

# Staff Report City of Manhattan Beach

**TO:** Honorable Mayor Tell and Members of the City Council

THROUGH: Geoff Dolan, City Manager

**FROM:** Bruce Moe, Finance Director

**DATE:** November 8, 2006

SUBJECT: Award of Professional Services Contract to True North Research to Conduct the

City's Biennial Resident Satisfaction Survey (Not to Exceed \$20,836)

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that the City Council award a contract to True North Research for an amount not to exceed \$20,836 to perform the City's biennial Resident Satisfaction Survey.

### FISCAL IMPLICATION:

Funds totaling \$25,000 are budgeted in FY 2006-2007 for the survey.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

In 2000, 2002 and 2004, the City performed statistically valid resident satisfaction surveys. The results have been consistently outstanding, with the City receiving very high scores for overall satisfaction with our services. It was Council's intention that we perform this survey every two years to gauge our progress. Therefore, we have anticipated and budgeted for the fourth survey in the current fiscal year.

## **DISCUSSION:**

The purpose of the survey is to determine our citizens' satisfaction with the breadth and quality of services we offer, as well as provide us with an opportunity to ask questions regarding current events. This important feedback will assist in policy making as well as provide us with benchmarks against which future performance indicators may be based, and improvements may be measured.

The basic survey instrument we have utilized in prior years remains unchanged. The same basic set of questions will be used, augmented by four "current events" questions. In the last survey, those current event questions addressed cable TV, the Stopper program, storm water awareness issues, and most recently residents' buying habits. For our 2006 survey, four questions have been developed relative to the Community Facility Strategic Plan (FSP), which is currently in progress (see Attachment "A"). These questions will assist us in identifying our community's wish list of amenities for the proposed new facilities (Community Center, Library, Aquatics Center and Cultural Arts Center). These four questions were reviewed and approved by our FSP consultant,

Agenda	item #:	
-6		

MDA Johnson Favaro, and the Facility Strategic Plan Subcommittee.

Gathering statistically valid results requires the assistance of a firm experienced in performing surveys. For the 2004 survey, staff received ten proposals from qualified firms. After careful consideration, staff recommended that Council award a contract to True North Research. Staff made this recommendation based on a number of factors, including: True North's prior experience and familiarity with the City in performing past Manhattan Beach surveys for the City, as well as with the General Plan survey and a revenue feasibility survey; the firm's thorough understanding of the project; and the cost effectiveness of their proposal. True North has held their pricing to the 2004 level for the 2006 survey. As a result, staff recommends that Council award the contract for the 2006 survey to True North Research for an amount not to exceed \$20,836.

True North Research will conduct a telephone survey of four hundred residents, who will be selected utilizing the Random Digital Dial (RDD) sampling method. The RDD sample is drawn by determining the active telephone exchanges (prefixes such as 545) within our zip code, and then producing a random list of all active residential phone numbers in the area (both listed and unlisted). The sample will have a margin of error of  $\pm 5\%$  with a confidence level of 95%. The actual survey work will be performed beginning in mid November, with calls taking place between 5:30 PM and 9:00 PM weekdays, and 10:00 AM to 6:00 PM on weekends.

The results of the survey will be presented to the Council and Community within 6-8 weeks of survey completion.

Attachment:

A – Facility Strategic Plan Survey Questions

City of Manhattan Beach Facilities Questions version 2.1T October 2006

# Section 1: Intro

The City of Manhattan Beach is in the process of creating a Strategic Plan for renovating and replacing aging community facilities, as well as constructing new facilities to meet the needs of Manhattan Beach residents – now and in the future. I'd like to ask you several questions about future facility improvements.

Section 2: Community Center									
May use split sample									
The City is considering building a multi-purpose <b>Community Center</b> . As I read each of the following amenities, I'd like you to indicate whether you think the amenity should be a high, medium or low priority for inclusion in the Community Center – or if you think it should <u>not</u> be a part of the Community Center. Please keep in mind that not all of the amenities can be high priorities.  Here is the (first/next) one: Should this amenity be a high, medium or low priority for the Center – or should it not include this amenity?									
	High Priority Medium Priority Low Priority Should not include in facility Ao Opinion						Refused		
Α	General purpose rooms that can be used for meetings, conferences and classes			2	3	4	98	99	
В	Special purpose rooms that can be used for activities like fitness classes			2	3	4	98	99	
С	Dedicated fitness and exercise facilities such as an indoor gymnasium and weight room			2	3	4	98	99	
D		oor courts for sports like setball, volleyball and racquetball	1	2	3	4	98	99	
Е	A community stage for ceremonies						99		
F	Band	quet facilities including a full-service	1	2	3	4	98	99	
G		mputer lab for drop-in use	1	2	3	4	98	99	
Н	A de	dicated Teen Center	1	2	3	4	98	99	
I	A dedicated Senior Center 1 2 3 4 98					99			
Are there any particular amenities that I did not mention that you think should be a high priority for inclusion in the Community Center? <i>If yes, ask:</i> Please describe the amenity.									
Record amenity description									
	2	No							
	98 Not sure								
	99	Prefer not to answer							

Section 3: Library									
May use split sample									
Q3	The City is considering renovating and expanding the <b>Community Library</b> . As I read each of the following amenities, I'd like you to indicate whether you think the amenity should be a high, medium or low priority for inclusion in the new <b>Library</b> – or if you think it should <u>not</u> be a part of the Library. Please keep in mind that not all of the amenities can be high priorities.  Here is the (first/next) one: Should this amenity be a high, medium or low priority for the Library – or should it not include this amenity?								
	Randomize			Medium Priority	Low Priority	Should not include in facility	No Opinion	Refused	
Α	Expanded <u>adult</u> collections and reading rooms			2	3	4	98	99	
В	Young adult reading area			2	3	4	98	99	
С	Expanded <u>children</u> collections and reading rooms			2	3	4	98	99	
D	Chile	dren's storytelling room	1	2	3	4	98	99	
Е	Com acce	puter lab with public Internet ss	1	2	3	4	98	99	
F	Coff	ee and beverage bar	1	2	3	4	98	99	
G	Community rooms for meetings and library programs			2	3	4	98	99	
Н							98	99	
Are there any particular amenities that I did not mention that you think should be a high priority for inclusion in the Library? <i>If yes, ask:</i> Please describe the amenity.									
Record amenity description									
	2	P. No							
	98	98 Not sure							
	99	9 Prefer not to answer							

Section 4: Aquatics Center									
May use split sample									
Q5	The City is considering building a new <b>Aquatics Center</b> . As I read each of the following amenities, I'd like you to indicate whether you think the amenity should be a high, medium or low priority for inclusion in the community Aquatics Center – or if you think it should <u>not</u> be a part of the Aquatics Center. Please keep in mind that not all of the amenities can be high priorities.  Here is the (first/next) one: Should this amenity be a high, medium or low priority for the Aquatics Center – or should it not include this amenity?								
	Randomize			High Priority	Medium Priority	Low Priority	Should not include in facility	No Opinion	Refused
Α	25 meter competitive lap pool			1	2	3	4	98	99
В	50 meter competitive lap pool			1	2	3	4	98	99
С	Diving pool with diving boards and platforms			1	2	3	4	98	99
D	Pool	for water a	erobics and exercise	1	2	3	4	98	99
E	Wate	er playgrour	nd pool for kids	1	2	3	4	98	99
F	Stadium seating or bleachers for competitive swim meets			1	2	3	4	98	99
Are there any particular amenities that I did not mention that you think should be a high priority for inclusion in the Aquatics Center? <i>If yes, ask:</i> Please describe the amenity.									
Record amenity description									
	2 No								
	98	98 Not sure							
	99	Prefer not to answer							

Section 5: Cultural Center									
May use split sample									
Q7	The City is considering building a new <b>Multi-purpose Cultural Center</b> . As I read each of the following amenities, I'd like you to indicate whether you think the amenity should be a high, medium or low priority for inclusion in the Cultural Center – or if you think it should <u>not</u> be a part of the Center. Please keep in mind that not all of the amenities can be high priorities.  Here is the (first/next) one: Should this amenity be a high, medium or low priority for the Cultural Center – or should it not include this amenity?								
	Randomize			Medium Priority	Low Priority	Should not include in facility	No Opinion	Refused	
Α	99-s	eat theater	1	2	3	4	98	99	
В	Public exhibition gallery space 1 2 3 4 98 9						99		
С		srooms for painting, drawing, oting and other visual arts	1	2	3	4	98	99	
D	Classrooms for performing arts						99		
Are there any particular amenities that I did not mention that you think should be a high priority for inclusion in the Cultural Center? If yes, ask: Please describe the amenity.									
Record amenity description									
	2	No							
	98	Not sure							
	99	9 Prefer not to answer							