

Town of Cary 2008 Biennial Citizen Survey Report

Methodology

The Town of Cary's 2008 Biennial Citizen Survey was conducted from February 1st through February 23rd of 2008. BKL Research administered the telephone survey to 405 residents of the Town of Cary. This resulted in a $\pm 5\%$ margin of error. Both listed and unlisted telephone numbers with Cary exchanges were included in the sampling frame and contacted using a random selection process. A minimum of four callbacks was attempted on each number not screened from the sampling frame. The potential respondents were screened with regards to residence in Cary and whether they were over the age of 18. The average survey completion time was 17 to 20 minutes. The refusal rate for the survey was 18.0%. The survey instrument is included in Appendix A.

The survey consisted of 46 core questions with related subparts to several of the questions. Respondents were asked to rate the Town Government staff, Police Department, Fire Department, Parks & Recreation programs, streets/roads, perceptions of safety, quality of life, and solid waste/recycling services. The survey also examined other issues including information sources, tax rates, internet access, the Town's cable programming, information dissemination, opportunities to participate in decision-making, instant runoff elections, emergency preparedness, and sense of community. Another series of questions examined Town Council focus areas in relation to issues such as environmental protection, schools, downtown revitalization, transportation, planning & development, and parks & recreation. The respondents were primarily asked to use a 9-point scale. There was an open-ended question included to examine the most important issue facing Cary. In addition, the respondents were asked to suggest improvements for streets/public areas, desirability of Cary, quality of life, environmental protection, Cary as a place to live, school issues, downtown revitalization, transportation, planning & development, and parks & recreation. The survey also incorporated 10 demographic breakdown questions.

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

The demographic profiles of the sample are exhibited in Figures 1-7 and Table 1. The age profile of the sample is illustrated in Figure 1. A large percentage of the respondents (70.9%) fell between the ages of 26 to 55 with the largest portion (29.4%) in the 36-45 year-old category. Figure 2 represents the number of years the respondents had lived in the Town of Cary. As for years of residency, 69.0%




Figure 1. Sample: Age Distribution.




Figure 2. Sample: Years Lived in Cary.




Figure 3. Sample: Children Under 18 in Household.




Figure 4. Sample: Educational Level.

of the respondents had lived in Cary for 6 years or more. There was also a large percentage who had lived in the Town for only 2 to 5 years (21.3%). Figure 3 illustrates the number of children under the age of 18 living in the household. There were 53.6% of the sample who had no children under 18 living at home, 38.5% had 1-2 children, and 7.9% had 3-5 children. The sample represented a highly educated group (Figure 4). Most of the respondents had graduated with a college degree (69.8%) with 22.6% of those earning a graduate degree and 5.5% a Ph.D., JD, or MD degree. Figure 5 details the racial breakdown of the sample showing 85.4% of the respondents were Caucasian, 6.5% were African-American, 5.3% were Asian, and 0.5% were Hispanic. There were high levels of household income for the sample (Figure 6). This is illustrated in the high percentage of respondents in the over \$100,000 (49.4%) and \$70,001-\$100,000 (24.7%) income categories. In terms of gender, 53.3% of the sample were female and 46.7% were male (Figure 7). The largest




Figure 5. Sample: Race.




Figure 6. Sample: Income.




Figure 7. Sample: Gender.

percentage of the respondents resided in single family dwellings (82.9%), 8.7% in a townhouse/condominium, 7.7% in an apartment, and 0.5% in a duplex. Several of the means for the service dimensions in the survey were converted into grades. The mean score was changed into a percentage (using 9 as the denominator) and compared to the grading scale shown in Table 1. This was done for

those question that rated the services on the 9-point scale using the very poor (1) to excellent (9) response set. Grades tend to be easier to understand and use in goal setting for planning cycles. The respondents were also asked if they would agree to participate in a focus group session to give Cary even more insight into their citizen’s opinions and attitudes. Approximately 50% of the respondents agreed to participate in a session. This reflects the citizen’s strong involvement and concern for Cary.

The report will include selected crosstabulations specifically chosen by the Town for questions in the survey (Appendix B). It is important to exercise caution in the interpretation of crosstabulations. They will act to segment or slice up the sample size and in turn increase the margin of error for a question. For example, it is difficult to interpret crosstabulations with small sample sizes. For that reason, sample sizes less than 10 in subgroupings will not be discussed in crosstabulations. Keep in mind that even crosstabulations with a sample this size will have exceptionally high margins of error. As for terminology, a subgroup would be a specific breakout category in a particular group such as 18-25 age group or \$20,001-\$30,000 income level.

The percentages in the tables are rounded off to one decimal place. Due to rounding this may result in row totals that do not always add up to exactly 100.0%. The demographic recodes for the crosstabulations were age (18-25, 26-55, 56-65, over 65), education (no college degree, college degree), children in household under 18 (no children, children), race (Caucasian, African-American, Asian, Hispanic, Other), internet (no access, access), literacy (all literate, one or more illiterate), and years in Cary (0-1, 2-5, 6-10, over 10).

Table 1. Grading Scale.

Rating (%)	Grade
97-100	A+
94-96	A
90-93	A-
87-89	B+
84-86	B
80-83	B-
77-79	C+
74-76	C
70-73	C-
67-69	D+
64-66	D
60-63	D-
Below 60	F

Town Government Staff

The performance of the Town Government staff was assessed with a set of five items or questions. These questions were only administered to those respondents who had contact with the Town Government in the past two years. Approximately 22.7% (25.4% in 2006) or 92 respondents indicated they had contact within that time frame. A 9-point grading scale from very poor (1) to excellent (9) was used to measure performance.

The results of the 1998, 2000, 2002, 2004, and 2006 Cary Biennial Surveys will be included in tables throughout the report when applicable. The 2008 Biennial Survey covered more topics and was inclusive of more questions. For that reason, tables with no comparisons represent the new items to the survey and will be labeled as 08 in the tables. The incorporation of the previous survey facilitates comparisons between survey periods to examine trends.

The results shown in Tables 2-6 show very high ratings for the Town Government staff that have improved from 2006. There were significant mean increases and grade improvements this year. The tables are placed in descending order of ratings. The grades improved for *courteous* (B to A-), *professionalism* (B to A-), *knowledgeable* (B to A-), and *promptness of response* (B- to B). Although the grade (B-) did not increase for *ability to resolve issues*, the mean increased from 7.27 to 7.37 this year. These grades are impressive due to the fact it can be a challenge for the Town Government staff to handle all contacts to the satisfaction of every citizen. Overall, the Town Government staff earned very impressive marks from the respondents with all the means increasing and the grades improving for 4 of the 5 service dimensions this year.

Table 2. Town Government Staff: Courteous.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	8.35	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	1.1	2.3	10.2	25.0	60.2	A-
06	7.77	2.9	0.0	0.0	1.0	5.9	4.9	14.7	27.5	43.1	B
04	8.33	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	5.1	5.1	25.3	61.6	A-
02	7.81	3.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	6.9	1.0	8.9	35.6	43.6	B+
00	7.98	1.2	2.3	1.2	1.2	3.5	3.5	8.1	23.3	55.8	B+
98	7.63	2.4	0.8	0.0	2.4	4.0	1.6	19.8	39.7	29.4	B

Table 3. Town Government Staff: Professionalism.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	8.14	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	4.4	4.4	11.1	18.9	58.9	A-
06	7.57	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	6.9	3.9	22.5	20.6	40.2	B
04	8.10	2.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	5.0	1.0	9.0	21.0	60.0	A-
02	7.55	3.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	7.9	3.0	17.8	32.7	33.7	B
00	7.73	1.2	2.3	1.2	0.0	3.5	7.0	19.8	19.8	45.3	B
98	7.32	3.2	1.6	3.2	0.8	4.0	2.4	27.0	31.7	26.2	B-

Table 4. Town Government Staff: Knowledgeable.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	8.12	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	5.6	2.2	12.4	22.5	55.1	A-
06	7.54	2.9	1.0	2.0	0.0	7.8	3.9	18.6	23.5	40.2	B
04	7.95	2.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	4.1	4.1	15.3	22.4	51.0	B+
02	7.44	4.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	10.1	2.0	17.2	27.3	36.4	B-
00	7.70	2.4	1.2	1.2	2.4	2.4	2.4	21.2	24.7	42.4	B
98	7.30	1.6	2.4	1.6	1.6	6.3	9.4	20.5	29.1	27.6	B-

Table 5. Town Government Staff: Promptness of Response.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	7.75	3.5	1.2	0.0	1.2	7.1	1.2	14.1	22.4	49.4	B
06	7.27	2.9	2.0	2.0	2.0	9.8	3.9	19.6	24.5	33.3	B-
04	7.79	2.1	1.0	2.1	2.1	7.2	3.1	5.2	25.8	51.5	B+
02	7.32	4.9	1.0	0.0	1.0	8.8	1.0	21.6	35.3	26.5	B-
00	7.45	3.6	3.6	1.2	0.0	3.6	6.0	18.1	25.3	38.6	B-
98	7.26	4.8	0.0	0.8	1.6	4.0	8.0	24.0	35.2	21.6	B-

Table 6. Town Government Staff: Ability to Resolve Issues.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	7.37	6.3	1.3	2.5	0.0	11.4	2.5	8.9	17.7	49.4	B-
06	7.27	5.4	1.1	1.1	0.0	11.8	5.4	16.1	20.4	38.7	B-
04	7.15	9.4	2.1	2.1	2.1	8.3	2.1	8.3	16.7	49.0	C+
02	7.06	8.3	0.0	1.0	2.1	8.3	5.2	16.7	28.1	30.2	C+
00	7.12	5.1	5.1	1.3	1.3	3.8	6.4	23.1	16.7	37.2	C+
98	6.77	8.2	0.0	3.3	4.1	6.6	4.1	28.7	21.3	23.8	C

Town Government Staff Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations (Appendix B) were conducted on selected demographic variables (age, education, gender, housing type, income, internet access, language, literacy, race). The breakdowns for contact with the Town Government are shown in Tables B1-B9. The subgroups with the highest levels of contact (in order) were over 65 age group (28.3%), 56-65 age group (27.3%), African-Americans (26.9%), over \$100,000 income level (26.9%), and those with a college degree (26.4%). The lowest levels of contact were among apartment dwellers (6.5%), 18-25 age group (11.1%), and those without a college degree (14.8%). The crosstabulations for *courteous* are shown in Tables B10-B18 and the grades were high and consistent across all subgroups. The marks for *professionalism* (B19-B27) were consistent with no grades falling below a B while no grades for *knowledgeable* (B28-B36) fell below a B+ this time. The *promptness of response* (B37-B45) grades were high and consistent with the only exception a C- given by the 56-65 age group. There were only two lower grades for the service dimension of *ability to resolve issues* (B46-B54). These were the C+ grades given by those without a college degree and \$70,001-\$100,000 income level. Keep in mind, the low sample size subgroups (n<10) were not included in the discussion due to the higher error rates.

Streets & Roads and Traffic

The *maintenance of streets and roads* was assessed using a same 9-point grading scale from very poor (1) to excellent (9). The results indicated improved ratings for the Town on street and road maintenance (Table 7). This year the mean increased from 6.55 to 6.61 with the grade remaining a C-. However, the mean now borders on moving to a grade of C.

Table 7. How Well Cary Maintains Streets and Roads.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	6.61	1.7	2.0	2.7	4.0	14.8	11.4	30.1	22.0	11.4	C-
06	6.55	2.0	0.7	3.7	4.5	16.9	12.9	27.0	19.4	12.9	C-
04	6.66	1.7	2.7	3.5	3.0	11.4	13.7	28.1	22.1	13.7	C
02	6.72	1.7	0.7	1.7	4.7	13.5	10.3	35.4	19.7	12.3	C
00	6.50	3.0	1.5	2.2	4.0	15.2	11.5	32.4	22.4	7.7	C-
98	6.04	2.2	2.7	4.7	9.0	15.5	17.7	27.9	15.0	5.2	D+

Streets/Roads Needing Attention

The respondents were asked to name streets/roads that need more attention and the problem(s). In this case, the problem mentioned for all of the areas was potholes. The streets/roads mentioned most often were Maynard (14 times), Cary Parkway (13 times), and Kildaire Farm (9 times). Other streets/roads mentioned to a lesser degree were High House (4 times), Carpenter Fire Station (3 times), Chatham (3 times), and Tryon (3 times). All the streets/roads mentioned are listed in Appendix C.

Traffic in Cary

The respondents were also asked to compare the traffic in Cary in relation to other areas inside the Triangle (Table 8). Most of the respondents (51.9%) indicated the traffic was about the same as most other areas in the Triangle. However, a large percentage (37.2%) of respondents felt traffic was actually better than most other places in the Triangle. Only 11.0% perceived traffic to be worse.

Table 8. Comparing Traffic in Cary to Other Areas Inside the Triangle.

Year	Better than most other places in the Triangle	About the same as most other places in the Triangle	Worse than most other places in the Triangle
08	37.2	51.9	11.0

Maintenance of Streets/Roads and Traffic Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations were performed on education, housing type, income, and years in Cary (Tables B55-B58). The grades for *maintenance of streets and roads* were consistently in the C range across subgroups with no grades falling in the D range (omitting low sample size groups). As for traffic in Cary (Tables B59-B62), only the 18-25 (18.5%) and over 65 (17.4%) age groups gave higher percentages for traffic being worse in Cary than other places in the Triangle.

Cleanliness and Appearance of Public Areas

The cleanliness and appearance of several public areas including *streets*, *median/roadsides*, *parks*, and *greenways* was assessed by a set of four questions in the survey. Again, the same 9-point scale from very poor (1) to excellent (9) was used.

The results shown in Tables 9-12 (placed in descending order by ratings) indicated the respondents were satisfied with the cleanliness and appearance of the Town's public areas. The grades have improved for all public areas examined in the survey. The cleanliness and appearance of *parks* earned the highest mark of A- (Table 9). In addition, the grade for cleanliness and appearance of *greenways* improved from B to B+ this year (Table 10). The cleanliness and appearance of *streets* and *median/roadsides* both earned grades of B improving from B- in 2006 (Tables 11 and 12). Overall, the means increased for cleanliness and appearance of *parks*, *greenways*, *streets*, and *median/roadsides* and the grades improved for all four of these public areas. The means also represent the highest earned to date for these public areas.

Table 9. Cleanliness and Appearance of Parks.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	8.14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	1.9	1.6	15.7	38.7	41.3	A-
06	7.88	0.5	0.3	1.4	0.3	4.1	4.4	15.9	34.9	38.2	B+
04	8.03	0.8	0.0	0.3	0.3	3.4	3.4	14.1	34.7	42.9	B+
02	7.99	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.5	4.0	2.1	15.7	40.7	36.4	B+
00	7.86	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.6	2.5	5.4	21.1	40.8	29.3	B+
98	7.42	3.9	0.0	0.5	1.0	2.6	5.4	26.6	39.0	20.9	B-

Table 10. Cleanliness and Appearance of Greenways.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	8.05	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.3	3.3	2.2	15.2	41.0	37.7	B+
06	7.78	0.6	0.3	1.4	0.3	4.9	4.3	17.3	37.9	32.9	B
04	7.86	0.9	0.0	0.9	0.0	3.0	6.3	17.1	36.8	35.0	B+
02	7.70	0.3	0.0	0.6	1.4	6.9	4.6	19.0	37.4	29.9	B
00	7.64	0.6	1.2	0.3	0.3	4.0	7.4	21.9	36.7	27.5	B
98	7.32	4.5	0.3	1.1	0.8	3.7	6.3	25.1	36.4	21.9	B-

Table 11. Cleanliness and Appearance of Streets.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	7.66	0.0	0.0	0.5	1.0	5.2	4.4	27.4	37.3	24.2	B
06	7.35	0.7	0.7	1.2	1.2	9.7	6.5	22.6	37.1	20.1	B-
04	7.44	0.7	0.7	1.7	1.0	6.5	9.5	21.9	30.9	26.9	B-
02	7.28	1.5	0.0	1.0	2.0	6.5	7.7	30.8	33.3	17.2	B-
00	7.43	0.8	0.0	0.5	0.5	4.8	8.8	30.5	39.8	14.5	B-
98	7.45	0.0	0.2	0.5	1.0	4.7	10.9	29.4	34.6	18.7	B-

Table 12. Cleanliness and Appearance of Median/Roadsides.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	7.61	0.2	0.7	0.7	1.5	4.2	5.9	24.9	36.0	25.7	B
06	7.31	1.3	0.5	2.0	2.0	7.3	7.0	23.6	36.1	20.3	B-
04	7.48	1.0	0.3	1.5	1.0	6.3	7.3	25.6	30.3	26.8	B-
02	7.16	1.0	0.3	2.3	2.5	8.3	9.3	28.0	31.3	17.3	B-
00	7.30	1.0	1.0	0.8	0.8	5.0	11.0	29.6	34.8	16.0	B-
98	7.16	0.5	1.0	0.2	2.0	7.7	13.2	31.3	28.6	15.4	B-

The respondents who gave lower ratings (below 5) were asked to give specific examples of places that need more attention. There were only 18 total responses given by the respondents. The primary issues and reasons were trash on the roadsides (7 times – Harrison, Maynard, 40), landscaping/overgrowth (3 times), and medians (3 times – visibility, pave not gravel, hard to navigate). All the responses are listed in Appendix D.

Public Areas Crosstabulations

Crosstabulations were conducted on education, housing type, income, and years in Cary for the cleanliness and appearance of public areas. The grades for cleanliness and appearance of *parks* (Tables B63-B66) were consistent and high across subgroups. The grades for cleanliness and appearance of *greenways* (Tables B67-B70) were also generally positive and consistent. In addition, the grades for cleanliness and appearance of *streets* (Tables B71-B74) and *median/roadsides* (Tables B75-B78) were generally consistent and in the B range. The only lower grades for all areas were from small sample size groups.

Police Department

The performance of the Cary Police Department was assessed with a set of 6 questions. These questions were only administered to those respondents who had contact with the Police Department in the past two years. In this case, it was approximately 25.7% (31.9% in 2006) or 104 respondents. Table 13 indicates most of the respondents had contact with an officer (68.3%) or a dispatcher (18.8%) with minimal contact with an animal control (3.4%), clerk (1.7%) or detective (0.9%).

Table 13. Police Department: Person Contacted.

Person Contacted	Number	Percentage
Officer	80	68.3
Dispatcher	22	18.8
Animal Control	4	3.4
Clerk	2	1.7
Detective	1	0.9
Not Sure	8	6.8

The Police Department was assessed on 5 service dimensions on the same 9-point grading scale (Tables 14-18 placed in descending order of ratings). The Police had an excellent profile that has improved significantly from 2006. The respondents rated the performance of the Police Department very strong this year with the grades improving for *courteous* (B+ to A), *competence* (B+ to A-), *fairness* (B+ to A-), *response time* (B to A-) and *problem solving* (B to B+). Overall, all of the means increased this year as well as the grades for the 5 service dimensions. These means represent the highest ratings earned for the Police service dimensions to date.

Table 14. Police Department: Courteous.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	8.43	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.9	9.8	15.7	69.6	A
06	7.98	2.4	0.0	0.8	1.6	6.3	2.4	11.1	15.9	59.5	B+
04	8.11	3.2	2.4	0.0	1.6	3.2	0.8	4.0	15.9	69.0	A-
02	8.24	0.8	0.8	1.5	0.8	2.3	3.0	6.8	20.3	63.9	A-
00	7.95	1.5	2.3	0.8	1.5	5.3	3.0	7.6	19.7	58.3	B+
98	7.72	3.3	1.1	2.2	2.2	3.9	4.4	9.9	21.0	51.9	B

Table 15. Police Department: Competence.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	8.36	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	3.9	8.7	19.4	65.0	A-
06	7.99	1.7	0.0	0.8	1.7	7.5	0.8	11.7	18.3	57.5	B+
04	8.13	2.6	1.7	0.9	0.9	3.4	2.6	4.3	15.4	68.4	A-
02	8.23	0.0	0.8	0.0	1.5	3.8	3.1	10.0	20.8	60.0	A-
00	7.89	3.1	2.4	0.8	0.0	2.4	5.5	7.1	24.4	54.3	B+
98	7.62	2.2	2.2	2.2	5.5	3.9	2.8	9.4	21.5	50.3	B

Table 16. Police Department: Fairness.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	8.32	1.1	0.0	2.2	1.1	0.0	1.1	11.0	15.4	68.1	A-
06	7.87	1.7	0.9	0.9	2.6	6.9	1.7	11.2	19.8	54.3	B+
04	8.10	3.5	1.7	2.6	0.0	1.7	0.9	4.3	15.7	69.6	A-
02	8.18	0.8	1.6	0.8	1.6	3.1	3.1	4.7	21.1	63.3	A-
00	7.74	3.9	3.1	2.4	1.6	3.9	1.6	4.7	20.5	58.3	B
98	7.49	3.9	2.8	2.2	3.4	7.3	1.7	8.4	18.5	51.7	B-

Table 17. Police Department: Response Time.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	8.18	1.1	0.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	4.4	14.3	15.4	61.5	A-
06	7.75	1.9	2.9	1.0	1.9	5.8	5.8	9.7	13.6	57.3	B
04	7.90	2.8	1.9	0.9	1.9	7.5	2.8	4.7	12.1	65.4	B+
02	7.99	0.0	1.7	0.9	0.0	6.1	3.5	13.9	20.9	53.0	B+
00	7.59	4.4	2.7	0.9	1.8	0.9	5.3	15.0	23.0	46.0	B
98	7.30	5.4	2.4	2.4	3.6	4.2	2.4	14.3	25.6	39.9	B-

Table 18. Police Department: Problem Solving.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	7.83	5.6	2.2	0.0	0.0	2.2	6.7	6.7	13.5	62.9	B+
06	7.70	1.0	1.9	0.0	4.8	10.6	3.8	7.7	15.4	54.8	B
04	7.69	3.6	4.5	0.0	2.7	4.5	1.8	9.1	14.5	59.1	B
02	7.79	3.3	0.0	0.8	1.7	3.3	6.6	14.9	18.2	51.2	B+
00	7.56	4.2	4.2	0.8	0.8	2.5	4.2	14.4	19.5	49.2	B
98	7.05	6.3	1.1	5.1	3.4	7.4	4.0	14.8	18.2	39.8	C+

Police Department Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations (age, education, gender, housing type, income, internet access, language, race) for contact with the Police Department are shown in Tables B79-B86. The highest levels of contact (in order) was among apartment dwellers (41.9%), \$20,001-\$30,000 income level (38.5%), 18-25 age group (37.0%), \$30,001-\$50,000 income level (34.3%), and \$50,001-\$70,000 income level (32.4%). The lowest levels of Police contact was the over 65 age group (17.4%) and \$70,001-\$100,000 income level (17.4%).

The crosstabulations were conducted on the same variables on the service dimensions. The grades were generally high and consistent across the subgroups for *courteous* (Tables B87-B94), *competence* (Tables B95-B102), *fairness* (Tables B103-B110), and *response time* (Tables B111-B118). The only lower grade outside of small sample size subgroups was the grade of C from the 56-65 age group for *problem solving* (B119-B126). Otherwise, the grades were generally high and consistent for *problem solving*.

Fire Department

The performance of the Cary Fire Department was assessed with a set of 5 questions concerning contact with the Department and their service dimensions. These questions were only administered to those respondents who had contact with the Fire Department in the past two years. In this case, it was only 8.4% (9.4% in 2006) or 34 respondents. The same 9-point grading scale from very poor (1) to excellent (9) was used to rate their performance.

The results shown in Tables 19-23 (placed in descending order of ratings) indicate that the Fire Department continues to have superior ratings that have even also shown improvement since 2006. The means and grades improved for *competence* (A to A+), *problem solving* (A- to A+), and *response time* (A to A+). The mean also improved for *fairness* although the grade cannot increase beyond its present A+ level. These means represent the highest ratings given for these service dimensions to date. The only mean that did not improve this year was for *courteous* which remained unchanged at 8.68 continuing as an impressive grade of A. Overall, the Fire Department had 4 means and 3 grades that improved of the 5 service dimensions measured. The Fire Department earned the highest marks for any Town department examined in the survey.

Table 19. Fire Department: Competence.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	8.88	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	3.1	93.8	A+
06	8.46	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	2.9	14.3	77.1	A
04	8.64	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	2.8	88.9	A
02	8.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	18.4	79.6	A+
00	8.66	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	24.1	72.4	A

Table 20. Fire Department: Problem Solving.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	8.87	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	3.3	93.3	A+
06	8.31	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	6.3	18.8	68.8	A-
04	8.39	3.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	6.1	84.8	A-
02	8.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.1	20.4	73.5	A
00	8.55	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	3.4	3.4	13.8	75.9	A

Table 21. Fire Department: Response Time.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	8.87	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	3.3	93.3	A+
06	8.50	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	12.5	78.1	A
04	8.40	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.7	0.0	0.0	14.3	77.1	A-
02	8.50	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	6.5	8.7	78.3	A
00	8.56	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	74.1	A

Table 22. Fire Department: Fairness.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	8.84	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	6.5	90.3	A+
06	8.71	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	22.6	74.2	A+
04	8.54	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	5.7	0.0	0.0	5.7	85.7	A
02	8.69	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	2.1	18.8	77.1	A+
00	8.73	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	26.7	73.3	A+

Table 23. Fire Department: Courteous.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	8.68	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	2.9	91.2	A
06	8.68	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.1	16.2	75.7	A
04	8.48	2.5	2.5	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	5.0	87.5	A
02	8.61	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.0	1.9	13.5	80.8	A
00	8.73	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	26.7	73.3	A+

Fire Department Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations for the Fire Department were conducted on age, education, gender, housing type, income, internet access, language, and race. The breakdowns for contact with the Fire Department are shown in Tables B127-B134. They indicate the highest levels of contact (in order) with the Fire Department were for 56-65 age group (22.7%), African-Americans (19.2%), \$20,001-\$30,000 income level (15.4%), and apartment dwellers (12.9%). The lowest levels of contact were for \$50,001-\$70,000 (2.7%), townhouse/condo dwellers (2.9%), and over 65 age group (4.3%).

Crosstabulations for the 5 service dimensions are shown in Tables B135-B174. The means were very high and consistent across the subgroups for *fairness*, *courteous*, *response time*, *competence*, and *problem solving*. There were no low marks given in the breakdowns.

Parks & Recreation and Cultural Programs

A series of 8 questions in the survey specifically examined Parks & Recreation and Cultural programs. Initially, the respondents were asked if they had participated in the Parks & Recreation programs. They were also asked to name which program(s) they were involved/location and to rate various aspects of the program including *instructor quality*, *ease of registration*, *program quality*, *overall experience*, *facility quality*, and *cost or fee*. The same 9-point grading scale was utilized.

The results showed that approximately 32.8% or 133 of the respondents (26.7% in 2006) indicated someone in their household had participated in a Parks & Recreation or Cultural Program in the past two years. This represents a relatively large increase in the level of participation. The programs they participated in and locations are illustrated in Appendix E. The most commonly mentioned were baseball, Lazy Days, basketball, classes, senior citizen activities, recreation programs, concerts, and tennis. Tables 24-29 (placed in descending order of rating) specifically examined the service dimensions related to the Parks & Recreation and Cultural programs. This year, the dimensions received continued high ratings with a degree of improvement. All the dimensions earned a grade of A- with the means for 4 of the 6 service dimension increasing this year. The means for *facility quality* and *cost or fee* decreased slightly while the grades remained unchanged. However, there was one grade improvement this year and it was for *program quality* which rose from a B+ to A-. Overall, Parks & Recreation earned high marks that have shown a degree of improvement over the past two years.

Table 24. Parks & Recreation: Instructor Quality.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	8.31	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.9	0.9	15.0	21.5	59.8	A-
06	8.22	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	2.1	12.8	28.7	53.2	A-
04	8.21	0.9	0.0	0.9	0.0	2.7	1.8	14.3	22.3	57.1	A-

Table 25. Parks & Recreation: Ease of Registration.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	8.26	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.0	1.8	2.7	11.8	19.1	61.8	A-
06	8.20	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	2.0	5.1	10.2	30.6	51.0	A-
04	8.32	0.8	0.0	0.8	0.0	2.5	3.3	7.5	21.7	63.3	A-

Table 26. Parks & Recreation: Program Quality.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	8.23	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	2.4	1.6	15.2	27.2	52.8	A-
06	8.03	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	3.8	3.8	17.1	31.4	42.9	B+
04	8.36	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.7	2.9	10.7	27.9	57.1	A-
02	8.01	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	4.5	3.9	15.6	31.2	43.5	B+
00	7.97	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.4	6.2	15.9	35.4	38.1	B+
98	7.85	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.7	5.8	22.6	37.2	32.1	B+

Table 27. Parks & Recreation: Overall Experience.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	8.21	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	1.6	3.2	13.5	31.0	50.0	A-
06	8.14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	6.6	14.2	34.0	44.3	A-
04	8.30	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.7	0.0	2.8	12.5	29.2	54.2	A-
02	8.11	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	3.9	1.3	13.7	32.7	46.4	A-
00	8.11	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	2.6	13.2	33.3	45.6	A-
98	7.88	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.7	5.8	22.6	37.2	32.1	B+

Table 28. Parks & Recreation: Facility Quality.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	8.11	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.8	3.8	0.8	15.4	27.7	50.0	A-
06	8.18	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	1.9	4.7	13.1	29.0	50.5	A-
04	8.30	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	3.5	4.9	7.7	20.4	62.7	A-
02	8.06	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	4.6	3.3	17.1	28.3	46.1	A-
00	7.59	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	5.3	9.7	24.8	28.3	30.1	B
98	7.72	0.7	0.0	0.7	0.7	2.2	7.4	27.2	28.7	32.4	B

Table 29. Parks & Recreation: Cost or Amount of Fee.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	8.09	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	4.2	5.1	16.1	21.2	52.5	A-
06	8.12	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	5.1	15.3	26.5	50.0	A-
04	8.10	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.8	4.0	8.0	10.4	19.2	56.8	A-
02	7.99	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.7	2.1	17.9	20.7	49.7	B+
00	8.01	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	4.7	6.6	10.4	33.0	44.3	B+
98	7.67	4.4	1.5	2.2	0.7	2.2	3.7	14.8	20.7	49.6	B

The respondents were additionally asked how many school-age children would participate at least once a year in a Parks & Recreation or cultural program specifically designed for year-round school students during the track-out periods (Table 30). Approximately 83% of the respondents did not have any children who would participate in such programs. However, 8.5% had one child and 8.5% had 2 children who would participate. The results indicate a relatively large number of potential children for the program. Assuming there are 43,000 households in Cary (2006 American Community Survey), the potential number of children for the program would be approximately 11,000.

Table 30. Number of School-Age Children Likely to Participate in Parks, Recreation, or Cultural Program Designed for Year-Round Students During Track-Out Periods.

Year	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
08	83.1	8.5	8.5	0.0	0.0	0.0

The survey also included a question to assess the number of people in the household of any age who would benefit from recreation services that accommodate individuals with such disabilities (Table 31). The results show 95.0% of the respondents did not have anyone in the home who would benefit from such services. There were 4.2% with one person, 0.5% with 2 people, and 0.2% with 3 people in the household. This extrapolates to approximately 2,500 disabled individuals who would benefit from the program.

Table 31. Number of People in the Home of Any Age Who Would Benefit from Recreation Services that Accommodate People with Disabilities.

Year	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
08	95.0	4.2	0.5	0.2	0.0	0.0

Parks & Recreation Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations (age, education, gender, housing type, income, internet access, language, race) for participation in Parks & Recreation programs are shown in Tables B175-B182. The highest levels of participation (in order) were for those with a college degree (37.9%), over \$100,000 income level (37.4%), \$70,001-\$100,000 income level (36.0%), 26-55 age group (35.9%), and single family housing (35.6%). The lowest levels of participation were by those without internet access (12.5%), \$20,001-\$30,000 income level (15.4%), apartment dwellers (16.1%), and 18-25 age group (18.5%).

The crosstabulations for the Parks & Recreation service dimensions are shown in Tables B183-B230. The grades for *instructor quality*, *ease of registration*, *facility quality*, *overall experience*, *cost or fee*, and *program quality* were generally high and consistent throughout the subgroupings. The few lower marks came from the subgroups with very small sample sizes. The crosstabulations for the number of school age children likely to participate in parks & recreation programs for year-round students during track-out periods are shown in Tables B231-B235. There were no subgroups (other than low sample size ones) with inordinately higher percentages if judged by combining the percentages for 1 and 2 children categories (the overall sample mean for these combined categories was 17.0%). The highest percentages of participants would be from the 26-55 age group (17.8%) while the lowest percentages would be from the \$50,001-\$70,000 income level (9.1%). Finally, the crosstabulations for number of people in the home who would benefit from recreation services that accommodate people with disabilities are shown in Tables B236-B240. In this case, the combined percentage for 1, 2, and 3 people categories for the entire sample was 4.9%. The subgroups with highest percentages of participants (excluding low sample size subgroups) would be from \$20,001-30,000 income level (23.1%), 56-65 age group (13.7%), those without internet access (12.5%), townhouse/condo dwellers (11.5%), and those without a college degree (9.0%). While the lowest percentages of participants would be from \$50,001-\$70,000 income level (2.7%) and over \$100,000 income level (2.9%).

Cary Overall as a Place to Live

The respondents were asked to rate Cary overall as a place to live using a 9-point scale from very undesirable (1) to very desirable (9). Table 32 indicates that Cary was perceived as a very good place to live. Although not in a traditional grading scale format, if converted to a grade it would remain an A- this year with the mean approximately the same as 2006 with a very slight increase from 8.09 to 8.10. There were 94.5% who responded on the “desirable” side of the scale (above the midpoint of 5) with 48.6% responding in the very desirable category. It was impressive that only 1.5% of the responses were in the “undesirable” side of the scale (below 5). To gather more insight into lower ratings, the respondents who answered with a rating below 5 were asked the reason for the low rating. The limited number of responses (7 comments) revealed no discernable pattern (Appendix F).

Table 32. Cary Overall as a Place to Live.

Year	Mean	Very Undesirable 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Desirable 9	Grade
08	8.10	0.0	0.0	0.5	1.0	4.0	4.2	12.1	29.6	48.6	A-
06	8.09	0.5	0.0	0.7	0.5	2.5	2.7	12.7	37.1	43.3	A-
04	8.31	0.5	0.5	0.2	0.2	2.2	2.2	10.3	22.6	61.2	A-
02	7.79	0.2	0.2	0.7	1.0	5.7	4.4	22.1	27.8	37.8	B+
00	7.63	1.3	0.3	0.5	2.5	3.8	9.0	20.1	27.6	34.9	B
98	7.61	0.0	0.3	0.8	1.0	3.0	8.0	30.6	30.3	26.1	B

Cary Overall as a Place to Live Crosstabulations

Crosstabulations for Cary as a place to live were conducted on age, education, gender, housing type, income, language, race, and years in Cary (Tables B241-B248). The grades were consistent and high across the subgroups.

Quality of Life in Cary

The perception of the quality of life in Cary over the past two years was assessed with a 5-point scale. The response categories for this question were much worse (1), somewhat worse (2), the same (3), somewhat better (4), and much better (5).

Overall, 51.0% of respondents perceived the quality of life in Cary as the same over the past two years (Table 33). However, the mean dropped from 3.24 in 2006 to 3.01 this year. This indicates a decline in the perception that the quality of life is better from the last survey. Keep in mind, lower means indicate perceptions of a decline in the quality of life. It is important to note the percentage on the “worse” side (below the midpoint of 3) of the scale exceeded the percentage on the “better” side (above 3) of the scale 26.1% to 22.9% (Figure 8).

This is the first time this has occurred. To gain more insight into the lower ratings, the respondents who answered with a rating below 3 were asked the reason for the low rating (Appendix G). There were 142 comments and the two primary reasons for the lower quality of life ratings were growth issues (47 comments) and traffic (33 comments). Other key concerns were increased crime (12 comments), construction issues (8 comments), schools issues (8 comments), and road conditions (7 comments).




Figure 8. Quality of Life.

Table 33. Quality of Life in Cary.

Year	Mean	Much Worse 1	Somewhat Worse 2	The Same 3	Somewhat Better 4	Much Better 5	% Below 3	% Above 3
08	3.01	0.8	25.3	51.0	18.1	4.8	26.1	22.9
06	3.24	1.9	10.2	57.3	22.9	7.7	12.1	30.6
04	3.44	0.5	7.9	50.0	30.6	11.0	8.4	41.6
02	3.18	1.0	18.6	49.0	23.9	7.5	19.6	31.4
00	3.05	1.6	22.8	49.2	22.0	4.4	24.4	26.4

Quality of Life Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations for age, education, gender, housing type, income, language, race, and years in Cary are shown in Tables B249-B256. The subgroups with the highest means (perceive quality of life improving) were African-Americans (3.24), 56-65 age group (3.21), Asians (3.20), 18-25 age group (3.20), and 0-1 year Cary residents (3.15). The lowest means (perceive quality of life declining) were for the \$20,001-\$30,000 income level (2.85), \$50,001-\$70,000 income level (2.86), apartment dwellers (2.89), and over 65 age group (2.91). In the 34 crosstabulations conducted this year, the “worse” percentages exceeded the “better” percentages by 18 to 14 (with 2 the same). This highlights the shift in the perception that the quality of life has declined slightly.

Most Important Issue Facing Cary

An open-ended question asked respondents what they feel is the most important issue facing the Town of Cary. The responses show that problems related to growth were perceived as the key issue (Appendix H). This is evident in the number of remarks concerning growth and growth-related issues this year (215 comments). In addition, there were three other major issues this year. These were traffic/improving roads (68 comments), water concerns (62 comments) and schools (60 comments). The major problems mentioned with schools focused on the reassignments and overcrowding. These four were by a wide margin the most important issues mentioned by the respondents. However, it was growth that was the predominate concern.

The respondents mentioned other important issues to a lesser degree including improving the infrastructure (11 comments), taxes (8 comments), construction (7 comments), crime/safety (7 comments), and improving planning (7 comments).

For a comparison basis, the most important issues in 2006 were growth (178 comments), traffic/improving roads (77 comments), schools (63 comments), water (14 comments), and public transportation (10 comments). Overall, growth continues to be the most important issue and has actually grown in importance this year as the number of comments has increased significantly. Traffic/improving roads and schools continue to be major issues again this year while water has grown significantly in importance.

How Safe Residents Feel in Cary

The respondents were asked how safe they feel in the Town of Cary. A 9-point scale that ranged from extremely unsafe (1) to extremely safe (9) was utilized. The results indicate the respondents perceived an exceptionally high degree of safety in the Town (Table 34). The mean was 8.09 with an impressive 98.2% responding on the “safe” side (above 5) of the scale including 38.5% who responded they felt extremely safe. There was only 0.4% below 5 on the “unsafe” side (Figure 9). Overall, the mean was virtually unchanged from 2006 when it was 8.10 with the percentage of respondents who answered on the “safe” side increasing from 97.5% to 98.2%.

The respondents were also asked how safe they feel in their home neighborhood (Table 35). The perception of safety was even higher in their neighborhoods. Note the mean was 8.29 with 99.2% answering on the “safe” side with 48.1% responding they felt extremely safe. It was even more impressive that there were no responses in the “unsafe” portion of the scale (Figure 10). The perception of safety in their home neighborhood has improved from 2006 when the mean was 8.22.

Finally, the respondents were asked about how safe they feel in public places around Cary. This would include such activities as shopping, eating out, or going to the movies (Table 36). The mean was 8.04 with 97.8% responding on the “safe” side of the scale including 36.8% in the extremely safe category. There was only 0.4% in the “unsafe” range (Figure 11). This represents an improvement from 2006 when the mean was 7.90. Overall, the respondents perceived a high degree of safety in Cary, their neighborhood, and in public places.

Table 34. How Safe Do You Feel in Cary Overall.

Year	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
08	8.09	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2	1.2	1.7	19.5	38.5	38.5	98.2
06	8.10	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	2.0	2.2	17.3	38.6	39.4	97.5
04	8.23	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	2.0	2.2	12.2	34.0	49.1	97.5
02	7.99	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0	4.7	2.7	17.0	37.3	37.8	94.8
00	7.93	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.3	2.0	4.0	22.5	39.0	32.0	97.5
98	7.55	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.8	2.5	8.8	30.7	37.5	18.6	95.6

Table 35. How Safe Do You Feel in Your Home Neighborhood.

Year	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
08	8.29	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	2.7	11.1	37.3	48.1	99.2
06	8.22	0.2	0.0	0.2	1.0	1.5	1.5	13.2	33.1	49.3	97.1

Table 36. How Safe Do You Feel in Public Places Around Cary (Shopping, Out to Eat, Movies).

Year	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
08	8.04	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2	1.7	2.2	20.5	38.3	36.8	97.8
06	7.90	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.5	3.0	4.8	21.5	35.5	34.3	96.1




Figure 9. Safe in Cary.




Figure 10. Safe in Neighborhood.

How Safe Residents Feel in Cary Crosstabulations

Crosstabulations for this set of questions were conducted for age, children in household under 18, education, gender, housing type, income, language, race, and years in Cary. The breakdowns for how safe the respondents feel in Cary are shown in Tables B257-B265. The means for the subgroups were generally high and consistent. There were slightly lower perceptions of safety for \$20,001-\$30,000 income level (7.69) and the over 65 age group (7.83). The crosstabulations for how safe respondents feel in their home neighborhoods are shown in Tables B266-B274. The means were high and consistent with the only subgroups showing slightly lower means were 18-25 age group (8.04), \$30,001-\$50,000 income level (8.14), Asians (8.15), and apartment dwellers (8.16). Finally, the crosstabulations for how safe respondents feel in public places around Cary are shown in Tables B275-B283. The means were generally high for most of the breakdowns. The only subgroups indicating somewhat less safety in public places were the \$20,001-\$30,000 income level (7.62), over 65 age group (7.78), \$30,001-\$50,000 income level (7.86), and townhouse/condo dwellers (7.89).




Figure 11. Safe in Public Places.

Cary Municipal Tax Rate

The survey examined Cary’s municipal tax rate of 42 cents per \$100 of property valuation as compared to other localities (Charlotte, Raleigh, and Durham). A 5-point scale was used. The response categories were very low (1), somewhat low (2), about right (3), somewhat high (4), and very high (5).

The results for the total sample are shown in Table 37. A majority (68.0%) of the respondents felt that the tax rate was about right in Cary. A slight skewing or slanting to the higher side is to be expected because these questions are often perceived as a potential justification for a tax increase. This year, it appears the skewing to the high side has decreased significantly. Note that only 18.9% (28.1% in 2006) answered on the “high” side of the scale (above 3). In addition, there was an increase in the responses on the “low” side of the scale from 7.5% in 2006 to 13.2% this year (Figure 12). This was also apparent in the mean reduction from 3.26 to 3.06. Overall, there has been a significant decrease in the perception that taxes in Cary were on the higher side with a majority of the respondents indicating the tax rate was about right or appropriate.




Figure 12. Municipal Tax Rate.

Table 37. Cary Municipal Tax Rate.

Year	Mean	Very Low 1	Somewhat Low 2	About Right 3	Somewhat High 4	Very High 5	% Below 3	% Above 3
08	3.06	2.6	10.6	68.0	16.3	2.6	13.2	18.9
06	3.26	1.9	5.6	64.6	21.2	6.9	7.5	28.1
04	3.34	0.8	3.6	64.8	21.9	8.9	4.4	30.8
02	3.20	0.5	6.3	69.5	20.4	3.3	6.8	23.7
00	3.30	0.5	3.6	66.4	24.0	5.2	4.1	29.2
98	3.13	0.5	7.3	73.7	15.9	2.5	7.8	18.4

Cary Municipal Tax Rate Crosstabulations

Crosstabulations were conducted on age, education, housing type, income, race, and years in Cary (Tables B284-B289). Across most of the breakdowns, the respondents indicated the tax rate was about right. The subgroups with the highest means or perceived taxes on the “high” side were African-Americans (3.33), \$20,001-\$30,000 income level (3.31), Asians (3.26), those without a college degree (3.22), and 56-65 age group (3.21).

Information Sources

The survey examined the respondent's usage of 14 information sources that Cary employs to communicate with its citizens. A 9-point scale was used that ranged from never use (1) to frequently use (9). The most frequently used information sources in order were Raleigh News & Observer, television, word-of-mouth, Cary News, BUD, radio, and Cary's website (Table 38). The only changes in usage among the top sources since 2006 were the slight increase in usage for word-of-mouth (4th to 3rd) and decrease for Cary News (3rd to 4th). Blogs/message boards/social media was a new information source examined this year. This source had limited usage finishing 11th in the rankings; although, it was used more than the Independent Weekly, 24-Hour Phone Service, and the Block Leader Program. Tables 39-43 show all the information sources' usage in previous years.

Table 38. Most Used Information Sources in 2008 (In Order of Usage).

Information Source	Mean	Never Use 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Frequently Use 9	% Above 5
Raleigh News & Observer	6.41	14.2	3.5	3.0	1.7	10.4	5.7	12.4	10.7	38.3	67.1
Television	5.89	13.2	3.0	7.0	5.7	11.4	11.9	11.2	10.7	25.9	59.7
Word-of-Mouth	5.63	7.3	4.8	6.5	6.3	21.6	15.0	16.8	10.3	11.5	53.6
Cary News	5.33	23.1	5.2	4.2	3.5	12.9	6.7	11.9	7.2	25.1	50.9
BUD	5.02	21.9	7.0	5.5	7.2	12.7	8.5	11.9	5.2	20.1	45.7
Radio	4.09	24.1	14.4	12.4	5.2	12.2	6.0	12.4	5.2	8.0	31.6
Cary's Website	3.96	28.3	10.2	9.7	7.2	14.4	10.4	9.4	5.2	5.2	30.2
Parks & Rec. Program	3.17	48.8	6.2	8.0	4.2	11.4	4.2	7.7	6.5	3.0	21.4
Cary TV Channel 11	2.67	51.1	10.4	10.4	6.5	9.4	3.2	3.0	3.2	2.7	12.1
Internet E-mail with Cary	2.40	63.7	7.5	5.5	2.0	6.7	5.2	5.5	2.0	2.0	14.7
Blogs/Msg. Boards/Social Media	1.89	70.9	8.5	6.8	2.8	6.0	0.8	1.3	1.0	2.0	5.1
Independent Weekly	1.87	71.3	7.5	6.2	4.0	5.7	1.2	2.7	0.2	1.0	5.1
24-Hr. Phone Service	1.46	82.0	8.2	2.7	1.5	3.2	0.2	0.7	0.7	0.5	2.1
Block Leader Program	1.37	87.3	5.0	1.5	1.3	2.5	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.5	2.5

Table 39. Most Used Information Sources in 2006 (In Order of Usage).

Information Source	Mean	Never Use 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Frequently Use 9	% Above 5
Raleigh News & Observer	6.10	13.1	4.1	7.5	3.9	12.1	5.9	7.7	10.1	35.6	59.3
Television	5.78	12.6	8.3	4.8	3.0	12.8	10.1	12.8	12.3	23.4	58.6
Cary News	5.40	17.9	5.9	6.4	4.9	15.6	8.2	9.0	7.7	24.6	49.5
Word-of-Mouth	5.27	9.0	10.0	7.7	6.4	19.2	11.3	15.1	12.1	9.2	47.7
BUD	5.19	23.8	5.3	4.8	5.9	8.8	7.8	12.8	10.7	20.1	51.4
Radio	4.53	20.4	13.4	10.2	7.9	9.9	8.6	8.4	7.1	14.1	38.2
Cary's Website	4.07	28.7	9.8	11.4	7.0	11.1	7.2	9.0	7.2	8.5	31.9
Parks & Rec. Program	3.75	43.0	6.3	7.2	2.9	9.5	4.3	11.5	5.7	9.7	31.2
Direct Mail	3.70	41.5	9.4	6.3	4.5	8.0	7.1	6.8	6.0	10.5	30.4
Cary TV Channel 11	3.06	46.1	10.1	9.0	4.1	13.7	3.9	4.9	3.9	4.4	17.1
Internet E-mail with Cary	2.73	58.5	7.8	6.7	2.7	6.5	3.8	5.4	2.2	6.5	17.9
Independent Weekly	2.72	54.7	12.1	5.4	3.9	6.0	3.6	6.9	5.1	2.1	17.7
CaryNow.com	2.55	64.6	4.7	6.6	2.5	5.3	2.5	5.0	5.0	3.8	16.3
24-Hr. Phone Service	1.79	77.7	4.8	3.7	3.1	4.5	1.4	2.0	1.7	1.1	6.2
Block Leader Program	1.55	83.4	5.2	2.4	1.7	1.7	2.8	1.0	1.0	0.7	5.5

Table 40. Most Used Information Sources in 2004 (In Order of Usage).

Information Source	Mean	Never Use 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Frequently Use 9	% Above 5
Raleigh News & Observer	6.54	11.8	5.7	3.2	2.2	10.3	5.7	7.4	8.1	45.6	66.8
Television	6.49	6.9	5.0	6.2	4.7	13.2	7.2	8.4	8.4	40.0	64.0
Word-of-Mouth	5.67	9.8	4.5	6.0	6.8	17.3	14.0	15.0	13.0	13.8	55.8
Radio	5.15	19.0	8.5	9.0	6.5	12.7	5.0	8.7	4.2	26.4	44.3
BUD	5.07	24.9	8.0	6.0	4.5	8.3	3.5	12.1	11.1	21.6	48.3
Cary News	4.64	34.3	6.4	5.7	3.2	8.4	2.7	7.4	10.1	21.7	41.9
Parks & Rec. Program	3.62	43.0	7.0	6.4	4.5	11.5	4.8	9.6	4.3	8.8	27.5
Internet E-mail with Cary	3.53	50.4	5.8	4.3	4.8	5.6	5.1	5.3	4.8	13.9	29.1
Cary's Website	3.52	42.9	7.7	9.5	3.7	8.2	6.7	7.5	7.0	6.7	27.9
Cary TV Channel 11	3.37	41.3	11.3	10.3	4.9	7.9	5.6	6.9	5.6	6.2	24.3
Direct Mail	3.19	50.1	6.0	5.5	5.2	12.5	3.9	6.5	3.7	6.5	20.6
24-Hr. Phone Service	1.93	74.0	6.3	3.9	4.2	3.9	1.0	3.1	0.8	2.6	7.5
Block Leader Program	1.59	82.3	4.3	3.9	1.3	3.6	1.6	1.3	0.3	1.3	4.5

Table 41. Most Used Information Sources in 2002 (In Order of Usage).

Information Source	Mean	Never Use 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Frequently Use 9	% Above 5
Raleigh News & Observer	6.47	12.8	2.2	4.0	2.5	13.3	5.2	10.9	8.1	41.0	65.2
Television	6.03	12.4	5.7	4.2	3.7	15.4	6.0	13.4	8.2	31.0	58.6
Word-of-Mouth	5.29	10.2	6.0	9.0	8.2	19.4	11.2	16.9	8.2	10.9	47.2
BUD	5.08	25.1	3.2	6.5	5.5	12.2	8.5	10.0	8.5	20.6	47.6
Radio	4.96	22.3	8.5	4.5	7.8	13.8	5.5	11.8	6.3	19.8	43.4
Cary News	4.56	34.0	6.7	6.7	2.0	10.8	4.2	7.6	4.2	23.9	39.9
Direct Mail	3.87	37.0	4.8	8.6	7.6	14.7	4.8	7.6	5.3	9.6	27.3
Parks & Rec. Program	3.78	40.0	5.5	8.5	5.5	11.5	5.5	7.8	6.8	9.0	29.1
Internet E-mail with Cary	3.06	56.4	5.8	5.0	4.8	6.8	2.8	5.3	3.0	10.3	21.4
Cary TV Channel 11	2.96	46.0	10.0	11.4	7.7	9.5	2.5	4.7	4.0	4.2	15.4
Cary's Website	2.98	48.6	9.4	6.7	6.2	11.4	4.5	7.2	2.0	4.0	17.7
24-Hr. Phone Service	1.94	74.4	6.6	3.5	3.3	3.8	1.8	2.3	2.0	2.3	8.4
Block Leader Program	1.59	84.1	5.0	1.6	1.0	2.9	0.8	2.3	0.5	1.8	5.4

Table 42. Most Used Information Sources in 2000 (In Order of Usage).

Information Source	Mean	Never Use 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Frequently Use 9	% Above 5
Raleigh News & Observer	6.87	8.6	3.3	3.8	2.8	10.1	5.3	8.6	10.9	46.6	71.4
Television	6.59	7.1	4.3	4.6	4.3	10.9	8.4	13.2	10.9	36.5	69.0
Water and Sewer Bills	5.73	16.9	4.1	4.4	3.3	15.6	6.9	12.8	11.3	24.6	55.6
Word-of-Mouth	5.54	9.0	3.6	6.4	6.7	25.9	11.8	13.8	11.0	11.8	48.4
Radio	5.36	15.7	5.3	9.9	5.3	14.2	7.1	14.2	8.6	19.5	49.4
Cary News	4.78	35.2	6.8	3.8	2.3	8.1	3.8	5.1	4.6	30.4	43.9
Direct Mail	4.64	30.4	6.5	5.2	3.1	14.1	5.5	9.7	8.1	17.3	40.6
Internet E-mail with Cary	2.78	67.6	3.1	2.6	2.0	3.8	2.0	3.8	5.1	9.9	20.8
Cary TV Channel 11	2.73	52.6	9.5	9.5	4.9	8.2	5.1	4.1	2.6	3.6	15.4
Cary's Website	2.30	64.1	9.9	5.9	4.1	4.1	2.3	3.3	2.5	3.8	11.9
24-Hr. Phone Service	1.91	75.6	5.4	4.9	1.0	4.6	2.8	1.5	2.1	2.1	8.5
Block Leader Program	1.66	83.8	3.8	2.7	0.8	3.0	0.5	0.8	1.3	3.2	5.8

Table 43. Most Used Information Sources in 1998 (In Order of Usage).

Information Source	Mean	Never Use 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Frequently Use 9	% Above 5
Raleigh News & Observer	6.70	7.5	2.8	4.0	3.8	12.0	9.5	9.8	12.5	38.3	70.1
Television	6.16	9.2	4.7	3.7	5.5	13.9	9.5	14.9	13.9	24.6	62.9
Word-of-Mouth	5.33	6.0	4.2	10.7	10.0	27.6	10.7	14.2	5.2	11.4	41.5
Cary News	5.15	28.2	5.5	5.7	4.2	8.2	3.0	7.2	9.0	28.9	48.1
Water and Sewer Bills	5.06	23.1	5.8	5.3	5.3	12.0	9.3	12.3	10.5	16.5	48.6
Radio	4.92	19.9	7.5	6.7	7.7	14.7	8.0	12.9	9.2	13.4	43.5
Direct Mail	4.08	36.7	6.5	6.7	5.2	12.2	4.5	7.5	9.0	11.7	32.7
Internet E-mail with Cary	2.06	76.3	4.2	4.0	1.7	3.2	1.0	1.7	1.5	6.2	10.4
24-Hr. Phone Service	1.99	72.1	7.7	3.5	2.0	6.2	2.0	2.7	2.5	1.2	8.4
Cary TV Channel 11	1.92	69.9	10.7	4.7	2.5	5.7	1.2	2.5	1.2	1.5	6.4
Block Leader Program	1.59	82.3	5.3	3.3	1.0	3.0	2.5	0.5	1.3	1.0	5.3
Cary's Website	1.58	81.3	7.2	2.0	1.2	3.2	2.0	1.7	0.2	1.0	4.9

The respondents were also asked about their internet access. Table 44 indicates internet access has continued to increase this year. There were only 4.0% of the respondents who did not have any internet access this year compared to 5.7% in 2006. In addition, internet access at both the home and office continued to grow slightly with 58.8% (58.4% in 2006) indicating they had dual access this year. Table 45 indicates that high speed access has grown significantly in the past two years with 93.8% (84.2% in 2006) indicating such access while dial-up continues to fall (7.6% to 2.3%).

Table 44. Internet Access.

Year	At Home	At Office	Both	Neither
08	36.7	0.5	58.8	4.0
06	34.2	1.7	58.4	5.7
04	32.9	3.0	54.5	9.7
02	27.4	6.4	54.1	12.1
00	20.9	9.0	54.5	15.6
98	17.0	15.0	45.3	22.8

Table 45. High Speed or Dial-Up Internet Access.

Year	High Speed	Dial-Up	Both
08	93.8	2.3	3.9
06	84.2	7.6	8.2

Another series of questions examined the viewing of Town's local programming on Time-Warner Cable. Table 46 shows that 77.0% of the respondents subscribed to Time-Warner Cable. The subscribers were then asked several questions in relation to the Town's local programs. The most viewed program was the meetings of the Town Council, School Board, or Wake County Board of Commissioner on Cary TV Channel 11 (Table 47). There were 54.3% of the subscribers who watched these meetings at some time during the year with the most frequent usage several times a year (22.0%). Table 48 shows the percentages for a similar question asked in 2004 and 2002. Note the scaling used this year was more precise. Although direct comparisons are not possible due to the

scaling, the percentages in the frequent viewing categories are higher this year with the never percentages being virtually identical. The next most watched local program was the Cary TV's Electronic Bulletin Board Messages (Table 49). In this case, 33.5% watched sometime during the year with the most frequent usage several times a year (13.7%). Since 2004, viewership has declined in that those who watched sometime during the year fell from 40.2% to 33.5%. However, there was a level of growth in frequent viewers. Note the increases for at least once every month (3.1% to 5.8%) and several times every month (0.5% to 6.7%). As for the Monthly News Magazine Program BUD-TV (Table 50), there was only 27.8% watching the program at sometime during the year with the most frequent usage several times a year (8.9%) and at least once a year (8.0%). There has been a large decline in viewing since 2004. There were 37.6% who watched the BUD-TV sometime during the year in 2004 compared 27.8% this year. Finally, there was also low viewership for Wink which airs live rush hour traffic camera images (Table 51). There were only 27.2% of the subscribers who watched Wink sometime during the year. The most frequent usage was several times a year (7.3%), at least once every month (7.0%), and several times every month (7.0%). The 7.0% who watched several times every month represents a core group of more frequency users, albeit a smaller group.

Table 46. Time-Warner Cable Usage.

Year	% Yes	% No
08	77.0	23.0

Table 47. How Often Watch Meetings of Cary Town Council, School Board, or Wake County Board of Commissioner on Cary TV Channel 11.

Year	Never	At Least Once a Year	Several Times a Year	At Least Once Every Month	Several Times Every Month
08	45.7	12.5	22.0	11.8	8.0

Table 48. Watching Town Council Meetings on the Town's Cable Access Channel.

Year	Never	Now and Then	Occasionally	Almost Always	Always
04	45.8	27.0	20.9	3.8	2.5
02	51.9	28.3	15.4	3.7	0.7

Table 49. How Often Watch Cary TV's Electronic Bulletin Board Messages.

Year	Never	At Least Once a Year	Several Times a Year	At Least Once Every Month	Several Times Every Month
08	66.5	7.3	13.7	5.8	6.7
04	59.8	24.7	8.8	3.1	0.5

Table 50. How Often Watch the Monthly News Magazine Program BUD-TV.

Year	Never	At Least Once a Year	Several Times a Year	At Least Once Every Month	Several Times Every Month
08	72.2	8.0	8.9	6.1	4.8
04	62.4	7.7	13.4	11.6	3.6

Table 51. How Often Watch Wink (live rush hour traffic camera images).

Year	Never	At Least Once a Year	Several Times a Year	At Least Once Every Month	Several Times Every Month
08	72.8	5.9	7.3	7.0	7.0

The survey also included a question to ascertain if the respondents watched (in part or whole) the 2007 Cary Community Candidate Forum (Table 52). This year 30.5% of the respondents indicated they watched the forum representing a significant increase from 14.3% in 2006.

Table 52. Watching 2007 Cary Community Candidate Forum on Cary TV 11.

Year	% Yes	% No
08	30.5	69.5
06	14.3	85.7

Information Sources Crosstabulations

Crosstabulations for the information sources were conducted on age, children in household under 18, housing type, language, race, and years in Cary (Tables B290-B295). Instead of examining each demographic variable separately, it would be more informative to examine where each information source was most effective. To accomplish this, each source was rated in effectiveness as *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, or *fair* by its ranking within a subgroups. If the information source finished in the 1st or 2nd spot within a subgroup, then it rated *excellent*, 3rd or 4th rated *very good*, 5th or 6th rated *good*, and 7th and 8th rated *fair*. Only subgroups with sample sizes over 10 will be considered. This results in 17 total subgroups used for comparisons.

The two top information sources were the News & Observer and television. The News & Observer was a broad-based (impacted all 17 subgroups) and effective (ranked high within the subgroups) information source to disseminate information. It garnered 16 *excellent* and 1 *very good* ratings among the 17 subgroupings attesting to its effectiveness. Similar to the News & Observer in ratings was television. It earned 14 *excellent* and 3 *very good* ratings making it broad-based and effective as well. Although television had many *excellent* ratings, the News & Observer tended to finish in the first position more often than television making it the best overall information source.

Another relatively effective source was word-of-mouth. This source received 4 *excellent* ratings making it a key information source for the 18-25 age group, households with children, Asians, and 2-5 year Cary residents. It was also received 12 *very good* and 1 *good* rating making this information source broad-based. However, the lower overall ratings indicated word-of-mouth is not as effective as the News & Observer and television. It is apparent many residents derive much of their information from word-of-mouth. Cary News did not receive any *excellent* ratings this year. However, it earned 15 *very good* and 2 *good* ratings making it a good broad-based information source with slightly less effectiveness than word-of-mouth.

BUD was also a relatively good information source. It received 2 *very good* ratings for townhouse/condo dwellers and those living in Cary over 10 years. It also earned 13 *good* and 2 *fair* ratings in the other subgroups making it broad-based with a relatively strong degree of effectiveness. Radio had a similar profile to BUD. It earned only 1 *very good* rating for African-Americans. Radio also earned 11 *good* and 5 *fair* ratings attesting to a level of broad appeal and degree of effectiveness.

Cary's website was broad-based (7 *good* and 10 *fair* ratings) and maintained a degree of effectiveness in selected subgroupings. The website was most effective (*good* ratings) for 26-55 age group, households with children, single family households, apartments, Asians, and 0-1 & 2-5 year Cary residents. The Parks & Recreation Program received no *excellent*, *very good*, or *good* ratings within the subgroups. It did receive 10 *fair* ratings indicating it was relatively broad-based; however, the effectiveness was somewhat limited due to the fact the highest ratings were only *fair*.

Cary TV Channel 11 was broad-based to a degree, but its effectiveness was limited to a total of 6 subgroups that it earned *fair* ratings. These were the 56-65 & over 65 age groups, households with no children, apartment dwellers, African-Americans, and Asians. The final information sources had very limited usage. Internet e-mail did not rate in any of the subgroupings. Its highest ranking was 9th (out of 14 information sources) in 26-55 age group, households with children, and 2-5 year Cary residents. Blogs/message boards/social media did receive a *fair* rating from the 18-25 age group and ranked 10th for apartment dwellers and 0-1 year Cary residents. Although, its other rankings were lower. Independent Weekly was not ranked in any of the subgroups. Its highest ranking was 9th for townhouse/condo dwellers. The 24-Hour Phone Service and the Block Leader Program consistently finished at the bottom of the rankings.

The internet access crosstabulations were conducted on age, children in household under 18, housing type, income, language, and race (Tables B296-B301). The subgroups with the highest percentages without internet access (in order) were \$20,001-\$30,000 income level (23.1%), over 65 age group (17.8%), \$50,001-\$70,000 income level (16.7%), townhouse/condo dwellers (11.4%), and apartment dwellers (10.0%). Note that the 0-\$20,000 income level had an exceptionally high percentage (60.0%) without internet access, but the sample size was very limited (n=5).

The high speed/dial-up access crosstabulations were conducted on age, children in household under 18, housing type, income, language, and race (Tables B302-B307). High speed access was common across most of the subgroups. The only subgroups with the lower levels of high speed access were over 65 age group (18.9% dial-up) and \$30,001-\$50,000 income level (12.1% dial-up).

The Time-Warner Cable usage crosstabulations were conducted on age, children in household under 18, education, housing type, income, language, and race (Tables B308-B314). The highest levels of usage (in order) were for townhouse/condo dwellers (88.6%), over 65 age group (80.4%), and those with a college degree (80.4%). The lowest levels of usage were for Asians (60.0%), \$20,001-\$30,000 income level (69.2%) and those without a college degree (69.7%).

The viewership of Town Council Meetings, School Board, or Wake County Board of Commissioner on Cary TV Channel 11 crosstabulations were conducted on age, children in household under 18, education, housing type, income, language, and race (Tables B315-B321). The highest viewership (watch sometime during the year) was from Asians (83.3%), 56-65 year olds (67.6%), over 65 age group (62.2%), and those without a college degree (60.5%). The lowest viewership (never watch) was from 18-25 age group (70.0%), townhouse/condo dwellers (64.5%), apartment dwellers (54.2%), households with no children (50.0%) and African-Americans (50.0%).

Cary's Efforts at Keeping Residents Informed and Involved in Decisions

A set of three questions examined information dissemination and opportunities for involvement in decision making by the residents. The respondents were first asked how informed they feel about Town services, issues, and programs that affect them. A 9-point rating scale ranging from not at all informed (1) to very well informed (9) was used. Table 53 indicates the respondents felt relatively well informed about matters that affect them. The mean was 6.09 with the percentage on the “informed” side (above 5) much greater than the percentage on the “not informed” side (below 5). In this case, it was 61.7% versus 16.6% (Figure 13). Overall, the results represent a significant increase from 2006 when the mean was 5.78.

The respondents were next asked their level of satisfaction with Cary making information available to them concerning Town services, projects, issues, and programs. A 9-point rating scale from very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (9) was used. Table 54 indicates a relatively high degree of satisfaction with Cary's efforts. This year the mean has improved to 6.87 from 6.63 in 2006. Even more impressive was the fact that 77.8% was on the “satisfied” side of the scale versus only 6.1% on the “dissatisfied” side (Figure 14).

Finally, the respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with the opportunities the Town gives them to participate in the decision-making process. The same 9-point satisfaction rating scale was used. Table 55 indicates there has been an increase in the level of satisfaction for opportunities given to residents to participate in the decision-making area. The mean was 6.36 this year compared to the mean of 6.19 in 2006. Note the percentage on the “satisfied” side of 66.4% significantly exceeds the “dissatisfied” side of the scale of 10.4% (Figure 15).

Table 53. How Informed Respondents Feel About Government Services, Projects, Issues, and Programs That Affect Them.

Year	Mean	Not At All Informed 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Well Informed 9	% Above 5
08	6.09	2.2	2.7	4.2	7.5	21.6	13.9	26.4	10.7	10.7	61.7
06	5.78	4.6	4.3	5.8	6.8	23.5	13.2	20.0	12.4	9.4	55.0
04	6.63	2.1	1.6	2.6	5.7	18.8	11.5	21.9	12.2	23.7	69.3
02	5.73	5.0	3.0	6.7	5.7	24.1	15.7	22.4	9.0	8.5	55.6

Table 54. Satisfaction with Cary Making Information Available to Citizens About Important Town Services, Projects, Issues and Programs.

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
08	6.87	0.7	0.0	2.7	2.7	15.9	12.9	27.1	20.4	17.4	77.8
06	6.63	2.1	1.0	0.8	2.6	19.5	13.8	28.7	19.2	12.3	74.0
04	7.15	0.8	1.0	2.1	2.1	14.1	12.6	18.7	17.4	31.3	80.0
02	6.27	2.7	1.2	2.5	7.9	22.6	11.2	24.3	15.9	11.7	63.1

Table 55. Satisfaction with Opportunities the Town Gives to Participate in the Decision Making Process.

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
08	6.36	2.0	1.3	2.5	4.6	23.2	12.0	28.5	15.0	10.9	66.4
06	6.19	2.9	1.3	2.1	3.7	25.4	15.2	27.3	15.0	7.0	64.5
04	6.62	4.0	2.9	4.3	1.6	18.2	9.7	18.0	13.7	27.6	69.0
02	5.92	3.2	4.0	5.9	6.1	24.2	11.7	21.5	13.6	9.8	56.6




Figure 13. Informed About Government Services.




Figure 14. Cary Making Information Available.

Resident Informed and Involved Crosstabulations

Crosstabulations were performed on age, education, gender, housing type, income, internet access, language, and race for this set of questions. The crosstabulations on how informed respondents felt about government projects, issues, and programs are shown in Tables B322-B329. There is a relatively high degree of consistency across the breakdowns. The subgroups that felt somewhat less informed (lower means) were the 18-25 age group (4.92), Asians (5.10), townhouse/condo dwellers (5.69), apartment dwellers (5.77), \$20,001-\$30,000 income level (5.85), and \$30,001-\$50,000 income level (5.86).




Figure 15. Opportunities to Participate in Decision Making.

The crosstabulations for making information available to citizens about important Town services, projects, issues, and programs are shown in Tables B330-B337. Again, the means were relatively consistent across groupings. The respondents who felt somewhat less satisfied (lower means) with Cary making information available were Asians (6.00), 18-25 age group (6.12), 20,001-\$30,000 income level (6.31), and townhouse/condo dwellers (6.63).

The crosstabulations for opportunities for residents to participate in the decision-making process are shown in Tables B338-B345. The lowest means were the 18-25 age group (5.44), African-Americans (5.69), Asians (5.95), apartment dwellers (5.97), and \$20,001-\$30,000 income level (6.00).

Recycling and Curbside Services

A set of questions was included in the survey to examine the respondent’s satisfaction with recycling and curbside pickup services. A 9-point scale from very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (9) was used to rate these pickup services.

This set included questions that examined the respondent’s satisfaction with curbside recycling and curbside garbage services. The curbside recycling service received a strong satisfaction mean of 7.74 which represents an increase from 7.56 in 2006 (Table 56). The percentages on the “satisfied” side (above 5) of the scale were very impressive at 90.0% this year compared to only 5.6% on the “dissatisfied” side (below 5) of the scale (Figure 16).

The level of satisfaction with the curbside garbage service was even higher than curbside recycling (Table 57). This year, the mean was 8.19. This represents a significant increase from the 2006 survey mean of 7.65 when 89.6% responded on the “satisfied” side. Note the very impressive numbers this year when 94.6% of the respondents were on the “satisfied” side of the scale versus only 1.5% on the “dissatisfied” side (Figure 17).

The respondents were also asked if they would support adding chipboard and junk mail to curbside recycling (Table 58). They were also informed that this could add as much as 50 cents to the monthly solid waste bill. There was a relatively solid level of support for implementing this proposal. The mean was 6.49 with 62.4% of the responses on the “support” side of the scale versus 19.1% on the “no support” side (Figure 18).

Table 56. Satisfaction with Curbside Recycling (n=372).

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
08	7.74	0.8	1.6	1.3	1.9	4.3	5.1	16.7	24.7	43.5	90.0
06	7.56	3.3	0.9	0.6	1.2	6.3	6.9	15.1	25.3	40.4	87.7
04	7.88	1.8	0.9	1.2	0.6	4.9	5.2	12.5	20.2	52.6	90.5

Table 57. Satisfaction with Curbside Garbage (n=379).

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
08	8.19	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.5	3.7	3.4	8.4	28.2	54.6	94.6
06	7.65	1.3	1.0	1.3	1.3	5.3	5.6	19.6	24.9	39.5	89.6
04	7.72	1.4	0.6	1.4	2.0	5.2	8.0	12.9	23.2	45.3	89.4

Table 58. Support for Adding Chipboard and Junk Mail to the Curbside Recycling Program.

Year	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Supportive 9	% Above 5
08	6.49	16.5	1.0	0.8	0.8	18.6	1.6	8.0	7.8	45.0	62.4




Figure 16. Curbside Recycling Satisfaction.




Figure 17. Curbside Garbage Satisfaction.

Recycling and Curbside Services Crosstabulations

Crosstabulations were conducted for age, housing type, and years in Cary for curbside collection set of questions. The crosstabulations for curbside recycling service are shown in Tables B346-B348. They were generally consistent and positive. The only subgroups with somewhat lower means were the younger and less tenured residents including 0-1 year Cary residents (7.06), 18-25 age group (7.30), and 2-5 year Cary residents (7.37). The crosstabulations for curbside garbage service are shown in Tables B349-B351. Similar to recycling service, the lowest means were from 18-25 age group (7.65), 0-1 year Cary residents (7.82), and townhouse/condo dwellers (7.83). Finally, the crosstabulations for support for adding chipboard and junk mail to curbside recycling are shown in Tables B352-B356. The lowest levels of support were from apartment dwellers (4.82), \$20,001-\$30,000 income level (5.27), 18-25 age group (5.50), \$30,001-\$50,000 income level (5.84), townhouse/condo dwellers (5.84), over 65 age group (5.87), and those without a college degree (5.97).




Figure 18. Support for Adding Chipboard and Junk Mail to Curbside Recycling.

Storm Drains

The next set of questions examined the respondent's knowledge of materials that are acceptable to be placed in storm drains (Table 59). Rainwater is the only acceptable material that can enter storm drains. The items the respondents deemed most acceptable for the storm drains were rainwater from a home's gutters (68.6%), water from draining a swimming pool (17.6%), and grass clippings, leaves, and other natural vegetation (8.2%). Again, since only rainwater from a home's gutters would be correct, there is some degree of inaccuracy in the respondent's perceptions. There has been a degree of improvement in water from a swimming pool (28.1% to 17.6%). However, there was slightly more inaccuracy for grass clippings, leaves, and other natural vegetation (8.2% to 6.5%). Grease and oil (0.2%) and paint (0.2%) remain accurately perceived as unacceptable materials. Tables 60 and 61 show the results from 2006 and 2004.

Overall, public knowledge of what is acceptable to go into storm drains improved again this year. The only area of concern is the slightly higher percentages (8.2%) for grass clippings, leaves, and other natural vegetation.

Table 59. Acceptable Materials for Storm Drains - 2008.

Materials	% Yes	% No	% Not Sure
Rainwater from a home's gutters	68.6	25.5	5.9
Water from draining a swimming pool	17.6	68.7	13.6
Grass clippings, leaves, and other natural vegetation	8.2	86.9	5.0
Grease and oil	0.2	98.3	1.5
Paint	0.2	98.3	1.5

Table 60. Acceptable Materials for Storm Drains - 2006.

Materials	% Yes	% No	% Not Sure
Rainwater from a home's gutters	87.6	9.5	3.0
Runoff from sprinklers and irrigation systems	68.1	23.7	8.2
Rinse water from washing a car	49.6	39.4	11.0
Water from draining a swimming pool	28.1	55.5	16.4
Grass clippings, leaves, and other natural vegetation	6.5	89.6	4.0
Grease and oil	1.2	97.5	1.2
Paint	1.0	98.0	1.0

Table 61. Acceptable Materials for Storm Drains - 2004.

Materials	% Yes	% No	% Not Sure
Rainwater from a home's gutters	88.7	8.0	3.4
Runoff from sprinklers and irrigation systems	84.5	11.7	3.9
Rinse water from washing a car	63.1	25.3	11.6
Water from draining a swimming pool	28.1	55.7	16.2
Grass clippings, leaves, and other natural vegetation	17.5	74.0	8.5
Grease and oil	0.8	98.5	0.8
Paint	0.3	99.0	0.8

Storm Drains Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations for acceptable materials to put in storm drains were conducted for housing type, language, and years in Cary (Tables B357-B359). Townhouse/condo dwellers (20.0%) and apartment dwellers (16.1%) were the most inaccurate for grass, leaves, and natural vegetation. The 0-1 year Cary residents (23.1%) and apartment dwellers (22.6%) were the least accurate for water from a swimming pool. However, the accuracy for grease, oil, and paints were very good for all the subgroups.

Instant Runoff Voting

A set of questions was included in the survey to examine the Instant Runoff Voting Method. The respondents were first asked if they were registered to vote in North Carolina. Table 62 indicates that almost 92% of the respondents were registered to vote in the state. Those respondents registered to vote were subsequently asked their understanding of the Instant Runoff Voting Method (Table 63). A 9-point scale was used ranging from do not understand at all (1) to understand very well (9). The results indicate there was a level of misunderstanding among the respondents. The mean was 5.83 with 58.6% on the “understand” side (above 5) of the scale and 30.6% on the “not understand” side (Figure 19). This includes 22.0% who indicated they do not understand at all. Overall this indicates a degree of misunderstanding among the respondents. The respondents were next asked their support for using the Instant Runoff Voting Method using a 9-point scale from not supportive at all (1) to very supportive (9). The respondents were also informed the use of the method would save Cary taxpayers approximately \$28,000 by not having to hold a physical runoff election. Table 63 shows there is a relatively high level of support for using the method. The mean was 7.21 with 68.8% on the “support” side of the scale versus only 7.2% on the “no support” side (Figure 20).

Table 62. Registered to Vote in NC.

Year	% Yes	% No
08	91.6	8.4

Table 63. How Well Do You Understand the Instant Runoff Voting Method (n=282).

Year	Mean	Do Not Understand At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Understand Very Well 9	% Above 5
08	5.83	22.0	5.0	2.5	1.1	11.0	4.3	10.3	8.9	35.1	58.6

Table 63. Support for the Instant Runoff Voting Method Being Used in Future Cary Elections (n=350).

Year	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Supportive 9	% Above 5
08	7.21	5.7	0.3	0.9	0.3	24.0	1.7	7.7	8.0	51.4	68.8




Figure 19. Understanding of Instant Runoff Voting Method.




Figure 20. Support for Using Instant Runoff Voting in Future Cary Elections.

Instant Runoff Voting Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations for registered to vote in North Carolina are shown in Tables B360-B367. They were conducted for age, education, gender, housing type, income, internet access, race, and years in Cary. The only subgroups not reaching the 90% range for registration were Asians (50.0%), 0-1 year Cary residents (78.9%), apartment dwellers (83.9%), 18-25 age group (84.6%), 6-10 year Cary residents (87.3%), African-Americans (88.5%), and those without a college degree (89.3).

The crosstabulations for understanding the Instant Runoff Voting Method are shown in Tables B368-B375. There were several subgroups indicating considerably lower levels of understanding including apartment dwellers (3.65), 0-1 year Cary residents (4.10), and those with no internet access (4.62). Also exhibiting a degree of misunderstanding were \$30,001-\$50,000 income level (4.96), 18-25 age group (5.00), 2-5 year Cary residents (5.25), townhouse/condo dwellers (5.33), 6-10 year Cary residents (5.52), \$70,001-\$100,000 income level (5.52), and those without a college degree (5.55).

The crosstabulations for support for using the Instant Runoff Voting Method in future elections are shown in Tables B376-B383. There were generally high levels of support among the breakdowns. However, there were somewhat lower levels from those without internet access (6.00), 18-25 age group (6.38), apartment dwellers (6.48), \$50,001-\$70,000 income level (6.50), 56-65 age group (6.69), and 0-1 year Cary residents (6.89).

Emergency Preparedness

There were two emergency preparedness questions included in the survey to examine if the respondents possessed a 3-day emergency kit (food, water, prescriptions, flashlight, radio, important papers, and contact information) and a family plan for how to get together if a disaster were to strike during work or school. The results indicate that 42.3% possessed a 3-day emergency kit available (Table 65). This represents a decline from 2006 when 48.8% had an emergency kit. The respondents were also asked if they had a family emergency plan for how to get together if a disaster were to strike (Table 66). This has increased this year with a higher percentage making family emergency plans compared to 2006 (49.5% versus 45.6%).

Table 65. Possession of 3-Day Emergency Kit.

Year	% Yes	% No	% Don't Know
08	42.3	57.4	0.2
06	48.8	50.3	1.0

Table 66. Family Emergency Plan If Disaster Struck During Work or School.

Year	% Yes	% No
08	49.5	50.5
06	45.6	54.4

Emergency Preparedness Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations (age, children in household under 18, housing type, income, race) for possession of a 3-day emergency kit are shown in Tables B384-B388. The highest percentages (in order) were for \$20,001-\$30,000 (61.5%), 56-65 age group (54.5%), and townhouse/condo dwellers (51.4%). The lowest percentages of possession were among apartment dwellers (32.3%), \$70,001-\$100,000 income level (33.7%), and 18-25 age group (34.6%).

The crosstabulations for having a family emergency plan in place to get together if a disaster were to strike during work or school are shown in Tables B389-B393. The highest percentages (in order) were for 56-65 age group (68.2%), \$20,001-\$30,000 (61.5%), apartment dwellers (58.1%), and African-Americans (57.7%). The subgroups with the lowest percentages were townhouse/condo dwellers (31.4%), Asians (35.0%), and 18-25 age group (38.5%).

Primary Language Spoken and Literacy

The survey included two questions that examined the primary language spoken in the home and literacy in Cary. Table 67 indicates the primary language spoken in the home was English (95.8%) with limited use of other languages including Hindi/Gujarati (1.2%), Korean (1.0%), Chinese (0.7%), and Spanish (0.7%). A second question examined the number of adults living at home who cannot read because they do not see well, have not learned to read, or any other reason (Table 68). There were 99.5% of the respondents who were literate with only 0.2% with 1 person at home who cannot read and 0.2% with 2 people at home who cannot read.

Table 67. Primary Language Spoken in the Home.

Year	% English	% Spanish	% Chinese	% Japanese	% Korean	% Hindi/Gujarati	% Other
08	95.8	0.7	0.7	0.0	1.0	1.2	0.5

Table 68. Number of Adults in Household Who Cannot Read for Any Reason.

Year	0	1	2	3	4	5 or More
08	99.5	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0

Primary Language and Literacy Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations children in household under 18, education, housing type, income and years in Cary for primary language spoken are shown in Tables B394-B398. Due to the fact that English was overwhelmingly the primary language, the sample sizes were too small for the other languages for viable breakdowns. The crosstabulations for household literacy are shown in Tables B399-B403. Again, the fact that virtually everyone was literate made the sample sizes too small in the categories (number of adults in household) for interpretation and discussion.

Sense of Community

A set of 3 questions examined the sense of community in Cary. The first question examined the importance of having a sense of community with your neighbors (Table 69). A 9-point scale from not important at all (1) to very important (9) was used. Having a sense of community was a much desired neighborhood aspect for the respondents as evidenced by the high mean of 7.76. Notice that 87.5% of the responses were on the “important” side of the scale above 5 versus only 3.1% on the “not important” side below 5 (Figure 21).

The respondents were then asked if they actually felt a sense of community with their neighbors (Table 70). A 9-point scale that ranged from no sense of community at all (1) to a very strong sense of community (9) was utilized. The mean was 6.64 with 70.1% on the “strong” sense of community side versus 15.4% on the “weak” side (Figure 22). This indicates a relatively strong neighborhood sense of community was perceived by most the respondents.

Table 69. Importance of Having a Sense of Community with Neighbors.

Year	Mean	Not Important At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Important 9	% Above 5
08	7.76	1.0	0.7	0.7	0.7	9.2	7.4	14.9	13.6	51.6	87.5

Table 70. Perceived Strength of the Sense of Community Actually Felt with Neighbors.

Year	Mean	No Sense of Community At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	A Very Strong Sense of Community 9	% Above 5
08	6.64	1.7	3.0	6.0	4.7	14.5	9.2	19.7	17.0	24.2	70.1




Figure 21. Importance of Sense of Community with Neighbors.




Figure 22. Perceived Strength of Community Actually Felt with Neighbors.

Finally, the respondents were asked how often they interact with their neighbors from just saying hello to visiting them to exchanging favors (Table 71). This appears to be a relatively common practice. The most common interactions were once or twice a week (44.3%) or everyday (31.9%). A further breakdown of the respondents who perceived a weak sense of community reveals they had limited interaction with neighbors (43.5% indicated only once or twice a month), more likely to be in

the 18-25 age group, and lived in apartments. Overall, the respondents felt a strong sense of community is very important. Most of the respondents generally perceived a relatively strong sense of community in their neighborhoods. In addition, they had frequent interactions with their neighbors usually once/twice a week or everyday.

Table 71. How Often Interact with Neighbors from Just Saying Hello to Visiting Them to Exchanging Favors.

Year	Never	Once or Twice a Year	Once or Twice a Month	Once or Twice a Week	Everyday
08	1.5	3.5	18.8	44.3	31.9

Sense of Community Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations examined for sense of community were age, children in household under 18, education, gender, housing type, income, internet access, language, literacy, race, and years in Cary. Tables B404-B414 shows the crosstabulations for importance of having a sense of community with neighbors. The highest levels of importance for sense of community was for over 65 age group (7.98), households with children (7.96), over \$100,000 income level (7.96), and 56-65 age group (7.96). The subgroups that rated the lowest importance for a sense of community were those without internet access (6.50), apartment dwellers (6.73), townhouse/condo dwellers (7.43), \$20,001-\$30,000 age group (7.46), and 18-25 age group (7.56).

The crosstabulations for strength of sense of community actually felt with neighbors are shown in Tables B415-B425. The highest sense of community with neighbors was perceived by over 65 age group (7.13), 56-65 age group (6.88), \$70,001-\$100,000 income level (6.86), and over 10 year Cary residents (6.83). The lowest sense of community with neighbors was for apartment dwellers (5.10), 18-25 age group (5.52), and \$20,001-\$30,000 income level (5.62). There was also a somewhat lower sense of community for the 2-5 year Cary residents (6.20), \$30,001-\$50,000 income level (6.24), \$50,001-\$70,000 income level (6.35), and townhouse/condo dwellers (6.43).

The crosstabulations for interacting with neighbors are shown in Tables B426-B436. The most frequent interaction with neighbors (once or twice a week and everyday percentages combined) was for over 65 age group (82.7%), \$70,001-\$100,000 income level (80.2%), Asians (80.0%), townhouse/condo dwellers (80.0%), 6-10 year Cary residents (79.8%), over 10 year Cary residents (79.4%), and households with children (79.2%). The lowest levels of interaction (never percentages) were for apartment dwellers (16.1%), households with no internet access (12.5%), African-Americans (7.7%), and \$20,001-\$30,000 income level (7.7%).

Town Council Focus Areas

The survey included several questions examining specific focus areas of the Town Council as determined in the 2008 Council Staff Retreat. The respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with the Town’s efforts in several areas including environmental protection, school issues, downtown revitalization, transportation, planning & development, and parks, recreation, & cultural issues. A 9-point scale from very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (9) was used for all the areas examined with the exception of a 9-point effectiveness scale used for one of the questions (effectiveness of Town Council working to keep Cary the best place to live, work, and raise a family). The aspects are listed in order of mean scores indicating higher levels of satisfaction and/or effectiveness from the respondents.

The job the Town is doing with parks, recreation, and cultural issues earned the highest rating of any of the focus areas examined this year. The respondents were asked to consider several factors in their rating including quality/quantity of existing parks, greenways, and community centers; how close these facilities are located to their home; planning for the aquatics center and performing arts center; and building new parks, community centers, greenways, and trails. Table 72 shows the very positive results from the respondents. The mean was 7.46 with 87.6% on the “satisfied” side of the scale above 5. There were only 0.9% of the responses on the “dissatisfied” side below 5 (Figure 23).

In addition, the ratings differed between those respondents who have participated in a Parks & Recreation program compared to those who have not participated. The mean for those who have participated in a program was 7.68 versus 7.35 for those who have not participated in a program. This highlights how actual experience with a program can alter the overall perceptions.

The respondents who gave the Town a rating below 5 (“dissatisfied” side) were subsequently asked what actions the Town could take to make them more satisfied with parks, recreation, and cultural resource issues. The comments are shown in Appendix I. In total, there were only 8 comments with no theme or central issue evident due to the limited number of comments.




Figure 23. Satisfaction with Job Town is Doing on Parks & Recreation.

Table 72. Satisfaction with Overall Job the Town is Doing on Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources Issues.

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
08	7.46	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.7	11.4	7.7	25.9	27.9	26.1	87.6

The respondents were also generally satisfied with the job the Town is doing on issues related to environmental protection. They were asked to consider the Town’s environmental efforts such as recycling, open space preservation, water conservation, and erosion control. The respondents gave the Town high marks with a mean of 7.04 (Table 73). This year there were 80.0% of the responses on the “satisfied” side of the scale and only 3.5% on the “dissatisfied” side indicating a strong level of support (Figure 24). The respondents who gave the Town a rating below 5 were asked what actions the Town could take to make them more satisfied with environmental protection (Appendix J). There were 24 total comments and the primary suggestions were to stop excessive water usage/abuse, recycling more items, and stop cutting down the trees.




Figure 24. Satisfaction with Job Town is Doing on Environmental Protection.

Table 73. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Environmental Protection.

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
08	7.04	1.0	0.0	1.0	1.5	16.6	11.8	25.4	22.4	20.4	80.0

The next highest rated of the focus areas was how effective the Town Council was in working to keep Cary the best place to live, work, and raise a family. This question did not use the satisfaction rating scale but a 9-point effectiveness scale ranging from very ineffective (1) to very effective (9). The results were positive and supportive of the Town Council with a mean of 6.85 (Table 74). There were 77.0% of the responses on the “effective” side of the scale and only 4.1% on the “ineffective” side (Figure 25). The respondents who gave the Town a rating below 5 were asked what actions the Town could take to make them more satisfied with keeping Cary the best place to live, work, and raise a family (Appendix K). There were 19 total comments which focused mostly on concerns about growth and development. Other suggestions centered on listening more to citizens, school issues, and safety.




Figure 25. Effectiveness in Keeping Cary the Best Place to Live, Work, & Raise a Family.

Table 74. Effectiveness of Town Council in Working to Keep Cary the Best Place to Live, Work, and Raise a Family.

Year	Mean	Very Ineffective 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Effective 9	% Above 5
08	6.85	1.3	0.3	0.5	2.0	19.0	12.3	28.8	20.1	15.8	77.0

The respondents were also positive concerning their level of satisfaction with the Town’s efforts with transportation. The respondents were asked to consider issues like widening roads, offering C-Tran bus service, synchronizing signal lights, adding bike lanes/greenways/sidewalks. Table 75 shows the mean was 6.66. There were 72.9% on the “satisfied” side of the scale and 11.1% on the “dissatisfied” side (Figure 26). This represents a relatively good rating for an issue that has been contentious in the past. The respondents who gave the Town a rating below 5 were asked what actions the Town could take to make them more satisfied with transportation (Appendix L). The 65 total comments focused on several issues including synchronizing lights, adding sidewalks, improving C-Tran (timing, routes, information availability), widening roads, and improving public transportation.




Figure 26. Satisfaction with Job Town is Doing on Transportation.

Table 75. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Transportation.

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
08	6.66	0.7	0.5	1.7	8.2	15.9	12.2	24.1	24.9	11.7	72.9

There were also positive results on the job the Town is doing with downtown revitalization. The respondents were asked to consider issues such as adding a new park, renovating old Cary Elementary into an arts space, improving parking, and creating fresh streetscape (new streets, sidewalks, lighting, furniture). The results indicated the respondents were generally satisfied with the Town’s downtown revitalization efforts (Table 76). The mean was 6.55 with 69.7% responding on the “satisfied” side and only 6.9% on the “dissatisfied” side (Figure 27). The respondents who gave the Town a rating below 5 were asked what actions the Town could take to make them more satisfied with downtown revitalization (Appendix M). There were 29 total comments which focused on not seeing any results downtown and/or to speed things up. Other comments included that it was a waste of money and others wanted downtown to stay the same.




Figure 27. Satisfaction with Job Town is Doing on Downtown Revitalization.

Table 76. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Downtown Revitalization.

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
08	6.55	0.8	0.8	2.0	3.3	23.5	13.0	26.3	18.9	11.5	69.7

The respondents were asked to rate the job the Town is doing with planning & development. They were asked to consider issues such as development land use plans for specific areas, ensuring new development is high quality and compatible with existing development, and making sure the infrastructure can support growth. The results show a relatively good level of satisfaction with a mean of 5.93 (Table 77). However, this aspect earned a somewhat lower rating than the other focus areas. There were 61.1% on the “satisfied” side of the scale and 18.4% on the “dissatisfied” side (Figure 28). The respondents who gave the Town a rating below 5 were subsequently asked what actions the Town could take to make them more satisfied with planning & development (Appendix N). There were 78 total suggestions and most focused on controlling growth/development (45 comments), improving the infrastructure (9 comments) and not giving developers so much influence (6 comments).




Figure 28. Satisfaction with Job Town is Doing on Planning & Development.

Table 77. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Planning & Development.

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
08	5.93	3.1	2.6	3.8	8.9	20.4	18.1	24.2	12.2	6.6	61.1

The final area examined the job the Town is doing in regards to school issues. Although the Wake County School Board operates Cary’s public schools, the respondents were asked to consider the Town’s efforts such as banking land for schools, placing police in schools, locating park facilities adjacent to schools, and being an advocate for Cary citizens with the School Board. The results show a degree of satisfaction with a mean of 5.73 (Table 78). There were 49.0% on the “satisfied” side of the scale and 15.3% on the “dissatisfied” side (Figure 29). Note the high percentage (35.6%) of neutral responses. Overall, the level of satisfaction was not as strong for this area. The respondents who gave the Town a rating below 5 were asked what actions the Town could take to make them more satisfied with school issues (Appendix O). There were 66 total suggestions that focused on ending reassignments (21 comments), Cary being more of an advocate for citizens (10 comments), ending year-round school (9 comments), and Cary starting its own school system (9 comments).




Figure 29. Satisfaction with Job Town is Doing on School Issues.

Table 78. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on School Issues Overall.

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
08	5.73	5.2	2.2	3.0	4.9	35.6	12.1	18.6	11.5	6.8	49.0

Town Council Focus Areas Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations for the focus areas were conducted on groupings of age, children in household under 18, education, housing type, income, race, and years in Cary. The crosstabulations for satisfaction with the job the Town is doing with parks, recreation, and cultural programs are shown in Tables B437-B443. The subgroups showing the lowest levels of satisfaction were from \$20,001-\$30,000 income level (6.77), 18-25 age group (6.80), townhouse/condo dwellers (6.97), apartment dwellers (7.03), Asians (7.10), \$30,001-\$50,000 income level (7.12), over 65 age group (7.17), and those without a college degree (7.20).

The crosstabulations for satisfaction with the job the Town is doing with environmental protection are shown in Tables B444-B450. The means were generally consistent and positive; however, a few areas did indicate lower levels of satisfaction including the 18-25 age group (6.15), townhouse/condo dwellers (6.67), \$30,001-\$50,000 income level (6.69), and 6-10 year Cary residents (6.75).

The crosstabulations for the effectiveness of Town Council in working to keep Cary the best place to live, work, and raise a family are shown in Tables B451-B457. This question had some of the most consistent means with very few lower ratings among the breakdowns. The only subgroups indicating slightly lower effectiveness means were 56-65 age group (6.57) and \$20,001-\$30,000 income level (6.62).

The crosstabulations for satisfaction with the job the Town is doing with transportation are shown in Tables B458-B464. Although most of the means were supportive, there were several subgroups with lower levels of satisfaction including the \$20,001-\$30,000 income level (6.15), \$50,001-\$70,000 income level (6.24), townhouse/condo dwellers (6.31), African-Americans (6.35), apartment dwellers (6.39), \$30,001-\$50,000 income level (6.40), and 2-5 year Cary residents (6.40).

The crosstabulations for satisfaction with the job the Town is doing with downtown revitalization are shown in Tables B465-B471. The levels of satisfaction were generally positive and consistent for the breakdowns. The only subgroups showing lower levels of satisfaction were apartment dwellers (6.03), townhouse/condo dwellers (6.03), Asians (6.11), and 18-25 age group (6.31).

The crosstabulations for satisfaction with the job the Town is doing with planning & development are shown in Tables B472-B478. The subgroups were generally consistent in their levels of satisfaction. The only areas demonstrating lower levels of satisfaction were townhouse/condo dwellers (5.62), 56-65 age group (5.70), and Asians (5.70).

The final crosstabulations for satisfaction with the job the Town is doing with school issues are shown in Tables B479-B485. The means were generally consistent in the breakdowns. There were several subgroups showing somewhat lower satisfaction means including townhouse/condo dwellers (5.13), \$20,001-\$30,000 income level (5.46), Asians (5.50), apartment dwellers (5.50), 56-65 age group (5.51), and over 65 age group (5.51).

Appendix A

**Town of Cary 2008
Biennial Citizen Survey**

Hello, my name is ____ and I am calling for the Town of Cary. On a regular basis Cary conducts a citizen survey so that we can improve the services the Town offers you. Your opinion is very important to Cary.

Are you a resident of the Town of Cary?

- Yes (Continue) No (Stop and thank the respondent)

Are you over the age of 18?

- Yes (Continue) No (Ask politely to speak with someone over 18)

1. Have you had any business contact with any Town Government staff in the past two years?

- Yes (Continue) No (Skip to #2)

Please tell us your opinion regarding that contact with Town Government using the following 9-point scale where 1 is very poor and 9 is excellent.

	Very Poor									Excellent
1a. Promptness of response?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA
1b. Professionalism?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA
1c. Knowledgeable?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA
1d. Courteous?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA
1e. Ability to resolve issues?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA

2. How well does the Town of Cary maintain streets and roads with regard to paving, potholes, etc.? (Read scale if skipped #1)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Very Poor								Excellent

(For responses below 5) Can you provide specific examples of roads that need more attention (ask to spell street name and then ask the problem)?

Street _____ Problem _____
Street _____ Problem _____

3. Please rate the cleanliness and appearance of the following public areas, again with the same 9-point scale.

	Very Poor									Excellent
3a. Streets?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
3b. Median and roadsides?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
3c. Parks?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
3d. Greenways?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	

(For responses below 5) Can you provide specific examples of places that need more attention (place name and problem)?

4. Have you had any contact with the Cary Police Department in the past two years?

- Yes (Continue) No (Skip to #5)

Was the person you contacted at the Police?

- Police Officer Clerk Dispatcher Animal Control Detective Not Sure

Using the same 9-point scale, please tell us your opinion regarding that contact with Cary Police.

	Very Poor									Excellent
4a. Courteous?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA
4b. Fairness?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA
4c. Competence?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA
4d. Problem solving?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA
4e. Response time?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA

5. Have you had contact with the Cary Fire Department in the past two years?

- Yes (Continue) No (Skip to #6)

Using the same 9-point scale from very poor to excellent, please tell us your opinion regarding that contact with Cary Fire Department.

	Very Poor									Excellent
5a. Courteous?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA
5b. Fairness?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA
5c. Competence?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA
5d. Problem solving?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA
5e. Response time?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA

6. Have you or anyone in your household participated in a Town of Cary Parks, Recreation & Cultural Resources' Department Program in the past two years?

- Yes (Continue) No (Skip to #7)

Please tell me which program you or a member of your household most frequently participated in and where?

Program _____ Location _____
 Program _____ Location _____

Using the 9-point scale from very poor to excellent, please give an overall rating to various aspects of the program.

	Very Poor									Excellent
6a. Program quality?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA
6b. Facility quality?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA
6c. Cost or amount of fee?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA
6d. Overall experience?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA
6e. Ease of registration?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA
6f. Instructor or coach quality?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA

7. Please tell me how many children under the age of 18 live in your household?

- 0 (Skip to #8) 1-2 3-5 Over 5

How many of your school-age children would likely participate at least once a year in a Town of Cary parks, recreation, or cultural program specifically designed for year-round school students during the track out periods? _____

8. How many people in your home of any age would benefit from recreation services that accommodate people with disabilities? _____

9. How would you rate Cary overall as a place to live? Use a 9-point scale this time 1 is very undesirable and 9 is very desirable.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very Average Very
Undesirable Desirable

(For responses below 5) Please tell us specifically what about Cary you're finding undesirable?

10. In the past two years, do you feel that the quality of life in the Town of Cary is? (Read choices)

- 1 2 3 4 5
Much Somewhat The Same Somewhat Much
Worse Worse Better Better

(For responses below 3) Please tell us which aspects of the quality of life in Cary seem worse?

11. What do you feel is the one most important issue facing the Town of Cary?

12. Comparing traffic inside Cary to traffic inside other areas in the Triangle, would you say that traffic generally flows in Cary (read choices)?

- Better than most other places in the Triangle About the same as most other places in the Triangle Worse than most other places in the Triangle

13. Please tell us how safe you feel in Cary overall? Use a 9-point scale where 1 is extremely unsafe and 9 is extremely safe.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Extremely Average Extremely
Unsafe Safe

14. Specifically, how safe do you feel in your home neighborhood?

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Extremely Average Extremely
Unsafe Safe

15. How about at public places around Cary, like when you're shopping, out to eat, or at the movies – how safe do you feel, using the same 9-point scale?

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Extremely Average Extremely
Unsafe Safe

16. Cary's municipal tax rate is 42 cents per \$100 of property valuation. So a home valued at \$100,000 will have a tax of \$420. By comparison the same home will have a tax of \$459 in Charlotte, \$730 in Raleigh, and \$618 in Durham. For the services provided, do you feel the Cary tax rate is? (Read choices)

- | | | | | |
|----------|--------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Very Low | Somewhat Low | About Right | Somewhat High | Very High |

17. Please indicate how much you use the following information sources that Cary uses to communicate with its citizens. This time use the following scale where 1 is never use to 9 is frequently use.

	Never Use				Average					Frequently Use
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
17a. Cary News	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
17b. Raleigh News & Observer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
17c. Television	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
17d. Radio	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
17e. The Town's website	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
17f. Internet e-mail with Cary	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
17g. Word of mouth (friends/neighbors)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
17h. The 24-hour Town Hall Phone Service	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
17i. CARY TV 11, Cary's Govt. Access Cable Channel	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
17j. BUD (Cary's water & sewer bill newsletter)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
17k. The Town's Block Leader Program	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
17l. Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources Program Brochure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
17m. Independent Weekly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
17n. Internet blogs, message boards, and other social media.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	

18. Do you have access to the Internet at? Home Office Both Neither (Skip to #20)

19. Is your internet access? High Speed Dial-up Both

20. Overall, how well informed do you feel about Town government services, projects, issues, and programs affecting you? Use a 9-point scale where 1 is not at all informed and 9 is very well informed.

- | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|---|---|---|---------|---|---|---|-----------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| Not at All
Informed | | | | Average | | | | Very Well
Informed |

21. How satisfied are you with the Town of Cary making information available to citizens about important Town services, projects, issues, and programs? Use a 9-point scale where 1 is very dissatisfied and 9 is very satisfied.

- | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|---|---------|---|---|---|-------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| Very
Dissatisfied | | | | Neutral | | | | Very
Satisfied |

22. Using the same scale, how satisfied are you with the opportunities the Town gives you to participate in the decision-making process?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very Dissatisfied Neutral Very Satisfied

23. Do you have cable service through Time-Warner Cable?

Yes (Continue) No (Skip to #28)

How often do you watch, whole or in part, meetings of the Cary Town Council, School Board, or Wake County Board of Commissioner on Cary TV Channel 11? (Read choices)

Never At Least Once a Year Several Times a Year At Least Once Every Month Several Times Every Month

24. How often do you watch, whole or in part, the station's monthly news magazine program BUD-TV? (Read choices)

Never At Least Once a Year Several Times a Year At Least Once Every Month Several Times Every Month

25. How often do you watch Cary TV's Electronic Bulletin Board messages? (Read choices)

Never At Least Once a Year Several Times a Year At Least Once Every Month Several Times Every Month

26. How often do you watch Wink – the live traffic camera images that run during rush hour? (Read choices)

Never At Least Once a Year Several Times a Year At Least Once Every Month Several Times Every Month

27. Did you watch, whole or in part, the 2007 Cary Community Candidate Forum this past fall?

Yes No

28. On a scale of 1 to 9 with 9 being the highest rating, rate your level of satisfaction with the following Town of Cary solid waste and recycling services. If you have not used any of the services respond with not applicable.

	Very Dissatisfied				Neutral			Very Satisfied			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	
28a. Curbside recycling											
28b. Curbside garbage											

29. How supportive would you be of the Town adding chip board and junk mail to the curbside recycling program keeping in mind it could add as much as 50 cents to your monthly solid waste bill? Use a 9-point scale where 1 is not supportive at all and 9 is very supportive, while 5 is neutral.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Not Supportive at All Neutral Very Supportive

30. We're interested in learning what Cary citizens know about storm drains, those openings and grates generally located in the curb along streets. Please tell us yes or no if it is acceptable to put the following in a storm drain.

30a. Grass clippings, leaves, and other natural vegetative matter	Yes	No	NS
30b. Paint	Yes	No	NS
30c. Grease and oil	Yes	No	NS
30d. Rainwater from your home's gutters	Yes	No	NS
30e. Water from draining your swimming pool	Yes	No	NS

31. Are you registered to vote in North Carolina?
 Yes (Continue) No (Skip to #33)

This past fall, Cary municipal elections were conducted using Instant Runoff Voting which asks voters to rank candidates in the same races according to their preference. How well do you understand the Instant Runoff Voting method? Use a 9-point scale where 1 is do not understand at all and 9 is understand very well, while 5 is neutral.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Do Not Neutral Understand
Understand at All Very Well

32. Considering that the Instant Runoff Voting saved Cary taxpayers about \$28,000 by not having to hold a physical runoff election, how supportive are you of the Instant Runoff Voting method being used in future Cary elections? Use a 9-point scale where 1 is not supportive at all and 9 is very supportive, while 5 is neutral.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Not Supportive Neutral Very
at All Supportive

33. Regarding the Town's environmental efforts such as recycling, open space preservation, water conservation, and erosion control, how satisfied are you with the job the Town is doing with environmental protection? Use a 9-point satisfaction scale where 1 is very dissatisfied and 9 is very satisfied.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very Neutral Very
Dissatisfied Satisfied

(For responses below 5) Could you please tell us specific actions the Town could take to make you more satisfied?

34. How effective do you feel that Cary Town Council is working together to keep Cary the best place to live, work, and raise a family? Use a 9-point scale where 1 is very ineffective and 9 is very effective.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very Neutral Very
Ineffective Effective

(For responses below 5) Could you please tell us specific actions the Town could take to be more effective?

35. The Wake County School Board has the legal responsibility to operate Cary’s public schools. Even so, the Town undertakes many efforts to help with schools such as banking land for schools, placing police in schools, locating park facilities adjacent to schools, and being an advocate for Cary citizens with the School Board. How satisfied are you with the job the Town is doing on school issues overall? Use a 9-point satisfaction scale where 1 is very dissatisfied and 9 is very satisfied.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very Neutral Very
Dissatisfied Satisfied

(For responses below 5) Could you please tell us specific actions the Town could take to make you more satisfied?

36. The Town has plans to create a more vibrant downtown including a new park, renovating old Cary Elementary into an arts space, improving parking, and creating fresh streetscape with new streets/ sidewalks/lighting/furniture. How satisfied are you with the job the Town is doing with downtown revitalization? Please use the same 9-point satisfaction scale.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very Neutral Very
Dissatisfied Satisfied

(For responses below 5) Could you please tell us specific actions the Town could take to make you more satisfied?

37. Regarding the Town’s efforts with transportation – like widening roads, offering C-Tran bus service, synchronizing signal lights, adding bike lanes, greenways and sidewalks for alternatives to driving cars – how satisfied would you say you are overall with the job the Town is doing with transportation? Use the same 9-point satisfaction scale.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very Neutral Very
Dissatisfied Satisfied

(For responses below 5) Could you please tell us specific actions the Town could take to make you more satisfied?

38. In regard to how the Town is doing with planning and development issues such as developing land use plans for specific areas of Town, ensuring that new development is high quality and compatible with existing development, making sure that the infrastructure like roads, water, and sewer are in place to support growth. How satisfied are you overall with the job the Town is doing with planning and development? Please use the same 9-point satisfaction scale.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very Neutral Very
Dissatisfied Satisfied

(For responses below 5) Could you please tell us specific actions the Town could take to make you more satisfied?

That concludes our questions about the Town of Cary. Now tell us a little about yourself.

47. How many years have you lived in the Town of Cary?

- 0-1 2-5 6-10 11-20 20 or more

48. Which of the following best describes where you live?

- Single Family Home Apartment Townhome/Condo Mobile Home Duplex Other _____

49. Stop me when I reach the age group you fall in.

- 18-25 26-35 36-45 46-55 56-65 66-75 Over 75

50. Please tell me the last grade or degree completed in school.

- High School or less Some College or Technical Bachelors Degree Masters Degree PhD, JD, MD

51. May I ask your race?

- Caucasian African-American Native-American Asian Hispanic Other _____

52. Stop me when I reach your household income level?

- 0-\$20,000 \$20,001-\$30,000 30,001-\$50,000 50,001-\$70,000 70,001-\$100,000 Over \$100,000

53. By voice: Male Female

Thank you for participating in the survey. After we compile and analyze this survey, the Town of Cary will also be conducting focus groups to get an even better understanding of our citizen's feelings and concerns. Would you be willing to participate in one of our sessions that will last about an hour on a weekend day? You would be compensated for participation.

- Yes Can I ask your first name _____ No

Appendix B: Crosstabulations

Town Government: Contact Crosstabulations

Table B1. Contact with the Town Government by Age.

Age	n	% Yes	% No
18-25	27	11.1	88.9
26-55	284	22.5	77.5
56-65	44	27.3	72.7
Over 65	46	28.3	71.7

Table B2. Contact with the Town Government by Education.

Education	n	% Yes	% No
HS/Some College	122	14.8	85.2
College Degree	280	26.4	73.6

Table B3. Contact with the Town Government by Gender.

Gender	n	% Yes	% No
Male	188	23.9	76.1
Female	216	21.8	78.2

Table B4. Contact with the Town Government by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	% Yes	% No
Single family	334	24.3	75.7
Apartment	31	6.5	93.5
Townhouse/Condo	35	25.7	74.3
Duplex	1	0.0	100.0
Other	2	--	100.0

Table B5. Contact with the Town Government by Income.

Income	n	% Yes	% No
0-\$20,000	5	40.0	60.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	0.0	100.0
\$30,001-\$50,000	35	20.0	80.0
\$50,001-\$70,000	37	24.3	75.7
\$70,001-\$100,000	86	20.9	79.1
Over \$100,000	171	26.9	73.1

Table B6. Contact with the Town Government by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	% Yes	% No
Have access	386	22.8	77.2
No access	16	25.0	75.0

Table B7. Contact with the Town Government by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	% Yes	% No
English	385	23.4	76.6
Spanish	3	0.0	100.0
Chinese	3	0.0	100.0
Korean	4	0.0	100.0
Hindi/Gujarati	5	20.0	80.0
Other	2	50.0	50.0

Table B8. Contact with the Town Government by Literacy.

Literacy	n	% Yes	% No
All Literate	401	22.9	77.1
1 or More Illiterate	2	0.0	100.0

Table B9. Contact with the Town Government by Race.

Race	n	% Yes	% No
Caucasian	340	24.4	75.6
African-American	26	26.9	73.1
Asian	20	0.0	100.0
Hispanic	2	0.0	100.0
Other	9	11.1	88.9

Town Government: Courteous Crosstabulations

Table B10. Town Government: Courteous by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	3	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
26-55	60	8.33	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	11.7	26.7	58.3	A-
56-65	12	8.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	8.3	33.3	50.0	A-
Over 65	13	8.46	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	7.7	15.4	69.2	A

Table B11. Town Government: Courteous by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	18	7.94	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	44.4	38.9	B+
College Degree	70	8.46	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	2.9	10.0	20.0	65.7	A

Table B12. Town Government: Courteous by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	41	8.32	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	14.6	29.3	53.7	A-
Female	47	8.38	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	6.4	21.3	66.0	A-

Table B13. Town Government: Courteous by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single family	78	8.30	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	1.3	2.6	11.5	25.6	57.7	A-
Apartment	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Townhouse/Condo	9	8.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	77.8	A+
Duplex	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B14. Town Government: Courteous by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
\$20,001-\$30,000	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
\$30,001-\$50,000	7	8.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	85.7	A+
\$50,001-\$70,000	8	8.63	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	62.5	A
\$70,001-\$100,000	17	8.53	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.8	23.5	64.7	A
Over \$100,000	44	8.21	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	2.3	2.3	11.4	25.0	56.8	A-

Table B15. Town Government: Courteous by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Have access	84	8.32	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	1.2	2.4	10.7	26.2	58.3	A-
No access	4	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B16. Town Government: Courteous by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
English	86	8.35	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	1.2	2.3	10.5	24.4	60.5	A-
Spanish	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Chinese	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Korean	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hindi/Gujarati	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+
Other	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B17. Town Government: Courteous by Literacy.

Literacy	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
All Literate	88	8.35	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	1.1	2.3	10.2	25.0	60.2	A-
1 or More Illiterate	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B18. Town Government: Courteous by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	79	8.33	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	1.3	2.5	10.1	25.3	59.5	A-
African-American	7	8.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	85.7	A+
Asian	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hispanic	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+

Town Government: Professionalism Crosstabulations

Table B19. Town Government: Professionalism by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	3	7.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	B
26-55	62	8.18	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0	1.6	6.5	12.9	21.0	56.5	A-
56-65	12	7.75	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	8.3	0.0	8.3	25.0	50.0	B
Over 65	13	8.46	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	7.7	7.7	76.9	A

Table B20. Town Government: Professionalism by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	18	7.78	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	33.3	44.4	B
College Degree	72	8.24	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	5.6	11.1	15.3	62.5	A-

Table B21. Town Government: Professionalism by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	43	8.23	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	7.0	11.6	23.3	55.8	A-
Female	47	8.06	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	6.4	2.1	10.6	14.9	61.7	A-

Table B22. Town Government: Professionalism by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single family	80	8.11	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	3.8	5.0	12.5	18.8	57.5	A-
Apartment	1	5.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	F
Townhouse/Condo	9	8.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	77.8	A+
Duplex	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B23. Town Government: Professionalism by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
\$20,001-\$30,000	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
\$30,001-\$50,000	7	8.29	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	14.3	71.4	A-
\$50,001-\$70,000	8	8.63	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	62.5	A
\$70,001-\$100,000	17	8.47	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.5	5.9	70.6	A
Over \$100,000	46	7.96	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	4.3	6.5	10.9	19.6	54.3	B+

Table B24. Town Government: Professionalism by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Have access	86	8.11	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	4.7	4.7	11.6	19.8	57.0	A-
No access	4	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B25. Town Government: Professionalism by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
English	88	8.13	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	4.5	4.5	11.4	19.3	58.0	A-
Spanish	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Chinese	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Korean	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hindi/Gujarati	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B26. Town Government: Professionalism by Literacy.

Literacy	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
All Literate	90	8.14	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	4.4	4.4	11.1	18.9	58.9	A-
1 or More Illiterate	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B27. Town Government: Professionalism by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	81	8.16	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	3.7	4.9	11.1	17.3	60.5	A-
African-American	7	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	42.9	42.9	B+
Asian	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hispanic	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Town Government: Knowledgeable Crosstabulations

Table B28. Town Government: Knowledgeable by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	3	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	66.7	B+
26-55	61	8.03	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	4.9	1.6	14.8	26.2	49.2	B+
56-65	12	8.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	16.7	16.7	58.3	A-
Over 65	13	8.54	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	15.4	76.9	A

Table B29. Town Government: Knowledgeable by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	18	7.83	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	5.6	11.1	33.3	38.9	B+
College Degree	71	8.20	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	4.2	1.4	12.7	19.7	59.2	A-

Table B30. Town Government: Knowledgeable by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	42	7.98	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	7.1	2.4	14.3	26.2	47.6	B+
Female	47	8.26	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	4.3	2.1	10.6	19.1	61.7	A-

Table B31. Town Government: Knowledgeable by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single family	79	8.04	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	6.3	2.5	13.9	22.8	51.9	B+
Apartment	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Townhouse/Condo	9	8.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	77.8	A+
Duplex	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B32. Town Government: Knowledgeable by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
\$20,001-\$30,000	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
\$30,001-\$50,000	7	8.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	85.7	A+
\$50,001-\$70,000	8	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	A
\$70,001-\$100,000	17	8.35	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	11.8	17.6	64.7	A-
Over \$100,000	45	7.93	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	6.7	4.4	15.6	24.4	46.7	B+

Table B33. Town Government: Knowledgeable by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Have access	85	8.08	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	5.9	2.4	12.9	23.5	52.9	A-
No access	4	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B34. Town Government: Knowledgeable by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
English	87	8.13	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	5.7	2.3	12.6	20.7	56.3	A-
Spanish	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Chinese	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Korean	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hindi/Gujarati	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+
Other	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+

Table B35. Town Government: Knowledgeable by Literacy.

Literacy	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
All Literate	89	8.12	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	5.6	2.2	12.4	22.5	55.1	A-
1 or More Illiterate	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B36. Town Government: Knowledgeable by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	80	8.14	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	5.0	2.5	12.5	21.3	56.3	A-
African-American	7	8.43	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	28.6	57.1	A
Asian	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hispanic	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+

Town Government: Promptness of Response Crosstabulations

Table B37. Town Government: Promptness of Response by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	3	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7	A-
26-55	59	7.73	1.7	1.7	0.0	1.7	8.5	1.7	15.3	23.7	45.8	B
56-65	10	6.60	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	20.0	40.0	C-
Over 65	13	8.62	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	23.1	69.2	A

Table B38. Town Government: Promptness of Response by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	17	7.41	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.8	0.0	11.8	41.2	29.4	B-
College Degree	68	7.84	2.9	1.5	0.0	1.5	5.9	1.5	14.7	17.6	54.4	B+

Table B39. Town Government: Promptness of Response by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	41	7.59	2.4	0.0	0.0	2.4	12.2	0.0	17.1	26.8	39.0	B
Female	44	7.91	4.5	2.3	0.0	0.0	2.3	2.3	11.4	18.2	59.1	B+

Table B40. Town Government: Promptness of Response by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single family	77	7.75	2.6	1.3	0.0	1.3	7.8	1.3	15.6	22.1	48.1	B
Apartment	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Townhouse/Condo	7	7.57	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	57.1	B
Duplex	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B41. Town Government: Promptness of Response by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	2	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	A
\$20,001-\$30,000	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
\$30,001-\$50,000	7	7.71	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	71.4	B
\$50,001-\$70,000	7	8.43	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	28.6	57.1	A
\$70,001-\$100,000	17	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	23.5	29.4	41.2	B+
Over \$100,000	44	7.55	4.5	2.3	0.0	0.0	9.1	2.3	13.6	22.7	45.5	B

Table B42. Town Government: Promptness of Response by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Have access	81	7.70	3.7	1.2	0.0	1.2	7.4	1.2	14.8	22.2	48.1	B
No access	4	8.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	A+

Table B43. Town Government: Promptness of Response by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
English	83	7.74	3.6	1.2	0.0	1.2	7.2	1.2	14.5	21.7	49.4	B
Spanish	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Chinese	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Korean	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hindi/Gujarati	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+
Other	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B44. Town Government: Promptness of Response by Literacy.

Literacy	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
All Literate	85	7.75	3.5	1.2	0.0	1.2	7.1	1.2	14.1	22.4	49.4	B
1 or More Illiterate	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B45. Town Government: Promptness of Response by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	77	7.74	3.9	1.3	0.0	1.3	6.5	1.3	14.3	20.8	50.6	B
African-American	7	7.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	14.3	28.6	42.9	B+
Asian	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hispanic	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+

Town Government: Ability to Resolve Issues Crosstabulations

Table B46. Town Government: Ability to Resolve Issues by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	3	7.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	B
26-55	55	7.33	3.6	1.8	3.6	0.0	12.7	3.6	10.9	20.0	43.6	B-
56-65	9	7.22	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	11.1	22.2	44.4	B-
Over 65	12	7.58	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	75.0	B

Table B47. Town Government: Ability to Resolve Issues by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	15	6.93	13.3	0.0	6.7	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	40.0	C+
College Degree	64	7.47	4.7	1.6	1.6	0.0	12.5	3.1	10.9	14.1	51.6	B-

Table B48. Town Government: Ability to Resolve Issues by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	37	7.19	2.7	0.0	5.4	0.0	21.6	0.0	10.8	18.9	40.5	B-
Female	42	7.52	9.5	2.4	0.0	0.0	2.4	4.8	7.1	16.7	57.1	B

Table B49. Town Government: Ability to Resolve Issues by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single family	70	7.19	7.1	1.4	2.9	0.0	12.9	2.9	10.0	17.1	45.7	B-
Apartment	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Townhouse/Condo	8	8.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	A+
Duplex	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B50. Town Government: Ability to Resolve Issues by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
\$20,001-\$30,000	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
\$30,001-\$50,000	7	8.71	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	71.4	A+
\$50,001-\$70,000	6	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	A
\$70,001-\$100,000	16	7.00	6.3	6.3	0.0	0.0	12.5	6.3	12.5	12.5	43.8	C+
Over \$100,000	41	7.29	7.3	0.0	2.4	0.0	12.2	2.4	12.2	17.1	46.3	B-

Table B51. Town Government: Ability to Resolve Issues by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Have access	75	7.28	6.7	1.3	2.7	0.0	12.0	2.7	9.3	18.7	46.7	B-
No access	4	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B52. Town Government: Ability to Resolve Issues by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
English	77	7.43	6.5	1.3	2.6	0.0	9.1	2.6	9.1	18.2	50.6	B-
Spanish	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Chinese	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Korean	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hindi/Gujarati	1	5.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	F
Other	1	5.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	F

Table B53. Town Government: Ability to Resolve Issues by Literacy.

Literacy	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
All Literate	79	7.37	6.3	1.3	2.5	0.0	11.4	2.5	8.9	17.7	49.4	B-
1 or More Illiterate	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B54. Town Government: Ability to Resolve Issues by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	71	7.41	7.0	1.4	2.8	0.0	8.5	2.8	8.5	16.9	52.1	B-
African-American	7	7.29	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	14.3	28.6	28.6	B-
Asian	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hispanic	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	1	5.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	F

Maintenance of Streets and Roads Crosstabulations

Table B55. Maintenance of Streets and Roads by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	122	6.56	1.6	1.6	3.3	4.9	16.4	9.0	32.0	18.9	12.3	C-
College Degree	280	6.62	1.8	2.1	2.5	3.6	14.3	12.1	29.3	23.6	10.7	C

Table B56. Maintenance of Streets and Roads by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single family	334	6.55	2.1	1.8	2.7	4.5	14.7	11.7	30.5	21.9	10.2	C-
Apartment	31	7.13	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	16.1	6.5	32.3	22.6	19.4	C+
Townhouse/Condo	35	6.57	0.0	5.7	5.7	0.0	14.3	14.3	22.9	22.9	14.3	C-
Duplex	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+
Other	2	6.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	D+

Table B57. Maintenance of Streets and Roads by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	5	7.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	0.0	C+
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	6.54	0.0	7.7	0.0	7.7	15.4	15.4	15.4	15.4	23.1	C-
\$30,001-\$50,000	35	6.77	2.9	0.0	2.9	8.6	8.6	8.6	28.6	22.9	17.1	C
\$50,001-\$70,000	37	6.38	0.0	5.4	2.7	5.4	21.6	8.1	27.0	16.2	13.5	C-
\$70,001-\$100,000	86	6.74	1.2	1.2	1.2	3.5	15.1	10.5	34.9	22.1	10.5	C
Over \$100,000	171	6.56	2.3	2.3	4.1	2.9	13.5	12.3	26.9	25.7	9.9	C-

Table B58. Maintenance of Streets and Roads by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	39	7.21	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	12.8	12.8	17.9	38.5	15.4	B-
2-5	86	6.84	2.3	1.2	1.2	2.3	14.0	8.1	38.4	14.0	18.6	C
6-10	79	6.76	2.5	1.3	2.5	2.5	7.6	13.9	34.2	26.6	8.9	C
Over 10	199	6.32	1.5	3.0	3.5	6.0	18.6	11.6	27.1	20.6	8.0	C-

Comparing Cary Traffic to Other Areas Inside the Triangle Crosstabulations

Table B59. Comparing Traffic in Cary to Other Areas Inside the Triangle by Age.

Age	n	Better than most other places in the Triangle	About the same as most other places in the Triangle	Worse than most other places in the Triangle
18-25	27	29.6	51.9	18.5
26-55	281	39.1	52.0	8.9
56-65	43	37.2	51.2	11.6
Over 65	46	32.6	50.0	17.4

Table B60. Comparing Traffic in Cary to Other Areas Inside the Triangle by Children in Household Under 18.

Children	n	Better than most other places in the Triangle	About the same as most other places in the Triangle	Worse than most other places in the Triangle
No children	215	34.9	52.6	12.6
Have children	185	40.0	50.8	9.2

Table B61. Comparing Traffic in Cary to Other Areas Inside the Triangle by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Better than most other places in the Triangle	About the same as most other places in the Triangle	Worse than most other places in the Triangle
Single family	330	36.1	52.4	11.5
Apartment	31	41.9	45.2	12.9
Townhouse/Condo	35	45.7	48.6	5.7
Duplex	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Other	2	50.0	50.0	0.0

Table B62. Comparing Traffic in Cary to Other Areas Inside the Triangle by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Better than most other places in the Triangle	About the same as most other places in the Triangle	Worse than most other places in the Triangle
0-1	39	38.5	56.4	5.1
2-5	85	36.5	55.3	8.2
6-10	78	37.2	51.3	11.5
Over 10	197	37.6	49.2	13.2

Cleanliness and Appearance of Parks Crosstabulations

Table B63. Cleanliness and Appearance of Parks by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	112	8.13	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	2.7	2.7	13.4	37.5	42.9	A-
College Degree	260	8.15	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	1.2	1.2	16.9	38.8	41.2	A-

Table B64. Cleanliness and Appearance of Parks by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single family	314	8.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.3	1.9	14.6	38.5	42.7	A-
Apartment	26	8.08	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	23.1	30.8	42.3	A-
Townhouse/Condo	30	8.07	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.3	46.7	30.0	A-
Duplex	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+
Other	2	7.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	C+

Table B65. Cleanliness and Appearance of Parks by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	4	7.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	25.0	B-
\$20,001-\$30,000	9	8.11	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	44.4	33.3	A-
\$30,001-\$50,000	33	8.12	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	24.2	30.3	42.4	A-
\$50,001-\$70,000	33	8.06	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.1	3.0	6.1	48.5	36.4	A-
\$70,001-\$100,000	82	8.13	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	2.4	1.2	14.6	37.8	42.7	A-
Over \$100,000	163	8.15	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.6	19.6	38.0	40.5	A-

Table B66. Cleanliness and Appearance of Parks by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	35	8.40	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.4	37.1	51.4	A-
2-5	81	8.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	1.2	16.0	37.0	43.2	A-
6-10	74	8.16	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	24.3	29.7	44.6	A-
Over 10	183	8.08	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	1.6	2.7	13.1	43.2	37.7	A-

Cleanliness and Appearance of Greenways Crosstabulations

Table B67. Cleanliness and Appearance of Greenways by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	108	8.09	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	2.8	13.9	39.8	39.8	A-
College Degree	251	8.04	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.4	2.8	2.0	15.9	41.4	37.1	B+

Table B68. Cleanliness and Appearance of Greenways by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single family	303	8.06	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	3.0	2.0	14.5	42.6	37.3	A-
Apartment	25	8.04	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	28.0	24.0	44.0	B+
Townhouse/Condo	28	8.11	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	14.3	39.3	39.3	A-
Duplex	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+
Other	2	7.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	C+

Table B69. Cleanliness and Appearance of Greenways by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	5	7.60	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	20.0	B
\$20,001-\$30,000	8	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	B+
\$30,001-\$50,000	29	8.10	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	24.1	31.0	41.4	A-
\$50,001-\$70,000	32	8.03	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	6.3	6.3	40.6	40.6	B+
\$70,001-\$100,000	81	8.06	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.9	2.5	12.3	42.0	38.3	A-
Over \$100,000	159	8.00	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.9	1.3	19.5	41.5	34.6	B+

Table B70. Cleanliness and Appearance of Greenways by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	34	8.29	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.7	41.2	44.1	A-
2-5	79	7.84	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.1	3.8	20.3	34.2	35.4	B+
6-10	73	8.16	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	1.4	17.8	38.4	41.1	A-
Over 10	173	8.07	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	3.5	2.3	12.1	45.1	36.4	A-

Cleanliness and Appearance of Streets Crosstabulations

Table B71. Cleanliness and Appearance of Streets by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	122	7.62	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	7.4	5.7	27.9	32.0	26.2	B
College Degree	280	7.69	0.0	0.0	0.7	1.1	3.9	3.9	27.1	39.6	23.6	B

Table B72. Cleanliness and Appearance of Streets by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single family	334	7.65	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.9	5.1	5.4	26.3	38.0	23.7	B
Apartment	31	7.94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	29.0	35.5	32.3	B+
Townhouse/Condo	35	7.69	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	2.9	0.0	34.3	37.1	22.9	B
Duplex	1	7.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	C+
Other	2	7.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	C+

Table B73. Cleanliness and Appearance of Streets by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	5	7.60	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	B
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	7.62	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	30.8	38.5	23.1	B
\$30,001-\$50,000	35	7.83	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.7	37.1	25.7	31.4	B+
\$50,001-\$70,000	37	7.43	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.4	5.4	5.4	32.4	27.0	24.3	B-
\$70,001-\$100,000	86	7.52	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	10.5	4.7	23.3	38.4	22.1	B
Over \$100,000	171	7.68	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6	2.9	5.3	26.9	43.9	19.9	B

Table B74. Cleanliness and Appearance of Streets by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	39	8.05	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	17.9	46.2	33.3	B+
2-5	86	7.70	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	4.7	3.5	31.4	31.4	27.9	B
6-10	79	7.79	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0	3.8	2.5	25.3	40.5	26.6	B+
Over 10	199	7.53	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	6.5	6.5	28.1	37.2	20.1	B

Cleanliness and Appearance of Median/Roadsides Crosstabulations

Table B75. Cleanliness and Appearance of Median/Roadsides by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	122	7.53	0.8	0.8	0.0	0.8	7.4	8.2	23.0	31.1	27.9	B
College Degree	280	7.65	0.0	0.7	1.1	1.8	2.5	4.6	26.1	38.2	25.0	B

Table B76. Cleanliness and Appearance of Median/Roadsides by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single family	334	7.65	0.0	0.9	0.3	1.5	3.9	5.4	24.6	38.6	24.9	B
Apartment	31	7.74	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	9.7	32.3	19.4	35.5	B
Townhouse/Condo	35	7.26	2.9	0.0	5.7	2.9	2.9	2.9	25.7	31.4	25.7	B-
Duplex	1	6.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	D+
Other	2	7.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	C+

Table B77. Cleanliness and Appearance of Median/Roadsides by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	5	7.60	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	B
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	7.54	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	7.7	23.1	38.5	23.1	B
\$30,001-\$50,000	35	7.71	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.7	11.4	22.9	25.7	34.3	B
\$50,001-\$70,000	37	7.35	0.0	2.7	0.0	2.7	8.1	5.4	29.7	24.3	27.0	B-
\$70,001-\$100,000	86	7.71	0.0	1.2	1.2	1.2	4.7	4.7	19.8	36.0	31.4	B
Over \$100,000	171	7.67	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.2	2.3	5.3	28.1	42.1	20.5	B

Table B78. Cleanliness and Appearance of Median/Roadsides by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	39	8.08	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	17.9	43.6	35.9	A-
2-5	86	7.64	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	3.5	5.8	30.2	30.2	27.9	B
6-10	79	7.76	0.0	1.3	0.0	2.5	5.1	0.0	22.8	36.7	31.6	B
Over 10	199	7.46	0.5	1.0	0.5	1.5	4.5	9.0	25.1	37.2	20.6	B-

Police Department: Contact Crosstabulations

Table B79. Contact with the Police Department by Age.

Age	n	% Yes	% No
18-25	27	37.0	63.0
26-55	284	26.1	73.9
56-65	44	27.3	72.7
Over 65	46	17.4	82.6

Table B80. Contact with the Police Department by Education.

Education	n	% Yes	% No
HS/Some College	122	21.3	78.7
College Degree	280	27.9	72.1

Table B81. Contact with the Police Department by Gender.

Gender	n	% Yes	% No
Male	188	21.8	78.2
Female	216	29.2	70.8

Table B82. Contact with the Police Department by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	% Yes	% No
Single family	334	24.3	75.7
Apartment	31	41.9	58.1
Townhouse/Condo	35	25.7	74.3
Duplex	1	100.0	0.0
Other	2	0.0	100.0

Table B83. Contact with the Police Department by Income.

Income	n	% Yes	% No
0-\$20,000	5	40.0	60.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	38.5	61.5
\$30,001-\$50,000	35	34.3	65.7
\$50,001-\$70,000	37	32.4	67.6
\$70,001-\$100,000	86	17.4	82.6
Over \$100,000	171	28.1	71.9

Table B84. Contact with the Police Department by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	% Yes	% No
Have access	386	25.6	74.4
No access	16	31.3	68.8

Table B85. Contact with the Police Department by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	% Yes	% No
English	385	26.5	73.5
Spanish	3	66.7	33.3
Chinese	3	0.0	100.0
Korean	4	0.0	100.0
Hindi/Gujarati	5	0.0	100.0
Other	2	0.0	100.0

Table B86. Contact with the Police Department by Race.

Race	n	% Yes	% No
Caucasian	340	26.5	73.5
African-American	26	30.8	69.2
Asian	20	0.0	100.0
Hispanic	2	50.0	50.0
Other	9	22.2	77.8

Police Department: Courteous Crosstabulations

Table B87. Police Department: Courteous by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	10	7.60	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	20.0	10.0	10.0	50.0	B
26-55	73	8.58	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	11.0	16.4	71.2	A
56-65	11	8.55	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	27.3	63.6	A
Over 65	8	8.00	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	87.5	B+

Table B88. Police Department: Courteous by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	26	8.00	3.8	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	7.7	7.7	11.5	65.4	B+
College Degree	76	8.58	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	10.5	17.1	71.1	A

Table B89. Police Department: Courteous by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	40	8.25	2.5	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	2.5	7.5	20.0	65.0	A-
Female	62	8.55	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	11.3	12.9	72.6	A

Table B90. Police Department: Courteous by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single family	79	8.38	1.3	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0	2.5	11.4	15.2	68.4	A-
Apartment	13	8.46	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	30.8	61.5	A
Townhouse/Condo	9	8.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	88.9	A+
Duplex	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B91. Police Department: Courteous by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	2	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	B+
\$20,001-\$30,000	5	7.20	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	B-
\$30,001-\$50,000	12	8.42	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	33.3	58.3	A
\$50,001-\$70,000	11	8.73	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	90.9	A+
\$70,001-\$100,000	15	8.80	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	6.7	86.7	A+
Over \$100,000	47	8.34	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	2.1	17.0	14.9	63.8	A-

Table B92. Police Department: Courteous by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Have access	97	8.45	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.1	9.3	16.5	70.1	A
No access	5	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	60.0	B+

Table B93. Police Department: Courteous by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
English	100	8.44	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	14.0	71.0	A
Spanish	2	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+
Chinese	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Korean	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hindi/Gujarati	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B94. Police Department: Courteous by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	89	8.40	1.1	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	3.4	10.1	14.6	69.7	A-
African-American	7	8.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	85.7	A+
Asian	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hispanic	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+
Other	2	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	B+

Police Department: Competence Crosstabulations

Table B95. Police Department: Competence by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	10	7.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	10.0	50.0	B-
26-55	74	8.57	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	9.5	20.3	68.9	A
56-65	11	8.27	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	36.4	45.5	A-
Over 65	8	7.63	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	75.0	B

Table B96. Police Department: Competence by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	26	7.85	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	11.5	3.8	11.5	61.5	B+
College Degree	77	8.53	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	10.4	22.1	66.2	A

Table B97. Police Department: Competence by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	40	8.18	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.5	10.0	20.0	60.0	A-
Female	63	8.48	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	1.6	7.9	19.0	68.3	A

Table B98. Police Department: Competence by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single family	80	8.31	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	5.0	10.0	18.8	63.8	A-
Apartment	13	8.39	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	30.8	61.5	A-
Townhouse/Condo	9	8.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	11.1	77.8	A
Duplex	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B99. Police Department: Competence by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	2	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	B+
\$20,001-\$30,000	5	7.20	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	B-
\$30,001-\$50,000	12	8.25	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	41.7	50.0	A-
\$50,001-\$70,000	12	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	83.3	A
\$70,001-\$100,000	15	8.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.3	6.7	80.0	A
Over \$100,000	47	8.36	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	4.3	10.6	21.3	61.7	A-

Table B100. Police Department: Competence by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Have access	98	8.38	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	3.1	8.2	20.4	65.3	A-
No access	5	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	60.0	B+

Table B101. Police Department: Competence by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
English	101	8.37	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	4.0	8.9	17.8	66.3	A-
Spanish	2	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+
Chinese	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Korean	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hindi/Gujarati	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B102. Police Department: Competence by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	89	8.34	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	4.5	10.1	19.1	64.0	A-
African-American	8	8.88	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	87.5	A+
Asian	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hispanic	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+
Other	2	7.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	C+

Police Department: Fairness Crosstabulations

Table B103. Police Department: Fairness by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	10	7.20	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	20.0	0.0	50.0	B-
26-55	64	8.52	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.9	17.2	70.3	A
56-65	10	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	30.0	60.0	A
Over 65	7	7.86	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	85.7	B+

Table B104. Police Department: Fairness by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	24	7.71	4.2	0.0	4.2	4.2	0.0	4.2	12.5	12.5	58.3	B
College Degree	67	8.54	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.4	16.4	71.6	A

Table B105. Police Department: Fairness by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	35	8.00	2.9	0.0	2.9	2.9	0.0	2.9	8.6	20.0	60.0	B+
Female	56	8.52	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	73.2	A

Table B106. Police Department: Fairness by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single family	70	8.29	1.4	0.0	1.4	1.4	0.0	1.4	11.4	17.1	65.7	A-
Apartment	11	8.09	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	18.2	63.6	A-
Townhouse/Condo	9	8.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	88.9	A+
Duplex	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B107. Police Department: Fairness by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	2	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	B+
\$20,001-\$30,000	5	7.20	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	B-
\$30,001-\$50,000	10	8.60	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	20.0	70.0	A
\$50,001-\$70,000	8	8.63	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	87.5	A
\$70,001-\$100,000	15	8.73	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	13.3	80.0	A+
Over \$100,000	43	8.23	0.0	0.0	2.3	2.3	0.0	0.0	16.3	18.6	60.5	A-

Table B108. Police Department: Fairness by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Have access	86	8.34	1.2	0.0	2.3	1.2	0.0	0.0	10.5	16.3	68.6	A-
No access	5	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	60.0	B+

Table B109. Police Department: Fairness by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
English	89	8.33	1.1	0.0	2.2	1.1	0.0	1.1	11.2	13.5	69.7	A-
Spanish	2	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+
Chinese	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Korean	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hindi/Gujarati	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B110. Police Department: Fairness by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	80	8.34	1.3	0.0	1.3	1.3	0.0	1.3	11.3	16.3	67.5	A-
African-American	6	8.00	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	83.3	B+
Asian	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hispanic	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+
Other	2	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	B+

Police Department: Response Time Crosstabulations

Table B111. Police Department: Response Time by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	7	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	14.3	57.1	B+
26-55	67	8.33	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	1.5	3.0	14.9	13.4	65.7	A-
56-65	11	8.09	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.3	36.4	36.4	A-
Over 65	6	6.83	16.7	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	C

Table B112. Police Department: Response Time by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	20	8.05	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	15.0	65.0	B+
College Degree	71	8.21	0.0	0.0	1.4	1.4	1.4	2.8	16.9	15.5	60.6	A-

Table B113. Police Department: Response Time by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	36	8.08	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	11.1	22.2	55.6	A-
Female	55	8.24	0.0	0.0	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	16.4	10.9	65.5	A-

Table B114. Police Department: Response Time by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single family	70	8.01	1.4	0.0	1.4	1.4	1.4	5.7	15.7	17.1	55.7	B+
Apartment	11	8.64	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	18.2	72.7	A
Townhouse/Condo	9	8.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	88.9	A+
Duplex	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B115. Police Department: Response Time by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	1	7.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	C+
\$20,001-\$30,000	5	7.20	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	B-
\$30,001-\$50,000	9	8.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	11.1	77.8	A
\$50,001-\$70,000	9	7.44	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	0.0	55.6	B-
\$70,001-\$100,000	14	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	21.4	64.3	A
Over \$100,000	45	8.20	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	6.7	15.6	15.6	60.0	A-

Table B116. Police Department: Response Time by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Have access	86	8.26	1.2	0.0	1.2	0.0	1.2	3.5	14.0	15.1	64.0	A-
No access	5	6.80	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	C

Table B117. Police Department: Response Time by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
English	89	8.17	1.1	0.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	4.5	14.6	14.6	61.8	A-
Spanish	2	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	A
Chinese	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Korean	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hindi/Gujarati	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B118. Police Department: Response Time by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	80	8.11	1.3	0.0	1.3	1.3	1.3	5.0	15.0	15.0	60.0	A-
African-American	6	8.83	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	83.3	A+
Asian	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hispanic	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Police Department: Problem Solving Crosstabulations

Table B119. Police Department: Problem Solving by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	7	7.43	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	71.4	B-
26-55	63	8.21	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	3.2	4.8	6.3	17.5	65.1	A-
56-65	11	6.64	18.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	18.2	0.0	45.5	C
Over 65	8	6.88	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	62.5	C

Table B120. Police Department: Problem Solving by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	21	7.48	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	4.8	14.3	61.9	B-
College Degree	68	7.94	2.9	2.9	0.0	0.0	2.9	7.4	7.4	13.2	63.2	B+

Table B121. Police Department: Problem Solving by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	35	7.46	11.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.6	8.6	20.0	51.4	B-
Female	54	8.07	1.9	3.7	0.0	0.0	3.7	5.6	5.6	9.3	70.4	A-

Table B122. Police Department: Problem Solving by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single family	70	7.77	4.3	2.9	0.0	0.0	2.9	8.6	7.1	17.1	57.1	B
Apartment	9	8.11	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	88.9	A-
Townhouse/Condo	9	7.89	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	77.8	B+
Duplex	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B123. Police Department: Problem Solving by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	2	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	B+
\$20,001-\$30,000	5	7.40	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	80.0	B-
\$30,001-\$50,000	9	7.89	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	66.7	B+
\$50,001-\$70,000	10	7.80	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	70.0	B+
\$70,001-\$100,000	14	8.57	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	21.4	71.4	A
Over \$100,000	40	7.70	2.5	5.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	10.0	12.5	10.0	57.5	B

Table B124. Police Department: Problem Solving by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Have access	84	7.82	6.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	2.4	6.0	6.0	14.3	63.1	B+
No access	5	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	60.0	B+

Table B125. Police Department: Problem Solving by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
English	87	7.82	5.7	2.3	0.0	0.0	2.3	6.9	6.9	12.6	63.2	B+
Spanish	2	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	A
Chinese	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Korean	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hindi/Gujarati	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B126. Police Department: Problem Solving by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	78	7.80	5.1	2.6	0.0	0.0	2.6	7.7	7.7	12.8	61.5	B+
African-American	6	7.67	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	83.3	B
Asian	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hispanic	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Fire Department: Contact Crosstabulations

Table B127. Contact with the Fire Department by Age.

Age	n	% Yes	% No
18-25	27	7.4	92.6
26-55	284	7.0	93.0
56-65	44	22.7	77.3
Over 65	46	4.3	95.7

Table B128. Contact with the Fire Department by Education.

Education	n	% Yes	% No
HS/Some College	122	8.2	91.8
College Degree	280	8.6	91.4

Table B129. Contact with the Fire Department by Gender.

Gender	n	% Yes	% No
Male	188	6.9	93.1
Female	216	9.7	90.3

Table B130. Contact with the Fire Department by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	% Yes	% No
Single family	334	8.4	91.6
Apartment	31	12.9	87.1
Townhouse/Condo	35	2.9	97.1
Duplex	1	0.0	100.0
Other	2	50.0	50.0

Table B131. Contact with the Fire Department by Income.

Income	n	% Yes	% No
0-\$20,000	5	20.0	80.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	15.4	84.6
\$30,001-\$50,000	35	8.6	91.4
\$50,001-\$70,000	37	2.7	97.3
\$70,001-\$100,000	86	8.1	91.9
Over \$100,000	171	9.4	90.6

Table B132. Contact with the Fire Department by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	% Yes	% No
Have access	386	8.8	91.2
No access	16	0.0	100.0

Table B133. Contact with the Fire Department by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	% Yes	% No
English	385	8.6	91.4
Spanish	3	33.3	66.7
Chinese	3	0.0	100.0
Korean	4	0.0	100.0
Hindi/Gujarati	5	0.0	100.0
Other	2	0.0	100.0

Table B134. Contact with the Fire Department by Race.

Race	n	% Yes	% No
Caucasian	340	7.6	92.4
African-American	26	19.2	80.8
Asian	20	0.0	100.0
Hispanic	2	50.0	50.0
Other	9	0.0	100.0

Fire Department: Fairness Crosstabulations

Table B135. Fire Department: Fairness by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
26-55	18	8.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	5.6	88.9	A+
56-65	10	8.90	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	90.0	A+
Over 65	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B136. Fire Department: Fairness by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	10	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
College Degree	21	8.76	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	9.5	85.7	A+

Table B137. Fire Department: Fairness by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	11	8.64	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	9.1	81.8	A
Female	20	8.95	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	95.0	A+

Table B138. Fire Department: Fairness by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single family	25	8.84	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	4.0	92.0	A+
Apartment	4	8.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	A+
Townhouse/Condo	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Duplex	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B139. Fire Department: Fairness by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
\$20,001-\$30,000	2	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	A
\$30,001-\$50,000	3	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
\$50,001-\$70,000	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
\$70,001-\$100,000	6	8.83	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	83.3	A+
Over \$100,000	15	8.80	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	93.3	A+

Table B140. Fire Department: Fairness by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Have access	31	8.84	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	6.5	90.3	A+
No access	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B141. Fire Department: Fairness by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
English	30	8.83	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	6.7	90.0	A+
Spanish	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Chinese	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Korean	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hindi/Gujarati	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B142. Fire Department: Fairness by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	23	8.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	8.7	87.0	A+
African-American	5	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Asian	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hispanic	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Fire Department: Courteous Crosstabulations

Table B143. Fire Department: Courteous by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
26-55	19	8.79	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	5.3	89.5	A+
56-65	11	8.36	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	90.9	A-
Over 65	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B144. Fire Department: Courteous by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	10	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
College Degree	24	8.54	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	4.2	87.5	A

Table B145. Fire Department: Courteous by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	13	8.23	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	84.6	A-
Female	21	8.95	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	95.2	A+

Table B146. Fire Department: Courteous by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single family	28	8.61	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	3.6	89.3	A
Apartment	4	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Townhouse/Condo	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Duplex	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B147. Fire Department: Courteous by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
\$20,001-\$30,000	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
\$30,001-\$50,000	3	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
\$50,001-\$70,000	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
\$70,001-\$100,000	7	8.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	85.7	A+
Over \$100,000	16	8.38	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0	87.5	A-

Table B148. Fire Department: Courteous by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Have access	34	8.68	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	2.9	91.2	A
No access	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B149. Fire Department: Courteous by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
English	33	8.67	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	3.0	90.9	A
Spanish	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Chinese	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Korean	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hindi/Gujarati	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B150. Fire Department: Courteous by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	25	8.84	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	4.0	92.0	A+
African-American	6	7.83	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	83.3	B+
Asian	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hispanic	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Fire Department: Response Time Crosstabulations

Table B151. Fire Department: Response Time by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
26-55	18	8.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	5.6	88.9	A+
56-65	9	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Over 65	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B152. Fire Department: Response Time by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	9	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
College Degree	21	8.81	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	4.8	90.5	A+

Table B153. Fire Department: Response Time by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	10	8.70	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	90.0	A+
Female	20	8.95	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	95.0	A+

Table B154. Fire Department: Response Time by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single family	25	8.84	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	4.0	92.0	A+
Apartment	3	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Townhouse/Condo	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Duplex	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B155. Fire Department: Response Time by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
\$20,001-\$30,000	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
\$30,001-\$50,000	3	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
\$50,001-\$70,000	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
\$70,001-\$100,000	7	8.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	85.7	A+
Over \$100,000	15	8.80	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	93.3	A+

Table B156. Fire Department: Response Time by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Have access	30	8.87	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	3.3	93.3	A+
No access	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B157. Fire Department: Response Time by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
English	29	8.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	3.4	93.1	A+
Spanish	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Chinese	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Korean	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hindi/Gujarati	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B158. Fire Department: Response Time by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	22	8.82	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	4.5	90.9	A+
African-American	5	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Asian	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hispanic	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Fire Department: Competence Crosstabulations

Table B159. Fire Department: Competence by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
26-55	18	8.83	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	94.4	A+
56-65	10	8.90	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	90.0	A+
Over 65	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B160. Fire Department: Competence by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	10	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
College Degree	22	8.82	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	4.5	90.9	A+

Table B161. Fire Department: Competence by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	11	8.64	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	9.1	81.8	A
Female	21	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B162. Fire Department: Competence by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single family	26	8.89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	96.2	A+
Apartment	4	8.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	A+
Townhouse/Condo	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Duplex	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B163. Fire Department: Competence by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
\$20,001-\$30,000	2	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	A
\$30,001-\$50,000	3	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
\$50,001-\$70,000	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
\$70,001-\$100,000	7	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Over \$100,000	15	8.80	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	93.3	A+

Table B164. Fire Department: Competence by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Have access	32	8.88	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	3.1	93.8	A+
No access	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B165. Fire Department: Competence by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
English	31	8.87	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	3.2	93.5	A+
Spanish	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Chinese	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Korean	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hindi/Gujarati	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B166. Fire Department: Competence by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	24	8.83	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	4.2	91.7	A+
African-American	5	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Asian	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hispanic	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Fire Department: Problem Solving Crosstabulations

Table B167. Fire Department: Problem Solving by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
26-55	18	8.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	5.6	88.9	A+
56-65	9	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Over 65	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B168. Fire Department: Problem Solving by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	8	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
College Degree	22	8.82	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	4.5	90.9	A+

Table B169. Fire Department: Problem Solving by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	11	8.73	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	90.9	A+
Female	19	8.95	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	94.7	A+

Table B170. Fire Department: Problem Solving by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single family	24	8.83	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	4.2	91.7	A+
Apartment	4	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Townhouse/Condo	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Duplex	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B171. Fire Department: Problem Solving by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
\$20,001-\$30,000	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
\$30,001-\$50,000	3	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
\$50,001-\$70,000	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
\$70,001-\$100,000	7	8.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	85.7	A+
Over \$100,000	15	8.80	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	93.3	A+

Table B172. Fire Department: Problem Solving by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Have access	30	8.87	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	3.3	93.3	A+
No access	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B173. Fire Department: Problem Solving by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
English	29	8.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	3.4	93.1	A+
Spanish	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Chinese	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Korean	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hindi/Gujarati	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B174. Fire Department: Problem Solving by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	23	8.83	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	4.3	91.3	A+
African-American	4	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Asian	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hispanic	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Participation in Parks & Recreation Program Crosstabulations

Table B175. Participation in Parks & Recreation Program by Age.

Age	n	% Yes	% No
18-25	27	18.5	81.5
26-55	284	35.9	64.1
56-65	44	31.8	68.2
Over 65	46	21.7	78.3

Table B176. Participation in Parks & Recreation Program by Education.

Education	n	% Yes	% No
HS/Some College	122	22.1	77.9
College Degree	280	37.9	62.1

Table B177. Participation in Parks & Recreation Program by Gender.

Gender	n	% Yes	% No
Male	188	33.0	67.0
Female	216	32.9	67.1

Table B178. Participation in Parks & Recreation Program by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	% Yes	% No
Single family	334	35.6	64.4
Apartment	31	16.1	83.9
Townhouse/Condo	35	22.9	77.1
Duplex	1	100.0	0.0
Other	2	0.0	100.0

Table B179. Participation in Parks & Recreation Program by Income.

Income	n	% Yes	% No
0-\$20,000	5	0.0	100.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	15.4	84.6
\$30,001-\$50,000	35	20.0	80.0
\$50,001-\$70,000	37	24.3	75.7
\$70,001-\$100,000	86	36.0	64.0
Over \$100,000	171	37.4	62.6

Table B180. Contact with the Parks & Recreation Program by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	% Yes	% No
Have access	386	33.9	66.1
No access	16	12.5	87.5

Table B181. Participation in Parks & Recreation Program by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	% Yes	% No
English	385	33.8	66.2
Spanish	3	33.3	66.7
Chinese	3	33.3	66.7
Korean	4	0.0	100.0
Hindi/Gujarati	5	20.0	80.0
Other	2	0.0	100.0

Table B182. Participation in Parks & Recreation Program by Race.

Race	n	% Yes	% No
Caucasian	340	33.8	66.2
African-American	26	26.9	73.1
Asian	20	30.0	70.0
Hispanic	2	50.0	50.0
Other	9	22.2	77.8

Parks & Recreation: Instructor Quality Crosstabulations

Table B183. Parks & Recreation: Instructor Quality by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	4	6.75	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	C
26-55	82	8.33	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	1.2	15.9	24.4	57.3	A-
56-65	11	8.36	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	9.1	9.1	72.7	A-
Over 65	9	8.89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	88.9	A+

Table B184. Parks & Recreation: Instructor Quality by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	20	8.05	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	25.0	60.0	B+
College Degree	87	8.37	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.1	17.2	20.7	59.8	A-

Table B185. Parks & Recreation: Instructor Quality by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	48	8.13	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	2.1	0.0	20.8	25.0	50.0	A-
Female	59	8.46	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	1.7	10.2	18.6	67.8	A

Table B186. Parks & Recreation: Instructor Quality by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single family	98	8.30	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	15.3	20.4	60.2	A-
Apartment	2	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	A
Townhouse/Condo	6	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	33.3	50.0	A-
Duplex	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B187. Parks & Recreation: Instructor Quality by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
\$20,001-\$30,000	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+
\$30,001-\$50,000	5	8.60	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	80.0	A
\$50,001-\$70,000	5	8.60	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	60.0	A
\$70,001-\$100,000	28	8.43	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	21.4	67.9	A
Over \$100,000	53	8.15	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.0	1.9	1.9	20.8	18.9	54.7	A-

Table B188. Parks & Recreation: Instructor Quality by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Have access	106	8.30	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.9	0.9	15.1	21.7	59.4	A-
No access	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B189. Parks & Recreation: Instructor Quality by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
English	104	8.31	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.0	1.0	1.0	14.4	22.1	59.6	A-
Spanish	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Chinese	1	7.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	C+
Korean	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hindi/Gujarati	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B190. Parks & Recreation: Instructor Quality by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	94	8.35	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	1.1	1.1	11.7	21.3	62.8	A-
African-American	5	7.80	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	B+
Asian	5	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	B+
Hispanic	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Parks & Recreation: Ease of Registration Crosstabulations

Table B191. Parks & Recreation: Ease of Registration by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	5	7.40	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	B-
26-55	84	8.25	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	1.2	2.4	9.5	22.6	60.7	A-
56-65	12	8.25	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	16.7	8.3	66.7	A-
Over 65	8	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B192. Parks & Recreation: Ease of Registration by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	22	8.00	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	4.5	9.1	13.6	63.6	B+
College Degree	88	8.32	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	2.3	2.3	12.5	20.5	61.4	A-

Table B193. Parks & Recreation: Ease of Registration by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	51	8.08	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	3.9	19.6	21.6	51.0	A-
Female	59	8.41	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	1.7	1.7	5.1	16.9	71.2	A-

Table B194. Parks & Recreation: Ease of Registration by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single family	100	8.24	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	2.0	3.0	11.0	19.0	62.0	A-
Apartment	3	8.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	A
Townhouse/Condo	6	8.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	16.7	50.0	A-
Duplex	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B195. Parks & Recreation: Ease of Registration by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
\$20,001-\$30,000	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+
\$30,001-\$50,000	6	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	16.7	66.7	A
\$50,001-\$70,000	5	7.20	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	B-
\$70,001-\$100,000	28	8.11	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	3.6	3.6	3.6	14.3	67.9	A-
Over \$100,000	53	8.28	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	3.8	15.1	22.6	56.6	A-

Table B196. Parks & Recreation: Ease of Registration by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Have access	109	8.25	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	1.8	2.8	11.9	19.3	61.5	A-
No access	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B197. Parks & Recreation: Ease of Registration by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
English	107	8.24	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	1.9	2.8	12.1	18.7	61.7	A-
Spanish	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Chinese	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+
Korean	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hindi/Gujarati	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B198. Parks & Recreation: Ease of Registration by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	97	8.27	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	2.1	3.1	9.3	18.6	63.9	A-
African-American	5	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	B+
Asian	4	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	B+
Hispanic	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Parks & Recreation: Facility Quality Crosstabulations

Table B199. Parks & Recreation: Facility Quality by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	5	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	B+
26-55	99	8.12	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	3.0	1.0	17.2	27.3	49.5	A-
56-65	14	7.50	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	14.3	0.0	14.3	21.4	42.9	B-
Over 65	11	8.82	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	81.8	A+

Table B200. Parks & Recreation: Facility Quality by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	27	8.04	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	7.4	0.0	3.7	37.0	48.1	B+
College Degree	103	8.13	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	2.9	1.0	18.4	25.2	50.5	A-

Table B201. Parks & Recreation: Facility Quality by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	60	7.85	0.0	0.0	1.7	1.7	5.0	0.0	20.0	36.7	35.0	B+
Female	70	8.33	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	2.9	1.4	11.4	20.0	62.9	A-

Table B202. Parks & Recreation: Facility Quality by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single family	117	8.15	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.9	3.4	0.9	15.4	28.2	50.4	A-
Apartment	5	6.80	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	C
Townhouse/Condo	7	8.29	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	14.3	57.1	A-
Duplex	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B203. Parks & Recreation: Facility Quality by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
\$20,001-\$30,000	2	5.50	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	D-
\$30,001-\$50,000	7	8.71	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	71.4	A+
\$50,001-\$70,000	8	8.38	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	12.5	62.5	A-
\$70,001-\$100,000	31	8.10	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	3.2	3.2	12.9	22.6	54.8	A-
Over \$100,000	63	8.03	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	4.8	0.0	19.0	31.7	42.9	B+

Table B204. Parks & Recreation: Facility Quality by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Have access	128	8.09	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.8	3.9	0.8	15.6	28.1	49.2	A-
No access	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B205. Parks & Recreation: Facility Quality by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
English	127	8.10	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.8	3.9	0.8	15.0	28.3	49.6	A-
Spanish	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Chinese	1	7.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	C+
Korean	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hindi/Gujarati	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B206. Parks & Recreation: Facility Quality by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	113	8.09	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.9	4.4	0.9	14.2	27.4	50.4	A-
African-American	7	8.57	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	14.3	71.4	A
Asian	5	7.80	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	B+
Hispanic	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	2	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	B+

Parks & Recreation: Overall Experience Crosstabulations

Table B207. Parks & Recreation: Overall Experience by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	5	7.80	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	B+
26-55	95	8.20	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	1.1	3.2	13.7	32.6	48.4	A-
56-65	14	8.14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	14.3	28.6	50.0	A-
Over 65	10	8.90	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	90.0	A+

Table B208. Parks & Recreation: Overall Experience by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	26	8.15	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	3.8	0.0	11.5	23.1	57.7	A-
College Degree	100	8.23	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	4.0	14.0	33.0	48.0	A-

Table B209. Parks & Recreation: Overall Experience by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	57	8.12	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.5	0.0	19.3	35.1	42.1	A-
Female	69	8.29	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	5.8	8.7	27.5	56.5	A-

Table B210. Parks & Recreation: Overall Experience by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single family	114	8.20	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	1.8	3.5	14.0	28.9	50.9	A-
Apartment	5	8.40	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	40.0	A-
Townhouse/Condo	6	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	33.3	50.0	A-
Duplex	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B211. Parks & Recreation: Overall Experience by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
\$20,001-\$30,000	2	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+
\$30,001-\$50,000	7	8.57	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	14.3	71.4	A
\$50,001-\$70,000	7	8.57	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	42.9	57.1	A
\$70,001-\$100,000	30	8.13	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	6.7	6.7	33.3	50.0	A-
Over \$100,000	61	8.15	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	1.6	19.7	27.9	47.5	A-

Table B212. Parks & Recreation: Overall Experience by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Have access	124	8.20	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	1.6	3.2	13.7	31.5	49.2	A-
No access	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B213. Parks & Recreation: Overall Experience by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
English	123	8.21	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	1.6	3.3	13.0	31.7	49.6	A-
Spanish	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Chinese	1	7.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	C+
Korean	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hindi/Gujarati	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B214. Parks & Recreation: Overall Experience by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	110	8.23	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	1.8	3.6	10.9	31.8	50.9	A-
African-American	6	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	16.7	66.7	A
Asian	5	7.60	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	20.0	20.0	B
Hispanic	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	2	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	B+

Parks & Recreation: Cost or Fee Crosstabulations

Table B215. Parks & Recreation: Cost or Fee by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	5	7.40	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	20.0	B-
26-55	90	8.07	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	3.3	5.6	16.7	23.3	50.0	A-
56-65	14	8.21	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	7.1	7.1	14.3	64.3	A-
Over 65	8	8.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	87.5	A+

Table B216. Parks & Recreation: Cost or Fee by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	22	7.77	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	9.1	9.1	9.1	13.6	54.5	B
College Degree	96	8.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.1	4.2	17.7	22.9	52.1	A-

Table B217. Parks & Recreation: Cost or Fee by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	52	8.10	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	19.2	21.2	51.9	A-
Female	66	8.09	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	1.5	9.1	13.6	21.2	53.0	A-

Table B218. Parks & Recreation: Cost or Fee by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single family	106	8.04	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	4.7	5.7	17.0	20.8	50.9	B+
Apartment	5	8.60	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	60.0	A
Townhouse/Condo	6	8.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	83.3	A
Duplex	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B219. Parks & Recreation: Cost or Fee by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
\$20,001-\$30,000	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
\$30,001-\$50,000	7	7.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	14.3	0.0	14.3	57.1	B+
\$50,001-\$70,000	8	8.38	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	12.5	62.5	A-
\$70,001-\$100,000	28	8.11	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	7.1	14.3	17.9	57.1	A-
Over \$100,000	54	8.15	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	3.7	14.8	29.6	48.1	A-

Table B220. Parks & Recreation: Cost or Fee by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Have access	116	8.10	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	4.3	5.2	15.5	21.6	52.6	A-
No access	2	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	B+

Table B221. Parks & Recreation: Cost or Fee by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
English	115	8.08	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	4.3	5.2	16.5	20.9	52.2	A-
Spanish	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Chinese	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+
Korean	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hindi/Gujarati	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B222. Parks & Recreation: Cost or Fee by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	103	8.12	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	3.9	4.9	15.5	21.4	53.4	A-
African-American	6	7.83	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	16.7	16.7	50.0	B+
Asian	5	8.20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	A-
Hispanic	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Parks & Recreation: Program Quality Crosstabulations

Table B223. Parks & Recreation: Program Quality by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	5	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	B+
26-55	95	8.21	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	2.1	2.1	14.7	28.4	51.6	A-
56-65	14	8.14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	21.4	14.3	57.1	A-
Over 65	9	8.89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	88.9	A+

Table B224. Parks & Recreation: Program Quality by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	25	8.20	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	4.0	32.0	56.0	A-
College Degree	100	8.24	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	18.0	26.0	52.0	A-

Table B225. Parks & Recreation: Program Quality by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	57	8.12	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.5	3.5	14.0	35.1	43.9	A-
Female	68	8.32	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	1.5	0.0	16.2	20.6	60.3	A-

Table B226. Parks & Recreation: Program Quality by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single family	113	8.21	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	2.7	1.8	15.0	27.4	52.2	A-
Apartment	5	8.60	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	60.0	A
Townhouse/Condo	6	8.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	16.7	50.0	A-
Duplex	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B227. Parks & Recreation: Program Quality by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
\$20,001-\$30,000	2	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+
\$30,001-\$50,000	7	8.57	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	14.3	71.4	A
\$50,001-\$70,000	6	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	B+
\$70,001-\$100,000	29	8.28	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.8	24.1	58.6	A-
Over \$100,000	61	8.18	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.9	3.3	13.1	26.2	52.5	A-

Table B228. Parks & Recreation: Program Quality by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Have access	124	8.23	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	2.4	1.6	15.3	27.4	52.4	A-
No access	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B229. Parks & Recreation: Program Quality by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
English	122	8.22	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	2.5	1.6	15.6	27.0	52.5	A-
Spanish	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Chinese	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+
Korean	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hindi/Gujarati	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B230. Parks & Recreation: Program Quality by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	110	8.23	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	2.7	1.8	14.5	26.4	53.6	A-
African-American	5	8.20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	A-
Asian	5	7.80	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	B+
Hispanic	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Parks & Recreation: Number of School-Aged Children Likely to Participate in Program Designed for Year-Round Students During Track-Out Periods Crosstabulations

Table B231. Number of School-Aged Children Likely to Participate in Parks, Recreation, or Culture Program Designed for Year-Round Students During Track-Out Periods by Age.

Age	n	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
18-25	4	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
26-55	180	82.2	8.9	8.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
56-65	5	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Over 65	0	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B232. Number of School-Aged Children Likely to Participate in Parks, Recreation, or Culture Program Designed for Year-Round Students During Track-Out Periods by Education.

Education	n	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
HS/Some College	37	83.8	8.1	8.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
College Degree	151	82.8	8.6	8.6	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table B233. Number of School-Aged Children Likely to Participate in Parks, Recreation, or Culture Program Designed for Year-Round Students During Track-Out Periods by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
Single family	177	83.1	7.9	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Apartment	7	85.7	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Townhouse/Condo	5	80.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Duplex	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B234. Number of School-Aged Children Likely to Participate in Parks, Recreation, or Culture Program Designed for Year-Round Students During Track-Out Periods by Income.

Income	n	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
0-\$20,000	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
\$20,001-\$30,000	3	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
\$30,001-\$50,000	12	83.3	8.3	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
\$50,001-\$70,000	11	90.9	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
\$70,001-\$100,000	39	82.1	15.4	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Over \$100,000	101	83.2	6.9	9.9	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table B235. Number of School-Aged Children Likely to Participate in Parks, Recreation, or Culture Program Designed for Year-Round Students During Track-Out Periods by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
Have access	188	83.5	8.0	8.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
No access	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Parks & Recreation: Number of People in Home Who Would Benefit from Recreation Services That Accommodate People with Disabilities Crosstabulations

Table B236. Number of People in Home of Any Age Who Would Benefit from Recreation Services that Accommodate People with Disabilities by Age.

Age	n	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
18-25	27	96.3	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
26-55	283	96.1	3.2	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.0
56-65	44	86.4	11.4	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Over 65	46	95.7	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table B237. Number of People in Home of Any Age Who Would Benefit from Recreation Services that Accommodate People with Disabilities by Education.

Education	n	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
HS/Some College	122	91.0	8.2	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0
College Degree	279	96.8	2.5	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table B238. Number of People in Home of Any Age Who Would Benefit from Recreation Services that Accommodate People with Disabilities by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
Single family	333	95.8	3.6	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0
Apartment	31	93.5	6.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Townhouse/Condo	35	88.6	8.6	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Duplex	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table B239. Number of People in Home of Any Age Who Would Benefit from Recreation Services that Accommodate People with Disabilities by Income.

Income	n	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
0-\$20,000	5	80.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	76.9	23.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
\$30,001-\$50,000	35	94.3	5.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
\$50,001-\$70,000	37	97.3	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
\$70,001-\$100,000	85	92.9	5.9	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0
Over \$100,000	171	97.1	2.3	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table B240. Number of People in Home of Any Age Who Would Benefit from Recreation Services that Accommodate People with Disabilities by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
Have access	385	95.3	3.9	0.5	0.3	0.0	0.0
No access	16	87.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Cary Overall as a Place to Live Crosstabulations

Table B241. Cary Overall as a Place to Live by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Undesirable 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Desirable 9	Grade
18-25	27	7.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	7.4	29.6	25.9	33.3	B
26-55	284	8.13	0.0	0.0	0.4	1.1	3.2	4.2	12.0	30.6	48.6	A-
56-65	44	8.11	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	4.5	4.5	6.8	29.5	52.3	A-
Over 65	46	8.09	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	8.7	2.2	6.5	26.1	54.3	A-

Table B242. Cary Overall as a Place to Live by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Undesirable 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Desirable 9	Grade
HS/Some College	122	7.93	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.8	6.6	7.4	12.3	19.7	51.6	B+
College Degree	280	8.16	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	2.9	2.9	12.1	33.9	47.1	A-

Table B243. Cary Overall as a Place to Live by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Undesirable 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Desirable 9	Grade
Male	188	8.01	0.0	0.0	0.5	2.1	3.7	3.7	13.3	33.0	43.6	B+
Female	216	8.18	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	4.2	4.6	11.1	26.9	52.8	A-

Table B244. Cary Overall as a Place to Live by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Undesirable 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Desirable 9	Grade
Single family	334	8.13	0.0	0.0	0.3	1.2	3.3	4.2	11.1	31.4	48.5	A-
Apartment	31	7.61	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	9.7	3.2	29.0	12.9	41.9	B
Townhouse/Condo	35	8.11	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.7	5.7	8.6	31.4	48.6	A-
Duplex	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B245. Cary Overall as a Place to Live by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Undesirable 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Desirable 9	Grade
0-\$20,000	5	7.20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	B-
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	7.62	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	7.7	0.0	30.8	0.0	53.8	B
\$30,001-\$50,000	35	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.7	5.7	11.4	37.1	40.0	B+
\$50,001-\$70,000	37	7.92	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.8	8.1	8.1	24.3	48.6	B+
\$70,001-\$100,000	86	8.22	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.2	4.7	11.6	30.2	51.2	A-
Over \$100,000	171	8.21	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	1.8	2.3	12.3	31.6	50.3	A-

Table B246. Cary Overall as a Place to Live by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Very Undesirable 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Desirable 9	Grade
English	385	8.08	0.0	0.0	0.5	1.0	4.2	4.2	12.5	29.4	48.3	A-
Spanish	3	8.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	A
Chinese	3	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	B+
Korean	4	8.25	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	A-
Hindi/Gujarati	5	8.20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	A-
Other	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B247. Cary Overall as a Place to Live by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Undesirable 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Desirable 9	Grade
Caucasian	340	8.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	3.2	4.1	11.5	30.0	50.3	A-
African-American	26	7.46	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	7.7	3.8	23.1	19.2	38.5	B-
Asian	20	7.85	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	45.0	35.0	B+
Hispanic	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Other	9	7.44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0	22.2	22.2	33.3	B-

Table B248. Cary Overall as a Place to Live by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Undesirable 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Desirable 9	Grade
0-1	39	8.18	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	2.6	5.1	10.3	23.1	56.4	A-
2-5	86	8.04	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	5.8	3.5	16.3	24.4	48.8	B+
6-10	79	8.24	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	2.5	6.3	40.5	46.8	A-
Over 10	199	8.05	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	3.5	5.0	13.1	29.1	47.2	B+

Quality of Life in Cary Crosstabulations

Table B249. Quality of Life in Cary by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Much Worse 1	Somewhat Worse 2	The Same 3	Somewhat Better 4	Much Better 5	% Below 3	% Above 3
18-25	25	3.20	0.0	20.0	52.0	16.0	12.0	20.0	28.0
26-55	276	2.98	0.7	26.1	51.4	18.5	3.3	26.8	21.8
56-65	43	3.21	2.3	23.3	39.5	20.9	14.0	25.6	34.9
Over 65	44	2.91	0.0	27.3	56.8	13.6	2.3	27.3	15.9

Table B250. Quality of Life in Cary by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Much Worse 1	Somewhat Worse 2	The Same 3	Somewhat Better 4	Much Better 5	% Below 3	% Above 3
HS/Some College	118	3.09	0.8	24.6	46.6	21.2	6.8	25.4	28.0
College Degree	271	2.97	0.7	25.8	52.8	16.6	4.1	26.5	20.7

Table B251. Quality of Life in Cary by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Much Worse 1	Somewhat Worse 2	The Same 3	Somewhat Better 4	Much Better 5	% Below 3	% Above 3
Male	182	3.04	1.1	25.8	46.7	20.9	5.5	26.9	26.4
Female	209	2.98	0.5	24.9	55.0	15.3	4.3	25.4	19.6

Table B252. Quality of Life in Cary by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Much Worse 1	Somewhat Worse 2	The Same 3	Somewhat Better 4	Much Better 5	% Below 3	% Above 3
Single family	325	3.02	0.6	25.8	49.5	18.8	5.2	26.4	24.0
Apartment	28	2.89	3.6	25.0	53.6	14.3	3.6	28.6	17.9
Townhouse/Condo	34	2.94	0.0	23.5	61.8	11.8	2.9	23.5	14.7
Duplex	1	3.00	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	2	3.50	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0

Table B253. Quality of Life in Cary by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Much Worse 1	Somewhat Worse 2	The Same 3	Somewhat Better 4	Much Better 5	% Below 3	% Above 3
0-\$20,000	5	3.20	0.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	2.85	7.7	23.1	53.8	7.7	7.7	30.8	15.4
\$30,001-\$50,000	32	3.09	0.0	21.9	53.1	18.8	6.3	21.9	25.1
\$50,001-\$70,000	35	2.86	0.0	34.3	51.4	8.6	5.7	34.3	14.3
\$70,001-\$100,000	85	3.00	0.0	21.2	60.0	16.5	2.4	21.2	18.9
Over \$100,000	165	3.05	1.2	28.5	41.8	21.2	7.3	29.7	28.5

Table B254. Quality of Life in Cary by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Much Worse 1	Somewhat Worse 2	The Same 3	Somewhat Better 4	Much Better 5	% Below 3	% Above 3
English	372	3.00	0.8	25.8	51.1	17.2	5.1	26.6	22.3
Spanish	3	2.67	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0
Chinese	3	3.33	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3
Korean	4	3.50	0.0	25.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	25.0	75.0
Hindi/Gujarati	5	3.00	0.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	20.0
Other	2	3.50	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0

Table B255. Quality of Life in Cary by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Much Worse 1	Somewhat Worse 2	The Same 3	Somewhat Better 4	Much Better 5	% Below 3	% Above 3
Caucasian	328	2.98	0.6	27.1	50.6	16.8	4.9	27.7	21.7
African-American	25	3.24	4.0	8.0	56.0	24.0	8.0	12.0	32.0
Asian	20	3.20	0.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	0.0	20.0	40.0
Hispanic	2	2.50	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
Other	9	2.89	0.0	22.2	66.7	11.1	0.0	22.2	11.1

Table B256. Quality of Life in Cary by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Much Worse 1	Somewhat Worse 2	The Same 3	Somewhat Better 4	Much Better 5	% Below 3	% Above 3
0-1	26	3.15	0.0	11.5	69.2	11.5	7.7	11.5	19.2
2-5	86	3.04	0.0	18.6	61.6	17.4	2.3	18.6	19.7
6-10	79	3.04	0.0	26.6	45.6	25.3	2.5	26.6	27.8
Over 10	199	2.97	1.5	29.6	46.2	16.1	6.5	31.1	22.6

How Safe Respondents Feel in Cary Crosstabulations

Table B257. How Safe Respondents Feel in Cary by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
18-25	27	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.4	0.0	25.9	18.5	48.1	92.5
26-55	284	8.13	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	1.1	19.4	41.9	37.0	99.4
56-65	44	8.18	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	20.5	29.5	47.7	97.7
Over 65	46	7.83	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	2.2	8.7	15.2	37.0	34.8	95.7

Table B258. How Safe Respondents Feel in Cary by Children in Household Under 18.

Children	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
No children	216	8.05	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.5	2.3	2.3	19.4	34.3	40.7	96.7
Have children	188	8.15	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	19.1	43.6	36.2	100.0

Table B259. How Safe Respondents Feel in Cary by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	122	7.98	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.8	2.5	2.5	21.3	32.0	40.2	96.0
College Degree	280	8.15	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	1.4	18.2	41.8	37.9	99.3

Table B260. How Safe Respondents Feel in Cary by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
Male	188	8.10	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.5	20.2	37.8	39.4	97.9
Female	216	8.09	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.9	2.8	18.5	39.4	38.0	98.7

Table B261. How Safe Respondents Feel in Cary by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
Single family	334	8.11	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.8	19.8	39.8	37.7	99.1
Apartment	31	8.13	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	22.6	29.0	45.2	96.8
Townhouse/Condo	35	7.94	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	5.7	2.9	14.3	31.4	42.9	91.5
Duplex	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Other	2	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0

Table B262. How Safe Respondents Feel in Cary by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
0-\$20,000	5	7.40	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	60.0	0.0	100.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	7.69	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.4	7.7	7.7	30.8	38.5	84.7
\$30,001-\$50,000	35	8.06	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	20.0	42.9	34.3	97.2
\$50,001-\$70,000	37	8.14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	13.5	51.4	32.4	100.0
\$70,001-\$100,000	86	8.06	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	19.8	41.9	36.0	97.7
Over \$100,000	171	8.16	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.2	19.9	38.6	39.8	99.5

Table B263. How Safe Respondents Feel in Cary by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
English	385	8.09	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3	1.3	1.8	19.0	39.0	38.4	98.2
Spanish	3	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7	100.0
Chinese	3	7.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	100.0
Korean	4	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	100.0
Hindi/Gujarati	5	8.20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	100.0
Other	2	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	100.0

Table B264. How Safe Respondents Feel in Cary by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
Caucasian	340	8.12	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.9	2.1	17.6	40.0	38.8	98.5
African-American	26	8.19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.1	34.6	42.3	100.0
Asian	20	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	35.0	30.0	35.0	100.0
Hispanic	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Other	9	7.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0	22.2	33.3	22.2	77.7

Table B265. How Safe Respondents Feel in Cary by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
0-1	39	8.31	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	15.4	28.2	53.8	97.4
2-5	86	8.15	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.2	17.4	41.9	38.4	98.9
6-10	79	8.20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	19.0	38.0	41.8	100.1
Over 10	199	7.99	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.5	1.5	2.5	21.1	39.7	34.2	97.5

How Safe Respondents Feel in Home Neighborhood Crosstabulations

Table B266. How Safe Respondents Feel in Home Neighborhood by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
18-25	27	8.04	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.4	3.7	18.5	18.5	51.9	92.6
26-55	284	8.31	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	2.8	9.2	41.2	46.5	99.7
56-65	44	8.41	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	22.7	59.1	100.0
Over 65	46	8.24	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	13.0	37.0	45.7	100.0

Table B267. How Safe Respondents Feel in Home Neighborhood by Children in Household Under 18.

Children	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
No children	216	8.28	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	2.8	12.0	33.8	50.0	98.6
Have children	188	8.31	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	10.1	41.0	46.2	100.0

Table B268. How Safe Respondents Feel in Home Neighborhood by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	122	8.28	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	3.3	13.1	29.5	52.5	98.4
College Degree	280	8.30	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	2.5	10.4	40.4	46.4	99.7

Table B269. How Safe Respondents Feel in Home Neighborhood by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
Male	188	8.30	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	1.1	13.3	38.3	46.8	99.5
Female	216	8.29	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	4.2	9.3	36.1	49.5	99.1

Table B270. How Safe Respondents Feel in Home Neighborhood by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
Single family	334	8.32	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	2.7	9.6	38.6	48.5	99.4
Apartment	31	8.16	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	3.2	16.1	29.0	48.4	96.7
Townhouse/Condo	35	8.23	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	20.0	28.6	48.5	100.0
Duplex	1	7.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	2	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0

Table B271. How Safe Respondents Feel in Home Neighborhood by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
0-\$20,000	5	7.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	0.0	100.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	8.31	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	7.7	30.8	53.8	100.0
\$30,001-\$50,000	35	8.14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	2.9	14.3	37.1	42.9	97.2
\$50,001-\$70,000	37	8.22	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	13.5	43.2	40.5	99.9
\$70,001-\$100,000	86	8.23	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	3.5	10.5	40.7	44.2	98.9
Over \$100,000	171	8.39	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.2	8.8	37.4	52.0	99.4

Table B272. How Safe Respondents Feel in Home Neighborhood by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
English	385	8.29	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	2.9	11.2	36.9	48.3	99.3
Spanish	3	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7	100.0
Chinese	3	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Korean	4	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	100.0
Hindi/Gujarati	5	8.20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	100.0
Other	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0

Table B273. How Safe Respondents Feel in Home Neighborhood by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
Caucasian	340	8.29	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	3.2	10.9	37.1	48.2	99.4
African-American	26	8.54	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	30.8	61.5	100.0
Asian	20	8.15	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	45.0	35.0	100.0
Hispanic	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Other	9	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	11.1	33.3	44.4	88.8

Table B274. How Safe Respondents Feel in Home Neighborhood by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
0-1	39	8.26	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.3	7.7	28.2	53.8	100.0
2-5	86	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.2	10.5	38.4	48.8	98.9
6-10	79	8.39	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	10.1	36.7	51.9	100.0
Over 10	199	8.25	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	2.5	12.6	38.7	45.2	99.0

How Safe Respondents Feel in Public Places Around Cary Crosstabulations

Table B275. How Safe Do You Feel in Public Places Around Cary (Shopping, Out to Eat, Movies) by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
18-25	27	7.96	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.4	0.0	29.6	14.8	48.1	92.5
26-55	284	8.07	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.7	2.1	19.7	42.6	34.5	98.9
56-65	44	8.18	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	22.7	27.3	47.7	97.7
Over 65	46	7.78	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	4.3	6.5	17.4	34.8	34.8	93.5

Table B276. How Safe Do You Feel in Public Places Around Cary (Shopping, Out to Eat, Movies) by Children in Household Under 18.

Children	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
No children	216	8.01	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	3.2	3.2	20.8	31.0	41.2	96.2
Have children	188	8.08	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	1.1	19.7	46.8	31.9	99.5

Table B277. How Safe Do You Feel in Public Places Around Cary (Shopping, Out to Eat, Movies) by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	122	7.95	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	3.3	4.1	20.5	32.8	38.5	95.9
College Degree	280	8.09	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	1.1	1.4	20.0	41.1	36.1	98.6

Table B278. How Safe Do You Feel in Public Places Around Cary (Shopping, Out to Eat, Movies) by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
Male	188	8.05	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	2.1	1.1	19.7	39.9	36.7	97.4
Female	216	8.04	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	1.4	3.2	20.8	37.0	37.0	98.0

Table B279. How Safe Do You Feel in Public Places Around Cary (Shopping, Out to Eat, Movies) by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
Single family	334	8.05	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.9	2.1	21.3	39.2	35.9	98.5
Apartment	31	8.16	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	19.4	32.3	45.2	96.9
Townhouse/Condo	35	7.89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.6	5.7	14.3	31.4	40.0	91.4
Duplex	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Other	2	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0

Table B280. How Safe Do You Feel in Public Places Around Cary (Shopping, Out to Eat, Movies) by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
0-\$20,000	5	7.40	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	60.0	0.0	100.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	7.62	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.4	7.7	7.7	38.5	30.8	84.7
\$30,001-\$50,000	35	7.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.7	0.0	28.6	34.3	31.4	94.3
\$50,001-\$70,000	37	8.14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.0	16.2	43.2	37.8	97.2
\$70,001-\$100,000	86	7.98	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	1.2	2.3	19.8	43.0	32.6	97.7
Over \$100,000	171	8.12	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	2.3	18.7	40.9	37.4	99.3

Table B281. How Safe Do You Feel in Public Places Around Cary (Shopping, Out to Eat, Movies) by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
English	385	8.04	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3	1.8	2.3	20.3	37.9	37.1	97.6
Spanish	3	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7	100.0
Chinese	3	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Korean	4	8.25	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	100.0
Hindi/Gujarati	5	8.20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	100.0
Other	2	7.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	100.0

Table B282. How Safe Do You Feel in Public Places Around Cary (Shopping, Out to Eat, Movies) by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
Caucasian	340	8.06	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3	1.5	2.4	19.4	38.8	37.4	98.0
African-American	26	8.12	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	23.1	30.8	42.3	100.0
Asian	20	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	100.0
Hispanic	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Other	9	7.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0	22.2	33.3	22.2	77.7

Table B283. How Safe Do You Feel in Public Places Around Cary (Shopping, Out to Eat, Movies) by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
0-1	39	8.23	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	17.9	30.8	48.7	97.4
2-5	86	8.09	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	2.3	18.6	41.9	36.0	98.8
6-10	79	8.18	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.3	41.8	38.0	100.1
Over 10	199	7.93	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.5	2.5	3.5	21.6	37.2	34.2	96.5

Cary Municipal Tax Rate Crosstabulations

Table B284. Cary Municipal Tax Rate by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Low 1	Somewhat Low 2	About Right 3	Somewhat High 4	Very High 5	% Below 3	% Above 3
18-25	24	3.17	0.0	8.3	66.7	25.0	0.0	8.3	25.0
26-55	274	3.01	3.3	11.7	67.9	15.3	1.8	15.0	17.1
56-65	42	3.21	0.0	11.9	61.9	19.0	7.1	11.9	26.1
Over 65	43	3.12	2.3	4.7	76.7	11.6	4.7	7.0	16.3

Table B285. Cary Municipal Tax Rate by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Low 1	Somewhat Low 2	About Right 3	Somewhat High 4	Very High 5	% Below 3	% Above 3
HS/Some College	114	3.22	0.9	5.3	69.3	20.2	4.4	6.2	24.6
College Degree	271	2.98	3.3	12.9	67.9	14.0	1.8	16.2	15.8

Table B286. Cary Municipal Tax Rate by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Low 1	Somewhat Low 2	About Right 3	Somewhat High 4	Very High 5	% Below 3	% Above 3
Single family	326	3.04	2.8	10.7	68.7	15.3	2.5	13.5	17.8
Apartment	25	3.08	4.0	12.0	56.0	28.0	0.0	16.0	28.0
Townhouse/Condo	32	3.19	0.0	9.4	68.8	15.6	6.3	9.4	21.9
Duplex	1	3.00	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	2	3.00	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table B287. Cary Municipal Tax Rate by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Low 1	Somewhat Low 2	About Right 3	Somewhat High 4	Very High 5	% Below 3	% Above 3
0-\$20,000	3	3.33	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	3.31	0.0	0.0	76.9	15.4	7.7	0.0	23.1
\$30,001-\$50,000	34	3.18	0.0	8.8	64.7	26.5	0.0	8.8	26.5
\$50,001-\$70,000	35	3.14	0.0	11.4	71.4	8.6	8.6	11.4	17.2
\$70,001-\$100,000	83	2.95	4.8	10.8	69.9	13.3	1.2	15.6	14.5
Over \$100,000	168	3.02	2.4	13.1	67.3	14.9	2.4	15.5	17.3

Table B288. Cary Municipal Tax Rate by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Low 1	Somewhat Low 2	About Right 3	Somewhat High 4	Very High 5	% Below 3	% Above 3
Caucasian	326	3.01	3.1	11.3	69.6	13.8	2.1	14.4	15.9
African-American	24	3.33	0.0	0.0	70.8	25.0	4.2	0.0	29.2
Asian	19	3.26	0.0	10.5	52.6	36.8	0.0	10.5	36.8
Hispanic	2	4.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	9	3.22	0.0	11.1	66.7	11.1	11.1	11.1	22.2

Table B289. Cary Municipal Tax Rate by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Low 1	Somewhat Low 2	About Right 3	Somewhat High 4	Very High 5	% Below 3	% Above 3
0-1	36	3.00	2.8	11.1	69.4	16.7	0.0	13.9	16.7
2-5	81	3.04	2.5	11.1	70.4	12.3	3.7	13.6	16.0
6-10	76	2.99	3.9	7.9	73.7	14.5	0.0	11.8	14.5
Over 10	193	3.10	2.1	11.4	64.8	18.1	3.6	13.5	21.7

Cary Information Source Usage Crosstabulations

Table B290. Information Source Usage by Age (Mean).

18-25 (n=25)	26-55 (n=281)	56-65 (n=42)	Over 65 (n=46)
News & Observer (6.00)	News & Observer (6.27)	Television (6.95)	News & Observer (7.41)
Word-of-Mouth (5.65)	Television (5.64)	News & Observer (6.35)	Television (7.00)
Television (4.50)	Word-of-Mouth (5.63)	Cary News (5.47)	Cary News (6.17)
Cary News (4.12)	Cary News (5.26)	Word-of-Mouth (5.38)	Word-of-Mouth (5.96)
Radio (3.54)	BUD (5.01)	BUD (5.37)	BUD (5.52)
BUD (3.39)	Cary's Website (4.22)	Radio (4.44)	Radio (3.94)
Cary's Website (2.85)	Radio (4.09)	Cary TV Ch. 11 (3.80)	Cary's Website (3.26)
Blogs/Msg. Boards/Social Media (2.32)	Parks & Rec. Program (3.46)	Cary's Website (3.73)	Cary TV Ch. 11 (2.76)
Cary TV Ch. 11 (2.00)	Internet E-mail (2.56)	Parks & Rec. Program (2.63)	Parks & Rec. Program (2.63)
Parks & Rec. Program (1.96)	Cary TV Ch. 11 (2.55)	Internet E-mail (2.28)	Internet E-mail (2.15)
Independent Weekly (1.73)	Blogs/Msg. Boards/Social Media (1.95)	Independent Weekly (2.00)	Independent Weekly (1.85)
Internet E-mail (1.35)	Independent Weekly (1.87)	Block Leader Program (1.56)	Blogs/Msg. Boards/Social Media (1.67)
Block Leader Program (1.31)	24-Phone Service (1.46)	24-Hr. Phone Service (1.54)	24-Hr. Phone Service (1.57)
24-Hr. Phone Service (1.04)	Block Leader Program (1.33)	Blogs/Msg. Boards/Social Media (1.47)	Block Leader Program (1.39)

Table B291. Information Source Usage by Children in Household Under 18 (Mean).

No Children (n=210)	Have Children (n=187)
News & Observer (6.78)	News & Observer (5.98)
Television (6.31)	Word-of-Mouth (5.77)
Cary News (5.53)	Television (5.40)
Word-of-Mouth (5.51)	Cary News (5.09)
BUD (5.19)	BUD (4.80)
Radio (4.23)	Cary's Website (4.68)
Cary's Website (3.33)	Parks & Rec. Program (3.98)
Cary TV Ch. 11 (2.75)	Radio (3.93)
Parks & Rec. Program (2.47)	Internet E-mail (2.62)
Internet E-mail (2.21)	Cary TV Ch. 11 (2.59)
Independent Weekly (1.96)	Blogs/Msg. Boards/Social Media (1.91)
Blogs/Msg. Boards/Social Media (1.87)	Independent Weekly (1.78)
24-Hr. Phone Service (1.46)	24-Hr. Phone Service (1.47)
Block Leader Program (1.39)	Block Leader Program (1.34)

Table B292. Information Source Usage by Housing Type (Mean).

Single Family (n=331)	Apartment (n=56)	Townhouse/Condo (n=29)	Duplex (n=1)	Other (n=2)
News & Observer (6.44)	Television (6.67)	News & Observer (6.54)	Word-of-Mouth (8.00)	News & Observer (9.00)
Television (5.85)	News & Observer (5.73)	Television (5.31)	BUD (8.00)	Television (9.00)
Word-of-Mouth (5.66)	Word-of-Mouth (5.45)	Word-of-Mouth (5.29)	Cary TV Ch. 11 (8.00)	Word-of-Mouth (9.00)
Cary News (5.51)	Cary News (4.37)	BUD (4.94)	News & Observer (7.00)	Cary TV Ch. 11 (6.00)
BUD (5.26)	Radio (4.27)	Cary News (4.37)	Television (7.00)	Radio (5.50)
Cary's Website (4.11)	Cary's Website (3.23)	Radio (3.66)	Radio (7.00)	Cary News (5.00)
Radio (4.10)	Cary TV Ch. 11 (3.00)	Cary's Website (3.23)	Cary's Website (7.00)	BUD (5.00)
Parks & Rec. Program (3.41)	BUD (2.27)	Parks & Rec. Program (1.89)	Cary News (6.00)	Parks & Rec. Program (3.00)
Cary TV Ch. 11 (2.70)	Parks & Rec. Program (2.13)	Independent Weekly (1.88)	Internet E-mail (6.00)	Cary's Website (1.00)
Internet E-mail (2.51)	Blogs/MBs/Soc. Media (2.03)	Cary TV Ch. 11 (1.80)	Block Leader Program (5.00)	Internet E-mail (1.00)
Blogs/MBs/Soc. Media (1.91)	Independent Weekly (1.97)	Internet E-mail (1.77)	Independent Weekly (4.00)	Block Leader Program (1.00)
Independent Weekly (1.87)	Internet E-mail (1.93)	Blogs/MBs/Soc. Media (1.68)	24-Hr. Phone Service (3.00)	Independent Weekly (1.00)
24-Hr. Phone Service (1.52)	24-Hr. Phone Service (1.30)	Block Leader Program (1.23)	Parks & Rec. Program (2.00)	Blogs/MBs/Soc. Media (1.00)
Block Leader Program (1.40)	Block Leader Program (1.07)	24-Hr. Phone Service (1.09)	Blogs/MBs/Soc. Media (1.00)	24-Hr. Phone Service (1.00)

Table B293. Information Source Usage by Primary Language Spoken (Mean).

English (n=380)	Spanish (n=3)	Chinese (n=3)	Korean (n=4)	Hindi/Gujarati (n=5)	Other (n=2)
News & Observer (6.43)	Television (6.33)	News & Observer (7.00)	Cary's Website (5.50)	BUD (8.20)	Cary's Website (7.50)
Television (5.90)	Cary News (6.00)	Television (6.67)	Television (5.25)	News & Observer (7.60)	News & Observer (6.50)
Word-of-Mouth (5.65)	Word-of-Mouth (6.00)	Cary News (5.00)	Parks & Rec. Program (3.75)	Word-of-Mouth (6.20)	Television (6.00)
Cary News (5.33)	BUD (5.67)	Radio (4.33)	Cary News (3.50)	Cary News (5.60)	Word-of-Mouth (5.50)
BUD (5.01)	Cary's Website (4.33)	Word-of-Mouth (4.33)	Word-of-Mouth (3.50)	Cary's Website (4.20)	Cary News (5.00)
Radio (4.12)	Parks & Rec. Program (4.33)	Cary's Website (3.67)	News & Observer (3.25)	Television (4.00)	Parks & Rec. Program (5.00)
Cary's Website (3.91)	Independent Weekly (4.33)	Cary TV Ch. 11 (3.33)	Radio (2.50)	Radio (3.60)	Independent Weekly (5.00)
Parks & Rec. Program (3.17)	News & Observer (4.00)	BUD (3.00)	BUD (2.50)	Internet E-mail (3.40)	Cary TV Ch. 11 (4.00)
Cary TV Ch. 11 (2.69)	Radio (4.00)	Parks & Rec. Program (2.67)	Blogs/MBs/Soc. Media (1.75)	Block Leader Program (2.20)	BUD (4.00)
Internet E-mail (2.42)	24-Hr. Phone Service (4.00)	Internet E-mail (1.00)	Internet E-mail (1.50)	Cary TV Ch. 11 (1.80)	Radio (3.50)
Blogs/MBs/Soc. Media (1.88)	Internet E-mail (3.33)	24-Hr. Phone Service (1.00)	Cary TV Ch. 11 (1.25)	24-Hr. Phone Service (1.75)	Blogs/MBs/Soc. Media (3.50)
Independent Weekly (1.87)	Cary TV Ch. 11 (3.33)	Block Leader Program (1.00)	24-Hr. Phone Service (1.00)	Parks & Rec. Program (1.60)	Block Leader Program (3.00)
24-Hr. Phone Service (1.45)	Blogs/MBs/Soc. Media (2.00)	Independent Weekly (1.00)	Block Leader Program (1.00)	Blogs/MBs/Soc. Media (1.60)	Internet E-mail (1.00)
Block Leader Program (1.34)	Block Leader Program (1.00)	Blogs/MBs/Soc. Media (1.00)	Independent Weekly (1.00)	Independent Weekly (1.20)	24-Hr. Phone Service (1.00)

Table B294. Information Source Usage by Race (Mean).

Caucasian (n=337)	African-American (n=25)	Asian (n=20)	Hispanic (n=2)	Other (n=9)
News & Observer (6.49)	Television (7.20)	Word-of-Mouth (6.00)	Television (9.00)	News & Observer (6.11)
Television (5.82)	News & Observer (6.28)	Television (5.45)	Cary's Website (6.50)	BUD (5.11)
Word-of-Mouth (5.64)	Word-of-Mouth (5.28)	News & Observer (5.30)	Internet E-mail (6.50)	Word-of-Mouth (4.56)
Cary News (5.36)	Radio (5.08)	Cary News (4.80)	Parks & Rec. Program (6.50)	Television (4.11)
BUD (5.11)	Cary News (4.80)	Cary's Website (4.45)	Cary News (6.00)	Cary News (4.00)
Radio (4.04)	BUD (4.00)	BUD (4.45)	Word-of-Mouth (6.00)	Radio (3.11)
Cary's Website (3.94)	Cary's Website (3.72)	Radio (4.05)	News & Observer (5.50)	Cary's Website (3.00)
Parks & Rec. Program (3.20)	Cary TV Ch. 11 (3.72)	Cary TV Ch. 11 (3.40)	24-Hr. Phone Service (5.00)	Internet E-mail (2.67)
Cary TV Ch. 11 (2.56)	Parks & Rec. Program (2.40)	Parks & Rec. Program (3.35)	BUD (5.00)	Independent Weekly (2.22)
Internet E-mail (2.39)	Independent Weekly (2.32)	Internet E-mail (2.55)	Radio (4.50)	Block Leader Program (2.00)
Blogs/Msg. Boards/Soc. Media (1.83)	Blogs/Msg. Boards/Soc. Media (2.04)	Independent Weekly (1.80)	Cary TV Ch. 11 (4.50)	Parks & Rec. Program (2.00)
Independent Weekly (1.82)	Internet E-mail (1.76)	Blogs/Msg. Boards/Soc. Media (1.74)	Independent Weekly (4.00)	Blogs/Msg. Boards/Soc. Media (1.89)
24-Hr. Phone Service (1.43)	24-Hr. Phone Service (1.56)	Block Leader Program (1.10)	Blogs/Msg. Boards/Soc. Media (2.50)	Cary TV Ch. 11 (1.78)
Block Leader Program (1.34)	Block Leader Program (1.20)	24-Hr. Phone Service (1.05)	Block Leader Program (1.00)	24-Hr. Phone Service (1.33)

Table B295. Information Source Usage by Years in Cary (Mean).

0-1 (n=38)	2-5 (n=84)	6-10 (n=78)	Over 10 (n=197)
News & Observer (6.23)	News & Observer (5.99)	Television (6.04)	News & Observer (6.86)
Television (6.13)	Word-of-Mouth (5.95)	News & Observer (5.81)	Television (5.96)
Word-of-Mouth (5.76)	Television (5.45)	Word-of-Mouth (5.38)	Cary News (5.86)
Cary News (4.92)	Cary News (4.85)	Cary News (4.68)	BUD (5.77)
BUD (4.54)	Radio (4.33)	Radio (4.28)	Word-of-Mouth (5.57)
Cary's Website (4.05)	Cary's Website (4.33)	BUD (4.27)	Radio (3.93)
Radio (3.97)	BUD (4.15)	Cary's Website (4.20)	Cary's Website (3.69)
Parks & Rec. Program (2.87)	Parks & Rec. Program (3.44)	Parks & Rec. Program (3.44)	Parks & Rec. Program (3.02)
Cary TV Ch. 11 (2.41)	Internet E-mail (2.54)	Cary TV Ch. 11 (2.71)	Cary TV Ch. 11 (2.92)
Blogs/Msg. Boards/Social Media (1.95)	Cary TV Ch. 11 (2.19)	Internet E-mail (2.54)	Internet E-mail (2.40)
Internet E-mail (1.85)	Blogs/Msg. Boards/Social Media (2.07)	Independent Weekly (2.03)	Independent Weekly (1.80)
Independent Weekly (1.61)	Independent Weekly (2.04)	Blogs/Msg. Boards/Social Media (2.01)	Blogs/Msg. Boards/Social Media (1.75)
Block Leader Program (1.39)	24-Hr. Phone Service (1.32)	24-Hr. Phone Service (1.44)	24-Hr. Phone Service (1.60)
24-Hr. Phone Service (1.10)	Block Leader Program (1.14)	Block Leader Program (1.22)	Block Leader Program (1.52)

Internet Access Crosstabulations

Table B296. Internet Access by Age.

Age	n	Home	Office	Both	Neither
18-25	26	30.8	3.8	57.7	7.7
26-55	284	28.9	0.4	69.4	1.4
56-65	44	47.7	0.0	47.7	4.5
Over 65	45	80.0	0.0	2.2	17.8

Table B297. Internet Access by Children in Household Under 18.

Children	n	Home	Office	Both	Neither
No children	214	40.7	0.5	51.9	7.0
Have children	188	32.4	0.5	66.5	0.5

Table B298. Internet Access by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Home	Office	Both	Neither
Single family	334	36.5	0.3	60.8	2.4
Apartment	30	26.7	3.3	60.0	10.0
Townhouse/Condo	35	45.7	0.0	42.9	11.4
Duplex	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0

Table B299. Internet Access by Income.

Income	n	Home	Office	Both	Neither
0-\$20,000	5	40.0	0.0	0.0	60.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	46.2	0.0	30.8	23.1
\$30,001-\$50,000	35	48.6	2.9	42.9	5.7
\$50,001-\$70,000	36	47.2	0.0	36.1	16.7
\$70,001-\$100,000	86	44.2	0.0	54.7	1.2
Over \$100,000	171	24.6	0.6	74.3	0.6

Table B300. Internet Access by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Home	Office	Both	Neither
English	384	37.0	0.5	58.3	4.2
Spanish	3	66.7	0.0	33.3	0.0
Chinese	3	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Korean	4	25.0	0.0	75.0	0.0
Hindi/Gujarati	5	20.0	0.0	80.0	0.0
Other	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0

Table B301. Internet Access by Race.

Race	n	Home	Office	Both	Neither
Caucasian	339	37.5	0.6	57.8	4.1
African-American	26	30.8	0.0	61.5	7.7
Asian	20	20.0	0.0	80.0	0.0
Hispanic	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	9	55.6	0.0	44.4	0.0

High Speed or Dial-Up Access Crosstabulations

Table B302. High Speed or Dial-Up Access by Age.

Age	n	High Speed	Dial-Up	Both
18-25	24	95.8	0.0	4.2
26-55	278	96.0	0.4	3.6
56-65	42	90.5	2.4	7.1
Over 65	37	78.4	18.9	2.7

Table B303. High Speed or Dial-Up Access by Children in Household Under 18.

Children	n	High Speed	Dial-Up	Both
No children	197	92.4	4.1	3.6
Have children	187	95.2	0.5	4.3

Table B304. High Speed or Dial-Up Access by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	High Speed	Dial-Up	Both
Single family	325	94.8	2.5	2.8
Apartment	26	80.8	0.0	19.2
Townhouse/Condo	31	93.5	3.2	3.2
Duplex	1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Other	1	100.0	0.0	0.0

Table B305. High Speed or Dial-Up Access by Income.

Income	n	High Speed	Dial-Up	Both
0-\$20,000	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	9	77.8	0.0	22.2
\$30,001-\$50,000	33	78.8	12.1	9.1
\$50,001-\$70,000	30	86.7	3.3	10.0
\$70,001-\$100,000	85	95.3	3.5	1.2
Over \$100,000	169	98.2	0.0	1.8

Table B306. High Speed or Dial-Up Access by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	High Speed	Dial-Up	Both
English	366	93.4	2.5	4.1
Spanish	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Chinese	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Korean	4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Hindi/Gujarati	5	100.0	0.0	0.0
Other	2	100.0	0.0	0.0

Table B307. High Speed or Dial-Up Access by Race.

Race	n	High Speed	Dial-Up	Both
Caucasian	323	93.8	2.8	3.4
African-American	24	87.5	0.0	12.5
Asian	20	95.0	0.0	5.0
Hispanic	2	100.0	0.0	0.0
Other	9	100.0	0.0	0.0

Time-Warner Cable Usage Crosstabulations

Table B308. Time-Warner Cable Usage by Age.

Age	n	% Yes	% No
18-25	26	76.9	23.1
26-55	284	76.4	23.6
56-65	44	79.5	20.5
Over 65	46	80.4	19.6

Table B309. Time-Warner Cable Usage by Children in Household Under 18.

Children	n	% Yes	% No
No children	215	78.1	21.9
Have children	188	76.1	23.9

Table B310. Time-Warner Cable Usage by Education.

Education	n	% Yes	% No
HS/Some College	122	69.7	30.3
College Degree	280	80.4	19.6

Table B311. Time-Warner Cable Usage by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	% Yes	% No
Single family	334	75.7	24.3
Apartment	31	77.4	22.6
Townhouse/Condo	35	88.6	11.4
Duplex	1	100.0	0.0
Other	2	100.0	0.0

Table B312. Time-Warner Cable Usage by Income.

Income	n	% Yes	% No
0-\$20,000	5	60.0	40.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	69.2	30.8
\$30,001-\$50,000	35	77.1	22.9
\$50,001-\$70,000	37	73.0	27.0
\$70,001-\$100,000	86	77.9	22.1
Over \$100,000	171	79.5	20.5

Table B313. Time-Warner Cable Usage by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	% Yes	% No
English	385	78.2	21.8
Spanish	3	66.7	33.3
Chinese	3	66.7	33.3
Korean	4	25.0	75.0
Hindi/Gujarati	5	60.0	40.0
Other	2	50.0	50.0

Table B314. Time-Warner Cable Usage by Race.

Race	n	% Yes	% No
Caucasian	340	78.5	21.5
African-American	26	76.9	23.1
Asian	20	60.0	40.0
Hispanic	2	50.0	50.0
Other	9	77.8	22.2

Viewership of Town Council Meetings, School Board, or Wake County Board of Commissioner on Cary TV Channel 11 Crosstabulations

Table B315. How Often Watch Meetings of Cary Town Council, School Board, or Wake County Board of Commissioner on Cary TV Channel 11 by Age.

Age	n	Never	At Least Once a Year	Several Times a Year	At Least Once Every Month	Several Times Every Month
18-25	20	70.0	10.0	0.0	15.0	5.0
26-55	220	46.8	12.3	23.2	10.9	6.8
56-65	34	32.4	8.8	26.5	17.6	14.7
Over 65	37	37.8	16.2	24.3	10.8	10.8

Table B316. How Often Watch Meetings of Cary Town Council, School Board, or Wake County Board of Commissioner on Cary TV Channel 11 by Children in Household Under 18.

Children	n	Never	At Least Once a Year	Several Times a Year	At Least Once Every Month	Several Times Every Month
No children	168	50.0	12.5	16.7	10.7	10.1
Have children	145	40.7	12.4	28.3	13.1	5.5

Table B317. How Often Watch Meetings of Cary Town Council, School Board, or Wake County Board of Commissioner on Cary TV Channel 11 by Education.

Education	n	Never	At Least Once a Year	Several Times a Year	At Least Once Every Month	Several Times Every Month
HS/Some College	86	39.5	10.5	23.3	18.6	8.1
College Degree	226	47.8	13.3	21.7	9.3	8.0

Table B318. How Often Watch Meetings of Cary Town Council, School Board, or Wake County Board of Commissioner on Cary TV Channel 11 by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Never	At Least Once a Year	Several Times a Year	At Least Once Every Month	Several Times Every Month
Single family	255	42.7	13.3	23.5	12.5	7.8
Apartment	24	54.2	4.2	16.7	8.3	16.7
Townhouse/Condo	31	64.5	12.9	16.1	6.5	0.0
Duplex	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0

Table B319. How Often Watch Meetings of Cary Town Council, School Board, or Wake County Board of Commissioner on Cary TV Channel 11 by Income.

Income	n	Never	At Least Once a Year	Several Times a Year	At Least Once Every Month	Several Times Every Month
0-\$20,000	3	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	9	44.4	11.1	22.2	22.2	0.0
\$30,001-\$50,000	27	48.1	14.8	22.2	7.4	7.4
\$50,001-\$70,000	27	40.7	11.1	18.5	7.4	22.2
\$70,001-\$100,000	68	44.1	10.3	20.6	20.6	4.4
Over \$100,000	137	46.7	14.6	21.2	10.2	7.3

Table B320. How Often Watch Meetings of Cary Town Council, School Board, or Wake County Board of Commissioner on Cary TV Channel 11 by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Never	At Least Once a Year	Several Times a Year	At Least Once Every Month	Several Times Every Month
English	303	45.5	12.2	21.8	12.2	8.3
Spanish	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Chinese	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
Korean	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hindi/Gujarati	3	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0
Other	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0

Table B321. How Often Watch Meetings of Cary Town Council, School Board, or Wake County Board of Commissioner on Cary TV Channel 11 by Race.

Race	n	Never	At Least Once a Year	Several Times a Year	At Least Once Every Month	Several Times Every Month
Caucasian	269	45.7	12.6	22.3	11.9	7.4
African-American	20	50.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	20.0
Asian	12	16.7	16.7	41.7	16.7	8.3
Hispanic	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	7	71.4	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0

Cary's Efforts at Keeping Residents Informed Crosstabulations

Table B322. How Informed Respondents Feel About Government Services, Projects, Issues, and Programs That Affect Them by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Not at All Informed 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Well Informed 9	% Above 5
18-25	26	4.92	11.5	7.7	11.5	19.2	7.7	3.8	23.1	7.7	7.7	42.3
26-55	284	5.99	1.4	3.2	3.2	8.1	24.6	15.5	26.4	9.9	7.7	59.5
56-65	44	6.34	4.5	0.0	6.8	2.3	20.5	13.6	22.7	9.1	20.5	65.9
Over 65	45	7.04	0.0	0.0	4.4	2.2	13.3	6.7	33.3	17.8	22.2	80.0

Table B323. How Informed Respondents Feel About Government Services, Projects, Issues, and Programs That Affect Them by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Not at All Informed 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Well Informed 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	121	6.14	5.0	2.5	3.3	5.8	19.0	12.4	28.1	10.7	13.2	64.4
College Degree	279	6.07	1.1	2.9	4.7	8.2	22.6	14.3	25.8	10.8	9.7	60.6

Table B324. How Informed Respondents Feel About Government Services, Projects, Issues, and Programs That Affect Them by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Not at All Informed 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Well Informed 9	% Above 5
Male	188	5.99	2.1	2.7	6.4	8.5	21.3	13.8	24.5	9.0	11.7	59.0
Female	213	6.17	2.3	2.8	2.3	6.6	22.1	13.6	28.2	12.2	9.9	63.9

Table B325. How Informed Respondents Feel About Government Services, Projects, Issues, and Programs That Affect Them by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Not at All Informed 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Well Informed 9	% Above 5
Single family	333	6.16	1.8	2.7	3.6	8.1	21.0	12.9	27.3	11.4	11.1	62.7
Apartment	30	5.77	3.3	3.3	6.7	6.7	26.7	13.3	23.3	6.7	10.0	53.3
Townhouse/Condo	35	5.69	5.7	2.9	8.6	2.9	20.0	22.9	22.9	5.7	8.6	60.1
Duplex	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Other	2	5.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table B326. How Informed Respondents Feel About Government Services, Projects, Issues, and Programs That Affect Them by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Not at All Informed 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Well Informed 9	% Above 5
0-\$20,000	5	6.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	40.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	5.85	0.0	0.0	7.7	7.7	23.1	30.8	23.1	0.0	7.7	61.6
\$30,001-\$50,000	35	5.86	5.7	2.9	8.6	2.9	28.6	5.7	20.0	11.4	14.3	51.4
\$50,001-\$70,000	36	6.17	0.0	0.0	11.1	13.9	11.1	16.7	19.4	13.9	13.9	63.9
\$70,001-\$100,000	86	6.26	3.5	0.0	1.2	7.0	18.6	17.4	31.4	15.1	5.8	69.7
Over \$100,000	171	6.09	1.2	3.5	4.1	8.2	22.8	12.9	26.9	8.2	12.3	60.3

Table B327. How Informed Respondents Feel About Government Services, Projects, Issues, and Programs That Affect Them by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Not at All Informed 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Well Informed 9	% Above 5
Have Access	385	6.04	2.3	2.9	4.4	7.5	21.8	14.0	26.8	10.1	10.1	61.0
No Access	16	7.13	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	18.8	6.3	18.8	25.0	25.0	75.1

Table B328. How Informed Respondents Feel About Government Services, Projects, Issues, and Programs That Affect Them by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Not at All Informed 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Well Informed 9	% Above 5
English	383	6.15	2.1	2.1	4.2	7.6	20.9	14.1	26.9	11.2	11.0	63.2
Spanish	3	5.00	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3
Chinese	3	3.67	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Korean	4	4.50	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0
Hindi/Gujarati	5	4.80	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	40.0
Other	2	6.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0

Table B329. How Informed Respondents Feel About Government Services, Projects, Issues, and Programs That Affect Them by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Not at All Informed 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Well Informed 9	% Above 5
Caucasian	338	6.14	2.4	1.8	4.1	7.4	21.3	14.5	26.3	11.8	10.4	63.0
African-American	26	6.27	0.0	3.8	3.8	3.8	26.9	11.5	26.9	7.7	15.4	61.5
Asian	20	5.10	5.0	15.0	5.0	10.0	25.0	5.0	25.0	0.0	10.0	40.0
Hispanic	2	6.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
Other	9	5.67	0.0	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	0.0	44.4	0.0	11.1	55.5

Cary's Efforts at Making Information Available to Citizens Crosstabulations

Table B330. Satisfaction with Cary Making Information Available to Citizens About Important Town Services, Projects, Issues and Programs by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18-25	26	6.12	3.8	0.0	0.0	15.4	11.5	19.2	34.6	7.7	7.7	69.2
26-55	283	6.81	0.4	0.0	3.2	2.5	18.0	12.7	27.6	19.8	15.9	76.0
56-65	44	7.09	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.9	15.9	18.2	25.0	22.7	81.8
Over 65	46	7.44	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	6.5	8.7	26.1	26.1	28.3	89.2

Table B331. Satisfaction with Cary Making Information Available to Citizens About Important Town Services, Projects, Issues and Programs by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	122	6.89	0.8	0.0	1.6	4.1	14.8	13.9	26.2	21.3	17.2	78.6
College Degree	278	6.86	0.7	0.0	3.2	2.2	16.5	12.2	27.3	20.1	17.6	77.2

Table B332. Satisfaction with Cary Making Information Available to Citizens About Important Town Services, Projects, Issues and Programs by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Male	187	6.76	0.5	0.0	3.2	4.8	17.1	13.9	23.5	19.3	17.6	74.3
Female	214	6.96	0.9	0.0	2.3	0.9	15.0	12.1	29.9	21.5	17.3	80.8

Table B333. Satisfaction with Cary Making Information Available to Citizens About Important Town Services, Projects, Issues and Programs by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Single family	332	6.88	0.9	0.0	3.0	2.1	16.3	13.0	25.3	21.4	18.1	77.8
Apartment	31	6.94	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.5	12.9	9.7	38.7	16.1	16.1	80.6
Townhouse/Condo	35	6.63	0.0	0.0	2.9	5.7	14.3	17.1	34.3	14.3	11.4	77.1
Duplex	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Other	2	7.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0

Table B334. Satisfaction with Cary Making Information Available to Citizens About Important Town Services, Projects, Issues and Programs by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-\$20,000	5	6.60	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	0.0	60.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	6.31	0.0	0.0	15.4	7.7	7.7	15.4	23.1	15.4	15.4	69.3
\$30,001-\$50,000	35	6.83	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.6	17.1	11.4	25.7	20.0	17.1	74.2
\$50,001-\$70,000	37	7.08	0.0	0.0	5.4	2.7	10.8	10.8	21.6	27.0	21.6	81.0
\$70,001-\$100,000	86	7.07	1.2	0.0	1.2	1.2	9.3	16.3	27.9	29.1	14.0	87.3
Over \$100,000	171	6.81	0.6	0.0	2.3	2.9	20.5	12.3	25.7	15.8	19.9	73.7

Table B335. Satisfaction with Cary Making Information Available to Citizens About Important Town Services, Projects, Issues and Programs by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Have Access	384	6.85	0.8	0.0	2.9	2.6	16.1	13.3	27.1	20.3	16.9	77.6
No Access	15	7.38	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	12.5	6.3	18.8	25.0	31.3	81.4

Table B336. Satisfaction with Cary Making Information Available to Citizens About Important Town Services, Projects, Issues and Programs by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
English	383	6.91	0.5	0.0	2.6	2.6	15.4	12.8	27.7	20.4	18.0	78.9
Spanish	3	7.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	99.9
Chinese	3	4.00	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Korean	4	6.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	75.0
Hindi/Gujarati	5	5.40	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	40.0
Other	2	6.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0

Table B337. Satisfaction with Cary Making Information Available to Citizens About Important Town Services, Projects, Issues and Programs by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Caucasian	338	6.92	0.6	0.0	2.4	2.4	16.0	12.7	26.9	21.3	17.8	78.7
African-American	26	7.15	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	19.2	7.7	23.1	19.2	26.9	76.9
Asian	20	6.00	5.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	15.0	10.0	35.0	15.0	5.0	65.0
Hispanic	2	6.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	9	6.00	0.0	0.0	11.1	11.1	22.2	11.1	22.2	11.1	11.1	55.5

Cary's Efforts at Involving Citizens in Decisions Crosstabulations

Table B338. Satisfaction with Opportunities the Town Gives to Participate in the Decision-Making Process by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18-25	25	5.44	4.0	0.0	8.0	16.0	32.0	8.0	20.0	4.0	8.0	40.0
26-55	278	6.31	1.8	1.4	1.8	4.7	24.5	12.2	30.6	15.1	7.9	65.8
56-65	43	6.54	4.7	0.0	2.3	2.3	20.9	14.0	20.9	16.3	18.6	69.8
Over 65	44	7.02	0.0	2.3	4.5	0.0	13.6	9.1	27.3	18.2	25.0	79.6

Table B339. Satisfaction with Opportunities the Town Gives to Participate in the Decision-Making Process by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	118	6.48	2.5	1.7	1.7	4.2	19.5	14.4	25.4	16.1	14.4	70.3
College Degree	273	6.31	1.8	1.1	2.9	4.8	24.5	11.0	29.7	14.7	9.5	64.9

Table B340. Satisfaction with Opportunities the Town Gives to Participate in the Decision-Making Process by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Male	184	6.32	2.7	1.1	3.3	5.4	23.4	10.3	27.2	13.0	13.6	64.1
Female	208	6.39	1.4	1.4	1.9	3.8	23.1	13.5	29.3	16.8	8.7	68.3

Table B341. Satisfaction with Opportunities the Town Gives to Participate in the Decision-Making Process by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Single family	324	6.41	2.5	1.5	2.2	4.3	20.7	11.7	30.2	15.1	11.7	68.7
Apartment	30	5.97	0.0	0.0	6.7	3.3	43.3	6.7	20.0	13.3	6.7	46.7
Townhouse/Condo	35	6.29	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.6	28.6	20.0	20.0	14.3	8.6	62.9
Duplex	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Other	2	4.00	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table B342. Satisfaction with Opportunities the Town Gives to Participate in the Decision-Making Process by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-\$20,000	5	6.60	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	0.0	60.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	6.00	0.0	0.0	7.7	7.7	23.1	23.1	23.1	7.7	7.7	61.6
\$30,001-\$50,000	35	6.20	0.0	2.9	5.7	5.7	28.6	14.3	14.3	11.4	17.1	57.1
\$50,001-\$70,000	35	6.57	0.0	5.7	2.9	0.0	20.0	17.1	11.4	31.4	11.4	71.3
\$70,001-\$100,000	85	6.58	1.2	0.0	0.0	4.7	18.8	16.5	32.9	18.8	7.1	75.3
Over \$100,000	167	6.20	3.6	1.2	3.0	6.0	23.4	9.6	31.7	9.6	12.0	62.9

Table B343. Satisfaction with Opportunities the Town Gives to Participate in the Decision-Making Process by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Have Access	377	6.33	2.1	1.3	2.4	4.8	23.6	12.2	28.6	14.3	10.6	65.7
No Access	15	7.13	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	13.3	6.7	20.0	33.3	20.0	80.0

Table B344. Satisfaction with Opportunities the Town Gives to Participate in the Decision-Making Process by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
English	374	6.39	1.9	1.3	2.4	4.8	22.2	12.6	28.6	15.0	11.2	67.4
Spanish	3	6.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	66.7
Chinese	3	4.33	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Korean	4	7.25	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	75.0
Hindi/Gujarati	5	5.40	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	40.0
Other	2	6.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0

Table B345. Satisfaction with Opportunities the Town Gives to Participate in the Decision-Making Process by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Caucasian	330	6.46	1.5	1.2	1.5	4.2	23.3	12.4	28.8	15.5	11.5	68.2
African-American	26	5.69	3.8	3.8	7.7	7.7	23.1	15.4	19.2	11.5	7.7	53.8
Asian	20	5.95	10.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	15.0	5.0	35.0	20.0	5.0	65.0
Hispanic	2	6.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
Other	9	5.44	0.0	0.0	11.1	22.2	33.3	0.0	22.2	0.0	11.1	33.3

Solid Waste: Curbside Recycling Service Crosstabulations

Table B346. Satisfaction with Curbside Recycling Service by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18-25	23	7.30	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	13.0	17.4	13.0	17.4	34.8	82.6
26-55	262	7.75	1.1	1.1	1.5	2.3	3.8	3.8	18.3	24.0	43.9	90.0
56-65	41	7.61	0.0	7.3	0.0	0.0	4.9	4.9	12.2	29.3	41.5	87.9
Over 65	42	8.12	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	2.4	4.8	11.9	26.2	52.4	95.3

Table B347. Satisfaction with Curbside Recycling Service by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Single family	329	7.75	0.6	1.5	1.2	2.1	4.3	5.2	17.0	24.9	43.2	90.3
Apartment	7	7.29	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	28.6	0.0	28.6	28.6	85.8
Townhouse/Condo	32	7.72	3.1	3.1	3.1	0.0	3.1	0.0	12.5	25.0	50.0	87.5
Duplex	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Other	2	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	100.0

Table B348. Satisfaction with Curbside Recycling Service by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-1	32	7.06	3.1	6.3	3.1	3.1	9.4	3.1	9.4	25.0	37.5	75.0
2-5	70	7.37	1.4	2.9	1.4	2.9	11.4	2.9	17.1	20.0	40.0	80.0
6-10	75	7.68	0.0	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	8.0	28.0	22.7	36.0	94.7
Over 10	194	8.02	0.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.1	5.2	12.9	27.3	49.0	94.4

Solid Waste: Curbside Garbage Service Crosstabulations

Table B349. Satisfaction with Curbside Garbage Service by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18-25	23	7.65	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.0	4.3	21.7	26.1	34.8	86.9
26-55	268	8.22	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.7	3.4	3.7	8.2	27.6	55.6	95.1
56-65	42	8.33	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	4.8	31.0	59.5	95.3
Over 65	42	8.24	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	2.4	7.1	26.2	59.5	95.2

Table B350. Satisfaction with Curbside Garbage Service by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Single family	332	8.23	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.6	3.6	3.3	8.4	28.6	54.8	95.1
Apartment	13	8.08	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	7.7	7.7	23.1	53.8	92.3
Townhouse/Condo	30	7.83	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	3.3	6.7	26.7	53.3	90.0
Duplex	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Other	2	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	100.0

Table B351. Satisfaction with Curbside Garbage Service by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-1	33	7.82	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	3.0	3.0	21.2	57.6	84.8
2-5	75	8.29	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	4.0	9.3	29.3	54.7	97.3
6-10	74	8.04	1.4	0.0	0.0	1.4	1.4	2.7	18.9	27.0	47.3	95.9
Over 10	196	8.28	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.5	4.1	3.6	5.1	29.1	57.1	94.9

Support for Adding Chipboard and Junk Mail to Curbside Recycling Crosstabulations

Table B352. Support for Adding Chipboard and Junk Mail to the Curbside Recycling Program by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Supportive 9	% Above 5
18-25	24	5.50	20.8	4.2	4.2	0.0	29.2	0.0	4.2	4.2	33.3	41.7
26-55	272	6.71	15.4	0.7	0.4	0.7	16.5	1.1	8.5	8.5	48.2	66.3
56-65	42	6.33	16.7	2.4	2.4	0.0	19.0	2.4	7.1	4.8	45.2	59.5
Over 65	45	5.87	20.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	26.7	4.4	8.9	4.4	33.3	51.0

Table B353. Support for Adding Chipboard and Junk Mail to the Curbside Recycling Program by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Supportive 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	118	5.97	17.8	1.7	1.7	1.7	24.6	1.7	9.3	8.5	33.1	52.6
College Degree	267	6.72	16.1	0.7	0.4	0.4	16.1	1.5	7.1	7.1	50.6	66.3

Table B354. Support for Adding Chipboard and Junk Mail to the Curbside Recycling Program by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Supportive 9	% Above 5
Single family	329	6.64	16.4	0.9	0.3	0.9	15.2	1.8	8.8	8.2	47.4	66.2
Apartment	22	4.82	13.6	4.5	4.5	0.0	59.1	0.0	4.5	4.5	9.1	18.1
Townhouse/Condo	32	5.84	21.9	0.0	3.1	0.0	28.1	0.0	3.1	3.1	40.6	46.8
Duplex	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Other	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0

Table B355. Support for Adding Chipboard and Junk Mail to the Curbside Recycling Program by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Supportive 9	% Above 5
0-\$20,000	4	4.00	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	11	5.27	18.2	9.1	0.0	0.0	36.4	0.0	9.1	0.0	27.3	36.4
\$30,001-\$50,000	31	5.84	22.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.8	0.0	16.1	0.0	35.5	51.6
\$50,001-\$70,000	35	6.54	11.4	0.0	0.0	2.9	31.4	0.0	2.9	8.6	42.9	54.4
\$70,001-\$100,000	83	6.43	18.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.5	3.6	6.0	7.2	44.6	61.4
Over \$100,000	167	6.92	13.8	1.2	0.6	0.6	12.0	1.8	9.6	10.2	50.3	71.9

Table B356. Support for Adding Chipboard and Junk Mail to the Curbside Recycling Program by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Supportive 9	% Above 5
0-1	37	6.78	10.8	0.0	2.7	0.0	24.3	2.7	2.7	8.1	48.6	62.1
2-5	77	6.55	13.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	26.0	1.3	10.4	3.9	44.2	59.8
6-10	78	6.97	11.5	0.0	1.3	0.0	17.9	1.3	9.0	9.0	50.0	69.3
Over 10	194	6.21	21.1	1.5	0.5	1.5	14.9	1.5	7.7	8.2	42.8	60.2

Acceptable Materials for Storm Drains Crosstabulations

Table B357. Acceptable Materials for Storm Drains by Housing Type.

Materials	Single Family % Yes (n=334)	Apartment % Yes (n=31)	Townhouse/ Condo % Yes (n=35)	Duplex % Yes (n=1)	Other % Yes (n=2)
Grass, leaves, natural vegetation	6.3	16.1	20.0	0.0	0.0
Paint	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Grease and oil	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rainwater from gutters	69.2	61.3	71.4	0.0	50.0
Water from swimming pool	17.4	22.6	17.1	0.0	0.0

Table B358. Acceptable Materials for Storm Drains by Primary Language Spoken.

Materials	English % Yes (n=384)	Spanish % Yes (n=3)	Chinese % Yes (n=3)	Korean % Yes (n=4)	Hindi/Gujarati % Yes (n=5)	Other % Yes (n=2)
Grass, leaves, natural vegetation	7.8	33.3	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
Paint	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
Grease and oil	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
Rainwater from gutters	69.4	33.3	66.7	75.0	20.0	100.0
Water from swimming pool	16.9	33.3	33.3	50.0	0.0	100.0

Table B359. Acceptable Materials for Storm Drains by Years in Cary.

Materials	0-1 % Yes (n=39)	2-5 % Yes (n=86)	6-10 % Yes (n=79)	Over 10 % Yes (n=199)
Grass, leaves, natural vegetation	5.1	8.1	7.6	9.0
Paint	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0
Grease and oil	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0
Rainwater from gutters	71.8	68.6	74.7	65.3
Water from swimming pool	23.1	12.8	19.0	18.2

Instant Runoff Voting: Registered to Vote in NC Crosstabulations

Table B360. Registered to Vote in NC by Age.

Age	n	% Yes	% No
18-25	26	84.6	15.4
26-55	284	90.1	9.9
56-65	44	100.0	0.0
Over 65	45	97.8	2.2

Table B361. Registered to Vote in NC by Education.

Education	n	% Yes	% No
HS/Some College	122	89.3	10.7
College Degree	279	92.8	7.2

Table B362. Registered to Vote in NC by Gender.

Gender	n	% Yes	% No
Male	187	91.4	8.6
Female	215	92.1	7.9

Table B363. Registered to Vote in NC by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	% Yes	% No
Single family	333	92.5	7.5
Apartment	31	83.9	16.1
Townhouse/Condo	35	91.4	8.6
Duplex	1	100.0	0.0
Other	2	100.0	0.0

Table B364. Registered to Vote in NC by Income.

Income	n	% Yes	% No
0-\$20,000	5	80.0	20.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	92.3	7.7
\$30,001-\$50,000	34	91.2	8.8
\$50,001-\$70,000	37	91.9	8.1
\$70,001-\$100,000	86	95.3	4.7
Over \$100,000	171	92.4	7.6

Table B365. Registered to Vote in NC by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	% Yes	% No
Have Access	385	91.7	8.3
No Access	16	93.8	6.3

Table B366. Registered to Vote in NC by Race.

Race	n	% Yes	% No
Caucasian	339	94.7	5.3
African-American	26	88.5	11.5
Asian	20	50.0	50.0
Hispanic	2	100.0	0.0
Other	9	77.8	22.2

Table B367. Registered to Vote in NC by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	% Yes	% No
0-1	38	78.9	21.1
2-5	86	93.0	7.0
6-10	79	87.3	12.7
Over 10	199	95.5	4.5

Instant Runoff Voting: Understanding of the Method Crosstabulations

Table B368. How Well Do You Understand the Instant Runoff Voting Method by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Do Not Understand At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Understand Very Well 9	% Above 5
18-25	12	5.00	33.3	8.3	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	8.3	33.3	41.6
26-55	194	5.67	24.7	5.2	2.1	1.5	10.3	3.1	9.8	9.3	34.0	56.2
56-65	38	6.32	13.2	7.9	2.6	0.0	10.5	7.9	10.5	5.3	42.1	65.8
Over 65	36	6.36	13.9	0.0	5.6	0.0	13.9	8.3	13.9	11.1	33.3	66.6

Table B369. How Well Do You Understand the Instant Runoff Voting Method by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Do Not Understand At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Understand Very Well 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	87	5.55	25.3	1.1	3.4	1.1	12.6	6.9	12.6	11.5	25.3	56.3
College Degree	194	5.97	20.6	6.2	2.1	1.0	10.3	3.1	9.3	7.7	39.7	59.8

Table B370. How Well Do You Understand the Instant Runoff Voting Method by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Do Not Understand At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Understand Very Well 9	% Above 5
Male	134	5.90	21.6	3.7	3.7	0.7	12.7	3.0	9.0	7.5	38.1	57.6
Female	148	5.77	22.3	6.1	1.4	1.4	9.5	5.4	11.5	10.1	32.4	59.4

Table B371. How Well Do You Understand the Instant Runoff Voting Method by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Do Not Understand At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Understand Very Well 9	% Above 5
Single family	241	5.99	18.7	5.4	2.9	1.2	10.8	4.6	12.0	9.5	34.9	61.0
Apartment	17	3.65	47.1	5.9	0.0	0.0	23.5	5.9	0.0	5.9	11.8	23.6
Townhouse/Condo	21	5.33	42.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	4.8	47.6	52.4
Duplex	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Other	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0

Table B372. How Well Do You Understand the Instant Runoff Voting Method by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Do Not Understand At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Understand Very Well 9	% Above 5
0-\$20,000	4	5.00	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	50.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	9	5.89	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	22.2	33.3	66.6
\$30,001-\$50,000	25	4.96	36.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.0	4.0	24.0	8.0	16.0	52.0
\$50,001-\$70,000	27	5.89	25.9	0.0	0.0	3.7	7.4	7.4	14.8	3.7	37.0	62.9
\$70,001-\$100,000	54	5.52	25.9	0.0	7.4	0.0	13.0	5.6	9.3	9.3	29.6	53.8
Over \$100,000	123	6.04	19.5	6.5	2.4	0.8	12.2	2.4	5.7	8.1	42.3	58.5

Table B373. How Well Do You Understand the Instant Runoff Voting Method by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Do Not Understand At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Understand Very Well 9	% Above 5
Have Access	268	5.89	20.9	5.2	2.6	1.1	11.2	3.7	10.4	9.0	35.8	58.9
No Access	13	4.62	46.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.4	7.7	7.7	23.1	53.9

Table B374. How Well Do You Understand the Instant Runoff Voting Method by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Do Not Understand At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Understand Very Well 9	% Above 5
Caucasian	250	5.91	22.0	4.8	2.4	1.2	9.6	4.8	8.4	9.2	37.6	60.0
African-American	16	6.38	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	12.5	25.0	62.5
Asian	5	3.40	40.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0
Hispanic	2	3.00	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	3	5.33	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3

Table B375. How Well Do You Understand the Instant Runoff Voting Method by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Do Not Understand At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Understand Very Well 9	% Above 5
0-1	21	4.10	47.6	4.8	0.0	4.8	9.5	0.0	4.8	4.8	23.8	33.4
2-5	53	5.25	30.2	3.8	3.8	1.9	11.3	1.9	5.7	13.2	28.3	49.1
6-10	54	5.52	22.2	7.4	1.9	1.9	13.0	5.6	11.1	7.4	29.6	53.7
Over 10	154	6.38	15.6	4.5	2.6	0.0	10.4	5.2	12.3	8.4	40.9	66.8

Instant Runoff Voting: Support for Using in Future Elections Crosstabulations

Table B376. Support for the Instant Runoff Voting Method Being Used in Future Cary Elections by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Supportive 9	% Above 5
18-25	21	6.38	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	14.3	4.8	38.1	57.2
26-55	245	7.32	4.5	0.0	0.8	0.4	25.3	0.8	6.1	9.0	53.1	69.0
56-65	42	6.69	11.9	2.4	0.0	0.0	21.4	2.4	9.5	7.1	45.2	64.2
Over 65	39	7.49	2.6	0.0	2.6	0.0	15.4	7.7	12.8	5.1	53.8	79.4

Table B377. Support for the Instant Runoff Voting Method Being Used in Future Cary Elections by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Supportive 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	104	7.05	4.8	0.0	1.9	0.0	27.9	2.9	9.6	5.8	47.1	65.4
College Degree	245	7.29	6.1	0.4	0.4	0.4	22.4	0.8	6.9	9.0	53.5	70.2

Table B378. Support for the Instant Runoff Voting Method Being Used in Future Cary Elections by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Supportive 9	% Above 5
Male	165	7.07	9.7	0.6	1.2	0.6	18.8	1.8	5.5	9.7	52.1	69.1
Female	185	7.34	2.2	0.0	0.5	0.0	28.6	1.6	9.7	6.5	50.8	68.6

Table B379. Support for the Instant Runoff Voting Method Being Used in Future Cary Elections by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Supportive 9	% Above 5
Single family	295	7.25	5.8	0.3	1.0	0.3	22.4	1.7	7.8	8.8	51.9	70.2
Apartment	25	6.48	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.0	4.0	12.0	8.0	28.0	52.0
Townhouse/Condo	27	7.59	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.9	0.0	3.7	0.0	66.7	70.4
Duplex	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Other	2	5.00	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0

Table B380. Support for the Instant Runoff Voting Method Being Used in Future Cary Elections by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Supportive 9	% Above 5
0-\$20,000	4	6.00	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	12	7.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	8.3	8.3	58.3	74.9
\$30,001-\$50,000	32	7.09	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	31.3	3.1	15.6	0.0	46.9	65.6
\$50,001-\$70,000	30	6.50	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.3	10.0	10.0	0.0	43.3	63.3
\$70,001-\$100,000	78	7.40	3.8	0.0	1.3	0.0	23.1	1.3	11.5	2.6	56.4	71.8
Over \$100,000	148	7.18	6.1	0.7	1.4	0.0	25.0	0.0	4.7	10.8	51.4	66.9

Table B381. Support for the Instant Runoff Voting Method Being Used in Future Cary Elections by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Supportive 9	% Above 5
Have Access	336	7.27	5.7	0.3	0.9	0.3	22.9	1.5	7.4	8.3	52.7	69.9
No Access	13	6.00	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	46.2	7.7	15.4	0.0	23.1	46.2

Table B382. Support for the Instant Runoff Voting Method Being Used in Future Cary Elections by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Supportive 9	% Above 5
Caucasian	304	7.24	6.3	0.0	1.0	0.3	22.4	1.6	8.2	7.9	52.3	70.0
African-American	23	7.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	26.1	0.0	4.3	8.7	60.9	73.9
Asian	8	6.38	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	62.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	25.0	37.5
Hispanic	2	5.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	7	6.00	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	42.9	0.0	14.3	0.0	28.6	42.9

Table B383. Support for the Instant Runoff Voting Method Being Used in Future Cary Elections by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Supportive 9	% Above 5
0-1	27	6.89	7.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	29.6	0.0	11.1	11.1	40.7	62.9
2-5	76	7.01	3.9	0.0	2.6	0.0	34.2	1.3	2.6	5.3	50.0	59.2
6-10	67	7.28	7.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.9	3.0	17.9	7.5	49.3	77.7
Over 10	180	7.32	5.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	22.2	1.7	5.6	8.9	54.4	70.6

Emergency Preparedness: Possession of 3-Day Emergency Kit Crosstabulations

Table B384. Possession of 3-Day Emergency Kit by Age.

Age	n	% Yes	% No	% Don't Know
18-25	26	34.6	65.4	0.0
26-55	284	41.2	58.5	0.4
56-65	44	54.5	45.5	0.0
Over 65	46	45.7	54.3	0.0

Table B385. Possession of 3-Day Emergency Kit by Children in Household Under 18.

Children	n	% Yes	% No	% Don't Know
No children	215	46.5	53.0	0.5
Have children	188	37.8	62.2	0.0

Table B386. Possession of 3-Day Emergency Kit by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	% Yes	% No	% Don't Know
Single family	334	42.5	57.2	0.3
Apartment	31	32.3	67.7	0.0
Townhouse/Condo	35	51.4	48.6	0.0
Duplex	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Other	2	50.0	50.0	0.0

Table B387. Possession of 3-Day Emergency Kit by Income.

Income	n	% Yes	% No	% Don't Know
0-\$20,000	5	60.0	40.0	0.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	61.5	38.5	0.0
\$30,001-\$50,000	35	42.9	57.1	0.0
\$50,001-\$70,000	37	48.6	51.4	0.0
\$70,001-\$100,000	86	33.7	66.3	0.0
Over \$100,000	171	43.3	56.7	0.0

Table B388. Possession of 3-Day Emergency Kit by Race.

Race	n	% Yes	% No	% Don't Know
Caucasian	340	42.6	57.4	0.0
African-American	26	38.5	61.5	0.0
Asian	20	40.0	55.0	5.0
Hispanic	2	50.0	50.0	0.0
Other	9	55.6	44.4	0.0

Emergency Preparedness: Family Emergency Plan Crosstabulations

Table B389. Family Emergency Plan If Disaster Struck During Work or School by Age.

Age	n	% Yes	% No
18-25	26	38.5	61.5
26-55	284	47.9	52.1
56-65	44	68.2	31.8
Over 65	46	50.0	50.0

Table B390. Family Emergency Plan If Disaster Struck During Work or School by Children in Household Under 18.

Children	n	% Yes	% No
No children	215	50.7	49.3
Have children	188	48.4	51.6

Table B391. Family Emergency Plan If Disaster Struck During Work or School by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	% Yes	% No
Single family	334	50.9	49.1
Apartment	31	58.1	41.9
Townhouse/Condo	35	31.4	68.6
Duplex	1	100.0	0.0
Other	2	0.0	100.0

Table B392. Family Emergency Plan If Disaster Struck During Work or School by Income.

Income	n	% Yes	% No
0-\$20,000	5	40.0	60.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	61.5	38.5
\$30,001-\$50,000	35	48.6	51.4
\$50,001-\$70,000	37	51.4	48.6
\$70,001-\$100,000	86	41.9	58.1
Over \$100,000	171	54.4	45.6

Table B393. Family Emergency Plan If Disaster Struck During Work or School by Race.

Race	n	% Yes	% No
Caucasian	340	49.4	50.6
African-American	26	57.7	42.3
Asian	20	35.0	65.0
Hispanic	2	50.0	50.0
Other	9	55.6	44.4

Primary Language Spoken Crosstabulations

Table B394. Primary Language Spoken in the Household by Children in Household Under 18.

Children	n	% English	% Spanish	% Chinese	% Korean	% Hindi/Gujarati	% Other
No children	215	98.1	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0
Have children	187	93.0	1.1	1.6	2.1	1.1	1.1

Table B395. Primary Language Spoken in the Household by Education.

Education	n	% English	% Spanish	% Chinese	% Korean	% Hindi/Gujarati	% Other
HS/Some College	122	96.7	0.8	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.8
College Degree	280	95.4	0.7	1.1	0.7	1.8	0.4

Table B396. Primary Language Spoken in the Household by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	% English	% Spanish	% Chinese	% Korean	% Hindi/Gujarati	% Other
Single family	333	95.2	0.6	0.9	1.2	1.5	0.6
Apartment	31	96.8	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Townhouse/Condo	35	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Duplex	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table B397. Primary Language Spoken in the Household by Income.

Income	n	% English	% Spanish	% Chinese	% Korean	% Hindi/Gujarati	% Other
0-\$20,000	5	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
\$30,001-\$50,000	35	91.4	2.9	0.0	0.0	2.9	2.9
\$50,001-\$70,000	37	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
\$70,001-\$100,000	86	97.7	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.2	0.0
Over \$100,000	171	94.2	1.2	1.8	1.2	1.2	0.6

Table B398. Primary Language Spoken in the Household by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	% English	% Spanish	% Chinese	% Korean	% Hindi/Gujarati	% Other
0-1	39	94.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	2.6
2-5	86	95.3	1.2	1.2	2.3	0.0	0.0
6-10	79	89.9	1.3	2.5	2.5	2.5	1.3
Over 10	198	98.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0

Household Literacy Crosstabulations

Table B399. Number of Adults in Household Who Cannot Read for Any Reason by Children in Household Under 18.

Children	n	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
No children	215	99.1	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Have children	188	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table B400. Number of Adults in Household Who Cannot Read for Any Reason by Education.

Education	n	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
HS/Some College	122	99.2	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
College Degree	280	99.6	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table B401. Number of Adults in Household Who Cannot Read for Any Reason by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
Single family	334	99.4	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Apartment	31	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Townhouse/Condo	35	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Duplex	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table B402. Number of Adults in Household Who Cannot Read for Any Reason by Income.

Income	n	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
0-\$20,000	5	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
\$30,001-\$50,000	35	94.3	2.9	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
\$50,001-\$70,000	37	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
\$70,001-\$100,000	86	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Over \$100,000	171	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table B403. Number of Adults in Household Who Cannot Read for Any Reason by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
0-1	39	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2-5	86	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
6-10	79	98.7	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Over 10	199	99.5	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0

Sense of Community: Importance in Neighborhood Crosstabulations

Table B404. Importance of Having a Sense of Community with Neighbors by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Not Important At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Important 9	% Above 5
18-25	25	7.56	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	20.0	8.0	4.0	8.0	56.0	76.0
26-55	284	7.71	1.1	0.7	0.7	1.1	8.8	8.5	15.8	13.7	49.6	87.6
56-65	44	7.96	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	6.8	15.9	15.9	52.3	90.9
Over 65	46	7.98	2.2	2.2	0.0	0.0	6.5	2.2	13.0	10.9	63.0	89.1

Table B405. Importance of Having a Sense of Community with Neighbors by Children in Household Under 18.

Children	n	Mean	Not Important At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Important 9	% Above 5
No children	214	7.59	0.9	0.5	1.4	0.9	13.6	6.5	16.4	10.7	49.1	82.7
Have children	188	7.96	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.5	4.3	8.5	13.3	16.5	54.8	93.1

Table B406. Importance of Having a Sense of Community with Neighbors by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Not Important At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Important 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	121	7.65	0.8	0.8	1.7	0.0	10.7	6.6	19.8	9.9	49.6	85.9
College Degree	280	7.81	1.1	0.7	0.4	1.1	8.6	7.5	12.9	15.0	52.9	88.3

Table B407. Importance of Having a Sense of Community with Neighbors by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Not Important At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Important 9	% Above 5
Male	188	7.62	0.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	13.8	6.4	14.9	14.9	46.8	83.0
Female	214	7.89	1.9	0.5	0.5	0.5	5.1	8.4	15.0	12.1	56.1	91.6

Table B408. Importance of Having a Sense of Community with Neighbors by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Not Important At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Important 9	% Above 5
Single family	334	7.88	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.9	7.8	7.5	15.3	15.6	51.8	90.2
Apartment	30	6.73	6.7	3.3	0.0	0.0	23.3	10.0	13.3	0.0	43.3	66.6
Townhouse/Condo	35	7.43	2.9	2.9	2.9	0.0	11.4	5.7	14.3	5.7	54.3	80.0
Duplex	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Other	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0

Table B409. Importance of Having a Sense of Community with Neighbors by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Not Important At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Important 9	% Above 5
0-\$20,000	5	6.00	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	60.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	7.46	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	7.7	7.7	23.1	0.0	53.8	84.6
\$30,001-\$50,000	34	7.65	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	5.9	11.8	20.6	14.7	44.1	91.2
\$50,001-\$70,000	37	7.65	2.7	0.0	2.7	2.7	8.1	2.7	18.9	5.4	56.8	83.8
\$70,001-\$100,000	86	7.69	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.0	15.1	2.3	17.4	11.6	51.2	82.5
Over \$100,000	171	7.96	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	7.0	8.8	12.9	18.1	52.0	91.8

Table B410. Importance of Having a Sense of Community with Neighbors by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	Not Important At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Important 9	% Above 5
Have Access	385	7.82	0.5	0.5	0.8	0.8	9.1	7.5	14.5	14.0	52.2	88.2
No Access	16	6.50	12.5	6.3	0.0	0.0	12.5	6.3	18.8	0.0	43.8	68.9

Table B411. Importance of Having a Sense of Community with Neighbors by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	Not Important At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Important 9	% Above 5
English	384	7.74	1.0	0.8	0.8	0.8	9.6	7.6	14.6	13.3	51.6	87.1
Spanish	3	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7	100.0
Chinese	3	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7	100.0
Korean	4	8.25	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	50.0	100.0
Hindi/Gujarati	5	8.60	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	60.0	100.0
Other	2	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	100.0

Table B412. Importance of Having a Sense of Community with Neighbors by Literacy.

Literacy	n	Mean	Not Important At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Important 9	% Above 5
All Literate	400	7.76	1.0	0.8	0.8	0.8	9.3	7.5	14.8	13.3	52.0	87.6
1 or More Illiterate	2	7.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	100.0

Table B413. Importance of Having a Sense of Community with Neighbors by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Not Important At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Important 9	% Above 5
Caucasian	339	7.74	0.9	0.6	0.9	0.9	9.1	8.3	15.3	13.3	50.7	87.6
African-American	26	7.81	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	15.4	0.0	7.7	15.4	57.7	80.8
Asian	20	7.85	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	30.0	15.0	45.0	90.0
Hispanic	2	5.00	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Other	9	8.89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	88.9	100.0

Table B414. Importance of Having a Sense of Community with Neighbors by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Not Important At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Important 9	% Above 5
0-1	38	7.63	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	7.9	13.2	15.8	15.8	44.7	89.5
2-5	86	7.67	1.2	1.2	1.2	2.3	10.5	8.1	11.6	7.0	57.0	83.7
6-10	79	7.81	1.3	0.0	1.3	0.0	10.1	5.1	12.7	20.3	49.4	87.5
Over 10	199	7.80	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	8.5	7.0	17.1	13.1	51.8	89.0

Sense of Community: Strength in Neighborhood Crosstabulations

Table B415. Perceived Strength of the Sense of Community Actually Felt with Neighbors by Age.

Age	n	Mean	No Sense of Community At All				Neutral					A Very Strong Sense of Community	% Above 5
			1	2	3	4		5	6	7	8		
18-25	25	5.52	0.0	12.0	12.0	8.0	24.0	8.0	12.0	8.0	16.0	44.0	
26-55	283	6.60	1.8	2.5	4.9	5.3	14.8	11.0	21.6	17.3	20.8	70.7	
56-65	43	6.88	0.0	4.7	9.3	2.3	11.6	4.7	14.0	23.3	30.2	72.2	
Over 65	46	7.13	4.3	0.0	6.5	2.2	10.9	4.3	17.4	10.9	43.5	76.1	

Table B416. Perceived Strength of the Sense of Community Actually Felt with Neighbors by Children in Household Under 18.

Children	n	Mean	No Sense of Community At All				Neutral					A Very Strong Sense of Community	% Above 5
			1	2	3	4		5	6	7	8		
No children	212	6.59	1.9	2.4	7.5	4.2	18.4	6.6	18.4	12.7	27.8	65.5	
Have children	188	6.69	1.6	3.7	4.3	5.3	10.1	12.2	20.7	21.8	20.2	74.9	

Table B417. Perceived Strength of the Sense of Community Actually Felt with Neighbors by Education.

Education	n	Mean	No Sense of Community At All				Neutral					A Very Strong Sense of Community	% Above 5
			1	2	3	4		5	6	7	8		
HS/Some College	119	6.65	0.0	4.2	9.2	2.5	16.0	6.7	18.5	16.8	26.1	68.1	
College Degree	280	6.64	2.5	2.5	4.6	5.7	13.6	10.4	20.0	17.1	23.6	71.1	

Table B418. Perceived Strength of the Sense of Community Actually Felt with Neighbors by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	No Sense of Community At All				Neutral					A Very Strong Sense of Community	% Above 5
			1	2	3	4		5	6	7	8		
Male	188	6.48	1.1	2.7	8.5	3.2	17.0	10.1	20.2	18.6	18.6	67.5	
Female	212	6.77	2.4	3.3	3.8	6.1	12.3	8.5	18.9	15.6	29.2	72.2	

Table B419. Perceived Strength of the Sense of Community Actually Felt with Neighbors by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	No Sense of Community At All				Neutral					A Very Strong Sense of Community	% Above 5
			1	2	3	4		5	6	7	8		
Single family	332	6.78	1.2	1.8	5.4	4.5	13.9	9.9	20.2	18.7	24.4	73.2	
Apartment	30	5.10	10.0	13.3	3.3	6.7	26.7	6.7	13.3	10.0	10.0	40.0	
Townhouse/Condo	35	6.43	0.0	5.7	14.3	5.7	11.4	5.7	17.1	5.7	34.3	62.8	
Duplex	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	
Other	2	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	100.0	

Table B420. Perceived Strength of the Sense of Community Actually Felt with Neighbors by Income.

Income	n	Mean	No Sense of Community At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	A Very Strong Sense of Community 9	% Above 5
0-\$20,000	5	6.60	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	40.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	5.62	0.0	23.1	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	15.4	7.7	23.1	53.9
\$30,001-\$50,000	34	6.24	2.9	8.8	2.9	2.9	17.6	8.8	20.6	20.6	14.7	64.7
\$50,001-\$70,000	37	6.35	5.4	2.7	13.5	8.1	5.4	2.7	18.9	13.5	29.7	64.8
\$70,001-\$100,000	84	6.86	1.2	1.2	2.4	6.0	15.5	9.5	25.0	11.9	27.4	73.8
Over \$100,000	171	6.73	1.2	1.8	5.8	4.7	13.5	12.3	19.3	18.1	23.4	73.1

Table B421. Perceived Strength of the Sense of Community Actually Felt with Neighbors by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Mean	No Sense of Community At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	A Very Strong Sense of Community 9	% Above 5
Have Access	384	6.63	1.6	2.9	6.3	4.9	14.3	9.4	19.5	17.7	23.4	70.0
No Access	15	6.60	6.7	6.7	0.0	0.0	20.0	6.7	20.0	0.0	40.0	66.7

Table B422. Perceived Strength of the Sense of Community Actually Felt with Neighbors by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Mean	No Sense of Community At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	A Very Strong Sense of Community 9	% Above 5
English	382	6.64	1.8	3.1	5.8	4.7	14.4	9.4	19.4	16.8	24.6	70.2
Spanish	3	7.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	66.6
Chinese	3	6.00	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	66.6
Korean	4	6.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	75.0
Hindi/Gujarati	5	7.40	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	80.0
Other	2	5.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0

Table B423. Perceived Strength of the Sense of Community Actually Felt with Neighbors by Literacy.

Literacy	n	Mean	No Sense of Community At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	A Very Strong Sense of Community 9	% Above 5
All Literate	398	6.64	1.8	3.0	6.0	4.8	14.3	9.3	19.6	16.8	24.4	70.1
1 or More Illiterate	2	6.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0

Table B424. Perceived Strength of the Sense of Community Actually Felt with Neighbors by Race.

Race	n	Mean	No Sense of Community At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	A Very Strong Sense of Community 9	% Above 5
Caucasian	337	6.62	1.8	2.7	6.2	4.2	14.8	10.4	19.9	16.3	23.7	70.3
African-American	26	6.62	0.0	11.5	3.8	7.7	11.5	0.0	19.2	11.5	34.6	65.3
Asian	20	6.70	0.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	15.0	5.0	20.0	30.0	15.0	70.0
Hispanic	2	3.00	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	9	7.22	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0	11.1	0.0	33.3	33.3	77.7

Table B425. Perceived Strength of the Sense of Community Actually Felt with Neighbors by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	No Sense of Community At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	A Very Strong Sense of Community 9	% Above 5
0-1	38	6.66	0.0	7.9	2.6	2.6	18.4	15.8	7.9	13.2	31.6	68.5
2-5	86	6.20	2.3	5.8	10.5	4.7	15.1	7.0	19.8	14.0	20.9	61.7
6-10	79	6.62	2.5	2.5	7.6	2.5	13.9	8.9	21.5	16.5	24.1	71.0
Over 10	197	6.83	1.5	1.0	4.1	6.1	13.7	9.1	20.8	19.3	24.4	73.6

Sense of Community: Interact with Neighbors Crosstabulations

Table B426. How Often Interact with Neighbors from Just Saying Hello to Visiting Them to Exchanging Favors by Age.

Age	n	Never	Once or Twice a Year	Once or Twice a Month	Once or Twice a Week	Everyday
18-25	26	3.8	11.5	26.9	30.8	26.9
26-55	284	1.1	3.5	19.0	47.5	28.9
56-65	44	2.3	0.0	20.5	38.6	38.6
Over 65	46	2.2	2.2	13.0	37.0	45.7

Table B427. How Often Interact with Neighbors from Just Saying Hello to Visiting Them to Exchanging Favors by Children in Household Under 18.

Children	n	Never	Once or Twice a Year	Once or Twice a Month	Once or Twice a Week	Everyday
No children	215	2.3	3.7	20.5	41.9	31.6
Have children	188	0.5	3.2	17.0	46.8	32.4

Table B428. How Often Interact with Neighbors from Just Saying Hello to Visiting Them to Exchanging Favors by Education.

Education	n	Never	Once or Twice a Year	Once or Twice a Month	Once or Twice a Week	Everyday
HS/Some College	122	1.6	4.9	20.5	37.7	35.2
College Degree	280	1.4	2.9	18.2	46.8	30.7

Table B429. How Often Interact with Neighbors from Just Saying Hello to Visiting Them to Exchanging Favors by Gender.

Gender	n	Never	Once or Twice a Year	Once or Twice a Month	Once or Twice a Week	Everyday
Male	188	1.6	2.7	18.1	46.8	30.9
Female	215	1.4	4.2	19.5	41.9	33.0

Table B430. How Often Interact with Neighbors from Just Saying Hello to Visiting Them to Exchanging Favors by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Never	Once or Twice a Year	Once or Twice a Month	Once or Twice a Week	Everyday
Single family	334	0.3	3.0	18.6	47.0	31.1
Apartment	31	16.1	12.9	22.6	29.0	19.4
Townhouse/Condo	35	0.0	0.0	20.0	34.3	45.7
Duplex	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Table B431. How Often Interact with Neighbors from Just Saying Hello to Visiting Them to Exchanging Favors by Income.

Income	n	Never	Once or Twice a Year	Once or Twice a Month	Once or Twice a Week	Everyday
0-\$20,000	5	20.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	20.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	7.7	7.7	30.8	15.4	38.5
\$30,001-\$50,000	35	0.0	14.3	17.1	37.1	31.4
\$50,001-\$70,000	37	2.7	5.4	21.6	27.0	43.2
\$70,001-\$100,000	86	0.0	2.3	17.4	43.0	37.2
Over \$100,000	171	1.2	1.8	19.9	50.9	26.3

Table B432. How Often Interact with Neighbors from Just Saying Hello to Visiting Them to Exchanging Favors by Internet Access.

Internet Access	n	Never	Once or Twice a Year	Once or Twice a Month	Once or Twice a Week	Everyday
Have Access	386	1.0	3.4	18.9	45.3	31.3
No Access	16	12.5	6.3	18.8	18.8	43.8

Table B433. How Often Interact with Neighbors from Just Saying Hello to Visiting Them to Exchanging Favors by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Never	Once or Twice a Year	Once or Twice a Month	Once or Twice a Week	Everyday
English	385	1.6	3.6	18.7	42.9	33.2
Spanish	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3
Chinese	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Korean	4	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Hindi/Gujarati	5	0.0	0.0	20.0	80.0	0.0
Other	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0

Table B434. How Often Interact with Neighbors from Just Saying Hello to Visiting Them to Exchanging Favors by Literacy.

Literacy	n	Never	Once or Twice a Year	Once or Twice a Month	Once or Twice a Week	Everyday
All Literate	401	1.5	3.5	19.0	43.9	32.2
1 or More Illiterate	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0

Table B435. How Often Interact with Neighbors from Just Saying Hello to Visiting Them to Exchanging Favors by Race.

Race	n	Never	Once or Twice a Year	Once or Twice a Month	Once or Twice a Week	Everyday
Caucasian	340	0.6	3.2	20.0	43.8	32.4
African-American	26	7.7	11.5	11.5	30.8	38.5
Asian	20	0.0	0.0	20.0	70.0	10.0
Hispanic	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
Other	9	11.1	0.0	11.1	44.4	33.3

Table B436. How Often Interact with Neighbors from Just Saying Hello to Visiting Them to Exchanging Favors by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Never	Once or Twice a Year	Once or Twice a Month	Once or Twice a Week	Everyday
0-1	39	0.0	5.1	23.1	35.9	35.9
2-5	86	2.3	7.0	23.3	37.2	30.2
6-10	79	2.5	3.8	13.9	45.6	34.2
Over 10	199	1.0	1.5	18.1	48.2	31.2

**Town Council Focus Areas: Satisfaction with Overall Job Town is Doing
with Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Programs Crosstabulations**

Table B437. Satisfaction with Overall Job the Town is Doing on Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources Issues by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18-25	25	6.80	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	20.0	20.0	28.0	4.0	24.0	76.0
26-55	283	7.59	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	8.1	7.4	26.9	29.0	27.9	91.2
56-65	44	7.25	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	15.9	4.5	25.0	31.8	20.5	81.8
Over 65	46	7.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.9	6.5	19.6	28.3	21.7	76.1

Table B438. Satisfaction with Overall Job the Town is Doing on Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources Issues by Children in Household Under 18.

Children	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
No children	213	7.24	0.0	0.5	0.0	1.4	16.0	8.9	24.9	25.8	22.5	82.1
Have children	188	7.71	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.4	6.4	27.1	29.8	30.3	93.6

Table B439. Satisfaction with Overall Job the Town is Doing on Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources Issues by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	121	7.20	0.0	0.8	0.0	1.7	17.4	8.3	23.1	25.6	23.1	80.1
College Degree	279	7.57	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	9.0	7.5	27.2	28.3	27.6	90.6

Table B440. Satisfaction with Overall Job the Town is Doing on Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources Issues by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Single family	333	7.54	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.6	8.1	7.5	27.9	30.3	25.2	90.9
Apartment	30	7.03	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	26.7	10.0	16.7	10.0	33.3	70.0
Townhouse/Condo	35	6.97	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	31.4	8.6	17.1	17.1	25.7	68.5
Duplex	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Other	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0

Table B441. Satisfaction with Overall Job the Town is Doing on Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources Issues by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-\$20,000	5	6.80	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	60.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	6.77	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	30.8	7.7	15.4	7.7	30.8	61.6
\$30,001-\$50,000	34	7.12	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	20.6	11.8	14.7	26.5	23.5	76.5
\$50,001-\$70,000	37	7.51	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.6	5.4	13.5	18.9	40.5	78.3
\$70,001-\$100,000	86	7.59	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.1	7.0	27.9	31.4	25.6	91.9
Over \$100,000	170	7.55	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	7.1	8.8	28.8	30.0	24.7	92.3

Table B442. Satisfaction with Overall Job the Town is Doing on Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources Issues by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Caucasian	338	7.49	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.6	10.7	7.4	26.9	26.9	27.2	88.4
African-American	26	7.62	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.2	3.8	7.7	34.6	34.6	80.7
Asian	20	7.10	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	50.0	20.0	10.0	90.0
Hispanic	2	7.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	100.0
Other	9	6.56	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	22.2	11.1	11.1	44.4	0.0	66.6

Table B443. Satisfaction with Overall Job the Town is Doing on Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources Issues by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-1	38	7.58	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.2	0.0	31.6	26.3	28.9	86.8
2-5	85	7.47	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.1	9.4	20.0	28.2	28.2	85.8
6-10	79	7.61	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	7.6	6.3	25.3	30.4	29.1	91.1
Over 10	199	7.37	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	11.6	9.0	27.6	26.6	23.6	86.8

Town Council Focus Areas: Satisfaction with Environment Protection Crosstabulations

Table B444. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Environmental Protection by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18-25	26	6.15	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	38.5	11.5	30.8	11.5	3.8	57.6
26-55	280	7.06	1.1	0.0	1.1	1.8	15.4	13.2	22.9	23.2	21.4	80.7
56-65	43	7.26	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.0	4.7	30.2	25.6	23.3	83.8
Over 65	45	7.20	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	13.3	8.9	33.3	22.2	20.0	84.4

Table B445. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Environmental Protection by Children in Household Under 18.

Children	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
No children	212	7.00	0.9	0.0	1.4	0.9	19.3	11.3	23.6	20.8	21.7	77.4
Have children	185	7.08	1.1	0.0	0.5	2.2	13.5	12.4	27.0	24.3	18.9	82.6

Table B446. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Environmental Protection by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	121	6.91	1.7	0.0	1.7	0.8	23.1	7.4	22.3	22.3	20.7	72.7
College Degree	275	7.09	0.7	0.0	0.7	1.8	13.8	13.8	26.5	22.2	20.4	82.9

Table B447. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Environmental Protection by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Single family	330	7.11	0.6	0.0	0.6	1.8	15.5	11.2	26.1	23.6	20.6	81.5
Apartment	31	6.81	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	22.6	16.1	19.4	22.6	16.1	74.2
Townhouse/Condo	33	6.67	3.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	21.2	15.2	24.2	12.1	21.2	72.7
Duplex	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Other	2	3.00	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table B448. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Environmental Protection by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-\$20,000	5	4.80	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	40.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	6.92	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.4	23.1	30.8	15.4	15.4	84.7
\$30,001-\$50,000	35	6.69	0.0	0.0	2.9	2.9	17.1	14.3	37.1	14.3	11.4	77.1
\$50,001-\$70,000	35	6.86	2.9	0.0	0.0	2.9	25.7	8.6	8.6	31.4	20.0	68.6
\$70,001-\$100,000	86	7.26	1.2	0.0	0.0	1.2	14.0	12.8	19.8	25.6	25.6	83.8
Over \$100,000	167	7.02	0.6	0.0	1.8	1.8	16.2	12.0	25.7	21.0	21.0	79.7

Table B449. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Environmental Protection by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Caucasian	335	7.05	0.9	0.0	0.9	1.5	16.7	11.9	26.0	20.6	21.5	80.0
African-American	26	7.15	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.4	11.5	15.4	26.9	26.9	80.7
Asian	19	6.84	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.1	10.5	36.8	26.3	5.3	78.9
Hispanic	2	5.50	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
Other	9	6.89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	11.1	22.2	44.4	0.0	77.7

Table B450. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Environmental Protection by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-1	38	7.05	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.2	15.8	23.7	26.3	18.4	84.2
2-5	85	6.93	0.0	0.0	1.2	4.7	22.4	10.6	17.6	20.0	23.5	71.7
6-10	76	6.75	2.6	0.0	2.6	0.0	19.7	9.2	28.9	23.7	13.2	75.0
Over 10	198	7.19	0.5	0.0	0.5	1.0	13.6	12.6	27.3	22.2	22.2	84.3

Town Council Focus Areas: Satisfaction with Keeping Cary the Best Place to Live, Work, and Raise a Family Crosstabulations

Table B451. Effectiveness of Town Council in Working to Keep Cary the Best Place to Live, Work, and Raise a Family by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Ineffective 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Effective 9	% Above 5
18-25	26	6.92	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.8	3.8	26.9	19.2	19.2	69.1
26-55	279	6.85	1.1	0.0	0.7	2.9	16.1	14.3	30.1	20.4	14.3	79.1
56-65	44	6.57	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.3	9.1	25.0	20.5	13.6	68.2
Over 65	46	7.02	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	21.7	6.5	28.3	19.6	21.7	76.1

Table B452. Effectiveness of Town Council in Working to Keep Cary the Best Place to Live, Work, and Raise a Family by Children in Household Under 18.

Children	n	Mean	Very Ineffective 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Effective 9	% Above 5
No children	213	6.78	1.9	0.5	0.0	1.9	23.0	9.4	28.6	17.4	17.4	72.8
Have children	185	6.91	0.5	0.0	1.1	2.2	14.6	15.7	29.2	23.2	13.5	81.6

Table B453. Effectiveness of Town Council in Working to Keep Cary the Best Place to Live, Work, and Raise a Family by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Ineffective 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Effective 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	122	6.93	0.8	0.8	0.8	1.6	20.5	8.2	28.7	18.0	20.5	75.4
College Degree	275	6.79	1.5	0.0	0.4	2.2	18.5	14.2	29.1	21.1	13.1	77.5

Table B454. Effectiveness of Town Council in Working to Keep Cary the Best Place to Live, Work, and Raise a Family by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Ineffective 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Effective 9	% Above 5
Single family	330	6.83	1.5	0.3	0.6	2.4	17.6	12.1	31.2	18.2	16.1	77.6
Apartment	31	6.97	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.8	9.7	16.1	38.7	9.7	74.2
Townhouse/Condo	34	6.79	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	26.5	17.6	20.6	20.6	14.7	73.5
Duplex	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Other	2	7.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0

Table B455. Effectiveness of Town Council in Working to Keep Cary the Best Place to Live, Work, and Raise a Family by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Ineffective 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Effective 9	% Above 5
0-\$20,000	5	6.60	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	60.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	6.62	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.8	30.8	7.7	7.7	23.1	69.3
\$30,001-\$50,000	35	6.86	2.9	0.0	2.9	0.0	11.4	8.6	37.1	28.6	8.6	82.9
\$50,001-\$70,000	37	6.84	0.0	2.7	0.0	2.7	24.3	5.4	21.6	27.0	16.2	70.2
\$70,001-\$100,000	86	7.02	0.0	0.0	1.2	3.5	12.8	10.5	36.0	18.6	17.4	82.5
Over \$100,000	167	6.71	2.4	0.0	0.0	2.4	20.4	13.2	29.9	17.4	14.4	74.9

Table B456. Effectiveness of Town Council in Working to Keep Cary the Best Place to Live, Work, and Raise a Family by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Ineffective 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Effective 9	% Above 5
Caucasian	335	6.81	1.5	0.3	0.6	2.1	18.8	13.1	28.7	19.4	15.5	76.7
African-American	26	7.12	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.2	7.7	30.8	26.9	15.4	80.8
Asian	20	7.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	15.0	5.0	40.0	20.0	15.0	80.0
Hispanic	2	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	100.0
Other	9	6.44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.4	0.0	22.2	33.3	0.0	55.5

Table B457. Effectiveness of Town Council in Working to Keep Cary the Best Place to Live, Work, and Raise a Family by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Ineffective 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Effective 9	% Above 5
0-1	37	7.16	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	13.5	8.1	29.7	32.4	13.5	83.7
2-5	86	6.93	1.2	0.0	1.2	0.0	17.4	14.0	30.2	18.6	17.4	80.2
6-10	78	6.92	0.0	0.0	1.3	1.3	23.1	9.0	24.4	25.6	15.4	74.4
Over 10	197	6.71	2.0	0.5	0.0	3.0	19.3	13.7	29.9	16.2	15.2	75.0

Town Council Focus Areas: Satisfaction with Transportation Crosstabulations

Table B458. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Transportation by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18-25	26	6.50	3.8	0.0	0.0	3.8	19.2	15.4	23.1	30.8	3.8	73.1
26-55	282	6.68	0.0	0.4	1.8	8.5	16.3	13.1	23.8	24.1	12.1	73.1
56-65	44	6.68	2.3	2.3	0.0	9.1	9.1	13.6	22.7	29.5	11.4	77.2
Over 65	46	6.65	2.2	0.0	4.3	4.3	19.6	4.3	28.3	21.7	15.2	69.5

Table B459. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Transportation by Children in Household Under 18.

Children	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
No children	214	6.57	1.4	0.5	2.3	7.9	17.8	10.7	24.8	22.4	12.1	70.0
Have children	187	6.78	0.0	0.5	1.1	8.0	13.9	13.9	23.5	27.8	11.2	76.4

Table B460. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Transportation by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	121	6.65	1.7	0.0	0.8	5.8	24.0	7.4	24.0	22.3	14.0	67.7
College Degree	279	6.67	0.4	0.7	2.2	9.0	12.5	14.3	24.4	25.8	10.8	75.3

Table B461. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Transportation by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Single family	332	6.72	0.3	0.3	1.5	8.4	15.1	12.0	24.7	26.2	11.4	74.3
Apartment	31	6.39	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.7	25.8	12.9	25.8	19.4	6.5	64.6
Townhouse/Condo	35	6.31	5.7	2.9	2.9	2.9	17.1	14.3	20.0	20.0	14.3	68.6
Duplex	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Other	2	6.00	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0

Table B462. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Transportation by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-\$20,000	5	7.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	80.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	6.15	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	30.8	23.1	15.4	15.4	7.7	61.6
\$30,001-\$50,000	35	6.40	5.7	0.0	0.0	8.6	22.9	2.9	20.0	31.4	8.6	62.9
\$50,001-\$70,000	37	6.24	2.7	2.7	2.7	8.1	13.5	18.9	24.3	18.9	8.1	70.2
\$70,001-\$100,000	86	6.80	0.0	0.0	1.2	5.8	17.4	11.6	23.3	32.6	8.1	75.6
Over \$100,000	170	6.62	0.0	0.6	2.4	8.8	14.7	15.3	25.9	18.8	13.5	73.5

Table B463. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Transportation by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Caucasian	338	6.71	0.9	0.3	1.8	7.7	15.4	11.5	24.9	25.1	12.4	73.9
African-American	26	6.35	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.4	26.9	7.7	19.2	19.2	11.5	57.6
Asian	20	6.65	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	25.0	35.0	20.0	5.0	85.0
Hispanic	2	7.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	100.0
Other	9	5.78	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	33.3	22.2	11.1	22.2	0.0	55.5

Table B464. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Transportation by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-1	39	7.21	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.4	7.7	35.9	23.1	17.9	84.6
2-5	86	6.40	0.0	2.3	2.3	8.1	18.6	16.3	22.1	22.1	8.1	68.6
6-10	78	6.65	1.3	0.0	3.8	6.4	14.1	11.5	23.1	32.1	7.7	74.4
Over 10	198	6.68	1.0	0.0	1.0	10.1	15.7	11.6	23.2	23.7	13.6	72.1

Town Council Focus Areas: Satisfaction with Downtown Revitalization Crosstabulations

Table B465. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Downtown Revitalization by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18-25	26	6.31	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	23.1	15.4	34.6	15.4	3.8	69.2
26-55	276	6.61	0.7	1.1	1.1	4.0	22.5	12.3	26.4	19.9	12.0	70.6
56-65	42	6.41	2.4	0.0	7.1	2.4	19.0	19.0	16.7	19.0	14.3	69.0
Over 65	44	6.57	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	34.1	11.4	29.5	13.6	11.4	65.9

Table B466. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Downtown Revitalization by Children in Household Under 18.

Children	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
No children	209	6.39	1.0	1.0	3.3	3.8	24.4	14.8	25.8	13.9	12.0	66.5
Have children	182	6.74	0.5	0.5	0.5	2.7	22.5	11.0	26.9	24.2	11.0	73.1

Table B467. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Downtown Revitalization by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	120	6.41	1.7	0.0	3.3	2.5	27.5	10.0	30.0	13.3	11.7	65.0
College Degree	270	6.61	0.4	1.1	1.5	3.7	21.9	14.4	24.8	20.7	11.5	71.4

Table B468. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Downtown Revitalization by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Single family	324	6.63	0.9	0.6	1.5	2.8	21.0	13.9	28.4	19.8	11.1	73.2
Apartment	31	6.03	0.0	0.0	3.2	3.2	48.4	6.5	19.4	9.7	9.7	45.3
Townhouse/Condo	33	6.03	0.0	3.0	6.1	9.1	27.3	12.1	15.2	18.2	9.1	54.6
Duplex	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Other	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0

Table B469. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Downtown Revitalization by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-\$20,000	5	7.20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	80.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	6.39	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	38.5	15.4	0.0	15.4	23.1	53.9
\$30,001-\$50,000	34	6.65	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	29.4	5.9	35.3	11.8	14.7	67.7
\$50,001-\$70,000	37	6.35	0.0	0.0	2.7	8.1	32.4	10.8	10.8	24.3	10.8	56.7
\$70,001-\$100,000	84	6.56	0.0	0.0	1.2	3.6	27.4	13.1	23.8	22.6	8.3	67.8
Over \$100,000	164	6.57	1.2	1.8	2.4	1.8	17.7	16.5	29.3	17.7	11.6	75.1

Table B470. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Downtown Revitalization by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Caucasian	329	6.57	0.9	0.9	1.8	3.6	21.3	13.1	28.6	18.2	11.6	71.5
African-American	26	6.62	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	38.5	15.4	11.5	15.4	19.2	61.5
Asian	19	6.11	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	42.1	5.3	26.3	21.1	0.0	52.7
Hispanic	2	7.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	100.0
Other	9	6.11	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	33.3	11.1	11.1	33.3	0.0	55.5

Table B471. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Downtown Revitalization by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-1	36	6.53	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	30.6	5.6	36.1	16.7	8.3	66.7
2-5	85	6.55	0.0	0.0	2.4	4.7	28.2	14.1	12.9	25.9	11.8	64.7
6-10	74	6.69	1.4	1.4	2.7	1.4	18.9	9.5	32.4	18.9	13.5	74.3
Over 10	196	6.50	1.0	0.5	2.0	4.1	21.9	15.3	28.1	15.8	11.2	70.4

Town Council Focus Areas: Satisfaction with Planning & Development Crosstabulations

Table B472. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Planning & Development by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18-25	24	6.54	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	16.7	20.8	29.2	16.7	8.3	75.0
26-55	277	5.91	3.2	2.9	4.0	8.7	19.9	18.4	24.9	11.6	6.5	61.4
56-65	43	5.70	4.7	2.3	4.7	11.6	20.9	20.9	16.3	11.6	7.0	55.8
Over 65	44	6.07	2.3	2.3	4.5	6.8	25.0	9.1	27.3	15.9	6.8	59.1

Table B473. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Planning & Development by Children in Household Under 18.

Children	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
No children	207	5.87	3.4	2.4	4.8	8.7	22.7	16.4	22.2	12.1	7.2	57.9
Have children	184	6.01	2.7	2.7	2.7	9.2	17.9	19.6	26.6	12.5	6.0	64.7

Table B474. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Planning & Development by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	118	5.92	4.2	1.7	3.4	6.8	26.3	12.7	26.3	11.9	6.8	57.7
College Degree	272	5.93	2.6	2.9	4.0	9.9	18.0	20.2	23.5	12.1	6.6	62.4

Table B475. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Planning & Development by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Single family	325	5.91	3.4	2.5	3.7	10.2	18.8	18.5	24.3	12.3	6.5	61.6
Apartment	29	6.66	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	24.1	13.8	31.0	13.8	13.8	72.4
Townhouse/Condo	34	5.62	2.9	5.9	2.9	5.9	32.4	14.7	20.6	11.8	2.9	50.0
Duplex	1	6.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	2	4.00	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table B476. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Planning & Development by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-\$20,000	5	5.60	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	40.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	12	5.75	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	33.3	16.7	16.7	8.3	8.3	50.0
\$30,001-\$50,000	34	5.97	0.0	2.9	5.9	2.9	29.4	14.7	32.4	5.9	5.9	58.9
\$50,001-\$70,000	36	5.92	0.0	5.6	2.8	11.1	22.2	16.7	22.2	13.9	5.6	58.4
\$70,001-\$100,000	82	6.27	3.7	0.0	3.7	3.7	18.3	24.4	20.7	15.9	9.8	70.8
Over \$100,000	167	5.77	4.8	3.6	3.0	13.2	16.8	16.8	23.4	12.0	6.6	58.8

Table B477. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Planning & Development by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Caucasian	330	5.88	3.6	2.7	3.6	9.7	19.4	18.5	24.2	11.8	6.4	60.9
African-American	25	6.56	0.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	28.0	8.0	24.0	16.0	16.0	64.0
Asian	20	5.70	0.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	25.0	15.0	25.0	15.0	0.0	55.0
Hispanic	2	6.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	8	6.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	12.5	25.0	12.5	0.0	50.0

Table B478. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Planning & Development by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-1	36	6.56	0.0	2.8	0.0	5.6	22.2	5.6	38.9	13.9	11.1	69.5
2-5	85	5.94	3.5	1.2	5.9	8.2	20.0	18.8	21.2	14.1	7.1	61.2
6-10	76	5.86	2.6	6.6	1.3	10.5	15.8	17.1	32.9	6.6	6.6	63.2
Over 10	194	5.85	3.6	1.5	4.6	9.3	22.2	20.1	19.6	13.4	5.7	58.8

Town Council Focus Areas: Satisfaction with School Issues Crosstabulations

Table B479. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on School Issues Overall by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18-25	24	5.58	4.2	0.0	4.2	4.2	50.0	12.5	8.3	8.3	8.3	37.4
26-55	260	5.82	6.2	2.3	3.1	4.6	28.8	13.1	21.9	13.1	6.9	55.0
56-65	37	5.51	5.4	2.7	2.7	2.7	45.9	10.8	16.2	8.1	5.4	40.5
Over 65	41	5.51	0.0	2.4	2.4	9.8	56.1	7.3	7.3	7.3	7.3	29.2

Table B480. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on School Issues Overall by Children in Household Under 18.

Children	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
No children	189	5.61	2.6	1.6	2.6	3.7	48.1	12.2	18.0	6.9	4.2	41.3
Have children	175	5.86	8.0	2.9	3.4	6.3	21.7	12.0	19.4	16.6	9.7	57.7

Table B481. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on School Issues Overall by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	115	5.75	3.5	1.7	0.9	3.5	47.8	9.6	14.8	13.0	5.2	42.6
College Degree	248	5.73	6.0	2.4	3.6	5.6	29.8	13.3	20.6	10.9	7.7	52.5

Table B482. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on School Issues Overall by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Single family	304	5.82	5.3	2.3	3.6	5.9	29.3	12.5	20.7	12.5	7.9	53.6
Apartment	26	5.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	80.8	3.8	0.0	15.4	0.0	19.2
Townhouse/Condo	31	5.13	9.7	3.2	0.0	0.0	51.6	16.1	16.1	0.0	3.2	35.4
Duplex	1	5.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	2	5.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table B483. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on School Issues Overall by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-\$20,000	4	5.25	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0
\$20,001-\$30,000	13	5.46	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	76.9	7.7	7.7	7.7	0.0	23.1
\$30,001-\$50,000	31	5.74	0.0	3.2	0.0	3.2	51.6	16.1	9.7	12.9	3.2	41.9
\$50,001-\$70,000	33	5.55	9.1	0.0	0.0	3.0	45.5	15.2	9.1	12.1	6.1	42.5
\$70,001-\$100,000	80	5.65	5.0	5.0	3.8	3.8	32.5	16.3	13.8	12.5	7.5	50.1
Over \$100,000	151	5.99	6.6	0.7	2.6	5.3	26.5	8.6	29.1	10.6	9.9	58.2

Table B484. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on School Issues Overall by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Caucasian	304	5.75	4.9	2.0	2.6	5.3	35.5	13.2	18.4	11.5	6.6	49.7
African-American	25	5.88	8.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	36.0	16.0	8.0	16.0	12.0	52.0
Asian	20	5.50	10.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	40.0	10.0	5.0	55.0
Hispanic	2	5.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	9	5.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	55.6	0.0	22.2	11.1	0.0	33.3

Table B485. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on School Issues Overall by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-1	32	5.63	9.4	3.1	0.0	3.1	37.5	9.4	15.6	15.6	6.3	46.9
2-5	75	5.69	5.3	2.7	0.0	6.7	41.3	6.7	18.7	13.3	5.3	44.0
6-10	76	5.78	6.6	0.0	1.3	6.6	34.2	15.8	15.8	13.2	6.6	51.4
Over 10	181	5.75	3.9	2.8	5.5	3.9	33.1	13.3	20.4	9.4	7.7	50.8

Housing Type Crosstabulations

Table B486. Housing Type by Age.

Age	n	Single Family Home	Apartment	Townhome/Condominium	Duplex	Other
18-25	26	61.5	26.9	11.5	0.0	0.0
26-55	284	86.3	6.3	7.0	0.0	0.4
56-65	44	79.5	6.8	11.4	2.3	0.0
Over 65	46	76.1	6.5	15.2	0.0	2.2

Table B487. Housing Type by Primary Language Spoken.

Language	n	Single Family Home	Apartment	Townhome/Condominium	Duplex	Other
English	385	82.3	7.8	9.1	0.3	0.5
Spanish	3	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Chinese	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Korean	4	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hindi/Gujarati	5	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table B488. Housing Type by Literacy.

Literacy	n	Single Family Home	Apartment	Townhome/Condominium	Duplex	Other
All Literate	401	82.8	7.7	8.7	0.2	0.5
1 or More Illiterate	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table B489. Housing Type by Race.

Race	n	Single Family Home	Apartment	Townhome/Condominium	Duplex	Other
Caucasian	340	84.4	5.6	9.1	0.3	0.6
African-American	26	57.7	30.8	11.5	0.0	0.0
Asian	20	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hispanic	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	9	66.7	22.2	11.1	0.0	0.0

Appendix C

Streets/Roads That Need Attention

2. Can you provide specific examples of streets and roads that need more attention?
 - Cape Cod Drive – Housing authority doesn't regulate; Cary should take over Beacon Cove
 - Carpenter Fire Station Road – potholes
 - Tryon and Cary Parkway – potholes, wear and tear
 - Jenks Carpenter – potholes
 - Church Road (near Home Depot) – new construction, potholes
 - Jenks Carpenter – potholes
 - Cary Parkway – potholes
 - Maynard – potholes
 - Davis Drive – potholes
 - Ashley subdivision – Carroway Street
 - Downtown Chatham Street – really bad potholes
 - Northwest Maynard – potholes and bumpy
 - Morrisville Carpenter – construction causes a lot of damage
 - Kildaire Farm – potholes
 - Cary Parkway (High House intersection headed east) – huge potholes
 - Lost Tree Lane – road has sunk down about 4 inches, now water sets
 - Carpenter Fire Station – potholes; new surfacing needed
 - Morrisville Parkway and several other areas – potholes and needs resurfacing
 - Davis Drive – potholes and heavy traffic
 - High House – potholes
 - 55/Green Level to Durham Road – potholes
 - Carpenter Fire Station and Green Level Church– construction damage from large trucks and equipment
 - Kildaire Farm – bad potholes
 - Harrison (at the railroad track) – dip is so bad it flips your car
 - Walnut Street to Kildaire Farm – bad dips
 - Tryon Road – widening
 - Kildaire Farm (Southbound between Cary Parkway and Triad Road) – numerous potholes and uneven roads
 - Queensferry – potholes
 - Cary Parkway – potholes
 - Hunter and Chatham – paving
 - Evans Road – potholes
 - Cary Parkway – potholes
 - Don't want to list any streets because there are too many of them
 - Cary Parkway – potholes
 - Maynard – totally torn up
 - Cary Parkway – very bumpy
 - Kildaire Farm and Green Level Church is horrible
 - Kildaire Farm – potholes

- Two Creeks Road – bad curve; people have been killed there, many accidents
- Cary Parkway – potholes
- Maynard – potholes
- West Chatham – patches/potholes
- Maynard Road – build roads better so they last longer
- 55 and High House – huge potholes and dips
- Cary Parkway – many potholes
- Tryon Road – potholes
- Maynard Road – potholes
- High House Road – potholes
- Kildaire Farm Road – potholes
- Regency Parkway – potholes
- All main streets – re-tar, potholes everywhere, need to be fixed and smoothed
- Northwest Maynard – potholes
- Kildaire Farm Road – potholes
- Maynard Road – potholes and needs to be repaved
- Old Cary Road – potholes
- Northwest Maynard – potholes and rough uneven pavements
- Kildaire Farm Road near McGregor – potholes
- Green Level Church (Westside of Cary) – potholes
- Yates Store – potholes
- Harrison Avenue – potholes
- South Maynard Road – potholes
- Cornerstone, Preston, High House roads– potholes, lights
- Cary Parkway – potholes, patches, rough spots
- Cary Parkway – potholes
- Old Apex Road – potholes
- Cary Parkway and Tryon Road – development causes these to be heavily damaged roads; potholes, bumpy, complete mess
- Holly Springs Road – bumpy and needs left turn lane
- Maynard Road – never has anyone working on it
- Many roads due to construction
- Tryon and Walnut – road damage due to construction
- Maynard Road – construction damages the roads and rips them all up
- Maynard Road – potholes
- Cary Parkway – potholes
- Maynard, Kildaire Farm and downtown road – construction has torn them up

Appendix D

Public Areas That Need Attention

3. Can you provide specific examples of places that need more attention?
 - Unnecessary widening of roads
 - Queensferry has heavy speeding; need speed bumps or some form of patrolling; would give speeding in Cary a rating of one due to low patrolling
 - Medians are hard to see when they are in the middle of double way turns; need reflectors to make them visible
 - Roads have a lot of bad potholes
 - North Dixon Park needs fixing up; need picnic areas; roadsides have a lot of trash and needs to be cleaned up
 - Median and roadsides need to be graveled rather than having ditches
 - Park fountains are not running; dirty bathrooms and overgrown shrubs
 - Need more trashcans on greenways
 - All the greenways should be paved not graveled
 - Harrison and Maynard could be kept cleaner
 - 40 – the entrance to 55; there is so much trash and litter
 - So much trash along the road
 - Very hard to navigate due to the medians
 - Landscaping has declined; trash everywhere
 - Median and roadsides are very trashy
 - The streets are messy with leaves in them; roadsides are overgrown and trash in the ditches
 - Roadsides are really bad due to construction
 - The park trashcans are always overflowing

Appendix E

Town Parks & Recreation or Cultural Program Participation

6. Please tell me which program you or a member of your household most frequently participated in and where?
- Baseball (13 times mentioned)
Location: Bond Park, Franklin Field, numerous locations
 - Lazy Days (13)
 - Basketball (12)
Location: Bond Park, Herbert Young, downtown, numerous locations
 - Classes (11)
Location: Bond Park, Herbert Young, Page Walker, Hemlock Bluffs, Old Cary High School, Jordan Arts Center
 - Senior Citizen Activities (11)
Location: Bond Park, Community Center, Senior Center, High House
 - Recreation Programs (10)
Location: Bond Park, Jordan Art Center, Crabtree Lake
 - Concerts (7)
Location: Bond Park, Amphitheatre, Koka Booth, Regency Park
 - Tennis (6)
Location: Cary Tennis Center
 - Summer Camp (5)
Locations: Bond Park, Regency Park
 - Art and Art class (5)
Location: Jordan Hall, Bond Park, Art Center
 - Spring Days (5)
 - Dance (5)
Location: Bond Park, Herbert Young
 - Volleyball (5)
Location: Bond Park, Herbert Young, numerous locations
 - Karate (4)
Location: Bond Park, Stevens Nature Center, Community Center
 - Softball (4)
Location: Thomas Brooks Park, Middle Creek, Green Hope, numerous locations
 - Plays (4)
Location: Old Cary High School, Davis Drive Park, Town Hall
 - Soccer (3)
Location: Crabtree Park, WRAL Center, numerous locations
 - T-Ball (3)
Location: Bond Park, numerous locations
 - Summer Arts Festival (3)
 - Numerous events (3)
Location: Bond Park
 - Can't remember (3)
Location: Regency Amphitheatre, Jordan Arts Hall

- Crafts (2)
Location: Jordan Hall
- Ballet (2)
Location: Bond Lake, Herbert Young
- Easter (2)
Location: Bond Park
- Stretch and Grow (2)
Location: Bond Park, Stevens Nature Center
- Aerobics
Location: Herbert Young
- American League Special Needs
Location: Adams School
- Cary Applause
Location: Cary Elementary
- Cary Plus Youth
Location: Old Cary Elementary
- Discovery Zone
Location: Bond Park
- July 4th
Location: Regency Park
- Labor Day
Location: Bond Park
- Skateboarding
Location: BMX Park
- Town Functions
Location: Regency Park
- Yoga
Location: Senior Center

Appendix F

Reasons for Low Ratings (Below 5) for Cary Overall as a Place to Live

9. Please tell us specifically what about Cary you're finding undesirable?
 - Politics and heavy handedness; too many rules without talking to citizens
 - Would rate it a nine if it weren't for school problems
 - The area is great, the people are horrible
 - It would be great if they could build a recreation center closer to West Cary
 - Too many people
 - Growth is not managed well
 - I was forced into the Town

Appendix G

Reasons for Low Ratings (Below 3) for Quality of Life in Cary

10. Please tell us which aspects of the quality of life in Cary seem worse? (# of comments)

- Controlling growth (47 comments)
- Traffic issues (33)
- Increased crime (12)
- Construction issues (8)
- Schools issues (8)
- Poor road conditions (7)
- Cost of living increases (4)
- Water concerns (4)
- Cutting down trees (3)
- Poor infrastructure (2)
- Land use
- Shopping
- Housing development
- Quality of life is lower
- Services don't match price or tax rate; need more and better services
- Safety and greenspace is great
- Need more police; too many speeders
- The arguing about growth and development
- Poor planning
- Greenways no buffers
- Need to remember to take care of older areas in Cary
- Lost hometown charm
- Lack of bike lanes; have to drive to get to the parks because of no shoulders; need more greenways
- Immigration

Appendix H

Most Important Issue Facing the Town

11. What do you feel is the one most important issue facing the Town of Cary? (# of comments)
- Growth/development (215 comments)
 - Water (62)
 - Schools (60)
 - Traffic (28)
 - Traffic/improve roads (40)
 - Infrastructure (11)
 - Taxes (8)
 - Construction (7)
 - Crime/safety (7)
 - Improved planning (7)
 - Illegal immigration (4)
 - Quality of life (2)
 - Empty buildings (2)
 - Destroying trees (2)
 - Revitalizing downtown (2)
 - Annexing
 - Family activities like movies in the park
 - Homes and communities for the elderly
 - More fire stations in the west part of Town needed
 - Cary is starting to lose its town feeling; starting to feel like an overrun city; losing its charm
 - Worry about Cary being annexed by surrounding cities like Raleigh or Charlotte
 - Decreased housing
 - Getting active on energy; closer attention to recycling
 - Electricity problems
 - Multi-family housing
 - Too many people moving in; they are telling old residents that they need to conserve when they have been doing it all their lives
 - Transportation
 - Have a child with Cerebral Palsy and there are no parks designed for handicapped; waiting lists for all programs; need more for handicapped
 - I-40 going into Raleigh – litter is awful and very embarrassing
 - Traffic lights; Chapel Hill and Maynard – the lights change too fast when making a left turn
 - Too many stores
 - More employment
 - Need through-fare
 - Try to maintain old town charm
 - Racism
 - Housing market
 - County choosing money over citizens opinions

- More recreational places like YMCA
- Dog poop laws
- More places for teens and young adults
- Sign laws – how you can't put signs in yards is ridiculous

Appendix I

Specific Actions to Improve Satisfaction with Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resource Issues

39. Could you please tell us specific actions the Town could take to make you more satisfied with parks, recreation, and cultural resource issues?
- Cultural arts issues movements
 - Remember walking, biking and public transportation
 - Need more full-sized baseball parks; demand is so high it's impossible to get on the field at American Legion
 - Oppose the Aquatic Center
 - Citizens need to be more involved
 - More neighborhood parks
 - Aquatic Center needs to hurry up; looking forward to it
 - New pool should not have been filled during the drought

Appendix J

Specific Actions to Improve Satisfaction with Environmental Protection

33. Could you please tell us specific actions the Town could take to make you more satisfied with environmental protection?
- Recycling cardboard would be great
 - Collect more at the curb like cereal boxes, phone books and paper; water conservation tiers aggressive towards law breakers and overusers
 - More recycling facilities and curb pickup
 - More recycling and collections and greenspace; more drop-off facilities
 - Need to do more environmental-friendly building; be more cautious with trees and water
 - Cutting down all the trees for new homes; reduces water, oxygen and normalcy of a town
 - Need to take more items for recycling
 - They take what they know they can recycle and throw the rest down; we need a list of what can be recycled
 - Clearing too much of the trees
 - Recycle more
 - Do not have recycling; should have it in my area
 - They can do better; the overdevelopment is causing most of the water issues
 - They cut down trees then have erosion then plant more trees
 - Need to get water from other places besides Jordan
 - Very poor in the way of recycling and trash all around the roads; people should be rewarded for recycling more – not charged more; if people were rewarded and not charged, more people would recycle; need to clean up area trash
 - Concerned about people still watering lawns during water shortage; homeowner's association should not penalize people who don't water their yards; water is more important than green grass
 - Erosion control is the only worry at this time; once growth is under control, this should not be an issue
 - Should have moved to water restrictions sooner
 - Inform people about water more; manage water better now, not later; offer rain barrels; developers need to put water-friendly appliances in homes and businesses
 - Overdevelopment; too many buildings such as multiple drug stores; only need one maybe two of each type of business
 - Stop cutting down trees
 - Nature's areas are too few
 - Trees are removed for new businesses that are already in the area
 - Should ban outside watering

Appendix K

Specific Actions the Town Could Take to be More Effective with Keeping Cary the Best Place to Live, Work, and Raise a Family

34. Could you please tell us specific actions the Town could take to be more effective with keeping Cary the best place to live, work, and raise a family?
- When breaking up teenage parties, have them arrested so kids are in custody and parents are contacted
 - Too much growth is changing the quality of life
 - Certain people can get away with more; contractors get more than they originally planned, Turner Creek subdivision
 - Too much growth
 - Council does nothing; listen to citizens instead of making choices based within the Council; Town Council is suppose to work with the citizens
 - Too much growth and Town is controlled with no citizen control or say
 - Council is new; no one I voted for was elected
 - The Town is growing too fast; nothing can accommodate the growth
 - Stop building houses; too many stores
 - Conflict between growth and schools
 - Quality of growth; no more buffers
 - They're not concerned about the safety of residents
 - Think about the future and being more green not about how much money the Town can make off of its citizens; make the citizens feel heard
 - Limit growth or stop growth if possible
 - More interested in the money
 - Growth, schools, jobs for the future and immigrants; plans and honesty and we get different stories from different people; they do what they want and if the plan changes, there is no notice
 - Be less political
 - Fix the school reassignment
 - No Police after 10:00 p.m. so there are robberies; should have Police

Appendix L

Specific Actions to Improve Satisfaction with Transportation Issues

37. Could you please tell us specific actions the Town could take to make you more satisfied with transportation?
- Ugly signs should be torn down; the ones on Davis Drive at the Town entrance they just painted them
 - Add more to C-Tran or add rail system
 - Light at High House and Cary Parkway – green left light is too short and bigger turn lane is needed
 - Not many people use C-Tran, book taxis instead; wasted resources – automated signs and signals painted was a waste of money
 - Widening of roads and synchronizing signal lights better
 - Need more mass transit systems; better synchronized lights
 - Need to widen more roads; have no need for C-Tran or trains; huge waste of money
 - Too many sidewalks and widening of roads; doing too much; not needed
 - Synchronizing signal lights better; High House and Davis left turn
 - Walnut Street to Crossroads area needs a sidewalk
 - C-Tran needs to be more reliable with timing; very hard to use because it is not time effective
 - Signal lights are too long; need to be better timed
 - Transit should just be shutdown due to loss of money and not useful due to bad routes
 - More information about C-Tran for citizens to learn more
 - Need a bus system that runs regularly like Durham and Raleigh
 - More bike lanes; make C-Tran more available; more sidewalks
 - C-Tran needs to have better routes; it's not working effectively for my disabled son
 - More sidewalks in the Crossroads area
 - C-Tran is not reliable on timing
 - Synchronize signal lights better
 - Fix the roads; they're a mess
 - Two Creeks Road needs a light; several fatalities; huge curb and a dark road
 - Don't think bike paths should be on roads; create more bike paths off road
 - Do more with bike lanes and don't do gravel paths; do all paved paths
 - Don't think bike lanes are safe on Chapel Hill and Maynard
 - Reassess traffic as growth occurs in Southwest Cary
 - Could do a lot better
 - Add rail service
 - Add more sidewalks
 - There's a lot of speeding; traffic conditions are horrible
 - Improve information and public transportation
 - More sidewalks; widen more roads; synchronize lights; currently only doing the smallest amount of repair and widening to get by
 - More public transportation
 - Synchronize stop lights better
 - Kildaire Farm Road large sign is a waste of money

- Need more sidewalks on Reedy Creek Road and really all throughout Cary; more bus activity; synchronize signal lights better
- Maintain what we have; don't widen streets; take care of them so they last; handle traffic on a schedule or timing; businesses needs to open at different hours so there is not so much traffic at one time and not so many employees trying to get to work at the same time or leave for home at the same time; it would really lower rush-hour traffic; the money wasted on widening roads can be given to the businesses instead to compensate the hours of work changing
- Synchronize lights better
- Synchronize signal lights a little better; bike lanes on main roads are not marked as bike lanes; need to mark lanes better
- Better marked bike lanes; make biking safer; make motorists more bike knowledgeable
- C-Tran is not very good; don't know much about it or if it even still runs; need to make it more known
- Love the signs that let you know the streets you are coming upon; need more sidewalks; widen roads before you build, not after
- Tryon and Piney Plains Drive needs to have the light synchronized; very long wait
- Address issues before they build
- Work faster in construction areas
- Too much traffic
- More greenways connecting parks, shoulders, and bike lanes on the west side
- Get rid of information signs
- Town has changed a lot; need lights and more turn space
- Increase bike lanes and public transportation to communities
- Leave it as it is; it's no big problem
- Paint lines more often on the roads
- More regular scheduled bus service
- Need a better bus system more visible and more available
- Crossroads area needs a right-turn lane, right turn and straight lane; left turn and straight lane, and left-turn lane only to help with congestion
- Quicker processes are needed; need everything to be completed quicker so it is not such an issue
- Lines on the lanes are very light; very hard to see when driving anytime
- Construction takes too long and no one works on the roads that often
- Lochmere area has a connector road and it has no sidewalks near the tennis club
- Traffic is still really bad at certain times
- Better synchronizing of lights
- Have not seen any of this yet; need to improve roads, C-Tran, lights, etc.
- Needs to happen quicker; it's very sparse
- Horrible traffic – 54 and Morrisville Carpenter/Crossroads
- They need to widen more lanes – Maynard, Cary Parkway, and Main Street through Cary

Appendix M

Specific Actions to Improve Satisfaction with Downtown Revitalization

36. Could you please tell us specific actions the Town could take to make you more satisfied with downtown revitalization?
- More cultural center movements
 - Accelerate tunnel under tracks
 - No traffic circles should be put in downtown
 - Needs to do more in downtown
 - Better spending of money, electronic traffic signs are an example of bad spending of the taxpayers money
 - Downtown there is basically nothing; great things throughout Cary; waste of money to try to update downtown area
 - More parking is needed downtown
 - Nicer attractions to draw people in for shopping
 - Need to speed up processes of fixing up downtown
 - Really unprepared for growth in the downtown area; don't put in metal benches to sit on; more high density things downtown to draw people in; need a larger post office and more workers to assist customers
 - Nothing really is being done downtown to make it interesting or to draw people in
 - If you want an old town, don't add new developments
 - Haven't noticed much happening
 - Haven't really noticed a change
 - Very slow; haven't noticed much of a change
 - Would love to see more done; would be wonderful; lived here almost 10 years and haven't noticed much of a difference
 - Nothing is really happening; knows there are plans, but sees no change
 - Need to keep its old charm; not change it, just keep it up
 - Hurry up and get done; eliminate business tax for the business owners until work is done
 - It's a slow process; need to move quicker
 - Don't neglect the current downtown businesses; no forcing them out of business
 - General cleanup of traffic
 - Leave it as it is and save money
 - More attention to downtown
 - Not currently seeing anything being done downtown; will be really good once all of the above is done
 - It's a waste
 - This will be good in the future but fix other projects first
 - Waste of money overall; no need to put money toward this
 - Downtown is fine the way it is

Appendix N

Specific Actions to Improve Satisfaction with Planning & Development

38. Could you please tell us specific actions the Town could take to make you more satisfied with planning & development?
- Developers should carry the burden for the infrastructure
 - Slow down growth to a lower density
 - Too much at the end of Walnut even when the roads were rated as unusable
 - Could do more and keep shops in Town
 - Too much commercial building
 - Poor water pressure
 - Growth of housing development; Town has no balance
 - Too many food stores and developments; need more gas stations
 - Growth amount and type control
 - Stop growth; grew too quickly and now we are suffering for it
 - Tax rates have changed; if tax rate on home goes up, so should the value; if home value drops, so should the tax rate; growing too fast, country people are being run out due to taxes being so high; really just overgrown pushing people away
 - Control growth; slow down to get growth back under control
 - Don't know the impact of these actions for years to come
 - Stop cutting down all the trees; need to keep trees for environmental issues in the future; makes area look bad and overbuilt
 - Need to preserve Cary as to what it was originally
 - Stop growth
 - Less development
 - Reduce growth
 - Buy land parcels and leave the areas natural
 - Too much growth
 - Road traffic and water is already bad; should not continue growth
 - Listen to the citizens about their concerns; stop letting developers run the Town; start planning around the infrastructure
 - Too much growth; too much construction causes traffic issues and environmental damage
 - The developers have influence letting the money do the talking
 - They can't keep up with the growth; should have land saved for development so things don't get cramped together
 - Everything is too cramped
 - There is hostility about High House and Davis Drive development
 - Should use available buildings rather than building new ones
 - It's overcrowded and more water is used
 - It's a tough job and they can't please everyone
 - Too much development – Davis Drive and High House
 - Things need to slow down; the Town can't keep up with growth
 - Limit the ability for business to develop and use so many utilities
 - Let too many homes in for the small amount of roads

- Less development
- There is too much development
- There doesn't need to be a shopping center one mile in every direction of my home
- There is more expansion than needs to be; never see them say no; what do they reject?
- Slapdash life conditions is not what Cary should go for
- It's just too overdeveloped; they can't maintain control of the growth development
- The school issues are a disaster; should do a better job of planning and keeping the schools in mind
- Growing too fast; not utilizing available space
- Control growth
- Need better infrastructure; don't wait until it's too late; think outside the box
- Widen roads and add more sidewalks and things before they continue development; make sure infrastructure is in before development
- Listen to what the citizens have to say and put it ahead of the contractors and the money talking
- Need to do better planning all together; plan area ahead of starting the development not in the middle
- Overgrowth of multiple buildings with the same purpose like three drugstores on one corner
- Need a better infrastructure; proactive not reactive; look at the planning and developing
- Overgrowth and overpopulation of schools due to overdeveloping
- Stop allowing so much growth; decrease the density of commercial developments
- Better use of infrastructure prior to growth
- Not sure at this time; will see how the new Mayor works; unsatisfied with the old Mayor's job; screwed up a lot
- Growing too fast
- Control developers
- Developers need to be limited
- Large bulletin board on Harrison is a waste of money and it looks stupid
- Smart growth plans needed; growth and development management
- Be more proactive, not reactive; don't wait too widen roads or build schools; do this ahead of time
- Less is more; stop developing every green inch
- Too much concrete; water tables confused; overdevelopment
- Don't forget about the older neighborhoods; place all lines underground
- Slow down development
- Stop building
- Slow down growth
- Overdeveloping the area; need to control growth
- Too much development; causes school issues
- Stop clearing our areas for townhomes and other buildings; need some sort of greenery
- Old areas need focus too
- Too much construction going on
- Growth is good but it happens without prior planning
- They are not keeping up with growth
- Have limitations on growth; all the free land is being developed
- Slow growth

- Better growth control and affordable housing
- Gave a low rating because of the Davis and High House development approval
- They can't keep up with the growth
- Need to do one project at a time

Appendix O

Specific Actions to Improve Satisfaction with School Issues

35. Could you please tell us specific actions the Town could take to make you more satisfied with school issues?
- Too much reassignment and too often
 - Too confusing because they reassign too often
 - Juggling kids in schools in the same neighborhood
 - Growth management; have three kids, one on year-round and one on traditional and this is too difficult; family life quality is very important
 - Cary needs to run their own schools
 - Need more neighborhood schools so children don't have to be separated and travel so far
 - Kids and parents are very upset with current program; kids are not sure where they are going to school in a year from now; schools need to do one or the other not year-round and part-time
 - Busing children around is a waste of time and money
 - Cary needs to think about the children and overgrowth; they are overdeveloping Cary, not thinking about room in the schools; now the students are being dragged to other areas for schooling
 - Break up schools to even out other races; kids feel scared and uncomfortable
 - Cary seems not to have a say or influence in the school issues; Cary needs to be more involved or at least do more
 - Loss of sense of community for the kids; nothing changes the School Board; doesn't seem like they are advocating at all; things are already set in stone before they let the parents know
 - Reassignment issue; improve closer schools; get parents more involved
 - No more year-round school
 - Cary should be more involved with school issues
 - Reassigning people is confusing to all within the system; ESL students need more attention but still give good students the help they need
 - Need to help the low income and problem child's families; family needs to be more involved to fix drug issues with unhappy or underprivileged families
 - Year-round schooling was the worse idea
 - Stop busing kids to school for hours at a time; need neighborhood schools – more convenient
 - Wake County reassignment and fees are confusing and cost too much; the new school systems in Town has more issues now
 - Rules with School Board needs to be done at the Town level; schools need to be handled by the Town not the County
 - School reassignment is very confusing; neighborhood kids go to six or seven different schools and never get to know each other
 - Not happy with the School Board; not spending money where it should be; against the bond issues
 - The schools are overcrowded
 - Gotten behind due to development; panic about year-round school

- They don't know what they're doing
- Hate how children are being bounced around; children are being brought to school in taxis
- Very unhappy with being forced to year-round school; hate that students are forced to ride a bus when they are in walking distance
- Hate year-round school; would like the Town to have it's own school system
- Let people attend schools that are not in the area and are not Cary citizens
- Can't seem to keep ahead
- Haven't been able to solve the problems
- The idea of year-round school is horrible; people act like they don't have any control over the issues
- Too tolerant; should allow people out of Cary to attend Cary schools
- Can't keep up with the growth; need to plan ahead
- Daughter saw a stabbing at Athens High School now she is terrified
- Schools are overcrowded
- Our child is not in school yet, but we are looking at private schools
- Better teachers, math and Trail Blazers program; should not force people into year-round systems
- Stop the rezoning and reassignment; causes too much confusion and breaks the kids up in the neighborhoods
- Not happy with Wake County School Board; Cary needs to step up and take care of their own citizens
- Cary needs to have a more direct say over the School Board in Cary; a very broken system
- Building too many year-round schools; need to have one year-round school and more schools for those who choose not to do year-round; stop forcing year-round school system; stop shuffling kids around; make the School Board understand that students should go to local schools and not transfer kids to multiple schools
- Need more schools in Cary area
- Independent school systems are needed so kids are not getting bused all around
- Validate what the School Board puts forward
- Cary needs to step up and have a say over their own schools
- Wake County School Board is the only issue
- Need to balance the schools before it ruins the area; people should have a choice where their kids should go; no re-busing and relocating kids; kids have no friends who last; schools are making Cary the worst place to live
- Charge people for allowing their child to go to Cary school if they are not local; kids are being separated from their sisters and brothers
- School changes too much
- Be more vocal and represent more and increase this as a primary concern
- More police on the west side
- They change the standards but Cary can't control them
- Wake County is not good now
- More localized and stop moving kids around so much
- Be more aggressive
- Have Cary break free
- I think it is Wake County's fault; need our own system
- Cary should go on their own away from Wake County School Board; start handling their own area

- Cary needs to step up and fix the school assignment
- Kids need to make friends that last, not get pulled away the next round; lost the sense of community within the kids; improve the schools in the middle of Cary, not just the rich areas
- School district splits moves kids too much
- Cary needs its own school district; I put my kid in private school for this reason
- The growth is causing problems
- Wish the Town could take a stronger stand