

**2019 Budget Planning Survey**  
**General Population Survey Results**

---

*Results weighted to ensure statistical  
validity to the Leduc Population*

**Conducted by:**



**ADVANIS**

*Advanis Inc.  
Suite 1600, Sun Life Place  
10123 99 Street  
Edmonton, AB  
T5J 3H1*

**Primary Contact:**

*Patrick Kyba  
pkyba@advanis.net  
780.229.1135*

June 28, 2018




## Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Budget Planning Survey Highlights .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Detailed Project Description .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Project Background.....	5
2.2	Methodology.....	5
2.2.1	Project Planning .....	5
2.2.2	Survey Design .....	5
2.2.3	Survey Population and Data Collection.....	6
2.2.4	Survey Awareness .....	6
<b>3</b>	<b>Study Findings .....</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	Property Tax Value.....	8
3.2	Overall Property Tax Preference.....	12
3.3	Adjustments to Variable Spending .....	15
3.3.1	Police Protection & Enforcement Services (Proposed 23%).....	17
3.3.2	Family & Community Support (Proposed 3%) .....	20
3.3.3	Fire & Ambulance Services (Proposed 19%) .....	23
3.3.4	Public Services (Proposed 16%) .....	25
3.3.5	Public Transportation (Proposed 5%) .....	28
3.3.6	Snow Removal (Proposed 5%) .....	31
3.3.7	Community Development (Proposed 6%) .....	34
3.3.8	Library Services (Proposed 4%).....	37
3.3.9	Parks & Athletic Field Maintenance (Proposed 9%) .....	40
3.3.10	Leduc Recreation Centre Operations (Proposed 10%) .....	43
3.3.11	Other Variable Spending Feedback.....	46
3.4	Other Projects and Priorities.....	47
<b>4</b>	<b>Appendices.....</b>	<b>49</b>
4.1	Respondent Demographics.....	49
4.2	Data Weighting .....	50
4.3	Survey.....	50

# 1 Budget Planning Survey Highlights

## 2019 Budget Planning Survey Highlights


Survey of 533 adult Leduc residents contacted by phone, May 2<sup>nd</sup> to 31<sup>st</sup>, 2018, and completed the survey. Results are weighted by age.




# 2018 Budget Planning Survey Highlights

Survey of 438 adult Leduc residents contacted by phone, April 24<sup>th</sup> to June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2017 and did an online survey. Results are weighted by age.


## City Service Value for Taxes




## Decrease Service Levels to Minimize Tax Increase?




## Preferred Tax Strategy (no changes)



## Desired Change to Variable Spending



## Most Important Priority Facing Leduc



## 2 Detailed Project Description

### 2.1 Project Background

In spring 2018, the City of Leduc (“the City”) contracted Advanis to conduct the 2019 City of Leduc General Population Budget Planning Survey. The primary purpose of this study is to assess the views of City of Leduc residents concerning the budgetary planning process for the 2019 budget. In total, 533 randomly selected City of Leduc residents aged 18 and older completed the survey between May 2<sup>nd</sup> and May 31<sup>st</sup>, 2018.

This report outlines the results of the 2019 General Population Budget Planning Survey. Comparisons to previous years’ survey data are included where appropriate to determine any shifts in the perceptions and opinions of Leduc residents.

### 2.2 Methodology

All components of the project were designed and executed in close consultation with the City of Leduc. A detailed description of each task of the project is outlined in the remainder of this section.

#### 2.2.1 Project Planning

Advanis team members reviewed the documents and met with City employees charged with leading this research to ensure total understanding of the purpose and needs of this study. Both the City and Advanis agreed upon a research methodology and detailed work plan. As with previous years, few changes were made to the Budget Planning surveys as detailed in the following sections.

For the 2019 Budget Planning Survey, the City wanted to attempt to capture responses from younger (16 or 17 year old) residents of Leduc. While these younger residents were not a part of this General Population study, they were allowed to complete the Stakeholder study’s survey. However, no surveys were completed in 2018 by this younger demographic.

#### 2.2.2 Survey Design

The 2019 Budget Planning Survey was based on the 2018 Budget Planning Survey, conducted in spring 2017. This maintained consistency between years and allowed many results to be compared between years. Specific changes made to the survey included:

- Adding a new question asking respondents if they recalled seeing or hearing an advertisement for the survey and if so, where.
- Removing “Leduc County and City of Edmonton Annexation” as a level from the most important priority question (Q6).
- Updating all dates in the survey to reflect 2018 dates and all budget percentages to reflect what was actually budgeted for in 2018.
- Changing the incentive from offering a Leduc Recreation Centre Family Flex Pass (10 admissions) to a movie pass for 4 to Leduc Cinemas.

Advanis provided the City with a draft of the survey which the City provided feedback on. Advanis incorporated this feedback and the survey was programmed and tested. The City had the opportunity to review the survey online and provided additional feedback, which Advanis incorporated. A text version of the final questionnaire is provided in the Appendix (section 4.3).

### 2.2.3 Survey Population and Data Collection

Advanis purchased a random set of landline telephone numbers and generated wireless numbers for the City of Leduc. Potential participants were contacted by telephone and recruited to complete the online survey. A link to the online survey was provided either by email or text message. This methodology is consistent with previous years and conducting the survey online is necessary given the need to show graphics in the survey to residents.

The City remains cognizant of the increased use of mobile devices within our community, and recognized the importance of creating a mobile friendly platform for the 2019 Budget Planning Survey in order to most effectively engage all Leduc residents. As mentioned, the survey platform used in 2018 allowed for a mobile-optimized experience ensuring that those who chose to complete the survey on a smartphone or tablet could do so with ease.

**In total, 54% of surveys collected for this report completed the survey on a mobile device** (compared to 44% in 2017). Due to the design and general population sample of the General Population survey, results are statistically representative.

A soft-launch of the survey was conducted on May 1<sup>st</sup> to May 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2018. The purpose of the soft-launch was to ensure the survey was functioning as intended on the survey platform, by collecting a limited number of completed surveys and reviewing the results. Since no data checks flagged any concerns, these results were included and the full survey was launched. The primary fielding dates for the remainder of residents who completed the survey was from May 2<sup>nd</sup> to May 31<sup>st</sup>, 2018. In total, 533 residents completed the survey which implies a margin of error no greater than  $\pm 4.2\%$  at 95% confidence.

Similar to previous years, for this analysis, weights were assigned based on the ages of residents to ensure that their representation in the City-wide sample was proportionate to the City of Leduc population as determined by the 2017 City of Leduc Census. Specific details of the weighting scheme used can be found in the Appendix (section 4.2).

### 2.2.4 Survey Awareness

Survey participants were asked if they recalled seeing or hearing an advertisement for the survey. 15% mentioned that they recalled it from the City of Leduc website, 11% from social media, 5% from radio, 4% from cinema, and 17% saw or heard an advertisement for the survey somewhere else. In total, 59% did not recall seeing or hearing an advertisement for the survey.




### 3 Study Findings

This section details the results of each specific topic in the survey. In this section, there are a few things to note:

- The term “significant” means “statistically significant at 95% confidence”.
- The analysis checked for statistical differences between the following groups:
  - Age (18 to 34, 35 to 54, 55 to 64, 65 or older);
  - Children in household (children, no children);
  - Income (under \$60,000, \$60,000 to \$99,999, \$100,000 to \$149,999, \$150,000 or more);
  - Employment status (employed full/part time, on leave/homemaker/student/not employed/retired);
  - Home ownership (owning, renting);
  - Perceived value from taxes (good/very good/excellent, fair/poor);
  - Preference regarding decreasing services to limit tax increases (support, neutral, oppose); and
  - Preferred tax strategy (prefer to increase taxes, prefer to cut services).
- The subgroup differences mentioned above are statistically tested in mutually exclusive groupings. For example, if a result says that it is statistically higher for those aged 18 to 34, this means that the result among those aged 18 to 34 is statistically higher than those who are not aged 18 to 34.
- To improve readability, bars with values less than 5% may not have the value shown. Actual percents are available in separate tables.
- Results have been rounded to remove decimal places. As a result, adding up values may not exactly equal the total expected.
- Arrows may appear on graphs that compare results over time. These indicate if the results are statistically (at 95% confidence) higher or lower than the previous year’s results.
- The term “(VOL)” at the start of labels indicate that this level was volunteered by residents who put text into the “other specify” level. These results are likely lower than they would have been had all residents seen these as levels.
- For results with a base size of fewer than 30 residents, percents are shown. However, results should be interpreted with caution due to the small base sizes. Additionally, statistical differences are not shown if a respondent subgroup has a base size of fewer than 30 residents.




### 3.1 Property Tax Value

Residents were informed that a portion of property tax is collected on behalf of the Province of Alberta and goes to pay for education. When asked what percent of property tax goes to the province, nearly three-quarters (72%) did not know. The true percent of property tax that pays for education is 29%. 8% of residents came close, mentioning between '27% and 31%', while less than 1% of residents correctly identified that '29%' of property tax pays for education.



Values may not sum to 100% due to rounding. Trending is not shown as the true percent (29%) has increased from last year (27%).


Subgroups that are significantly more likely to answer in the 27% to 31% range include:

-  19%: Those who are 65 or older;
-  12%: Those without children in the home; and
-  10%: Those who own their primary residence.



All residents were then made aware that 29% of property taxes are collected on behalf of the province to pay for education. They were then asked what level of value they felt they received from the remaining 71% used to fund city services. Consistent with last year, sentiment continues to be quite positive.


### Perceived Value Received for Taxes Paid





Values may not sum to 100% due to rounding. Bars missing values are less than 5%.

The percent of residents that feel they received “good”, “very good”, or “excellent” value for their taxes (73%) continues to remain high in 2018 and is similar to the high scores in previous years.

### Perceived Value Received for Taxes Paid (Good, Very Good, Excellent)




Subgroups that are significantly more likely to feel they receive “good”, “very good”, or “excellent” value include:

-  82%: Those who oppose decreasing services to minimize tax increases; and
-  85%: Those who favour increasing taxes to improve or maintain services.

Residents were asked the reason why they felt that way. Given that most residents feel that they have received “good” or better value, it is not surprising that most reasons provided are positive. Although there were a number of different reasons mentioned, the top **+** **positive** reasons are that residents feel that city recreation, parks, and trails are good (18%), city infrastructure is well maintained (14%), the City overall is well maintained (12%), snow removal is good (12%) and the level of services is good (10%). The top **-** **negative** reason provided by 16% of residents is the desire to see a specific service improved. Note that over a third (39%) of residents were unable to provide a reason for the value they receive. These results are statistically consistent with the comments provided last year.


### Why Residents Feel this Way



n=533. Values may sum to more than 100% as multiple mentions were allowed.

### 3.2 Overall Property Tax Preference

Residents were shown four different tax strategies and asked for their preference. Results were similar to 2017, and split between 42% preferring to increase taxes to increase or maintain services, and 33% preferring cutting services to maintain or reduce taxes. A further 24% did not provide an opinion.



Values may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Results are not trended prior to 2017 due to the removal of the “something else” category.


Significant subgroup differences include:

Increase taxes, increase services	Increase taxes, maintain services	Cut services, maintain taxes	Cut services, cut taxes
✂️ 40%: Those who oppose a decrease in service levels to minimize tax increases	✂️ 27%: Those who oppose a decrease in service levels to minimize tax increases 😊 23%: Those who feel they get good/very good/excellent value for taxes	🏠 24%: Those who own their primary residence	✂️ 25%: Those who support a decrease in service levels to minimize tax increases 😞 22%: Those who feel they get fair/poor value for taxes 🏠 14%: Those who own their primary residence

The City is sensitive to the economic climate and residents' desire to keep tax increases to a minimum. As such, residents were asked for their level of support or opposition for decreasing service levels to minimize tax increases.

Results were mixed with 44% opposing this approach, compared to 28% who supported it. One quarter did not feel strongly either way, while another 4% did not have an opinion. These results are similar to 2017.

### Support/Opposition for a Decrease in Service Levels to Maintain Taxes



Values may not sum to 100% due to rounding.  
Results are not trended prior to 2017 since a likelihood scale was used in 2016.

Subgroups that are significantly more likely to **support** decreasing service levels to maintain taxes include:

- 46%: Those who prefer to cut services to maintain or cut taxes; and
- 32%: Those who own their primary residence.

No subgroups are significantly more likely to **neither support or oppose** decreasing service levels to maintain taxes.

Subgroups that are significantly more likely to **oppose** decreasing service levels to maintain taxes include:


- 69%: Those who prefer to increase taxes to improve or maintain services;
- 65%: Those who rent their primary residence; and
- 48%: Those who feel they receive “good”, “very good”, or “excellent” value for their taxes.

In terms of why residents support or oppose decreasing service levels to minimize tax increases, nearly a fifth (18%) of those who support decreasing service levels to minimize tax increases want only some, but not all, services to be affected, while 16% would only support a minimal decrease. Note that there are significantly fewer who support this action due to being unable to afford a tax increase or because of the slow economy (7%, down from 22% in 2017).

In contrast, 26% oppose decreasing service levels because they feel that services attract and retain residents, or to avoid future problems, and a further 11% say services are already minimal, and prefer a small increase in taxes.

It should be noted that just over a third (34% of those who support and 35% of those who oppose) did not provide any justification for their views.

### Reasons for Support/Opposition



n=139 (Support), 237 (Oppose). Values may sum to more than 100% as multiple mentions were allowed. Bars with values that are **bold and underlined** are statistically higher than the other bar above/below it.

### 3.3 Adjustments to Variable Spending


The City of Leduc budget includes two spending categories:

- Fixed Spending (58%) includes items that are necessary to govern, operate and maintain the City of Leduc and do not vary based on the level of service provided, including:
  - Mayor and City Council;
  - Corporate and Legislative Services;
  - Engineering Services;
  - Planning Services;
  - Facility Services;
  - Debt Repayment; and
  - Capital Transfer.
- Variable Spending (42%) includes categories where spending can be increased or decreased depending on the level of service provided.

The proposed City of Leduc 2019 variable budget is split between the following services:





#### **City of Leduc 2019 Variable Budget**

*Proposed Net Spending by Program*








Residents were asked to rate their preference for how the City should allocate funds (increase, decrease or remain the same) for each of the services. Most residents would like budgets to remain the same. That said, the following services had the highest percent of residents requesting an **increase** in spending:


-  32%: Police protection and enforcement services;
-  30%: Family and community support;
-  25%: Fire & Ambulance Services; and
-  17%: Public services.

Services that had the highest percent of residents requesting a **decrease** in spending include:

-  27%: Leduc Recreation Centre Operations;
-  20%: Community development; and
-  20%: Library services.

### Comparison of Preferred Budget Adjustments for all Services

*Proposed % of budget*



n=533. Values may not sum to 100% due to rounding.


\* Fire and ambulance services are contracted services provided by the City on behalf of the Province of Alberta and cannot be reduced.

The remainder of this section of the report explores each of these services in more detail.

### 3.3.1 Police Protection & Enforcement Services (Proposed 23%)



This year, 32% of residents would like funding to increase for Police Protection and Enforcement Services (the highest increase % among all services), up significantly from 20% in 2017. This shift has led to fewer residents wanting funding to remain the same (57%) compared to last year, although about one in ten (11%, similar to last year) would like funding to decrease.

#### Budget Adjustment for Police Protection & Enforcement Services (Proposed 23%)



Values may not add to 100% due to rounding. Bars missing values are less than 5%.

Subgroups that are significantly more likely to want an **increase** in funding include:

-  48%: Those favouring increasing taxes to increase or maintain services; and
-  42%: Those who oppose a decrease in services to minimize tax increase.

Subgroups that are significantly more likely to want funding to **remain the same** include:


-  66%: Those favouring cutting services to maintain or decrease taxes.

Subgroups that are significantly more likely to want a **decrease** in funding include:

-  18%: Those who support a decrease in services to maintain taxes.

Residents who would **increase** spending on *Police Protection and Enforcement Services* most often explained that they would like to keep up with population growth (74%). Furthermore, a majority of residents feel a need to increase funding to keep crime down (72%) and would like more police presence (56%). These results are statistically consistent with the comments provided last year.


### Reasons to Increase Police Protection & Enforcement Services Spending



n=176. Values may sum to more than 100% as multiple mentions were allowed.

Three out of five (60%) residents who would **decrease** spending on *Police Protection and Enforcement Services* suggested less focus on traffic and speeding enforcement. These results are statistically consistent with the comments provided last year.

### Reasons to Decrease Police Protection & Enforcement Services Spending




n=54. Values may sum to more than 100% as multiple mentions were allowed.

### 3.3.2 Family & Community Support (Proposed 3%)




Most residents prefer to see Family and Community Support Services funding remain the same, similar to 2017. However, close to one-third (30%) would like funding to be increased, while 11% would prefer to see funding decrease, both of which are similar to results found in 2017.

**Budget Adjustment for Family & Community Support (Proposed 3%)**




Values may not add to 100% due to rounding. Bars missing values are less than 5%.





Subgroups that are significantly more likely to want an **increase** in funding include:

-  46%: Those 18 to 34 years old;
-  42%: Those favouring increasing taxes to increase or maintain services; and
-  41%: Those who oppose a decrease in service levels to minimize tax increase;

Subgroups that are significantly more likely to want funding to **remain the same** include:


-  71%: Those with a household income between \$60,000 and \$99,999.

Subgroups that are significantly more likely to want a **decrease** in funding include:

-  24%: Those favouring cutting services to maintain or decrease taxes;
-  22%: Those with a household income between \$100,000 and \$149,999;
-  20%: Those who support decreasing services to maintain taxes; and
-  14%: Those who own their primary residence.

Most of the residents who would **increase** spending on *Family and Community Support Services* felt that funding helps provide affordable support services (61%). About half also say additional funding is needed to keep up with population growth (54%), or would like more or different types of services to be available (45%). These results are statistically consistent with the comments provided last year.


### Reasons to Increase Family & Community Support Spending



n=131. Values may sum to more than 100% as multiple mentions were allowed.

About two-fifths (44%) of residents who would **decrease** spending on *Family and Community Support Services* cited a desire for more funding from other levels of government. In addition, one-third (33%) would like funding to decrease because they do not know what this service offers. These results are statistically consistent with the comments provided last year.

### Reasons to Decrease Family & Community Support Spending




n=60. Values may sum to more than 100% as multiple mentions were allowed.



### 3.3.3 Fire & Ambulance Services (Proposed 19%)



Fire and Ambulance Services are contracted services provided by the City on behalf of the Province of Alberta and cannot be reduced. There has been a decrease in the percent of residents (75%) who would like the budget for fire and ambulance services to remain the same compared to 2017 as a larger proportion would like to see an increase in services (25%).

**Budget Adjustment for Fire & Ambulance Services** (Proposed 19%)








Values may not add to 100% due to rounding. Bars missing values are less than 5%.

Subgroups that are significantly more likely to want an **increase** in funding include:


-  37%: Those favouring increasing taxes to increase or maintain services; and
-  34%: Those who oppose decreasing services to maintain taxes.

Subgroups that are significantly more likely to want funding to **remain the same** include:

-  84%: Those who feel they get fair/poor value for their taxes;
-  84%: Those who support decreasing services to maintain taxes;
-  83%: Those who neither oppose nor support decreasing services to maintain taxes;
-  84%: Those favouring cutting services to maintain or decrease taxes; and
-  81%: Those between the ages of 35 and 54.

Residents who would **increase** spending on *Fire and Ambulance Services* most often explained that this is an essential service to the community (89%). Approximately two-thirds (66%) said they would like to increased funding for the safety of residents. These results are statistically consistent with the comments provided last year.

### Reasons to Increase Fire & Ambulance Services Spending




n=119. Values may sum to more than 100% as multiple mentions were allowed.

### 3.3.4 Public Services (Proposed 16%)





Residents' opinions regarding spending on Public Services have changed again, after shifting significantly in 2017. More residents (17%) want spending to increase, and fewer want spending to remain the same (70%). However, a similar proportion (13%) wants spending on public services to decrease.

**Budget Adjustment for Public Services** (Proposed 16%)



Values may not add to 100% due to rounding. Bars missing values are less than 5%.




Subgroups that are significantly more likely to want an **increase** in funding include:

-  36%: Those who rent their primary residence;
-  29%: Those with a household income of \$60,000 or less;
-  25%: Those who prefer increasing taxes to maintain or increase services; and,
-  24%: Those who oppose a decrease in service levels to minimize tax increase.

Subgroups that are significantly more likely to want funding to **remain the same** include:


-  76%: Those who feel they get good/very good/excellent value for their taxes.

Subgroups that are significantly more likely to want a **decrease** in funding include:

-  30%: Those who prefer cutting services to maintain or lower taxes;
-  30%: Those who support a decrease in services to minimize tax increases; and
-  29%: Those who feel they get fair/poor value for their taxes.

When it comes to *Public Services*, those who would like an **increase** in funding primarily want more roads, sidewalks, and other trails to keep up with population growth (48%). Many others would like to reduce traffic congestion (42%), or see more road maintenance (35%). Note that only 9% (down from 32% in 2017) would like more sidewalks and other walking or biking trails.


### Reasons to Increase Public Services Spending



n=74. Values may sum to more than 100% as multiple mentions were allowed.

In contrast, those residents who suggested a **decrease** in funding for *Public Services* often mentioned that sidewalks and other trails are satisfactory (61%) and well maintained (52%). Additionally, 49% feel that roads, sidewalks and other trails can handle some population growth while 47% feel that roads are already well maintained. These results are statistically consistent with the comments provided last year.

### Reasons to Decrease Public Services Spending




n=72. Values may sum to more than 100% as multiple mentions were allowed.

### 3.3.5 Public Transportation (Proposed 5%)



In 2018, over two in three residents (69%) would like the budget for Public Transportation to remain the same, 16% would like to see it increase, and 15% would like the budget to decrease. These results are similar to last year.

**Budget Adjustment for Public Transportation (Proposed 5%)**




Values may not add to 100% due to rounding. Bars missing values are less than 5%.






Subgroups that are significantly more likely to want an **increase** in funding include:

-  25%: Those who favour increasing taxes to increase or maintain services; and
-  23%: Those who oppose a decrease in service levels to minimize tax increase.

Subgroups that are significantly more likely to want funding to **remain the same** include:


-  80%: Those who neither oppose nor support decreasing services to maintain taxes.

Subgroups that are significantly more likely to want a **decrease** in funding include:

-  30%: Those with a household income of \$150,000 or more;
-  27%: Those who feel they get fair/poor value for their taxes;
-  26%: Those favouring cutting services to maintain or decrease taxes;
-  24%: Those who support decreasing services to maintain taxes; and
-  21%: Those between the ages of 35 and 54.

Nearly three-quarters (73%) of residents who would **increase** spending on *Public Transportation* said they would like more busses, more routes, and/or increased frequency of service. Additionally, over half would also like more funds to encourage more people to use public transit (59%), and to facilitate earlier or later bus service (52%, up from 27% in 2017).

### Reasons to Increase Public Transportation Spending




n=78. Values may sum to more than 100% as multiple mentions were allowed.



A lack of personal and household use of *Public Transportation* (69%) is the most common reason mentioned by residents who would **decrease** spending. An additional 39% suggest charging riders more for the service.

### Reasons to Decrease Public Transportation Spending




n=85. Values may sum to more than 100% as multiple mentions were allowed.

### 3.3.6 Snow Removal (Proposed 5%)




More residents would like Snow Removal’s budget to increase (12%) compared to 2017 while fewer residents feel that the budget should decrease (7%). That said, the vast majority of residents (81%) want spending to stay the same, which is on par with 2017.

**Budget Adjustment for Snow Removal** (Proposed 5%)





Values may not add to 100% due to rounding. Bars missing values are less than 5%.



Subgroups that are significantly more likely to want an **increase** in funding include:

-  42%: Those who rent their primary residence;
-  25%: Those with a household income under \$60,000; and
-  17%: Those favouring increasing taxes to increase or maintain services

Subgroups that are significantly more likely to want funding to **remain the same** include:


-  86%: Those who own their primary residence; and
-  85%: Those who feel they get good/very good/excellent value for their taxes.

Subgroups that are significantly more likely to want a **decrease** in funding include:

-  16%: Those who support decreasing services to maintain taxes; and
-  14%: Those favouring cutting services to maintain or decrease taxes.

The most common reasons mentioned by residents who would **increase** funding for *Snow Removal* are that they would like residential areas and side streets to be cleared more often (81%), roads cleared and sanded sooner (46%), and they would like Leduc to be more prepared for winter (36%).


### Reasons to Increase Snow Removal Spending



n=53. Values may sum to more than 100% as multiple mentions were allowed.

Residents who would like to **decrease** funding for *Snow Removal* were more split in their reasons; 41% feel that residential areas and side streets could be cleared less often, 32% feel roads should be cleared less frequently during prolonged storms, and 27% would like the City to consider waiting longer before clearing and sanding roads. These results are statistically consistent with the comments provided last year.

### Reasons to Decrease Snow Removal Spending




n=36. Values may sum to more than 100% as multiple mentions were allowed.

### 3.3.7 Community Development (Proposed 6%)




Community Development is tied for the second highest percentage of residents suggesting that funding should decrease (20%). Overall, the percentage of residents who feel that funding should decrease, remain the same (69%), or should increase (11%) have all remained consistent over the past several years.

**Budget Adjustment for Community Development** (Proposed 6%)




Values may not add to 100% due to rounding. Bars missing values are less than 5%.





Subgroups that are significantly more likely to want an **increase** in funding include:

-  21%: Those favouring increasing taxes to increase or maintain services;
-  15%: Those who oppose a decrease in service levels to minimize tax increase; and
-  13%: Those who feel they get good/very good/excellent value for their taxes.

Subgroups that are significantly more likely to want funding to **remain the same** include:


-  81%: Those with a household income between \$60,000 and \$99,999.

Subgroups that are significantly more likely to want a **decrease** in funding include:

-  37%: Those whose preferred tax strategy is to cut services to maintain or lower taxes;
-  34%: Those who support a decrease in services levels to maintain taxes;
-  26%: Those between ages of 35 and 54; and
-  23%: Those who own their primary residence.

Those residents who would **increase** spending on *Community Development* mentioned a number of different reasons, with promoting a healthy lifestyle mentioned by most (61%). Another 49% would like increased spending to make Leduc an attractive place to live and 34% would like to increase the quality of existing parks.


### Reasons to Increase Community Development Spending



n=49. Values may sum to more than 100% as multiple mentions were allowed. Trending is not analyzed because 2017 has fewer than 30 responses.

Residents who would **decrease** spending on *Community Development* were mostly split between feeling that the quality (65%) and number (63%) of existing parks are adequate.

### Reasons to Decrease Community Development Spending




n=113. Values may sum to more than 100% as multiple mentions were allowed.



### 3.3.8 Library Services (Proposed 4%)





Few residents feel that the budget for Library Services should increase (8%), although this is an increase from last year. In contrast, one-fifth (20%) feel that the budget should decrease, while the remaining 72% feel that the budget should remain the same (both similar to last year).

**Budget Adjustment for Library Services** (Proposed 4%)





Values may not add to 100% due to rounding. Bars missing values are less than 5%.

Subgroups that are significantly more likely to want an **increase** in funding include:

-  20%: Those who rent their primary residence;
-  17%: Those between the ages of 18 and 34;
-  16%: Those with a household income between \$60,000 and \$99,999; and
-  12%: Those who oppose a decrease in service levels to minimize tax increase.


There are no subgroups significantly more likely to want funding to **remain the same**.

Subgroups that are significantly more likely to want a **decrease** in funding include:

-  30%: Those who support a decrease in services to minimize tax increases; and
-  30%: Those who prefer cutting services to maintain or lower taxes.

Only 26 residents suggested an **increase** in spending for *Library Services*. Keeping up with demand due to city growth (n=13), wanting more programs or resources (n=13), wanting to increase the collection of books (n=13), and their household using the library (n=13) are all top reasons for wanting library services spending increased.


### Reasons to Increase Library Services Spending



n=26. Due to the base being less than n=30, interpret with caution. Trending is not analyzed because both 2017 and 2018 have fewer than 30 responses. Values may sum to more than 100% as multiple mentions were allowed.

More than half of those residents who would like *Library Services'* budget to **decrease** mentioned that an expansion is not needed at this time (60%). A further 44% suggested adding a user fee for the library to help with funding, 41% mentioned that their household does not use the library, and 39% mentioned that the library should be able to handle current population growth.

### Reasons to Decrease Library Services Spending




n=113. Values may sum to more than 100% as multiple mentions were allowed.

### 3.3.9 Parks & Athletic Field Maintenance (Proposed 9%)

Similar to 2017, 17% of residents feel that the budget for Parks and Athletic Field Maintenance should decrease compared to only 7% who feel that the budget should increase. Also similar to 2017, the remaining 76% think that the budget should remain the same.




**Budget Adjustment for Parks & Athletic Field Maintenance** (Proposed 9%)






Values may not add to 100% due to rounding. Bars missing values are less than 5%.

There are no specific subgroups that are significantly more likely to want an **increase** funding.

Subgroups that are significantly more likely to want funding to **remain the same** include:


-  85%: Those who oppose a decrease in service levels to minimize tax increases;
-  84%: Those who favour increasing taxes to maintain or increase services; and
-  81%: Those who feel that they receive “good”, “very good”, or “excellent” value for their taxes.

Subgroups that are significantly more likely to want a **decrease** in funding include:

-  34%: Those who support a decrease in service levels to minimize tax increases;
-  31%: Those who favour cutting services to maintain or lower taxes; and
-  29%: Those who feel that they receive “fair” or “poor” value for their taxes.

Although very few residents mentioned that they would like to **increase** spending on *Parks and Athletic Field Maintenance*, the most common reasons cited are to encourage more use of parks and other outdoor facilities (67%) and wanting more attractions, park and trails for the community (61%).


### Reasons to Increase Parks & Athletic Field Maintenance Spending



n=35. Values may sum to more than 100% as multiple mentions were allowed. Trending is not analyzed because 2017 has fewer than 30 responses.

Residents who would like a **decrease** in funding for *Parks and Athletic Field Maintenance* were more unified in their reasons with just over half (54%) mentioning that grass and shrubs could be maintained in parks, gardens, and boulevards less frequently, while one-fifth (20%) suggest considering less weed and pest control. These results are statistically consistent with the comments provided last year.

### Reasons to Decrease Parks & Athletic Field Maintenance Spending




n=87. Values may sum to more than 100% as multiple mentions were allowed.

### 3.3.10 Leduc Recreation Centre Operations (Proposed 10%)

There has been a significant increase in the percentage of residents wanting Leduc Recreation Centre operations funding decreased; over one-quarter (27%) want funding decreased. In contrast, very few (5%) want funding to be increased, while about two-thirds (68%) would prefer that funding stay the same.





**Budget Adjustment for Leduc Recreation Centre Operations (Proposed 10%)**






Values may not add to 100% due to rounding. Bars missing values are less than 5%.

There are no subgroups significantly more likely to want an **increase** in funding.

Subgroups that are significantly more likely to want funding to **remain the same** include:


-  79%: Those who oppose a decrease in service levels to minimize tax increase;
-  77%: Those 65 or older;
-  76%: Those favouring increasing taxes to increase or maintain services; and
-  74%: Those who feel they receive “good”, “very good” or “excellent” value from their taxes.

Subgroups that are significantly more likely to want a **decrease** in funding include:

-  47%: Those who feel they get fair/poor value for their taxes;
-  46%: Those who support a decrease in services levels to minimize tax increases; and
-  41%: Those whose preferred tax strategy is to cut services to maintain or lower taxes.

Wanting lower user fees (61%) is the most mentioned reason provided by residents who would **increase** spending on *Leduc Recreation Centre Operations*. Additionally, half of those who would like increased funding indicated their household uses the Leduc Recreation Centre (50%) while 44% would like more facilities. These results are statistically consistent with the comments provided last year.

### Reasons to Increase Leduc Recreation Centre Operations Spending




n=34. Values may sum to more than 100% as multiple mentions were allowed.



Just over half (56%) of residents who would **decrease** spending on *Leduc Recreation Centre Operations* feel that the current equipment in the facilities is adequate. In addition, 40% feel that no new facilities are needed and 39% would like those who use the Leduc Recreation Centre to pay more. These results are statistically consistent with the comments provided last year.

### Reasons to Decrease Leduc Recreation Centre Operations Spending




n=122. Values may sum to more than 100% as multiple mentions were allowed.

### 3.3.11 Other Variable Spending Feedback

After residents rated their preference for how the City should allocate funds, they were provided with an additional chance to offer any other feedback on spending that may not have already been covered. Given that they had just provided feedback for the ten different services categories, only 18% provided further feedback. In total, 8% reiterated that they would like spending to **increase** in general or for specific services, compared to 5% who reiterated that they wanted spending to **decrease**.

#### Other Variable Spending Feedback




n=533. Values may sum to more than 100% as multiple mentions were allowed.

### 3.4 Other Projects and Priorities

Residents were provided an opportunity to state other projects or goals for the City to consider. The vast majority (72%) could not think of any other projects or goals. That said, the top suggestion was to see improved roads, access to certain areas, and/or traffic flow (7%).


#### Other Projects of Goals to Consider



n=533. Values may sum to more than 100% as multiple mentions were allowed.


Finally, when asked about the top priority facing the City, over one-quarter (29%) chose smooth tax strategies. A further 22% (up from 13% in 2017) would like the City to attract new and maintain current businesses and amenities, 14% would like the City to be preparing for and reacting to changes in the economy, and 13% would like the City to be finding ways to lower property taxes in the future.

### Most Important Priority Facing the City



n=533. Values may not add to 100% due to rounding. Note that in 2018, the level “Leduc County and City of Edmonton Annexation” was not offered as an option.

After grouping some of the categories we find that 52% of residents would like the City to prioritize the taxation of residents and another 43% would like the City to adopt a long term focus.



## 4 Appendices

### 4.1 Respondent Demographics

	Percent of Residents						
	2018 (n=533)	2017 (n=438)	2016 (n=426)	2015 (n=452)	2014 (n=445)	2013 (n=461)	2012 (n=401)
<b>Age</b>							
18 to 24 years	7%	2%	6%	4%	4%	4%	2%
25 to 34 years	23%	30%	26%	31%	32%	32%	14%
35 to 44 years	16%	18%	18%	18%	18%	18%	21%
45 to 54 years	21%	18%	19%	18%	17%	17%	22%
55 to 64 years	14%	14%	15%	14%	14%	12%	18%
65 years or older	18%	17%	15%	13%	14%	16%	22%
Not stated	1%	1%	2%	3%	2%	1%	2%
<b>Employment Status</b>							
Working full time, including self-employment (more than 30 hours/ week)	51%	49%	53%	63%	59%	64%	54%
Working part time, including self-employment (30 hours per week or less)	11%	14%	15%	8%	11%	10%	12%
On leave (disability, paternity, etc.)	2%	4%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Homemaker	6%	6%	7%	9%	8%	9%	7%
Student	5%	3%	3%	1%	3%	1%	1%
Not employed	2%	3%	6%	3%	4%	3%	2%
Retired	18%	16%	15%	14%	14%	13%	24%
Prefer not to answer	4%	5%	1%	1%	1%	<1%	1%
<b>Household Income</b>							
Under \$20,000	2%	2%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
\$20,000 to \$39,999	6%	5%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
\$40,000 to \$59,999	10%	11%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
\$60,000 to \$79,999	12%	9%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
\$80,000 to \$99,999	11%	12%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
\$100,000 to \$124,999	14%	18%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
\$125,000 to \$149,999	10%	10%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
\$150,000 or more	17%	14%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Prefer not to answer	19%	19%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Primary Residence</b>							
Own	81%	92%	89%	92%	89%	88%	91%
Rent	14%	7%	11%	7%	9%	11%	7%
Not stated	5%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%
<b>City of Leduc Employee?</b>							
Yes	5%	5%	3%	4%	5%	7%	4%
No/Prefer not to say	92%	90%	96%	95%	94%	93%	94%
Not stated	4%	5%	1%	1%	1%	<1%	2%

Children (under 18) in Household?							
Yes	<b>45%</b>	49%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
No	<b>55%</b>	50%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Prefer not to answer	<b>1%</b>	1%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Values may not add to 100% due to rounding.

## 4.2 Data Weighting

The data was weighted to the age characteristics of the residents of Leduc as determined by the 2017 Leduc Census. The following outlines the weighting factors utilized in this research:

Age group	Number of completed surveys	Proportion of completed surveys	Census proportions*	Weight factor
<b>18 to 34</b>	35	7%	30%	4.60
<b>35 to 54</b>	181	34%	37%	1.09
<b>55 to 64</b>	139	26%	14%	0.55
<b>65 or older</b>	175	33%	18%	0.55
<b>Unknown/Refused*</b>	3	1%	1%	1.00

\* Residents were allowed to refuse to answer their age as long as they confirmed that they are at least 18 years old. These cases are left unweighted (i.e. with a weight of 1) and the census proportions for this group are scaled to match accordingly.

## 4.3 Survey

What follows is the paper version of the survey. The online version of the survey was slightly different as completing surveys online allows for:

- Question randomization (the order of the B questions were randomized);
- Level randomization (the order of some lists were randomized);
- Response ordering (for example, some residents saw “Strongly oppose” first and others saw “Strongly support” first in Q2);
- Conditional text (for example, online Q1b asks why they feel they receive <Q1a value>); and
- Popup text (the ability to provide additional information in the form of a popup only to those who want it).



## Intro1

Have your say in your city's budget planning process! The City of Leduc is committed to gathering input from citizens regarding the planning for the future of the City, as demonstrated through the Citizen Satisfaction Survey and Community Visioning Workshops. In 2018, the City is seeking input from citizens to assist in the 2019 budget planning process through this survey.

The budget is a plan for tomorrow's Leduc and this is your chance to share your thoughts with City Council and Administration to help guide the 2019 budget. Doing so makes you **eligible to enter a draw to win a movie pass for 4 to Leduc Cinemas.**

We want to hear from you! You can complete this paper survey or you can complete the survey online using this link:

<http://surveys.advanis.ca/leduc2018budget>

---

To ensure your confidentiality, the third-party vendor Advanis Inc. has been hired to ensure only aggregated results are shared. There will be no way for anyone to tie the responses you provide back to you.

Advanis' Privacy Policy can be found here: [http://www.advanis.ca/privacy\\_policy2.html](http://www.advanis.ca/privacy_policy2.html)

© 2018 Advanis

## Intro2

Please read each question and statement carefully. For each question, please select the response(s) that best represents your point of view.

Please respond before **May 31, 2018.**

To begin, how old are you?

*(Select one)*

- 15 or younger
- 16 or 17
- 18 to 24
- 25 to 34
- 35 to 44
- 45 to 54
- 55 to 64
- 65 or older

## D1

Do you live **within the city limits** of Leduc?

*(Select one)*

- Yes
- No

**D1a**

Do you own or rent your primary residence in the City of Leduc?

(Select one)

- Own
- Rent
- Not applicable

**Q0**

A portion of property tax is collected on behalf of the Province of Alberta to pay for education.

To the best of your knowledge, what percent of property tax is collected on behalf of the Province of Alberta to pay **for education**?

\_\_\_\_\_ %

- Don't know

**Q1a**

In fact, of property tax collected in 2017:

- **29%** is collected *on behalf of the province* to pay for **education**.
- **71%** goes to the *City of Leduc* to fund **city services**.



Thinking about the **71%** used to fund **city services**, would you say you receive...?

(Select one)

- Excellent value
- Very good value
- Good value
- Fair value
- Poor value
- Don't know

**Q1b/Q1c**

What is the **main reason** you feel that way?

---

---

---



**Q2**

The City of Leduc understands and recognizes that residents’ desire to keep tax increases to a minimum. In order to do this, the city may need to consider reducing current service levels.

Would you oppose or support a **decrease in service levels** to minimize tax increases in 2019?  
(Select one)

- Strongly oppose** a decrease in service levels
- Somewhat oppose** a decrease in service levels
- Neither oppose nor support** a decrease in service levels
- Somewhat support** a decrease in service levels
- Strongly support** a decrease in service levels
- Don't know

**Q2a**

Why do you feel this way?

---

---

---

**Q3**

Next, thinking about the City of Leduc infrastructure (public buildings, road, etc.) and services overall, which of the following tax strategies **best represents** your preference?

(Select one)

- Increase taxes to fund growth needs, infrastructure maintenance and improve services
- Increase taxes to maintain all existing infrastructure and services
- Cut existing services to maintain current taxes
- Cut existing services to reduce taxes
- Don't know


**BIntro**

The City of Leduc budget includes two spending categories:

**Fixed Spending (58%)** includes items that are necessary to govern, operate and maintain the City of Leduc and do not vary based on the level of service provided:

- Mayor and City Council
- Corporate and Legislative Services
- Engineering Services
- Planning Services
- Facility Services
- Debt Repayment
- Capital Transfer

**Variable Spending (42%)** includes categories where spending can be increased or decreased depending on the level of service provided.



Have your say in your city’s budget planning process!

**BInstruction**

The next section wishes to understand your opinions on how **City of Leduc** spending should be altered (if at all). For each service, please specify if you think spending should increase, stay the same, or decrease in 2019. If you select increase or decrease, please let us know **all** the reasons you feel the way you do.

**B1a**

How would you adjust the variable spending in 2019 for **Police Protection & Enforcement Services** (proposed 23%)? This includes RCMP contract and detachment administrative support, community safety, animal control and other bylaw enforcement.

*(Select one)*

- Increase spending (may increase taxes)
- Spending should remain the same
- Decrease spending (may decrease taxes)

*Answer this question if you would **increase** spending:*

**B1b**

Why would you increase spending on **Police Protection & Enforcement Services**?

*(Please select all that apply)*

- Would like to keep crime down
- To keep up with population growth
- Would like more police presence
- Would like more traffic/speeding enforcement
- Some other reason (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Don't know

*Answer this question if you would **decrease** spending:*

**B1c**

Why would you decrease spending on **Police Protection & Enforcement Services**?

*(Please select all that apply)*

- I feel safe in the City of Leduc
- Current enforcement levels could handle population growth
- Police presence should be adequate
- Consider less focus on traffic and speeding enforcement
- Some other reason (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Don't know

**B2a**

How would you adjust the variable spending in 2019 for **Fire and Ambulance Services** (proposed 19%)? This includes Fire and Ambulance response, rescue and patient treatment services, community prevention and inspection services and emergency preparedness.

**Note:** *Ambulance services are contracted services provided by the City of Leduc on behalf of the Province of Alberta and cannot be reduced.*

*(Select one)*

- Increase spending (may increase taxes)
- Spending should remain the same

Answer this question if you would **increase** spending:

**B2b**

Why would you increase spending on **Fire and Ambulance Services**?

(Please select all that apply)

- Would like additional funding due to population growth
- Would like to ensure the quickest fire and/or ambulance response times
- This is an essential service to the community
- For the safety of residents
- Some other reason (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Don't know

**B3a**

How would you adjust the variable spending in 2019 for **Public Services** (proposed 16%)? This includes maintenance of roadways, sidewalks, multi-ways, bridges, overpasses, traffic controls, including: pot hole patching, crack sealing, grading, guard repair, cleaning, dust control, and pavement marking.

(Select one)

- Increase spending (may increase taxes)
- Spending should remain the same
- Decrease spending (may decrease taxes)

Answer this question if you would **increase** spending:

**B3b**

Why would you increase spending on **Public Services**?

(Please select all that apply)

- Population growth may require more roads, sidewalks, and other trails
- Would like more maintenance of sidewalks and other walking or biking trails
- Would like more sidewalks and other walking or biking trails
- Would like more road maintenance
- Would like to increase the number of roads or overpasses to help reduce traffic congestion
- Some other reason (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Don't know

Answer this question if you would **decrease** spending:

**B3c**

Why would you decrease spending on **Public Services**?

(Please select all that apply)

- Roads, sidewalks, and other trails can already handle some population growth
- Sidewalks and other walking or biking trails are well maintained
- Sidewalks and other walking or biking trails are satisfactory
- Roads are well maintained
- The roads and/or overpasses meet the city's needs
- Some other reason (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Don't know

**B4a**

How would you adjust the variable spending in 2019 for **Parks & Athletic Field Maintenance** (proposed 9%)? This includes maintenance, grass cutting, cleaning and repairs to cemetery, sports fields, tennis courts, outdoor ice rinks, skateboard parks, lakes and storm ponds, garden plots and playgrounds, parks landscaping and pest control.

*(Select one)*

- Increase spending (may increase taxes)
- Spending should remain the same
- Decrease spending (may decrease taxes)

*Answer this question if you would **increase** spending:*

**B4b**

Why would you increase spending on **Parks & Athletic Field Maintenance**?

*(Please select all that apply)*

- Would like grass/shrubs to be maintained in parks, gardens, and boulevards more frequently
- Would like better weed and/or pest control (e.g., mosquitoes)
- Would like more attractions, parks, and trails for the community
- To encourage more people to use parks and other outdoor facilities
- Some other reason (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Don't know

*Answer this question if you would **decrease** spending:*

**B4c**

Why would you decrease spending on **Parks & Athletic Field Maintenance**?

*(Please select all that apply)*

- Grass/shrubs could be maintained in parks, gardens, and boulevards less frequently
- Consider doing less weed and/or pest control (e.g., mosquitoes)
- There are too many attractions, parks, and trails in the community
- No one in my household uses parks or other outdoor facilities
- Some other reason (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Don't know

**B5a**

How would you adjust the variable spending in 2019 for **Leduc Recreation Centre Operations** (proposed 10%)? This includes Leduc Recreation facility maintenance and operations, sports & tourism, guest services, fitness centre and track, pool services, ice skating, field house and programmed services (i.e. child minding).

*(Select one)*

- Increase spending (may increase taxes)
- Spending should remain the same
- Decrease spending (may decrease taxes)

Answer this question if you would **increase** spending:

**B5b**

Why would you increase spending on **Leduc Recreation Centre Operations**?

(Please select all that apply)

- Would like more accessibility to existing facilities
- Would like more facilities
- Would like existing facilities to receive more frequent maintenance
- Would like more programs and/or equipment in the facilities
- Would like facilities to be open earlier and/or close later
- To help lower user fees
- My household uses the Leduc Recreation Centre
- Would like to more accessibility to existing facilities
- Some other reason (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Don't know

Answer this question if you would **decrease** spending:

**B5c**

Why would you decrease spending on **Leduc Recreation Centre Operations**?

(Please select all that apply)

- No new facilities are needed
- Would like existing facilities to be maintained less frequently
- Current equipment in the facilities are adequate
- Would like facilities to open later and/or close earlier
- Would like the users of the facilities to pay more
- My household does not use the Leduc Recreation Centre
- Some other reason (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Don't know

**B6a**

How would you adjust the variable spending in 2019 for **Snow Removal** (proposed 5%)? This includes street, parking lot and alleyway sanding, snow plowing and snow removal.

(Select one)

- Increase spending (may increase taxes)
- Spending should remain the same
- Decrease spending (may decrease taxes)

Answer this question if you would **increase** spending:

**B6b**

Why would you increase spending on **Snow Removal**?

(Please select all that apply)

- Would like Leduc to be more prepared for winters
- Consider clearing and sanding roads sooner or more often
- Would like more or better snow clearing equipment
- Would like residential areas and side streets to be cleared more often
- Public sidewalks and trails should be cleared sooner
- Some other reason (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Don't know

Answer this question if you would **decrease** spending:

**B6c**

Why would you decrease spending on **Snow Removal**?

(Please select all that apply)

- Consider clearing roads less frequently during prolonged storms
- Consider waiting longer before clearing and sanding roads
- Consider replacing and/or maintaining snow removal equipment less frequently
- Residential areas and side streets could be cleared less often
- Consider waiting longer to clear public sidewalks and trails
- Some other reason (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Don't know

**B7a**

How would you adjust the variable spending in 2019 for **Community Development** (proposed 6%)? This includes parks (e.g. spray parks, playgrounds, off-leash areas, etc.), recreation and culture planning and development including building playgrounds, Communities in Bloom, Healthy Hearts, and Canada Day programs.

(Select one)

- Increase spending (may increase taxes)
- Spending should remain the same
- Decrease spending (may decrease taxes)

Answer this question if you would **increase** spending:

**B7b**

Why would you increase spending on **Community Development**?

(Please select all that apply)

- Would like more parks
- Would like to increase the quality of existing parks
- Would like more community programs and/or events (e.g. Rock the Rails, etc.)
- Would like to increase the quality and/or frequency of existing programs
- To promote a healthy lifestyle
- This makes Leduc an attractive place to live
- Some other reason (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Don't know

Answer this question if you would **decrease** spending:

**B7c**

Why would you decrease spending on **Community Development**?

(Please select all that apply)

- The number of parks is adequate
- The quality of existing parks is adequate
- Consider lowering the quality and/or frequency of existing programs
- My household does not use or attend existing parks or programs
- Some other reason (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Don't know

**B8a**

How would you adjust the variable spending in 2019 for **Public Transportation** (proposed 5%)? Leduc Transit provides Leduc Assisted Transportation Service (LATS) to seniors (65+) and persons with disabilities within the City of Leduc. Leduc Transit also provides a separate inter-municipal transit service, in partnership with Leduc County, offering service that connects the Leduc and Nisku areas and also stops at the Edmonton International Airport and the Century Park LRT station in south Edmonton.

*(Select one)*

- Increase spending (may increase taxes)
- Spending should remain the same
- Decrease spending (may decrease taxes)

*Answer this question if you would **increase** spending:*

**B8b**

Why would you increase spending on **Public Transportation**?

*(Please select all that apply)*

- Would like more busses, more routes, and/or frequency of service
- Would like newer busses or added features to existing buses
- Would like to make public transit more affordable
- To encourage more people to use public transit
- Consider starting bus service sooner and/or ending service later
- My household uses public transportation
- Some other reason (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Don't know

*Answer this question if you would **decrease** spending:*

**B8c**

Why would you decrease spending on **Public Transportation**?

*(Please select all that apply)*

- Current service schedules should be adequate
- Existing buses should be adequate
- Consider charging riders more for this service
- My household does not use public transit
- Consider starting bus service later and/or ending service sooner
- Some other reason (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Don't know

**B9a**

How would you adjust the variable spending in 2019 for **Library Services** (proposed 4%)? This includes provision of children, teen and adult literary programs, exam proctoring, e-resources, e-books, internet access, audio books, DVD's, CD's, outreach services and access to resources from over 150 Alberta libraries.

*(Select one)*

- Increase spending (may increase taxes)
- Spending should remain the same
- Decrease spending (may decrease taxes)



Answer this question if you would **increase** spending:

**B9b**

Why would you increase spending on **Library Services**?

(Please select all that apply)

- To keep up with demand due to city growth
- Would like the library to be expanded
- Would like more programs or resources
- Would like to increase the collection of books
- My household uses the library
- Some other reason (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Don't know

Answer this question if you would **decrease** spending:

**B9c**

Why would you decrease spending on **Library Services**?

(Please select all that apply)

- Consider adding some type of user fee
- The library should be able to handle current population growth
- The library does not need to be expanded at this time
- Would like less programs or resources offered
- Consider obtaining fewer books and similar types of resources throughout the year
- My household does not use the library
- Some other reason (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Don't know

**B10a**

How would you adjust the variable spending in 2019 for **Family and Community Support Services** (proposed 3%)? This includes family counseling and support, prevention and education regarding social issues, meals on wheels program, senior support, and homemaking services.

(Select one)

- Increase spending (may increase taxes)
- Spending should remain the same
- Decrease spending (may decrease taxes)

Answer this question if you would **increase** spending:

**B10b**

Why would you increase spending on **Family and Community Support Services**?

(Please select all that apply)

- To keep up with population growth
- To help provide affordable support services
- Would like more or different types of services available
- Would like better quality of existing services
- I support this service
- Some other reason (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Don't know

Answer this question if you would **decrease** spending:

**B10c**

Why would you decrease spending on **Family and Community Support Services**?

(Please select all that apply)

- Existing services could handle population growth
- Would like more funding from other levels of government
- I don't know what this service offers
- Some other reason (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Don't know

**Q4**

Thank you for your input on the City of Leduc's variable spending budget. Is there any additional feedback you would like to provide regarding your choices?

---

---

---

**Q5**

What other projects or goals (if any) should the City be thinking of when planning the budget for 2019 and beyond? These may result in a tax increase.

---

---

---

**Q6**

Finally, with respect to the budget process, which of the following would you say is the **most important priority** facing the City?

(Select one)

- Focusing on long-term fiscal sustainability (smooth tax strategies)
- Planning for future growth to prevent overcrowding
- Attract new and maintain current businesses and amenities
- Finding ways to lower property taxes in the future
- Finding ways to ensure property taxes stay the same in the future
- Preparing for and reacting to changes in the economy
- Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

**DTxt**

In order for the City to better understand the different views and needs of citizens, this final set of questions will allow us to analyze the data by sub-groups. Please be assured that nothing will be recorded to link your answers with you or your household.

**D2**

Are there any children under the age of 18 in your household?

(Select one)

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to answer

**D6**

Which of the following categories applies to your total household income before taxes in 2016?

*(Select one)*

- Under \$20,000
- \$20,000 to \$39,999
- \$40,000 to \$59,999
- \$60,000 to \$79,999
- \$80,000 to \$99,999
- \$100,000 to \$124,999
- \$125,000 to \$149,999
- \$150,000 or more
- Prefer not to answer

**D3**

Which of the following best describes your current employment status?

*(Select one)*

- Working full time, including self-employment (more than 30 hours per week)
- Working part time, including self-employment (30 hours per week or less)
- On leave (disability, paternity, etc.)
- Homemaker
- Student
- Not employed
- Retired
- Prefer not to answer

*Answer this question if you are employed:*

**D5a**

And, do you work for the City of Leduc?

*(Select one)*

- Yes
- No

*Answer this question if you are on leave (disability, paternity, etc.):*

**D5b**

Immediately prior to the start of your leave, did you work for the City of Leduc?

*(Select one)*

- Yes
- No

**D7**

Which of the following are places that you have heard or seen advertisements promoting this survey?

*(Select all that apply)*

- Radio
- Social media
- City of Leduc website
- Cinema
- Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- I have not heard or seen any advertisements promoting this survey

**FB1**

Finally, we wish to get your feedback on this survey. Please tell us what you thought of this survey below! For example: What did you think of the survey? Was anything confusing? How could we make the survey better for others? We really appreciate your feedback!

---

---

---

**I0**

Thank you for completing the survey! You now have the option to enter a randomly selected prize draw for people who have taken part in the survey. Doing so makes you eligible to **enter a draw to win a movie pass for 4 to Leduc Cinemas.**

Do you wish to be entered into this draw? Your contact information will only be used for the purposes of the draw and will not be tied to your survey responses.

*(Select one)*

- Yes, I allow Advanis to provide the City of Leduc with my contact information should I be the winner of this draw
- No, remove me from the draw

**I1**

If you wish to participate in the draw, please provide your contact details below so that we may contact you should you be the winner of the draw. Personal information will remain confidential and **only** be used to contact the individual who has won the draw. Personal information provided as part of the City of Leduc Budget Survey contest is collected under the authority of section 33(c) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

First name: \_\_\_\_\_

Last name: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone number: \_\_\_\_\_



**End**

Thank you very much for your participation in this important study, your time and feedback are greatly appreciated by the City of Leduc!

Please note that the results of this survey will be shared with City Council during the budget planning process for 2019. Should you have any additional questions, please contact:

Carmen Dragan-Sima  
Manager, Financial Planning & Budgets  
City of Leduc  
780-980-7161  
[cdragansima@leduc.ca](mailto:cdragansima@leduc.ca)