewhat unsafe I Very unsafe I Not sure]

- From COVID-19, the coronavirus
- From violence
- From harassment
- From theft
- From fire
- From reckless driving
- From losing your job or income
- From losing your housing

29*. How safe do you feel: [Very safe I Somewhat safe I Somewhat unsafe I Very unsafe]

- In downtown Olympia during the day
- In your neighborhood during the day
- In downtown Olympia at night
- In your neighborhood at night

30. In general, how much do you trust the criminal justice system in Olympia to act in the best interests of Olympia residents?

- Strongly trust
- Somewhat trust
- Neither trust nor distrust
- Somewhat distrust
- Strongly distrust

31. In the last twelve months, have you or anyone you are close to had any of the following experiences? [Yes, I have I Yes, a person close to me has I No, neither] [Randomize]

- Interacted with an Olympia police officer for any reason
- Been stopped by Olympia Police
- Been arrested by Olympia Police
- Reported a crime to Olympia Police
- Been a victim of a violent crime
- Been a victim of a property crime

32. Do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about Olympia police? [Agree ।

Disagree] [Rotate]

- I trust the police to make decisions that are good for everyone in the city.
- There are many things about the police and their policies that need to be changed.
- The police are not consistent in how they apply the rules to people
- The police treat people with dignity and respect.
- Some of the things the police do embarrass the city.


## Engagement and information

33-35. Do you agree or disagree with each of the following? [Strongly agree | Somewhat agree | Neither agree nor disagree I Somewhat disagree I Strongly disagree I Not sure] [Rotate]

- The City keeps residents informed about what is happening in government
- The City is open and transparent
- I am well informed about the actions and ongoing work of City Council
- Residents have the ability to be involved in the decisions that impact city government
- I know where to go to get information about the City when I need it
- Information provided by the City is current and up-to-date
- I know how to provide information and/or share feedback with the City of Olympia
- I feel confident that the City listens to the feedback it receives from residents

36. How do you prefer to hear about what is happening in the City of Olympia? Please select up to three.

- Cable Channel 3 - TCTV
- The City website
- Council meetings/public meetings
- Email
- Newspaper
- Notice or hanger on the door of your residence
- Postcard/direct mail
- Radio
- Social media
- Text message
- Utility bill insert
- Friends and family
- Something else (please specify)

37. In the last twelve months, have you heard about what is going on in the City by any of the following methods? Please select all that apply.

- TV or Radio
- Online (website, email)
- Social media
- Printed communication (mailers, utility bill insert, etc.)
- Meetings (Council meetings/public meetings)
- Word of mouth

38. How effective would you say each of the following is as a way to get information about what is going on in the City? [Not effective at all I Not too effective I Somewhat effective I Very effective]

- [List of selected items from Q36]

39. Do you use any of the following social media platforms? Please check all that apply.

- Facebook
- Instagram
- NextDoor
- Twitter
- YouTube

40. What kinds of information about the City would you say are the most important to you? Please select up to five.

- Information about projects in my neighborhood
- General information about the City operations
- City Council business
- Information about public events
- Information about issues of public concern (homelessness, public safety, climate change, etc.)
- Emergency information
- City utilities rates, services, and programs
- Parking rates, policies, and enforcement
- Police Department information
- Fire Department information
- Development, permits, or zoning issues
- Recreational programming and facilities
- Arts, culture, and heritage
- Environmental education
- Current budget information
- None of these

41. Where do you currently receive information about each of the following? [TV or Radio I Website or email I Social media I Printed communication I Meetings I Word of mouth]

- [Selected items from Q38]

42. If you had one recommendation to the City about how to communicate better with residents, what would it be? [Open-end; coded]
43. Which best describes your living situation?

- I own the home that I live in
- I rent the home that I live in
- I live in a home owned or rented by family members or friends
- Prefer not to say

44. For statistical purposes, what is your household income?

- Less than \$20,000
- \$20,000 to $\$ 34,999$
- \$35,000 to \$49,999
- \$50,000 to $\$ 74,999$
- \$75,000 to \$99,999
- $\$ 100,000$ to $\$ 249,999$
- $\$ 250,000$ or more
- Prefer not to say


## Olympia Survey

1. Are you:

- A man
- A woman
- Non-binary
- Something else (please specify)
- Prefer not to say

2. In what year were you born?
3. In what ZIP code do you currently live?

3b. Do you live in:

- Downtown Olympia
- Northwest Olympia
- Northeast Olympia
- Southwest Olympia
- Southeast Olympia
- None of these

4. What is your race/ethnicity? [multi-select]

- White/Caucasian
- Hispanic or Latino/a
- Asian / Pacific Islander
- Black or African American
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Something else (please specify)

5. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- High school diploma or less
- Some college, but no degree
- Associate's degree or a technical / vocational degree
- Bachelor's degree, or four-year college degree
- Graduate degree

6. Which best describes your living situation?

- I own the home that I live in
- I rent the home that I live in
- I live in a home owned or rented by family members or friends
- Prefer not to say

7. Which of the following best describes your current employment status?

- Employed full-time
- Employed part-time
- Retired
- Unemployed, looking for work
- Not employed for pay
- Disabled
- Student
- Something else


## Downtown

8. Do you think things in downtown Olympia are heading in the right direction or off on the wrong track?

- Right direction
- Wrong track

9. Specifically, when it comes to each of the following, are things heading in the right direction or off on the wrong track? [Right direction I Wrong track]

- Housing downtown
- Downtown as a place to work
- Shops and restaurants downtown
- Events, arts, and culture downtown
- Homelessness downtown
- Public safety downtown
- Quality of sidewalks and streets downtown

10. When it comes to the following kinds of city employees downtown, do you think there are not enough or too much? [Not enough | About the right amount | Too much] [Randomize]

- City staff removing garbage and graffiti
- Downtown ambassadors
- Police foot patrols
- Unarmed crisis responders

11. When it comes to developing housing, office space, shops, and restaurants to downtown Olympia, do you think there is: [Flip]

- Too much new development downtown
- About the right amount of new development downtown
- Not enough new development downtown

12. Which of the following most concern you about downtown Olympia? Please select up to 3. [Randomize]

- People not having access to permanent shelter
- People having mental health crises
- Lack of visible law enforcement
- Lack of lighting at night
- Trash, litter, graffiti, and hygiene
- Public drug use
- Public demonstrations by armed protestors
- Parking availability and pricing
- Traffic
- None of the above
- Something else (please specify)


## Homelessness / housing

13. When it comes to addressing affordable housing in Olympia, do you support or oppose each of the following? [Strongly support | Somewhat support I Somewhat oppose I Strongly oppose I Not sure] [Randomize]

- Incentivizing developers who build low- and moderate-income housing
- Using taxpayer dollars to encourage building low- and moderate-income housing
- Allowing the development of smaller, more affordable units in all areas of the city
- Reduce regulations and restrictions on private housing development

14-16. When it comes to addressing homelessness in Olympia, do you support or oppose each of the following? [Strongly support | Somewhat support I Somewhat oppose I Strongly oppose I Not sure] [Randomize]

- Building more supportive housing
- Expanding access to mental health treatment
- Expanding access to substance abuse treatment
- Increasing presence of law enforcement
- Increasing presence of unarmed crisis responders
- Identifying appropriate locations for homeless services outside downtown Olympia
- Preventing and removing new homeless encampments
- Prohibiting and responding to open fires, pollution, and waste accumulation

17. Which of the following do you think are the most important ways to address homelessness in Olympia? Please select up to two.

- [repeat list]
- Something else (please specify)


## Personal experiences, outlook

18. In the last year, have you or your household experienced any of the following? Please check all that apply or indicate if none do.

- Lost your job or business
- Lost income or hours
- Moved in with family or friends
- Moved to a less expensive neighborhood
- Been late on a rent or mortgage payment
- Been late on a utility payment
- Been evicted
- Had difficulty paying for food, groceries, or essential expenses
- Become homeless
- None of the above

19. Looking ahead to the next year, how do you feel about each of the following? [Somewhat worried and uncertain I Very worried and uncertain I Somewhat confident and optimistic | Very confident and optimistic]

- Your household income
- Your personal finances
- Your housing costs
- The local economy in Olympia

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample Size (Weighted) |  | 515 | 261 | 231 | 163 | 128 | 108 | 109 | 402 | 100 | 230 | 281 | 232 | 216 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General outlook |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How would you say things in the following areas are going? Are they going in the right direction, or are they off on the wrong track? - Olympia in | Right direction | 49 | 51 | 46 | 43 | 50 | 45 | 58 | 49 | 45 | 61 | 39 | 52 | 45 |
|  | Wrong track | 51 | 49 | 54 | 57 | 50 | 55 | 42 | 51 | 55 | 39 | 61 | 48 | 55 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How would you say things in the following areas are going? Are they going in the right direction, or are they off on the wrong track? - Downtown | Right direction | 21 | 20 | 22 | 19 | 21 | 16 | 29 | 22 | 19 | 32 | 13 | 20 | 25 |
|  | Wrong track | 79 | 80 | 78 | 81 | 79 | 84 | 71 | 78 | 81 | 68 | 87 | 80 | 75 |
| How would you say things in the following areas are going? Are they going in the right direction, or are they off on the wrong track? - Your |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| in the right direction, or are they off on the wrong track? - Your | Right direction | 71 | 75 | 68 | 62 | 74 | 71 | 82 | 72 | 71 | 83 | 62 | 80 | 62 |
|  | Wrong track | 29 | 25 | 32 | 38 | 26 | 29 | 18 | 28 | 29 | 17 | 38 | 20 | 38 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How would you rate Olympia as a place to live? | Poor | 11 | - 8 | 15 | 14 | 13 | 12 | 2 | , | 17 | 5 | 15 | 9 | 13 |
|  | Only fair | 21 | 22 | 20 | 28 | 19 | 17 | 16 | 22 | 16 | 14 | 26 | 22 | 22 |
|  | Satisfactory | 30 | 33 | 27 | 31 | 30 | 26 | 35 | 29 | 39 | 29 | 31 | 25 | 31 |
|  | Very good | 31 | 32 | 30 | 23 | 29 | 35 | 38 | 33 | 22 | 41 | 23 | 34 | 31 |
|  | Excellent | 7 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 10 | 4 | 10 | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How would you rate your neighborhood as a place to live? | Poor | 4 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 7 |
|  | Only fair | 10 | 8 | 13 | 14 | 11 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 17 | 7 | 13 | 7 | 15 |
|  | Satisfactory | 28 | 28 | 27 | 27 | 29 | 26 | 30 | 27 | 32 | 22 | 32 | 22 | 35 |
|  | Very good | 37 | 43 | 31 | 41 | 32 | 35 | 39 | 37 | 37 | 38 | 37 | 41 | 31 |
|  | Excellent | 21 | 17 | 25 | 11 | 25 | 28 | 24 | 23 | 12 | 32 | 12 | 30 | 12 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How satisfied are you with olympia as a: - Place to raise a family | Very satisfied | 24 | 23 | 25 | 15 | 24 | 30 | 29 | 23 | 23 | 31 | 18 | 27 | 19 |
|  | Somewhat satisfied | 28 | 26 | 29 | 20 | 33 | 30 | 34 | 29 | 26 | 31 | 26 | 28 | 28 |
|  | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 20 | 24 | 14 | 27 | 16 | 9 | 24 | 21 | 14 | 21 | 19 | 16 | 25 |
|  | Somewhat dissatisfied | 14 | 15 | 13 | 17 | 13 | 16 | 9 | 13 | 17 | 10 | 17 | 16 | 12 |
|  | Very dissatisfied | 14 | 11 | 18 | 21 | 14 | 15 | 4 | 13 | 19 | 8 | 19 | 12 | 16 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total satisfied | 52 | 49 | 54 | 35 | 57 | 60 | 63 | 53 | 49 | 61 | 44 | 55 | 47 |
|  | Total dissatisfied | 28 | 27 | 32 | 37 | 27 | 31 | 13 | 26 | 36 | 18 | 36 | 29 | 29 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How satisfied are you with Olympia as a: - Place to work | Very satisfied | 20 | 23 | 17 | 13 | 23 | 25 | 25 | 22 | 14 | 27 | 15 | 24 | 21 |
|  | Somewhat satisfied | 29 | 28 | 30 | 30 | 27 | 31 | 28 | 30 | 27 | 35 | 24 | 31 | 28 |
|  | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 27 | 30 | 22 | 25 | 29 | 20 | 36 | 26 | 31 | 23 | 30 | 26 | 24 |
|  | Somewhat dissatisfied | 15 | 13 | 18 | 21 | 11 | 17 | 8 | 14 | 18 | $\square$ | 20 | 14 | 17 |
|  | Very dissatisfied | 9 | 5 | 13 | 11 | 11 | 8 | 3 | 8 | 10 | 6 | 11 | - 6 | 10 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total satisfied | 50 | 52 | 47 | 42 | 50 | 56 | 53 | 52 | 41 | 63 | 39 | 55 | 49 |
|  | Total dissatisfied | 24 | 18 | 31 | 32 | 22 | 24 | 11 | 22 | 28 | 14 | 31 | 20 | 27 |









|  |  |  |  |  |  | $3^{50^{09}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How satisfied are you with how the city is doing on each of the following? - Arts and community events | Very satisfied | 13 | 14 | 12 | 12 | 14 | 11 | 18 | 15 | - 6 | 15 | 12 | 16 | 10 |
|  | Somewhat satisfied | 36 | 37 | 34 | 32 | 37 | 38 | 34 | 37 | 29 | 41 | 31 | 35 | 37 |
|  | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 31 | 30 | 31 | 33 | 24 | 31 | 37 | 29 | 41 | 28 | 34 | 31 | 31 |
|  | Somewhat dissatisfied | 15 | 15 | 14 | 14 | 18 | 15 | 11 | 14 | 16 | 13 | 15 | 13 | 14 |
|  | Very dissatisfied | 6 | 4 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 15 | 58 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 59 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total satisfied | 49 | 51 | 46 | 44 | 51 | 49 | 52 | 52 | 35 | 56 | 43 | 51 | 47 |
|  | Total dissatisfied | 21 | 19 | 23 | 23 | 26 | 20 | 12 | 19 | 23 | 17 | 24 | 18 | 22 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How satisfied are you with how the city is doing on each of the following? | Very satisfied | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 1 | $1 \quad 4$ | 8 | 6 | 64 | 4 | 53 |
|  | Somewhat satisfied | 13 | 11 | 17 | 12 | 13 | 16 | 14 | 15 | 10 | 16 | 11 | 19 | 9 |
|  | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 59 | 66 | 52 | 63 | 55 | 54 | 63 | 59 | 59 | 55 | 63 | 48 | 71 |
|  | Somewhat dissatisfied | 11 | 10 | 13 | 9 | 11 | 13 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 9 | 14 | 4 |
|  | Very dissatisfied | 11 | 9 | 13 | 10 | 14 | 12 | 10 | 10 | 14 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total satisfied | 18 | 15 | 22 | 18 | 20 | 21 | 15 | 19 | 18 | 22 | 15 | 24 | 12 |
|  | Total dissatisfied | 22 | 19 | 26 | 19 | 25 | 24 | 23 | 22 | 23 | 23 | 22 | 27 | 16 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How satisfied are you with how the city is doing on each of the following? | Very satisfied | 8 | 6 | 10 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 9 | 98 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 98 | 8 7 |
|  | Somewhat satisfied | 22 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 22 | 17 | 23 | 23 | 19 | 28 | 16 | 23 | 20 |
|  | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 45 | 50 | 40 | 41 | 39 | 51 | 52 | 44 | 49 | 41 | 48 | 43 | 47 |
|  | Somewhat dissatisfied | 15 | 15 | 14 | 13 | 18 | 16 | 11 | 16 | - 8 | 15 | 14 | 18 | 12 |
|  | Very dissatisfied | 11 | 8 | 14 | 15 | 12 | 9 | 5 | 10 | 16 | 8 | 13 | 8 | 15 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total satisfied | 30 | 28 | 32 | 31 | 32 | 24 | 32 | 31 | 27 | 36 | 25 | 31 | 27 |
|  | Total dissatisfied | 25 | 22 | 28 | 28 | 29 | 25 | 16 | 25 | 24 | 23 | 27 | 26 | 26 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How satisfied are you with how the city is doing on each of the following? - Code enforcement | Very satisfied | 6 | 68 | 5 | 4 | 10 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 67 | $7{ }^{6}$ | $6{ }^{3}$ |
|  | Somewhat satisfied | 13 | 13 | 13 | 8 | 15 | 11 | 19 | 13 | 12 | 17 | 9 | 14 | 13 |
|  | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 47 | 53 | 40 | 51 | 43 | 45 | 46 | 48 | 42 | 47 | 46 | 42 | 52 |
|  | Somewhat dissatisfied | 14 | 10 | 18 | 9 | 13 | 19 | 18 | 13 | 15 | 15 | 13 | 15 | 11 |
|  | Very dissatisfied | 20 | 17 | 24 | 28 | 18 | 20 | 11 | 20 | 22 | 15 | 25 | 22 | 21 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total satisfied | 19 | 21 | 18 | 12 | 25 | 16 | 25 | 19 | 21 | 23 | 16 | 20 | 16 |
|  | Total dissatisfied | 34 | 27 | 42 | 37 | 31 | 39 | 29 | 33 | 37 | 30 | 37 | 37 | 32 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How satisfied are you with how the city is doing on each of the following? - Drinking water | Very satisfied | 34 | 30 | 38 | 36 | 33 | 31 | 35 | 37 | 24 | 41 | 28 | 37 | 32 |
|  | Somewhat satisfied | 32 | 32 | 33 | 28 | 33 | 34 | 32 | 34 | 25 | 34 | 30 | 32 | 28 |
|  | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 24 | 29 | 18 | 26 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 19 | 39 | 19 | 28 | 24 | 25 |
|  | Somewhat dissatisfied | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 10 | 8 | $8 \quad 7$ | 76 | 5 | 59 | 95 | 59 |
|  | Very dissatisfied | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 51 | 2 | 23 | 36 | 1 | - 6 | 62 | 25 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total satisfied | 66 | 62 | 71 | 64 | 67 | 66 | 67 | 70 | 49 | 75 | 58 | 69 | 61 |
|  | Total dissatisfied | 10 | 9 | 11 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 12 | 6 | 14 | , | 14 |





|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Safety |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In general, how safe do you feel in Olympia? | Very safe | 16 | 13 | 19 | 14 | 17 | 13 | 20 | 18 | 4 | 21 | 11 | 13 | 17 |
|  | Somewhat safe | 37 | 39 | 35 | 25 | 40 | 43 | 45 | 35 | 49 | 41 | 34 | 37 | 37 |
|  | Somewhat unsafe | 28 | 28 | 28 | 36 | 26 | 23 | 24 | 30 | 19 | 26 | 30 | 27 | 27 |
|  | Very unsafe | 18 | 19 | 17 | 25 | 15 | 21 | 10 | 16 | 25 | 12 | 23 | 21 | 16 |
|  | Not sure | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 12 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How safe do you feel: - From COVID-19, the coronavirus | Very safe | 31 | 28 | 36 | 37 | 33 | 27 | 25 | 31 | 30 | 32 | 31 | 33 | 32 |
|  | Somewhat safe | 43 | 45 | 42 | 30 | 40 | 52 | 57 | 43 | 42 | 47 | 40 | 47 | 39 |
|  | Somewhat unsafe | 18 | 20 | 13 | 18 | 21 | 16 | 14 | 19 | 15 | 16 | 19 | 14 | 21 |
|  | Very unsafe | 6 | 7 | 5 | 11 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 3 | 9 | 93 | 37 |
|  | Not sure | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 31 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How safe do you feel: - From violence | Very safe | 12 | 8 | 17 | 13 | 11 | 10 | 14 | 14 | - 8 | 17 | 8 | 9 | 16 |
|  | Somewhat safe | 33 | 37 | 29 | 21 | 37 | 33 | 42 | 33 | 33 | 35 | 31 | 35 | 30 |
|  | Somewhat unsafe | 32 | 34 | 31 | 36 | 30 | 30 | 32 | 35 | 22 | 32 | 33 | 35 | 29 |
|  | Very unsafe | 21 | 20 | 20 | 28 | 17 | 27 | 11 | 18 | 32 | 13 | 28 | 21 | 22 |
|  | Not sure | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 0 | - 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How safe do you feel:- From harassment | Very safe | 13 | 8 | 18 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 16 | 15 | 5 | 16 | 10 | 13 | 14 |
|  | Somewhat safe | 32 | 33 | 31 | 17 | 35 | 31 | 48 | 33 | 26 | 39 | 25 | 36 | 31 |
|  | Somewhat unsafe | 27 | 32 | 21 | 29 | 27 | 25 | 23 | 29 | 17 | 26 | 28 | 27 | 26 |
|  | Very unsafe | 27 | 27 | 27 | 39 | 22 | 31 | 13 | 21 | 48 | 16 | 36 | 24 | 29 |
|  | Not sure | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How safe do you feel: - From theft | Very safe | 7 | 5 | 9 | 6 | 8 | , | 14 | 9 | 2 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 8 |
|  | Somewhat safe | 34 | 35 | 32 | 26 | 31 | 33 | 48 | 34 | 34 | 38 | 30 | 29 | 39 |
|  | Somewhat unsafe | 29 | 33 | 26 | 29 | 31 | 35 | 21 | 30 | 24 | 31 | 27 | 31 | 26 |
|  | Very unsafe | 27 | 25 | 29 | 32 | 27 | 29 | 18 | 25 | 34 | 21 | 32 | 33 | 24 |
|  | Not sure | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How safe do you feel: - From fire | Very safe | 40 | 36 | 42 | 44 | 35 | 39 | 42 | 42 | 30 | 48 | 32 | 45 | 35 |
|  | Somewhat safe | 47 | 51 | 43 | 35 | 50 | 52 | 54 | 46 | 47 | 43 | 50 | 47 | 47 |
|  | Somewhat unsafe | 8 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 59 |
|  | Very unsafe | 2 | 1 | 3 | 36 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 31 | 13 |
|  | Not sure | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 3 | 5 | 1 | \% 6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How safe do you feel: - From reckless driving | Very safe | 13 | 13 | 11 | 12 | 15 | 8 | 16 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 |
|  | Somewhat safe | 41 | 45 | 38 | 38 | 42 | 49 | 35 | 43 | 31 | 48 | 35 | 44 | 40 |
|  | Somewhat unsafe | 26 | 29 | 23 | 27 | 26 | 21 | 32 | 27 | 23 | 28 | 25 | 29 | 22 |
|  | Very unsafe | 17 | 10 | 24 | 21 | 12 | 18 | 14 | 14 | 29 | 8 | 24 | 13 | 23 |
|  | Not sure | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How safe do you feel:- From losing your job or income | Very safe | 33 | 30 | 37 | 25 | 35 | 27 | 45 | 36 | 19 | 40 | 25 | 45 | 23 |
|  | Somewhat safe | 34 | 37 | 30 | 36 | 27 | 43 | 31 | 33 | 38 | 33 | 35 | 35 | 34 |
|  | Somewhat unsafe | 15 | 13 | 18 | 20 | 15 | 14 | 10 | 16 | 15 | 12 | 18 | 10 | 19 |
|  | Very unsafe | 12 | 14 | 10 | 15 | 14 | 13 | 5 | 11 | 18 | 7 | 17 | 5 | 19 |
|  | Not sure | , | 6 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 10 | - 8 | 4 | 5 | 5 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How safe do you feel: - From losing your housing | Very safe | 43 | 44 | 44 | 36 | 41 | 48 | 51 | 49 | 21 | 54 | 34 | 64 | 25 |
|  | Somewhat safe | 27 | 27 | 26 | 23 | 30 | 28 | 29 | 25 | 36 | 29 | 26 | 24 | 33 |
|  | Somewhat unsafe | 16 | 13 | 20 | 19 | 16 | 17 | 12 | 16 | 19 | 12 | 20 | 8 | 23 |
|  | Very unsafe | 10 | 13 | 6 | 15 | 12 | 5 | 6 | - 8 | 18 | 4 | 16 | - 2 | 16 |
|  | Not sure | 3 | 3 | 4 | $4{ }^{4}$ | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 3 | 3 3 |










|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Demographics, housing, economics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| For statistical purposes, what is your household income? | Less than \$20,000 | 8 | 8 9 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 8 | 8 | 3 | 12 | , | 14 |
|  | \$20,000 to \$34,999 | 9 | 13 | 4 | 10 | $\square$ | 8 | 13 | -8 | 11 | ${ }^{6}$ | 11 | 3 | 14 |
|  | \$35,000 to \$49,999 | 11 | 10 | 12 | 20 | 4 | 3 | 15 | 11 | 9 | 7 | 15 | 5 | 15 |
|  | \$50,000 to \$74,999 | 22 | 23 | 22 | 30 | 24 | 20 | 12 | 21 | 31 | 24 | 21 | 17 | 32 |
|  | \$75,000 to \$99,999 | 18 | 19 | 17 | 15 | 23 | 18 | 17 | 18 | 17 | 24 | 13 | 24 | 11 |
|  | \$100,000 to \$249,999 | 21 | 14 | 29 | 12 | 27 | 28 | 18 | 22 | 15 | 26 | 16 | 36 | 8 |
|  | \$250,000 or more | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | - 3 | 2 | 2 | $3^{3}$ | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | $4{ }^{4}$ |
|  | Prefer not to say | 9 | 8 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Which best describes your living situation? | I own the home that I live in | 45 | 43 | 49 | 25 | 45 | 57 | 62 | 47 | 37 | 58 | 35 | 100 | 0 |
|  | I rent the home that llive in | 42 | 46 | 39 | 55 | 45 | 34 | 30 | 44 | 40 | 35 | 49 | 0 | 100 |
|  | I live in a home owned or rented by family members or friends | 10 | 11 | 9 | 18 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 20 | 6 | 14 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Prefer not to say | 2 | 0 | - 4 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | $3^{3}$ | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Are you: | A man | 45 | 0 | 100 | 48 | 48 | 42 | 42 | 45 | 45 | 48 | 43 | 49 | 41 |
|  | A woman | 51 | 100 | 0 | 50 | 49 | 53 | 54 | 51 | 52 | 49 | 53 | 49 | 55 |
|  | Non-binary | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
|  | Prefer not to say | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  | Other (specified) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Do you live in: | Downtown Olympia | 13 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 13 | 15 | 8 | 12 | 18 | 12 | 14 | , | 21 |
|  | Northwest Olympia | 18 | 15 | 22 | 21 | 18 | 12 | 21 | 20 | 12 | 19 | 18 | 16 | 21 |
|  | Northeast Olympia | 20 | 19 | 21 | 18 | 20 | 24 | 19 | 22 | 14 | 22 | 18 | 23 | 16 |
|  | Southwest Olympia | 18 | 24 | 13 | 17 | 18 | 18 | 21 | 16 | 24 | 16 | 19 | 17 | 18 |
|  | Southeast Olympia | 21 | 22 | 20 | 18 | 25 | 20 | 22 | 20 | 27 | 23 | 19 | 25 | 15 |
|  | Refused / no response | 9 | - 8 | 11 | 12 | 7 | 10 | 8 | 11 | 4 | 7 | 11 | 12 | - 8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age Range | 18 to 34 | 32 | 31 | 34 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 42 | 25 | 38 | 18 | 41 |
|  | 35 to 49 | 25 | 24 | 27 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 30 | 31 | 21 | 26 | 27 |
|  | 50 to 64 | 21 | 22 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 22 | 18 | 22 | 21 | 27 | 17 |
|  | 65 or older | 21 | 23 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 24 | 10 | 22 | 21 | 30 | 15 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ethnicity | American Indian or Alaska Native | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|  | Asian / Pacific Islander | 8 | 87 | 8 | 11 | 10 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 40 | 9 | - 7 | 7 | 74 |
|  | Black or African American | 3 | $3 \quad 4$ | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
|  | Hispanic or Latino/a | 7 | 7 8 | 7 | 8 | - 6 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 38 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 10 |
|  | Other | 2 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | , | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |  | 1 |
|  | White / Caucasian | 79 | 79 | 79 | 73 | 76 | 82 | 88 | 100 | 0 | 82 | 76 | 82 | 80 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Educational Attainment | High school diploma or less | 12 | 11 | 13 | 23 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 11 | 17 | 0 | 21 | 8 | 15 |
|  | Some college, but no degree | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 18 | 34 | 29 | 27 | 20 | 0 | 47 | 20 | 29 |
|  | Associate's degree or a technical / vocational degree | 17 | 20 | 14 | 16 | 20 | 14 | 20 | 15 | 26 | 0 | 32 | 14 | 19 |
|  | Bachelor's degree, or four-year college degree | 26 | 27 | 25 | 26 | 30 | 26 | 20 | 27 | 21 | 57 | 0 | 31 | 23 |
|  | Graduate degree | 19 | 16 | 23 | 9 | 25 | 21 | 27 | 20 | 16 | 43 | 0 | 26 | 15 |




|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Housing/homelessness |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| When it comes to addressing affordable housing in Olympia, do you support or oppose each of the following? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Incentivizing developers who build low-and moderate-income housing | Strongly support | 50 | 55 | 47 | 58 | 52 | 38 | 52 | 42 | 53 | 59 | 46 | 43 | $3 \quad 40$ | 06 |
|  | Somewhat support | 30 | 27 | 30 | 22 | 30 | 35 | 33 | 28 | 30 | 24 | 32 | 29 | 935 | $5{ }^{23}$ |
|  | Somewhat oppose | 7 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 54 | 11 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
|  | Strongly oppose | 5 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 57 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 8 3 |
|  | Not sure | 8 | 9 | ${ }^{8}$ | 11 | 9 | 10 | 3 | 13 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 21 | 1 | 9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total support | 80 | 82 | 77 | 80 | 82 | 73 | 85 | 70 | 82 | 83 | 78 | 73 | $3 \quad 75$ | 7589 |
|  | Total oppose | 12 | 9 | 15 | 9 | 9 | 18 | 12 | 17 | 11 | 10 | 13 | 7 | 716 | 6 |
|  | Net support | 68 | 73 | 61 | 72 | 73 | 55 | 73 | 53 | 72 | 73 | 65 | 66 | 6 59 | 982 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Using taxpayer dollars to encourage building low- and moderate-income | Strongly support | 42 | 44 | 38 | 46 | 53 | 30 | 37 | 41 | 42 | 51 | 37 | 26 | $6 \quad 32$ | 22.60 |
|  | Somewhat support | 28 | 31 | 28 | 31 | 20 | 25 | 39 | 23 | 30 | 26 | 32 | 40 | $0 \quad 27$ | $7 \quad 26$ |
|  | Somewhat oppose | 12 | 10 | 12 | 7 | 12 | 18 | 9 | 5 | 13 | , | 14 | 11 | $1{ }^{17}$ | 7 |
|  | Strongly oppose | 15 | 12 | 18 | 11 | 11 | 26 | 13 | 26 | 13 | 11 | 15 | 11 | 120 | 2 |
|  | Not sure | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 51 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 12 | 2 | 40 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total support | 70 | 76 | 66 | 78 | 72 | 55 | 76 | 64 | 72 | 76 | 68 | 66 | $6 \quad 59$ | 9 86 |
|  | Total oppose | 27 | 22 | 30 | 18 | 23 | 44 | 22 | 31 | 26 | 20 | 29 | 22 | 223 | $7 \quad 14$ |
|  | Net support | 43 | 54 | 36 | 60 | 50 | 11 | 53 | 33 | 46 | 56 | 39 | 44 | $4 \quad 22$ | 22 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Allowing the development of smaller, more affordable units in all areas of the city | Strongly support | 57 | ${ }^{63}$ | 53 | 62 | 68 | 49 | 52 | 59 | 58 | 65 | 51 | 53 | $3 \quad 49$ | $9 \quad 72$ |
|  | Somewhat support | 23 | 20 | 27 | 19 | 24 | 22 | 28 | 23 | 23 | 22 | 26 | 24 | 4 26 | 620 |
|  | Somewhat oppose | 7 | ${ }^{6}$ | 7 | 4 | 4 | $4{ }^{8}$ | $8{ }^{8}$ | 0 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
|  | Strongly oppose | 9 | , | 11 | 9 | 2 | 17 | 8 | 17 | 7 | ${ }^{6}$ | 10 |  | $2 \quad 13$ | 3 |
|  | Not sure | 4 | 6 | 2 | $2{ }^{6}$ | $6{ }^{2}$ | - 6 | 5 5 | 1 | 5 | $5{ }^{2}$ | 5 | 13 | $3 \quad 4$ | 4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total support | 80 | 82 | 79 | 81 | 93 | 70 | 79 | 82 | 82 | 87 | 77 | 77 | $7{ }^{75}$ | 5 91 |
|  | Total oppose | 15 | 12 | 18 | 13 | - 6 | 24 | 16 | 17 | 14 | 10 | 18 | 10 | $0 \quad 21$ | 1 |
|  | Net support | 65 | 71 | 61 | 68 | 87 | 46 | 63 | 64 | 68 | 77 | 60 | 67 | $7 \quad 54$ | $4 \quad 85$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reducing regulations and restrictions on private housing development | Strongly support | 24 | 15 | 32 | 30 | 28 | 22 | 17 | 29 | 24 | 24 | 21 | 19 | $9 \quad 26$ | $6{ }^{23}$ |
|  | Somewhat support | 29 | 29 | 30 | 20 | 28 | 40 | 29 | 25 | 30 | 34 | 25 | 25 | $5 \quad 27$ | 729 |
|  | Somewhat oppose | 19 | 20 | 19 | 9 | 21 | 21 | 28 | 18 | 19 | 22 | 17 | 1 | $1 \quad 22$ | $22 \quad 21$ |
|  | Strongly oppose | 11 | 13 | 9 | - 8 | $3 \quad 7$ | 13 | 17 | 7 | 12 | 10 | 13 | 5 | $5 \quad 12$ | $2 \quad 13$ |
|  | Not sure | 17 | 23 | 10 | 33 | 16 | 5 | $5 \quad 9$ | 21 | 15 | 11 | 23 | 50 | $0 \quad 13$ | $3 \quad 14$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total support | 53 | 44 | 62 | 50 | 56 | 62 | 46 | 55 | 54 | 58 | 47 | 44 | $4 \quad 53$ | $3 \quad 52$ |
|  | Total oppose | 30 | 33 | 28 | 17 | 28 | 33 | 45 | 24 | 31 | 32 | 31 | - 6 | $6 \quad 34$ | 434 |
|  | Net support | 23 | 11 | 34 | 34 | 27 | 28 | - 1 | 30 | 23 | 26 | 16 | 37 | 719 | $9 \quad 18$ |






## City Manager \& Executive Team

The City Manager implements the policy direction of the City Council and administers City operations. The City Manager relies on the Executive Team to help provide the City the cohesive leadership and strategic direction necessary to create a healthy, respectful organization where employees thrive and to advance the Community's Vision as outlined in the Comprehensive Plan.

## The Community's Vision

In 2014, the City Council adopted a 20-year Comprehensive Plan that outlines a broad and ambitious vision for our community. To help us track, share and evaluate our progress, the City organized the plan into six focus areas.

Every year we evaluate our performance and engage with the community to ensure we're making progress on our priorities. This informs where we invest resources and our annual work plan.

## Jay Burney <br> City Manager

## Susan Grisham

Assistant to the City Manager
Keith Stahley
Assistant City Manager • Community Vitality
Debbie Sullivan
Assistant City Manager • Strategic Initiatives
Mark Barber
City Attorney
Leonard Bauer
Community Planning \& Development Director
Kellie Purce Braseth
Strategic Communications Director

## Rich Hoey

Public Works Director
Linnaea Jablonski
Human Resources Director
Aaron Jelcick
Interim Police Chief
Mark John
Fire Chief
Nanci Lien
Finance Director
Paul Simmons
Parks, Arts \& Recreation Director
Mike Reid
Economic Development Director

Comprehensive Plan Six Focus Areas


Informs the Annual Work Plan

## City Work Plan

## A Commitment to a Diverse, Equitable and Inclusive Community

- Establish Social Justice and Equity Commission
- Implement Transgender Rights Resolution action items
- Create equity framework to guide decision-making
- Citywide DEI Assessment and Strategic Plan


## Access to Affordable and Stable Housing

- Landlord/tenant protections
- Select development partner for Boulevard Road parcel
- Collaborate with partners to leverage funding to build 300 new supportive housing units


## A Safe Transportation System with Options for Everyone

- Fones Road multi-modal improvements project
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety improvements project - State and Plum intersection
- Finalize and implement ADA Transition Plan


## Recreation Opportunities for Everyone

- Adopt the Parks, Arts \& Recreation Plan
- Finalize the Yelm Highway Park design
- Complete an Aquatic Center Feasibility Study


## Connections to Our Culture and History

- Develop City Council/Squaxin Tribal Council strategic work plan
- Install Squaxin Island Tribal Land Acknowledgement in City Hall
- Work with Squaxin Island Tribe to design and install Historical Marker on Percival Landing


## Economy <br> Outcomes and Work Plan Items

## A Stable and Resilient Economy

- Complete Economic Development/Resiliency Strategic Plan


## Thriving, Independent and Locally Owned Businesses

- Implement COVID Recovery \& Reopening Plan


## Economically Secure with Opportunities to Prosper

- Develop City-owned real estate to support future economic development opportunities
- Develop plan to leverage American Recovery Plan funding


## A Vibrant Urban Destination

- Open seasonal ice rink
- Develop Peace Park at Fertile Grounds
- Complete Franklin Street Improvements project
- Re-envision Percival Landing
- Develop partnership with ODA for COVID response and reopening


## Safe and Welcoming for All

- Implement Downtown Clean and Safe program
- Implement CRU expansion pilot program
- Implement Ambassador expansion program


## A Mix of Housing for All Income Levels

- Develop Griswold Property
- Implement Housing Action Plan


## Engaging Arts and Entertainment

- Engage stakeholders and expand Creative District
- Use LTAC Funds and reserves to support local arts and entertainment partners
- Acquire Armory and develop creative campus concept


## Neighborhoods

Outcomes and Work Plan Items

## A Leader on Climate Action

- Implement Regional Climate Plan Phase III
- Create Climate framework to guide decisionmaking
- Become a Sol-Smart Community
- Implement Sea Level Rise Response Plan


## Opportunities for a Daily Connection to Nature

- Develop Grass Lake Park trail
- Construct Kaiser Woods Park improvements
- Transfer stormwater properties for parks/open space use


## Protected Water Resources and Natural Areas

- Harrison Avenue Stormwater Treatment improvements
- Aquatic habitat stewardship projects
- Use EPA Brownfield grants to clean up contaminated properties
- Support Capitol Lake/Deschutes Estuary EIS process


## Embrace a Waste-Free Culture

- Waste ReSources Master Plan update
- Reduce contamination in recycling stream
- Improve recycling at multi-family complexes


## Distinctive Places \& Gathering Spaces

- Complete a Neighborhood Gateway art project
- Award neighborhood matching grants


## Nearby Goods and Services

- Develop and support urban agriculture projects and policies
- Review incentives to establish neighborhood centers


## Engaged in Community Decision Making

- Update Coalition of Neighborhood Association MOU


## Safe and Welcoming Places to Live

- Partner with community to solve neighborhood problems
- Create strong partnerships with Neighborhood Associations
- Proactively address crime trends impacting neighborhoods
- Promote crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) strategies


# City of Olympia 

Connecting Our Community's Vision with Our 2021-2022 Work Plan

## City Councilmembers



Cheryl Selby
Mayor


Dani Madrone


Yến Huýnh


Clark Gilman
Mayor Pro Tem


Lisa Parshley


Renata Rollins


Jim Cooper


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ We adopt The Pew Research Center's convention for the term "modeled margin of error" (mMOE) to indicate that our surveys are not simple random samples in the pure sense, similar to any survey that has either non-response bias or for which the general population was not invited at random. A common, if imperfect, convention for reporting survey results is to use a single, survey-level mMOE based on a normal approximation. This is a poor approximation for proportion estimates close to 0 or 1 . However, it is a useful communication tool in many settings and is reasonable in places where the proportion of interest is close to $50 \%$. We report this normal approximation for our surveys assuming a proportion estimate of $50 \%$.
    ${ }^{2}$ The effective sample size adjusts for the weighting applied to respondents, and is calculated using Kish's approximation. Kish, Leslie. Survey Sampling, 1965.
    ${ }^{3}$ For comparison, see a fairly high design effect of 1.92 for a resident survey conducted for Pew Research in heterogeneous Philadelphia County, PA. For a more typical example, see an estimated design effect of 1.38 for a Rutgers resident survey of Newark, NJ, as estimated by the adjusted margin of error given.

[^1]:    ${ }^{4}$ That is, $51 \%$ of the housed population, including children, lives in owner-occupied units, as estimated by the number of owner-occupied units and the average household size of owner-occupied units in Olympia. This is distinct from the $47 \%$ of units which are owner-occupied. According to publicly available estimates for the smallest geography unit the Census Bureau publishes (Central Thurston County PUMA), estimates for the housed adult population are slightly higher ( $61 \%$ in owner-occupied, $39 \%$ in renter-occupied) than those for the overall housed population ( $59 \%$ in owner-occupied, $41 \%$ in renter-occupied).
    ${ }^{5}$ That is, $49 \%$ of the housed population, including children, is estimated to live in renter-occupied units.

[^2]:    ${ }^{6}$ Due to sample size, grouping together respondents who identified as Hispanic or Latino/a, Asian American, Pacific Islander, Black or African American, or American Indian or Alaska Native. While people of color are not a monolith and the results should not be interpreted as such a claim, this aggregation is nevertheless useful to increase statistical power at a sample size where disaggregation is not possible.

[^3]:    ${ }^{7}$ Full regression analysis omitted. Adjusted R-squared of 0.11 -much variance not explained by demographics. P-value $=0.0004$ for age, p -value $<0.0001$ for educational attainment (college/non-college). Responses to overall rating coded 1 for poor through 5 for excellent and regressed on age, gender, reduced ethnicity, and housing tenure.

[^4]:    ${ }^{8}$ Cronbach's alpha of 0.71 , reverse scoring "It is hard for people like me..."
    ${ }^{9}$ Response frequencies given to illustrate visible patterns outside of regression. A cursory three-way ANOVA suggests different group means for reduced race/ethnicity, reduced educational attainment, gender, and the interaction of race/ethnicity and education at the $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ level.

[^5]:    ${ }^{10}$ In January 2020, the official county-wide point-in-time count of people experiencing homelessness across Thurston County exceeded the previous year's count by 24\%: 995 in 2020, 800 in 2019.

[^6]:    ${ }^{11}$ As the regressions here are mostly an aside, no interpretation of coefficients in terms of log odds or change in the odds ratio for this logistic regression will be provided for a general audience. Although p -values are flawed as a bright-line threshold for "statistical significance," we report p=0.002 for downtown residency in lieu of a full table, regressing right direction/wrong track for downtown Olympia on age, downtown residency, reduced educational attainment, gender, and reduced ethnicity (white / POC). ${ }^{12}$ Logistic regression, $\mathrm{p}=0.0001$ for downtown residency when right direction/wrong track for neighborhood regressed on age, downtown residency, reduced educational attainment, gender, and reduced ethnicity (white/POC).

[^7]:    ${ }^{13}$ Cronbach's alpha of 0.90 (reverse scoring statements about inconsistency, change, and embarrassment). Factor analysis using polychoric correlations suggests that one factor is sufficient.

[^8]:    ${ }^{14}$ Cronbach's alpha of 0.89 implies good internal consistency. Factor analysis suggests two or three factors reasonable.

