

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 21-25 (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 21. 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 22. 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 23. 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 24. 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 25. 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.