

**Development Services - Voice of the Customer Survey
April 2013**

Why Survey? = To improve our service it's critical to understand how customers think of SPU as a service provider. Unlike other City-wide "developer" surveys, this one focused exclusively on SPU.

Who Surveyed? = Respondents were 41 of 336 individual developers, related consultants, contractors and property owners who had SPU development service interactions in 2012.

What Next? = The Core Group will be intentionally addressing customer needs expressed in its redesign approach.

Question	Response Thumbnail	Interpretation
8. My search for applicable requirements and standards info will be efficient and timely.	44% - Disagree 15% - Unsure 41% - Agree	Requirements aren't clear to at least half the customer base. Repeat customers have likely figured things out. New customers will likely be discouraged. Speaks to need for CLARITY, better types of information, as well as availability. Also implies need for more than the current "here's the code, you wade thru it" approach. Hire a specialist, do more CAMS, increase web links approach.
9. I will rely on certain staff exclusively as point of contact about information and decisions.	29% - Disagree 22% - Unsure 39% - Agree	Suggests varying levels of service and reliability. Finding information and being "successful" should not be a function of WHO is asked.
10. There are SPU staff I will try to <u>avoid</u> for information and decisions.	32% - Disagree 22% - Unsure 46% - Agree	Suggests varying levels of service and reliance on WHO you ask or know. Speaks to need to look at overall customer service approach and values. Are developer customers to be served or problems to be addressed?
11. SPU staff have positive attitude about growth and development consistent with City Growth Management Act goals.	37% - Disagree 20% - Unsure 43% - Agree	Respondents mixed on what SPU's attitude is about development. Suggests need for clarity about what SPU service goals are and how they align with larger City goals.
12. The necessary technical people within SPU are available when needed.	44% - Disagree 20% - Unsure 35% - Agree	Suggests that technical staff are not considered available when needed. The question doesn't address frequency of need. Refer to Q8 and Q9 – If customer can't understand and find requirements, they must seek help. Some customers may have figured out WHO to ask while others may be at a loss. Prior surveys indicate "every project special" and tech staff seem to weigh in on most.
13. SPU decision-making process is easy to understand and follow.	53% - Disagree 22% - Unsure 24% - Agree	Suggests that customers don't know how requirements or decisions are made, who makes them and why. Points to need for making criteria and steps transparent and reducing subjectivity.
14. The conflict resolution process involved with SPU issues is reasonable efficient and timely.	39% - Disagree 39% - Unsure 22% - Agree	Relates to Q13 and suggests problem with customer service and satisfaction. Prior surveys indicate many issues elevate to Director's office creating delay and inefficiency. Decision making and conflict resolution authority needs to be defined and made efficient.
15. If changes in my scope remain minor, early decisions are applied with consistency to the end of the project	29% - Disagree 22% - Unsure 49% - Agree	Respondents are mixed but disagree level is still fairly high suggesting that at least 1/3 of customers feel they can't rely on what they are told. This means surprises and dissatisfaction. Suggests need to make clear how much change is allowed, clarify regulations.
16. Requirements are applied uniformly across similar projects throughout the city.	22% - Disagree 44% - Unsure 34% - Agree	Respondents still somewhat mixed. Clarifying regulations and decision making processes should help address this issue.
17. Work with SPU compares favorably to other utilities/jurisdictions where I've done similar projects.	27% - Disagree 27% - Unsure 34% - Agree 12% - N/A	Respondents somewhat mixed however there is still a high level of dissatisfaction with SPU service here which could push developers to invest elsewhere.
18. Estimates provided by SPU for taps,	27% - Disagree	Results mixed. Disagreement could represent a number of issues –

mainline extensions, etc are reasonable, accurate and delivered as projected.	27% - Unsure 42% - Agree 5% - Not Applicable	price too high, not what was advertised (cost ceiling). Reasons for disagreement should be probed further and addressed by making costs easy to anticipate, calculate, assess.
19. For pavement restoration, I prefer to use:	15% - SDOT 71% - My own contractor 15% - N/A	Respondents included side sewer customers that do pavement restoration already. Preference appears to keeping customer in control of costs.