



THE NCSTM
The National Community SurveyTM

Richmond, CA

Trends over Time

2019



NRC
National Research Center Inc.

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



Leaders at the Core of Better Communities

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

Summary

The National Community 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 2019 ratings for the City of Richmond to its previous survey results in 2007, 2009, 2011, 2013, 2015, and 2017. Additional reports and technical appendices are available under separate cover.

Trend data for Richmond 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 five percentage points between the 2017 and 2019 surveys, otherwise the comparisons between 2017 and 2019 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 Richmond for 2019 generally remained stable. Of the 131 items for which comparisons were available, 108 items were rated similarly in 2017 and 2019, seven items showed a decrease in ratings and 16 showed an increase in ratings. Notable trends over time included the following:

- Within the pillar of Community Characteristics, ratings for nine aspects increased from 2017 to 2019, with most concentrated within the facet of Recreation and Wellness. Additionally, assessments of opportunities to participate in religious or spiritual events and activities, overall education and enrichment opportunities, opportunities to volunteer, and overall quality of life also improved over time. Residents' evaluations of K-12 education decreased from 2017 to 2019.
- In Governance, reviews of emergency preparedness, street repair, street lighting, natural areas preservation, and public information improved from 2017 to 2019. However, respondents were more critical of the City of Richmond being honest and services provided by the Federal Government in 2019 than in 2017.
- Respondents reported increased levels of using public transportation instead of driving and were less likely to be under housing cost stress in 2019 than in 2017. Conversely, fewer residents used Richmond recreation centers, watched a local public meeting, or read or watched local news in 2019. Additionally, more respondents reported observing a code violation in 2019 than in 2017.

The National Community Survey™

Table 1: Community Characteristics General

	Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)							2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark						
	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
Overall quality of life	17%	18%	21%	30%	31%	32%	38%	Higher	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
Overall image	4%	6%	6%	6%	8%	14%	13%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
Place to live	20%	25%	32%	36%	41%	47%	47%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
Neighborhood	50%	50%	59%	53%	57%	62%	65%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
Place to raise children	9%	12%	13%	14%	19%	24%	26%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
Place to retire	15%	18%	17%	27%	28%	32%	31%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
Overall appearance	8%	14%	18%	18%	17%	15%	17%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower

Table 2: Community Characteristics by Facet

		Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)							2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark						
		2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
Safety	Overall feeling of safety	NA	NA	NA	NA	21%	22%	24%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Safe in neighborhood	64%	68%	70%	70%	74%	73%	74%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Safe downtown/commercial area	25%	29%	34%	37%	48%	43%	46%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
Mobility	Overall ease of travel	NA	NA	NA	NA	60%	52%	52%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Paths and walking trails	NA	34%	33%	36%	38%	44%	41%	Similar	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Ease of walking	20%	24%	24%	30%	41%	35%	39%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Lower
	Travel by bicycle	28%	35%	32%	32%	37%	46%	44%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Travel by public transportation	49%	52%	47%	44%	48%	39%	38%	Similar	Similar	Higher	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Travel by car	41%	47%	48%	58%	73%	62%	61%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Public parking	NA	NA	NA	NA	69%	54%	55%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Traffic flow	47%	36%	36%	34%	49%	43%	40%	Similar	NA	Similar	Lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar

The National Community Survey™

		Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)							2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark						
		2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
Natural Environment	Overall natural environment	NA	23%	25%	23%	39%	42%	38%	Similar	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Cleanliness	NA	12%	15%	16%	15%	13%	13%	Similar	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Air quality	20%	20%	24%	24%	29%	28%	28%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
Built Environment	Overall built environment	NA	NA	NA	NA	35%	28%	26%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Much lower	Much lower
	New development in Richmond	25%	31%	31%	23%	28%	30%	30%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Affordable quality housing	19%	29%	31%	34%	25%	23%	23%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Housing options	NA	27%	31%	28%	23%	23%	26%	Similar	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower
	Public places	NA	NA	NA	NA	25%	20%	25%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
Economy	Overall economic health	NA	NA	NA	NA	14%	16%	16%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Vibrant downtown/commercial area	NA	NA	NA	NA	12%	10%	10%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Business and services	NA	23%	24%	23%	26%	26%	26%	Similar	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Cost of living	NA	NA	NA	NA	30%	30%	26%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Lower
	Shopping opportunities	19%	27%	28%	30%	27%	19%	17%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Employment opportunities	10%	12%	10%	9%	16%	20%	21%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Place to visit	NA	NA	NA	NA	26%	29%	27%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Place to work	24%	22%	23%	22%	34%	38%	36%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower
Recreation and Wellness	Health and wellness	NA	NA	NA	NA	34%	25%	33%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Mental health care	NA	NA	NA	NA	19%	21%	20%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Preventive health services	NA	25%	27%	34%	31%	30%	37%	Higher	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Lower
	Health care	25%	24%	27%	27%	31%	33%	36%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Lower

The National Community Survey™

		Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)							2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark						
		2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
	Food	32%	32%	29%	36%	30%	31%	36%	Higher	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Recreational opportunities	20%	23%	25%	28%	34%	33%	39%	Higher	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Lower
	Fitness opportunities	NA	NA	NA	NA	36%	34%	42%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Lower
Education and Enrichment	Education and enrichment opportunities	NA	NA	NA	NA	21%	21%	26%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Religious or spiritual events and activities	NA	NA	44%	56%	53%	46%	57%	Higher	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Cultural/arts/music activities	22%	24%	29%	22%	29%	30%	33%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Lower
	Adult education	NA	NA	NA	NA	33%	37%	34%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower
	K-12 education	14%	18%	20%	20%	22%	23%	17%	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Child care/preschool	23%	18%	26%	25%	20%	25%	21%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Social events and activities	NA	21%	26%	24%	29%	31%	31%	Similar	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower
Community Engagement	Neighborhoodliness	NA	NA	NA	NA	29%	42%	42%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Openness and acceptance	37%	39%	42%	47%	44%	53%	56%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Similar
	Opportunities to participate in community matters	NA	37%	42%	43%	38%	48%	48%	Similar	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Similar
	Opportunities to volunteer	NA	35%	43%	54%	43%	48%	55%	Higher	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Similar

The National Community Survey™

Table 3: Governance General

	Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)							2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark						
	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
Services provided by Richmond	17%	26%	29%	34%	34%	35%	36%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
Customer service	52%	52%	61%	61%	41%	43%	44%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower
Value of services for taxes paid	18%	19%	20%	35%	24%	23%	24%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Lower
Overall direction	27%	28%	30%	36%	42%	38%	37%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Lower	Lower
Welcoming resident involvement	41%	23%	31%	31%	25%	40%	37%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Lower
Confidence in City government	NA	NA	NA	NA	25%	26%	23%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Much lower
Acting in the best interest of Richmond	NA	NA	NA	NA	33%	31%	29%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower
Being honest	NA	NA	NA	NA	29%	33%	28%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower
Treating all residents fairly	NA	NA	NA	NA	31%	33%	30%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower
Services provided by the Federal Government	17%	27%	29%	29%	29%	28%	20%	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Lower

Table 4: Governance by Facet

		Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)							2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark						
		2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
Safety	Police	38%	54%	51%	57%	59%	54%	50%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Much lower
	Fire	70%	79%	71%	69%	79%	80%	80%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Ambulance/EMS	66%	78%	71%	NA	72%	68%	73%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Crime prevention	11%	19%	22%	27%	36%	29%	33%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Fire prevention	41%	45%	39%	46%	59%	54%	55%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Animal control	31%	NA	30%	25%	30%	27%	26%	Similar	Much lower	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Emergency preparedness	NA	28%	28%	37%	32%	31%	42%	Higher	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Lower
Mobility	Traffic enforcement	34%	36%	34%	38%	44%	30%	29%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower

The National Community Survey™

		Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)							2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark						
		2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
	Street repair	9%	14%	15%	15%	13%	10%	17%	Higher	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Street cleaning	20%	29%	31%	43%	36%	25%	30%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Street lighting	20%	25%	25%	36%	34%	34%	44%	Higher	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Sidewalk maintenance	14%	24%	20%	31%	27%	25%	21%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Traffic signal timing	36%	40%	37%	40%	35%	40%	39%	Similar	Lower	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Bus or transit services	48%	50%	42%	42%	42%	44%	40%	Similar	Lower	Similar	Lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
Natural Environment	Garbage collection	70%	73%	69%	67%	72%	68%	67%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Lower	Lower
	Recycling	71%	70%	68%	70%	70%	66%	64%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Yard waste pick-up	61%	64%	59%	NA	70%	60%	64%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Natural areas preservation	NA	32%	30%	35%	39%	42%	49%	Higher	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Similar
	Open space	NA	NA	NA	NA	39%	48%	49%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Similar
Built Environment	Storm drainage	31%	42%	41%	51%	53%	44%	43%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Lower	Lower
	Sewer services	41%	45%	46%	51%	52%	57%	55%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Power utility	NA	NA	56%	NA	63%	57%	54%	Similar	NA	NA	Much lower	NA	Similar	Lower	Lower
	Utility billing	NA	NA	NA	NA	52%	52%	47%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower	Lower
	Land use, planning and zoning	13%	20%	21%	24%	22%	26%	23%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Code enforcement	9%	10%	19%	15%	22%	15%	14%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Economy	Economic development	13%	11%	15%	21%	19%	21%	21%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower
Recreation and Wellness	City parks	30%	39%	43%	46%	45%	47%	50%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Recreation programs	24%	30%	37%	44%	39%	39%	40%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower
	Recreation centers	23%	33%	34%	42%	37%	36%	40%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower

The National Community Survey™

		Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)							2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark						
		2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
	Health services	31%	30%	28%	31%	34%	35%	34%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Special events	NA	NA	NA	NA	31%	42%	46%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower
Education and Enrichment	Public libraries	35%	51%	48%	52%	61%	56%	54%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Much lower
Community Engagement	Public information	20%	31%	38%	41%	46%	36%	43%	Higher	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Lower

Table 5: Participation General

		Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)						2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark							
		2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017		2019	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
	Sense of community	17%	27%	27%	27%	22%	30%	34%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower
	Recommend Richmond	NA	41%	49%	55%	53%	63%	62%	Similar	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Remain in Richmond	NA	60%	67%	68%	66%	72%	77%	Similar	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Similar
	Contacted Richmond employees	NA	47%	43%	35%	42%	50%	50%	Similar	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar

Table 6: Participation by Facet

		Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)							2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark						
		2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
	Stocked supplies for an emergency	NA	NA	NA	NA	47%	54%	58%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Higher	Much higher
	Did NOT report a crime	NA	NA	NA	NA	62%	57%	61%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Much lower	Lower
Safety	Was NOT the victim of a crime	NA	72%	73%	78%	72%	76%	78%	Similar	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Used public transportation instead of driving	NA	NA	NA	NA	63%	59%	66%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher
	Carpooled instead of driving alone	NA	NA	NA	NA	46%	44%	45%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Mobility	Walked or biked instead of driving	NA	NA	NA	NA	60%	54%	57%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Conserved water	NA	NA	NA	NA	96%	95%	92%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Higher	Higher

The National Community Survey™

		Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)							2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark						
		2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
Natural Environment	Made home more energy efficient	NA	NA	NA	NA	76%	79%	80%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Recycled at home	NA	93%	94%	90%	95%	96%	97%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Similar
Built Environment	Did NOT observe a code violation	NA	NA	NA	NA	40%	32%	25%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Much lower	Much lower
	NOT under housing cost stress	NA	40%	43%	49%	51%	39%	48%	Higher	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower
Economy	Purchased goods or services in Richmond	NA	NA	NA	NA	92%	92%	88%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Economy will have positive impact on income	NA	10%	18%	22%	48%	24%	25%	Similar	NA	Much lower	Similar	Higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar
	Work in Richmond	NA	NA	NA	NA	35%	36%	34%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Recreation and Wellness	Used Richmond recreation centers	NA	44%	40%	40%	45%	46%	37%	Lower	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Visited a City park	NA	78%	73%	71%	78%	79%	83%	Similar	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Ate 5 portions of fruits and vegetables	NA	NA	NA	NA	86%	86%	88%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Participated in moderate or vigorous physical activity	NA	NA	NA	NA	85%	83%	84%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	In very good to excellent health	NA	NA	NA	NA	50%	48%	48%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Education and Enrichment	Used Richmond public libraries	NA	59%	59%	52%	47%	51%	50%	Similar	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Participated in religious or spiritual activities	NA	41%	43%	42%	41%	37%	34%	Similar	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Lower
	Attended a City-sponsored event	NA	NA	NA	NA	35%	47%	52%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Similar	Similar
Community Engagement	Campaigned for an issue, cause or candidate	NA	NA	NA	NA	26%	39%	39%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Higher	Higher
	Contacted Richmond elected officials	NA	NA	NA	NA	22%	31%	30%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Higher	Higher

The National Community Survey™

	Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)							2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark						
	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
Volunteered	NA	37%	34%	29%	27%	36%	41%	Similar	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Similar
Participated in a club	NA	24%	20%	24%	17%	22%	21%	Similar	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Similar
Talked to or visited with neighbors	NA	NA	NA	NA	91%	85%	89%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Done a favor for a neighbor	NA	NA	NA	NA	84%	81%	80%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Attended a local public meeting	NA	37%	31%	32%	25%	38%	38%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Higher	Much higher	Similar	Higher	Higher
Watched a local public meeting	NA	52%	47%	37%	28%	43%	34%	Lower	NA	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Higher	Higher
Read or watched local news	NA	NA	NA	NA	87%	95%	88%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Higher	Similar
Voted in local elections	NA	73%	70%	68%	79%	87%	89%	Similar	NA	Similar	Lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar