

Jupiter, FL

Trends over Time

2017/2018



2955 Valmont Road Suite 300 Boulder, Colorado 80301 n-r-c.com • 303-444-7863



777 North Capitol Street NE Suite 500 Washington, DC 20002 icma.org • 800-745-8780

Summary

The National Citizen Survey™ (The NCS™) is a collaborative effort between National Research Center, Inc. (NRC) and the International City/County Management Association (ICMA). The survey and its administration are standardized to assure high quality research methods and directly comparable results across The NCS communities. The NCS captures residents' opinions within the three pillars of a community (Community Characteristics, Governance and Participation) across eight central facets of community (Safety, Mobility, Natural Environment, Built Environment, Economy, Recreation and Wellness, Education and Enrichment and Community Engagement). This report discusses trends over time, comparing the 2017 ratings for the Town of Jupiter to its previous survey results in 2009, 2011, 2013, 2015 and 2016. Additional reports and technical appendices are available under separate cover.

Trend data for Jupiter represent important comparison data and should be examined for improvements or declines. Deviations from stable trends over time, especially, represent opportunities for understanding how local policies, programs or public information may have affected residents' opinions.

Meaningful differences between survey years have been noted within the following tables as being "higher" or "lower" if the differences are greater than seven percentage points between the 2016 and 2017 surveys, otherwise the comparisons between 2016 and 2017 are noted as being "similar." Additionally, benchmark comparisons for all survey years are presented for reference. Changes in the benchmark comparison over time can be impacted by various trends, including varying survey cycles for the individual communities that comprise the benchmarks, regional and national economic or other events, as well as emerging survey methodologies.

Overall, ratings in Jupiter for 2017 generally remained stable. Of the 133 items for which comparisons were available, 116 items were rated similarly in 2016 and 2017; seven items showed a decrease in ratings and 10 showed an increase in ratings. Notable trends over time included the following:

- While almost all aspects of Community Characteristics remained stable from 2016 to 2017, there were a handful of noteworthy changes. Jupiter residents gave less favorable ratings to the ease of walking and traffic flow, which has been steadily declining since 2009. Respondents gave higher ratings in 2017 to the overall built environment, the overall quality of businesses and services and the availability of preventive health services. Ratings for the overall quality of new development also increased in 2017 to the levels seen in 2015. The overall quality of businesses and services, shopping opportunities and employment opportunities reached the highest levels since these questions were first asked in 2009.
- Within the pillar of Governance, Jupiter residents gave lower ratings to traffic enforcement, street repair and traffic signal timing in 2017 compared to 2016, which also were the lowest ratings given since the baseline survey in 2009. While survey respondents had a less favorable view of the services provided by the Federal Government, they gave higher ratings in 2017 to the overall direction of Jupiter and the job Jupiter does at welcoming citizen involvement.
- There were a few significant changes in rates of reported Participation in 2017 compared to 2016. More residents reported that they had stocked supplies for an emergency (an upward trend since 2013), used Jupiter public libraries and worked in Jupiter in 2017. Further, survey respondents had a more positive outlook on their personal economic future, which has been on the rise since 2011. Fewer had watched a local public meeting.

Table 1: Community Characteristics General

	Perce	nt rating	positivel	y (e.g., e	xcellent/	good)			Comp	arison to b	enchmark		
	2009	2011	2013	2015	2016	2017	2017 rating compared to 2016	2009	2011	2013	2015	2016	2017
Overall quality of life	93%	92%	94%	94%	96%	95%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
Overall image	91%	92%	91%	92%	94%	93%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
Place to live	96%	97%	97%	96%	98%	97%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
Neighborhood	90%	91%	89%	92%	94%	92%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Higher	Higher
Place to raise children	86%	89%	89%	88%	92%	90%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Higher	Higher
Place to retire	82%	91%	88%	83%	85%	89%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher	Much higher
Overall appearance	92%	92%	90%	92%	94%	94%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher	Higher

Table 2: Community Characteristics by Facet

		Perc		positivel ery/some			ood,	2017 rating compared to		С	omparison	to benchma	ark	
		2009	2011	2013	2015	2016	2017	2016	2009	2011	2013	2015	2016	2017
	Overall feeling of safety	NA	NA	91%	91%	92%	91%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Safe in neighborhood	97%	98%	97%	97%	98%	98%	Similar	Higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Safety	Safe downtown/commercial area	88%	90%	88%	93%	93%	94%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Overall ease of travel	NA	NA	83%	77%	73%	75%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Paths and walking trails	73%	73%	76%	70%	72%	73%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Ease of walking	73%	70%	73%	65%	76%	69%	Lower	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Travel by bicycle	62%	61%	52%	53%	59%	55%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Travel by public transportation	NA	NA	25%	26%	23%	27%	Similar	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Travel by car	75%	80%	73%	62%	67%	63%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Public parking	NA	NA	74%	66%	67%	69%	Similar	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Mobility	Traffic flow	60%	58%	57%	45%	48%	40%	Lower	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Overall natural environment	83%	90%	86%	83%	86%	89%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Natural	Cleanliness	90%	89%	88%	88%	92%	93%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
Environment	Air quality	NA	NA	91%	90%	91%	92%	Similar	NA	NA	Higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Overall built environment	NA	NA	69%	72%	65%	74%	Higher	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Built	New development in Jupiter	76%	75%	59%	62%	55%	63%	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Environment	Affordable quality housing	40%	48%	45%	36%	32%	30%	Similar	Higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

		Perc		g positivel ery/some			jood,	2017 rating compared to		C	omparison	to benchma	ark	
		2009	2011	2013	2015	2016	2017	2016	2009	2011	2013	2015	2016	2017
	Housing options	67%	71%	69%	63%	58%	59%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Public places	NA	NA	80%	85%	83%	86%	Similar	NA	NA	Higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Overall economic health	NA	NA	80%	83%	83%	87%	Similar	NA	NA	Higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Vibrant downtown/commercial area	NA	NA	34%	48%	47%	50%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Business and services	72%	77%	70%	78%	73%	81%	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Cost of living	NA	NA	39%	31%	33%	34%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Shopping opportunities	63%	66%	62%	74%	68%	75%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Higher
	Employment opportunities	31%	44%	37%	46%	42%	47%	Similar	Similar	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Place to visit	NA	NA	90%	91%	94%	92%	Similar	NA	NA	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher
Economy	Place to work	74%	76%	73%	73%	82%	78%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Health and wellness	NA	NA	86%	87%	84%	85%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Mental health care	NA	NA	58%	58%	55%	55%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Higher	Similar
	Preventive health services	67%	73%	79%	81%	69%	76%	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Similar	Similar
	Health care	63%	68%	77%	76%	71%	76%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Similar	Higher
	Food	76%	71%	74%	77%	73%	76%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Recreation and	Recreational opportunities	81%	83%	81%	83%	83%	83%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
Wellness	Fitness opportunities	NA	NA	80%	77%	80%	80%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Education and enrichment opportunities	NA	NA	77%	77%	78%	81%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Religious or spiritual events and activities	NA	NA	80%	85%	82%	89%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Cultural/arts/music activities	57%	66%	69%	68%	65%	68%	Similar	Similar	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Adult education	NA	NA	70%	73%	69%	72%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	K-12 education	83%	84%	82%	80%	84%	84%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Higher
Education and Enrichment	Child care/preschool	46%	58%	61%	60%	68%	62%	Similar	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Higher	Similar
Community	Social events and activities	67%	77%	66%	66%	68%	74%	Similar	Similar	Much	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

			v	positivel ery/some	what safe	e)	•	2017 rating compared to	2000	1		to benchma		2017
		2009	2011	2013	2015	2016	2017	2016	2009	2011	2013	2015	2016	2017
Engagement										higher				
	Neighborliness	NA	NA	65%	63%	73%	70%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
										Much				
	Openness and acceptance	70%	74%	63%	64%	71%	65%	Similar	Higher	higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Opportunities to participate in community matters	73%	72%	67%	70%	68%	74%	Similar	Higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Opportunities to volunteer	77%	82%	78%	77%	75%	78%	Similar	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

Table 3: Governance General

		Percer	t rating	positivel	y (e.g.,								
			exceller				2017 rating compared to		Compai	rison to bei	nchmark		
	2009	2011	2013	2015	2016	2017	2016	2009	2011	2013	2015	2016	2017
Services provided by Jupiter	86%	87%	82%	87%	87%	85%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Higher	Higher
Customer service	83%	93%	79%	84%	88%	86%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Higher	Similar
Value of services for taxes paid	65%	66%	66%	64%	68%	66%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Overall direction	64%	70%	59%	58%	52%	62%	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Welcoming citizen involvement	60%	64%	60%	63%	58%	66%	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Confidence in Town government	NA	NA	58%	58%	61%	57%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Acting in the best interest of Jupiter	NA	NA	58%	58%	55%	61%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Being honest	NA	NA	65%	65%	59%	65%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Treating all residents fairly	NA	NA	61%	64%	65%	64%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Services provided by the Federal Government	38%	42%	33%	39%	50%	36%	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

Table 4: Governance by Facet

Table 4. Governa	rice by racec													
				_	positivel nt/good)	, , , ,		2017 rating compared		Compa	arison to b	enchmark		
		2009	2011 2013 2015 2016 2017				2017	to 2016	2009	2011	2013	2015	2016	2017
									Much					
	Police	85%	82%	88%	89%	93%	89%	Similar	higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Higher	Similar
	Fire	91%	94%	97%	96%	98%	96%	Similar	Higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
									Much					
	Ambulance/EMS	95%	93%	94%	95%	98%	96%	Similar	higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Safety	Crime prevention	77%	80%	82%	82%	82%	81%	Similar	Much	Much	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

The National Citizen Survey $\mbox{^{TM}}$

			Percen	it rating exceller		y (e.g.,		2017 rating compared		Comp	arison to b	enchmark		
		2009	2011	2013	2015	2016	2017	to 2016	2009	2011	2013	2015	2016	2017
									higher	higher				
	Fire prevention	NA	NA	80%	87%	88%	84%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Simila
	Animal control	69%	73%	69%	71%	78%	79%	Similar	Higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Higher	Highe
	Emergency preparedness	87%	89%	78%	79%	86%	86%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher	Highe
	Traffic enforcement	76%	79%	70%	72%	75%	67%	Lower	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Simil
	Street repair	76%	73%	73%	71%	71%	62%	Lower	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher	High
	Street cleaning	78%	75%	73%	77%	77%	75%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Higher	Simila
	Street lighting	73%	71%	69%	76%	70%	70%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Higher	Similar	Simila
	Sidewalk maintenance	79%	74%	74%	74%	73%	67%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher	Highe
	Traffic signal timing	54%	53%	51%	50%	54%	46%	Lower	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Simil
Mobility	Bus or transit services	46%	48%	44%	53%	46%	39%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Simil
	Garbage collection	91%	91%	90%	90%	89%	90%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Simila
	Recycling	88%	90%	86%	87%	86%	90%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Simil
	Yard waste pick-up	85%	86%	85%	85%	89%	85%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Higher	Simil
	Drinking water	82%	82%	80%	79%	76%	81%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Simil
	Natural areas preservation	74%	88%	67%	66%	68%	71%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Simila
Natural Environment	Open space	NA	NA	65%	66%	64%	69%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Simil
	Storm drainage	74%	78%	70%	72%	79%	78%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Higher	High
	Sewer services	87%	88%	86%	89%	86%	90%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	High
	Power utility	NA	88%	81%	85%	85%	88%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Simil
	Utility billing	NA	NA	80%	80%	78%	85%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Highe
	Land use, planning and zoning	65%	67%	54%	52%	52%	55%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Simil
Built Environment	Code enforcement	67%	71%	64%	68%	68%	69%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Higher	Higher	High

			Percen	nt rating exceller	positivel nt/good)	, , , ,		2017 rating compared		Comp	arison to b	enchmark		
		2009	2011	2013	2015	2016	2017	to 2016	2009	2011	2013	2015	2016	2017
	Cable television	NA	NA	59%	53%	56%	59%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Economy	Economic development	53%	67%	66%	62%	66%	65%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Town parks	92%	98%	90%	89%	92%	91%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Recreation programs	86%	90%	82%	85%	80%	84%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Higher
	Recreation centers	88%	89%	83%	85%	86%	87%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Higher	Higher	Higher
Recreation and Wellness	Health services	74%	83%	82%	84%	82%	81%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Higher	Similar	Higher
	Special events	NA	NA	79%	75%	77%	80%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Education and Enrichment	Public libraries	93%	96%	86%	92%	91%	92%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Community Engagement	Public information	80%	82%	79%	80%	79%	79%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

Table 5: Participation General

	Percent r	ating positiv	ely (e.g., alw	ays/sometin	nes, more th	an once a							
			month	ı, yes)			2017 rating compared		Comp	arison to b	enchmark		
	2009	2011	2013	2015	2016	2017	to 2016	2009	2011	2013	2015	2016	2017
Sense of community	72%	78%	66%	71%	70%	74%	Similar	Higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Recommend Jupiter	92%	95%	95%	93%	93%	94%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Remain in Jupiter	90%	93%	95%	92%	91%	92%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Contacted Jupiter employees	50%	46%	43%	43%	37%	44%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

Table 6: Participation by Facet

		Percent		sitively (e. nan once a		s/sometim res)	es, more	2017 rating compared to		C	omparison t	to benchma	rk	
		2009	2011	2013	2015	2016	2017	2016	2009	2011	2013	2015	2016	2017
	Stocked supplies for an											Much	Much	Much
	emergency	NA	NA	53%	62%	78%	85%	Higher	NA	NA	Higher	higher	higher	higher
	Did NOT report a crime	NA	NA	81%	79%	78%	80%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Was NOT the victim of a													
Safety	crime	90%	88%	90%	88%	91%	92%	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Mobility	Used public	NA	NA	5%	6%	5%	6%	Similar	NA	NA	Much	Much	Much	Much

		Percent	٠.	sitively (e nan once a		•	ies, more	2017 rating compared to		C	Comparison	to benchma	rk	
		2009	2011	2013	2015	2016	2017	2016	2009	2011	2013	2015	2016	2017
	transportation instead of driving										lower	lower	lower	lower
	Carpooled instead of driving alone	NA	NA	35%	37%	36%	40%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Walked or biked instead of driving	NA	NA	60%	59%	57%	60%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Conserved water	NA	NA	83%	82%	88%	86%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Made home more energy efficient	NA	NA	78%	78%	76%	73%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Natural Environment	Recycled at home	93%	94%	95%	91%	97%	91%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Higher	Similar
	Did NOT observe a code violation	NA	NA	64%	64%	69%	66%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Higher	Higher	Higher
Built Environment	NOT under housing cost stress	52%	58%	67%	71%	69%	63%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Purchased goods or services in Jupiter	NA	NA	99%	99%	98%	100%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Economy will have positive impact on income	16%	16%	28%	36%	35%	47%	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Higher
Economy	Work in Jupiter	NA	NA	34%	36%	34%	48%	Higher	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
,	Used Jupiter recreation centers	63%	62%	59%	60%	64%	63%	Similar	Higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Visited a Town park	89%	92%	85%	85%	88%	88%	Similar	Higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Ate 5 portions of fruits and vegetables	NA	NA	79%	87%	84%	85%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Participated in moderate or vigorous physical activity	NA	NA	85%	86%	85%	88%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Recreation and Wellness	In very good to excellent health	NA	NA	72%	72%	72%	77%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Used Jupiter public libraries	72%	71%	59%	65%	57%	65%	Higher	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Participated in religious or spiritual activities	NA	NA	45%	44%	48%	47%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Education and Enrichment	Attended a Town- sponsored event	NA	NA	58%	53%	62%	56%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Community	Campaigned for an issue, cause or candidate	NA	NA	19%	18%	24%	22%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Engagement	Contacted Jupiter	NA	NA	14%	11%	13%	12%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

	Percent		sitively (e nan once a		s/sometim res)	es, more	2017 rating compared to		C	Comparison	to benchma	rk	
	2009	2011	2013	2015	2016	2017	2016	2009	2011	2013	2015	2016	2017
elected officials													
Volunteered	47%	45%	38%	40%	43%	37%	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Participated in a club	27%	31%	29%	28%	25%	28%	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Talked to or visited with neighbors	NA	NA	96%	95%	94%	95%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Done a favor for a neighbor	NA	NA	85%	87%	92%	90%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Higher	Similar
Attended a local public meeting	27%	25%	25%	24%	24%	21%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Watched a local public meeting	27%	28%	17%	15%	22%	13%	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Similar	Lower
Read or watched local news	NA	NA	90%	91%	92%	85%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Voted in local elections	82%	80%	83%	83%	83%	85%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar