

Pasco, WA

Trends over Time

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 City of Pasco to its previous survey results in 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2013 and 2015. Additional reports and technical appendices are available under separate cover.

Trend data for Pasco 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 nine percentage points between the 2015 and 2017 surveys, otherwise the comparisons between 2015 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 Pasco for 2017 generally remained stable. Of the 133 items for which comparisons were available, 107 items were rated similarly in 2015 and 2017; five items showed a decrease in ratings and 21 showed an increase in ratings. Notable trends over time included the following:

- Several aspects of Community Characteristics received higher marks in 2017 compared to 2015, and one decreased during that same time period. Ratings for the overall quality of life in Pasco, Pasco as a place to retire, Pasco as a place to live and the overall image of the City all improved in 2017. The rating for Pasco as a place to retire was at an all-time high in 2017.
- Pasco residents also gave more positive ratings to Pasco as a place to work, fitness opportunities, health care, mental health care, education and enrichment opportunities, openness and acceptance of the community and neighborliness in 2017 compared to 2015. Ratings for public parking decreased in 2017.
- Ratings for most aspects of Governance remained stable from 2015 to 2017, however some changes were observed. Survey respondents gave lower marks to snow removal and public information services and gave higher marks to police services, crime prevention and animal control. While the rating for recycling services had been declining since 2005, 2017 showed improvement over 2015.
- Pasco residents also gave higher ratings to their overall confidence in City government and the job the City government does at being honest. These were the highest ratings observed since the questions were first asked in 2013.
- While rates of reported Participation generally remained stable from 2015 to 2017, there were a few significant changes. Fewer Pasco residents reported that they had recycled at home or volunteered in the last 12 months. More residents had carpooled instead of driving alone, walked or biked instead of driving alone, participated in religious or spiritual events or activities and attended a City-sponsored event. Reported rates of volunteerism were at an all-time low in 2017, while attendance at City-sponsored events were the highest yet observed.

The National Citizen Survey $^{\scriptscriptstyle\mathsf{TM}}$

Table 1: Community Characteristics General

	Pe	rcent rat	ing posi	tively (e	.g., exce	llent/goo	od)	2017 rating compared			Compa	rison to ben	chmark		
	2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	to 2015	2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017
Overall quality of										Much		Much			
life	64%	52%	76%	64%	69%	59%	69%	Higher	Lower	lower	Similar	lower	Similar	Lower	Similar
									Much	Much	Much	Much	Much	Much	Much
Overall image	46%	35%	37%	32%	28%	23%	34%	Higher	lower	lower	lower	lower	lower	lower	lower
										Much		Much			
Place to live	75%	59%	78%	73%	69%	66%	77%	Higher	Similar	lower	Lower	lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
										Much					
Neighborhood	68%	63%	77%	71%	77%	74%	73%	Similar	Similar	lower	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
Place to raise										Much	Much	Much			
children	66%	49%	62%	63%	63%	61%	60%	Similar	Similar	lower	lower	lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
										Much					
Place to retire	54%	45%	60%	59%	59%	45%	66%	Higher	Similar	lower	Similar	Lower	Similar	Lower	Similar
Overall									Much	Much	Much	Much	Much		
appearance	48%	33%	46%	37%	33%	44%	45%	Similar	lower	lower	lower	lower	lower	Lower	Lower

Table 2: Community Characteristics by Facet

		Pe	ercent ra		tively (e. omewha		llent/goo	od,	2017 rating compared			Compar	ison to ber	nchmark		
		2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	to 2015	2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017
	Overall feeling of safety	NA	NA	NA	NA	48%	53%	53%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much lower	Lower	Lower
	Safe in neighborhood	85%	80%	92%	91%	92%	85%	87%	Similar	Lower	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Safety	Safe downtown/commercial area	69%	64%	60%	61%	60%	59%	61%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Overall ease of travel	NA	NA	NA	NA	67%	72%	77%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Paths and walking trails	NA	NA	62%	59%	47%	61%	60%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Ease of walking	67%	57%	61%	55%	47%	57%	56%	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Travel by bicycle	63%	55%	67%	53%	35%	57%	52%	Similar	Higher	Higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Travel by public transportation	NA	NA	NA	NA	55%	59%	62%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Higher	Higher
	Travel by car	73%	64%	72%	72%	67%	72%	66%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Public parking	NA	NA	NA	NA	63%	66%	57%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Mobility	Traffic flow	65%	53%	54%	55%	47%	47%	49%	Similar	NA	NA	Higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Natural Environment	Overall natural environment	NA	NA	56%	55%	57%	58%	62%	Similar	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower

		Pe	ercent ra		itively (e omewha	.g., exce t safe)	llent/goo	d,	2017 rating compared			Compar	ison to ber	nchmark		
		2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	to 2015	2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017
	Cleanliness	NA	NA	45%	38%	32%	52%	47%	Similar	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower
	Air quality	64%	59%	62%	56%	56%	64%	65%	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Overall built environment	NA	NA	NA	NA	45%	42%	41%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower
	New development in Pasco	73%	65%	73%	66%	54%	44%	52%	Similar	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Affordable quality housing	55%	52%	66%	52%	54%	48%	41%	Similar	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Housing options	NA	NA	70%	57%	57%	52%	50%	Similar	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Built Environment	Public places	NA	NA	NA	NA	31%	41%	46%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much lower	Lower	Lower
	Overall economic health	NA	NA	NA	NA	44%	40%	45%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower	Similar
	Vibrant downtown/commercial area	NA	NA	NA	NA	18%	14%	23%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Lower
	Business and services	NA	NA	58%	54%	38%	43%	42%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Cost of living	NA	NA	NA	NA	48%	49%	48%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	_									Much	Much		Much			
	Shopping opportunities	35%	38%	38%	35%	31%	35%	40%	Similar	lower	lower	Lower	lower	Lower	Lower	Similar
	Employment opportunities	39%	33%	48%	40%	28%	37%	45%	Similar	Similar	Higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Place to visit	NA	NA	NA	NA	43%	34%	39%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower
Economy	Place to work	65%	57%	64%	63%	56%	47%	72%	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Health and wellness	NA	NA	NA	NA	49%	40%	48%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Mental health care	NA	NA	NA	NA	30%	38%	49%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Preventive health services	NA	NA	53%	49%	43%	53%	57%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Health care	42%	45%	54%	43%	51%	47%	60%	Higher	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Food	58%	59%	NA	NA	NA	NA	59%	Similar	NA	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
Recreation	Recreational opportunities	47%	48%	47%	45%	42%	42%	50%	Similar	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Similar
and Wellness	Fitness opportunities	NA	NA	NA	NA	53%	49%	59%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Similar
	Education and enrichment opportunities	NA	NA	NA	NA	52%	40%	55%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower	Lower
	Religious or spiritual events and activities	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	63%	66%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Similar
Education and	Cultural/arts/music activities	49%	51%	47%	45%	27%	36%	33%	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
Enrichment	Adult education	NA	NA	NA	NA	54%	59%	57%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar

		Pe	ercent ra	.	tively (e omewha	.	llent/goo	od,	2017 rating compared			Compar	ison to ber	nchmark		
		2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	to 2015	2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017
	K-12 education	62%	50%	63%	53%	54%	53%	55%	Similar	Higher	Lower	Similar	Lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Child care/preschool	41%	40%	54%	47%	38%	46%	48%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Social events and activities	NA	NA	57%	50%	29%	41%	44%	Similar	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Neighborliness	NA	NA	NA	NA	40%	41%	50%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Similar
	Openness and acceptance	54%	56%	63%	57%	45%	48%	66%	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar
	Opportunities to participate in community matters	NA	NA	58%	51%	37%	47%	45%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Lower	Lower	Lower	Similar
Community Engagement	Opportunities to volunteer	NA	NA	72%	58%	45%	53%	60%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Similar

Table 3: Governance General

	Pe	rcent rat	ing posit	tively (e.	.g., exce	llent/god	od)	2017 rating compared			Compariso	on to bend	hmark		
	2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	to 2015	2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017
Services provided by Pasco	69%	58%	69%	61%	64%	60%	63%	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
										Much					
Customer service	58%	60%	68%	71%	55%	57%	61%	Similar	Lower	lower	Lower	Similar	Lower	Lower	Similar
Value of services for taxes paid	52%	51%	53%	49%	34%	45%	37%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Overall direction	61%	54%	60%	45%	51%	42%	46%	Similar	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Welcoming citizen involvement	56%	48%	47%	40%	34%	38%	44%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Lower	Lower	Similar	Similar
Confidence in City government	NA	NA	NA	NA	39%	34%	44%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Acting in the best interest of	NA	NA	NA	NA	40%	43%	43%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Pasco											1				
Being honest	NA	NA	NA	NA	40%	39%	52%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower	Similar
Treating all residents fairly	NA	NA	NA	NA	46%	42%	50%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Services provided by the Federal Government	50%	41%	50%	42%	36%	44%	36%	Similar	Higher	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

Table 4: Governance by Facet

	,	Pe	rcent rat	ing posi	tively (e.	.g., exce	llent/god	od)	2017 rating			Compar	ison to ben	chmark		
									compared to							
		2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2015	2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017
	Police	70%	63%	71%	74%	67%	63%	78%	Higher	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar
	Fire 89% 87% 88% 88% 78% 8							90%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar
Safety	Ambulance/EMS	73%	87%	84%	73%	85%	92%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	

		Pe	rcent rat	ting posi	tively (e	.g., exce	llent/goo	od)	2017 rating			Compa	rison to ben	chmark		
		2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	compared to 2015	2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017
	Crime prevention	56%	43%	57%	56%	50%	45%	62%	Higher	Lower	Much lower	Similar	Lower	Lower	Lower	Similar
	Fire prevention	NA	NA	68%	70%	62%	65%	68%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar
	Animal control	53%	45%	43%	37%	46%	36%	47%	Higher	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Lower	Lower
	Emergency preparedness	NA	NA	53%	47%	32%	40%	44%	Similar	NA	NA	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower
	Traffic enforcement	63%	59%	63%	57%	61%	50%	56%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar
	Street repair	54%	57%	53%	53%	39%	46%	49%	Similar	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Street cleaning	62%	59%	62%	60%	49%	59%	56%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Street lighting	57%	54%	57%	51%	46%	50%	47%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Lower	Lower	Similar	Similar
	Snow removal	45%	46%	51%	47%	45%	51%	36%	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Lower
	Sidewalk maintenance	53%	51%	47%	50%	49%	48%	42%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Traffic signal timing	57%	44%	49%	57%	41%	48%	52%	Similar	Higher	Higher	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Mobility	Bus or transit services	NA	77%	68%	73%	69%	64%	69%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Higher
	Garbage collection	85%	84%	83%	84%	76%	84%	82%	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Recycling	65%	52%	51%	43%	34%	32%	46%	Higher	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Yard waste pick-up	61%	56%	65%	66%	65%	66%	67%	Similar	Similar	Much lower	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Drinking water	56%	54%	62%	65%	63%	64%	71%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Natural	Natural areas preservation	NA	NA	57%	51%	42%	46%	51%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar
Environment	Open space	NA	NA	NA	NA	37%	47%	43%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Similar	Lower
	Storm drainage	66%	63%	65%	68%	60%	69%	73%	Similar	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Sewer services	69%	71%	73%	76%	65%	77%	76%	Similar	Similar	Higher	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Utility billing	NA	NA	NA	NA	56%	66%	62%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Land use, planning and zoning	53%	46%	45%	46%	36%	33%	38%	Similar	Higher	Higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar
Built	Code enforcement	38%	39%	30%	27%	33%	31%	37%	Similar	Lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Similar
Environment	Cable television	40%	49%	53%	54%	50%	51%	48%	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

		Pe	rcent rat	ing posi	tively (e.	g., exce	llent/goo	od)	2017 rating			Compar	ison to ben	chmark		
		2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	compared to 2015	2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017
Economy	Economic development	49%	53%	47%	46%	43%	41%	40%	Similar	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	City parks	70%	68%	65%	65%	56%	66%	68%	Similar	Similar	Lower	Lower	Lower	Lower	Similar	Similar
	Recreation programs	69%	59%	56%	53%	45%	50%	53%	Similar	Similar	Lower	Lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
Recreation and	Recreation centers	59%	53%	51%	53%	38%	56%	50%	Similar	Similar	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Lower
Wellness	Health services	NA	NA	54%	58%	57%	48%	55%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Special events	NA	NA	NA	NA	37%	39%	39%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much lower	Lower	Lower
Education and Enrichment	Public libraries	68%	74%	76%	61%	69%	79%	77%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Lower	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Similar
Community Engagement	Public information	55%	58%	65%	57%	51%	63%	53%	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

Table 5: Participation General

	Percent	rating pos	itively (e.g	., always/s	ometimes,	more than	n once a								
				month, yes)			2017 rating compared			Compa	arison to ben	chmark		
	2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	to 2015	2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017
												Much			
Sense of community	56%	46%	53%	48%	33%	38%	34%	Similar	Similar	Lower	Lower	lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
Recommend Pasco	NA	NA	83%	79%	77%	76%	84%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
Remain in Pasco	NA	NA	85%	83%	85%	80%	83%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Contacted Pasco												Much			
employees	61%	71%	56%	46%	45%	44%	43%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	lower	Similar	Similar	Similar

Table 6: Participation by Facet

		Perce	ent rating	positively than on	y (e.g., a ce a mor		metimes,	more	2017 rating compared to			Com	parison to l	oenchmark		
		2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2015	2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017
	Stocked supplies for an emergency	NA	NA	NA	NA	40%	35%	31%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Did NOT report a crime	NA	NA	NA	NA	73%	76%	70%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Safety	Was NOT the victim of a crime	74%	83%	83%	88%	88%	87%	82%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Mobility	Used public transportation instead of driving	NA	NA	NA	NA	26%	28%	20%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar

		Perce	ent rating		y (e.g., a ce a mor	lways/sointh, yes)	metimes,	more	2017 rating compared to			Com	parison to l	oenchmark		
		2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2015	2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017
	Carpooled instead of driving alone	NA	NA	NA	NA	47%	45%	56%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Higher
	Walked or biked instead of driving	NA	NA	NA	NA	52%	41%	58%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower	Similar
	Conserved water	NA	NA	NA	NA	76%	81%	83%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Made home more energy efficient	NA	NA	NA	NA	80%	83%	75%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Natural Environment	Recycled at home	70%	57%	59%	62%	68%	72%	62%	Lower	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Much lower
	Did NOT observe a code violation	NA	NA	NA	NA	45%	56%	48%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Built Environment	NOT under housing cost stress	NA	NA	68%	65%	61%	68%	63%	Similar	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Purchased goods or services in Pasco	NA	NA	NA	NA	97%	94%	92%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Economy will have positive impact on income	32%	23%	25%	25%	25%	30%	26%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Economy	Work in Pasco	NA	NA	NA	NA	51%	40%	45%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
·	Used Pasco recreation centers	62%	45%	48%	47%	40%	46%	54%	Similar	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Similar
	Visited a City park	88%	87%	78%	79%	78%	83%	88%	Similar	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Ate 5 portions of fruits and vegetables	NA	NA	NA	NA	81%	85%	86%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Participated in moderate or vigorous physical activity	NA	NA	NA	NA	80%	79%	76%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Recreation and Wellness	In very good to excellent health	NA	NA	NA	NA	55%	47%	43%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Used Pasco public libraries	74%	66%	60%	67%	66%	58%	66%	Similar	NA	NA	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Participated in religious or spiritual activities	NA	NA	52%	55%	47%	42%	58%	Higher	NA	NA	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Higher
Education and Enrichment	Attended a City- sponsored event	NA	NA	NA	NA	31%	31%	43%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Lower
	Campaigned for an issue, cause or candidate	NA	NA	NA	NA	20%	27%	18%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Community Engagement	Contacted Pasco elected officials	NA	NA	NA	NA	15%	15%	14%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar

	Perce	ent rating	positively than on	y (e.g., a ce a mor		metimes,	more	2017 rating compared to			Com	parison to I	oenchmark		
	2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2015	2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017
Volunteered	41%	43%	40%	38%	35%	37%	22%	Lower	NA	NA	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Lower
Participated in a club	NA	NA	31%	22%	14%	23%	15%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Lower
Talked to or visited with neighbors	NA	NA	NA	NA	82%	87%	82%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Done a favor for a neighbor	NA	NA	NA	NA	75%	85%	84%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Attended a local public meeting	31%	19%	19%	22%	14%	21%	20%	Similar	NA	NA	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Similar	Similar
Watched a local public meeting	45%	41%	39%	47%	30%	29%	36%	Similar	NA	NA	Lower	Higher	Similar	Similar	Higher
Read or watched local news	NA	NA	NA	NA	87%	89%	86%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Voted in local elections	58%	51%	63%	57%	77%	76%	72%	Similar	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Lower