

Town of Cary 2014 Biennial Citizen Survey Report

March 2014

Conducted by



PO Box 1174 Salem VA 24153 800-372-5443

**Town of Cary
2014 Biennial Citizen Survey Report**

Table of Contents

Contents	Page
Methodology	1
Demographic Characteristics of the Sample	1
Town Government Staff.....	4
Town Government Staff Crosstabulations	5
Streets and Roads	7
Streets and Roads Needing Attention.....	7
Streets and Roads Crosstabulations	7
Cleanliness and Appearance of Public Areas	8
Public Areas Needing Attention.....	9
Public Areas Crosstabulations.....	9
Police Department.....	10
Police Department Crosstabulations	12
Fire Department	13
Fire Department Crosstabulations.....	14
Parks & Recreation and Cultural Programs.....	15
Parks & Recreation Crosstabulations	17
Cary Overall as a Place to Live.....	18
Cary Overall as a Place to Live Crosstabulations	18
Quality of Life in Cary.....	19
Quality of Life in Cary Crosstabulations	19
Most Important Issue Facing Cary	20
How Safe Residents Feel in Cary.....	21
How Safe Residents Feel in Cary Crosstabulations	22
Cary Municipal Tax Rate	24
Cary Municipal Tax Rate Crosstabulations	25
Barriers to Citizen Involvement	26
Barriers to Citizen Involvement Crosstabulations.....	27
Information Sources	28
Information Sources Crosstabulations	32
Cary’s Efforts at Keeping Residents Informed and Involved in Decisions	36
Resident Informed and Involved Crosstabulations	38
Solid Waste Services.....	39
Solid Waste Services Crosstabulations	41
Town Council Focus Areas	43
Town Council Focus Areas Crosstabulations	47
Downtown Revitalization.....	48
Downtown Revitalization Crosstabulations	49
Recycling	52
Recycling Crosstabulations.....	54

Tables	Page(s)
1. Grading Scale.....	3
2. Town Government Staff: Courteous	4
3. Town Government Staff: Professionalism	4
4. Town Government Staff: Promptness of Response	5
5. Town Government Staff: Helpful	5
6. Town Government Staff: Knowledgeable.....	5
7. Town Government Staff: Overall Quality of Customer Service	5
8. How Well Cary Maintains Streets and Roads	7
9. Cleanliness and Appearance of Parks	8
10. Cleanliness and Appearance of Greenways	8
11. Cleanliness and Appearance of Median/Roadsides.....	9
12. Cleanliness and Appearance of Streets	9
13. Police Department: Person Contacted.....	10
14. Police Department: Courteous	10
15. Police Department: Response Time	11
16. Police Department: Competence.....	11
17. Police Department: Fairness	11
18. Police Department: Problem Solving.....	12
19. Fire Department: Competence	13
20. Fire Department: Courteous.....	13
21. Fire Department: Fairness.....	13
22. Fire Department: Problem Solving	14
23. Fire Department: Response Time.....	14
24. Parks & Recreation: Ease of Registration.....	15
25. Parks & Recreation: Program Quality.....	15
26. Parks & Recreation: Facility Quality	16
27. Parks & Recreation: Overall Experience	16
28. Parks & Recreation: Instructor Quality.....	16
29. Parks & Recreation: Cost or Amount of Fee.....	16
30. Cary Overall as a Place to Live.....	18
31. Quality of Life in Cary.....	19
32. How Safe Do You Feel in Cary Overall	21
33. How Safe Do You Feel in Your Home Neighborhood	22
34. How Safe Do You Feel in Public Places Around Cary (Shopping, Out to Eat, Movies).....	22
35. Cary Municipal Tax Rate.....	24
36. Support for the Town Increasing Property Tax to Purchase Land and Banking it for Future Public Uses Such as Parks, Fire Stations, and Open Space	25
37. Barrier to Involvement in Town Government (In Descending Mean Order) - 2014.....	26
38. Barrier to Involvement in Town Government (In Descending Mean Order) - 2012.....	26
39. Barrier to Involvement in Town Government (In Descending Mean Order) - 2010.....	27
40. Most Used Information Sources in 2014 (In Order of Usage)	28
41. Most Used Information Sources in 2012 (In Order of Usage)	28
42. Most Used Information Sources in 2010 (In Order of Usage)	29
43. Most Used Information Sources in 2008 (In Order of Usage)	29
44. Most Used Information Sources in 2006 (In Order of Usage)	29
45. Most Used Information Sources in 2004 (In Order of Usage)	30
46. Most Used Information Sources in 2002 (In Order of Usage)	30
47. Most Used Information Sources in 2000 (In Order of Usage)	30

48. Most Used Information Sources in 1998 (In Order of Usage)	31
49. Potential Use of New Media Sources if Cary Used Them to Communicate With Citizens in 2014 (In Order of Usage)	31
50. Potential Use of New Media Sources if Cary Used Them to Communicate With Citizens in 2012 (In Order of Usage)	31
51. Potential Use of New Media Sources if Cary Used Them to Communicate With Citizens in 2010 (In Order of Usage)	31
52. Viewership of Video Programs About Government Activities and Issues Via Cable, Cary’s Website, and YouTube.....	32
53. How Respondents Watch the Live and Recorded Programs About Government Activities and Issues	32
54. Respondent’s Access to the Internet	32
55. How Informed Respondents Feel About Government Services, Projects, Issues, and Programs That Affect Them	36
56. Satisfaction with Cary Making Information Available to Citizens About Important Town Services, Projects, Issues and Programs	37
57. Satisfaction with Opportunities the Town Gives to Participate in the Decision Making Process	37
58. Satisfaction with Curbside Christmas Tree Collection	39
59. Satisfaction with Curbside Garbage Collection	40
60. Satisfaction with Curbside Yard Waste Collection.....	40
61. Satisfaction with Curbside Recycling Collection.....	41
62. Satisfaction with Curbside Loose Leaf Collection.....	41
63. Satisfaction with Overall Job the Town is Doing on Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources Issues	43
64. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Environmental Protection.....	44
65. Effectiveness of Town Council in Working to Keep Cary the Best Place to Live, Work, and Raise a Family.....	45
66. Satisfaction with Overall Job the Town is Doing on Transportation	45
67. Satisfaction with Overall Job the Town is Doing on Planning & Development	46
68. Satisfaction with Overall Job the Town is Doing on Downtown Revitalization.....	46
69. The Likelihood of Amenities or Activities in Bringing Respondents to Downtown Cary in 2014 (In Order of Usage)	48
70. The Likelihood of Amenities or Activities in Bringing Respondents to Downtown Cary in 2012 (In Order of Usage)	49
71. Barriers to Residential Recycling (In Descending Mean Order).....	52
72. Impact of Ideas to Expand Residential Recycling Service (In Descending Mean Order).....	53
73. Support for Paying a Higher Monthly Fee for Solid Waste Service for Recycling Service Expansion	53

Figures

Page

1. Sample: Age Distribution.....	1
2. Sample: Years Lived in Cary	1
3. Sample: Educational Level	2
4. Sample: Race	2
5. Sample: Income	2
6. Sample: Gender.....	2
7. Quality of Life.....	19
8. Safe in Cary Overall.....	21
9. Safe in Home Neighborhood.....	21
10. Safe in Public Places	22
11. Municipal Tax Rate.....	24
12. Informed About Government Services	36
13. Cary Making Information Available	36

14. Opportunities to Participate in Decision Making.....	37
15. Christmas Tree Collection Satisfaction.....	39
16. Garbage Collection Satisfaction.....	39
17. Yard Waste Collection Satisfaction	40
18. Recycling Collection Satisfaction	40
19. Loose Leaf Collection Satisfaction	41
20. Satisfaction with Job Town is Doing on Parks & Recreation	43
21. Satisfaction with Job Town is Doing on Environmental Protection	44
22. Effectiveness in Keeping Cary the Best Place to Live, Work, & Raise a Family	44
23. Satisfaction with Job Town is Doing on Transportation	45
24. Satisfaction with Job Town is Doing on Planning & Development.....	45
25. Satisfaction with Job Town is Doing on Downtown Revitalization	46

Appendices

Page(s)

A: Town of Cary 2012 Biennial Citizen Survey Questionnaire.....	57-66
B: Crosstabulations	67-206
C: Town Government Staff Interaction	207
D: Streets/Roads That Need Attention.....	208
E: Public Areas That Need Attention	209
F: Town Parks & Recreation or Cultural Program Participation.....	210-211
G: Reasons for Low Ratings (Below 3) for Quality of Life in Cary	212
H: Most Important Issue Facing the Town.....	213-214
I: Well Informed on Town Government Aspects – Services, Projects, Issues, and Programs That Come to Mind.....	215-216
J: Satisfaction with Making Information Available to Citizens – Services, Projects, Issues, and Programs That Come to Mind.....	217
K: Satisfaction with Opportunities to Participate in Decision Making – Services, Projects, Issues, and Programs That Come to Mind	218
L: Specific Actions the Town Could Take to Improve Satisfaction with Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resource Issues	219
M: Specific Actions the Town Could Take to Improve Satisfaction with Environmental Protection	220
N: Specific Actions the Town Could Take to be More Effective with Keeping Cary the Best Place, to Live, Work, and Raise a Family	221
O: Specific Actions the Town Could Take to Improve Satisfaction with Transportation.....	222-223
P: Specific Actions the Town Could Take to Improve Satisfaction with Planning & Development	224-225
Q: Specific Actions the Town Could Take to Improve Satisfaction with Downtown Revitalization	226-227
R: What Drew Respondent to Visit Downtown.....	228
S: Why Respondent Did Not Visit Downtown Last Year	229
T: Amenities for Downtown – Other.....	230-231
U: Barriers to Recycling – Other	232
V: Items to Recycle – Other.....	233
W: Ideas to Help Recycle More.....	234
X: Statistical Significance of the Town’s Service Dimensions.....	235

Crosstabulation Tables (Appendix B)

Page(s)

B1-B56	Town Government Crosstabulations.....	67-80
B57-B59	Maintenance of Streets and Roads Crosstabulations.....	81
B60-B62	Cleanliness and Appearance of Parks Crosstabulations.....	82
B63-B65	Cleanliness and Appearance of Greenways Crosstabulations.....	83

B66-B68	Cleanliness and Appearance of Median/Roadsides Crosstabulations	84
B69-B71	Cleanliness and Appearance of Streets Crosstabulations	85
B72-B119	Police Department Crosstabulations	86-97
B120-B167	Fire Department Crosstabulations	98-109
B168-B223	Parks & Recreation Crosstabulations	110-123
B224-B231	Cary as a Place to Live Crosstabulations	124-125
B232-B239	Quality of Life in Cary Crosstabulations	126-127
B240-B263	Respondent’s Perception of Safety in Cary Crosstabulations	128-133
B264-B273	Cary Municipal Tax Rate Crosstabulations	134-135
B274-B283	Support for Town Increasing Property Taxes to Purchase Land and Banking it for Future Public Uses Crosstabulations	136-137
B284-B291	Barriers to Citizen Involvement Crosstabulations	138-140
B292-B337	Informational Aspects Crosstabulations	141-154
B338-B347	Cary’s Efforts at Keeping Residents Informed Crosstabulations.....	155-156
B348-B357	Cary’s Efforts at Making Information Available to Citizens Crosstabulations.....	157-158
B358-B367	Cary’s Efforts at Involving Citizens in Decisions Crosstabulations	159-160
B368-B382	Solid Waste Crosstabulations.....	161-165
B383-B442	Town Council Focus Areas Crosstabulations	166-177
B443-B450	Visiting Downtown in the Past Year Crosstabulations	178-179
B451-B458	Downtown Revitalization Crosstabulations	180-183
B459-B484	Recycling Crosstabulations.....	184-193
B485-B492	Age Crosstabulations	194-195
B493-B498	Education Crosstabulations.....	196-197
B499-B503	Housing Type Crosstabulations	198
B504-B509	Income Crosstabulations	199-200
B510-B515	Race Crosstabulations	201-202
B516-B520	Registered Voters Crosstabulations	203
B521-B525	Voted in 2013 Local Elections Crosstabulations	204
B526-B532	Years in Cary Crosstabulations.....	205-206

Town of Cary 2014 Biennial Citizen Survey Report

Methodology

The Town of Cary’s 2014 Biennial Citizen Survey was conducted from January 11th through February 4th of 2014. 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, unlisted, and wireless 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 Cary residence and over the age of 18. The average survey completion time was between 18 to 21 minutes and the refusal rate was 34.0%. The survey instrument is included in Appendix A.

The survey consisted of 41 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, information dissemination, opportunities to participate in decision-making, citizen involvement barriers, and new media usage. Another series of questions examined Town Council focus areas in relation to issues such as keeping Cary the best place to live, environmental protection, downtown revitalization, transportation, planning & development, and parks & recreation. The respondents were also asked actions that could improve dissatisfaction with these focus areas. There were questions examining new downtown amenities/activities, viewership of live/recorded video programs on government activities, and recycling barriers/issues. The respondents were primarily asked to use a 9-point scale. There were open-ended questions examining streets/roads and public areas needing attention and most important issues. The survey incorporated 9 demographic questions.

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

The demographic profiles of the sample are exhibited in Figures 1-6. The age profile of the sample is illustrated in Figure 1. A large percentage of the respondents (65.0%) fell between the ages of 26 to 55 with the largest portion in the 46-55 (25.0%) and 36-45 (24.5%) age categories. Figure 2 represents the number of years the respondents had lived in the Town of Cary. A large percentage (78.2%) of the respondents had lived in Cary for 6 or more years including natives. There was also a




Figure 1. Sample: Age Distribution.




Figure 2. Sample: Years Lived in Cary.




Figure 3. Sample: Educational Level.




Figure 4. Sample: Race.

relatively high percentage who had lived in the Town for only 2-5 years (17.7%). Figure 3 shows the sample to be a highly educated group. Most of the respondents had graduated with a college degree (60.1%) including 21.6% of those earning a graduate degree and 4.8% a PhD, JD, or MD degree. Figure 4 details the racial breakdown of the sample showing 74.4% of the respondents were Caucasian, 10.0% were Asian, 8.2% were African-American, and 5.6% were Hispanic. There were high levels of household income for the sample (Figure 5). This is illustrated in the large percentage of respondents in the \$100,001-\$150,000 (24.8%) and over \$150,000 (21.1%) income categories. In terms of gender, 53.7% of the sample were female and 46.3% were male (Figure 6). The largest percentage of the respondents (78.9%) resided in single family homes, 10.7% in an apartment, and




Figure 5. Sample: Income.




Figure 6. Sample: Gender.

9.0% in a townhouse/condominium/duplex. There were 89.0% (87.4% in 2012) of the respondents who indicated they were registered voters and 57.8% (55.0% in 2012) of those voted in the 2013 local elections. In terms of zip codes, the areas represented were 27513 (29.6%), 27519 (29.3%), 27511 (24.2%), and 27518 (17.0%). Selected crosstabulations on age (B485-B492), education (B493-B498), housing type (B499-B503), income (B504-B509), race (B510-B515), voter status (B516-B520), voted in 2013 local elections (B521-B525), and years in Cary (B526-B532) are included in Appendix B. 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 questions 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 with 45.9% of the respondents agreeing to participate in a session.

The report will include selected crosstabulations expressly chosen by the Town for specific 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. It is difficult to interpret crosstabulations with small sample sizes for a specific demographic subgrouping. For that reason, sample sizes with less than 10 respondents in a subgroup will not be discussed. Keep in mind that any of the crosstabulations with a sample size this small will have exceptionally high margins of error. As for terminology, a subgroup would be a specific breakout category in a particular demographic group such as 18-25 age group or \$100,001-\$150,000 income level.

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

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 (high school degree/some college, college degree, PhD/JD/MD), race (Caucasian, Asian, African-American, Hispanic, other), and years in Cary (0-1, 2-5, 6-10, over 10, native). All the tables are displayed in percentages unless otherwise stated.

Significance tests were conducted on the mean differences for the 2012 and 2014 surveys. Any service dimension which was measured in both years was compared with statistical analysis. No assumption of homogeneity of variance was assumed since the sample sizes for the service dimensions generally differed for the two measurement periods. For that reason, a Welch's t-test was utilized with a two-tailed test at the .05 confidence level to determine significance. This statistical method will test the null hypothesis that the two population means are equal while correcting for unequal variances. A two-tailed test was employed due to the fact the mean difference could be higher or lower. An asterisk will be placed after any mean in the tables that is statistically significant such as 8.53*. Appendix X lists the significance tests for all the Town's service dimensions comparing changes from 2012 to 2014.

Town Government Staff

The performance of the Town Government staff was assessed with a set of seven items or questions. These questions were only administered to those respondents who had contact with the Town Government in the past two years. There were 24.0% (20.6% in 2012) or 97 respondents who indicated they had contact within that time frame. A 9-point grading scale from very poor (1) to excellent (9) was used to rate performance. The results of the 1998-2012 Cary Biennial Surveys will be included in the tables throughout the report when applicable. The incorporation of the previous survey results facilitates comparisons between survey periods to reveal possible trends.

The results show continued high ratings for the Town Government staff in 2014; although, there has been a slight decline from 2012. The means decreased for five of the six service dimensions with one remaining unchanged while two grades declined from B+ to B for *knowledgeable* and *overall quality of customer service*. However, none of the mean decreases were statistically significant. Tables 2-7 placed in descending order of ratings indicate the solid marks for *courteous* (A-), *professionalism* (B+), *promptness of response* (B+), *helpful* (B+), *knowledgeable* (B), and *overall quality of customer service* (B).

Overall, the Town Government staff continued to earn good marks from the respondents but not quite up to the 2012 results. This year five of the six means for the service dimensions decreased (none statistically significant) and two grades fell half a letter grade from B+ to B.

Table 2. Town Government Staff: Courteous.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	8.06	2.1	2.1	0.0	0.0	1.1	3.2	11.7	24.5	55.3	A-
12	8.11	2.4	0.0	1.2	1.2	3.6	4.8	3.6	21.4	61.9	A-
10	7.98	2.9	0.0	0.0	1.0	3.8	5.8	10.6	20.2	55.8	B+
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	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	7.97	3.2	2.1	0.0	1.1	2.1	2.1	9.6	23.4	56.4	B+
12	8.02	2.4	0.0	1.2	1.2	3.6	6.0	6.0	21.4	58.3	B+
10	7.99	2.9	0.0	0.0	1.0	3.8	6.7	6.7	24.8	54.3	B+
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: Promptness of Response.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	7.84	3.2	0.0	0.0	1.1	6.5	2.2	14.0	24.7	48.4	B+
12	7.84	3.7	1.2	1.2	1.2	3.7	3.7	7.3	24.4	53.7	B+
10	7.79	3.9	0.0	0.0	1.9	4.9	4.9	13.6	19.4	51.5	B+
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 5. Town Government Staff: Helpful.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	7.82	3.2	1.1	0.0	2.1	4.3	4.3	10.6	23.4	51.1	B+
12	7.94	4.8	1.2	0.0	0.0	3.6	4.8	3.6	22.9	59.0	B+

Table 6. Town Government Staff: Knowledgeable.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	7.77	3.2	1.1	0.0	2.1	5.3	5.3	8.5	25.5	48.9	B
12	7.98	2.4	1.2	1.2	1.2	3.6	4.8	3.6	25.3	56.6	B+
10	7.84	2.9	1.0	0.0	1.0	4.8	7.7	8.7	22.1	51.9	B+
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 7. Town Government Staff: Overall Quality of Customer Service

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	7.76	3.1	1.0	0.0	1.0	5.2	7.3	10.4	22.9	49.0	B
12	8.01	2.4	0.0	1.2	1.2	4.8	4.8	3.6	25.3	56.6	B+

The respondents who gave lower marks (below 5) to any of the service dimensions were subsequently asked what they recalled about the interaction. There were only 10 total comments and they are shown in Appendix C. There was no overriding theme evident in the responses.

Town Government Staff Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations (Appendix B) were conducted on selected demographic variables (age, education, gender, housing type, income, race, years in Cary, and zip code). As mentioned earlier, any subgroupings with sample sizes less than 10 will not be discussed in the report due to excessive

margins of error. The breakdowns for contact with the Town Government are shown in Tables B1-B8. The highest levels of contact (in order) were PhD/JD/MD degrees (36.8%), 56-65 age group (34.5%), \$75,001-\$100,000 income level (32.1%), over 10 year residents (30.4) and 27518 zip code (30.3%). The lowest levels of contact with the Town Government were 0-1 year residents (0.0%), Hispanics (9.1%), 18-25 age group (11.4%), 0-\$45,000 income level (15.1%) and Asians (15.4%).

The grades for *courteous* (B9-B16), *professionalism* (B17-B24), *promptness of response* (B25-B32), *helpful* (B33-B40), *knowledgeable* (B41-B48), and *overall quality of customer service* (B49-B56) were all consistent across the subgroups and above the mark of C. The only grades that fell in the C range or lower were the low sample size subgroups (n<10).

Streets and Roads

The *maintenance of streets and roads* was assessed using a same 9-point grading scale ranging from very poor (1) to excellent (9). The results were virtually unchanged from 2012 (Table 8). This year the mean was 6.83 compared to 6.85 in 2012 with the grade remaining a C. Note that this year's mean represents the second highest mean earned by the Town for maintaining streets and roads. It is important to keep in mind that streets and roads will likely remain a challenging area for any municipality to earn higher grades when experiencing elevated levels of growth and traffic.

Table 8. How Well Cary Maintains Streets and Roads.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	6.83	0.5	1.0	2.0	3.2	11.9	15.3	30.4	24.0	11.9	C
12	6.85	0.7	0.5	1.7	5.2	9.0	14.4	34.6	20.9	12.9	C
10	6.58	2.5	2.0	2.8	7.0	12.3	10.1	27.1	22.4	13.8	C-
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 and Roads Needing Attention

The respondents who rated the streets and roads below 5 were asked to name specific streets/roads that need more attention and the problem(s). The problems or issues cited for virtually all the roads were potholes and rough pavement. The streets/roads mentioned most often were Maynard Road (10 times), Cary Parkway (9 times), and High House Road (5 times). In addition, Chatham Street, Kildaire Farm Road, and Walnut Street were referred to 3 times each. In 2012, the streets mentioned the most often were Maynard Road (11 times), Kildaire Farm Road (5 times), and Walnut Street (5 times). See Appendix D for all the streets/roads mentioned and their problems.

Streets and Roads Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations for streets and roads were performed on housing type, years in Cary, and zip code (Tables B57-B59). The grades for *maintenance of streets and roads* were mostly in the C range across the subgroups. The lowest marks were C- grades given by townhouse/condo dwellers and 27511 zip code. The highest grade of B was from 0-1 year residents.

Cleanliness and Appearance of Public Areas

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

The cleanliness and appearance of public areas continued to receive very high marks. The results shown in Tables 9-12 (placed in descending mean order) indicated the respondents were very satisfied with the *parks*, *greenways*, *median/roadsides*, and *streets*. This year's means were consistent with 2012 with slight decreases in two means offset by small increases in the other two means. The cleanliness and appearance of *parks* garnered the highest rating of 8.41. This represented a small decrease from 2012 when the mean was 8.47. However, this corresponded to a grade decline from A to A- but this was mitigated by the fact 8.42 is the cutoff for a grade of A. The grade for *greenways* remained an A- with approximately the same mean as 2012. The grade for *median/roadsides* improved from a B+ to an A- after a small mean increase while the grade for *streets* remained at the B+ level also after a small mean increase. The means for *median/roadsides* and *streets* represent the highest earned to date by the Town. In addition, the means for *parks* and *greenways* were also the second highest earned in Biennial surveys. Overall, this year ranks once again as one of Cary's most successful years for cleanliness and appearance of public areas.

Table 9. Cleanliness and Appearance of Parks.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	8.41	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	1.5	9.3	27.6	59.6	A-
12	8.47	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.5	7.5	30.2	60.2	A
10	8.41	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	1.8	8.3	31.0	57.4	A-
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	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	8.37	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	1.8	7.4	30.9	57.0	A-
12	8.38	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	1.8	1.6	6.6	33.9	55.6	A-
10	8.34	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	1.3	2.4	9.0	33.8	53.3	A-
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 Median/Roadsides.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	8.06	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	3.5	5.0	17.0	29.2	44.9	A-
12	8.03	0.5	0.0	0.2	0.5	3.0	3.7	16.4	33.1	42.5	B+
10	7.87	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	2.8	6.5	19.6	39.8	30.7	B+
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-

Table 12. Cleanliness and Appearance of Streets.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	8.05	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	3.5	5.7	14.7	32.8	43.0	B+
12	8.01	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.5	3.0	3.2	16.2	36.7	39.4	B+
10	7.79	0.0	0.5	0.3	0.8	5.0	5.0	18.6	39.9	29.9	B+
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-

Public Areas Needing Attention

The respondents who gave ratings below 5 were asked to give specific examples of public areas needing attention. There were only 6 responses with no pattern to the comments (Appendix E).

Public Areas Crosstabulations

Crosstabulations were conducted on housing type, years in Cary, and zip code for the cleanliness and appearance of public areas. The grades were high and generally consistent for *parks* (Tables B60-B62), *greenways* (Tables B63-B65), *median/roadsides* (Tables B66-B68), and *streets* (Tables B69-B71). Note that no grades fell into the C range this year.

Police Department

The performance of the Cary Police Department was assessed with a set of seven 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 29.4% (30.8% in 2012) or 118 respondents. Table 13 indicates most of the respondents had contact with an officer (71.1%) or dispatcher (14.8%). There was more limited contact with Animal Control (4.4%), clerk (4.4%), and detective (3.0%). The results in the table represent several multiple contacts with different Police personnel by the same individual.

Table 13. Police Department: Person Contacted.

Person Contacted	Number	Percentage
Officer	96	71.1
Dispatcher	20	14.8
Animal Control	6	4.4
Clerk	6	4.4
Detective	3	3.0
Not Sure	2	2.2
District Commander	0	0.0

The Police Department was assessed on five service dimensions (*courteous, competence, response time, fairness, and problem solving*) on the same 9-point grading scale from very poor (1) to excellent (9) placed in descending mean order (Tables 14-18). The Police continue to have a very good profile but there has been a discernible drop since 2012. This year all the service dimension means decreased including statistically significant declines for *courteous, fairness, and problem solving*. In addition, all the service dimensions saw grade reductions including *courteous* (A to A-), *response time* (A- to B+), *competence* (A- to B+), *fairness* (A- to B+), and *problem solving* which had the largest decline from A- to B. It is important to consider that in 2012 the Police garnered their highest rating to date which makes for a difficult comparison base. Overall, the Police continued to earn very good marks again for 2014 but there is a level of concern for the decline over the past two years.

Table 14. Police Department: Courteous.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	8.09*	5.1	0.0	0.8	2.5	0.0	1.7	5.1	16.9	67.8	A-
12	8.53	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.8	1.6	1.6	4.8	15.3	75.0	A
10	8.40	1.7	0.8	1.7	0.8	0.8	0.0	3.4	16.8	73.9	A-
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: Response Time.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	8.01	3.9	0.0	1.3	1.3	5.2	1.3	5.2	18.2	63.6	B+
12	8.36	2.6	0.0	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	5.3	9.2	77.6	A-
10	8.31	1.1	0.0	1.1	2.1	2.1	1.1	8.4	15.8	68.4	A-
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 16. Police Department: Competence.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	7.93	5.1	0.8	0.8	1.7	2.5	3.4	5.9	14.4	65.3	B+
12	8.40	1.7	0.9	0.0	0.9	0.9	2.6	6.9	11.2	75.0	A-
10	8.32	1.7	0.0	1.7	0.8	3.4	1.7	3.4	14.4	72.9	A-
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 17. Police Department: Fairness.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	7.89*	5.1	0.9	0.9	3.4	0.9	6.0	3.4	13.7	65.8	B+
12	8.39	1.7	0.0	0.9	0.0	1.7	3.4	5.1	14.5	72.6	A-
10	8.19	3.4	1.7	0.8	0.8	2.5	0.0	4.2	15.1	71.4	A-
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 18. Police Department: Problem Solving.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	7.76*	6.0	0.9	0.9	1.7	2.6	4.3	9.5	13.8	60.3	B
12	8.38	1.8	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.9	2.7	5.5	12.7	74.5	A-
10	8.09	3.6	0.0	0.9	0.9	2.7	0.9	10.8	17.1	63.1	A-
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, race, years in Cary, and zip code) for contact with the Police Department are shown in Tables B72-B79 in Appendix B. The highest levels of contact (in order) were 0-1 year residents (43.8%), 0-\$45,000 income level (39.6%), African-American (38.7%), townhouse/condo dwellers (35.9%), and over \$150,000 income level (35.3%). The lowest levels of contact were for Asians (23.1%), apartment dwellers (23.8%), and 2-5 year residents (24.6%).

The grades for the five service dimensions were generally high and consistent across the subgroups (Tables B80-B119). The only grades in C range came from three subgroups. First, African-Americans gave the Police average grades for *courteous* (C-), *response time* (C+), *competence* (C-), *fairness* (C-), and *problem solving* (C-). Keep in mind, the sample size was 12 or less depending on the service dimension rated for this breakout. Second, apartment dwellers also gave average grades for *courteous* (C+), *competence* (C+), *fairness* (C), and *problem solving* (C). Again, the sample size was small (n=10). Finally, townhouse/condo dwellers gave a C+ for *courteous*, *competence*, *fairness*, and *problem solving* while the sample size for this grouping was only 13.

Fire Department

The performance of the Cary Fire Department was assessed with a set of six questions regarding 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 11.4% (10.9% in 2012) or 46 respondents. The same 9-point grading scale from very poor (1) to excellent (9) was used. The results shown in Tables 19-23 (placed in descending mean order) indicate the Fire Department continues to have superior ratings earning an A+ for *competence*, *courteous*, *fairness*, *problem solving*, and *response time*. There was a decline in the means for *response time* (9.00 to 8.70) and *problem solving* (8.86 to 8.76). *Fairness* also declined but it was minimal (8.78 to 8.76). The declines were not statistically significant and did not impact the high marks of A+. Overall, the Fire Department continues to earn the highest marks for any department.

Table 19. Fire Department: Competence.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	8.78	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.7	89.1	A+
12	8.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	92.5	A+
10	8.82	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	8.9	88.9	A+
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: Courteous.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	8.78	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.7	89.1	A+
12	8.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.9	0.0	0.0	2.4	92.7	A+
10	8.92	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.5	91.5	A+
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+

Table 21. Fire Department: Fairness.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	8.76	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.7	89.1	A+
12	8.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	92.5	A+
10	8.89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.4	88.6	A+
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 22. Fire Department: Problem Solving

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	8.76	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.7	89.1	A+
12	8.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	2.8	94.4	A+
10	8.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	9.1	88.6	A+
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	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	8.70	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.8	86.5	A+
12	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
10	8.61	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	10.5	84.2	A
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

Fire Department Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations for the Fire Department were conducted on age, education, gender, housing type, income, race, years in Cary, and zip code. The breakdowns for contact with the Fire Department are shown in Tables B120-B127 in Appendix B. They indicate the highest levels of contact (in order) with the Fire Department were for African-Americans (19.4%), 27518 zip code (16.7%), and 0-\$45,000 income level (15.1%). The lowest levels of contact were for Hispanics (0.0%), Asians (5.1%), townhouse/condo dwellers (5.1%), PhD/JD/MD degrees (5.3%), and 18-25 age group (5.7%). As for the five service dimensions (*competence, courteous, fairness, problem solving, and response time*), the grades were high and consistent across the subgroups (Tables B128-B167).

Parks & Recreation and Cultural Programs

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

The results showed that 27.9% or 112 of the respondents (24.1% in 2012) indicated someone in their household had participated in a Parks & Recreation or Cultural Program in the past two years. The programs they participated in and locations are shown in Appendix F. The most commonly mentioned programs in order were art/art classes, camps, festival/events, baseball/t-ball, basketball, Lazy Daze, sports/athletics, and senior activities.

The ratings for the six service dimensions examined for the Parks & Recreation and Cultural programs are shown in Tables 24-29 (placed in descending mean order). This year, the service dimensions continued to receive high marks. However, all the means decreased this year with the decline for *overall experience* reaching statistical significance. The mean decreases resulted in the grades falling from A to A- for *overall experience* and *instructor quality* while the other grades remained unchanged. *Ease of registration*, *program quality*, and *facility quality* continued to earn an A grade and *cost or amount of fee* remained an A-. Overall, the marks for Parks & Recreation remain excellent with three A grades and three A- grades even taking into account the mean decreases. This year's results did not quite match 2012 which were the department's best ratings to date.

Table 24. Parks & Recreation: Ease of Registration.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	8.48	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.9	2.8	5.7	23.6	66.0	A
12	8.64	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	6.6	16.5	74.7	A
10	8.36	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.8	2.3	2.3	8.3	22.6	63.2	A-
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 25. Parks & Recreation: Program Quality.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	8.46	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.9	9.1	25.5	62.7	A
12	8.62	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	12.1	11.0	75.8	A
10	8.35	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	2.1	2.1	11.9	21.7	61.5	A-
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 26. Parks & Recreation: Facility Quality.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	8.44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.9	12.6	24.3	61.3	A
12	8.54	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	8.3	16.7	72.9	A
10	8.44	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	1.4	2.1	8.3	22.2	65.3	A
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 27. Parks & Recreation: Overall Experience.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	8.41*	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	2.7	0.0	8.1	26.1	62.2	A-
12	8.68	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	7.5	14.0	77.4	A
10	8.43	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.7	2.1	0.7	8.3	21.5	66.0	A
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-

Table 28. Parks & Recreation: Instructor Quality.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	8.37	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	6.1	28.0	61.0	A-
12	8.62	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	9.6	15.1	74.0	A
10	8.30	0.9	0.9	0.0	1.7	1.7	0.9	10.4	18.3	65.2	A-
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 29. Parks & Recreation: Cost or Amount of Fee.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
14	8.28	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.4	1.1	8.7	29.3	55.4	A-
12	8.40	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	1.5	13.2	17.6	64.7	A-
10	8.25	0.0	0.8	0.8	0.8	1.7	3.3	10.8	21.7	60.0	A-
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

Parks & Recreation Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations (age, education, gender, housing type, income, race, years in Cary, and zip code) for participation in Parks & Recreation programs are shown in Tables B168-B175 in Appendix B. The highest levels of participation (in order) were for PhD/JD/MD degrees (57.9%), over \$150,000 income level (41.2%), \$100,001-\$150,000 income level (37.5%), 27513 zip code (35.1%), and 26-55 age group (34.1%). The lowest levels of participation were for the 18-25 age group (5.7%), 0-1 residents (6.3%), 0-\$45,000 income level (11.3%), apartment dwellers (11.9%), townhouse/condo dwellers (12.8%), and Hispanics (13.6%). The grades for all the six service dimensions (*ease of registration, program quality, facility quality, overall experience, instructor quality, and cost or amount of fee*) were high and consistent across the subgroups (Tables B176-B223). The only lower grades were for subgroups with low sample sizes.

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 30 indicates that Cary was perceived as a very good place to live. Although not in a traditional grading scale format, if the mean were converted to a grade, then the rating would remain a very strong A- this year. The mean of 8.23 is virtually unchanged from 2012 when it was 8.25. This year 97.5% (98.6% in 2012) were on the “desirable” side of the scale (above 5). More telling was the fact that only 0.4% of the responses were on the “undesirable” side of the scale (below 5). The mean of 8.23 represents the fourth highest mean earned by the Town. To gather more insight into any lower ratings, the respondents who answered with a rating below 5 were asked the reason for the low rating. There were only two individuals who made comments. Their remarks were the Town was too crowded with poor street layout and no police protection.

Table 30. Cary Overall as a Place to Live.

Year	Mean	Very Undesirable 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Desirable 9	Grade
14	8.23	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0	2.0	1.5	15.7	30.1	50.2	A-
12	8.25	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	1.3	2.0	14.0	35.3	47.3	A-
10	8.28	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.5	2.8	0.8	12.5	30.1	53.1	A-
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, race, years in Cary, and zip code (Tables B224-B231) in Appendix B. The means were generally consistent and high across all the subgroups. There were only three means below 8.00 among the subgroups including apartment dwellers (7.81), 0-1 year residents (7.81), and Asians (7.92). All these earned the grade of B+ showing the high levels of desirability of Cary as a place to live.

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, a very large percentage of the respondents (66.4%) perceived the quality of life in Cary as the “same” over the past two years (Table 31). This year, the mean has remained approximately unchanged at 3.23 compared to 3.22 in 2012. Keep in mind, higher means (above 3.00) indicate perceptions of an improvement in the quality of life. It is also important to note the percentage on the “better” side (above the midpoint of 3) of the scale exceeded the percentage on the “worse” side (below 3) of the scale 25.7% to 7.9% (Figure 7). 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 21 total comments and the primary reasons for lower quality of life were development/growth issues (9 comments), traffic volume (3 comments), construction on Davis/High House (3 comments), infrastructure concerns (2 comments), schools issues (2 comments), overpopulation (2 comments), and police/crime issues (2 comments).




Figure 7. Quality of Life.

Table 31. 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
14	3.23	0.7	7.2	66.4	19.2	6.5	7.9	25.7
12	3.22	0.0	5.3	70.9	20.9	3.0	5.3	23.9
10	3.11	0.0	7.5	77.1	12.3	3.0	7.5	15.3
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, race, years in Cary, and zip code are shown in Tables B232-B239 in Appendix B. The subgroups with the highest means (getting better) were Hispanics (3.55), 0-\$45,000 income level (3.38), 18-25 age group (3.37), and PhD/JD/MD (3.37). The lowest means (getting worse) were Asians (2.95), 0-1 year residents (3.13), college degrees (3.18), \$100,001-\$150,000 (3.18), and males (3.19). In the 29 crosstabulations conducted this year, the “better” percentages exceeded the “worse” percentages by 28 to 1. The only exception was for Asians with 25.6% “worse” versus 15.4% “better”.

Most Important Issue Facing Cary

An open-ended question asked respondents what they feel is the most important issue facing the Town of Cary (Appendix H). The responses show that problems related to growth were again perceived as the key issue. There were 93 comments concerning controlling growth. In addition, there were other growth-related issues of overdevelopment (35 comments) and overpopulation (23 comments). This resulted in 151 total comments directly related to the growth issue. The key concerns besides growth were traffic/improving roads ranking second with 76 comments and school issues ranking third with a total of 41 comments. Downtown revitalization was fourth mentioned by 18 respondents including the concerns of adding more to draw people downtown, moving too slow, careful not to overdevelop, parking problems, and making sure to spend wisely. Other issues mentioned were high taxes (14 comments), safety/crime (12 comments), budget/spending (10 comments), housing issues (10 comments), infrastructure concerns (7 comments), and public transportation (5 comments). There were also 54 none/no issues/can't think of any comments and 26 not sure comments. The not sure responses do have a positive component to it considering that major issues did not come to mind immediately.

For a comparison basis, the most important issues in 2012 were growth issues (137 comments), traffic/improving roads (59 comments), school issues (47 comments), safety/crime (12 comments), revitalizing downtown (11 comments), and high taxes (11 comments).

Overall, growth continues to be the most important issue and has increased in importance since 2012 with 151 versus 137 comments. Traffic/improving roads continue to rank second and has also gained importance (76 versus 59 comments). Schools continue to rank third with slightly less overall comments (41 versus 47 comments) over the two year survey window.

How Safe Residents Feel in Cary

The survey included a set of three questions that examine the respondent’s perceptions of safety in Cary overall, in their home neighborhood, and around public places in Town. The respondents were first asked how safe they feel in the Town of Cary overall. A 9-point scale that ranged from extremely unsafe (1) to extremely safe (9) was utilized. The results indicate the respondents perceived a very high level of safety in the Town (Table 32). The mean was 8.15 with an impressive 96.8% responding on the “safe” side (above 5) of the scale including 43.0% who answered they felt extremely safe. There was only 0.8% on the “unsafe” side of the scale (Figure 8). The mean decreased somewhat from 8.22 in 2012; however, the mean of 8.15 this year represents the fourth highest mean for feeling safe overall in Cary earned by the Town.




Figure 8. Safe in Cary Overall.

Table 32. 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
14	8.15	0.3	0.0	0.5	0.0	2.5	2.0	12.6	39.2	43.0	96.8
12	8.22	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.8	2.5	15.9	32.7	47.6	98.7
10	8.29	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.7	12.0	39.4	46.6	98.7
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

The respondents were next asked how safe they feel in their home neighborhood (Table 33). The perception of safety was even higher in their neighborhoods with a mean of 8.36 and 96.5% responding on the “safe” side of the scale including 58.3% responding extremely safe. The “unsafe” side of the scale garnered only 1.0% of the responses (Figure 9). The perception of respondent safety in their neighborhood is virtually the same as it was in 2012 with a minimal decrease from 8.38. This year’s mean represents the third highest mean earned for how safe respondents felt in their home neighborhood.




Figure 9. Safe in Home Neighborhood.

Table 33. 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
14	8.36	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.5	2.5	2.0	5.0	31.2	58.3	96.5
12	8.38	0.3	0.0	0.8	0.5	1.0	1.5	9.3	25.9	60.7	97.4
10	8.41	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	1.5	1.0	7.2	34.2	55.9	98.3
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

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 34). The mean was 7.87 with 94.7% responding on the “safe” side of the scale including 34.9% in the extremely safe category. There was only 1.1% on the “unsafe” side (Figure 10). However, this mean has decreased since 2012 when it was 8.19. The difference is also statistically significant. Although the respondents overall felt a high degree of safety in public places, there is a degree of concern for the somewhat larger decline in the mean this year.




Figure 10. Safe in Public Places.

This is the lowest mean earned to date for safety in public places. Even though there was a decline in this area, it needs to be stressed that respondents felt very safe in all areas including overall in Cary, their neighborhood, and in public places.

Table 34. 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
14	7.87*	0.0	0.3	0.5	0.3	4.3	5.3	19.6	34.9	34.9	94.7
12	8.19	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.5	2.5	17.1	34.3	45.1	99.0
10	8.18	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	2.5	1.0	17.0	34.4	44.9	97.3
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

How Safe Residents Feel in Cary Crosstabulations

Crosstabulations for this set of questions were conducted for age, education, gender, housing type, income, race, years in Cary, and zip code. The breakdowns for how safe the respondents feel in Cary overall are shown in Tables B240-B247 in Appendix B. The means for the subgroups were generally high and consistent. Even the lowest perceptions of safety were quite high and these were for 0-1 year residents (7.50) and Asians (7.69). The highest means were for PhD/JD/MD degrees (8.58), African-Americans (8.53), 18-25 age group (8.44), and Hispanics (8.32). The crosstabulations for how safe respondents feel in their home neighborhoods are shown in Tables B248-B255. These means were also high and consistent. The lowest means were again for 0-1 year residents (7.88) and Asians (7.95). The highest means were for African-Americans (8.77), 18-25 age group (8.71), and PhD/JD/MD degrees (8.68). Finally, the crosstabulations for how safe respondents feel in public

places around Cary are shown in Tables B256-B263. The means were generally high for most of the breakdowns. The lowest means were given by 0-1 year residents (7.38), Asians (7.51), and apartment dwellers (7.55). The highest means were from African-Americans (8.20), 0-\$45,000 income level (8.15), 18-25 age group (8.12), and PhD/JD/MD degrees (8.05). These were the only means over 8.00.

Cary Municipal Tax Rate

The survey examined Cary’s municipal tax rate of 35 cents per \$100 of property valuation as compared to other localities (Charlotte, Raleigh, and Durham). A 5-point scale was employed using the response categories of very low (1), somewhat low (2), about right (3), somewhat high (4), and very high (5).

The results for the total sample are illustrated in Table 35. A majority (66.9%) of the respondents felt that the tax rate was “about right” in Cary. This percentage has decreased from 71.4% in 2012. Questions such as this will tend to have a slight skewing to the higher side because these questions are often perceived as a potential justification for a tax increase. However, there was more skewing this year as the mean increased from 3.02 to 3.27 indicating more respondents perceived the taxes were on the higher side of the scale. This change was statistically significant. What drove this mean increase was the percentage of responses on the “high” side rose from 15.7% to 26.7% while the percentage on the “low” side fell from 12.9% to 6.4% (Figure 11).




Figure 11. Municipal Tax Rate.

Overall, taxes are perceived to be “about right” in Cary but there is now a leaning that they are somewhat on the “high” side. It is important to note the Town raised property taxes by 2 cents in 2013 for the first time in over 20 years. This was a component of a 2012 voter-approved bond referendum. This referendum also approved another 2 cent property tax increase that will go into effect in 2015.

Table 35. 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
14	3.27*	1.3	5.1	66.9	19.1	7.6	6.4	26.7
12	3.02	2.0	10.9	71.4	14.4	1.3	12.9	15.7
10	3.10	2.3	7.9	71.1	15.5	3.3	10.2	18.8
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

The respondents were next asked about their level of support for the Town increasing property taxes so they can proactively purchase land and bank it for future public uses such as parks, fire stations, and open space. Table 36 shows there was limited support for this initiative. The mean was 4.12 which was below the scale midpoint of 5.0. There were only 26.2% on the “supportive” side of the scale compared to 44.2% were on the “unsupportive” side with 29.6% as “neutral”.

Table 36. Support for the Town Increasing Property Taxes to Purchase Land and Banking it for Future Public Uses Such as Parks, Fire Stations, and Open Space.

Year	Mean	Not At All Supportive 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Extremely Supportive 9	% Above 5
14	4.12	27.4	7.5	4.5	4.8	29.6	7.3	10.6	3.3	5.0	26.2

Cary Municipal Tax Rate Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations for Cary municipal tax rate were conducted on age, education, gender, housing type, income, race, voter status, voted in 2013 local elections, years in Cary, and zip code (Appendix B). As for the perceptions of the municipal tax rate (Tables B264-B273), the subgroups who perceived the tax rate on the higher side (i.e., highest means) were Asians (3.47), townhouse/condo dwellers (3.35), 0-\$45,000 income level (3.34), over 65 age group (3.33), high school/some college (3.33), and 27518 zip code (3.33). The subgroups who perceived the tax rate on the lower side were 0-1 year residents (3.00), PhD/JD/JD degrees (3.11), nonregistered voters (3.14), Hispanics (3.14), and 27511 zip code (3.18).

The crosstabulations for a property tax increase to support proactively purchasing land to bank it for future public uses was conducted on the same set of demographic variables. The crosstabulations are shown in Tables B274-B283 in Appendix B. The most support for a tax increase was from PhD/JD/JD degrees (5.05), 6-10 year residents (4.69), \$100,001-\$150,000 income level (4.59), Hispanics (4.55), 27519 zip code (4.55), and over \$150,000 income level (4.49). The least support for a tax increase was from 18-25 age group (3.29), 0-\$45,000 income level (3.31), over 65 age group (3.57), African-Americans (3.73), and apartment dwellers (3.74).

Barriers to Citizen Involvement

The survey included a set of questions designed to examine nine barriers to the respondent's involvement in Town government. The scaling utilized ranged from not a barrier at all (1) to very significant barrier (9). Table 37 shows that the most significant overall barrier continues to be *too busy – don't have time* with a mean of 5.43 with 47.4% of the responses on the “barrier” side (above 5) of the scale. Even though it was the most important barrier, there were still 34.1% of the responses on the side of “not a barrier” (below 5). There were two other key barriers to involvement including *don't know about the opportunities* (4.33 with 34.3% on the “barrier” side) and *timing is inconvenient* (3.95 with 24.8% on the “barrier” side).

Several other potential barriers were much less significant hindrances to involvement including *topics don't interest me* (2.66), *issues don't affect me* (2.43), *don't feel qualified to offer input* (2.06), *don't understand government processes* (2.01), *waste of time – one person cannot make a difference* (1.71), and *don't have transportation* (1.37). There have been no changes in the ordering since 2012 (Table 38). The top three barriers of *too busy – don't have time*, *don't know about the opportunities*, and *timing is inconvenient* continue to be the strongest barriers while the bottom six are relatively insignificant barriers as evidenced by their means. In addition, the means for all the barriers have increased somewhat indicating all have increased in importance as barriers to some degree.

Table 37. Barriers to Involvement in Town Government (In Descending Mean Order) – 2014.

Barrier Type	Mean	Not a Barrier at All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Significant Barrier 9	% Above 5
Too busy; don't have time	5.43	21.5	3.8	4.8	4.0	18.4	4.8	6.3	8.8	27.5	47.4
Don't know about opportunities	4.33	30.8	8.8	7.3	1.5	17.2	5.3	7.8	6.6	14.6	34.3
Timing is inconvenient	3.95	33.7	8.6	5.3	4.3	23.3	6.1	3.5	3.3	11.9	24.8
Topics don't interest me	2.66	51.8	11.7	5.6	4.3	15.6	3.3	3.3	3.1	1.3	11.0
Issues don't affect me	2.43	57.5	11.9	5.3	2.5	14.4	1.0	3.3	2.5	1.5	8.3
Don't feel qualified to offer input	2.06	66.8	9.6	5.3	2.8	9.6	1.0	2.0	0.8	2.0	5.8
Don't understand government processes	2.01	71.6	5.8	2.5	3.0	11.1	1.5	2.3	1.0	1.0	5.8
Waste of time; one person can't make a difference	1.71	78.3	4.0	4.5	0.5	9.6	1.0	1.5	0.3	0.3	3.1
Don't have transportation	1.37	91.1	1.3	1.0	0.8	3.0	0.8	0.3	0.5	1.3	2.9

Table 38. Barriers to Involvement in Town Government (In Descending Mean Order) – 2012.

Barrier Type	Mean	Not a Barrier at All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Significant Barrier 9	% Above 5
Too busy; don't have time	5.08	30.9	3.4	2.6	1.3	14.7	4.9	9.3	7.0	26.0	47.2
Don't know about opportunities	4.09	37.2	4.4	4.4	2.8	22.1	5.4	7.2	3.8	12.8	29.2
Timing is inconvenient	3.63	43.8	5.7	3.9	3.6	19.7	4.1	4.9	4.4	9.8	23.2
Topics don't interest me	2.47	59.5	9.2	4.4	4.4	13.1	2.6	2.1	0.5	4.4	9.6
Issues don't affect me	2.35	64.2	3.4	8.8	3.9	10.8	2.8	1.8	0.5	3.9	9.0
Don't feel qualified to offer input	2.02	67.4	9.8	5.4	3.3	9.5	0.0	1.5	0.5	2.6	4.6
Don't understand government processes	1.70	73.5	11.3	3.9	2.1	6.2	0.8	1.0	0.3	1.0	3.1
Waste of time; one person can't make a difference	1.57	79.9	6.9	4.4	1.5	4.4	0.8	0.5	0.0	1.5	2.8
Don't have transportation	1.19	94.1	1.8	0.8	0.0	2.6	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.9

Table 39. Barriers to Involvement in Town Government (In Descending Mean Order) – 2010.

Barrier Type	Mean	Not a Barrier at All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Significant Barrier 9	% Above 5
Too busy; don't have time	4.63	29.0	6.6	9.3	5.1	8.3	6.8	7.6	8.6	18.7	41.7
Don't know about opportunities	3.84	39.5	3.6	7.5	3.1	20.2	5.2	7.0	4.1	9.8	26.1
Timing is inconvenient	3.73	36.0	9.3	9.1	6.5	12.4	5.2	8.0	5.7	7.8	26.7
Topics don't interest me	2.59	55.8	11.8	4.1	3.3	12.6	4.6	2.8	1.0	3.9	12.3
Issues don't affect me	2.21	63.0	10.0	4.6	3.1	12.3	2.6	2.1	0.8	1.5	7.0
Don't understand government processes	1.93	64.8	12.9	5.9	4.4	8.2	2.3	0.5	0.5	0.5	3.8
Waste of time; one person can't make a difference	1.78	72.8	6.4	6.9	4.4	6.4	1.5	0.8	0.0	0.8	3.1
Don't feel qualified to offer input	1.76	68.6	13.6	6.9	2.3	4.9	1.3	1.0	0.8	0.5	3.6
Don't have transportation	1.25	91.0	3.9	1.5	0.5	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.8	1.3

Barriers to Involvement Crosstabulations

Crosstabulations for the barriers to involvement in Town government were conducted on age, education, gender, housing type, income, race, years in Cary, and zip code. The breakdowns are shown in Tables B284-B291 of Appendix B. *Too busy, don't have time* was ranked as the top barrier to involvement rating 1st in 28 of 29 subgroups (with sample sizes of 10 or more). The only subgroup it ranked 2nd was the over 65 age group. In most of the other subgroups, it was *don't know about opportunities* which usually ranked 2nd finishing that way in 23 of the subgroups. Although its highest rating was 1st for over 65 age group. *Timing is inconvenient* generally ranked 3rd and did so in 23 of the subgroups. It did rank 2nd in 5 of the subgroups including males, PhD/JD/MD degrees, Asians, Hispanics, and 6-10 year residents. *Topics don't interest me* was usually ranked 4th and did so in 23 of the 29 subgroups but never higher than that in any subgroup.

The impact of the remaining barriers was more limited. These finished at the lower end of the rankings for most of the subgroups. There was only one of these that finished among the top three barriers for any subgroup and this was *don't feel qualified to offer input* which was 3rd for 0-1 year residents. *Waste of time – one person cannot make a difference* and *don't have transportation* generally ranked at the bottom in most of the subgroups.

Information Sources

The survey examined the respondent's usage of 17 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). Table 40 indicates the most frequently used information sources this year in order were word-of-mouth (6.14), Cary News (5.58), television (5.08), BUD (4.78), Raleigh News & Observer (4.70), and Cary's website (4.03). The key changes from 2012 (Table 41) included the reversal of word-of-mouth and Cary News as the top sources. In addition, television moved from 4th to 3rd switching with BUD. The only other changes were within the less significant information sources including the decline for Cary email list services from 9th to 13th and the increase for Cary's citizen website (11th to 9th). Facebook (12th) and YouTube (16th) were two new information sources examined this year showing limited usage. Tables 41-48 show all the information sources' usage in previous years.

Table 40. Most Used Information Sources in 2014 (In Order of Usage).

Information Source	Mean	Never Use	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Frequently Use	% Above 5
		1								9	
Word-of-Mouth	6.14	5.5	1.3	6.5	10.6	16.4	10.1	15.9	13.6	20.2	59.8
Cary News	5.58	27.8	3.0	3.0	2.0	6.0	5.3	10.5	9.8	32.6	58.2
Television	5.08	17.5	13.3	8.5	3.5	9.8	6.3	12.0	8.5	20.6	47.4
BUD	4.78	32.6	5.0	3.0	4.5	8.5	7.5	9.5	9.5	19.8	46.3
Raleigh News & Observer	4.70	39.1	3.0	3.8	3.0	6.8	2.8	7.8	7.8	26.1	44.5
Cary's website	4.03	32.6	9.3	8.5	7.5	10.3	6.0	8.3	7.0	10.5	31.8
Radio	3.40	39.2	17.1	8.3	4.3	8.3	2.0	7.3	2.0	11.6	22.9
Parks & Rec. Brochure	3.07	51.4	10.0	7.0	2.0	8.5	4.3	5.0	3.3	8.5	21.1
Cary Citizen Website	2.40	65.8	7.5	3.3	2.3	7.3	4.5	3.0	1.0	5.3	13.8
Cary TV Channel 11	2.32	65.1	10.1	5.3	2.0	5.0	2.5	3.5	0.8	5.8	12.6
Homeowners' Association	2.31	62.7	13.0	4.8	2.8	6.3	1.0	2.0	1.8	5.8	10.6
Facebook	2.24	75.2	3.5	2.3	2.3	3.3	2.5	1.3	1.8	8.0	13.6
Cary email list services	2.10	76.6	3.5	3.3	0.5	4.3	2.0	2.8	1.8	5.3	11.9
Independent Weekly	1.95	68.1	13.1	5.5	1.8	5.0	1.0	2.0	0.3	3.3	6.6
Block Leader Program	1.71	79.3	6.8	3.0	1.3	4.3	0.5	1.5	0.3	3.0	5.3
YouTube	1.58	89.2	0.8	0.8	0.8	2.3	1.3	0.5	0.5	4.0	6.3
Twitter	1.42	92.0	0.8	0.0	1.0	2.0	0.5	0.5	1.3	2.0	4.3

Table 41. Most Used Information Sources in 2012 (In Order of Usage).

Information Source	Mean	Never Use	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Frequently Use	% Above 5
		1								9	
Cary News	5.97	19.6	5.5	3.0	3.0	7.5	6.0	7.8	11.1	36.4	61.3
Word-of-mouth	5.67	6.6	4.6	8.9	6.1	22.3	15.2	11.4	7.1	17.8	51.5
BUD	5.59	24.9	2.8	5.0	3.0	7.1	6.8	7.3	13.6	29.5	57.2
Television	5.43	10.4	9.8	9.6	7.8	14.1	5.8	13.4	7.8	21.2	48.2
Raleigh News & Observer	5.03	30.7	5.0	5.3	3.8	6.5	4.3	8.5	9.8	26.1	48.7
Cary's website	5.02	24.7	6.8	7.3	5.0	9.3	6.5	10.1	7.1	23.2	46.9
Radio	3.69	25.6	16.2	11.4	10.4	14.9	5.3	6.8	3.3	6.1	21.5
Parks & Rec. Brochure	3.38	41.4	7.3	10.6	6.8	12.1	4.0	8.3	4.3	5.1	21.7
Cary email list services	2.90	59.1	6.6	5.6	3.5	6.1	2.3	2.8	3.3	10.9	19.3
Cary TV Channel 11	2.46	54.2	15.7	7.8	3.8	7.1	3.0	3.0	1.5	3.8	11.3
Cary Citizen Website	2.44	68.9	4.8	4.3	1.8	5.1	2.0	4.3	1.3	7.4	15.0
Homeowners' Association	2.40	65.7	5.8	5.8	3.0	6.6	3.8	2.8	1.0	5.6	13.2
Independent Weekly	1.77	75.7	6.3	6.1	3.0	4.1	1.3	0.8	0.3	2.5	4.9
Block Leader Program	1.49	84.3	4.8	3.3	1.3	3.0	0.5	1.3	0.3	1.3	3.4
Twitter	1.45	90.2	1.3	0.8	1.0	2.8	0.8	1.0	0.3	2.0	4.1

Table 42. Most Used Information Sources in 2010 (In Order of Usage).

Information Source	Mean	Never Use	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Frequently Use	% Above 5
		1								9	
Cary News	5.62	19.6	4.5	5.8	3.0	9.5	7.8	13.1	12.3	24.4	57.6
Word-of-mouth	5.57	9.4	3.8	7.7	9.4	14.8	14.5	16.6	12.0	11.7	54.8
Raleigh News & Observer	5.54	22.5	3.8	5.5	3.3	10.0	5.5	11.0	12.0	26.5	55.0
BUD	5.47	24.4	2.0	5.5	2.3	9.3	7.8	12.1	13.6	22.9	56.4
Television	5.23	12.1	4.5	10.1	8.8	13.1	18.3	15.3	6.5	11.3	51.4
Cary's website	4.56	26.8	7.0	6.3	5.5	13.5	11.8	8.3	9.5	11.3	40.9
Radio	3.28	28.4	21.1	12.6	11.3	9.3	5.3	5.0	2.0	5.0	17.3
Parks & Rec. Brochure	3.12	51.6	7.8	6.5	5.0	5.8	4.8	6.8	5.5	6.3	23.4
Cary TV Channel 11	3.12	45.8	10.3	7.8	6.8	9.3	4.0	7.6	4.0	4.3	19.9
Cary email list services	2.68	62.9	6.5	3.5	2.0	6.5	5.5	2.5	4.3	6.3	18.6
Homeowners' Association	1.88	75.9	6.5	4.0	1.0	5.5	1.3	1.8	1.0	3.0	7.1
Independent Weekly	1.84	74.4	7.5	4.5	3.5	4.0	1.0	1.5	1.0	2.5	6.0
Block Leader Program	1.37	86.9	4.3	2.3	1.8	2.5	1.3	0.5	0.3	0.3	2.4

Table 43. Most Used Information Sources in 2008 (In Order of Usage).

Information Source	Mean	Never Use	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Frequently Use	% Above 5
		1								9	
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. Brochure	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 email 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 44. Most Used Information Sources in 2006 (In Order of Usage).

Information Source	Mean	Never Use	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Frequently Use	% Above 5
		1								9	
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. Brochure	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 email 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 45. Most Used Information Sources in 2004 (In Order of Usage).

Information Source	Mean	Never Use	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Frequently Use	% Above 5
		1								9	
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. Brochure	3.62	43.0	7.0	6.4	4.5	11.5	4.8	9.6	4.3	8.8	27.5
Internet email 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 46. Most Used Information Sources in 2002 (In Order of Usage).

Information Source	Mean	Never Use	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Frequently Use	% Above 5
		1								9	
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. Brochure	3.78	40.0	5.5	8.5	5.5	11.5	5.5	7.8	6.8	9.0	29.1
Internet email 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 47. Most Used Information Sources in 2000 (In Order of Usage).

Information Source	Mean	Never Use	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Frequently Use	% Above 5
		1								9	
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 email 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 48. Most Used Information Sources in 1998 (In Order of Usage).

Information Source	Mean	Never Use	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Frequently Use	% Above 5
		1								9	
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 email 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 survey also examined the respondent's potential usage of four new media sources to communicate with citizens (Table 49). The new media sources examined included Google Plus, Instagram, Tumbler, and Next Door. Google Plus (2.31) and Instagram (1.92) would have the most potential, but it appears limited. Tables 50-51 shows new media sources from previous years.

Table 49. Potential Use of New Media Sources if Cary Used Them to Communicate With Citizens in 2014 (In Order of Usage).

Information Source	Mean	Never Use	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Frequently Use	% Above 5
		1								9	
Google Plus	2.31	73.7	3.3	2.8	2.5	3.8	1.8	1.8	3.8	6.8	14.2
Instagram	1.92	81.7	2.0	1.8	2.0	3.3	0.5	2.0	1.3	5.5	9.3
Tumbler	1.42	90.2	1.8	0.5	1.0	3.3	0.5	0.5	0.0	2.3	3.3
Next Door	1.41	91.5	1.0	0.5	1.0	2.8	0.0	0.3	0.3	2.8	3.4

Table 50. Potential Use of New Media Sources if Cary Used Them to Communicate With Citizens in 2012 (In Order of Usage).

Information Source	Mean	Never Use	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Frequently Use	% Above 5
		1								9	
Facebook	3.19	60.1	3.5	3.3	1.5	7.8	3.0	3.3	1.5	15.9	23.7
YouTube	2.06	77.9	3.6	2.5	1.0	4.6	1.3	1.3	0.8	7.1	10.5
Google Plus	1.78	85.7	2.3	1.3	0.3	1.8	0.5	1.3	0.5	6.4	8.7
LinkedIn	1.46	90.6	1.3	1.5	0.8	1.5	0.0	0.5	0.0	3.8	4.3
Flickr	1.32	92.9	1.8	0.8	0.3	1.5	0.0	0.3	0.3	2.3	2.9
Ustream	1.25	94.9	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.0	2.3	2.9

Table 51. Potential Use of New Media Sources if Cary Used Them to Communicate With Citizens in 2010 (In Order of Usage).

Information Source	Mean	Never Use	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Frequently Use	% Above 5
		1								9	
Facebook	2.54	67.8	1.3	5.0	2.8	6.5	3.5	5.0	3.8	4.3	16.6
YouTube	1.78	77.7	4.3	5.0	3.5	3.5	1.5	1.3	1.5	1.8	6.1
Twitter	1.69	84.9	1.8	2.3	1.0	2.0	2.3	2.5	1.0	2.3	8.1
LinkedIn	1.54	86.7	2.3	2.5	0.8	3.0	0.8	1.0	1.3	1.8	4.9
MySpace	1.48	88.7	1.8	1.5	1.3	2.5	0.8	0.8	1.3	1.5	4.4
Flickr	1.39	89.0	3.0	0.8	2.3	2.3	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.3	2.8

The survey next asked respondents if they viewed the live and recorded video programs about governmental activities and issues via cable television, Cary’s website, or YouTube. Table 52 indicated most of the respondents do not watch the programs (69.9%). Those who watch the programs tend to view it *several times a year* (12.8%) or *at least once a year* (12.5%). There was less frequent viewing for *at least once a month* (2.8%) and *several times a month* (2.0%).

Table 52. Viewership of Video Programs About Government Activities and Issues Via Cable, Cary’s Website, and YouTube.

Year	Never	At Least Once a Year	Several Times a Year	At Least Once Every Month	Several Times a Month
14	69.9	12.5	12.8	2.8	2.0

The respondents were subsequently asked how they watch these video programs about government activities and issues. Again, most indicated they don’t watch (65.2%). Those who watch indicated cable television (29.1%) was the primary medium they use to view the programs (Table 53). There was limited use of Cary’s website (2.0%) and YouTube (0.5%). In addition, there was minimal use of multiple sources.

Table 53. How Respondents Watch the Live and Recorded Programs About Government Activities and Issues.

Year	Cable TV	Cary’s Website	YouTube	Cable TV and Cary’s Website	Cable TV and YouTube	Cable TV, Cary’s Website and YouTube	I Don’t Watch
14	29.1	2.0	0.5	2.8	0.3	0.3	65.2

The final question in this information series asked the respondents where they had access to the internet (Table 54). This refers to ready, direct access not outside sources such as libraries and clubs. The results show internet access is widespread with only 2.8% of the respondents not having internet access. Multiple sources for internet access were common including home, work, and mobile device (62.1%), home and mobile device (11.6%) and home and work (5.8%). As for single sources, the home (15.6%) was the primary point of access. There was little single source access for mobile device (0.5%) and work (0.3%).

Table 54. Respondent’s Access to the Internet.

Year	Home	Work	Mobile Device	Home and Work	Home and Mobile Device	Work and Mobile Device	Home, Work, and Mobile Device	No Access
14	15.6	0.3	0.5	5.8	11.6	1.5	62.1	2.8

Information Sources Crosstabulations

Crosstabulations for the information sources were conducted on age, education, gender, housing type, income, race, voter status, voted in 2013 local elections, years in Cary, and zip code are shown in Appendix B (Tables B292-B301). Instead of examining each demographic variable separately, it would be more informative to examine where each information source was effective in the 33 subgroups with sample sizes of 10 or greater. The information sources will be discussed in order of overall ranking by the total sample. To avoid confusion, overall rankings by the total sample are written out (such as ninth) and ranking in the subgroups are numerical (such as 9th).

The two top information sources were the word-of-mouth and Cary News. Word-of-mouth was the most effective of all the information sources. It was ranked 1st in 26 of the 33 subgroups and in the top three in the rest of them. Cary News was the second most used information source, but not as effective as word-of-mouth. This source ranked 1st in 6 subgroups including 56-65 age group, over 65 age group, \$75,001-\$100,000 income level, over \$150,000 income level, registered voters, and 27519 zip code. In addition, it also ranked an impressive 2nd in 16 other subgroups. Its lowest ranking was 7th in the 18-25 age group.

The next most effective source was television ranking third overall. While this source did not rank first in any of the subgroups, it was notable that it ranked 2nd in 11 of the subgroups. The lowest that television ranked in any of the subgroups was only 5th indicating its high level of usage. BUD was ranked fourth overall by the total sample. Its highest ranking was 3rd in 7 of the subgroups including 26-55 age group, high school/some college, single family households, Caucasians, registered voters, over 10 year residents, and 27518 zip code. BUD also ranked 4th in 11 of the other subgroups. The lowest ranking for this source was for 18-25 age group (11th), apartment dwellers (9th), and 0-1 year residents (9th).

The Raleigh News & Observer continued to rank fifth overall. This source did rate 1st for PhD/JD/MD degrees. In addition, it ranked 3rd for 7 of the subgroups and 4th for another 9 showing its widespread usage. The Raleigh News & Observer was least effective for 18-25 age group (10th) and apartment dwellers (8th). Cary's website ranked sixth overall this year. This source was most effective for Asians (4th), 0-1 year residents (4th), African-Americans (5th), nonregistered voters (5th), 2-5 year residents (5th), and 6-10 year residents (5th), while ranking 6th for 20 other subgroups. This source was least effective for high school/some college and 0-\$45,000 income level ranking 8th.

Radio ranked seventh overall by the respondents and it ranked the same in 20 of the subgroups. However, there were subgroups where radio was more effective (ranking 3rd) including the 18-25 age group, apartment dwellers, 0-\$45,000 income level, and African-Americans. However, it was least effective for over 65 age group where it ranked 10th. Parks & Recreation Brochure was the eighth ranked information source for the total sample and earned that same ranking in 17 of the subgroups. It was most effective for PhD/JD/MD (6th) while least effective for 0-\$45,000 income level (13th) and 18-25 age group (12th).

Cary's Citizen Website was ranked ninth overall. It generally rated between 9th and 11th in most of the subgroups. This source was most effective for apartment dwellers (6th), 0-1 year residents (6th), and \$45,001-\$75,000 income level (8th). It was least effective for the over 65 age group (14th). Cary TV 11 was ranked tenth in the total sample this year. This source generally ranked 10th or 11th in most of the subgroups. It was most effective for over 65 age group (6th) and African-Americans (8th) while more ineffective for 0-1 year residents (15th), 2-5 year residents (15th), and PhD/JD/MD degrees (14th).

Homeowners' Associations ranked eleventh overall by the respondents. It consistently ranked between 9th and 12th in the subgroups. This source was most effective for 27519 zip code (7th) and it ranked 8th in the 56-65 age group, over 65 age group, and Hispanics. The Associations were the least effective information source for 18-25 age group, apartment dwellers, and African-Americans. The twelfth ranked information source this year was Facebook and it usually ranked between 12th and 15th within most of the subgroups. However, Facebook was especially effective for 18-25 age group (4th), apartment dwellers (5th), and 0-\$45,000 income level (7th). The lowest rankings of 15th were for 56-65 age group, over 65 age group, and PhD/JD/MD degrees.

Cary's email list services was ranked thirteenth overall and generally rated between 11th and 13th within most of the subgroups. Its highest ranking was in the over \$150,000 income level (9th) and lowest in 0-1 year residents (17th), townhouse/condo dwellers (16th), and 0-\$45,000 income level (16th). The information source ranked fourteenth was the Independent Weekly. In most of the subgroups this source ranked either 13th or 14th. It was most effective for over 65 age group (11th), PhD/JD/MD degrees (11th), and 27519 zip code (12th). There was limited effectiveness for 0-1 year residents (16th), nonregistered voters (15th), and 27518 zip code (15th).

The Block Leader Program was ranked fifteenth overall indicating its limited impact. In most of the subgroups this information source ranked 15th or 16th. However, it did have a degree of effectiveness for 0-1 year residents (11th) and over 65 age group (12th). YouTube ranked next to last for all the information sources examined and did so in 14 of the subgroups. This source did have an especially strong level of effectiveness for the 18-25 age group (5th). In addition, it ranked 9th in the 0-\$45,000 income level and 10th for apartment dwellers and nonregistered voters. Finally the lowest rated information source was Twitter ranking last in 20 of the subgroups. Although it did have a stronger impact on the 18-25 age group (8th), 0-\$45,000 income level (12th), apartment dwellers (13th), and 0-1 year residents (13th).

The crosstabulations for new media sources are shown in Tables B302-B311 broken down by age, education, gender, housing type, income, race, voter status, voted in 2013 local election, years in Cary, and zip code. The new media sources will be discussed in order of overall ranking by the total sample. There were 33 total subgroups with sample sizes of 10 or greater. The highest ranked was Google Plus by a significant margin. This source was 1st in 30 of the 33 subgroups. Instagram was ranked second by the respondents. This new source rated 1st in 3 subgroups (18-25 age group, PhD/JD/MD degrees, and 0-\$45,000 income level) and rated 2nd in all the other subgroups. Tumblr and Next Door had similar low rankings in the subgroups. The only exception was that Next Door rated 2nd for PhD/JD/MD degrees.

The crosstabulations for viewership of video programs about government activities and issues via cable, Cary's website, and YouTube are shown in Tables B312-B321. The breakdowns include age, education, gender, housing type, income, race, voter status, voted in 2013 local election, years in Cary, and zip code. The highest viewership (percentage who viewed programs) were for over 65 age group (50.0%), \$75,001-\$100,000 income level (42.9%), 56-65 age group (39.7%), \$45,001-\$75,000 income level (38.7%), townhouse/condo dwellers (38.5%), and African-Americans (36.7%). The lowest viewership was from 0-1 year residents (6.2%), PhD/JD/MD degrees (10.5%), 18-25 age group (14.3%), and over \$150,000 income level (17.6%). The most frequent viewers (at least once a month or more) were African-Americans (13.4%), over 65 age group (13.0%), \$45,001-\$75,000 income level (9.7%), and Hispanics (9.0%).

The crosstabulations for how the respondents watch the video programs about government activities and issues are shown in Tables B322-B329. The breakdowns are for age, education, gender, housing type, income, race, years in Cary, and zip code. The highest usage of cable television was for over 65 age group (54.3%), African-Americans (46.7%), \$45,001-\$75,000 income level (41.9%), and \$75,001-\$100,000 income level (37.5%). The highest usage for Cary's website was for PhD/JD/MD degrees (5.3%), 27518 zip code (4.5%), over \$150,000 income level (4.4%), and 2-5 year residents (4.3%). The highest usage of YouTube was for African-Americans (3.3%), 18-25 age group (2.9%) and Asians (2.6%). There was also usage of both cable television and Cary's website to watch the video programs for Asians (10.3%), \$75,001-\$100,000 income level (7.1%), and 2-5 year residents (5.8%).

The final set of crosstabulations examined where the respondents had access to the internet (Tables B330-B337). The breakdowns are for age, education, gender, housing type, income, race, years in Cary, and zip code. The subgroups with the least internet access were over 65 age group (13.3%), apartment dwellers (7.1%), African-Americans (6.7%), 0-\$45,000 income level (5.8%), and high school/some college (5.1%). The highest home only internet access was for over 65 age group (53.3%), 56-65 age group (29.3%), \$75,001-\$100,000 income level (23.2%), townhouse/condo dwellers (23.1%), and African-Americans (20.0%). The highest work only internet access was 2.6% for Asians and townhouse/condo dwellers. The highest mobile device only internet access was for Hispanics (4.5%), 0-\$45,000 income level (3.8%), and 18-25 age group (2.9%). The subgroups with the highest internet access using two of the three sources (cable, work, and mobile device) were 18-25 age group (34.3%), 0-\$45,000 (26.9%), 56-65 age group (25.9%), and 0-1 year residents (25.1%). The highest usage for having internet access in all three sources was over \$150,000 income level (88.2%), Asians (76.9%), 26-55 age group (76.2%), PhD/JD/MD degrees (73.7%), and Hispanics (72.7%).

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. The respondents were first asked *how informed they feel about Town services, issues, and programs that affect them* using a 9-point rating scale ranging from not at all informed (1) to very well informed (9). Table 55 indicates the respondents felt well informed about matters that affect them. The mean was 6.52 with 68.3% on the “informed” side of the scale (above 5) versus only 6.8% on the “uninformed” side (Figure 12). The mean has fallen from 6.88 in 2012 and the decrease was statistically significant. The decrease was driven by more responses on the “average” side (15.5% to 24.9%) and less on the “informed” side (76.1% to 68.3%) of the scale, while the “uninformed” side has actually decreased (8.6% to 6.8%). Overall, the respondents continue to feel well informed this year but there has been a drop off from 2012. The respondent’s comments when deciding on their rating are shown in Appendix I. There were 65 total comments and 27 involved the respondent not actively seeking Town related information which is partially responsible for not feeling informed and possibly impacted the rating this year.




Figure 12. Informed About Government Services.

Table 55. 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
14	6.52*	1.3	1.0	3.5	1.0	24.9	13.8	22.6	18.8	13.1	68.3
12	6.88	1.8	1.5	3.0	2.3	15.5	9.0	25.5	18.8	22.8	76.1
10	6.59	1.8	1.3	4.3	3.8	20.0	12.0	20.0	18.5	18.5	69.0
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

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 56 indicates a high degree of satisfaction with Cary’s efforts with a mean of 7.07. However, this mean has declined from 2012 when it was 7.33 and this decrease was statistically significant. There were 78.2% on the “satisfied” side of the scale versus only 4.6% on the “dissatisfied” side (Figure 13). These percentages are similar to 2012 when 80.4% were on the




Figure 13. Cary Making Information Available.

“satisfied” side of the scale and 5.1% were on the “dissatisfied” side. The big driver of change was in the very satisfied category (9) which decreased from 29.1% to 22.1% in 2014. Overall, the results are still positive even though there has been a decline this year. The mean of 7.07 represents the third highest mean earned by the Town. The respondent’s comments when they decided on their rating are shown in Appendix J. There were 27 total comments and the more frequent ones mentioned were more mailings (4 comments), more flyers/brochures (3 comments), hard to find information/website not user friendly (3 comments), and have not seen any information (3 comments).

Table 56. 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
14	7.07*	1.3	0.5	1.0	1.8	17.3	10.0	19.3	26.8	22.1	78.2
12	7.33	0.5	0.3	1.8	2.5	14.5	5.0	19.0	27.3	29.1	80.4
10	6.95	0.8	0.8	2.0	1.0	20.1	11.3	22.1	18.6	23.4	75.4
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

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 57 shows a mean of 6.56 this year with 65.0% on the “satisfied” side of the scale and only 4.6% on the “dissatisfied” side (Figure 14). This mean has declined from 7.01 in 2012 and the decrease was statistically significant. The difference rests in the growth of “neutral” responses (20.5% to 30.6%) and reduction in the “satisfied” responses (75.4% to 65.0%). Overall, the ratings remain solid and in line with previous years, but there is a level of concern for the somewhat larger decrease. Appendix K shows the respondent’s comments when deciding on their rating. There were 19 total comments and the most frequently mentioned (4 comments) were I did not know about the opportunities and the Town already made up its mind/will not listen to citizens.




Figure 14. Opportunities to Participate in Decision Making.

Table 57. 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
14	6.56*	2.0	0.5	1.8	0.3	30.6	9.3	20.1	22.1	13.5	65.0
12	7.01	1.3	0.3	1.0	1.5	20.5	6.8	24.2	23.2	21.2	75.4
10	6.68	1.5	1.5	3.0	2.0	24.8	8.9	18.2	18.5	21.5	67.1
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

Resident Informed and Involved Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations on how informed respondents feel about government projects, issues, and programs are shown in Tables B338-B347. Breakdowns were performed on age, education, gender, housing type, income, race, voter status, voted in 2013 local elections, years in Cary, and zip code (Appendix B). Overall, there was a relatively high degree of consistency across the subgroups. Those who felt the most informed about government projects, issues, and programs were over 65 age group (7.33), PhD/JD/MD degrees (6.95), over \$150,000 income level (6.72), and 2013 local election voters (6.66). The subgroups that felt less informed (lower means) were Asians (5.92), 18-25 age group (6.03), apartment dwellers (6.05), nonregistered voters (6.10), Hispanics (6.18), and 0-\$45,000 income level (6.20).

The crosstabulations for making information available to citizens about important Town services, projects, issues, and programs are shown in Tables B348-B357. Again, the means were relatively consistent across groupings. The most satisfied were PhD/JD/MD degrees (7.58), over 65 age group (7.41), 0-1 year residents (7.31), over \$150,000 income level (7.29), and 27519 zip code (7.28). The respondents somewhat less satisfied (lower means) with Cary making information available were Asians (6.54), Hispanics (6.55), 18-25 age group (6.66), and African-Americans (6.66).

The crosstabulations for opportunities for residents to participate in the decision-making process are shown in Tables B358-B367. The most satisfied with the participation opportunities were PhD/JD/MD degrees (6.90), \$75,001-\$100,000 income level (6.84), 27513 zip code (6.83), and 27519 zip code (6.76). Those least satisfied were 27518 zip code (6.02), Hispanics (6.14), nonregistered voters (6.19), and 0-1 year residents (6.25).

Solid Waste Services

A set of questions was included in the survey to examine the respondent’s satisfaction with five curbside solid waste collection services. The services examined include *curbside garbage collection*, *curbside recycling collection*, *curbside yard waste collection*, *curbside loose leaf collection*, and *curbside Christmas Tree collection*. A 9-point scale from very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (9) was used to rate these collection services. The solid waste services are discussed in order of ratings from highest to lowest in order of means.

The level of satisfaction with the *curbside Christmas Tree collection* was very high again this year (Table 58). The mean was 8.45 improving from 8.37 in 2012. This represents the second highest rating earned by the Department for this curbside service and this was the highest rated of the collection services this year. Figure 15 shows there were 97.7% on the “satisfied” side of the scale (above 5) and only 1.2% on the “dissatisfied” side (below 5). If this were to be converted into a grade, the mark would be an A this year. In 2012, the grade would have translated to an A-.




Figure 15. Christmas Tree Collection Satisfaction.

Table 58. Satisfaction with Curbside Christmas Tree Collection (n=176)

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
14	8.45	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6	1.1	0.6	9.1	24.4	63.6	97.7
12	8.37	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.6	2.5	1.9	8.2	22.8	63.3	96.2
10	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	2.2	7.1	14.7	72.3	96.3
08	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
06	7.60	1.3	1.0	1.3	1.3	5.3	5.6	19.6	24.9	39.5	89.6
04	7.70	1.6	1.2	1.2	1.6	7.7	6.1	10.9	22.7	47.0	86.7

The results indicate the respondents continue to be very satisfied with *curbside garbage collection*. The mean this year was 8.41. This represents a slight decline from 8.46 in 2012 (Table 59). Overall, this mean represents the third highest rating earned by the Department to date. Figure 16 shows the percentages on the “satisfied” side of the scale were 97.6% versus only 0.3% on the “dissatisfied” side. If this mean were converted into a grade, then curbside garbage collection would earn an A- while the grade in 2012 would be an A. However, the grade is only .01 percentage points from remaining in the A range.




Figure 16. Garbage Collection Satisfaction.

Table 59. Satisfaction with Curbside Garbage Collection (n=380)

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
14	8.41	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	2.1	1.6	9.7	25.0	61.3	97.6
12	8.46	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.8	2.9	6.7	23.5	65.3	98.4
10	8.58	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	1.6	4.6	18.2	73.2	97.6
08	8.19	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.5	3.7	3.4	8.4	28.2	54.6	94.6
06	7.61	3.8	1.2	1.5	0.3	4.7	5.0	14.0	28.4	41.2	88.6
04	7.91	1.2	1.8	1.5	1.8	4.6	2.1	8.3	26.3	52.3	89.0

The Town continues to earn good marks for *curbside yard waste collection*. The mean has also declined slightly this year from 8.25 to 8.19 (Table 60). However, just as with *curbside garbage collection* service, the mean this year was the third highest the Department has earned. Figure 17 shows there were 94.8% of the respondents on the “satisfied” side of the scale versus only 2.5% on the “dissatisfied” side. If the yard waste collection mean were converted to a grade, then it would translate to a grade of A- which is the same as the grade earned in 2012.




Figure 17. Yard Waste Collection Satisfaction.

Table 60. Satisfaction with Curbside Yard Waste Collection (n=320)

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
14	8.19	0.3	1.3	0.3	0.6	2.8	3.8	10.0	22.2	58.8	94.8
12	8.25	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3	3.0	3.4	11.1	26.9	54.9	96.3
10	8.37	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.3	3.8	2.3	8.1	17.1	67.6	95.1
08	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
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

The respondent’s level of satisfaction with *curbside recycling collection* was somewhat lower this year. The mean declined somewhat from 8.24 in 2012 to 8.12 (Table 61). Although the mean declined, again this rating represents the third highest overall mean earned by the Department for this curbside service. There were 94.2% of the responses on the “satisfied” side of the scale versus only 1.9% on the “dissatisfied” side (Figure 18). If converted to a grade, then the grade for curbside recycling collection would have been in the A- range which is the same as 2012.




Figure 18. Recycling Collection Satisfaction.

Table 61. Satisfaction with Curbside Recycling Collection (n=373)

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
14	8.12	0.5	0.0	1.1	0.3	4.0	3.8	12.3	23.9	54.2	94.2
12	8.24	0.3	0.8	0.3	0.5	3.5	2.7	10.4	21.1	60.4	94.6
10	8.37	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.3	3.8	2.4	7.2	17.7	67.6	94.9
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

The respondents indicated that *curbside loose leaf collection* has improved in 2014. The mean increased from 7.95 in 2012 to 8.11 this year (Table 62). This is a large increase for a service that has generally ranked last among all the curbside services. In addition, this represents the second highest mean earned for this service to date. There were 93.2% on the “satisfied” side of the scale versus only 2.9% on the “dissatisfied” side (Figure 19). If this mean were converted into a grade, then it would earn the mark of an A- this year. When comparing this to 2012, the mean that year would have earned the mark of B+.




Figure 19. Loose Leaf Collection Satisfaction.

Table 62. Satisfaction with Loose Leaf Collection (n=310)

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
14	8.11	0.6	1.0	1.0	0.3	3.9	3.5	10.3	22.6	56.8	93.2
12	7.95	0.4	0.7	0.4	1.4	5.1	5.8	12.6	24.9	48.7	92.0
10	8.18	0.3	0.0	0.9	1.6	3.2	4.4	12.0	15.8	61.8	94.0
08	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
06	7.49	0.9	0.9	4.7	2.3	4.7	5.1	16.3	20.5	44.7	86.6
04	7.40	1.9	1.9	1.6	2.3	6.1	9.4	16.2	24.6	35.9	86.1

Overall, the curbside collection of Solid Waste Services continued to earn very good marks. The grades have improved for *Christmas tree collection* (A- to A) and *curbside loose leaf collection* (B+ to A-). The grades remain high and unchanged for *curbside yard waste collection* (A-) and *curbside recycling collection* (A-). The grade did decline for *curbside garbage collection* (A to A-), but the mean decrease was minimal on a borderline grade reduction.

Solid Waste Services Crosstabulations

Crosstabulations were conducted for housing type, years in Cary, and zip code for the set of solid waste curbside services (Appendix B). The crosstabulations for Christmas tree curbside collection are shown in Tables B368-B370. They were generally consistent and high. The only subgroups with somewhat lower means were townhouse/condo dwellers (8.23), 2-5 year residents (8.29), and 27511

zip code (8.35). Although lower, all of these means would still earn a grade of A-. The crosstabulations for curbside garbage collection are shown in Tables B371-B373. The only lower mean was for townhouse/condo dwellers (8.08) which would rate as an A-. Curbside yard waste collection crosstabulations are shown in Tables B374-B376. The only lower mean was for the 27518 zip code (7.97). This mean would equate to a grade of B+. The crosstabulations for curbside recycling collection are shown in Tables B377-B379. The lowest means were for 0-1 year residents (7.91) and townhouse/condo dwellers (7.92) which would translate to a B+. Finally, the crosstabulations for curbside loose leaf collection are shown in Tables B380-B382. The means were all relatively consistent and high. Overall, the ratings for the curbside services were very good and even the lowest means generally received from newer residents and townhouse/condo dwellers earned solid marks.

Town Council Focus Areas

The survey included several questions examining specific focus areas of the Town Council. The respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with the Town’s efforts in several areas including *environmental protection; keeping Cary the best place to live, work, and raise a family; 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 *keeping 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* continued to earn the highest rating of any of the focus areas just as in 2012. The respondents were asked to consider several factors in their rating. These include quality/quantity of existing parks, greenways, and community centers; how close these facilities are located to their home; and planning for building new parks, community centers, greenways, and trails. Table 63 shows the positive results from the respondents. The mean was 7.61 with 90.5% on the “satisfied” side of the scale (above 5) while there were only 1.2% of the responses on the “dissatisfied” side (Figure 20).




Figure 20. Satisfaction with Job Town is Doing on Parks & Recreation.

However, this represents a decline from 2012 (7.87) that was statistically significant. There has only been a small drop on the “satisfied” side of the scale (90.5% versus 91.2%) between 2014 and 2012. The key difference was the much lower percentage who responded with very satisfied or 9 dropping from 41.4% to 26.7%. It appears these respondents are now giving ratings of 7 and 8 instead of 9. Even with the decline, the respondents were satisfied with the job the Town is doing on parks, recreation, and cultural resources. This is evident in the fact that only 1.2% of the respondents were on the “dissatisfied” side of the scale.

Table 63. Satisfaction with the 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
14	7.61*	0.2	0.5	0.0	0.5	8.2	6.0	21.9	35.9	26.7	90.5
12	7.87	0.5	0.5	0.3	1.0	6.6	4.1	15.0	30.7	41.4	91.2
10	7.68	0.0	0.0	0.3	1.3	9.8	4.0	21.0	31.5	32.3	88.8
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 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*. All the comments are shown in Appendix L. Due to the higher levels of satisfaction, there were only 14 comments which make it difficult to establish a key issue due to the limited number of responses. There were two comments calling for more dog parks in Town.

The respondents were also 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, sustainability, erosion control and litter reduction. The respondents gave the Town high marks with a mean of 7.53. The mean is similar to 2012 with a slight decline from 7.62 (Table 64). There were 89.1% of the responses on the “satisfied” side of the scale up from 88.6% in 2012 with only 2.5% on the “dissatisfied” side (Figure 21). 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 M). There were 16 total comments with 8 of those focused on recycling issues (too restrictive, no collection in area, business recycling, waste drop offs, and bins) and 2 concerning water issues.




Figure 21. Satisfaction with Job Town is Doing on Environmental Protection.

Table 64. 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
14	7.53	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.0	8.5	5.3	22.0	37.5	24.3	89.1
12	7.62	1.3	0.0	0.5	0.8	8.8	5.3	19.4	30.8	33.1	88.6
10	7.67	0.5	0.0	0.8	0.5	7.0	5.3	19.5	39.8	26.8	91.4
08	7.04	1.0	0.0	1.0	1.5	16.6	11.8	25.4	22.4	20.4	80.0

The third highest rated of the focus areas was how effective the Town Council was in *keeping 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 respondents were again positive and supportive of the Town’s efforts with a mean of 7.49 (Table 65). However, the mean has declined from 7.83 in 2012 and the difference was statistically significant. This year, there were 87.1% of the responses on the “effective” side of the scale (Figure 22). This decline from 2012 is an area of concern but it is important to note there were only 1.9% of the responses were on the “ineffective” side of the scale. What drove the change this year was the growth in the neutral response (4.9% to 10.9%) and reduction in the very effective responses (33.4% to 25.4%). 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 N). This year there were 15 comments and the most frequent themes were budget/spending concerns (4 comments) and schools (3 comments).




Figure 22. Effectiveness in Keeping Cary the Best Place to Live, Work, & Raise a Family.

Table 65. 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
14	7.49*	0.5	0.0	0.7	0.7	10.9	6.0	21.9	33.8	25.4	87.1
12	7.83	0.8	0.3	0.5	0.5	4.9	3.9	17.0	38.8	33.4	93.1
10	7.65	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	9.3	4.3	21.1	36.1	28.3	89.8
08	6.85	1.3	0.3	0.5	2.0	19.0	12.3	28.8	20.1	15.8	77.0

The respondent’s satisfaction with the Town’s *transportation* efforts has also declined slightly. The respondents were asked to consider issues like widening roads, C-Tran bus service, synchronizing signal lights, adding bike lanes/greenways/sidewalks. The mean fell from 7.07 to 6.94 but it was not statistically significant (Table 66). There were 79.9% on the “satisfied” side of the scale and 6.4% on the “dissatisfied” side (Figure 23). Even with the decline, this is the second highest rating for transportation. The respondents who gave a rating below 5 were asked what actions the Town could take to make them more satisfied with *transportation* (Appendix O). The 45 total comments focused on adding bike lanes/issues (14 comments), improving traffic lights (10 comments), roads/widening roads (8 comments), roundabouts concerns (5 comments), and C-Tran issues (5 comments).




Figure 23. Satisfaction with Job Town is Doing on Transportation.

Table 66. 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
14	6.94	0.5	0.5	2.2	3.2	13.7	12.0	26.2	26.2	15.5	79.9
12	7.07	1.3	0.8	1.8	3.0	12.4	9.8	22.0	28.5	20.5	80.8
10	6.73	1.3	1.5	2.5	2.8	20.0	9.3	23.3	23.5	16.0	72.1
08	6.66	0.7	0.5	1.7	8.2	15.9	12.2	24.1	24.9	11.7	72.9

The respondents were asked to rate the job the Town is doing with *planning & development*. They were asked to consider issues such as developing land use plans for specific areas, ensuring high-quality development compatible with existing development, and making sure the infrastructure can support growth. The results show a decline in the mean from 6.82 to 6.60 this year although the decrease was not statistically significant (Table 67). There were 72.6% on the “satisfied” side of the scale and 7.0% on the “dissatisfied” side (Figure 24). The drivers of the change this year were the




Figure 24. Satisfaction with Job Town is Doing on Planning & Development.

decline in the very satisfied category (17.3% to 11.7%) and gain in the neutral responses (16.6% to 20.4%). Note that the percentages on the “dissatisfied” side of the scale have in fact decreased (7.6% to 7.0%). Overall, the planning and development ratings are again solid even with the reduction; although, this is now one of the lower ranked focus areas. The respondents who gave the Town a rating below 5 were asked what actions the Town could take to make them more satisfied with *planning & development* (Appendix P). There were 40 total suggestions including improving planning for growth (11 comments), roads/traffic (9 comments), too many apartments (5 comments), schools (4 comments), and High House/Davis construction (3 comments).

Table 67. 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
14	6.60	1.5	2.0	1.5	2.0	20.4	14.0	24.7	22.2	11.7	72.6
12	6.82	1.0	1.8	2.0	2.8	16.6	11.7	22.4	24.2	17.3	75.6
10	6.73	0.3	1.0	1.3	2.5	19.1	14.1	30.2	18.1	13.4	75.8
08	5.93	3.1	2.6	3.8	8.9	20.4	18.1	24.2	12.2	6.6	61.1

The job the Town is doing with *downtown revitalization* continues to rank the lowest of the focus areas. The respondents were asked to consider issues such as converting old Cary Elementary into an arts space, renovating the movie theater, designing downtown park/streetscapes, and holding outdoor events. The results indicated the respondents were generally satisfied with the Town’s *downtown revitalization* efforts (Table 68). The mean decreased from 6.80 to 6.58 this year but the difference was not statistically significant. There were 68.7% responding on the “satisfied” side versus 9.2% on the “dissatisfied” side (Figure 25). This is the only focus area where the




Figure 25. Satisfaction with Job Town is Doing on Downtown Revitalization.

“dissatisfied” side of the scale actually increased (8.1% to 9.2%) this year. Overall, there is still a high level of satisfaction with the job the Town is doing downtown but there has been a slight uptick in level of dissatisfaction. The respondents who gave the Town a rating below 5 were then asked what actions the Town could take to make them more satisfied with *downtown revitalization* (Appendix Q). There were 45 total comments including revitalization is a waste of time/money (8 comments), need more to do/entertainment (6 comments), progress is too slow (4 comments), keep present businesses/small town feel (4 comments), and copy Apex’s downtown (3 comments).

Table 68. 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
14	6.58	1.5	2.0	3.5	2.2	22.1	11.4	19.7	21.9	15.7	68.7
12	6.80	1.5	0.5	2.8	3.3	20.5	9.5	18.2	23.3	20.3	71.3
10	6.64	2.0	1.3	1.5	2.5	21.5	10.3	25.8	21.8	13.5	71.4
08	6.55	0.8	0.8	2.0	3.3	23.5	13.0	26.3	18.9	11.5	69.7

Town Council Focus Areas Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations for the focus areas were conducted on age, education, gender, housing type, income, race, voter status, voted in 2013 local elections, years in Cary, and zip code. First, the crosstabulations for satisfaction with the job the Town is doing with *parks, recreation, and cultural programs* are shown in Tables B383-B392. The subgroups showing the lowest levels of satisfaction were the apartment dwellers (7.19), Asians (7.33), 56-65 age group (7.33), and 0-1 year residents (7.38). The highest levels of satisfaction were from PhD/JD/MD degrees (7.95), over \$150,000 income level (7.90), townhouse/condo dwellers (7.87), and Hispanics (7.86).

The crosstabulations for satisfaction with the job the Town is doing with *environmental protection* are shown in Tables B393-B402. The means were generally consistent and positive; however, a few areas did indicate lower levels of satisfaction. These were apartment dwellers (7.26), Asians (7.36), townhouse/condo dwellers (7.36), and 0-\$45,000 income level (7.36). The highest levels of satisfaction were expressed by Hispanics (7.91), 6-10 year residents (7.69), 27518 zip code (7.69), \$100,001-\$150,000 income level (7.68), and over \$150,000 income level (7.66).

The crosstabulations for the effectiveness of Town Council *keeping Cary the best place to live, work, and raise a family* are shown in Tables B403-B412. The subgroups indicating slightly lower levels of effectiveness were 56-65 age group (7.12), apartment dwellers (7.31), 27513 zip code (7.31), over 10 year residents (7.33), over 65 age group (7.37), and 0-\$45,000 income level (7.38). The highest means were from Hispanics (8.05), 0-1 year residents (7.94), and 27519 zip code (7.72).

The crosstabulations for satisfaction with the job the Town is doing with *transportation* are shown in Tables B413-B422. Although most of the means were supportive, there were several subgroups with somewhat lower levels of satisfaction including Asians (6.39), over 10 year residents (6.73), 27518 zip code (6.73), 56-65 age group (6.74), \$100,001-\$150,000 income level (6.76), and males (6.77). The highest satisfaction was from Hispanics (7.46), 0-1 year residents (7.19), 6-10 year residents (7.19), and 18-25 age group (7.17).

The crosstabulations for satisfaction with the job the Town is doing with *planning & development* are shown in Tables B423-B432. The subgroups were generally consistent in their levels of satisfaction. There were a few subgroups demonstrating lower levels of satisfaction including Asians (6.18), 56-65 age group (6.31), over 10 year residents (6.34), 27513 zip code (6.34), and \$100,001-\$150,000 income level (6.35). The highest levels of satisfaction were for Hispanics (7.23), African-Americans (7.23), 18-25 age group (7.17), and 0-1 year residents (7.13).

Finally, the crosstabulations for satisfaction with the job the Town is doing with *downtown revitalization* are shown in Tables B433-B442. The levels of satisfaction were generally positive and consistent for the breakdowns. The only subgroups showing lower levels of satisfaction were 56-65 age group (5.78), \$100,001-\$150,000 income level (6.15), over 10 year residents (6.35), and 27518 zip code (6.35). The highest levels of satisfaction were for African-Americans (7.03), townhouse/condo dwellers (7.00), apartment dwellers (6.98), 18-25 age group (6.94), 2-5 year residents (6.93), 0-\$45,000 income level (6.91), over 65 age group (6.91), and PhD/JD/MD degrees (6.90).

Downtown Revitalization

A set of questions was included in the survey asking the respondents how Cary could create a more vibrant downtown area. The respondents were first asked if they had visited downtown in the last year and 85.6% indicated they had visited the area. This is up from 78.9% in 2012. Those who answered “yes” were then asked what drew them to downtown (Appendix R). There were 481 total comments (there could be more than one reason) and the two key reasons were shops/shopping (74 comments) and restaurants (65 comments). Other prominent reasons included visiting the area/pleasure (48 comments), art/art center (43 comments), library (35 comments), business/work (35 comments), and just driving through (32 comments). In addition, the respondents also mentioned the post office (17 comments), drug store (14 comments), Lazy Daze (13 comments), church (11 comments), events (11 comments), live in the area (11 comments), festivals (10 comments), and Christmas parade/parades (8 comments). Those who responded “no” they had not visited downtown were then asked why not (Appendix S). The most common reasons were no interest/don’t like it (16 comments) and schedule/work/too busy (12 comments). Other reasons given include nothing down there (9 comments), no reason (8 comments), and no parking (6 comments).

The respondents were then asked to rate how effective various amenities/activities would be in bringing them to downtown Cary. A 9-point scale was used from not likely at all (1) to extremely likely (9). The survey examined a total of 18 different amenities/activities. Table 69 shows cafes/restaurants would be the most likely amenity to draw the respondents downtown with a mean of 7.35. Festivals (6.55) and outdoor performances (6.52) were also effective after a rather large drop in the means. Other amenities/activities with drawing power were shopping opportunities (6.43), concerts (6.09), Farmer’s Market (5.88), preserve/reuse of historical buildings (5.81) ice cream/yogurt shop (5.58), and museums (5.47). The amenities with the lowest draw were grocery store (3.60), pet shop (3.89), and artist working studio space (4.18). There were 95 responses given to the “other” category for amenities/activities (Appendix T). The most frequent were to improve parking (13 comments), more family events (6 comments), and make it more like downtown Apex (4 comments).

Table 69. The Likelihood of Amenities or Activities in Bringing Respondents to Downtown Cary in 2014 (In Order of Usage).

Amenity/Activity	Mean	Not Likely At All 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Likely 9	% Above 5
Cafes/restaurants	7.35	6.7	1.5	2.7	2.0	6.2	3.7	10.0	18.2	49.0	80.9
Festivals	6.55	10.9	3.0	2.5	2.2	12.2	5.7	15.9	12.7	34.8	69.1
Outdoor performances	6.52	11.9	2.5	3.2	4.5	8.7	6.7	12.2	13.7	36.6	69.2
Shopping opportunities	6.43	12.7	3.7	2.2	1.7	12.2	5.7	13.7	13.7	34.2	67.3
Concerts	6.09	13.7	3.5	4.7	4.5	12.2	5.5	15.5	9.7	30.7	61.4
Farmer’s Market	5.88	16.2	3.7	4.0	3.7	12.5	7.5	13.5	14.5	24.4	59.9
Preserve/reuse historic building	5.81	16.5	4.5	4.3	4.3	15.0	6.0	8.8	13.0	27.6	55.4
Ice cream/yogurt shop	5.58	17.3	6.0	5.0	3.3	15.5	6.5	12.0	10.5	24.0	53.0
Museums	5.47	17.4	6.7	6.5	3.7	14.7	4.2	11.7	14.2	20.9	51.0
Historical walking tour	5.25	20.4	5.7	5.7	4.2	17.2	5.2	10.9	10.2	20.4	46.7
Coffee shop	5.21	23.4	6.0	6.5	3.2	12.7	5.0	9.5	9.7	23.9	48.1
Public Art	5.11	22.1	7.5	5.2	4.2	15.4	4.7	10.2	10.4	20.1	45.4
Bars/pubs	4.93	25.7	7.5	6.2	4.0	12.7	4.5	10.0	7.5	21.9	43.9
Additional art exhibition space	4.88	24.1	8.0	6.2	2.7	16.2	7.5	10.0	5.5	19.9	42.9
Gallery Crawl	4.63	29.9	6.0	5.0	5.2	17.2	3.7	6.5	7.0	19.5	36.7
Artist working studio space	4.18	31.6	10.4	6.5	4.7	14.7	5.5	7.0	4.2	15.4	32.1
Pet shop	3.89	35.2	11.2	5.2	4.2	17.2	5.0	5.2	4.5	12.2	26.9
Grocery store	3.60	41.3	10.2	5.0	4.7	14.9	3.2	5.7	4.2	10.7	23.8

There have been changes in the rankings of amenities/activities bringing respondents downtown relative to 2012 (Table 70). The two new amenities/activities examined this year rated very high – outdoor performances (3rd) and Farmer’s Market (6th). Several other downtown amenities/activities gained importance this year including festivals (3rd to 2nd), preserve/reuse historic buildings (13th to 7th), and historic walking tour (15th to 10th). Those losing a degree of importance were shopping opportunities (2nd to 4th), concerts (4th to 5th), museums (5th to 9th), and coffee shop (6th to 11th).

Table 70. The Likelihood of Amenities or Activities in Bringing Respondents to Downtown Cary in 2012 (In Order of Usage).

Amenity/Activity	Mean	Not Likely At All 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Likely 9	% Above 5
Cafes/restaurants	7.48	4.1	1.5	1.3	2.0	11.7	3.3	10.2	14.2	51.8	79.5
Shopping opportunities	6.61	8.4	3.3	5.1	3.6	11.4	6.6	11.2	12.7	37.8	68.3
Festivals	6.26	9.1	5.1	4.5	2.5	15.9	7.6	14.1	11.6	29.5	62.8
Concerts	5.97	13.9	3.8	4.3	4.8	13.4	9.6	11.1	11.6	27.5	59.8
Museums	5.76	12.9	5.6	6.1	3.8	15.5	8.1	14.0	11.2	22.8	56.1
Coffee shop	5.66	18.0	6.1	4.8	4.1	11.9	7.6	10.6	6.8	30.1	55.1
Public plaza	5.56	12.3	6.4	7.9	5.1	18.9	6.9	11.5	8.7	22.3	49.4
1,100 seat performance center	5.56	14.0	8.1	3.6	6.1	16.8	9.1	9.9	9.6	22.8	51.4
Movie theater	5.54	17.4	8.6	4.8	3.0	12.1	7.6	10.6	10.1	25.8	54.1
Ice cream shop	5.54	16.2	8.1	5.1	4.6	13.9	7.1	10.6	8.6	25.8	52.1
Parks	5.31	15.7	7.8	6.6	7.6	15.4	7.6	10.1	7.1	22.2	47.0
Public art	5.24	17.6	8.1	6.1	4.3	14.2	10.9	10.7	8.7	19.3	49.6
Preserve/reuse historic building	5.11	15.7	9.9	6.6	7.8	17.2	6.1	10.6	7.6	18.5	42.8
Wine shop	4.91	25.6	9.6	4.8	3.8	10.9	6.8	9.6	5.6	23.3	45.3
Historical walking tour	4.89	20.3	9.9	6.1	5.6	16.5	5.1	12.9	7.6	16.0	41.6
Additional art exhibition	4.72	22.2	10.6	7.1	4.8	14.9	8.3	9.8	5.8	16.4	40.3
Artist working studio space	4.18	32.9	7.3	8.4	5.1	13.9	6.6	6.6	3.8	15.4	32.4

Downtown Revitalization Crosstabulations

Crosstabulations were conducted on visiting downtown in the past year on age, education, gender, housing type, income, race, years in Cary, and zip code. These are shown in Tables B443-B450 in Appendix B. The highest level of downtown visitation was from PhD/JD/MD degrees (100.0%), 27511 zip code (95.7%), over \$150,000 income level (94.1%), and townhouse/condo dwellers (92.3%). The lowest levels of visitation among the subgroups were from 0-1 year residents (68.8%), apartment dwellers (73.8%), Asians (74.4%), 0-\$45,000 income level (77.4%), African Americans (77.4%), 27518 zip code (78.8%), and 2-5 year residents (79.7%).

The crosstabulations for the likelihood of amenities/activities to bring respondents downtown were conducted on age, education, gender, housing type, income, race, years in Cary, and zip code (Tables B451-B458). Instead of examining each demographic variable separately, it would be more informative to look at each amenity/activity separately and its likelihood at bringing respondents downtown. There were a total of 29 subgroups with sample sizes of 10 or greater. The amenities will be discussed in order of overall ranking by the total sample. To avoid confusion, overall rankings by the total sample are written out (such as ninth) and ranking in the subgroups are numerical (such as 9th).

The top-rated amenity or activity was cafes/restaurants in the total sample. This amenity was ranked 1st in 28 of the 29 subgroups indicating its effectiveness as the key downtown drawing card. Festivals ranked second overall. It earned one 1st ranking for PhD/JD/MD degrees but placed 2nd for 6 subgroups and 3rd for 14 others. Its lowest ranking was 9th for the over 65 age group.

Outdoor performance was ranked third overall in the total sample. This activity was ranked 2nd by 14 subgroups, 3rd by 6 subgroups, and 4th by 7 subgroups showing its overall effectiveness as a draw for downtown. Its lowest ranking was 10th by the over 65 age group. Next was shopping opportunities which were ranked fourth by the total sample. This amenity generally rated between 2nd and 5th within most of the subgroups including 2nd by 8 subgroups and 4th by another 10 subgroups. Its lowest ranking was 6th by the over 65 age group.

Concerts were rated fifth overall by the respondents. This activity also ranked 5th in 17 of the subgroups. The most interest (ranking 3rd) was shown by the 18-25 age group, PhD/JD/MD degrees, and African-Americans. The lowest level of interest was from the 56-65 age group (9th) and over 65 age group (13th). The Farmer's Market was ranked sixth by the total sample and earned that same ranking in 12 of the subgroups. The most interest (ranking 4th) in this amenity was shown by the 56-65 age group, over 65 age group, and \$45,001-\$75,000 income level. There was minimal interest from the 18-25 age group (15th).

The preservation/reuse of historic buildings ranked seventh overall. It generally rated 6th or 7th within most of the subgroups. The highest interest (ranked 5th) was from 56-65 age group and over 10 year residents while its lowest was from Hispanics (12th) and African-Americans (11th). Ice cream/yogurt shop ranked eighth overall and generally ranked 7th or 8th within most of the subgroups. African-Americans (5th) and PhD/JD/MD degrees (6th) showed the most interest in this amenity. The lowest interest (ranking 10th) was from Asians, 2-5 year residents, and the zip codes of 27518 and 27519.

It was museums that ranked ninth overall in the total sample. In the subgroups, this amenity usually ranged between 7th and 11th (the latter was its lowest ranking). Museums garnered its highest interest from over 65 age group (3rd) and Asians (6th). The historical walking tour was ranked tenth overall by the respondents and earned that same rating in 9 of the subgroups. The most interest in the tours was expressed by the over 65 age group (5th) and over \$150,000 income level (8th) while the lowest was from PhD/JD/MD degrees and Hispanics who rated 15th.

Ranking eleventh overall was a coffee shop. Most of the ratings were concentrated between 9th and 13th within the subgroups. The most interest in this amenity was from the 18-25 age group (6th), African-Americans (7th), and 56-65 age group (7th). The least was from the 27518 zip code (14th). Public art was next in the overall rankings finishing twelfth. The rankings within the subgroups usually fell between 10th and 13th (the latter was its lowest ranking). The most interest was shown by the over 65 age group (8th), 27518 zip code (8th), and Asians (9th).

Bars/pubs ranked thirteenth overall by the respondents. There was a degree of variability in the rankings from a high of 6th to a low of 17th. Apartment dwellers and 0-\$45,000 income level were the subgroups that ranked it highest (6th). There were also relatively high levels of interest (ranking 8th) from 18-25 age group, males, African-Americans, 0-1 year residents, and 2-5 year residents. The over 65 age group ranked it 17th. Finishing fourteenth overall was additional art exhibition space. This amenity generally rated 13th (9 subgroups) and 14th (11 subgroups). The most interest (ranking 11th) was shown by \$75,001-\$100,000 income level, over 65 age group, Asians, and 27518 zip code. Less interest was shown by the \$100,001-\$150,000 income level and 27513 zip code rating it 15th.

The Gallery Crawl was ranked fifteenth overall by the total sample and ranking the same in 16 of the subgroups. However, it did rate somewhat higher in two of the subgroups including over \$150,000 income level (11th) and Hispanics (13th). The lowest ratings were from the 18-25 age group (17th), apartment dwellers (16th), 0-\$45,000 income level (16th), and Asians (16th). Artist working studio space downtown was ranked only sixteenth overall and it ranked the same in 22 of the subgroups. The highest level of interest (rating 14th) was shown by the 18-25 age group and Asians. The lowest was from Hispanics (18th), 56-65 age group (17th), and \$100,001-\$150,000 income level (17th).

The next to last rating of seventeenth was for a pet shop. This amenity ranked 17th in 22 of the subgroups and 18th or last in another 5 of them. There was a slight level of interest expressed by the 18-25 age group and \$100,001-\$150,000 income level rating it as high as 16th. Finally, the lowest ranking amenity was a downtown grocery store and it rated last in 23 of the 29 subgroups. However, this amenity did have a slight degree of interest from three groups including the over 65 age group (15th), Hispanics (16th), and 56-65 age group (16th).

Recycling

A survey included several questions examining recycling issues including barriers to recycling and the impact of several recycling service expansion ideas that could serve to increase recycling. They were also asked about their support for paying a higher monthly fee for recycling to implement any of the recycling expansion ideas.

The first set of questions examined 11 potential barriers to recycling in the Town. The results show only two of the barriers had any level of impact (Table 71). The predominant barrier to recycling was *recycling cart/bin too small* with a mean of 3.09 and 21.5% of the respondents indicating it was a “barrier” (above 5). This also included 11.4% of the respondents who felt it was a very significant barrier. The only other barrier was *not sure which things can be recycled* with a mean of 2.46 and 12.8% indicating it was a “barrier”. After those two, none of the other potential barriers broke 10.0% on the “barrier” side of the scale. The highest of those were *the Town doesn’t recycle the kinds of things I want to recycle* (1.82) and *I need additional recycling carts/bins* (1.74). These were viewed as “barriers” by 6.7% and 5.7% of the respondents, respectively. The lowest rated potential barriers were *recycling costs too much* (1.14), *don’t have room at my home for recycling carts/bins* (1.20), and *recycling is not available where I live* (1.32). There were 34 total comments for other perceived barriers (Appendix U) and the most frequent responses were need to recycle weekly (11 comments), need larger bin (5 comments), doing a good job (3 comments), poor bundling rules (3 comments), and not sure what to recycle (3 comments). Appendix V lists the other items the respondents want recycled that the Town does not presently accommodate. The most common items among the 79 total comments were batteries (8 comments), plastic bags (8 comments), styrofoam (8 comments), and electronics (7 comments). Cardboard boxes, egg cartons, paint, and pizza boxes each had 5 comments.

Table 71. Barriers to Residential Recycling (In Descending Mean Order).

Barrier Type	Mean	Not a Barrier at All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Significant Barrier 9	% Above 5
Recycling cart/bin too small	3.09	59.0	3.0	4.6	3.0	8.9	2.5	4.8	2.8	11.4	21.5
Not sure which things can be recycled	2.46	62.5	6.5	7.8	2.0	8.3	3.5	3.3	1.0	5.0	12.8
The Town doesn’t recycle the kinds of things I want to recycle	1.82	75.7	4.9	5.1	3.6	4.1	3.3	1.8	0.3	1.3	6.7
I need additional recycling carts/bins	1.74	81.2	3.6	3.1	1.8	4.8	1.0	0.8	0.8	3.1	5.7
I forget, don’t remember to recycle	1.69	79.4	7.4	3.3	1.8	3.3	0.3	0.8	0.3	3.6	5.0
I’m too busy, don’t have time	1.64	82.7	5.3	2.8	1.0	3.0	0.3	0.8	0.5	3.6	5.2
Preparing items is too much of a hassle, too much trouble	1.53	82.5	6.3	3.3	0.8	3.5	1.3	0.5	0.0	1.8	3.6
Recycling isn’t important to me	1.38	85.1	6.3	3.0	1.0	3.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.5	1.5
Recycling is not available where I live	1.32	93.9	0.3	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	2.5	2.8
Don’t have room at my home for recycling carts/bins	1.20	94.2	1.3	1.0	0.3	2.3	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.3	1.1
Recycling costs too much	1.14	93.7	3.8	0.0	0.3	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

The respondents were next asked about the impact of 10 different ideas that may serve to increase the respondent’s recycling efforts (Table 72). The results indicate that four of the recycling ideas would have the most impact. However, it was *collecting recycling every week, not every other week* that would have the most significant impact. The mean was 4.82 with 45.3% on the “impact” side of the

scale or above 5. The three other ideas with potential to increase recycling were *financial incentive to recycle* (3.97), *more education about what can be recycled* (3.55), and *larger recycling carts/bins* (3.40). In addition, *sending out regular electronic reminders like texts or emails* (2.22) may also be effective to some extent. There were 10.4% of the respondents who felt it would have an “impact”. *Curbside recycling of food waste for composting* (1.92) and *additional recycling carts/bins* (1.90) had limited impact on recycling. The ideas with the least overall impact were *making recycling available where I live* (1.32), *easing restrictions on where I can put cart/bin outside my home* (1.54), and *not requiring items to be cleaned before recycling* (1.69).

Table 72. Impact of Ideas to Expand Residential Recycling Service (In Descending Mean Order).

Barrier Type	Mean	Very Little Impact 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Significant Impact 9	% Above 5
Collecting recycling every week, not every other week	4.82	38.8	3.0	3.0	0.3	9.6	4.3	6.0	3.5	31.5	45.3
Financial incentive to recycle	3.97	41.3	5.5	5.8	3.5	12.8	3.3	7.8	4.3	15.6	31.0
More education about what can be recycled	3.55	45.6	6.0	6.0	3.5	13.6	4.5	6.3	3.3	11.1	25.2
Larger recycling carts/bins	3.40	58.0	3.8	2.3	1.3	9.6	1.0	3.0	1.8	19.2	25.0
Sending out regular electronic reminders like texts or emails	2.22	69.3	7.6	3.5	1.3	8.1	2.3	2.0	0.8	5.3	10.4
Curbside recycling of food waste for composting	1.92	77.5	5.1	2.3	2.0	5.3	1.3	1.8	0.8	4.1	8.0
Additional recycling carts/bins	1.90	78.5	5.1	3.3	0.8	4.6	1.0	0.5	0.8	5.6	7.9
Not requiring items to be cleaned before recycling	1.69	80.4	6.5	3.0	0.8	4.3	0.5	0.8	0.0	3.8	5.1
Easing restrictions on where I can put cart/bin outside home	1.54	84.6	5.1	1.8	0.5	4.6	0.0	1.3	0.0	2.3	3.6
Making recycling available where I live	1.32	93.2	0.5	0.5	0.5	3.0	0.3	0.5	0.0	1.5	2.3

Appendix W shows other ideas the respondents believed would increase recycling. There were 15 total comments made by the respondents but there was no common theme among them. One other open-ended question asked respondents who did not have recycling in their areas where they lived. Besides apartments, there were only five areas mentioned including West Carnaby, Chatham, Timber Hitch, Bennington Woods, and Brisbane Woods.

The final question in this set on recycling asked the respondents if they would be willing to pay a higher monthly fee to pay for any of the previous recycling service expansion ideas. There was limited support for paying higher recycling fees. The mean was 3.40 which was well below the midpoint of 5 on the scale. There was only 20.4% on the “supportive” side of the scale with 21.0% responding neutral (Table 73). However, there were 58.5% on the “unsupportive” side. In addition, there was a very high percentage (42.9%) responding not at all supportive to the increase in the monthly fee.

Table 73. Support for Paying a Higher Monthly Fee for Solid Waste Service for Recycling Service Expansion.

Year	Mean	Not At All Supportive 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Extremely Supportive 9	% Above 5
14	3.40	42.9	6.3	6.3	3.0	21.0	5.8	7.3	3.0	4.3	20.4

Recycling Crosstabulations

Crosstabulations were conducted on barriers to residential recycling were conducted on age, education, gender, housing type, income, race, years in Cary, and zip code are shown in Tables B459-B466 of Appendix B. Instead of examining each demographic variable separately, it would be more informative to look at each barrier separately as it impacts residential recycling. There were a total of 29 subgroups with sample sizes over 10. The barriers will be discussed in order of overall ranking by the total sample. To avoid confusion, overall rankings by the total sample are written out (such as ninth) and ranking in the subgroups are numerical (such as 9th).

The top barrier for the total sample was *recycling cart/bin too small*. This barrier ranked 1st in 21 of the 29 subgroups indicating this was the most important barrier. Its lowest rating was 5th for apartment dwellers. The barrier that rated second was *not sure which things can be recycled*. This was the most significant barrier (rated 1st) for 8 subgroups including 18-25 age group, over 65 age group, apartment dwellers, townhouse/condo dwellers, Asians, 0-\$45,000 income level, 2-5 year residents, and Hispanics. In addition, this barrier ranked 2nd in 19 other subgroups. Its lowest ranking was 4th for 0-1 year residents and African-Americans.

The barrier rated third overall was *the Town doesn't recycle the kinds of things I want to recycle*. The highest rating for this barrier was 3rd (10 subgroups). It also rated 4th by 4 other subgroups. This barrier had the least impact on 0-1 year residents (11th), apartment dwellers (10th), and African-Americans (10th). *I need additional recycling carts/bins* was rated fourth by the total sample and was rated the same in 9 of the subgroups. It was more of a significant barrier for 0-1 year residents where it ranked 2nd. In addition, it ranked 3rd for 56-65 age group, females, \$100,001-\$150,000 income level, and the zip code areas of 27511 and 27518. The lowest impact was for the 18-25 age group ranking 10th.

The fifth rated overall barrier was *I forget, don't remember to recycle*. This barrier was frequently ranked 3rd (8 subgroups) and 5th (8 subgroups). It was a more considerable barrier (ranking 2nd) for 18-25 age group, 0-\$45,000, and African-Americans. Its lowest impact (ranking 7th) was for \$75,001-\$100,000 income level, \$100,001-\$150,000 income level, and 27518 zip code. The barrier *I'm too busy, don't have time* ranked sixth overall and in the subgroups it generally rated 5th (11 subgroups) or 6th (7 subgroups). This was a stronger barrier for Hispanics (2nd), males (3rd), 0-\$45,000 income level (3rd), and Asians (3rd). It had the least impact on the over 65 age group (8th) and 18-25 age group (7th).

Preparing items is too much of a hassle, too much trouble ranked seventh overall. Within the subgroups, this barrier generally rated 6th (11 subgroups) or 7th (12 subgroups). This was a stronger barrier for Asians (4th), 0-\$45,000 income level (5th), and 0-1 year residents (5th). The lowest impact was 9th for PhD/JD/MD degrees. The barrier ranked eighth overall was *recycling isn't important to me* and this barrier earned the same ranking in 14 of the subgroups. It had its strongest impact on PhD/JD/MD degrees (4th) and 18-25 age group (5th) and lowest for \$75,001-\$100,000 income level (11th), over 65 age group (10th) and females (10th).

The barrier rated ninth by the total sample was *recycling is not available where I live*. There was a higher degree of variability in the subgroups with the most frequent ratings of 8th (6 subgroups) and 9th (8 subgroups). However, this served as an important barrier for apartment dwellers (2nd), African-Americans (3rd), and 0-1 year residents (3rd). The next to last place barrier was *don't have room at my home for recycling carts/bins*. Within the subgroups, the ranking for this barrier generally ranged

between 9th and 11th. The three subgroups where it was more of a barrier (ranking 7th) was PhD/JD/MD degrees, apartment dwellers, and African-Americans. The barrier with the least impact was *recycling costs too much* ranking eleventh overall. The 0-1 year residents did rank this somewhat higher at 7th.

The crosstabulations for ideas to expand residential recycling are shown in Tables (B467-B472). They were conducted on age, education, gender, housing type, income, race, years in Cary, and zip code are shown in Appendix B.

The idea rated first by the total sample was *collecting recycling every week, not every other week*. This idea also ranked 1st in 22 of the 29 subgroups with sample size over 10. Its lowest impact was ranking 3rd for the 18-25 age group and apartment dwellers. *Financial incentive to recycle* was rated second overall. This idea rated 1st in 7 subgroups including the 18-25 age group, apartment dwellers, townhouse/condo dwellers, 0-\$45,000 income level, African-Americans, Hispanics, and 2-5 year residents. It also rated 2nd in 16 subgroups. The idea had the lowest impact (ranked 4th) for 56-65 age group, over 65 age group, \$100,001-\$150,000 income level, and 27518 zip code.

More education about what can be recycled ranked third overall. Within the subgroups, this idea generally ranked 3rd (14 subgroups) and 4th (9 subgroups). Its strongest impact (ranking 2nd) was for 18-25 age group, over 65 age group, apartment dwellers, \$75,001-\$100,000 income level, and \$100,001-\$150,000 income level. The least impact was for African-Americans ranking 5th. Ranking fourth overall was the need for *larger recycling carts/bins*. This idea generally rated 3rd (11 subgroups) or 4th (11 subgroups). It had the greatest impact (ranking 2nd) on 56-65 age group, over \$150,000 income level, and 27518 zip code. The least impact was for 0-1 year residents and apartment dwellers ranking 6th.

Sending out regular electronic reminders like texts or emails was rated fifth by the total sample. This was also rated 5th in 20 of the subgroups. The highest rating was 4th by 18-25 age group, apartment dwellers, 0-\$45,000 income level, and African-Americans. The least impact was for over 65 age group (8th), PhD/JD/MD degrees (7th), 0-1 year residents (7th), and 27518 zip code (7th). Ranking sixth was *curbside recycling of food waste for composting*. Within the subgroups, most of the ratings were 6th (11 subgroups) and 7th (9 subgroups). The highest rating was 5th for PhD/JD/MD degrees. The lowest rating were from apartment dwellers (10th) followed by the 56-65 age group, over 65 age group, \$45,001-\$75,000 income level, and African-Americans who rated it 9th.

Additional recycling carts/bins was ranked seventh overall. There was a higher degree of variability within the subgroups for this idea. Most of the ratings varied between 6th and 9th. This idea would have the most impact on 0-1 year residents (4th), 56-65 age group (5th), and 27518 zip code (5th). It would have lesser impact on 18-25 age group (10th), apartment dwellers (9th), townhouse/condo dwellers (9th), 0-\$45,000 income level (9th), and 2-5 year residents (9th). The idea that ranked eighth overall was *not requiring items to be cleaned before recycling*. The most frequent rating was 8th in 13 subgroups. The highest rating was only 6th in 6 of the subgroups and the lowest was from Hispanics (10th).

Easing restrictions on where I can put cart/bin outside my home was rated next to last or 9th overall. Within the subgroups, the most frequent rating was 9th by 17 of the subgroups. There were a few subgroups that this idea would have a greater impact including over 65 age group (5th), \$45,001-\$75,000 income level (6th), and African-Americans (6th). There were three subgroups that rated this last including 0-\$45,000 income level, 0-1 year residents, and 27511 zip code. The idea rated last

was *making recycling available where I live*. This was rated last or 10th by 23 of the subgroups. There were two subgroups where this would have the most impact. This would be apartments (5th) and 0-1 year residents (5th).

The final set of crosstabulations for the recycling section examined paying a higher monthly fee for solid waste service for recycling service expansion (B475-B484). The crosstabulations were run on age, education, gender, housing type, income, race, voter status, voted in 2013 local elections, years in Cary, and zip code. The highest level of support (highest means) was from PhD/JD/MD degrees (4.47), 0-1 year residents (4.38), over \$150,000 income level (4.12), 27519 zip code (3.89), and \$100,001-\$150,000 income level (3.81). The lowest level of support was from 0-\$45,000 income level (2.28), 18-25 age group (2.33), apartment dwellers (2.65), Asians (2.72), and nonregistered voters (2.79).

Appendix A

Town of Cary 2014 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 that 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. How would you rate Cary overall as a place to live? Use a 9-point scale where 1 is very undesirable and 9 is very desirable, 5 is average.

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

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

2. 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 Worse	Somewhat Worse	The Same	Somewhat Better	Much Better

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

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

4. On a scale of 1 to 9 with 1 being very dissatisfied to 9 being very satisfied, rate your level of satisfaction with the following Town of Cary solid waste services. If you have not used any of the services respond with not applicable.

	Very Dissatisfied				Neutral					Very Dissatisfied	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
4a. Curbside recycling collection.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	
4b. Curbside garbage collection.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	
4c. Curbside yard waste collection.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	
4d. Curbside loose leaf collection.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	
4e. Curbside Christmas Tree collection.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	

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

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

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

Area _____ Problem _____
 Area _____ Problem _____

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

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Very Poor				Average				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 _____

7. Thinking about the Town’s environmental efforts such as recycling, open space preservation, water conservation, sustainability, erosion control, and litter reduction, 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 Dissatisfied				Neutral				Very Satisfied

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

8. How effectively do you feel the 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 Ineffective				Neutral				Very Effective

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

9. The Town is working to create a more vibrant downtown including converting old Cary Elementary into the Cary Arts Center, renovating the community's first movie theater, designing a new downtown park and upgraded streetscapes, and holding more outdoor events downtown. Using the same 9-point satisfaction scale, how satisfied are you with the job the Town is doing with downtown revitalization?

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?

10. Thinking now about the Town's efforts with transportation like widening roads, offering C-Tran bus service, synchronizing signal lights, adding bike lanes, greenways and sidewalks. 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?

11. Next we'd like your opinion on how the Town is doing with planning and development issues like 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 is in place to support growth. Using the same 9-point satisfaction scale, how satisfied would you say you are overall with the job the Town is doing with planning and development?

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?

12. We'd like your opinion on how the Town is doing with parks, recreation, and cultural resources issues such as the quality and quantity of existing parks, greenways, and community centers, how close these facilities are located to your home, planning for and building new parks, community centers, greenways, and trails. How satisfied are you with the overall job the Town is doing with parks, recreation, and cultural resources issues using the same 9-point 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?

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

- Yes (Continue) No (Skip to #15)

14. Please tell us your opinion regarding that contact with Town staff using a 9-point scale where 1 is very poor and 9 is excellent, 5 is average.

	Very Poor			Average			Excellent		
14a. Overall quality of customer service.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
14b. Promptness of response.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
14c. Professionalism.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
14d. Knowledgeable.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
14e. Courteous.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
14f. Helpful.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

(For responses below 5) Please tell us specifically what you recall about this interaction.

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

- Yes (Continue) No (Skip to #18)

16. Was the person you contacted at the Police Department?

- Police Officer
 Clerk
 Dispatcher
 Animal Control
 Detective
 District Commander
 Not Sure

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

	Very Poor			Average			Excellent		
17a. Courteous.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
17b. Fairness.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
17c. Competence.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
17d. Problem solving.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
17e. Response time.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

NA

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

- Yes (Continue) No (Skip to #20)

19. 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			Average			Excellent		
19a. Courteous.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
19b. Fairness.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
19c. Competence.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
19d. Problem solving.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
19e. Response time.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

NA

20. 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 #23)

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

Program _____ Location _____
Program _____ Location _____

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

	Very Poor				Average				Excellent	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
22a. Program quality.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
22b. Facility quality.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
22c. Cost or amount of fee.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA
22d. Overall experience.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
22e. Ease of registration.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
22f. Instructor or coach quality.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA

23. Cary's municipal tax rate is 35 cents per \$100 of property valuation. So a home valued at \$100,000 will have a tax of \$350. By comparison the same home will have a tax of about \$469 in Charlotte, \$383 in Raleigh, and \$568 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

24. Have you visited downtown Cary in the last year?

- Yes – what drew you to downtown? _____
 No – why not? _____

25. The Town is working hard to create a more vibrant downtown. For each of the following amenities or activities, please tell us how effective it would be in bringing you downtown more often. Use a 9-point scale from 1 which is not likely at all to 9 which is extremely likely, 5 is neutral.

	Not Likely at All				Neutral				Extremely Likely	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
25a. Festivals.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
25b. Additional art exhibition space.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
25c. Concerts.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
25d. Working studio space for artists.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
25e. Outdoor performances.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
25f. Grocery store.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
25g. Farmer's Market.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
25h. Preservation/adaptive reuse of historic building.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
25i. Cafes and restaurants.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
25j. Historical walking tour.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
25k. Shopping opportunities.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
25l. Public art.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
25m. Museums.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
25n. Pet shop.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
25o. Coffee shop.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
25p. Bars/Pubs.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
25q. Ice cream/Yogurt shop.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
25r. Gallery Crawl.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
25s. Other? _____										

26. 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, 5 is average.

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

What specific projects, services, or issues came to mind when you decided on that rating?

27. How satisfied are you with the Town of Cary's 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, 5 is neutral.

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

Again, what specific projects, services, or issues came to mind when you decided on that rating?

28. 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 Neutral Very
 Dissatisfied Satisfied

Again, what specific projects, services, or issues came to mind when you decided on that rating?

29. The Town would like more involvement from its citizens such as volunteering for an advisory board, attending community meetings, or commenting on proposed projects. For the following items, please tell us if it is a barrier or hinders your involvement in Town government. Use a 9-point scale where 1 is not a barrier at all and 9 is a very significant barrier, 5 is neutral.

	Not a Barrier At All		Neutral					Very Significant Barrier	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
29a. Don't know about opportunities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
29b. Topics don't interest me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
29c. Issues don't affect me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
29d. Too busy, don't have time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
20e. Timing of opportunities is inconvenient	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
29f. Don't have transportation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
29g. Waste of time, 1 person can't make a difference	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
29h. Don't understand government processes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
29i. Don't feel qualified to offer input	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
29j. Other _____									

30. Please indicate how much you use the following information sources that Cary uses to communicate with its citizens. Use a 9-point scale from 1 never use to 9 frequently use.

	Never Use								Frequently Use
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
30a. Cary News.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
30b. Raleigh News & Observer.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
30c. Television.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
30d. Radio.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
30e. The Town's website.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
30f. The Town's email list services.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
30g. Word of mouth (friends/neighbors).....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
30h. Cary TV 11, Cary's Govt. Access Cable Channel.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
30i. BUD (Cary's water & sewer bill newsletter).....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
30j. The Town's Block Leader Program.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
30k. Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources Program Brochure.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
30l. Independent Weekly/Indy Week.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
30m. Homeowner's association.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
30n. Twitter.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
30o. Cary Citizen website.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
30p. Facebook.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
30q. YouTube.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

31. Please indicate how much you would use the following social media sources if Cary used them to communicate with its citizens. Use the same 9-point scale from 1 never use to 9 frequently use.

	Never Use								Frequently Use
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31a. Tumblr.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31b. Next Door.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31c. Instagram.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31d. Google Plus.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

32. The Town offers live and recorded video programs about government activities and issues via cable television, the Town's website, and YouTube. Programs include meetings of the Cary Town Council, the Wake County School Board, and the Wake County Commissioners. Other programs include live traffic cameras during rush hours as well as monthly news shows like BUD TV and Cary Matters. There's also the Biennial Cary Community Candidate Forum for local elected offices. In the last two years, how often would you say that your or a member of your family has watched any of these programs, in whole or in part? (Read choices)

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

33. In thinking about all of the video programs the Town offers, do you watch them via? (check all that apply)

- Cable TV
- Town's website
- You Tube
- I don't watch

34. Do you have access to the Internet at? (check all that apply)

- Home
- Work
- Mobile Device
- No Access

35. 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, 5 is average.

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

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

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

37. 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 Unsafe Average Extremely Safe

38. Since 2008, the Town of Cary has been proactively purchasing land and banking it for future public uses such as parks, fire stations, and open space. Generally speaking, how supportive would you be of the Town's increasing property taxes to help continue paying for the land banking program? Use a 1-9 scale where 1 is "not at all supportive" and 9 is "extremely supportive?"

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

39. Our final questions deal with recycling. When thinking about residential recycling, please tell us how much of a barrier each of the following is to your recycling efforts. Use a 9-point scale where 1 is not a barrier at all and 9 is a very significant barrier, 5 is neutral.

	Not a Barrier At All		Neutral					Very Significant Barrier	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
39a. Not sure which things can be recycled.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
39b. I forget, don't remember to recycle.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
39c. Recycling isn't important to me.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
39d. I'm too busy; don't have time.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
39e. My recycling cart/bin is too small.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
39f. Preparing items for recycling is too much of a hassle, too much trouble.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
39g. Don't have room at my home for recycling carts/bins.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
39h. Recycling isn't available where I live.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
39i. I need additional recycling carts/bins.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
39j. Recycling costs too much.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
39k. The Town doesn't recycle the kinds of things I want to recycle.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Please specify if over 5:

39l. Other barriers to recycling that you face? Please specify _____

40. Still thinking about recycling, please tell us the level of impact each of the following would likely have on your recycling more. Use a 1-9 scale where 1 is very little impact and 9 is a very significant impact.

	Very Little Impact					Neutral				Very Significant Impact
40a. More education about what can be recycled.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
40b. Sending me regular electronic recycling reminders like texts or emails.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
40c. A financial incentive to recycle.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
40d. Collecting recycling every week instead of every other week.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
40e. Larger recycling carts/bins.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
40f. Not requiring items to be cleaned before being recycled.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
40g. Easing restrictions on where I can put my recycling cart/bin outside my home.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
40h. Additional recycling carts/bins.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
40i. Curbside recycling of food waste for composting.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
40j. Making recycling available where I live..... Please specify street name if over 5:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	

40k. Other ideas for helping you recycle more? Please specify _____

41. If the Town were able to implement any of these recycling service expansion ideas, how supportive would you be of paying a higher monthly fee for solid waste services, keeping in mind that the current fee is \$15. Use a 1-9 scale where 1 is not at all supportive of paying more and 9 is extremely supportive of paying more for service changes.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Not At All Supportive				Neutral				Extremely Supportive

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

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

- 0-1
 2-5
 6-10
 11-20
 More than 20
 Cary Native

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

- Single family detached home
- Apartment
- Townhouse
- Condominium
- Mobile home
- Duplex
- Other _____

44. 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

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

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

46. May I ask your race?

- Caucasian African-American Native-American Asian Hispanic Other

47. Are you a registered voter?

- Yes No

48. Did you vote in the 2013 local elections this past fall?

- Yes No

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

- 0-\$45,000 \$45,001-\$75,000 \$75,001-\$100,000 \$100,001-\$150,000 Over \$150,000

50. 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 how our citizen's feelings and concerns. Would you be willing to participate in one of our sessions that will last about an hour? 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	35	11.4	88.6
26-55	258	22.5	77.5
56-65	58	34.5	65.5
Over 65	46	26.1	73.9

Table B2. Contact with the Town Government by Education.

Education	n	Yes	No
HS/Some College	158	17.7	82.3
College Degree	218	28.0	72.0
PhD/JD/MD	19	36.8	63.2

Table B3. Contact with the Town Government by Gender.

Gender	n	Yes	No
Male	186	24.2	75.8
Female	215	23.7	76.3

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

Housing Type	n	Yes	No
Single Family	315	25.1	74.9
Apartment	42	19.0	81.0
Townhouse/Condo	39	20.5	79.5

Table B5. Contact with the Town Government by Income.

Income	n	Yes	No
0-\$45,000	53	15.1	84.9
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	24.2	75.8
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	32.1	67.9
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	25.0	75.0
Over \$150,000	68	27.9	72.1

Table B6. Contact with the Town Government by Race.

Race	n	Yes	No
Caucasian	288	26.7	73.3
African-American	31	29.0	71.0
Asian	39	15.4	84.6
Hispanic	22	9.1	90.9
Other	7	14.3	85.7

Table B7. Contact with the Town Government by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Yes	No
0-1	16	0.0	100.0
2-5	69	20.3	79.7
6-10	101	19.8	80.2
Over 10	204	30.4	69.6
Native	9	0.0	100.0

Table B8. Contact with the Town Government by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Yes	No
27511	93	23.7	76.3
27513	114	21.1	78.9
27518	66	30.3	69.7
27519	113	23.9	76.1

Town Government Staff: Courteous Crosstabulations

Table B9. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Courteous by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	4	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
26-55	56	7.80	3.6	3.6	0.0	0.0	1.8	3.6	10.7	26.8	50.0	B+
56-65	19	8.32	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	15.8	21.1	57.9	A-
Over 65	12	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	16.7	66.7	A

Table B10. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Courteous by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	27	7.78	3.7	3.7	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	18.5	14.8	55.6	B
College Degree	59	8.14	1.7	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.1	10.2	25.4	55.9	A-
PhD/JD/MD	7	8.57	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	42.9	57.1	A

Table B11. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Courteous by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	44	7.71	2.3	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	18.2	29.5	40.9	B
Female	49	8.39	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	6.1	18.4	69.4	A-

Table B12. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Courteous by Housing.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	76	8.12	1.3	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	10.5	26.3	55.3	A-
Apartment	8	7.25	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	12.5	0.0	62.5	B-
Townhouse/Condo	8	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	25.0	62.5	A

Table B13. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Courteous by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$45,000	8	6.50	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	62.5	C-
\$45,001-\$75,000	15	8.47	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	13.3	66.7	A
\$75,001-\$100,000	18	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	16.7	66.7	A
\$100,001-\$150,000	18	7.89	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	5.6	27.8	50.0	B+
Over \$150,000	19	8.32	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	10.5	31.6	52.6	A-

Table B14. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Courteous by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	75	8.19	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	1.3	4.0	13.3	28.0	52.0	A-
African-American	8	7.75	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	75.0	B
Asian	6	8.83	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	83.3	A+
Hispanic	2	5.00	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	F
Other	1	2.00	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	F

Table B15. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Courteous by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-5	14	7.93	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	28.6	50.0	B+
6-10	18	7.89	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	16.7	11.1	61.1	B+
Over 10	61	8.15	1.6	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.9	9.8	26.2	55.7	A-
Native	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B16. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Courteous by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	21	7.81	9.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	14.3	61.9	B+
27513	24	7.83	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	8.3	33.3	41.7	B+
27518	19	8.58	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.5	21.1	68.4	A
27519	26	8.12	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	11.5	23.1	57.7	A-

Town Government Staff: Professionalism Crosstabulations

Table B17. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff – Professionalism by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	4	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
26-55	56	7.82	3.6	3.6	0.0	1.8	1.8	1.8	8.9	25.0	53.6	B+
56-65	19	7.84	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	15.8	21.1	52.6	B+
Over 65	12	8.42	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	8.3	16.7	66.7	A

Table B18. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Professionalism by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	27	7.70	3.7	3.7	0.0	3.7	3.7	3.7	7.4	14.8	59.3	B
College Degree	59	8.00	3.4	1.7	0.0	0.0	1.7	1.7	11.9	25.4	54.2	B+
PhD/JD/MD	7	8.71	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	71.4	A+

Table B19. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Professionalism by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	44	7.48	4.5	4.5	0.0	2.3	2.3	4.5	11.4	27.3	43.2	B-
Female	49	8.41	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	8.2	18.4	69.4	A-

Table B20. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Professionalism by Housing.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	76	8.04	2.6	2.6	0.0	0.0	1.3	2.6	9.2	25.0	56.6	B+
Apartment	8	6.88	12.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	62.5	C
Townhouse/Condo	8	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	25.0	62.5	A

Table B21. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Professionalism by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$45,000	8	6.50	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	62.5	C-
\$45,001-\$75,000	15	7.93	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	6.7	6.7	6.7	13.3	60.0	B+
\$75,001-\$100,000	18	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	16.7	66.7	A
\$100,001-\$150,000	18	7.78	5.6	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	27.8	55.6	B
Over \$150,000	19	8.37	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	10.5	26.3	57.9	A-

Table B22. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Professionalism by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	75	8.08	1.3	1.3	0.0	1.3	2.7	2.7	9.3	28.0	53.3	A-
African-American	8	7.75	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	75.0	B
Asian	6	8.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	83.3	A
Hispanic	2	5.00	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	F
Other	1	2.00	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	F

Table B23. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Professionalism by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-5	14	7.71	0.0	7.1	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	7.1	28.6	50.0	B
6-10	18	7.89	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	16.7	11.1	61.1	B+
Over 10	61	8.05	3.3	1.6	0.0	0.0	1.6	3.3	8.2	24.6	57.4	B+
Native	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B24. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Professionalism by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	21	7.76	9.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	19.0	57.1	B
27513	24	7.63	4.2	4.2	0.0	0.0	4.2	8.3	4.2	25.0	50.0	B
27518	19	8.47	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.5	31.6	57.9	A
27519	26	8.04	0.0	3.8	0.0	3.8	3.8	0.0	11.5	11.5	65.4	B+

Town Government Staff: Promptness of Response Crosstabulations

Table B25. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff – Promptness of Response by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	4	8.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	A+
26-55	55	7.76	1.8	0.0	0.0	1.8	7.3	3.6	16.4	27.3	41.8	B
56-65	19	7.47	10.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	15.8	15.8	52.6	B-
Over 65	12	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	8.3	16.7	66.7	A-

Table B26. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Promptness of Response by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	26	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	7.7	0.0	11.5	26.9	50.0	B+
College Degree	59	7.71	5.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.8	3.4	13.6	23.7	47.5	B
PhD/JD/MD	7	8.29	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.	28.6	14.3	57.1	A-

Table B27. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Promptness of Response by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	43	7.49	4.7	0.0	0.0	2.3	7.0	4.7	18.6	23.3	39.5	B-
Female	49	8.14	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.1	0.0	10.2	24.5	57.1	A-

Table B28. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Promptness of Response by Housing.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	75	7.97	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	2.7	16.0	25.3	48.0	B+
Apartment	8	6.75	12.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	50.0	C
Townhouse/Condo	8	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	25.0	62.5	A

Table B29. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Promptness of Response by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$45,000	7	7.14	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	14.3	57.1	C+
\$45,001-\$75,000	15	7.60	6.7	0.0	0.0	6.7	6.7	0.0	6.7	13.3	60.0	B
\$75,001-\$100,000	18	8.39	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	11.1	16.7	66.7	A-
\$100,001-\$150,000	18	7.56	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	11.1	33.3	38.9	B
Over \$150,000	19	8.05	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	26.3	26.3	42.1	B+

Table B30. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Promptness of Response by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	75	7.91	1.3	0.0	0.0	1.3	6.7	2.7	14.7	28.0	45.3	B+
African-American	8	6.88	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	62.5	C
Asian	6	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7	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	5.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	F

Table B31. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Promptness of Response by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-5	14	7.79	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	7.1	0.0	14.3	28.6	42.9	B+
6-10	17	8.06	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.9	5.9	17.6	17.6	52.9	A-
Over 10	61	7.79	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.6	1.6	13.1	24.6	49.2	B+
Native	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B32. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Promptness of Response by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	20	7.55	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	25.0	50.0	B
27513	24	7.50	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	4.2	16.7	20.8	41.7	B-
27518	19	8.37	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.8	31.6	52.6	A-
27519	26	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	7.7	0.0	15.4	19.2	53.8	B+

Town Government Staff: Helpful Crosstabulations

Table B33. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff – Helpful by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	4	8.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	A+
26-55	56	7.70	3.6	1.8	0.0	1.8	3.6	7.1	8.9	26.8	46.4	B
56-65	19	7.63	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.5	0.0	21.1	10.5	52.6	B
Over 65	12	8.25	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	8.3	16.7	66.7	A-

Table B34. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Helpful by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	27	7.67	3.7	3.7	0.0	3.7	3.7	0.0	14.8	14.8	55.6	B
College Degree	59	7.78	3.4	0.0	0.0	1.7	5.1	6.8	10.2	25.4	47.5	B
PhD/JD/MD	7	8.71	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	71.4	A+

Table B35. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Helpful by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	44	7.41	4.5	2.3	0.0	2.3	6.8	6.8	11.4	25.0	40.9	B-
Female	49	8.18	2.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	10.2	20.4	61.2	A-

Table B36. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Helpful by Housing.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	76	7.87	2.6	1.3	0.0	1.3	3.9	5.3	10.5	23.7	51.3	B+
Apartment	8	6.88	12.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	62.5	C
Townhouse/Condo	8	8.38	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	37.5	50.0	A-

Table B37. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Helpful by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$45,000	8	6.78	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	50.0	C
\$45,001-\$75,000	15	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	6.7	0.0	20.0	0.0	66.7	B+
\$75,001-\$100,000	18	8.22	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	5.6	0.0	5.6	16.7	66.7	A-
\$100,001-\$150,000	18	7.61	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	5.6	11.1	33.3	38.9	B
Over \$150,000	19	8.16	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.5	10.5	31.6	47.4	A-

Table B38. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Helpful by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	75	7.92	1.3	0.0	0.0	2.7	5.3	4.0	12.0	26.7	48.0	B+
African-American	8	7.75	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	75.0	B
Asian	6	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	83.3	A
Hispanic	2	5.00	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	F
Other	1	2.00	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	F

Table B39. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Helpful by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-5	14	7.57	0.0	7.1	0.0	7.1	7.1	0.0	0.0	28.6	50.0	B
6-10	18	7.67	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	5.6	22.2	5.6	55.6	B
Over 10	61	7.92	3.3	0.0	0.0	1.6	3.3	4.9	9.8	26.2	50.8	B+
Native	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B40. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Helpful by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	21	7.52	9.5	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	14.3	19.0	52.4	B
27513	24	7.46	4.2	4.2	0.0	0.0	4.2	8.3	12.5	25.0	41.7	B-
27518	19	8.26	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	10.5	31.6	52.6	A-
27519	26	8.08	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	7.7	3.8	7.7	15.4	61.5	A-

Town Government Staff: Knowledgeable Crosstabulations

Table B41. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff – Knowledgeable by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	4	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	A
26-55	56	7.63	3.6	1.8	0.0	1.8	7.1	5.4	8.9	25.0	46.4	B
56-65	19	7.68	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	10.5	10.5	15.8	52.6	B
Over 65	12	8.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	8.3	25.0	58.3	A-

Table B42. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Knowledgeable by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	27	7.59	3.7	3.7	0.0	3.7	3.7	3.7	11.1	18.5	51.9	B
College Degree	59	7.76	3.4	0.0	0.0	1.7	6.8	6.8	6.8	27.1	47.5	B
PhD/JD/MD	7	8.43	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	28.6	57.1	A

Table B43. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Knowledgeable by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	44	7.32	4.5	2.3	0.0	2.3	6.8	9.1	11.4	27.3	36.4	B-
Female	49	8.16	2.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	4.1	2.0	6.1	22.4	61.2	A-

Table B44. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Knowledgeable by Housing.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	76	7.83	2.6	1.3	0.0	1.3	5.3	5.3	9.2	25.0	50.0	B+
Apartment	8	6.75	12.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	50.0	C
Townhouse/Condo	8	8.25	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	37.5	50.0	A-

Table B45. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Knowledgeable by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$45,000	8	6.25	25.0	0.0	0.0	.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	25.0	37.5	D+
\$45,001-\$75,000	15	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	6.7	0.0	13.3	13.3	60.0	B+
\$75,001-\$100,000	18	8.22	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	11.1	0.0	16.7	66.7	A-
\$100,001-\$150,000	18	7.56	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	5.6	5.6	27.8	44.4	B
Over \$150,000	19	8.11	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.5	15.8	26.3	47.4	A-

Table B46. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Knowledgeable by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	75	7.87	1.3	0.0	0.0	2.7	6.7	5.3	9.3	28.0	46.7	B+
African-American	8	7.63	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	62.5	B
Asian	6	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	83.3	A
Hispanic	2	5.00	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	F
Other	1	2.00	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	F

Table B47. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Knowledgeable by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-5	14	7.64	0.0	7.1	0.0	7.1	0.0	7.1	0.0	28.6	50.0	B
6-10	18	7.56	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	11.1	5.6	11.1	55.6	B
Over 10	61	7.85	3.3	0.0	0.0	1.6	4.9	3.3	11.5	27.9	47.5	B+
Native	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B48. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Knowledgeable by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	21	7.57	9.5	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	9.5	23.8	52.4	B
27513	24	7.42	4.2	4.2	0.0	0.0	8.3	4.2	8.3	33.3	37.5	B-
27518	19	8.32	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	10.5	31.6	52.6	A-
27519	26	7.89	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	7.7	11.5	7.7	11.5	57.7	B+

Town Government Staff: Overall Quality of Customer Service Crosstabulations

Table B49. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Overall Quality of Customer Service by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	4	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
26-55	58	7.55	3.4	1.7	0.0	1.7	5.2	10.3	10.3	24.1	43.1	B
56-65	19	7.79	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	21.1	15.8	52.6	B+
Over 65	12	8.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	8.3	0.0	25.0	58.3	A-

Table B50. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Overall Quality of Customer Service by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	28	7.64	3.6	0.0	0.0	3.6	7.1	10.7	7.1	14.3	53.6	B
College Degree	60	7.73	3.3	1.7	0.0	0.0	5.0	6.7	11.7	25.0	46.7	B
PhD/JD/MD	7	8.43	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	28.6	57.1	A

Table B51. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Overall Quality of Customer Service by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	44	7.39	4.5	0.0	0.0	2.3	6.8	11.4	13.6	25.0	36.4	B-
Female	51	8.08	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	3.9	7.8	19.6	60.8	A-

Table B52. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Overall Quality of Customer Service by Housing.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	78	7.78	2.6	1.3	0.0	0.0	5.1	9.0	10.3	24.4	47.4	B
Apartment	8	6.88	12.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	62.5	C
Townhouse/Condo	8	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	25.0	62.5	A

Table B53. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Overall Quality of Customer Service by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$45,000	8	6.50	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	62.5	C-
\$45,001-\$75,000	15	7.93	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	6.7	6.7	6.7	13.3	60.0	B+
\$75,001-\$100,000	19	8.05	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	10.5	15.8	63.2	B+
\$100,001-\$150,000	19	7.58	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	10.5	5.3	36.8	36.8	B
Over \$150,000	19	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.8	15.8	21.1	47.4	B+

Table B54. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Overall Quality of Customer Service by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	77	7.81	1.3	1.3	0.0	1.3	5.2	7.8	11.7	26.0	45.5	B+
African-American	8	7.75	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	75.0	B
Asian	6	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	16.7	66.7	A-
Hispanic	2	5.00	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	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 B55. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Overall Quality of Customer Service by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-5	14	7.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	7.1	0.0	14.3	21.4	50.0	B+
6-10	19	7.68	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	10.5	15.8	5.3	57.9	B
Over 10	62	7.76	3.2	1.6	0.0	0.0	4.8	8.1	8.1	27.4	46.8	B
Native	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B56. Opinion Regarding Contact with Town Government Staff - Overall Quality of Customer Service by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	22	7.55	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	4.5	9.1	22.7	50.0	B
27513	25	7.28	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	12.0	12.0	20.0	40.0	B-
27518	19	8.21	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	15.8	31.6	47.4	A-
27519	26	8.08	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	7.7	3.8	7.7	15.4	61.5	A-

Maintenance of Streets and Roads Crosstabulations

Table B57. Maintenance of Streets and Roads by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	315	6.86	0.3	1.0	1.9	3.5	10.8	15.2	30.8	25.4	11.1	C
Apartment	42	6.95	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	14.3	21.4	23.8	21.4	16.7	C+
Townhouse/Condo	39	6.59	0.0	2.6	2.6	5.1	17.9	12.8	25.6	20.5	12.8	C-

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

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	16	7.69	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	12.5	12.5	43.8	25.0	B
2-5	69	6.78	0.0	0.0	1.4	4.3	11.6	17.4	34.8	23.2	7.2	C
6-10	11	7.02	0.0	1.0	0.0	4.0	12.9	12.9	26.7	27.7	14.9	C+
Over 10	204	6.68	1.0	1.5	3.4	2.5	12.3	16.2	31.4	21.1	10.8	C
Native	9	6.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	11.1	22.2	11.1	33.3	11.1	C

Table B59. Maintenance of Streets and Roads by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	93	6.60	1.1	1.1	3.2	3.2	14.0	18.3	28.0	21.5	9.7	C-
27513	114	6.68	0.9	0.0	2.6	6.1	14.9	16.7	24.6	20.2	14.0	C
27518	66	6.99	0.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	7.6	16.7	34.8	24.2	12.1	C+
27519	113	7.06	0.0	1.8	0.9	1.8	8.0	12.4	33.6	31.0	10.6	C+

Cleanliness and Appearance of Parks Crosstabulations

Table B60. Cleanliness and Appearance of Parks by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	314	8.43	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	1.6	8.9	26.8	60.8	A
Apartment	40	8.35	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	2.5	10.0	17.5	65.0	A-
Townhouse/Condo	39	8.46	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	38.5	53.8	A

Table B61. Cleanliness and Appearance of Parks by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	15	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	13.3	13.3	66.7	A-
2-5	67	8.39	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	7.5	25.4	61.2	A-
6-10	101	8.39	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	7.9	31.7	56.4	A-
Over 10	204	8.45	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	1.0	9.8	27.0	60.8	A
Native	9	8.56	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	22.2	66.7	A

Table B62. Cleanliness and Appearance of Parks by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	92	8.44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.1	10.9	27.2	59.8	A
27513	113	8.42	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	2.7	9.7	23.9	61.9	A
27518	65	8.37	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	10.8	29.2	56.9	A-
27519	113	8.44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	1.8	5.3	29.2	61.1	A

Cleanliness and Appearance of Greenways Crosstabulations

Table B63. Cleanliness and Appearance of Greenways by Housing Type.

Housing Type	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	307	8.38	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	2.0	6.8	30.6	58.0	A-
Apartment	40	9.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.5	0.0	10.0	17.5	65.0	A+
Townhouse/Condo	38	8.45	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	44.7	50.0	A

Table B64. Cleanliness and Appearance of Greenways by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	15	8.40	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	6.7	20.0	66.7	A-
2-5	67	8.43	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	4.5	26.9	62.7	A
6-10	97	8.37	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	2.1	7.2	34.0	54.6	A-
Over 10	200	8.35	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	1.0	8.0	32.0	56.0	A-
Native	9	8.56	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	22.2	66.7	A

Table B65. Cleanliness and Appearance of Greenways by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	89	8.29	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	2.2	11.2	28.1	55.1	A-
27513	112	8.33	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	1.8	8.0	27.7	58.9	A-
27518	63	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	1.6	6.3	36.5	52.4	A-
27519	112	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.9	4.5	31.3	61.6	A

Cleanliness and Appearance of Median/Roadsides Crosstabulations

Table B66. Cleanliness and Appearance of Median/Roadsides by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	314	8.10	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	2.5	4.8	15.6	31.2	45.2	A-
Apartment	42	8.02	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.5	2.4	19.0	14.3	54.8	B+
Townhouse/Condo	39	7.90	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.1	5.1	23.1	28.2	38.5	B+

Table B67. Cleanliness and Appearance of Median/Roadsides by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	16	8.06	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	25.0	18.8	50.0	A-
2-5	69	7.96	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	7.2	2.9	17.4	24.6	46.4	B+
6-10	101	8.02	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	9.9	13.9	28.7	44.6	B+
Over 10	203	8.09	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	2.5	3.9	17.7	31.5	43.8	A-
Native	9	8.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	A

Table B68. Cleanliness and Appearance of Median/Roadsides by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	93	7.98	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	6.5	19.4	26.9	43.0	B+
27513	114	8.10	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	2.6	3.5	15.8	33.3	43.9	A-
27518	65	7.95	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	4.6	4.6	15.4	33.8	40.0	B+
27519	113	8.13	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.5	5.3	15.9	24.8	50.4	A-

Cleanliness and Appearance of Streets Crosstabulations

Table B69. Cleanliness and Appearance of Streets by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	315	8.10	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	2.2	5.4	14.3	34.6	43.2	A-
Apartment	42	7.88	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.9	4.8	16.7	16.7	50.0	B+
Townhouse/Condo	39	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.1	7.7	10.3	35.9	41.0	B+

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

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	16	8.13	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	6.3	18.8	6.3	62.5	A-
2-5	69	7.94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.1	4.3	13.0	26.1	46.4	B+
6-10	101	8.07	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	5.9	13.9	35.6	41.6	A-
Over 10	204	8.06	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	1.5	6.4	15.2	35.8	40.7	A-
Native	9	8.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	A

Table B71. Cleanliness and Appearance of Streets by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	93	7.99	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	10.8	12.9	25.8	46.2	B+
27513	114	8.09	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	2.6	3.5	13.2	38.6	41.2	A-
27518	66	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	4.5	18.2	37.9	36.4	B+
27519	113	8.11	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.4	4.4	14.2	30.1	46.9	A-

Police Department: Contact Crosstabulations

Table B72. Contact with the Police Department by Age.

Age	n	Yes	No
18-25	35	31.4	68.6
26-55	257	30.7	69.3
56-65	58	25.9	74.1
Over 65	46	26.1	73.9

Table B73. Contact with the Police Department by Education.

Education	n	Yes	No
HS/Some College	158	27.8	72.2
College Degree	217	31.3	68.7
PhD/JD/MD	19	31.6	68.4

Table B74. Contact with the Police Department by Gender.

Gender	n	Yes	No
Male	186	27.4	72.6
Female	214	31.3	68.7

Table B75. Contact with the Police Department by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Yes	No
Single Family	314	29.6	70.4
Apartment	42	23.8	76.2
Townhouse/Condo	39	35.9	64.1

Table B76. Contact with the Police Department by Income.

Income	n	Yes	No
0-\$45,000	53	39.6	60.4
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	27.4	72.6
\$75,001-\$100,000	55	34.5	65.5
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	25.0	75.0
Over \$150,000	68	35.3	64.7

Table B77. Contact with the Police Department by Race.

Race	n	Yes	No
Caucasian	287	30.7	69.3
African-American	31	38.7	61.3
Asian	39	23.1	76.9
Hispanic	22	31.8	68.2
Other	7	0.0	100.0

Table B78. Contact with the Police Department by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Yes	No
0-1	16	43.8	56.3
2-5	69	24.6	75.4
6-10	101	26.7	73.3
Over 10	203	32.0	68.0
Native	9	22.2	77.8

Table B79. Contact with the Police Department by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Yes	No
27511	93	34.4	65.6
27513	113	27.4	72.6
27518	66	25.8	74.2
27519	113	31.9	68.1

Police Department: Courteous Crosstabulations

Table B80. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department – Courteous by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	11	7.73	9.1	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	72.7	B
26-55	79	8.27	2.5	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	2.5	7.6	17.7	67.1	A-
56-65	15	7.40	13.3	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.3	66.7	B-
Over 65	12	8.17	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	75.0	A-

Table B81. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Courteous by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	44	7.71	9.1	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	2.3	4.5	18.2	61.4	B
College Degree	68	8.32	2.9	0.0	1.5	1.5	0.0	0.0	5.9	16.2	72.1	A-
PhD/JD/MD	6	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	16.7	66.7	A-

Table B82. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Courteous by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	50	7.88	4.0	0.0	2.0	4.0	0.0	4.0	6.0	24.0	56.0	B+
Female	68	8.25	5.9	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	4.4	11.8	76.5	A-

Table B83. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Courteous by Housing.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	94	8.36	1.1	0.0	1.1	3.2	0.0	1.1	6.4	17.0	70.2	A-
Apartment	10	6.90	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	20.0	50.0	C+
Townhouse/Condo	13	7.00	23.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.4	61.5	C+

Table B84. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Courteous by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$45,000	21	7.48	14.3	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	66.7	B-
\$45,001-\$75,000	18	8.22	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	16.7	72.2	A-
\$75,001-\$100,000	19	8.00	5.3	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	15.8	68.4	B+
\$100,001-\$150,000	20	8.00	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	25.0	60.0	B+
Over \$150,000	24	8.46	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	12.5	16.7	66.7	A

Table B85. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Courteous by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	88	8.16	3.4	0.0	1.1	3.4	0.0	1.1	5.7	18.2	67.0	A-
African-American	12	6.58	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	8.3	0.0	58.3	C-
Asian	9	8.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	A
Hispanic	7	8.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	85.7	A+
Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B86. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Courteous by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	7	7.57	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	71.4	B
2-5	17	8.06	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.8	35.3	47.1	A-
6-10	27	8.19	3.7	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	3.7	0.0	22.2	66.7	A-
Over 10	65	8.25	4.6	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	1.5	3.1	12.3	75.4	A-
Native	2	4.00	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	F

Table B87. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Courteous by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	33	7.67	9.1	0.0	0.0	6.1	0.0	0.0	9.1	12.1	63.6	B
27513	31	7.84	6.5	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	6.5	6.5	16.1	61.3	B+
27518	17	8.47	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.6	76.5	A
27519	35	8.49	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	22.9	71.4	A

Police Department: Response Time Crosstabulations

Table B88. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department – Response Time by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	6	8.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	16.7	66.7	A-
26-55	57	8.09	1.8	0.0	1.8	1.8	5.3	1.8	7.0	17.5	63.2	A-
56-65	7	7.71	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	71.4	B
Over 65	6	7.50	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	66.7	B-

Table B89. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Response Time by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	26	8.00	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.5	0.0	3.8	15.4	65.4	B+
College Degree	46	8.02	4.3	0.0	2.2	2.2	0.0	2.2	6.5	19.6	63.0	B+
PhD/JD/MD	5	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	B+

Table B90. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Response Time by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	34	7.77	2.9	0.0	0.0	2.9	8.8	2.9	8.8	23.5	50.0	B
Female	43	8.21	4.7	0.0	2.3	0.0	2.3	0.0	2.3	14.0	74.4	A-

Table B91. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Response Time by Housing.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	58	8.11	1.7	0.0	1.7	1.7	5.2	1.7	6.9	17.2	63.8	A-
Apartment	8	7.75	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	62.5	B
Townhouse/Condo	11	7.73	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	18.2	63.6	B

Table B92. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Response Time by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$45,000	13	7.62	7.7	0.0	7.7	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	76.9	B
\$45,001-\$75,000	9	8.44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	22.2	66.7	A
\$75,001-\$100,000	13	7.85	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.4	23.1	53.8	B+
\$100,001-\$150,000	14	8.07	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	35.7	57.1	A-
Over \$150,000	17	8.24	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.8	0.0	5.9	17.6	64.7	A-

Table B93. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Response Time by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	55	8.13	1.8	0.0	0.0	1.8	7.3	0.0	7.3	20.0	61.8	A-
African-American	8	7.00	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	C+
Asian	8	7.63	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	25.0	50.0	B
Hispanic	4	8.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	A+
Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B94. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Response Time by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
2-5	13	8.00	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	38.5	46.2	B+
6-10	19	8.26	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	31.6	63.2	A-
Over 10	41	7.95	4.9	0.0	0.0	2.4	7.3	2.4	4.9	7.3	70.7	B+
Native	2	6.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	D+

Table B95. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Response Time by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	22	7.64	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	4.5	13.6	4.5	63.6	B
27513	22	7.82	4.5	0.0	0.0	4.5	9.1	0.0	4.5	13.6	63.6	B+
27518	9	8.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	A
27519	23	8.26	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	30.4	60.9	A-

Police Department: Competence Crosstabulations

Table B96. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department – Competence by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	11	8.00	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	81.8	B+
26-55	79	7.99	2.5	1.3	0.0	2.5	3.8	3.8	8.9	15.2	62.0	B+
56-65	15	7.40	13.3	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.3	66.7	B-
Over 65	12	8.17	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	75.0	A-

Table B97. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Competence by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	44	7.73	9.1	0.0	0.0	2.3	2.3	2.3	6.8	13.6	63.6	B
College Degree	68	8.03	2.9	1.5	1.5	1.5	2.9	2.9	5.9	14.7	66.2	B+
PhD/JD/MD	6	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	16.7	66.7	A-

Table B98. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Competence by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	50	7.72	4.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	4.0	6.0	20.0	56.0	B
Female	68	8.09	5.9	0.0	0.0	1.5	1.5	2.9	5.9	10.3	72.1	A-

Table B99. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Competence by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	94	8.15	1.1	1.1	1.1	2.1	2.1	4.3	7.4	16.0	64.9	A-
Apartment	10	7.00	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	70.0	C+
Townhouse/Condo	13	7.00	23.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.4	61.5	C+

Table B100. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Competence by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$45,000	21	7.48	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.5	0.0	9.5	66.7	B-
\$45,001-\$75,000	18	8.11	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	5.6	11.1	72.2	A-
\$75,001-\$100,000	19	7.95	5.3	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	21.1	63.2	B+
\$100,001-\$150,000	20	7.90	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	25.0	55.0	B+
Over \$150,000	24	7.92	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	8.3	4.2	8.3	16.7	58.3	B+

Table B101. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Competence by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	88	8.14	3.4	0.0	1.1	2.3	0.0	3.4	8.0	14.8	67.0	A-
African-American	12	6.33	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	58.3	C-
Asian	9	7.22	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	11.1	11.1	0.0	22.2	44.4	B-
Hispanic	7	8.71	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	71.4	A+
Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B102. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Competence by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	7	7.57	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	71.4	B
2-5	17	7.88	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	5.9	5.9	5.9	23.5	52.9	B+
6-10	27	8.00	3.7	0.0	0.0	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	18.5	63.0	B+
Over 10	65	8.08	4.6	1.5	0.0	1.5	1.5	3.1	4.6	12.3	70.8	A-
Native	2	4.00	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	F

Table B103. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Competence by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	33	7.67	9.1	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	3.0	12.1	12.1	60.6	B
27513	31	7.68	6.5	0.0	0.0	3.2	6.5	6.5	3.2	12.9	61.3	B
27518	17	8.47	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.6	76.5	A
27519	35	8.09	2.9	2.9	0.0	0.0	2.9	2.9	5.7	17.1	65.7	A-

Police Department: Fairness Crosstabulations

Table B104. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department – Fairness by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	11	7.55	9.1	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	72.7	B
26-55	78	7.99	2.6	1.3	0.0	3.8	1.3	7.7	5.1	14.1	64.1	B+
56-65	15	7.40	13.3	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.3	66.7	B-
Over 65	12	8.17	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	75.0	A-

Table B105. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Fairness by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	43	7.61	9.3	0.0	0.0	4.7	0.0	7.0	4.7	11.6	62.8	B
College Degree	68	8.03	2.9	1.5	1.5	2.9	1.5	4.4	2.9	14.7	67.6	B+
PhD/JD/MD	6	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	16.7	66.7	A-

Table B106. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Fairness by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	50	7.64	4.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	2.0	8.0	4.0	18.0	56.0	B
Female	67	8.08	6.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	4.5	3.0	10.4	73.1	A-

Table B107. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Fairness by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	93	8.12	1.1	1.1	1.1	4.3	1.1	5.4	4.3	15.1	66.7	A-
Apartment	10	6.80	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	C
Townhouse/Condo	13	7.00	23.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.4	61.5	C+

Table B108. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Fairness by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$45,000	21	7.29	14.3	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	9.5	0.0	4.8	66.7	B-
\$45,001-\$75,000	17	8.24	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	11.8	76.5	A-
\$75,001-\$100,000	19	8.00	5.3	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	15.8	68.4	B+
\$100,001-\$150,000	20	7.90	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	30.0	55.0	B+
Over \$150,000	24	7.88	0.0	4.2	0.0	4.2	4.2	4.2	8.3	16.7	58.3	B+

Table B109. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Fairness by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	87	8.07	3.4	0.0	1.1	3.4	0.0	5.7	4.6	14.9	66.7	A-
African-American	12	6.33	25.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	58.3	C-
Asian	9	7.33	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	11.1	11.1	0.0	11.1	55.6	B-
Hispanic	7	8.71	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	71.4	A+
Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B110. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Fairness by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	7	7.43	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	71.4	B-
2-5	17	7.65	0.0	0.0	5.9	5.9	0.0	11.8	5.9	23.5	47.1	B
6-10	26	8.04	3.8	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	7.7	0.0	23.1	61.5	B+
Over 10	65	8.06	4.6	1.5	0.0	3.1	1.5	3.1	3.1	9.2	73.8	A-
Native	2	4.00	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	F

Table B111. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Fairness by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	32	7.53	9.4	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	6.3	6.3	9.4	62.5	B
27513	31	7.61	6.5	0.0	0.0	6.5	0.0	12.9	3.2	9.7	61.3	B
27518	17	8.47	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.6	76.5	A
27519	35	8.11	2.9	2.9	0.0	0.0	2.9	2.9	2.9	20.0	65.7	A-

Police Department: Problem Solving Crosstabulations

Table B112. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department – Problem Solving by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18-25	11	7.73	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.3	0.0	63.6	B
26-55	77	7.79	3.9	1.3	0.0	2.6	3.9	6.5	7.8	16.9	57.1	B+
56-65	15	7.27	13.3	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.3	0.0	66.7	B-
Over 65	12	8.17	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	75.0	A-

Table B113. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Problem Solving by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	44	7.48	11.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	18.2	11.4	54.5	B-
College Degree	66	7.89	3.0	1.5	1.5	3.0	4.5	3.0	4.5	15.2	63.6	B+
PhD/JD/MD	6	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	16.7	66.7	A-

Table B114. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Problem Solving by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	49	7.71	4.1	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	4.1	10.2	18.4	55.1	B
Female	67	7.79	7.5	0.0	0.0	1.5	3.0	4.5	9.0	10.4	64.2	B+

Table B115. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Problem Solving by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	92	7.97	2.2	1.1	1.1	2.2	3.3	4.3	9.8	15.2	60.9	B+
Apartment	10	6.70	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	20.0	0.0	50.0	C
Townhouse/Condo	13	7.00	23.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.4	61.5	C+

Table B116. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Problem Solving by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$45,000	21	7.43	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	9.5	9.5	61.9	B-
\$45,001-\$75,000	18	8.00	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	16.7	5.6	66.7	B+
\$75,001-\$100,000	18	7.56	5.6	0.0	5.6	5.6	0.0	0.0	5.6	27.8	50.0	B
\$100,001-\$150,000	19	7.79	10.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.5	15.8	63.2	B+
Over \$150,000	24	7.83	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	8.3	8.3	4.2	20.8	54.2	B+

Table B117. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Problem Solving by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	86	7.95	4.7	0.0	1.2	1.2	1.2	3.5	12.8	14.0	61.6	B+
African-American	12	6.42	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	8.3	0.0	0.0	58.3	C-
Asian	9	6.67	0.0	11.1	0.0	11.1	11.1	11.1	0.0	22.2	33.3	C
Hispanic	7	8.71	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	71.4	A+
Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B118. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Problem Solving by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	6	7.67	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	83.3	B
2-5	17	7.65	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	5.9	5.9	17.6	23.5	41.2	B
6-10	27	7.78	7.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.4	11.1	18.5	55.6	B
Over 10	64	7.91	4.7	1.6	0.0	3.1	3.1	3.1	6.3	10.9	67.2	B+
Native	2	4.00	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	F

Table B119. Opinion Regarding Contact with Police Department - Problem Solving by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	32	7.63	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	62.5	B
27513	31	7.52	6.5	0.0	0.0	3.2	6.5	9.7	9.7	6.5	58.1	B
27518	17	8.06	0.0	0.0	5.9	5.9	0.0	0.0	5.9	17.6	64.7	A-
27519	34	7.88	2.9	2.9	0.0	0.0	2.9	5.9	8.8	20.6	55.9	B+

Fire Department: Contact Crosstabulations

Table B120. Contact with the Fire Department by Age.

Age	n	Yes	No
18-25	35	5.7	94.3
26-55	258	12.0	88.0
56-65	58	10.3	89.7
Over 65	46	10.9	89.1

Table B121. Contact with the Fire Department by Education.

Education	n	Yes	No
HS/Some College	158	7.6	92.4
College Degree	218	14.7	85.3
PhD/JD/MD	19	5.3	94.7

Table B122. Contact with the Fire Department by Gender.

Gender	n	Yes	No
Male	186	8.6	91.4
Female	215	14.0	86.0

Table B123. Contact with the Fire Department by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Yes	No
Single Family	315	12.7	87.3
Apartment	42	7.1	92.9
Townhouse/Condo	39	5.1	94.9

Table B124. Contact with the Fire Department by Income.

Income	n	Yes	No
0-\$45,000	53	15.1	84.9
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	6.5	93.5
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	7.1	92.9
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	8.8	91.3
Over \$150,000	68	10.3	89.7

Table B125. Contact with the Fire Department by Race.

Race	n	Yes	No
Caucasian	288	11.5	88.5
African-American	31	19.4	80.6
Asian	39	5.1	94.9
Hispanic	22	0.0	100.0
Other	7	0.0	100.0

Table B126. Contact with the Fire Department by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Yes	No
0-1	16	12.5	87.5
2-5	69	11.6	88.4
6-10	101	8.9	91.1
Over 10	204	12.3	87.7
Native	9	11.1	88.9

Table B127. Contact with the Fire Department by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Yes	No
27511	93	11.8	88.2
27513	114	10.5	89.5
27518	66	16.7	83.3
27519	113	8.0	92.0

Fire Department: Competence Crosstabulations

Table B128. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department – Competence by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 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	31	8.68	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.9	83.9	A
56-65	6	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Over 65	5	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B129. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Competence by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	9	8.92	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	91.7	A+
College Degree	26	8.75	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	90.6	A+
PhD/JD/MD	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B130. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Competence by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	16	8.63	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	93.8	A
Female	30	8.87	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.3	86.7	A+

Table B131. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Competence by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	40	8.80	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	92.5	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	2	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	A

Table B132. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Competence by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$45,000	8	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
\$45,001-\$75,000	4	7.50	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	B-
\$75,001-\$100,000	4	8.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	A+
\$100,001-\$150,000	7	8.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	85.7	A+
Over \$150,000	7	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B133. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Competence by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	33	8.91	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	90.9	A+
African-American	6	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Asian	2	6.00	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	D+
Hispanic	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B134. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Competence by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
2-5	8	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
6-10	9	8.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	77.8	A+
Over 10	25	8.72	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	92.0	A+
Native	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B135. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Competence by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	11	8.46	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	90.9	A
27513	12	8.92	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	91.7	A+
27518	11	8.91	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	90.9	A+
27519	9	8.89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	88.9	A+

Fire Department: Courteous Crosstabulations

Table B136. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department – Courteous by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 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	31	8.68	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.9	83.9	A
56-65	6	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Over 65	5	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B137. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Courteous by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	12	8.92	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	91.7	A+
College Degree	32	8.75	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	90.6	A+
PhD/JD/MD	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B138. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Courteous by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	16	8.62	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	93.8	A
Female	30	8.87	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.3	86.7	A+

Table B139. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Courteous by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	40	8.80	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	92.5	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	2	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	A

Table B140. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Courteous by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$45,000	8	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
\$45,001-\$75,000	4	7.50	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	B-
\$75,001-\$100,000	4	8.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	A+
\$100,001-\$150,000	7	8.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	85.7	A+
Over \$150,000	7	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B141. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Courteous by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	33	8.91	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	90.9	A+
African-American	6	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Asian	2	6.00	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	D+
Hispanic	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B142. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Courteous by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
2-5	8	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
6-10	9	8.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	77.8	A+
Over 10	25	8.72	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	92.0	A+
Native	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B143. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Courteous by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	11	8.46	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	90.9	A
27513	12	8.92	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	91.7	A+
27518	11	8.91	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	90.9	A+
27519	9	8.89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	88.9	A+

Fire Department: Fairness Crosstabulations

Table B144. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department – Fairness by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 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	31	8.65	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.9	83.9	A
56-65	6	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Over 65	5	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B145. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Fairness by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	12	8.92	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	91.7	A+
College Degree	32	8.72	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	90.6	A+
PhD/JD/MD	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B146. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Fairness by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	16	8.56	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	93.8	A
Female	30	8.87	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.3	86.7	A+

Table B147. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Fairness by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	40	8.78	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	92.5	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	2	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	A

Table B148. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Fairness by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$45,000	8	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
\$45,001-\$75,000	4	7.25	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	B-
\$75,001-\$100,000	4	8.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	A+
\$100,001-\$150,000	7	8.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	85.7	A+
Over \$150,000	7	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B149. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Fairness by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	33	8.91	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	90.9	A+
African-American	6	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Asian	2	5.50	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	D-
Hispanic	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B150. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Fairness by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
2-5	8	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
6-10	9	8.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	77.8	A+
Over 10	25	8.68	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	92.0	A
Native	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B151. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Fairness by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	11	8.36	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	90.9	A-
27513	12	8.92	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	91.7	A+
27518	11	8.91	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	90.9	A+
27519	9	8.89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	88.9	A+

Fire Department: Problem Solving Crosstabulations

Table B152. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department – Problem Solving by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 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	31	8.65	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.9	83.9	A
56-65	6	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Over 65	5	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B153. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Problem Solving by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	12	8.92	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	91.7	A+
College Degree	32	8.72	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	90.6	A+
PhD/JD/MD	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B154. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Problem Solving by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	16	8.56	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	93.8	A
Female	30	8.87	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.3	86.7	A+

Table B155. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Problem Solving by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	40	8.78	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	92.5	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	2	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	A

Table B156. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Problem Solving by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$45,000	8	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
\$45,001-\$75,000	4	7.25	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	B-
\$75,001-\$100,000	4	8.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	A+
\$100,001-\$150,000	7	8.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	85.7	A+
Over \$150,000	7	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B157. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Problem Solving by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	33	8.91	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	90.9	A+
African-American	6	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Asian	2	5.50	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	D-
Hispanic	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B158. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Problem Solving by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
2-5	8	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
6-10	9	8.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	77.8	A+
Over 10	25	8.68	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	92.0	A
Native	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B159. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Problem Solving by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	11	8.36	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	90.9	A-
27513	12	8.92	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	91.7	A+
27518	11	8.91	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	90.9	A+
27519	9	8.89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	88.9	A+

Fire Department: Response Time Crosstabulations

Table B160. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department – Response Time by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 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	24	8.54	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	79.2	A
56-65	5	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Over 65	5	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B161. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Response Time by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	9	8.89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	88.9	A+
College Degree	26	8.65	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	88.5	A
PhD/JD/MD	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B162. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Response Time by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	13	8.46	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	92.3	A
Female	24	8.83	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	83.3	A+

Table B163. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Response Time by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	32	8.72	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	90.6	A+
Apartment	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Townhouse/Condo	2	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	A

Table B164. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Response Time by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$45,000	5	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
\$45,001-\$75,000	3	6.67	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	C
\$75,001-\$100,000	4	8.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	A+
\$100,001-\$150,000	6	8.83	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	83.3	A+
Over \$150,000	5	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B165. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Response Time by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	26	8.89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.5	88.5	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	2	5.50	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	D-
Hispanic	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B166. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Response Time by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
2-5	7	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
6-10	6	8.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	A
Over 10	20	8.60	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	90.0	A
Native	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B167. Opinion Regarding Contact with Fire Department - Response Time by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	10	8.30	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	90.0	A-
27513	8	8.88	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	87.5	A+
27518	9	8.89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	88.9	A+
27519	7	8.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	85.7	A+

Participation in Parks & Recreation Program Crosstabulations

Table B168. Participation in Parks & Recreation Program by Age.

Age	n	Yes	No
18-25	35	5.7	94.3
26-55	258	34.1	65.9
56-65	58	22.4	77.6
Over 65	46	15.2	84.8

Table B169. Participation in Parks & Recreation Program by Education.

Education	n	Yes	No
HS/Some College	158	18.4	81.6
College Degree	218	32.1	67.9
PhD/JD/MD	19	57.9	42.1

Table B170. Participation in Parks & Recreation Program by Gender.

Gender	n	Yes	No
Male	186	26.9	73.1
Female	215	28.4	71.6

Table B171. Participation in Parks & Recreation Program by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Yes	No
Single Family	315	32.1	67.9
Apartment	42	11.9	88.1
Townhouse/Condo	39	12.8	87.2

Table B172. Participation in Parks & Recreation Program by Income.

Income	n	Yes	No
0-\$45,000	53	11.3	88.7
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	21.0	79.0
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	26.8	73.2
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	37.5	62.5
Over \$150,000	68	41.2	58.8

Table B173. Participation in Parks & Recreation Program by Race.

Race	n	Yes	No
Caucasian	288	29.9	70.1
African-American	31	25.8	74.2
Asian	39	17.9	82.1
Hispanic	22	13.6	86.4
Other	7	14.3	85.7

Table B174. Participation in Parks & Recreation Program by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Yes	No
0-1	16	6.3	93.8
2-5	69	30.4	69.6
6-10	101	23.8	76.2
Over 10	204	31.4	68.6
Native	9	11.1	88.9

Table B175. Participation in Parks & Recreation Program by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Yes	No
27511	93	19.4	80.6
27513	114	35.1	64.9
27518	66	21.2	78.8
27519	113	31.9	68.1

Parks and Recreation: Ease of Registration Crosstabulations

Table B176. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Ease of Registration by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 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	82	8.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.2	3.7	7.3	25.6	61.0	A+
56-65	13	8.77	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.1	76.9	A+
Over 65	7	8.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	85.7	A+

Table B177. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Ease of Registration by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	25	8.68	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	12.0	80.0	A
College Degree	68	8.49	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	2.9	4.4	27.9	63.2	A
PhD/JD/MD	11	8.09	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	9.1	27.3	54.5	A-

Table B178. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Ease of Registration by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	47	8.45	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	8.5	25.5	61.7	A
Female	58	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	1.7	1.7	3.4	22.4	69.0	A

Table B179. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Ease of Registration by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	96	8.48	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	3.1	6.3	25.0	64.6	A
Apartment	5	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	B+
Townhouse/Condo	4	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B180. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Ease of Registration by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$45,000	5	8.20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	A-
\$45,001-\$75,000	11	8.46	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	18.2	72.7	A
\$75,001-\$100,000	15	8.60	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	20.0	73.3	A
\$100,001-\$150,000	29	8.69	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	24.1	72.4	A+
Over \$150,000	26	8.35	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	11.5	23.1	61.5	A-

Table B181. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Ease of Registration by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	83	8.48	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	2.4	7.2	24.1	65.1	A
African-American	6	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+
Asian	7	8.29	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	28.6	57.1	A-
Hispanic	3	8.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	A
Other	1	5.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	F

Table B182. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Ease of Registration by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	1	5.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	F
2-5	20	8.55	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	30.0	65.0	A
6-10	22	8.36	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	4.5	4.5	18.2	68.2	A-
Over 10	61	8.56	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	8.2	23.0	67.2	A
Native	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+

Table B183. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Ease of Registration by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	17	8.77	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.5	76.5	A+
27513	38	8.40	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	5.3	5.3	23.7	63.2	A-
27518	14	8.71	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	71.4	A+
27519	33	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	3.0	9.1	24.2	60.6	A-

Parks and Recreation: Program Quality Crosstabulations

Table B184. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Program Quality by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 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	86	8.43	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.2	10.5	27.9	59.3	A
56-65	13	8.46	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	7.7	7.7	76.9	A
Over 65	7	8.57	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	42.9	57.1	A

Table B185. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Program Quality by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	28	8.68	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	17.9	75.0	A
College Degree	69	8.38	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	1.4	8.7	29.0	58.0	A-
PhD/JD/MD	11	8.55	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	27.3	63.6	A

Table B186. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Program Quality by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	48	8.38	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	2.1	12.5	22.9	60.4	A-
Female	61	8.53	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0	6.6	27.9	63.9	A

Table B187. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Program Quality by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	100	8.46	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	10.0	27.0	61.0	A
Apartment	5	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	B+
Townhouse/Condo	4	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B188. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Program Quality by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$45,000	5	8.80	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	80.0	A+
\$45,001-\$75,000	13	8.62	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	7.7	84.6	A
\$75,001-\$100,000	15	8.13	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	13.3	40.0	40.0	A-
\$100,001-\$150,000	30	8.57	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	6.7	16.7	73.3	A
Over \$150,000	27	8.48	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	29.6	59.3	A

Table B189. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Program Quality by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	85	8.52	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	9.4	24.7	64.7	A
African-American	8	8.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	A+
Asian	7	7.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	28.6	14.3	42.9	B+
Hispanic	3	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	A-
Other	1	5.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	F

Table B190. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Program Quality by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	1	5.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	F
2-5	21	8.48	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	42.9	52.4	A
6-10	23	8.61	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.7	21.7	69.6	A
Over 10	63	8.44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	1.6	11.1	22.2	63.5	A
Native	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B191. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Program Quality by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	17	8.53	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	23.5	70.6	A
27513	40	8.38	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	2.5	12.5	20.0	62.5	A-
27518	14	8.71	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	71.4	A+
27519	35	8.46	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.4	31.4	57.1	A

Parks and Recreation: Facility Quality Crosstabulations

Table B192. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Facility Quality by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 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	87	8.38	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.1	13.8	26.4	57.5	A-
56-65	13	8.69	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	15.4	76.9	A+
Over 65	7	8.43	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	28.6	57.1	A

Table B193. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Facility Quality by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	28	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	10.7	17.9	67.9	A
College Degree	70	8.44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	10.0	30.0	58.6	A
PhD/JD/MD	11	8.36	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.3	9.1	63.6	A-

Table B194. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Facility Quality by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	49	8.47	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.3	20.4	63.3	A
Female	61	8.41	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	1.6	9.8	27.9	59.0	A-

Table B195. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Facility Quality by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	100	8.44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	14.0	25.0	60.0	A
Apartment	5	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	B+
Townhouse/Condo	5	8.80	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	80.0	A+

Table B196. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Facility Quality by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$45,000	6	8.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	A
\$45,001-\$75,000	13	8.54	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	15.4	76.9	A
\$75,001-\$100,000	15	8.07	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	20.0	33.3	40.0	A-
\$100,001-\$150,000	30	8.63	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	23.3	70.0	A
Over \$150,000	27	8.48	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.8	22.2	63.0	A

Table B197. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Facility Quality by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	85	8.49	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	11.8	23.5	63.5	A
African-American	8	8.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	A+
Asian	7	8.14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	42.9	0.0	57.1	A-
Hispanic	3	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	A-
Other	1	5.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	F

Table B198. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Facility Quality by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	1	5.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	F
2-5	21	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	9.5	33.3	52.4	A-
6-10	24	8.54	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	20.8	66.7	A
Over 10	63	8.49	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	22.2	63.5	A
Native	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+

Table B199. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Facility Quality by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	18	8.61	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	27.8	66.7	A
27513	40	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	2.5	15.0	20.0	60.0	A-
27518	14	8.64	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	35.7	64.3	A
27519	35	8.46	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	25.7	60.0	A

Parks and Recreation: Overall Experience Crosstabulations

Table B200. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Overall Experience by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 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	87	8.35	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	2.3	0.0	10.3	28.7	57.5	A-
56-65	13	8.85	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.4	84.6	A+
Over 65	7	8.14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	28.6	57.1	A-

Table B201. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Overall Experience by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	28	8.57	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.7	21.4	67.9	A
College Degree	70	8.34	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	4.3	0.0	5.7	28.6	60.0	A-
PhD/JD/MD	11	8.55	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	27.3	63.6	A

Table B202. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Overall Experience by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	49	8.37	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	10.2	22.4	63.3	A-
Female	61	8.44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	6.6	29.5	60.7	A

Table B203. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Overall Experience by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	100	8.41	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	9.0	27.0	61.0	A-
Apartment	5	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	B+
Townhouse/Condo	5	8.80	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	80.0	A+

Table B204. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Overall Experience by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$45,000	6	8.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	A
\$45,001-\$75,000	13	8.46	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	23.1	69.2	A
\$75,001-\$100,000	15	8.07	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	20.0	26.7	46.7	A-
\$100,001-\$150,000	30	8.70	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	23.3	73.3	A+
Over \$150,000	27	8.41	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	11.1	22.2	63.0	A-

Table B205. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Overall Experience by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	85	8.39	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	2.4	0.0	9.4	25.9	61.2	A-
African-American	8	8.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	A+
Asian	7	8.57	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	14.3	71.4	A
Hispanic	3	8.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	A
Other	1	5.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	F

Table B206. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Overall Experience by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	1	5.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	F
2-5	21	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	4.8	38.1	52.4	A-
6-10	24	8.42	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	25.0	66.7	A
Over 10	63	8.49	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0	11.1	22.2	65.1	A
Native	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+

Table B207. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Overall Experience by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	18	8.44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	5.6	22.2	66.7	A
27513	40	8.40	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	12.5	25.0	60.0	A-
27518	14	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	21.4	71.4	A
27519	35	8.40	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.7	31.4	60.0	A-

Parks and Recreation: Instruction or Coach Quality Crosstabulations

Table B208. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Instructor or Coach Quality by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 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	66	8.39	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	6.1	30.3	59.1	A-
56-65	8	8.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	A+
Over 65	6	7.33	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	16.7	50.0	B-

Table B209. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Instructor or Coach Quality by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	17	8.53	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.9	35.3	58.8	A
College Degree	53	8.30	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	5.7	0.0	5.7	22.6	64.2	A-
PhD/JD/MD	10	8.40	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	40.0	50.0	A-

Table B210. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Instructor or Coach Quality by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	35	8.43	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	8.6	28.6	60.0	A
Female	46	8.30	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	4.3	28.3	60.9	A-

Table B211. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Instructor or Coach Quality by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	75	8.37	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.0	6.7	29.3	60.0	A-
Apartment	5	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	B+
Townhouse/Condo	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B212. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Instructor or Coach Quality by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$45,000	3	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	A-
\$45,001-\$75,000	10	8.40	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	70.0	A-
\$75,001-\$100,000	12	7.58	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	16.7	16.7	50.0	B
\$100,001-\$150,000	18	8.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	77.8	A+
Over \$150,000	22	8.46	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.6	27.3	59.1	A

Table B213. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Instructor or Coach Quality by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	62	8.36	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	6.5	27.4	61.3	A-
African-American	5	8.80	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	80.0	A+
Asian	7	8.43	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	28.6	57.1	A
Hispanic	3	8.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	A
Other	1	5.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	F

Table B214. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Instructor or Coach Quality by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	1	5.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	F
2-5	17	8.18	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	41.2	52.9	A-
6-10	20	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	30.0	65.0	A
Over 10	42	8.45	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	11.9	21.4	64.3	A
Native	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+

Table B215. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Instructor or Coach Quality by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	12	8.17	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	66.7	A-
27513	28	8.25	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	7.1	32.1	53.6	A-
27518	10	8.70	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.0	70.0	A+
27519	29	8.48	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	6.9	24.1	65.5	A

Parks and Recreation: Cost or Amount of Fee Crosstabulations

Table B216. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Cost or Amount of Fee by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 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	73	8.22	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.5	1.4	11.0	30.1	52.1	A-
56-65	11	8.73	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.3	72.7	A+
Over 65	5	7.80	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	B+

Table B217. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Cost or Amount of Fee by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
HS/Some College	20	8.45	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	35.0	55.0	A
College Degree	60	8.25	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	1.7	8.3	26.7	56.7	A-
PhD/JD/MD	10	8.40	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	40.0	50.0	A-

Table B218. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Cost or Amount of Fee by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Male	39	8.05	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	2.6	15.4	25.6	48.7	B+
Female	52	8.44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	3.8	32.7	59.6	A

Table B219. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Cost or Amount of Fee by HousingType.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Single Family	84	8.27	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	1.2	9.5	31.0	53.6	A-
Apartment	5	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	B+
Townhouse/Condo	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	A+

Table B220. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Cost or Amount of Fee by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-\$45,000	3	8.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	A
\$45,001-\$75,000	10	8.40	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	70.0	A-
\$75,001-\$100,000	12	7.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	8.3	41.7	33.3	B
\$100,001-\$150,000	26	8.58	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	34.6	61.5	A
Over \$150,000	23	8.35	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	17.4	17.4	60.9	A-

Table B221. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Cost or Amount of Fee by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
Caucasian	70	8.29	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	1.4	8.6	32.9	52.9	A-
African-American	7	8.71	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	85.7	A+
Asian	6	7.83	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	16.7	16.7	50.0	B+
Hispanic	3	8.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	A
Other	1	5.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	F

Table B222. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Cost or Amount of Fee by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
0-1	1	5.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	F
2-5	20	8.40	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	30.0	60.0	A-
6-10	22	8.41	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	9.1	22.7	63.6	A-
Over 10	47	8.23	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	2.1	10.6	31.9	51.1	A-
Native	1	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	B+

Table B223. Opinion Regarding Parks & Recreation Aspects – Cost or Amount of Fee by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
27511	12	8.25	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	8.3	25.0	58.3	A-
27513	33	7.97	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.1	3.0	6.1	33.3	45.5	B+
27518	11	8.46	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	36.4	54.5	A
27519	32	8.56	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.4	25.0	65.6	A

Cary as a Place to Live Crosstabulations

Table B224. Rating Cary 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	35	8.23	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	22.9	22.9	51.4	A-
26-55	258	8.19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	1.6	18.2	32.6	45.7	A-
56-65	58	8.10	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.2	1.7	10.3	29.3	51.7	A-
Over 65	46	8.59	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	23.9	71.7	A

Table B225. Rating Cary 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	158	8.27	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	1.3	17.1	24.7	54.4	A-
College Degree	218	8.22	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	1.8	14.7	32.1	49.1	A-
PhD/JD/MD	19	8.37	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.5	42.1	47.4	A-

Table B226. Rating Cary 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	186	8.04	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.0	2.2	2.7	19.4	32.8	41.9	B+
Female	215	8.39	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.5	12.6	27.4	57.7	A-

Table B227. Rating Cary as a Place to Live by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Undesirable 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Desirable 9	Grade
Single Family	315	8.31	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	1.3	1.9	13.0	30.2	53.3	A-
Apartment	42	7.81	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	28.6	33.3	31.0	B+
Townhouse/Condo	39	8.15	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	25.6	23.1	48.7	A-

Table B228. Rating Cary 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-\$45,000	53	8.13	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	22.6	26.4	47.2	A-
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	8.15	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	19.4	21.0	54.8	A-
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	8.46	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	1.8	3.6	33.9	58.9	A
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	8.13	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	3.8	16.3	33.8	43.8	A-
Over \$150,000	68	8.41	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	11.8	29.4	57.4	A-

Table B229. Rating Cary 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	288	8.30	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	1.4	13.5	29.2	53.5	A-
African-American	31	8.16	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.4	19.4	58.1	A-
Asian	39	7.92	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	5.1	20.5	41.0	30.8	B+
Hispanic	22	8.32	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	31.8	50.0	A-
Other	7	8.14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	42.9	0.0	57.1	A-

Table B230. Rating Cary 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	16	7.81	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	31.3	31.3	31.3	B+
2-5	69	8.04	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	1.4	20.3	33.3	40.6	B+
6-10	101	8.23	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	20.8	28.7	48.5	A-
Over 10	204	8.30	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.0	1.5	2.0	11.3	28.4	55.9	A-
Native	9	8.56	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.4	55.6	A

Table B231. Rating Cary as a Place to Live by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Undesirable 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Desirable 9	Grade
27511	93	8.16	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	2.2	17.2	25.8	51.6	A-
27513	114	8.30	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.9	0.9	15.8	27.2	54.4	A-
27518	66	8.21	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	1.5	18.2	31.8	47.0	A-
27519	113	8.23	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.5	1.8	11.5	34.5	48.7	A-

Quality of Life in Cary Crosstabulations

Table B232. 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	35	3.37	0.0	5.7	57.1	31.4	5.7	5.7	37.1
26-55	258	3.22	0.8	7.0	68.2	17.8	6.2	7.8	24.0
56-65	58	3.21	1.7	5.2	69.0	19.0	5.2	6.9	24.2
Over 65	46	3.24	0.0	10.9	63.0	17.4	8.7	10.9	26.1

Table B233. 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	158	3.30	0.0	5.1	67.1	20.3	7.6	5.1	27.9
College Degree	218	3.18	1.4	8.3	66.1	19.3	5.0	9.7	24.3
PhD/JD/MD	19	3.37	0.0	5.3	68.4	10.5	15.8	5.3	26.3

Table B234. 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	186	3.19	0.5	7.0	71.0	16.1	5.4	7.5	21.5
Female	215	3.28	0.9	7.0	62.8	21.9	7.4	7.9	29.3

Table B235. Quality of Life in Cary by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Much Worse 1	Somewhat Worse 2	The Same 3	Somewhat Better 4	Much Better 5	% Below 3	% Above 3
Single Family	315	3.23	0.6	6.3	67.9	19.4	5.7	6.9	25.1
Apartment	42	3.24	0.0	9.5	66.7	14.3	9.5	9.5	23.8
Townhouse/Condo	39	3.23	0.0	10.3	61.5	23.1	5.1	10.3	28.2

Table B236. 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-\$45,000	53	3.38	0.0	3.8	66.0	18.9	11.3	3.8	30.2
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	3.21	1.6	11.3	62.9	12.9	11.3	12.9	24.2
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	3.21	1.8	8.9	60.7	23.2	5.4	10.7	28.6
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	3.18	0.0	8.8	71.3	13.8	6.3	8.8	20.1
Over \$150,000	68	3.27	1.5	4.4	66.2	22.1	5.9	5.9	28.0

Table B237. 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	288	3.25	0.7	4.9	68.1	21.5	4.9	5.6	26.4
African-American	31	3.32	3.2	6.5	61.3	12.9	16.1	9.7	29.0
Asian	39	2.95	0.0	25.6	59.0	10.3	5.1	25.6	15.4
Hispanic	22	3.55	0.0	0.0	68.2	9.1	22.7	0.0	31.8
Other	7	2.86	0.0	14.3	85.7	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0

Table B238. 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	16	3.13	0.0	0.0	87.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	12.5
2-5	69	3.20	0.0	4.3	76.8	13.0	5.8	4.3	18.8
6-10	101	3.31	0.0	7.9	59.4	26.7	5.9	7.9	32.6
Over 10	204	3.20	1.5	7.8	66.7	17.6	6.4	9.3	24.0
Native	9	3.56	0.0	11.1	44.4	22.2	22.2	11.1	44.4

Table B239. Quality of Life in Cary by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Much Worse 1	Somewhat Worse 2	The Same 3	Somewhat Better 4	Much Better 5	% Below 3	% Above 3
27511	93	3.27	1.1	7.5	61.3	23.7	6.5	8.6	30.2
27513	114	3.21	0.0	8.8	69.3	14.0	7.9	8.8	21.9
27518	66	3.32	0.0	3.0	68.2	22.7	6.1	3.0	28.8
27519	113	3.20	1.8	7.1	66.4	18.6	6.2	8.9	24.8

How Safe Respondents Feel in Cary Overall Crosstabulations

Table B240. How Safe Respondents Feel in Cary Overall by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
18-25	34	8.44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	2.9	41.2	52.9	99.9
26-55	256	8.12	0.4	0.0	0.4	0.0	2.7	2.3	12.9	38.7	42.6	96.5
56-65	58	8.02	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.2	0.0	19.0	39.7	36.2	94.9
Over 65	46	8.26	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	2.2	6.5	41.3	47.8	97.8

Table B241. How Safe Respondents Feel in Cary Overall by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	156	8.23	0.6	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.6	1.9	9.6	40.4	46.2	98.1
College Degree	218	8.07	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.1	2.3	15.6	38.5	39.4	95.8
PhD/JD/MD	19	8.58	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	42.1	57.9	100.0

Table B242. How Safe Respondents Feel in Cary Overall by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
Male	184	8.23	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	1.1	1.6	12.5	39.1	45.1	98.3
Female	214	8.07	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.0	3.7	2.3	12.6	39.3	41.1	95.3

Table B243. How Safe Respondents Feel in Cary Overall by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
Single Family	314	8.19	0.3	0.0	0.6	0.0	2.2	1.3	10.8	40.4	44.3	96.8
Apartment	42	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	7.1	14.3	31.0	42.9	95.3
Townhouse/Condo	39	8.03	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	2.6	20.5	38.5	35.9	97.5

Table B244. How Safe Respondents Feel in Cary Overall by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
0-\$45,000	52	8.23	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	9.6	42.3	44.2	96.1
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	8.05	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	3.2	12.9	40.3	38.7	95.1
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	8.11	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	1.8	19.6	30.4	44.6	96.4
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	8.10	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0	2.5	1.3	13.8	41.3	40.0	96.4
Over \$150,000	68	8.21	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	1.5	8.8	39.7	47.1	97.1

Table B245. How Safe Respondents Feel in Cary Overall by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
Caucasian	287	8.19	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.0	1.7	1.7	11.5	40.8	43.6	97.6
African-American	30	8.53	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.3	20.0	66.7	100.0
Asian	39	7.69	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	5.1	23.1	38.5	25.6	92.3
Hispanic	22	8.32	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.6	40.9	45.5	100.0
Other	7	7.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	57.1	28.6	85.7

Table B246. How Safe Respondents Feel in Cary Overall 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	16	7.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.8	6.3	18.8	18.8	37.5	81.4
2-5	69	8.15	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	2.9	15.9	39.1	40.6	98.5
6-10	101	8.15	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	11.9	41.6	41.6	97.1
Over 10	203	8.19	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.0	2.0	1.5	11.3	38.9	45.3	97.0
Native	9	8.22	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	55.6	33.3	100.0

Table B247. How Safe Respondents Feel in Cary Overall by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
27511	92	8.05	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	1.1	5.4	14.1	39.1	39.1	97.7
27513	114	8.25	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	2.6	0.9	11.4	34.2	50.0	96.5
27518	66	8.11	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	12.1	43.9	37.9	96.9
27519	112	8.18	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.0	12.5	39.3	44.6	96.4

How Safe Respondents Feel in Home Neighborhood Crosstabulations

Table B248. 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	34	8.71	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	23.5	73.5	99.9
26-55	256	8.35	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.8	2.7	2.0	4.7	28.9	60.2	95.8
56-65	58	8.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.2	0.0	8.6	44.8	41.4	94.8
Over 65	46	8.44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.5	2.2	32.6	58.7	100.0

Table B249. 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	156	8.39	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	2.6	3.2	32.1	59.6	97.5
College Degree	218	8.32	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	3.7	1.4	6.9	30.7	56.4	95.4
PhD/JD/MD	19	8.68	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	31.6	68.4	100.0

Table B250. 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	184	8.45	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	2.7	4.9	30.4	60.3	98.3
Female	214	8.29	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.9	3.3	1.4	5.1	31.8	56.5	94.8

Table B251. How Safe Respondents Feel in Home Neighborhood by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
Single Family	314	8.37	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.9	1.6	5.4	31.5	58.3	96.8
Apartment	42	8.36	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	4.8	2.4	26.2	61.9	95.3
Townhouse/Condo	39	8.36	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.1	2.6	2.6	30.8	59.0	95.0

Table B252. 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-\$45,000	52	8.44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	1.9	3.8	26.9	63.5	96.1
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	8.23	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.5	0.0	4.8	41.9	46.8	93.5
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	8.30	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	3.6	5.4	1.8	26.8	60.7	94.7
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	8.34	1.3	0.0	0.0	1.3	1.3	1.3	5.0	31.3	58.8	96.4
Over \$150,000	68	8.49	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.4	25.0	66.2	98.6

Table B253. 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	287	8.38	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.3	1.7	2.1	5.6	30.3	59.2	97.2
African-American	30	8.77	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	16.7	80.0	100.0
Asian	39	7.95	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	7.7	2.6	5.1	43.6	38.5	89.8
Hispanic	22	8.59	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	31.8	63.6	99.9
Other	7	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	42.9	42.9	85.8

Table B254. 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	16	7.88	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	6.3	12.5	18.8	50.0	87.6
2-5	69	8.45	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	1.4	4.3	30.4	60.9	97.0
6-10	101	8.39	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	5.9	36.6	55.4	97.9
Over 10	203	8.35	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.5	3.0	3.0	4.4	29.1	59.6	96.1
Native	9	8.56	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.4	55.6	100.0

Table B255. How Safe Respondents Feel in Home Neighborhood by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
27511	92	8.16	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	5.4	9.8	26.1	54.3	95.6
27513	114	8.54	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	1.8	1.8	27.2	66.7	97.5
27518	66	8.23	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	3.0	1.5	6.1	40.9	47.0	95.5
27519	112	8.49	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	2.7	31.3	63.4	97.4

How Safe Respondents Feel in Public Places Around Cary Crosstabulations

Table B256. How Safe Respondents 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	34	8.12	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	26.5	26.5	44.1	100.0
26-55	256	7.86	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.4	4.7	6.3	16.4	36.7	34.8	94.2
56-65	58	7.85	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.2	3.4	25.9	32.8	32.8	94.9
Over 65	46	7.78	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	4.3	4.3	23.9	30.4	34.8	93.4

Table B257. How Safe Respondents 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	156	7.86	0.0	0.6	1.3	0.0	3.8	6.4	19.2	28.8	39.7	94.1
College Degree	218	7.88	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	4.1	4.1	21.6	38.1	31.7	95.5
PhD/JD/MD	19	8.05	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	5.3	5.3	47.4	36.8	94.8

Table B258. How Safe Respondents 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	184	7.94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.9	4.3	20.7	32.6	37.5	95.1
Female	214	7.81	0.0	0.5	0.9	0.5	3.7	6.1	18.7	36.9	32.7	94.4

Table B259. How Safe Respondents Feel in Public Places Around Cary (Shopping, Out to Eat, Movies) by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
Single Family	314	7.92	0.0	0.3	0.6	0.3	2.9	4.5	19.7	36.3	35.4	95.9
Apartment	42	7.55	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	9.5	14.3	31.0	31.0	85.8
Townhouse/Condo	39	7.92	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	7.7	23.1	28.2	38.5	97.5

Table B260. How Safe Respondents 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-\$45,000	52	8.15	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	3.8	11.5	42.3	40.4	98.0
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	7.71	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.1	4.8	25.8	30.6	30.6	91.8
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	7.84	0.0	0.0	1.8	1.8	5.4	1.8	21.4	26.8	41.1	91.1
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	7.84	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	7.5	22.5	41.3	27.5	98.8
Over \$150,000	68	7.96	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	4.4	7.4	8.8	36.8	41.2	94.2

Table B261. How Safe Respondents 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	287	7.92	0.0	0.3	0.7	0.0	2.8	4.9	20.2	35.5	35.5	96.1
African-American	30	8.20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	20.0	26.7	50.0	96.7
Asian	39	7.51	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	7.7	12.8	17.9	30.8	28.2	89.7
Hispanic	22	7.91	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	18.2	45.5	27.3	100.1
Other	7	7.29	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	14.3	28.6	28.6	71.5

Table B262. How Safe Respondents 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	16	7.38	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	6.3	12.5	18.8	37.5	75.1
2-5	69	7.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.8	4.3	21.7	34.8	33.3	94.1
6-10	101	7.73	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	5.9	8.9	20.8	28.7	34.7	93.1
Over 10	203	7.98	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.5	3.9	18.2	39.4	35.5	97.0
Native	9	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	99.9

Table B263. How Safe Respondents Feel in Public Places Around Cary (Shopping, Out to Eat, Movies) by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
27511	92	7.76	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	5.4	6.5	20.7	34.8	31.5	93.5
27513	114	7.98	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	4.4	3.5	17.5	34.2	39.5	94.7
27518	66	7.83	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	7.6	25.8	33.3	31.8	98.5
27519	112	7.99	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	3.6	3.6	16.1	37.5	38.4	95.6

Cary Municipal Tax Rate Crosstabulations

Table B264. 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	34	3.24	0.0	2.9	76.5	14.7	5.9	2.9	20.6
26-55	254	3.26	0.8	4.7	68.9	18.5	7.1	5.5	25.6
56-65	58	3.28	1.7	10.3	55.2	24.1	8.6	12.0	32.7
Over 65	42	3.33	4.8	2.4	59.5	21.4	11.9	7.2	33.3

Table B265. 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	152	3.33	0.7	4.6	65.1	20.4	9.2	5.3	29.6
College Degree	215	3.23	1.4	5.6	67.9	18.6	6.5	7.0	25.1
PhD/JD/MD	19	3.11	5.3	5.3	68.4	15.8	5.3	10.6	21.1

Table B266. Cary Municipal Tax Rate by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Low 1	Somewhat Low 2	About Right 3	Somewhat High 4	Very High 5	% Below 3	% Above 3
Male	185	3.30	1.1	4.9	64.9	21.1	8.1	6.0	29.2
Female	207	3.24	1.4	5.3	68.6	17.4	7.2	6.7	24.6

Table B267. Cary Municipal Tax Rate by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Low 1	Somewhat Low 2	About Right 3	Somewhat High 4	Very High 5	% Below 3	% Above 3
Single Family	310	3.26	1.6	4.5	67.4	19.4	7.1	6.1	26.5
Apartment	40	3.25	0.0	7.5	70.0	12.5	10.0	7.5	22.5
Townhouse/Condo	37	3.35	0.0	8.1	59.5	21.6	10.8	8.1	32.4

Table B268. 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-\$45,000	50	3.34	0.0	6.0	64.0	20.0	10.0	6.0	30.0
\$45,001-\$75,000	61	3.26	0.0	3.3	72.1	19.7	4.9	3.3	24.6
\$75,001-\$100,000	55	3.20	3.6	12.7	50.9	25.5	7.3	16.3	32.8
\$100,001-\$150,000	79	3.24	0.0	6.3	69.6	17.7	6.3	6.3	24.0
Over \$150,000	66	3.21	3.0	4.5	65.2	22.7	4.5	7.5	27.2

Table B269. 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	280	3.23	1.8	5.4	68.2	17.1	7.5	7.2	24.6
African-American	31	3.29	0.0	9.7	61.3	19.4	9.7	9.7	29.1
Asian	38	3.47	0.0	2.6	55.3	34.2	7.9	2.6	42.1
Hispanic	22	3.14	0.0	4.5	77.3	18.2	0.0	4.5	18.2
Other	7	3.57	0.0	0.0	57.1	28.6	14.3	0.0	42.9

Table B270. Cary Municipal Tax Rate by Voter Status.

Voter Status	n	Mean	Very Low 1	Somewhat Low 2	About Right 3	Somewhat High 4	Very High 5	% Below 3	% Above 3
Registered	347	3.28	1.4	5.2	64.8	20.5	8.1	6.6	28.6
Not Registered	42	3.14	0.0	4.8	81.0	9.5	4.8	4.8	14.3

Table B271. Cary Municipal Tax Rate by Voted in 2013 Local Elections.

Voting Action	n	Mean	Very Low 1	Somewhat Low 2	About Right 3	Somewhat High 4	Very High 5	% Below 3	% Above 3
Voter	228	3.31	1.8	5.7	62.7	19.7	10.1	7.5	29.8
Nonvoter	160	3.22	0.6	4.4	71.9	18.8	4.4	5.0	23.2

Table B272. 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	15	3.00	6.7	6.7	73.3	6.7	6.7	13.4	13.4
2-5	64	3.28	0.0	3.1	70.3	21.9	4.7	3.1	26.6
6-10	100	3.22	0.0	5.0	71.0	21.0	3.0	5.0	24.0
Over 10	202	3.31	1.5	5.9	63.9	17.8	10.9	7.4	28.7
Native	9	3.22	11.1	0.0	55.6	22.2	11.1	11.1	33.3

Table B273. Cary Municipal Tax Rate by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Low 1	Somewhat Low 2	About Right 3	Somewhat High 4	Very High 5	% Below 3	% Above 3
27511	91	3.18	2.2	5.5	69.2	18.7	4.4	7.7	23.1
27513	113	3.32	1.8	4.4	66.4	15.0	12.4	6.2	27.4
27518	63	3.33	0.0	4.8	63.5	25.4	6.3	4.8	31.7
27519	110	3.23	0.9	6.4	67.3	20.0	5.5	7.3	25.5

Support for the Town Increasing Property Taxes to Purchasing Land to Bank it for Future Public Uses Crosstabulations

Table B274. Support for the Town Increasing Property Taxes to Purchase Land and Banking it for Future Public Uses Such as Parks, Fire Stations, and Open Space by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Extremely Supportive 9	% Above 5
18-25	35	3.29	31.4	11.4	5.7	2.9	45.7	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9
26-55	255	4.35	24.3	7.8	4.7	4.7	26.7	9.4	12.5	4.3	5.5	31.7
56-65	58	4.10	27.6	8.6	3.4	6.9	29.3	5.2	8.6	3.4	6.9	24.1
Over 65	46	3.57	41.3	2.2	4.3	4.3	30.4	2.2	10.9	0.0	4.3	17.4

Table B275. Support for the Town Increasing Property Taxes to Purchase Land and Banking it for Future Public Uses Such as Parks, Fire Stations, and Open Space by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Extremely Supportive 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	157	3.84	33.8	5.7	4.5	3.8	30.6	5.7	8.3	3.8	3.8	21.6
College Degree	217	4.27	22.1	9.2	5.1	5.5	30.4	8.3	12.0	3.2	4.1	27.6
PhD/JD/MD	19	5.05	31.6	0.0	0.0	5.3	15.8	10.5	10.5	0.0	26.3	47.3

Table B276. Support for the Town Increasing Property Taxes to Purchase Land and Banking it for Future Public Uses Such as Parks, Fire Stations, and Open Space by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Extremely Supportive 9	% Above 5
Male	185	3.96	30.8	6.5	4.9	7.0	25.9	7.6	9.7	2.2	5.4	24.9
Female	213	4.27	24.4	8.5	4.2	2.8	32.9	7.0	11.3	4.2	4.7	27.2

Table B277. Support for the Town Increasing Property Taxes to Purchase Land and Banking it for Future Public Uses Such as Parks, Fire Stations, and Open Space by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Extremely Supportive 9	% Above 5
Single Family	314	4.19	26.4	7.3	4.8	5.7	28.3	7.6	10.5	3.5	5.7	27.3
Apartment	42	3.74	28.6	9.5	4.8	0.0	42.9	2.4	11.9	0.0	0.0	14.3
Townhouse/Condo	39	4.13	30.8	7.7	2.6	2.6	25.6	10.3	10.3	5.1	5.1	30.8

Table B278. Support for the Town Increasing Property Taxes to Purchase Land and Banking it for Future Public Uses Such as Parks, Fire Stations, and Open Space by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Extremely Supportive 9	% Above 5
0-\$45,000	52	3.31	44.2	3.8	5.8	0.0	32.7	1.9	7.7	1.9	1.9	13.4
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	4.34	22.6	9.7	3.2	1.6	32.3	11.3	11.3	4.8	3.2	30.6
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	4.11	25.0	10.7	7.1	7.1	23.2	7.1	8.9	3.6	7.1	26.7
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	4.59	23.8	3.8	2.5	10.0	26.3	6.3	16.3	3.8	7.5	33.9
Over \$150,000	67	4.49	20.9	6.0	6.0	7.5	29.9	6.0	13.4	4.5	6.0	29.9

Table B279. Support for the Town Increasing Property Taxes to Purchase Land and Banking it for Future Public Uses Such as Parks, Fire Stations, and Open Space by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Extremely Supportive 9	% Above 5
Caucasian	287	4.10	28.9	7.0	4.5	4.9	29.6	5.2	10.5	3.5	5.9	25.1
African-American	30	3.73	40.0	3.3	3.3	3.3	23.3	6.7	16.7	0.0	3.3	26.7
Asian	39	4.26	20.5	10.3	5.1	5.1	30.8	12.8	7.7	5.1	2.6	28.2
Hispanic	22	4.55	13.6	13.6	0.0	4.5	40.9	9.1	13.6	0.0	4.5	27.2
Other	7	4.43	14.3	0.0	14.3	0.0	42.9	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6

Table B280. Support for the Town Increasing Property Taxes to Purchase Land and Banking it for Future Public Uses Such as Parks, Fire Stations, and Open Space by Voter Status.

Voter Status	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Extremely Supportive 9	% Above 5
Registered	353	4.15	27.2	7.4	5.1	5.1	27.8	7.4	11.3	3.7	5.1	27.5
Not Registered	43	3.86	30.2	7.0	0.0	2.3	46.5	7.0	2.3	0.0	4.7	14.0

Table B281. Support for the Town Increasing Property Taxes to Purchase Land and Banking it for Future Public Uses Such as Parks, Fire Stations, and Open Space Voted in 2013 Local Elections.

Voting Action	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Extremely Supportive 9	% Above 5
Voter	230	4.30	26.5	6.1	5.7	3.5	27.8	7.4	13.0	3.9	6.1	30.4
Nonvoter	165	3.88	29.1	8.5	3.0	6.7	32.7	7.3	6.7	2.4	3.6	20.0

Table B282. Support for the Town Increasing Property Taxes to Purchase Land and Banking it for Future Public Uses Such as Parks, Fire Stations, and Open Space by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Extremely Supportive 9	% Above 5
0-1	16	3.94	31.3	6.3	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	6.3	12.6
2-5	69	4.09	24.6	5.8	8.7	4.3	36.2	5.8	7.2	2.9	4.3	20.2
6-10	101	4.69	21.8	5.0	4.0	3.0	28.7	10.9	16.8	2.0	7.9	37.6
Over 10	203	3.83	31.0	9.4	3.9	6.4	26.6	6.9	8.4	3.4	3.9	22.6
Native	9	4.89	22.2	11.1	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0	22.2	22.2	0.0	44.4

Table B283. Support for the Town Increasing Property Taxes to Purchase Land and Banking it for Future Public Uses Such as Parks, Fire Stations, and Open Space by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Extremely Supportive 9	% Above 5
27511	93	4.09	29.0	6.5	5.4	3.2	31.2	6.5	8.6	4.3	5.4	24.8
27513	114	3.82	30.7	12.3	2.6	4.4	28.1	3.5	11.4	3.5	3.5	21.9
27518	65	4.17	24.6	7.7	3.1	4.6	35.4	12.3	6.2	0.0	6.2	24.7
27519	112	4.55	24.1	2.7	6.3	6.3	25.9	8.9	15.2	4.5	6.3	34.9

Barriers to Citizen Involvement Crosstabulations

Table B284. Barriers to Involvement in Town Government by Age (In Descending Mean Order).

18-25 (n=34)	26-55 (n=250)	56-65 (n=56)	Over 65 (n=46)
Too busy (6.86)	Too busy (5.86)	Too busy (4.46)	Don't know opportunities (3.48)
Don't know opportunities (5.74)	Don't know opportunities (4.41)	Don't know opportunities (3.97)	Too busy (3.13)
Timing inconvenient (5.11)	Timing inconvenient (3.99)	Timing inconvenient (3.63)	Timing inconvenient (3.02)
Don't feel qualified (4.26)	Topics don't interest me (2.75)	Topics don't interest me (2.42)	Topics don't interest me (2.04)
Don't understand process (3.40)	Issues don't affect me (2.49)	Issues don't affect me (2.11)	Issues don't affect me (1.91)
Topics don't interest me (3.34)	Don't understand process (1.97)	Don't understand process (1.52)	Don't feel qualified (1.80)
Issues don't affect me (3.23)	Don't feel qualified (1.91)	Don't feel qualified (1.50)	Don't understand process (1.70)
Waste of time (2.23)	Waste of time (1.77)	Waste of time (1.47)	Don't have transportation (1.67)
Don't have transportation (1.97)	Don't have transportation (1.29)	Don't have transportation (1.05)	Waste of time (1.24)

Table B285. Barriers to Involvement in Town Government by Education (In Descending Mean Order).

HS/Some College (n=154)	College Degree (n=216)	PhD/JD/MD (n=19)
Too busy (5.45)	Too busy (5.33)	Too busy (6.63)
Don't know opportunities (4.43)	Don't know opportunities (4.31)	Timing inconvenient (4.84)
Timing inconvenient (3.91)	Timing inconvenient (3.93)	Don't know opportunities (3.90)
Topics don't interest me (2.89)	Topics don't interest me (2.55)	Topics don't interest me (2.00)
Issues don't affect me (2.63)	Issues don't affect me (2.32)	Issues don't affect me (1.90)
Don't feel qualified (2.48)	Don't understand process (1.85)	Don't feel qualified (1.47)
Don't understand process (2.30)	Don't feel qualified (1.80)	Waste of time (1.32)
Waste of time (1.88)	Waste of time (1.62)	Don't understand process (1.32)
Don't have transportation (1.65)	Don't have transportation (1.19)	Don't have transportation (1.00)

Table B286. Barriers to Involvement in Town Government by Gender (In Descending Mean Order).

Male (n=184)	Female (n=211)
Too busy (5.77)	Too busy (5.14)
Timing inconvenient (4.18)	Don't know opportunities (4.47)
Don't know opportunities (4.17)	Timing inconvenient (3.76)
Topics don't interest me (2.74)	Topics don't interest me (2.59)
Issues don't affect me (2.48)	Issues don't affect me (2.38)
Don't feel qualified (1.95)	Don't understand process (2.20)
Don't understand process (1.79)	Don't feel qualified (2.15)
Waste of time (1.78)	Waste of time (1.65)
Don't have transportation (1.23)	Don't have transportation (1.49)

Table B287. Barriers to Involvement in Town Government by Housing Type (In Descending Mean Order).

Single Family (n=312)	Apartment (n=42)	Townhouse/Condo (n=37)
Too busy (5.31)	Too busy (6.00)	Too busy (5.82)
Don't know opportunities (4.24)	Don't know opportunities (5.17)	Don't know opportunities (4.13)
Timing inconvenient (3.92)	Timing inconvenient (4.14)	Timing inconvenient (3.90)
Topics don't interest me (2.62)	Don't feel qualified (2.91)	Topics don't interest me (2.81)
Issues don't affect me (2.42)	Topics don't interest me (2.83)	Don't feel qualified (2.55)
Don't feel qualified (1.88)	Don't understand process (2.83)	Issues don't affect me (2.40)
Don't understand process (1.87)	Issues don't affect me (2.43)	Don't understand process (2.21)
Waste of time (1.63)	Waste of time (2.17)	Waste of time (1.84)
Don't have transportation (1.30)	Don't have transportation (1.57)	Don't have transportation (1.61)

Table B288. Barriers to Involvement in Town Government by Income (In Descending Mean Order).

0-\$45,000 (n=51)	\$45,001-\$75,000 (n=60)	\$75,001-\$100,000 (n=54)	\$100,001-\$150,000 (n=79)	Over \$150,000 (n=68)
Too busy (5.29)	Too busy (5.43)	Too busy (5.51)	Too busy (5.88)	Too busy (5.31)
Don't know opportunities (4.52)	Don't know opportunities (4.39)	Don't know opportunities (4.16)	Don't know opportunities (4.39)	Don't know opportunities (4.15)
Timing inconvenient (4.12)	Timing inconvenient (3.95)	Timing inconvenient (4.11)	Timing inconvenient (4.03)	Timing inconvenient (3.73)
Don't feel qualified (3.02)	Topics don't interest me (2.51)	Topics don't interest me (2.61)	Topics don't interest me (2.64)	Topics don't interest me (2.63)
Topics don't interest me (2.90)	Issues don't affect me (2.34)	Issues don't affect me (2.33)	Issues don't affect me (2.30)	Issues don't affect me (2.38)
Issues don't affect me (2.65)	Don't understand process (2.15)	Don't understand process (1.86)	Don't understand process (1.85)	Don't understand process (1.66)
Don't understand process (2.44)	Don't feel qualified (2.12)	Don't feel qualified (1.78)	Waste of time (1.70)	Don't feel qualified (1.63)
Waste of time (2.15)	Waste of time (1.77)	Waste of time (1.75)	Don't feel qualified (1.70)	Waste of time (1.37)
Don't have transportation (1.96)	Don't have transportation (1.58)	Don't have transportation (1.40)	Don't have transportation (1.19)	Don't have transportation (1.09)

Table B289. Barriers to Involvement in Town Government by Race (In Descending Mean Order).

Caucasian (n=284)	Asian (n=38)	African-American (n=29)	Hispanic (n=22)	Other (n=7)
Too busy (5.35)	Too busy (6.44)	Too busy (5.43)	Too busy (5.73)	Too busy (4.43)
Don't know opportunities (4.24)	Timing inconvenient (5.59)	Don't know opportunities (5.00)	Timing inconvenient (4.05)	Don't know opportunities (2.71)
Timing inconvenient (3.83)	Don't know opportunities (5.03)	Timing inconvenient (3.70)	Don't know opportunities (3.59)	Don't feel qualified (2.57)
Topics don't interest me (2.72)	Topics don't interest me (2.76)	Don't feel qualified (3.17)	Don't understand process (2.77)	Timing inconvenient (2.14)
Issues don't affect me (2.49)	Don't understand process (2.49)	Don't understand process (2.90)	Don't feel qualified (2.77)	Topics don't interest me (2.00)
Don't understand process (1.82)	Don't feel qualified (2.46)	Issues don't affect me (2.17)	Topics don't interest me (2.64)	Issues don't affect me (1.71)
Don't feel qualified (1.82)	Issues don't affect me (2.34)	Topics don't interest me (2.03)	Issues don't affect me (2.50)	Waste of time (1.57)
Waste of time (1.67)	Waste of time (1.85)	Waste of time (1.87)	Waste of time (2.05)	Don't understand process (1.43)
Don't have transportation (1.32)	Don't have transportation (1.54)	Don't have transportation (1.55)	Don't have transportation (1.73)	Don't have transportation (1.00)

Table B290. Barriers to Involvement in Town Government by Years in Cary (In Descending Mean Order).

0-1 (n=16)	2-5 (n=69)	6-10 (n=98)	Over 10 (n=202)	Native (n=9)
Too busy (6.25)	Too busy (5.78)	Too busy (5.80)	Too busy (5.01)	Too busy (6.78)
Don't know opportunities (4.31)	Don't know opportunities (5.07)	Timing inconvenient (4.01)	Don't know opportunities (4.22)	Don't know opportunities (5.11)
Don't feel qualified (2.25)	Timing inconvenient (4.36)	Don't know opportunities (3.98)	Timing inconvenient (3.91)	Timing inconvenient (4.22)
Timing inconvenient (2.19)	Topics don't interest me (2.96)	Topics don't interest me (2.52)	Topics don't interest me (2.73)	Don't feel qualified (2.44)
Issues don't affect me (2.00)	Issues don't affect me (2.71)	Issues don't affect me (2.17)	Issues don't affect me (2.49)	Issues don't affect me (2.33)
Topics don't interest me (1.75)	Don't feel qualified (2.67)	Don't feel qualified (2.16)	Don't understand process (1.75)	Waste of time (2.33)
Don't understand process (1.56)	Don't understand process (2.65)	Don't understand process (2.15)	Don't feel qualified (1.75)	Topics don't interest me (2.22)
Waste of time (1.25)	Waste of time (1.86)	Waste of time (1.67)	Waste of time (1.69)	Don't understand process (2.22)
Don't have transportation (1.06)	Don't have transportation (1.45)	Don't have transportation (1.36)	Don't have transportation (1.37)	Don't have transportation (1.44)

Table B291. Barriers to Involvement in Town Government by Zip Code (In Descending Mean Order).

27511 (n=88)	27513 (n=113)	27518 (n=66)	27519 (n=111)
Too busy (5.17)	Too busy (5.65)	Too busy (4.89)	Too busy (5.70)
Don't know opportunities (4.34)	Don't know opportunities (4.20)	Don't know opportunities (4.12)	Don't know opportunities (4.42)
Timing inconvenient (3.97)	Timing inconvenient (3.87)	Timing inconvenient (4.11)	Timing inconvenient (3.81)
Topics don't interest me (2.49)	Topics don't interest me (2.76)	Topics don't interest me (2.82)	Topics don't interest me (2.43)
Issues don't affect me (2.38)	Issues don't affect me (2.53)	Issues don't affect me (2.59)	Issues don't affect me (2.20)
Don't feel qualified (2.27)	Don't understand process (2.17)	Don't understand process (1.96)	Don't feel qualified (1.96)
Don't understand process (1.94)	Don't feel qualified (2.04)	Don't feel qualified (1.86)	Don't understand process (1.84)
Waste of time (1.72)	Waste of time (1.81)	Waste of time (1.62)	Waste of time (1.55)
Don't have transportation (1.44)	Don't have transportation (1.38)	Don't have transportation (1.59)	Don't have transportation (1.16)

Cary Information Source Usage Crosstabulations

Table B292. Information Source Usage by Age (In Descending Mean Order).

18-25 (n=35)	26-55 (n=255)	56-65 (n=57)	Over 65 (n=45)
Word-of-Mouth (6.51)	Word-of-Mouth (6.04)	Cary News (6.86)	Cary News (7.13)
Television (5.37)	Cary News (5.34)	Word-of-Mouth (6.30)	Word-of-Mouth (6.29)
Radio (4.26)	BUD (4.95)	News & Observer (6.05)	News & Observer (6.22)
Facebook (4.26)	Television (4.87)	BUD (5.55)	Television (5.76)
YouTube (3.51)	News & Observer (4.48)	Television (5.16)	BUD (4.94)
Cary's Website (3.31)	Cary's Website (4.30)	Cary's Website (4.07)	Cary TV 11 (3.22)
Cary News (3.26)	Radio (3.50)	Radio (2.98)	Cary's Website (3.17)
Twitter (2.57)	Parks & Rec. Brochure (3.38)	Homeowners' Assoc. (2.83)	Homeowners' Assoc. (3.17)
Cary Citizen website (2.46)	Cary Citizen website (2.58)	Parks & Rec. Brochure (2.72)	Parks & Rec. Brochure (2.57)
News & Observer (2.20)	Facebook (2.30)	Cary TV 11 (2.57)	Radio (2.46)
BUD (2.09)	Cary Email List Service (2.26)	Cary Citizen website (2.31)	Independent Weekly (2.33)
Parks & Rec. Brochure (1.86)	Homeowners' Assoc. (2.18)	Cary Email List Service (1.93)	Block Leader Program (1.87)
Cary TV 11 (1.83)	Cary TV 11 (2.15)	Independent Weekly (1.93)	Cary Email List Service (1.85)
Independent Weekly (1.66)	Independent Weekly (1.93)	Block Leader Program (1.51)	Cary Citizen website (1.61)
Cary Email List Service (1.63)	Block Leader Program (1.76)	Facebook (1.33)	Facebook (1.48)
Block Leader Program (1.40)	YouTube (1.53)	YouTube (1.10)	YouTube (1.07)
Homeowners' Assoc. (1.29)	Twitter (1.42)	Twitter (1.09)	Twitter (1.00)

Table B293. Information Source Usage by Education (In Descending Mean Order).

HS/Some College (n=156)	College Degree (n=217)	PhD/JD/MD (n=19)
Word-of-Mouth (6.26)	Word-of-Mouth (6.10)	News & Observer (6.63)
Television (5.55)	Cary News (5.77)	Cary News (6.32)
Cary News (5.33)	BUD (5.25)	Word-of-Mouth (5.53)
News & Observer (4.20)	News & Observer (4.95)	Television (5.00)
BUD (4.19)	Television (4.78)	BUD (4.53)
Radio (3.64)	Cary's Website (4.63)	Parks & Rec. Brochure (4.26)
Parks & Rec. Brochure (3.39)	Parks & Rec. Brochure (3.39)	Cary's Website (3.90)
Cary's Website (3.27)	Radio (3.25)	Radio (3.47)
Cary Citizen website (2.50)	Cary Citizen website (2.50)	Homeowners' Assoc. (2.68)
Homeowners' Assoc. (2.49)	Homeowners' Assoc. (2.49)	Cary Citizen website (2.63)
Cary TV 11 (2.39)	Cary Email List Service (2.32)	Independent Weekly (2.47)
Facebook (2.04)	Cary TV 11 (2.31)	Cary Email List Service (2.32)
Independent Weekly (1.88)	Facebook (2.04)	Block Leader Program (2.16)
Cary Email List Service (1.80)	Independent Weekly (1.88)	Cary TV 11 (2.16)
Block Leader Program (1.48)	Block Leader Program (1.86)	Facebook (1.90)
YouTube (1.39)	YouTube (1.39)	Twitter (1.47)
Twitter (1.36)	Twitter (1.36)	YouTube (1.47)

**Table B294. Information Source Usage by Gender
(In Descending Mean Order).**

Male (n=184)	Female (n=212)
Word-of-Mouth (5.77)	Word-of-Mouth (6.45)
Cary News (5.08)	Cary News (6.01)
Television (4.89)	Television (5.23)
BUD (4.54)	News & Observer (5.14)
News & Observer (4.20)	BUD (5.00)
Cary's Website (3.96)	Cary's Website (4.09)
Radio (3.40)	Radio (3.40)
Parks & Rec. Brochure (2.68)	Parks & Rec. Brochure (3.40)
Cary Citizen website (2.33)	Cary TV 11 (2.50)
Facebook (2.18)	Homeowners' Assoc. (2.49)
Homeowners' Assoc. (2.11)	Cary Citizen website (2.46)
Cary TV 11 (2.11)	Facebook (2.30)
Cary Email List Service (1.88)	Cary Email List Service (2.29)
Independent Weekly (1.85)	Independent Weekly (2.02)
YouTube (1.65)	Block Leader Program (1.82)
Block Leader Program (1.59)	YouTube (1.52)
Twitter (1.50)	Twitter (1.35)

Table B295. Information Source Usage by Housing Type (In Descending Mean Order).

Single Family (n=313)	Apartment (n=41)	Townhouse/Condo (n=38)
Word-of-Mouth (6.04)	Word-of-Mouth (6.31)	Word-of-Mouth (6.58)
Cary News (5.87)	Television (5.52)	Cary News (5.46)
BUD (5.10)	Radio (4.21)	Television (5.46)
Television (4.96)	Cary News (3.76)	News & Observer (4.95)
News & Observer (4.95)	Facebook (3.48)	BUD (4.74)
Cary's Website (4.19)	Cary Citizen website (3.29)	Radio (3.90)
Radio (3.21)	Cary's Website (3.17)	Cary's Website (3.85)
Parks & Rec. Brochure (3.18)	News & Observer (2.74)	Parks & Rec. Brochure (2.97)
Homeowners' Assoc. (2.50)	BUD (2.48)	Facebook (2.64)
Cary TV 11 (2.32)	YouTube (2.43)	Cary Citizen website (2.49)
Cary Citizen website (2.29)	Parks & Rec. Brochure (2.41)	Cary TV 11 (2.31)
Cary Email List Service (2.19)	Cary TV 11 (2.31)	Homeowners' Assoc. (2.23)
Facebook (2.04)	Twitter (1.98)	Independent Weekly (2.15)
Independent Weekly (1.96)	Independent Weekly (1.74)	YouTube (2.10)
Block Leader Program (1.76)	Cary Email List Service (1.71)	Twitter (1.90)
YouTube (1.41)	Block Leader Program (1.62)	Cary Email List Service (1.87)
Twitter (1.29)	Homeowners' Assoc. (1.12)	Block Leader Program (1.51)

Table B296. Information Source Usage by Income (In Descending Mean Order).

0-\$45,000 (n=52)	\$45,001-\$75,000 (n=62)	\$75,001-\$100,000 (n=55)	\$100,001-\$150,000 (n=78)	Over \$150,000 (n=67)
Word-of-Mouth (6.40)	Word-of-Mouth (6.26)	Cary News (6.52)	Word-of-Mouth (5.99)	Cary News (6.24)
Television (5.92)	Television (5.47)	Word-of-Mouth (6.20)	Cary News (5.78)	Word-of-Mouth (6.18)
Radio (4.31)	Cary News (5.34)	News & Observer (5.50)	News & Observer (5.10)	News & Observer (5.15)
BUD (3.87)	BUD (4.23)	BUD (5.25)	BUD (5.08)	Television (5.03)
Cary News (3.77)	News & Observer (3.94)	Television (5.16)	Television (4.46)	BUD (4.85)
News & Observer (3.44)	Cary's Website (3.92)	Cary's Website (4.50)	Cary's Website (4.05)	Cary's Website (4.81)
Facebook (3.17)	Radio (3.55)	Radio (3.68)	Parks & Rec. Brochure (3.39)	Radio (3.49)
Cary's Website (3.10)	Cary Citizen website (3.24)	Parks & Rec. Brochure (3.32)	Radio (2.94)	Parks & Rec. Brochure (3.03)
YouTube (2.77)	Parks & Rec. Brochure (3.11)	Cary Citizen website (2.88)	Homeowners' Assoc. (2.49)	Cary Email List Service (2.67)
Cary TV 11 (2.71)	Cary TV 11 (2.74)	Cary TV 11 (2.59)	Cary Citizen website (2.33)	Homeowners' Assoc. (2.63)
Cary Citizen website (2.44)	Facebook (2.48)	Cary Email List Service (2.43)	Cary Email List Service (2.18)	Cary TV 11 (2.31)
Twitter (2.00)	Homeowners' Assoc. (2.40)	Homeowners' Assoc. (2.43)	Cary TV 11 (2.16)	Cary Citizen website (2.13)
Parks & Rec. Brochure (1.96)	Independent Weekly (2.03)	Independent Weekly (2.36)	Facebook (2.03)	Independent Weekly (1.99)
Independent Weekly (1.90)	YouTube (1.82)	Facebook (2.29)	Independent Weekly (1.94)	Facebook (1.87)
Homeowners' Assoc. (1.77)	Cary Email List Service (1.69)	Block Leader Program (2.18)	Block Leader Program (1.81)	Block Leader Program (1.58)
Cary Email List Service (1.67)	Twitter (1.66)	YouTube (1.66)	Twitter (1.34)	Twitter (1.19)
Block Leader Program (1.64)	Block Leader Program (1.55)	Twitter (1.30)	YouTube (1.33)	YouTube (1.10)

Table B297. Information Source Usage by Race (In Descending Mean Order).

Caucasian (n=287)	Asian (n=39)	African-American (n=29)	Hispanic (n=22)	Other (n=7)
Word-of-Mouth (6.11)	Word-of-Mouth (5.92)	Word-of-Mouth (6.93)	Word-of-Mouth (6.82)	Television (5.43)
Cary News (5.84)	Cary News (5.80)	Television (6.00)	Television (5.36)	Word-of-Mouth (4.71)
BUD (5.13)	Television (5.21)	Radio (4.30)	News & Observer (4.59)	Cary Citizen website (3.43)
News & Observer (4.95)	Cary's Website (4.77)	Cary News (4.20)	Cary News (4.46)	Cary News (3.29)
Television (4.95)	BUD (4.72)	Cary's Website (3.50)	Radio (3.91)	Facebook (3.14)
Cary's Website (4.07)	News & Observer (4.41)	News & Observer (3.37)	BUD (3.14)	Radio (2.86)
Radio (3.24)	Parks & Rec. Brochure (3.74)	BUD (3.13)	Cary's Website (3.00)	Cary's Website (2.86)
Parks & Rec. Brochure (3.11)	Radio (3.64)	Cary TV 11 (2.63)	Homeowners' Assoc. (2.36)	BUD (2.86)
Homeowners' Assoc. (2.42)	Cary Citizen website (3.36)	Cary Citizen website (2.47)	Cary Citizen website (2.36)	News & Observer (2.71)
Cary Citizen website (2.24)	Facebook (3.13)	Facebook (2.43)	Parks & Rec. Brochure (2.32)	Homeowners' Assoc. (2.57)
Cary TV 11 (2.21)	Cary TV 11 (3.05)	Parks & Rec. Brochure (2.27)	Cary TV 11 (2.32)	Parks & Rec. Brochure (2.43)
Cary Email List Service (2.17)	Cary Email List Service (2.56)	YouTube (2.27)	Facebook (2.23)	Cary TV 11 (2.14)
Facebook (2.12)	Independent Weekly (2.46)	Independent Weekly (2.10)	YouTube (2.14)	Block Leader Program (1.29)
Independent Weekly (1.89)	YouTube (2.36)	Twitter (1.90)	Independent Weekly (2.00)	Independent Weekly (1.29)
Block Leader Program (1.72)	Homeowners' Assoc. (2.21)	Cary Email List Service (1.67)	Cary Email List Service (1.50)	Cary Email List Service (1.00)
Twitter (1.40)	Block Leader Program (1.95)	Block Leader Program (1.52)	Block Leader Program (1.50)	Twitter (1.00)
YouTube (1.38)	Twitter (1.39)	Homeowners' Assoc. (1.40)	Twitter (1.32)	YouTube (1.00)

Table B298. Information Source Usage by Voter Status (In Descending Mean Order).

Registered (n=352)	Not Registered (n=43)
Word-of-Mouth (6.13)	Word-of-Mouth (6.14)
Cary News (5.81)	Television (4.44)
Television (5.16)	Cary News (3.81)
BUD (4.98)	BUD (3.26)
News & Observer (4.91)	Cary's Website (3.19)
Cary's Website (4.14)	News & Observer (3.09)
Radio (3.46)	Radio (2.98)
Parks & Rec. Brochure (3.19)	Facebook (2.70)
Cary TV 11 (2.38)	Cary Citizen website (2.58)
Cary Citizen website (2.38)	YouTube (2.19)
Homeowners' Assoc. (2.36)	Parks & Rec. Brochure (2.09)
Facebook (2.19)	Homeowners' Assoc. (1.93)
Cary Email List Service (2.14)	Cary TV 11 (1.84)
Independent Weekly (2.01)	Cary Email List Service (1.81)
Block Leader Program (1.76)	Independent Weekly (1.47)
YouTube (1.51)	Twitter (1.42)
Twitter (1.42)	Block Leader Program (1.33)

Table B299. Information Source Usage by Voted in 2013 Local Elections (In Descending Mean Order).

Voter (n=230)	Nonvoter (n=164)
Cary News (6.33)	Word-of-Mouth (6.17)
Word-of-Mouth (6.12)	Television (4.96)
BUD (5.29)	Cary News (4.56)
News & Observer (5.24)	BUD (4.10)
Television (5.16)	News & Observer (3.96)
Cary's Website (4.19)	Cary's Website (3.82)
Radio (3.40)	Radio (3.41)
Parks & Rec. Brochure (3.36)	Parks & Rec. Brochure (2.69)
Homeowners' Assoc. (2.47)	Cary Citizen website (2.40)
Facebook (2.44)	Cary TV 11 (2.18)
Cary TV 11 (2.43)	Homeowners' Assoc. (2.11)
Cary Citizen website (2.41)	Facebook (1.98)
Cary Email List Service (2.26)	Cary Email List Service (1.88)
Independent Weekly (2.04)	Independent Weekly (1.82)
Block Leader Program (1.82)	YouTube (1.61)
YouTube (1.57)	Block Leader Program (1.57)
Twitter (1.56)	Twitter (1.23)

Table B300. Information Source Usage by Years in Cary (In Descending Mean Order).

0-1 (n=16)	2-5 (n=68)	6-10 (n=101)	Over 10 (n=203)	Native (n=9)
Word-of-Mouth (6.75)	Word-of-Mouth (5.91)	Word-of-Mouth (6.28)	Word-of-Mouth (6.08)	Word-of-Mouth (6.33)
Television (4.00)	Television (4.91)	Cary News (5.55)	Cary News (6.00)	Cary News (6.00)
Cary News (3.88)	Cary News (4.71)	Television (5.20)	BUD (5.31)	Television (5.89)
Cary's Website (3.06)	News & Observer (4.22)	BUD (4.65)	News & Observer (5.24)	News & Observer (5.33)
News & Observer (2.93)	Cary's Website (4.10)	Cary's Website (4.20)	Television (5.12)	Radio (4.11)
Cary Citizen website (2.81)	BUD (4.10)	News & Observer (4.17)	Cary's Website (4.06)	BUD (3.78)
Radio (2.69)	Radio (3.91)	Radio (3.26)	Radio (3.32)	Facebook (3.67)
Parks & Rec. Brochure (2.44)	Facebook (3.32)	Parks & Rec. Brochure (3.00)	Parks & Rec. Brochure (3.28)	Cary TV 11 (3.22)
BUD (2.38)	Parks & Rec. Brochure (2.74)	Cary Citizen website (2.58)	Cary TV 11 (2.48)	Cary Citizen website (2.67)
Facebook (2.38)	Homeowners' Assoc. (2.67)	Cary TV 11 (2.41)	Homeowners' Assoc. (2.34)	Cary's Website (2.56)
Block Leader Program (1.75)	Cary Citizen website (2.45)	Homeowners' Assoc. (2.17)	Cary Email List Service (2.26)	Parks & Rec. Brochure (2.56)
Homeowners' Assoc. (1.69)	YouTube (2.07)	Cary Email List Service (2.08)	Cary Citizen website (2.25)	YouTube (2.11)
Twitter (1.69)	Independent Weekly (1.96)	Independent Weekly (2.06)	Independent Weekly (1.95)	Homeowners' Assoc. (1.78)
YouTube (1.50)	Cary Email List Service (1.90)	Facebook (2.03)	Facebook (1.91)	Cary Email List Service (1.67)
Cary TV 11 (1.31)	Cary TV 11 (1.84)	Block Leader Program (1.67)	Block Leader Program (1.82)	Independent Weekly (1.67)
Independent Weekly (1.31)	Twitter (1.65)	YouTube (1.58)	YouTube (1.40)	Block Leader Program (1.11)
Cary Email List Service (1.25)	Block Leader Program (1.53)	Twitter (1.39)	Twitter (1.36)	Twitter (1.00)

Table B301. Information Source Usage by Zip Code (In Descending Mean Order).

27511 (n=93)	27513 (n=113)	27518 (n=65)	27519 (n=111)
Word-of-Mouth (6.39)	Word-of-Mouth (6.35)	Word-of-Mouth (6.14)	Cary News (5.80)
Cary News (5.51)	Cary News (5.41)	Cary News (5.70)	Word-of-Mouth (5.80)
Television (5.26)	Television (4.90)	BUD (5.39)	News & Observer (5.07)
News & Observer (4.73)	BUD (4.83)	Television (5.23)	Television (5.07)
BUD (4.51)	News & Observer (4.19)	News & Observer (5.09)	BUD (4.71)
Cary's Website (4.01)	Cary's Website (3.64)	Cary's Website (4.11)	Cary's Website (4.48)
Radio (3.86)	Radio (3.34)	Radio (3.42)	Homeowners' Assoc. (3.67)
Parks & Rec. Brochure (3.00)	Parks & Rec. Brochure (3.02)	Parks & Rec. Brochure (3.30)	Radio (3.15)
Facebook (2.50)	Facebook (2.44)	Homeowners' Assoc. (2.86)	Parks & Rec. Brochure (2.97)
Cary Citizen website (2.45)	Cary Citizen website (2.40)	Cary TV 11 (2.46)	Cary TV 11 (2.42)
Cary TV 11 (2.38)	Cary TV 11 (2.18)	Cary Citizen website (2.42)	Cary Citizen website (2.41)
Cary Email List Service (1.99)	Homeowners' Assoc. (2.04)	Facebook (2.32)	Independent Weekly (2.28)
Independent Weekly (1.88)	Cary Email List Service (2.00)	Cary Email List Service (2.15)	Cary Email List Service (2.26)
Homeowners' Assoc. (1.88)	Independent Weekly (1.64)	Block Leader Program (2.11)	Facebook (1.88)
YouTube (1.75)	YouTube (1.59)	Independent Weekly (1.99)	Block Leader Program (1.75)
Block Leader Program (1.61)	Block Leader Program (1.58)	YouTube (1.79)	YouTube (1.36)
Twitter (1.57)	Twitter (1.43)	Twitter (1.53)	Twitter (1.24)

Potential New Media Source Usage Crosstabulations

Table B302. Potential Use of New Media if Cary Used Them to Communicate With Citizens by Age (In Descending Mean Order).

18-25 (n=35)	26-55 (n=256)	56-65 (n=58)	Over 65 (n=46)
Instagram (3.89)	Google Plus (2.43)	Google Plus (1.74)	Google Plus (1.39)
Google Plus (3.51)	Instagram (1.95)	Instagram (1.22)	Instagram (1.17)
Tumblr (2.34)	Next Door (1.44)	Next Door (1.17)	Tumblr (1.13)
Next Door (2.06)	Tumblr (1.43)	Tumblr (1.09)	Next Door (1.13)

Table B303. Potential Use of New Media if Cary Used Them to Communicate With Citizens by Education (In Descending Mean Order).

HS/Some College (n=157)	College Degree (n=218)	PhD/JD/MD (n=19)
Google Plus (2.38)	Google Plus (2.39)	Instagram (1.74)
Instagram (2.28)	Instagram (1.70)	Next Door (1.58)
Tumblr (1.54)	Next Door (1.36)	Tumblr (1.53)
Next Door (1.48)	Tumblr (1.34)	Google Plus (1.16)

Table B304. Potential Use of New Media if Cary Used Them to Communicate With Citizens by Gender (In Descending Mean Order).

Male (n=185)	Female (n=214)
Google Plus (2.31)	Google Plus (2.31)
Instagram (2.10)	Instagram (1.76)
Tumblr (1.50)	Next Door (1.38)
Next Door (1.45)	Tumblr (1.36)

Table B305. Potential Use of New Media if Cary Used Them to Communicate With Citizens by Housing Type (In Descending Mean Order).

Single Family (n=315)	Apartment (n=42)	Townhouse/Condo (n=39)
Google Plus (2.07)	Google Plus (3.45)	Google Plus (2.90)
Instagram (1.67)	Instagram (3.02)	Instagram (2.59)
Tumblr (1.32)	Tumblr (1.83)	Next Door (1.87)
Next Door (1.32)	Next Door (1.74)	Tumblr (1.77)

Table B306. Potential Use of New Media if Cary Used Them to Communicate With Citizens by Income (In Descending Mean Order).

0-\$45,000 (n=52)	\$45,001-\$75,000 (n=62)	\$75,001-\$100,000 (n=56)	\$100,001-\$150,000 (n=80)	Over \$150,000 (n=68)
Instagram (3.33)	Google Plus (2.77)	Google Plus (2.25)	Google Plus (1.99)	Google Plus (2.15)
Google Plus (3.12)	Instagram (2.13)	Instagram (2.05)	Instagram (1.68)	Instagram (1.52)
Tumblr (1.94)	Tumblr (1.73)	Tumblr (1.59)	Next Door (1.30)	Tumblr (1.28)
Next Door (1.81)	Next Door (1.73)	Next Door (1.59)	Tumblr (1.29)	Next Door (1.18)

Table B307. Potential Use of New Media if Cary Used Them to Communicate With Citizens by Race (In Descending Mean Order).

Caucasian (n=288)	Asian (n=39)	African-American (n=30)	Hispanic (n=22)	Other (n=7)
Google Plus (2.12)	Google Plus (2.36)	Google Plus (3.57)	Google Plus (2.68)	Google Plus (3.86)
Instagram (1.80)	Instagram (1.95)	Instagram (2.90)	Instagram (2.32)	Instagram (1.86)
Next Door (1.38)	Tumblr (1.64)	Next Door (1.80)	Tumblr (1.68)	Tumblr (1.00)
Tumblr (1.36)	Next Door (1.41)	Tumblr (1.73)	Next Door (1.55)	Next Door (1.00)

Table B308. Potential Use of New Media if Cary Used Them to Communicate With Citizens by Voter Status (In Descending Mean Order).

Registered (n=354)	Not Registered (n=43)
Google Plus (2.22)	Google Plus (3.09)
Instagram (1.90)	Instagram (2.09)
Tumblr (1.43)	Tumblr (1.40)
Next Door (1.43)	Next Door (1.28)

Table B309. Potential Use of New Media if Cary Used Them to Communicate With Citizens by Voted in 2013 Local Elections (In Descending Mean Order).

Voter (n=231)	Nonvoter (n=165)
Google Plus (2.48)	Google Plus (2.10)
Instagram (2.05)	Instagram (1.75)
Next Door (1.54)	Tumblr (1.29)
Tumblr (1.52)	Next Door (1.25)

Table B310. Potential Use of New Media if Cary Used Them to Communicate With Citizens by Years in Cary (In Descending Mean Order).

0-1 (n=16)	2-5 (n=69)	6-10 (n=101)	Over 10 (n=204)	Native (n=9)
Google Plus (2.50)	Google Plus (3.28)	Google Plus (2.38)	Google Plus (1.92)	Google Plus (2.78)
Instagram (1.63)	Instagram (2.57)	Instagram (2.08)	Instagram (1.61)	Instagram (2.67)
Tumblr (1.31)	Next Door (1.55)	Tumblr (1.53)	Next Door (1.36)	Tumblr (1.89)
Next Door (1.25)	Tumblr (1.51)	Next Door (1.41)	Tumblr (1.33)	Next Door (1.89)

Table B311. Potential Use of New Media if Cary Used Them to Communicate With Citizens by Zip Code (In Descending Mean Order).

27511 (n=93)	27513 (n=114)	27518 (n=66)	27519 (n=112)
Google Plus (2.29)	Google Plus (2.25)	Google Plus (2.56)	Google Plus (2.31)
Instagram (2.19)	Instagram (1.73)	Instagram (2.14)	Instagram (1.80)
Tumblr (1.66)	Next Door (1.37)	Tumblr (1.53)	Next Door (1.40)
Next Door (1.53)	Tumblr (1.33)	Next Door (1.44)	Tumblr (1.28)

Viewership of Video Programs About Government Activities and Issues Crosstabulations

Table B312. Viewership of Video Programs About Government Activities and Issues Via Cable, Cary's Website, and YouTube by Age.

Age	n	Never	At Least Once a Year	Several Times a Year	At Least Once a Month	Several Times Every Month
18-25	35	85.7	2.9	5.7	0.0	5.7
26-55	256	74.2	11.3	11.7	2.0	0.8
56-65	58	60.3	17.2	17.2	3.4	1.7
Over 65	46	50.0	17.4	19.6	8.7	4.3

Table B313. Viewership of Video Programs About Government Activities and Issues Via Cable, Cary's Website, and YouTube by Education.

Education	n	Never	At Least Once a Year	Several Times a Year	At Least Once a Month	Several Times Every Month
HS/Some College	157	67.5	11.5	14.6	4.5	1.9
College Degree	218	69.3	14.2	12.4	1.8	2.3
PhD/JD/MD	19	89.5	5.3	5.3	0.0	0.0

Table B314. Viewership of Video Programs About Government Activities and Issues Via Cable, Cary's Website, and YouTube by Gender.

Gender	n	Never	At Least Once a Year	Several Times a Year	At Least Once a Month	Several Times Every Month
Male	185	71.9	12.4	13.0	1.6	1.1
Female	214	68.2	12.6	12.6	3.7	2.8

Table B315. Viewership of Video Programs About Government Activities and Issues Via Cable, Cary's Website, and YouTube by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Never	At Least Once a Year	Several Times a Year	At Least Once a Month	Several Times Every Month
Single Family	315	70.8	12.7	12.4	2.2	1.9
Apartment	42	71.4	2.4	19.0	2.4	4.8
Townhouse/Condo	39	61.5	20.5	10.3	7.7	0.0

Table B316. Viewership of Video Programs About Government Activities and Issues Via Cable, Cary's Website, and YouTube by Income.

Income	n	Never	At Least Once a Year	Several Times a Year	At Least Once a Month	Several Times Every Month
0-\$45,000	52	67.3	13.5	11.5	3.8	3.8
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	61.3	6.5	22.6	6.5	3.2
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	57.1	19.6	17.9	1.8	3.6
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	71.3	11.3	12.5	3.8	1.3
Over \$150,000	68	82.4	10.3	7.4	0.0	0.0

Table B317. Viewership of Video Programs About Government Activities and Issues Via Cable, Cary’s Website, and YouTube by Race.

Race	n	Never	At Least Once a Year	Several Times a Year	At Least Once a Month	Several Times Every Month
Caucasian	288	70.5	13.9	12.2	2.1	1.4
Asian	39	76.9	5.1	15.4	2.6	0.0
African-American	30	63.3	6.7	16.7	6.7	6.7
Hispanic	22	68.2	13.6	9.1	4.5	4.5
Other	7	57.1	28.6	14.3	0.0	0.0

Table B318. Viewership of Video Programs About Government Activities and Issues Via Cable, Cary’s Website, and YouTube by Voter Status.

Voter Status	n	Never	At Least Once a Year	Several Times a Year	At Least Once a Month	Several Times Every Month
Registered	354	69.5	12.4	13.6	2.5	2.0
Not Registered	43	72.1	14.0	7.0	4.7	2.3

Table B319. Viewership of Video Programs About Government Activities and Issues Via Cable, Cary’s Website, and YouTube by Voting Action.

Voting Action	n	Never	At Least Once a Year	Several Times a Year	At Least Once a Month	Several Times Every Month
Voter	231	66.2	13.9	14.3	3.5	2.2
Nonvoter	165	74.5	10.9	10.9	1.8	1.8

Table B320. Viewership of Video Programs About Government Activities and Issues Via Cable, Cary’s Website, and YouTube by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Never	At Least Once a Year	Several Times a Year	At Least Once a Month	Several Times Every Month
0-1	16	93.8	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0
2-5	69	72.5	11.6	13.0	0.0	2.9
6-10	101	75.2	5.9	14.9	3.0	1.0
Over 10	204	65.2	17.2	12.3	2.9	2.5
Native	9	55.6	11.1	22.2	11.1	0.0

Table B321. Viewership of Video Programs About Government Activities and Issues Via Cable, Cary’s Website, and YouTube by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Never	At Least Once a Year	Several Times a Year	At Least Once a Month	Several Times Every Month
27511	93	69.9	14.0	12.9	1.1	2.2
27513	114	69.3	10.5	12.3	5.3	2.6
27518	66	66.7	16.7	12.1	3.0	1.5
27519	112	71.4	11.6	13.4	1.8	1.8

How Respondents Watch Video Programs About Government Activities and Issues Crosstabulations

Table B322. How Respondents Watch the Live and Recorded Programs About Government Activities and Issues by Age.

Age	n	Cable TV	Cary's Website	YouTube	Cable TV and Cary's Website	Cable TV and YouTube	Cable TV, Cary's Website and YouTube	I Don't Watch
18-25	35	14.3	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	82.9
26-55	256	24.2	2.0	0.4	3.5	0.4	0.4	69.1
56-65	58	36.2	3.4	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	58.6
Over 65	46	54.3	2.2	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	41.3

Table B323. How Respondents Watch the Live and Recorded Programs About Government Activities and Issues by Education.

Education	n	Cable TV	Cary's Website	YouTube	Cable TV and Cary's Website	Cable TV and YouTube	Cable TV, Cary's Website and YouTube	I Don't Watch
HS/Some College	157	31.8	0.6	0.6	1.9	0.0	0.0	65.0
College Degree	218	28.4	2.8	0.5	3.7	0.5	0.5	63.8
PhD/JD/MD	19	10.5	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	84.2

Table B324. How Respondents Watch the Live and Recorded Programs About Government Activities and Issues by Gender.

Gender	n	Cable TV	Cary's Website	YouTube	Cable TV and Cary's Website	Cable TV and YouTube	Cable TV, Cary's Website and YouTube	I Don't Watch
Male	185	22.7	2.7	0.5	4.9	0.0	0.5	68.6
Female	214	34.6	1.4	0.5	0.9	0.5	0.0	62.1

Table B325. How Respondents Watch the Live and Recorded Programs About Government Activities and Issues by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Cable TV	Cary's Website	YouTube	Cable TV and Cary's Website	Cable TV and YouTube	Cable TV, Cary's Website and YouTube	I Don't Watch
Single Family	315	27.6	2.2	0.6	2.5	0.0	0.3	66.7
Apartment	42	33.3	0.0	0.0	4.8	2.4	0.0	59.5
Townhouse/Condo	39	35.9	2.6	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	59.0

Table B326. How Respondents Watch the Live and Recorded Programs About Government Activities and Issues by Income.

Income	n	Cable TV	Cary's Website	YouTube	Cable TV and Cary's Website	Cable TV and YouTube	Cable TV, Cary's Website and YouTube	I Don't Watch
0-\$45,000	52	30.8	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	0.0	61.5
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	41.9	1.6	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	51.6
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	37.5	3.6	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	51.8
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	26.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	73.8
Over \$150,000	68	16.2	4.4	1.5	2.9	0.0	0.0	75.0

Table B327. How Respondents Watch the Live and Recorded Programs About Government Activities and Issues by Race.

Race	n	Cable TV	Cary's Website	YouTube	Cable TV and Cary's Website	Cable TV and YouTube	Cable TV, Cary's Website and YouTube	I Don't Watch
Caucasian	288	28.8	2.1	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.3	67.0
Asian	39	15.4	2.6	2.6	10.3	0.0	0.0	69.2
African-American	30	46.7	0.0	3.3	0.0	3.3	0.0	46.7
Hispanic	22	22.7	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	72.7
Other	7	57.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	42.9

Table B328. How Respondents Watch the Live and Recorded Programs About Government Activities and Issues by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Cable TV	Cary's Website	YouTube	Cable TV and Cary's Website	Cable TV and YouTube	Cable TV, Cary's Website and YouTube	I Don't Watch
0-1	16	18.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	81.3
2-5	69	23.2	4.3	0.0	5.8	0.0	0.0	66.7
6-10	101	25.7	1.0	1.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	69.3
Over 10	204	32.8	1.5	0.5	2.0	0.5	0.5	62.3
Native	9	44.4	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.4

Table B329. How Respondents Watch the Live and Recorded Programs About Government Activities and Issues by Years in Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Cable TV	Cary's Website	YouTube	Cable TV and Cary's Website	Cable TV and YouTube	Cable TV, Cary's Website and YouTube	I Don't Watch
27511	93	25.8	2.2	0.0	3.2	1.1	0.0	67.7
27513	114	36.0	1.8	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.9	59.6
27518	66	22.7	4.5	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	69.7
27519	112	29.5	0.9	0.9	4.5	0.0	0.0	64.3

Respondent Internet Access Crosstabulations

Table B330. Where Respondent Has Internet Access by Age.

Age	n	Home	Work	Mobile Device	Home and Work	Home and Mobile Device	Work and Mobile Device	Home, Work, and Mobile Device	No Access
18-25	35	2.9	0.0	2.9	2.9	25.7	5.7	60.0	0.0
26-55	256	7.8	0.4	0.4	3.9	8.2	1.6	76.2	1.6
56-65	58	29.3	0.0	0.0	12.1	13.8	0.0	44.8	0.0
Over 65	45	53.3	0.0	0.0	8.9	15.6	0.0	8.9	13.3

Table B331. Where Respondent Has Internet Access by Education.

Education	n	Home	Work	Mobile Device	Home and Work	Home and Mobile Device	Work and Mobile Device	Home, Work, and Mobile Device	No Access
HS/Some College	156	18.6	0.6	1.3	4.5	13.5	1.9	54.5	5.1
College Degree	218	14.2	0.0	0.0	6.9	10.1	1.4	67.0	0.5
PhD/JD/MD	19	5.3	0.0	0.0	5.3	15.8	0.0	73.7	0.0

Table B332. Where Respondent Has Internet Access by Gender.

Gender	n	Home	Work	Mobile Device	Home and Work	Home and Mobile Device	Work and Mobile Device	Home, Work, and Mobile Device	No Access
Male	184	12.5	0.5	0.5	4.9	8.7	2.2	67.9	2.7
Female	214	18.2	0.0	0.5	6.5	14.0	0.9	57.0	2.8

Table B333. Where Respondent Has Internet Access by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Home	Work	Mobile Device	Home and Work	Home and Mobile Device	Work and Mobile Device	Home, Work, and Mobile Device	No Access
Single Family	314	15.3	0.0	0.0	6.1	11.8	0.3	64.0	2.5
Apartment	42	9.5	0.0	2.4	4.8	9.5	9.5	57.1	7.1
Townhouse/Condo	39	23.1	2.6	0.0	5.1	12.8	2.6	53.8	0.0

Table B334. Where Respondent Has Internet Access by Income.

Income	n	Home	Work	Mobile Device	Home and Work	Home and Mobile Device	Work and Mobile Device	Home, Work, and Mobile Device	No Access
0-\$45,000	52	17.3	1.9	3.8	1.9	19.2	5.8	44.2	5.8
\$45,001-\$75,000	61	19.7	0.0	0.0	6.6	11.5	1.6	55.7	4.9
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	23.2	0.0	0.0	5.4	3.6	1.8	62.5	3.6
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	15.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	1.3	63.8	0.0
Over \$150,000	68	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.8	0.0	88.2	0.0

Table B335. Where Respondent Has Internet Access by Race.

Race	n	Home	Work	Mobile Device	Home and Work	Home and Mobile Device	Work and Mobile Device	Home, Work, and Mobile Device	No Access
Caucasian	287	16.4	0.0	0.3	5.6	13.6	1.0	60.3	2.8
Asian	39	10.3	2.6	0.0	5.1	2.6	2.6	76.9	0.0
African-American	30	20.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	13.3	3.3	53.3	6.7
Hispanic	22	4.5	0.0	4.5	0.0	9.1	4.6	72.7	4.5
Other	7	14.3	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	71.4	0.0

Table B336. Where Respondent Has Internet Access by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Home	Work	Mobile Device	Home and Work	Home and Mobile Device	Work and Mobile Device	Home, Work, and Mobile Device	No Access
0-1	16	18.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.8	6.3	56.3	0.0
2-5	69	10.1	1.4	0.0	5.8	10.1	1.4	69.6	1.4
6-10	101	9.9	0.0	2.0	6.9	8.9	3.0	66.3	3.0
Over 10	203	19.7	0.0	0.0	5.9	12.8	0.0	58.6	3.0
Native	9	22.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	11.1	44.4	11.1

Table B337. Where Respondent Has Internet Access by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Home	Work	Mobile Device	Home and Work	Home and Mobile Device	Work and Mobile Device	Home, Work, and Mobile Device	No Access
27511	93	21.5	0.0	2.2	6.5	17.2	1.1	48.4	3.2
27513	113	12.4	0.0	0.0	4.4	9.7	0.9	69.0	3.5
27518	66	13.6	0.0	0.0	7.6	9.1	4.5	63.6	1.5
27519	112	16.1	0.9	0.0	6.3	9.8	0.9	64.3	1.8

Cary's Efforts at Keeping Residents Informed Crosstabulations

Table B338. How Well 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	34	6.03	0.0	2.9	5.9	0.0	32.4	17.6	17.6	23.5	0.0	58.7
26-55	256	6.41	2.0	0.8	3.9	1.2	25.8	14.5	22.3	18.0	11.7	66.5
56-65	58	6.60	0.0	1.7	1.7	1.7	25.9	12.1	25.9	17.2	13.8	69.0
Over 65	46	7.33	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	15.2	8.7	23.9	19.6	30.4	82.6

Table B339. How Well 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	155	6.36	1.3	1.3	5.2	0.6	31.0	12.3	16.1	18.1	14.2	60.7
College Degree	218	6.59	1.4	0.9	2.8	1.4	21.1	13.8	28.4	17.9	12.4	72.5
PhD/JD/MD	19	6.95	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.8	31.6	10.5	26.3	15.8	84.2

Table B340. How Well 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	185	6.57	0.5	0.5	2.7	1.1	27.0	14.6	22.2	17.3	14.1	68.2
Female	212	6.47	1.9	1.4	4.2	0.9	23.1	13.2	23.1	19.8	12.3	68.4

Table B341. How Well Informed Respondents Feel About Government Services, Projects, Issues, and Programs That Affect Them by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Not at All Informed 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Well Informed 9	% Above 5
Single family	314	6.56	1.3	1.0	4.5	1.0	22.6	12.4	24.2	19.4	13.7	69.7
Apartment	41	6.05	2.4	2.4	0.0	2.4	46.3	7.3	12.2	14.6	12.2	46.3
Townhouse/Condo	39	6.56	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.1	30.8	23.1	12.8	10.3	77.0

Table B342. How Well 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-\$45,000	51	6.20	2.0	3.9	3.9	2.0	27.5	17.6	11.8	17.6	13.7	60.7
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	6.63	1.6	0.0	1.6	1.6	29.0	11.3	17.7	21.0	16.1	66.1
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	6.63	0.0	0.0	3.6	1.8	21.4	16.1	28.6	16.1	12.5	73.3
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	6.38	1.3	2.5	2.5	1.3	30.0	10.0	23.8	16.3	12.5	62.6
Over \$150,000	68	6.72	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	17.6	22.1	26.5	20.6	10.3	79.5

Table B343. How Well 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	287	6.61	1.0	0.7	3.8	1.0	22.3	13.9	23.0	20.2	13.9	71.0
African-American	29	6.38	3.4	3.4	3.4	0.0	27.6	10.3	13.8	20.7	17.2	62.0
Asian	39	5.92	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	38.5	15.4	15.4	10.3	10.3	51.4
Hispanic	22	6.18	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	45.5	4.5	22.7	13.6	9.1	49.9
Other	7	7.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	42.9	28.6	14.3	14.3	100.1

Table B344. How Well Informed Respondents Feel About Government Services, Projects, Issues, and Programs That Affect Them by Voter Status.

Voter Status	n	Mean	Not at All Informed 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Well Informed 9	% Above 5
Registered	353	6.56	1.1	1.1	4.0	0.8	22.7	14.2	23.2	19.5	13.3	70.2
Not Registered	42	6.10	2.4	0.0	0.0	2.4	45.2	11.9	16.7	9.5	11.9	50.0

Table B345. How Well Informed Respondents Feel About Government Services, Projects, Issues, and Programs That Affect Them by Voted in 2013 Local Elections.

Voting Action	n	Mean	Not at All Informed 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Well Informed 9	% Above 5
Voter	231	6.66	1.3	1.3	3.0	0.0	20.3	14.7	25.5	19.5	14.3	74.0
Nonvoter	163	6.31	1.2	0.6	3.7	2.5	31.9	12.9	18.4	17.2	11.7	60.2

Table B346. How Well Informed Respondents Feel About Government Services, Projects, Issues, and Programs That Affect Them by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Not at All Informed 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Well Informed 9	% Above 5
0-1	16	6.56	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	43.8	0.0	25.0	18.8	12.5	56.3
2-5	68	6.52	2.9	0.0	0.0	1.5	25.0	19.1	19.1	22.1	10.3	70.6
6-10	101	6.49	1.0	1.0	4.0	2.0	27.7	7.9	25.7	16.8	13.9	64.3
Over 10	204	6.56	1.0	1.5	4.4	0.5	21.1	16.2	22.5	18.6	14.2	71.5
Native	8	5.50	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	50.0	12.5	12.5	12.5	0.0	37.5

Table B347. How Well Informed Respondents Feel About Government Services, Projects, Issues, and Programs That Affect Them by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Not at All Informed 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Well Informed 9	% Above 5
27511	93	6.57	1.1	1.1	5.4	1.1	24.7	11.8	18.3	18.3	18.3	66.7
27513	112	6.41	1.8	1.8	3.6	1.8	25.9	9.8	23.2	22.3	9.8	65.1
27518	66	6.53	0.0	1.5	0.0	1.5	21.2	22.7	33.3	9.1	10.6	75.7
27519	112	6.57	1.8	0.0	4.5	0.0	24.1	15.2	18.8	22.3	13.4	69.7

Cary's Efforts at Making Information Available to Citizens Crosstabulations

Table B348. 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	35	6.66	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	28.6	11.4	25.7	20.0	11.4	68.5
26-55	256	7.12	1.6	0.4	0.8	1.6	16.4	9.4	19.5	27.3	23.0	79.2
56-65	58	6.79	1.7	1.7	1.7	3.4	19.0	12.1	13.8	27.6	19.0	72.5
Over 65	46	7.41	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	13.0	8.7	19.6	28.3	28.3	84.9

Table B349. 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	156	7.01	0.0	0.6	1.3	1.9	24.4	7.7	15.4	25.6	23.1	71.8
College Degree	218	7.06	2.3	0.5	0.9	1.8	12.8	12.8	19.7	28.4	20.6	81.5
PhD/JD/MD	19	7.58	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	52.6	15.8	26.3	94.7

Table B350. 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	185	7.19	0.5	0.0	0.5	1.1	20.0	9.2	16.8	27.0	24.9	77.9
Female	213	6.96	1.9	0.9	1.4	2.3	15.0	10.8	21.6	26.3	19.7	78.4

Table B351. Satisfaction with Cary Making Information Available to Citizens About Important Town Services, Projects, Issues and Programs by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Single family	314	7.11	1.6	0.6	1.3	1.6	15.3	8.3	20.7	29.0	21.7	79.7
Apartment	42	6.79	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	38.1	7.1	11.9	11.9	28.6	59.5
Townhouse/Condo	39	7.05	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	12.8	25.6	15.4	23.1	20.5	84.6

Table B352. 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-\$45,000	51	7.10	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	21.6	13.7	13.7	15.7	31.4	74.5
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	7.13	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0	22.6	11.3	11.3	30.6	22.6	75.8
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	7.11	0.0	0.0	3.6	1.8	12.5	10.7	25.0	26.8	19.6	82.1
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	6.89	2.5	1.3	0.0	2.5	16.3	13.8	18.8	26.3	18.8	77.7
Over \$150,000	68	7.29	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.2	8.8	23.5	32.4	20.6	85.3

Table B353. 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	288	7.22	1.0	0.3	1.0	0.7	15.3	9.0	19.1	30.9	22.6	81.6
African-American	29	6.66	3.4	3.4	3.4	0.0	24.1	10.3	13.8	6.9	34.5	65.5
Asian	39	6.54	2.6	0.0	0.0	7.7	15.4	20.5	25.6	12.8	15.4	74.3
Hispanic	22	6.55	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	40.9	4.5	13.6	18.2	18.2	54.5
Other	7	8.14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	57.1	28.6	100.0

Table B354. Satisfaction with Cary Making Information Available to Citizens About Important Town Services, Projects, Issues and Programs by Voter Status.

Voter Status	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Registered	353	7.10	1.1	0.6	1.1	2.0	15.3	10.5	20.7	26.6	22.1	79.9
Not Registered	43	6.77	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	34.9	7.0	9.3	25.6	20.9	62.8

Table B355. Satisfaction with Cary Making Information Available to Citizens About Important Town Services, Projects, Issues and Programs by Voted in 2013 Local Elections.

Voting Action	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Voter	231	7.11	1.3	0.4	1.7	0.9	14.3	10.8	21.6	27.7	21.2	81.3
Nonvoter	164	7.01	1.2	0.6	0.0	2.4	22.0	9.1	16.5	25.0	23.2	73.8

Table B356. Satisfaction with Cary Making Information Available to Citizens About Important Town Services, Projects, Issues and Programs 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	16	7.31	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	31.3	6.3	0.0	25.0	37.5	68.8
2-5	69	7.10	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.7	7.2	21.7	26.1	21.7	76.7
6-10	101	7.08	1.0	0.0	1.0	3.0	16.8	10.9	21.8	19.8	25.7	78.2
Over 10	204	7.07	1.5	1.0	1.0	2.0	14.7	10.8	18.1	30.9	20.1	79.9
Native	8	6.00	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	25.0	12.5	37.5	12.5	0.0	62.5

Table B357. Satisfaction with Cary Making Information Available to Citizens About Important Town Services, Projects, Issues and Programs by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
27511	93	6.91	0.0	0.0	2.2	1.1	21.5	14.0	22.6	17.2	21.5	75.3
27513	113	7.08	1.8	0.9	0.9	2.7	17.7	8.0	13.3	31.9	23.0	76.2
27518	66	6.97	0.0	1.5	0.0	1.5	16.7	15.2	22.7	27.3	15.2	80.4
27519	112	7.28	2.7	0.0	0.9	1.8	11.6	7.1	20.5	27.7	27.7	83.0

Cary's Efforts at Involving Citizens in Decisions Crosstabulations

Table B358. 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	35	6.40	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	42.9	5.7	17.1	22.9	8.6	54.3
26-55	256	6.59	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	30.9	10.2	18.0	24.2	12.9	65.3
56-65	58	6.48	3.4	1.7	1.7	0.0	25.9	8.6	27.6	17.2	13.8	67.2
Over 65	46	6.59	2.2	2.2	2.2	0.0	28.3	8.7	19.6	17.4	19.6	65.3

Table B359. 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	156	6.53	0.6	1.3	1.3	0.6	36.5	7.7	16.7	19.9	15.4	59.7
College Degree	218	6.56	3.2	0.0	2.3	0.0	25.7	11.5	22.0	23.9	11.5	68.9
PhD/JD/MD	19	6.90	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	36.8	0.0	26.3	10.5	26.3	63.1

Table B360. 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	185	6.57	1.1	0.5	1.1	0.0	32.4	9.7	21.6	22.2	11.4	64.9
Female	213	6.56	2.8	0.5	2.3	0.5	29.1	8.9	18.3	22.1	15.5	64.8

Table B361. Satisfaction with Opportunities the Town Gives to Participate in the Decision-Making Process by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Single family	314	6.62	2.5	0.6	1.9	0.0	27.1	9.2	21.7	22.9	14.0	67.8
Apartment	42	6.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	54.8	0.0	7.1	21.4	14.3	42.8
Townhouse/Condo	39	6.49	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	30.8	17.9	20.5	17.9	10.3	66.6

Table B362. 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-\$45,000	51	6.61	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	43.1	5.9	17.6	13.7	19.6	56.8
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	6.66	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	29.0	14.5	14.5	25.8	12.9	67.7
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	6.84	1.8	1.8	1.8	0.0	17.9	8.9	26.8	26.8	14.3	76.8
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	6.44	6.3	0.0	1.3	0.0	25.0	13.8	17.5	22.5	13.8	67.6
Over \$150,000	68	6.72	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	26.5	10.3	23.5	26.5	10.3	70.6

Table B363. 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	288	6.63	1.4	0.7	2.1	0.3	28.5	9.4	20.8	22.9	13.9	67.0
African-American	29	6.72	3.4	0.0	3.4	0.0	31.0	3.4	13.8	17.2	27.6	62.0
Asian	39	6.31	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.2	20.5	28.2	17.9	2.6	69.2
Hispanic	22	6.14	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	54.5	0.0	9.1	13.6	18.2	40.9
Other	7	6.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	42.9	0.0	0.0	42.9	14.3	57.2

Table B364. Satisfaction with Opportunities the Town Gives to Participate in the Decision-Making Process by Voter Status.

Voter Status	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Registered	353	6.60	2.0	0.6	2.0	0.0	28.6	9.9	21.2	21.5	14.2	66.8
Not Registered	43	6.19	2.3	0.0	0.0	2.3	48.8	4.7	9.3	23.3	9.3	46.6

Table B365. Satisfaction with Opportunities the Town Gives to Participate in the Decision-Making Process by Voted in 2013 Local Elections.

Voting Action	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Voter	231	6.49	2.6	0.9	2.6	0.0	29.9	9.1	20.3	20.8	13.9	64.1
Nonvoter	164	6.64	1.2	0.0	0.6	0.6	32.3	9.8	18.9	23.2	13.4	65.3

Table B366. Satisfaction with Opportunities the Town Gives to Participate in the Decision-Making Process 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	16	6.25	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	62.5	0.0	0.0	25.0	12.5	37.5
2-5	69	6.61	1.4	0.0	2.9	1.4	29.0	4.3	23.2	27.5	10.1	65.1
6-10	101	6.54	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	35.6	11.9	17.8	18.8	13.9	62.4
Over 10	204	6.62	2.9	0.5	2.0	0.0	26.0	10.3	21.1	22.1	15.2	68.7
Native	8	5.63	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	37.5	12.5	25.0	12.5	0.0	50.0

Table B367. Satisfaction with Opportunities the Town Gives to Participate in the Decision-Making Process by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
27511	93	6.46	0.0	1.1	1.1	0.0	40.9	7.5	20.4	12.9	16.1	56.9
27513	113	6.83	1.8	0.0	0.9	0.9	24.8	7.1	19.5	33.6	11.5	71.7
27518	66	6.02	6.1	1.5	3.0	0.0	30.3	15.2	18.2	18.2	7.6	59.2
27519	112	6.76	1.8	0.0	2.7	0.0	25.0	9.8	21.4	21.4	17.9	70.5

Solid Waste: Curbside Christmas Tree Collection Crosstabulations

Table B368. Satisfaction with Curbside Christmas Tree Collection by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Single family	154	8.47	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6	1.3	0.6	7.8	23.4	65.6	97.4
Apartment	6	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	16.7	66.7	100.1
Townhouse/Condo	13	8.23	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.1	30.8	46.2	100.1

Table B369. Satisfaction with Curbside Christmas Tree Collection 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	2	7.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	100.0
2-5	28	8.29	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	21.4	60.7	96.4
6-10	49	8.41	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	20.4	63.3	98.0
Over 10	91	8.53	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	1.1	4.4	26.4	65.9	97.8
Native	4	8.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	100.0

Table B370. Satisfaction with Curbside Christmas Tree Collection by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
27511	37	8.35	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.0	13.5	27.0	56.8	97.3
27513	53	8.53	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	1.9	5.7	22.6	67.9	98.1
27518	33	8.64	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.1	24.2	69.7	100.0
27519	46	8.44	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.9	21.7	65.2	97.8

Solid Waste: Curbside Garbage Collection Crosstabulations

Table B371. Satisfaction with Curbside Garbage Collection by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Single family	315	8.44	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	1.9	1.3	9.5	23.8	63.2	97.8
Apartment	22	8.46	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	36.4	54.5	100.0
Townhouse/Condo	37	8.08	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.4	5.4	13.5	27.0	48.6	94.5

Table B372. Satisfaction with Curbside Garbage Collection 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	11	8.27	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	9.1	27.3	54.5	100.0
2-5	57	8.35	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	1.8	10.5	28.1	57.9	98.3
6-10	98	8.49	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	9.2	25.5	63.3	99.0
Over 10	202	8.40	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	1.5	10.4	23.3	61.9	97.1
Native	9	8.22	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	33.3	55.6	88.9

Table B373. Satisfaction with Curbside Garbage Collection by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
27511	90	8.42	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	2.2	11.1	20.0	64.4	97.7
27513	107	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.7	1.9	10.3	22.4	60.7	95.3
27518	60	8.53	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0	6.7	26.7	65.0	98.4
27519	109	8.42	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	1.8	9.2	28.4	59.6	99.0

Solid Waste: Curbside Yard Waste Collection Crosstabulations

Table B374. Satisfaction with Curbside Yard Waste Collection by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Single family	280	8.19	0.4	1.4	0.4	0.7	2.9	3.2	10.0	21.1	60.0	94.3
Apartment	11	8.36	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	9.1	18.2	63.6	100.0
Townhouse/Condo	24	8.13	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	4.2	12.5	33.3	45.8	95.8

Table B375. Satisfaction with Curbside Yard Waste Collection 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	5	7.40	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	80.0
2-5	41	8.20	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	2.4	4.9	4.9	31.7	53.7	95.2
6-10	81	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.2	2.5	12.3	23.5	59.3	97.6
Over 10	183	8.16	0.5	1.6	0.0	0.5	3.3	3.8	10.9	19.1	60.1	93.9
Native	7	8.14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	28.6	57.1	85.7

Table B376. Satisfaction with Curbside Yard Waste Collection by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
27511	78	8.31	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	2.6	3.8	9.0	20.5	62.8	96.1
27513	89	8.16	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	4.5	5.6	11.2	19.1	58.4	94.3
27518	57	7.97	1.8	3.5	0.0	1.8	3.5	1.8	5.3	26.3	56.1	89.5
27519	85	8.38	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	1.2	2.4	10.6	22.4	62.4	97.8

Solid Waste: Curbside Recycling Collection Crosstabulations

Table B377. Satisfaction with Curbside Recycling Collection by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Single family	312	8.12	0.3	0.0	1.0	0.3	4.8	3.8	12.2	23.1	54.5	93.6
Apartment	20	8.40	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	10.0	25.0	60.0	100.0
Townhouse/Condo	36	7.92	2.8	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	2.8	16.7	27.8	47.2	94.5

Table B378. Satisfaction with Curbside Recycling Collection 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	11	7.91	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	9.1	36.4	36.4	100.1
2-5	55	8.07	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	3.6	9.1	10.9	18.2	56.4	94.6
6-10	96	8.22	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.1	2.1	10.4	30.2	53.1	95.8
Over 10	199	8.12	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.5	5.0	2.5	14.1	21.1	55.3	93.0
Native	9	7.56	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	33.3	44.4	88.8

Table B379. Satisfaction with Curbside Recycling Collection by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
27511	87	8.17	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	2.3	4.6	12.6	20.7	57.5	95.4
27513	104	8.15	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.9	3.8	13.5	21.2	56.7	95.2
27518	60	8.10	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	6.7	0.0	13.3	28.3	50.0	91.6
27519	109	8.07	0.9	0.0	0.9	0.0	5.5	4.6	9.2	25.7	53.2	92.7

Solid Waste: Curbside Loose Leaf Collection Crosstabulations

Table B380. Satisfaction with Curbside Loose Leaf Collection by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Single family	271	8.11	0.7	0.7	1.1	0.4	4.4	3.3	10.3	21.0	57.9	92.5
Apartment	12	8.42	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	41.7	50.0	100.0
Townhouse/Condo	22	8.00	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	13.6	27.3	50.0	95.4

Table B381. Satisfaction with Curbside Loose Leaf Collection 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	5	7.40	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	80.0
2-5	40	8.05	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	2.5	5.0	12.5	30.0	47.5	95.0
6-10	75	8.32	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	2.7	1.3	10.7	25.3	58.7	96.0
Over 10	179	8.08	1.1	0.6	1.1	0.0	5.0	3.9	10.6	19.6	58.1	92.2
Native	8	7.88	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	62.5	87.5

Table B382. Satisfaction with Curbside Loose Leaf Collection by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
27511	78	8.19	0.0	1.3	1.3	0.0	3.8	3.8	9.0	19.2	61.5	93.5
27513	89	8.11	1.1	2.2	0.0	0.0	2.2	4.5	9.0	23.6	57.3	94.4
27518	55	8.15	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.5	0.0	10.9	27.3	54.5	92.7
27519	78	8.18	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	2.6	3.8	12.8	19.2	59.0	94.8

**Town Council Focus Areas: Satisfaction with Overall Job Town is Doing
with Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Programs Crosstabulations**

Table B383. Satisfaction with 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	35	7.60	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	8.6	2.9	22.9	31.4	31.4	88.6
26-55	257	7.66	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.8	7.8	5.1	20.6	39.3	26.1	91.1
56-65	58	7.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.1	12.1	27.6	27.6	20.7	88.0
Over 65	46	7.76	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	6.5	4.3	17.4	34.8	34.8	91.3

Table B384. Satisfaction with 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	158	7.60	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.6	7.6	8.9	19.6	36.1	26.6	91.2
College Degree	217	7.60	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.5	9.7	3.7	24.9	34.6	26.3	89.5
PhD/JD/MD	19	7.95	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.5	10.5	52.6	26.3	99.9

Table B385. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources Issues by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Male	185	7.56	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.5	7.0	7.6	24.9	36.8	22.7	92.0
Female	215	7.65	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.5	9.3	4.7	19.5	35.3	29.8	89.3

Table B386. Satisfaction with Job the Town is Doing on Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources Issues by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Single family	314	7.65	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.6	8.3	5.7	20.4	38.5	26.1	90.7
Apartment	42	7.19	2.4	2.4	0.0	0.0	11.9	7.1	26.2	23.8	26.2	83.3
Townhouse/Condo	39	7.87	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	5.1	28.2	30.8	33.3	97.4

Table B387. Satisfaction with 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-\$45,000	53	7.66	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.7	7.5	32.1	24.5	30.2	94.3
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	7.53	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.1	8.1	19.4	38.7	24.2	90.4
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	7.59	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	8.9	5.4	21.4	37.5	25.0	89.3
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	7.55	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.3	6.3	22.5	36.3	23.8	88.9
Over \$150,000	68	7.90	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.4	2.9	25.0	33.8	33.8	95.5

Table B388. Satisfaction with the 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	288	7.66	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.7	7.3	6.6	20.5	37.8	26.7	91.6
African-American	30	7.63	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.3	3.3	23.3	26.7	33.3	86.6
Asian	39	7.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.8	7.7	30.8	30.8	17.9	87.2
Hispanic	22	7.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	27.3	45.5	22.7	100.0
Other	7	7.14	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	14.3	57.1	71.4

Table B389. Satisfaction with Job the Town is Doing on Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources Issues by Voter Status.

Voter Status	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Registered	353	7.62	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.6	8.2	5.9	21.5	36.8	26.3	90.5
Not Registered	44	7.48	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	9.1	6.8	25.0	29.5	27.3	88.6

Table B390. Satisfaction with Job the Town is Doing on Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources Issues by Voted in 2013 Local Elections.

Voting Action	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Voter	230	7.64	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.4	7.0	7.0	22.6	33.9	28.3	91.8
Nonvoter	166	7.57	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.6	10.2	4.8	21.1	38.6	24.1	88.6

Table B391. Satisfaction with 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	16	7.38	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.8	0.0	6.3	25.0	43.8	75.1
2-5	68	7.53	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	8.8	4.4	23.5	41.2	20.6	89.7
6-10	101	7.87	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	3.0	20.8	42.6	28.7	95.1
Over 10	204	7.54	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.5	9.3	7.8	23.5	32.4	26.0	89.7
Native	9	7.56	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	11.1	11.1	33.3	33.3	88.8

Table B392. Satisfaction with Job the Town is Doing on Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources Issues by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
27511	92	7.54	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	9.8	5.4	25.0	29.3	28.3	88.0
27513	114	7.56	0.9	1.8	0.0	0.0	7.9	7.0	17.5	36.8	28.1	89.4
27518	66	7.42	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.6	7.6	27.3	25.8	25.8	86.5
27519	113	7.80	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	4.4	21.2	43.4	25.7	94.7

Town Council Focus Areas: Satisfaction with Environmental Protection Crosstabulations

Table B393. 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	35	7.60	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	5.7	17.1	31.4	31.4	85.6
26-55	256	7.58	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.8	6.3	5.9	22.7	39.1	23.8	91.5
56-65	58	7.43	0.0	1.7	0.0	1.7	12.1	0.0	24.1	39.7	20.7	84.5
Over 65	46	7.44	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	13.0	6.5	19.6	32.6	26.1	84.8

Table B394. 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	157	7.47	0.6	0.6	0.6	1.3	11.5	5.7	17.2	36.3	26.1	85.3
College Degree	218	7.60	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	5.5	5.0	25.7	39.4	22.5	92.6
PhD/JD/MD	18	7.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	5.6	16.7	33.3	27.8	83.4

Table B395. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Environmental Protection by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Male	186	7.52	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	10.2	5.4	17.7	41.4	23.1	87.6
Female	213	7.56	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.9	7.0	5.2	25.8	34.3	25.4	90.7

Table B396. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Environmental Protection by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Single family	313	7.60	0.3	0.6	0.3	1.0	7.0	5.1	23.0	37.1	25.6	90.8
Apartment	42	7.26	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	21.4	4.8	14.3	31.0	26.2	76.3
Townhouse/Condo	39	7.36	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	7.7	20.5	48.7	12.8	89.7

Table B397. 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-\$45,000	53	7.36	1.9	0.0	1.9	0.0	11.3	3.8	22.6	35.8	22.6	84.8
\$45,001-\$75,000	61	7.51	0.0	1.6	1.6	0.0	8.2	4.9	23.0	34.4	26.2	88.5
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	7.46	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	8.9	3.6	25.0	39.3	19.6	87.5
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	7.68	0.0	1.3	0.0	1.3	6.3	5.0	16.3	45.0	25.0	91.3
Over \$150,000	68	7.66	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.4	7.4	23.5	35.3	26.5	92.7

Table B398. 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	287	7.54	0.7	0.7	0.3	0.7	8.4	4.2	22.6	39.0	23.3	89.1
African-American	31	7.42	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	12.9	9.7	19.4	19.4	35.5	84.0
Asian	39	7.36	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	7.7	10.3	30.8	28.2	20.5	89.8
Hispanic	22	7.91	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	9.1	4.5	54.5	27.3	95.4
Other	7	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	42.9	42.9	85.8

Table B399. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Environmental Protection by Voter Status.

Voter Status	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Registered	352	7.55	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	8.2	5.7	21.3	37.8	24.7	89.5
Not Registered	44	7.46	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	11.4	2.3	27.3	36.4	20.5	86.5

Table B400. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Environmental Protection by Voted in 2013 Local Elections.

Voting Action	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Voter	229	7.53	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.4	9.2	5.7	18.3	36.2	27.5	87.7
Nonvoter	166	7.55	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	7.8	4.8	27.1	39.2	19.9	91.0

Table B401. 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	16	7.63	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.8	0.0	12.5	37.5	31.3	81.3
2-5	69	7.42	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	11.6	7.2	21.7	39.1	18.8	86.8
6-10	101	7.69	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	6.9	5.0	21.8	39.6	25.7	92.1
Over 10	202	7.54	0.5	1.0	1.0	0.5	7.4	5.4	22.3	36.6	25.2	89.5
Native	9	6.89	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	22.2	33.3	22.2	77.7

Table B402. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Environmental Protection by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
27511	93	7.45	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	10.8	6.5	22.6	40.9	18.3	88.3
27513	113	7.47	1.8	0.9	0.9	1.8	8.0	3.5	22.1	31.9	29.2	86.7
27518	65	7.69	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.2	4.6	20.0	40.0	26.2	90.8
27519	113	7.64	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.9	6.2	6.2	21.2	39.8	24.8	92.0

Town Council Focus Areas: Satisfaction with Keeping Cary the Best Place to Live, Work, and Raise a Family Crosstabulations

Table B403. 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	35	7.63	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	11.4	2.9	17.1	31.4	34.3	85.7
26-55	258	7.57	0.4	0.0	0.4	1.2	9.3	5.8	20.5	35.7	26.7	88.7
56-65	58	7.12	1.7	0.0	1.7	0.0	13.8	5.2	29.3	34.5	13.8	82.8
Over 65	46	7.37	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.4	8.7	19.6	28.3	26.1	82.7

Table B404. 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	158	7.48	0.6	0.0	0.6	0.0	12.0	7.0	22.8	29.1	27.8	86.7
College Degree	218	7.50	0.5	0.0	0.9	1.4	9.6	4.6	22.0	38.1	22.9	87.6
PhD/JD/MD	19	7.47	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.8	5.3	21.1	31.6	26.3	84.3

Table B405. Effectiveness of Town Council in Working to Keep Cary the Best Place to Live, Work, and Raise a Family by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Ineffective 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Effective 9	% Above 5
Male	186	7.48	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.5	9.7	7.0	25.8	30.6	25.3	88.7
Female	215	7.50	0.5	0.0	0.9	0.9	12.1	4.7	18.6	36.7	25.6	85.6

Table B406. Effectiveness of Town Council in Working to Keep Cary the Best Place to Live, Work, and Raise a Family by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Ineffective 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Effective 9	% Above 5
Single family	315	7.53	0.3	0.0	1.0	1.0	9.5	5.1	23.2	34.3	25.7	88.3
Apartment	42	7.31	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.0	7.1	9.5	33.3	28.6	78.5
Townhouse/Condo	39	7.39	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.8	7.7	28.2	30.8	20.5	87.2

Table B407. 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-\$45,000	53	7.38	1.9	0.0	1.9	0.0	15.1	3.8	17.0	30.2	30.2	81.2
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	7.40	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.5	4.8	17.7	38.7	22.6	83.8
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	7.57	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	7.1	5.4	26.8	35.7	23.2	91.1
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	7.55	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.3	10.0	16.3	37.5	25.0	88.8
Over \$150,000	68	7.47	0.0	0.0	1.5	1.5	13.2	0.0	29.4	25.0	29.4	83.8

Table B408. 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	288	7.47	0.3	0.0	0.7	0.7	11.1	5.2	23.6	35.4	22.9	87.1
African-American	31	7.45	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.9	6.5	16.1	25.8	35.5	83.9
Asian	39	7.41	0.0	0.0	2.6	2.6	7.7	7.7	25.6	25.6	28.2	87.1
Hispanic	22	8.05	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	4.5	13.6	36.4	40.9	95.4
Other	7	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	14.3	14.3	57.1	85.7

Table B409. Effectiveness of Town Council in Working to Keep Cary the Best Place to Live, Work, and Raise a Family by Voter Status.

Voter Status	n	Mean	Very Ineffective 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Effective 9	% Above 5
Registered	354	7.48	0.6	0.0	0.8	0.8	10.2	5.9	22.6	34.2	24.9	87.6
Not Registered	44	7.46	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	4.5	18.2	31.8	27.3	81.8

Table B410. Effectiveness of Town Council in Working to Keep Cary the Best Place to Live, Work, and Raise a Family by Voted in 2013 Local Elections.

Voting Action	n	Mean	Very Ineffective 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Effective 9	% Above 5
Voter	231	7.50	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.9	10.8	7.8	19.0	34.2	26.4	87.4
Nonvoter	166	7.46	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.6	11.4	3.0	25.9	33.7	23.5	86.1

Table B411. 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	16	7.94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.8	0.0	0.0	31.3	50.0	81.3
2-5	69	7.58	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.0	4.3	23.2	30.4	29.0	86.9
6-10	101	7.64	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	8.9	6.9	16.8	34.7	30.7	89.1
Over 10	204	7.33	1.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	11.3	5.4	26.5	34.3	19.6	85.8
Native	9	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	11.1	44.4	33.3	99.9

Table B412. Effectiveness of Town Council in Working to Keep Cary the Best Place to Live, Work, and Raise a Family by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Ineffective 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Effective 9	% Above 5
27511	93	7.51	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.7	5.4	23.7	38.7	21.5	89.3
27513	114	7.31	0.9	0.0	1.8	1.8	14.0	7.9	18.4	26.3	28.9	81.5
27518	66	7.41	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	10.6	1.5	33.3	37.9	15.2	87.9
27519	113	7.72	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	9.7	5.3	17.7	32.7	33.6	89.3

Town Council Focus Areas: Satisfaction with Transportation Crosstabulations

Table B413. 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	35	7.17	0.0	0.0	2.9	5.7	14.3	8.6	11.4	31.4	25.7	77.1
26-55	257	6.93	0.4	0.8	2.3	2.7	14.4	10.5	26.8	28.0	14.0	79.3
56-65	58	6.74	1.7	0.0	1.7	3.4	12.1	15.5	34.5	20.7	10.3	81.0
Over 65	46	6.96	0.0	0.0	2.2	4.3	13.0	17.4	23.9	17.4	21.7	80.4

Table B414. 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	158	7.10	0.0	0.0	2.5	3.8	13.9	9.5	22.8	26.6	20.9	79.8
College Degree	217	6.82	0.9	0.9	1.8	3.2	13.4	13.8	28.6	25.3	12.0	79.7
PhD/JD/MD	19	6.90	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	15.8	10.5	26.3	31.6	10.5	78.9

Table B415. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Transportation by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Male	185	6.77	1.1	1.1	2.7	2.7	13.5	14.1	26.5	27.6	10.8	79.0
Female	215	7.07	0.0	0.0	1.9	3.7	14.0	10.2	26.0	24.7	19.5	80.4

Table B416. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Transportation by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Single family	314	6.89	0.3	0.3	2.5	3.5	14.0	13.1	26.8	24.8	14.6	79.3
Apartment	42	7.02	2.4	0.0	2.4	2.4	23.8	0.0	16.7	23.8	28.6	69.1
Townhouse/Condo	39	7.13	0.0	2.6	0.0	2.6	2.6	15.4	33.3	33.3	10.3	92.3

Table B417. 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-\$45,000	53	7.04	0.0	0.0	1.9	3.8	15.1	11.3	20.8	30.2	17.0	79.3
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	7.15	1.6	0.0	1.6	1.6	11.3	8.1	29.0	27.4	19.4	83.9
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	7.11	0.0	0.0	1.8	3.6	12.5	8.9	28.6	26.8	17.9	82.2
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	6.76	1.3	1.3	2.5	2.5	16.3	13.8	22.5	26.3	13.8	76.4
Over \$150,000	68	6.91	0.0	1.5	4.4	2.9	10.3	8.8	30.9	27.9	13.2	80.8

Table B418. 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	288	6.91	0.3	0.3	2.1	2.1	14.9	13.5	27.1	26.7	12.8	80.1
African-American	30	7.13	0.0	0.0	3.3	10.0	10.0	3.3	26.7	13.3	33.3	76.6
Asian	39	6.39	2.6	2.6	5.1	7.7	12.8	12.8	17.9	28.2	10.3	69.2
Hispanic	22	7.46	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.6	9.1	22.7	27.3	27.3	86.4
Other	7	7.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	14.3	28.6	42.9	85.8

Table B419. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Transportation by Voter Status.

Voter Status	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Registered	353	6.92	0.3	0.6	2.3	3.7	13.0	12.7	26.3	26.6	14.4	80.0
Not Registered	44	7.00	2.3	0.0	2.3	0.0	20.5	4.5	25.0	22.7	22.7	74.9

Table B420. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Transportation by Voted in 2013 Local Elections.

Voting Action	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Voter	230	6.94	0.4	0.9	2.2	3.0	12.6	15.2	23.9	24.3	17.4	80.8
Nonvoter	166	6.92	0.6	0.0	2.4	3.6	15.7	7.2	28.9	28.9	12.7	77.7

Table B421. 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	16	7.19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	31.3	6.3	0.0	37.5	25.0	68.8
2-5	68	6.97	1.5	0.0	2.9	2.9	16.2	5.9	23.5	29.4	17.6	76.4
6-10	101	7.19	0.0	2.0	0.0	1.0	10.9	10.9	27.7	30.7	16.8	86.1
Over 10	204	6.73	0.5	0.0	3.4	4.9	13.7	15.7	27.9	20.6	13.2	77.4
Native	9	7.89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	44.4	22.2	99.9

Table B422. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Transportation by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
27511	92	7.14	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.1	15.2	12.0	23.9	29.3	17.4	82.6
27513	114	6.93	0.9	0.0	2.6	4.4	11.4	14.0	27.2	20.2	19.3	80.7
27518	66	6.73	0.0	1.5	3.0	6.1	15.2	10.6	25.8	24.2	13.6	74.2
27519	113	7.00	0.9	0.9	0.9	2.7	13.3	10.6	25.7	31.9	13.3	81.5

Town Council Focus Areas: Satisfaction with Planning & Development Crosstabulations

Table B423. 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	35	7.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	8.6	20.0	37.1	14.3	80.0
26-55	257	6.60	1.6	2.3	1.6	1.2	19.5	14.8	26.1	22.2	10.9	74.0
56-65	58	6.31	1.7	1.7	1.7	5.2	22.4	13.8	29.3	17.2	6.9	67.2
Over 65	46	6.57	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	23.9	15.2	15.2	15.2	21.7	67.3

Table B424. 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	158	6.80	0.0	1.9	1.3	1.9	19.6	13.9	23.4	22.8	15.2	75.3
College Degree	217	6.48	2.3	2.3	1.4	1.8	21.2	13.8	25.3	23.5	8.3	70.9
PhD/JD/MD	19	6.58	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	26.3	15.8	26.3	5.3	21.1	68.5

Table B425. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Planning & Development by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Male	185	6.61	1.6	2.2	1.1	1.1	22.2	12.4	24.9	23.2	11.4	71.9
Female	215	6.60	1.4	1.9	1.9	2.3	19.1	15.3	24.7	21.4	12.1	73.5

Table B426. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Planning & Development by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Single family	314	6.52	1.6	2.2	1.9	2.2	21.0	14.6	24.2	21.0	11.1	70.9
Apartment	42	6.98	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.4	7.1	26.2	23.8	19.0	76.1
Townhouse/Condo	39	6.92	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	15.4	15.4	25.6	30.8	10.3	82.1

Table B427. 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-\$45,000	53	7.11	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.9	9.4	28.3	28.3	15.1	81.1
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	6.65	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	22.6	12.9	25.8	12.9	19.4	71.0
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	6.64	0.0	3.6	5.4	0.0	14.3	16.1	21.4	30.4	8.9	76.8
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	6.35	2.5	2.5	1.3	2.5	26.3	13.8	20.0	21.3	10.0	65.1
Over \$150,000	68	6.59	1.5	2.9	1.5	2.9	14.7	17.6	25.0	23.5	10.3	76.4

Table B428. 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	288	6.53	1.4	2.4	1.7	1.4	20.5	14.9	26.4	21.9	9.4	72.6
African-American	30	7.23	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	16.7	10.0	23.3	16.7	30.0	80.0
Asian	39	6.18	2.6	2.6	2.6	5.1	25.6	12.8	23.1	15.4	10.3	61.6
Hispanic	22	7.23	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.6	18.2	18.2	31.8	18.2	86.4
Other	7	7.29	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	14.3	28.6	28.6	71.5

Table B429. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Planning & Development by Voter Status.

Voter Status	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Registered	353	6.58	1.4	2.3	1.7	2.0	21.0	13.6	24.1	22.1	11.9	71.7
Not Registered	44	6.80	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	15.9	29.5	22.7	11.4	79.5

Table B430. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Planning & Development by Voted in 2013 Local Elections.

Voting Action	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Voter	230	6.60	1.3	3.0	1.7	2.6	20.4	12.2	22.6	21.7	14.3	70.8
Nonvoter	166	6.61	1.8	0.6	1.2	0.6	21.1	16.3	27.1	22.9	8.4	74.7

Table B431. 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	16	7.13	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	12.5	12.5	25.0	25.0	75.0
2-5	68	6.63	1.5	0.0	1.5	1.5	22.1	14.7	26.5	23.5	8.8	73.5
6-10	101	6.95	0.0	3.0	1.0	0.0	15.8	14.9	20.8	28.7	15.8	80.2
Over 10	204	6.34	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.9	23.0	12.7	27.0	18.1	9.3	67.1
Native	9	7.56	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	22.2	33.3	22.2	99.9

Table B432. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Planning & Development by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
27511	92	7.03	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	19.6	8.7	30.4	25.0	15.2	79.3
27513	114	6.34	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	21.1	14.0	26.3	18.4	9.6	68.3
27518	66	6.58	0.0	1.5	1.5	0.0	25.8	13.6	28.8	21.2	7.6	71.2
27519	113	6.54	2.7	3.5	0.9	2.7	18.6	16.8	15.9	24.8	14.2	71.7

Town Council Focus Areas: Satisfaction with Downtown Revitalization Crosstabulations

Table B433. 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	35	6.94	0.0	0.0	2.9	2.9	17.1	17.1	17.1	20.0	22.9	77.1
26-55	258	6.63	0.8	1.6	3.5	1.6	23.3	10.9	20.9	23.6	14.0	69.4
56-65	58	5.78	6.9	3.4	3.4	5.2	27.6	12.1	17.2	15.5	8.6	53.4
Over 65	46	6.91	0.0	4.3	4.3	2.2	15.2	8.7	17.4	19.6	28.3	74.0

Table B434. 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	158	6.79	0.6	1.3	3.2	3.2	18.4	14.6	15.8	24.1	19.0	73.5
College Degree	218	6.39	2.3	2.8	4.1	1.4	24.3	10.1	21.6	20.6	12.8	65.1
PhD/JD/MD	19	6.90	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	26.3	0.0	31.6	15.8	21.1	68.5

Table B435. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Downtown Revitalization by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Male	186	6.44	0.5	2.7	3.8	1.6	24.7	14.0	22.6	16.1	14.0	66.7
Female	215	6.69	2.3	1.4	3.3	2.8	20.0	9.3	17.2	26.5	17.2	70.2

Table B436. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Downtown Revitalization by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Single family	315	6.46	1.9	2.5	3.8	2.2	23.5	11.1	18.7	21.9	14.3	66.0
Apartment	42	6.98	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	28.6	4.8	21.4	19.0	23.8	69.0
Townhouse/Condo	39	7.00	0.0	0.0	5.1	2.6	7.7	17.9	25.6	20.5	20.5	84.5

Table B437. 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-\$45,000	53	6.91	0.0	0.0	3.8	3.8	15.1	13.2	22.6	22.6	18.9	77.3
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	6.82	0.0	4.8	1.6	1.6	17.7	12.9	17.7	21.0	22.6	74.2
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	6.54	0.0	3.6	5.4	3.6	25.0	5.4	12.5	30.4	14.3	62.6
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	6.15	3.8	2.5	6.3	0.0	26.3	10.0	22.5	20.0	8.8	61.3
Over \$150,000	68	6.59	1.5	0.0	1.5	2.9	23.5	17.6	22.1	14.7	16.2	70.6

Table B438. 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	288	6.48	1.7	2.1	4.5	2.1	22.2	12.5	19.1	21.2	14.6	67.4
African-American	31	7.03	0.0	3.2	0.0	6.5	12.9	12.9	12.9	25.8	25.8	77.4
Asian	39	6.44	2.6	2.6	2.6	0.0	25.6	10.3	20.5	28.2	7.7	66.7
Hispanic	22	6.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.3	9.1	31.8	13.6	18.2	72.7
Other	7	8.14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	14.3	0.0	71.4	85.7

Table B439. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Downtown Revitalization by Voter Status.

Voter Status	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Registered	354	6.56	1.7	2.3	3.7	2.5	21.8	10.7	19.8	20.9	16.7	68.1
Not Registered	44	6.66	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	27.3	15.9	18.2	27.3	9.1	70.5

Table B440. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Downtown Revitalization by Voted in 2013 Local Elections.

Voting Action	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Voter	231	6.69	2.2	2.2	2.6	2.6	19.5	10.4	19.5	21.6	19.5	71.0
Nonvoter	166	6.40	0.6	1.8	4.8	1.8	26.5	12.7	19.3	21.7	10.8	64.5

Table B441. 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	16	6.88	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	6.3	12.5	18.8	25.0	62.6
2-5	69	6.93	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	27.5	7.2	24.6	18.8	20.3	70.9
6-10	101	6.66	1.0	0.0	5.0	2.0	18.8	15.8	20.8	21.8	14.9	73.3
Over 10	204	6.35	2.5	3.9	4.4	2.9	21.1	11.8	17.6	21.6	14.2	65.2
Native	9	7.22	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0	22.2	44.4	11.1	77.7

Table B442. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Downtown Revitalization by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
27511	93	6.83	2.2	1.1	3.2	2.2	16.1	11.8	17.2	28.0	18.3	75.3
27513	114	6.48	2.6	3.5	3.5	0.9	21.1	12.3	19.3	21.1	15.8	68.5
27518	66	6.35	0.0	1.5	3.0	6.1	27.3	10.6	22.7	19.7	9.1	62.1
27519	113	6.62	0.9	1.8	4.4	1.8	23.9	9.7	20.4	17.7	19.5	67.3

Visiting Downtown in the Past Year Crosstabulations

Table B443. Have You Visited Downtown in the Past Year by Age.

Age	n	Yes	No
18-25	35	80.0	20.0
26-55	258	87.6	12.4
56-65	58	81.0	19.0
Over 65	46	82.6	17.4

Table B444. Have You Visited Downtown in the Past Year by Education.

Education	n	Yes	No
HS/Some College	158	81.0	19.0
College Degree	218	88.1	11.9
PhD/JD/MD	19	100.0	0.0

Table B445. Have You Visited Downtown in the Past Year by Gender.

Gender	n	Yes	No
Male	186	81.7	18.3
Female	215	88.8	11.2

Table B446. Have You Visited Downtown in the Past Year by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Yes	No
Single family	315	86.3	13.7
Apartment	42	73.8	26.2
Townhouse/Condo	39	92.3	7.7

Table B447. Have You Visited Downtown in the Past Year by Income.

Income	n	Yes	No
0-\$45,000	53	77.4	22.6
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	87.1	12.9
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	85.7	14.3
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	83.8	16.3
Over \$150,000	68	94.1	5.9

Table B448. Have You Visited Downtown in the Past Year by Race.

Race	n	Yes	No
Caucasian	288	88.9	11.1
Asian	39	74.4	25.6
African-American	31	77.4	22.6
Hispanic	22	86.4	13.6
Other	7	85.7	14.3

Table B449. Have You Visited Downtown in the Past Year by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Yes	No
0-1	16	68.8	31.3
2-5	69	79.7	20.3
6-10	101	88.1	11.9
Over 10	204	87.7	12.3
Native	9	77.8	22.2

Table B450. Have You Visited Downtown in the Past Year by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Yes	No
27511	93	95.7	4.3
27513	114	83.3	16.7
27518	66	78.8	21.2
27519	113	83.2	16.8

Effectiveness of Potential Downtown Amenities or Activities Crosstabulations

Table B451. How Likely Would the Following Amenities or Activities Be In Bringing You Downtown by Age (In Descending Mean Order).

18-25 (n=34)	26-55 (n=255)	56-65 (n=58)	Over 65 (n=46)
Cafes/restaurants (8.31)	Cafes/restaurants (7.61)	Cafes/restaurants (6.62)	Cafes/restaurants (6.15)
Outdoor performances (7.74)	Outdoor performances (7.11)	Shopping (5.55)	Preserve/reuse historic building (5.44)
Concerts (7.49)	Festivals (7.09)	Festivals (5.52)	Museums (5.26)
Festivals (7.26)	Shopping (6.88)	Farmer's Market (5.45)	Farmer's Market (5.09)
Shopping (6.43)	Concerts (6.60)	Preserve/reuse historic building (5.35)	Historical walking tour (5.07)
Coffee shop (6.31)	Farmer's Market (6.29)	Outdoor performances (4.97)	Shopping (5.04)
Ice cream/yogurt shop (6.24)	Preserve/reuse historic building (6.04)	Coffee shop (4.86)	Ice cream/yogurt shop (4.61)
Bars/pubs (6.20)	Ice cream/yogurt shop (5.85)	Ice cream/yogurt shop (4.85)	Public art (4.57)
Museums (5.60)	Museums (5.66)	Concerts (4.83)	Festivals (4.39)
Preserve/reuse historic building (5.49)	Historical walking tour (5.44)	Historical walking tour (4.81)	Outdoor performances (4.30)
Public art (5.37)	Bars/pubs (5.38)	Museums (4.78)	Art exhibition space (4.20)
Art exhibition space (5.20)	Public art (5.34)	Public art (4.36)	Coffee shop (4.13)
Historical walking tour (4.94)	Coffee shop (5.32)	Art exhibition space (4.28)	Concerts (3.74)
Working artist studio space (4.83)	Art exhibition space (5.10)	Bars/pubs (3.93)	Gallery Crawl (3.72)
Farmer's Market (4.71)	Gallery Crawl (4.99)	Gallery Crawl (3.93)	Grocery store (3.57)
Pet shop (4.66)	Working artist studio space (4.47)	Grocery store (3.47)	Working artist studio space (3.30)
Gallery Crawl (4.57)	Pet shop (4.24)	Working artist studio space (3.22)	Bars/pubs (2.67)
Grocery store (3.43)	Grocery store (3.67)	Pet shop (2.95)	Pet shop (2.50)

Table B452. How Likely Would the Following Amenities or Activities Be In Bringing You Downtown by Education (In Descending Mean Order).

HS/Some College (n=157)	College Degree (n=216)	PhD/JD/MD (n=18)
Cafes/restaurants (7.17)	Cafes/restaurants (7.46)	Festivals (7.53)
Outdoor performances (6.29)	Festivals (6.75)	Outdoor performances (7.47)
Shopping (6.19)	Outdoor performances (6.61)	Concerts (7.37)
Festivals (6.13)	Shopping (6.53)	Cafes/restaurants (7.37)
Concerts (5.91)	Concerts (6.11)	Shopping (6.90)
Farmer's Market (5.53)	Farmer's Market (6.08)	Ice cream/yogurt shop (6.26)
Preserve/reuse historic building (5.46)	Preserve/reuse historic building (6.01)	Museums (6.21)
Ice cream/yogurt shop (5.25)	Ice cream/yogurt shop (5.73)	Preserve/reuse historic building (6.17)
Museums (5.03)	Museums (5.70)	Coffee shop (6.16)
Coffee shop (5.01)	Historical walking tour (5.55)	Public art (6.11)
Bars/pubs (4.93)	Public art (5.38)	Farmer's Market (5.90)
Historical walking tour (4.77)	Coffee shop (5.28)	Bars/pubs (5.79)
Public art (4.59)	Art exhibition space (5.10)	Art exhibition space (5.68)
Art exhibition space (4.44)	Bars/pubs (4.87)	Gallery Crawl (5.47)
Gallery Crawl (4.21)	Gallery Crawl (4.83)	Historical walking tour (5.37)
Working artist studio space (3.77)	Working artist studio space (4.41)	Working artist studio space (5.05)
Pet shop (3.57)	Pet shop (4.00)	Pet shop (4.95)
Grocery store (3.50)	Grocery store (3.69)	Grocery store (3.26)

Table B453. How Likely Would the Following Amenities or Activities Be In Bringing You Downtown by Gender (In Descending Mean Order).

Male (n=185)	Female (n=213)
Cafes/restaurants (7.16)	Cafes/restaurants (7.51)
Outdoor performances (6.30)	Shopping (6.85)
Festivals (6.20)	Festivals (6.84)
Shopping (5.93)	Outdoor performances (6.71)
Concerts (5.83)	Concerts (6.30)
Farmer's Market (5.57)	Preserve/reuse historic building (6.19)
Preserve/reuse historic building (5.35)	Farmer's Market (6.14)
Bars/pubs (5.10)	Ice cream/yogurt shop (6.04)
Ice cream/yogurt shop (5.03)	Museums (5.95)
Museums (4.90)	Coffee shop (5.86)
Historical walking tour (4.81)	Public art (5.74)
Coffee shop (4.45)	Historical walking tour (5.61)
Public art (4.38)	Art exhibition space (5.45)
Art exhibition space (4.19)	Gallery Crawl (5.19)
Gallery Crawl (3.95)	Bars/pubs (4.77)
Working artist studio space (3.67)	Working artist studio space (4.61)
Pet shop (3.60)	Pet shop (4.12)
Grocery store (3.30)	Grocery store (3.85)

Table B454. How Likely Would the Following Amenities or Activities Be In Bringing You Downtown by Housing Type (In Descending Mean Order).

Single Family (n=312)	Apartment (n=42)	Townhouse/Condo (n=39)
Cafes/restaurants (7.27)	Cafes/restaurants (7.98)	Cafes/restaurants (7.46)
Festivals (6.44)	Outdoor performances (7.55)	Outdoor performances (6.77)
Outdoor performances (6.37)	Shopping (7.33)	Festivals (6.67)
Shopping (6.33)	Festivals (7.26)	Concerts (6.18)
Concerts (5.96)	Concerts (6.95)	Shopping (6.18)
Preserve/reuse historic building (5.86)	Bars/pubs (6.57)	Farmer's Market (5.85)
Farmer's Market (5.82)	Ice cream/yogurt shop (6.50)	Preserve/reuse historic building (5.77)
Museums (5.46)	Farmer's Market (6.48)	Ice cream/yogurt shop (5.55)
Ice cream/yogurt shop (5.45)	Coffee shop (5.91)	Coffee shop (5.46)
Historical walking tour (5.31)	Preserve/reuse historic building (5.67)	Bars/pubs (5.33)
Coffee shop (5.09)	Museums (5.62)	Museums (5.23)
Public art (5.05)	Art exhibition space (5.50)	Public art (5.13)
Art exhibition space (4.82)	Public art (5.48)	Historical walking tour (4.87)
Bars/pubs (4.65)	Historical walking tour (5.33)	Art exhibition space (4.56)
Gallery Crawl (4.64)	Working artist studio space (5.12)	Gallery Crawl (4.21)
Working artist studio space (4.10)	Gallery Crawl (4.88)	Working artist studio space (3.92)
Pet shop (3.77)	Pet shop (4.71)	Pet shop (3.74)
Grocery store (3.51)	Grocery store (4.45)	Grocery store (3.26)

Table B455. How Likely Would the Following Amenities or Activities Be In Bringing You Downtown by Income (In Descending Mean Order).

0-\$45,000 (n=52)	\$45,001-\$75,000 (n=61)	\$75,001-\$100,000 (n=56)	\$100,001-\$150,000 (n=80)	Over \$150,000 (n=68)
Cafes/restaurants (7.45)	Cafes/restaurants (7.24)	Cafes/restaurants (7.05)	Cafes/restaurants (7.31)	Cafes/restaurants (7.81)
Outdoor performances (6.28)	Shopping (6.76)	Festivals (6.93)	Shopping (6.34)	Outdoor performances (7.40)
Festivals (5.96)	Outdoor performances (6.42)	Outdoor performances (6.75)	Festivals (6.26)	Shopping (7.09)
Concerts (5.87)	Farmer's Market (6.31)	Shopping (6.48)	Outdoor performances (6.14)	Festivals (7.04)
Shopping (5.66)	Festivals (6.19)	Concerts (6.34)	Farmer's Market (6.09)	Concerts (6.62)
Bars/pubs (5.19)	Concerts (5.97)	Farmer's Market (6.14)	Concerts (5.85)	Preserve/reuse historic building (6.56)
Ice cream/yogurt shop (4.90)	Ice cream/yogurt shop (5.97)	Preserve/reuse historic building (6.09)	Preserve/reuse historic building (5.66)	Farmer's Market (6.15)
Preserve/reuse historic building (4.83)	Preserve/reuse historic building (5.89)	Ice cream/yogurt shop (6.07)	Museums (5.61)	Historical walking tour (6.04)
Coffee shop (4.60)	Museums (5.63)	Historical walking tour (5.84)	Ice cream/yogurt shop (5.43)	Ice cream/yogurt shop (5.91)
Farmer's Market (4.40)	Historical walking tour (5.52)	Museums (5.82)	Public art (5.16)	Museums (5.74)
Museums (4.32)	Coffee shop (5.49)	Art exhibition space (5.45)	Coffee shop (5.14)	Gallery Crawl (5.63)
Art exhibition space (3.98)	Public art (5.24)	Public art (5.43)	Bars/pubs (5.06)	Public art (5.50)
Public art (3.96)	Bars/pubs (4.97)	Coffee shop (5.43)	Historical walking tour (5.04)	Coffee shop (5.50)
Historical walking tour (3.70)	Art exhibition space (4.87)	Bars/pubs (4.75)	Gallery Crawl (4.80)	Art exhibition space (5.49)
Working artist studio space (3.57)	Gallery Crawl (4.61)	Gallery Crawl (4.52)	Art exhibition space (4.76)	Bars/pubs (5.44)
Gallery Crawl (3.49)	Working artist studio space (4.37)	Working artist studio space (4.34)	Pet shop (4.04)	Working artist studio space (4.87)
Grocery store (3.11)	Grocery store (4.29)	Pet shop (4.11)	Working artist studio space (4.01)	Pet shop (4.18)
Pet shop (3.04)	Pet shop (4.16)	Grocery store (3.54)	Grocery store (3.59)	Grocery store (3.69)

Table B456. How Likely Would the Following Amenities or Activities Be In Bringing You Downtown by Race (In Descending Mean Order).

Caucasian (n=285)	Asian (n=39)	African-American (n=30)	Hispanic (n=22)	Other (n=7)
Cafes/restaurants (7.28)	Cafes/restaurants (7.13)	Cafes/restaurants (7.65)	Cafes/restaurants (8.32)	Cafes/restaurants (8.00)
Outdoor performances (6.48)	Shopping (6.64)	Shopping (6.97)	Outdoor performances (7.59)	Festivals (7.57)
Festivals (6.45)	Festivals (6.46)	Concerts (6.81)	Shopping (7.50)	Shopping (7.00)
Shopping (6.24)	Outdoor performances (6.33)	Outdoor performances (6.77)	Festivals (7.46)	Outdoor performances (6.57)
Concerts (5.94)	Concerts (6.26)	Ice cream/yogurt shop (6.73)	Concerts (6.86)	Concerts (6.43)
Farmer's Market (5.92)	Museums (5.54)	Festivals (6.55)	Farmer's Market (6.41)	Bars/pubs (6.00)
Preserve/reuse historic building (5.88)	Farmer's Market (5.51)	Coffee shop (6.39)	Ice cream/yogurt shop (6.32)	Historical walking tour (5.00)
Ice cream/yogurt shop (5.46)	Preserve/reuse historic building (5.49)	Bars/pubs (6.29)	Museums (6.14)	Preserve/reuse historic building (4.86)
Museums (5.35)	Public art (5.36)	Museums (6.23)	Coffee shop (6.14)	Ice cream/yogurt shop (4.71)
Historical walking tour (5.18)	Ice cream/yogurt shop (5.26)	Farmer's Market (6.03)	Public art (5.96)	Farmer's Market (4.57)
Coffee shop (5.13)	Art exhibition space (5.15)	Preserve/reuse historic building (6.03)	Bars/pubs (5.96)	Museums (4.57)
Public art (4.98)	Historical walking tour (5.08)	Historical walking tour (5.71)	Preserve/reuse historic building (5.59)	Gallery Crawl (4.43)
Art exhibition space (4.77)	Coffee shop (4.87)	Public art (5.71)	Gallery Crawl (5.50)	Art exhibition space (4.29)
Bars/pubs (4.77)	Working artist studio space (4.54)	Art exhibition space (5.39)	Art exhibition space (5.41)	Working artist studio space (4.29)
Gallery Crawl (4.55)	Bars/pubs (4.36)	Gallery Crawl (5.39)	Historical walking tour (5.32)	Public art (4.29)
Working artist studio space (4.13)	Gallery Crawl (3.87)	Working artist studio space (4.84)	Grocery store (4.73)	Coffee shop (3.86)
Pet shop (3.84)	Pet shop (3.56)	Pet shop (4.58)	Pet shop (4.41)	Grocery store (3.57)
Grocery store (3.44)	Grocery store (3.44)	Grocery store (4.32)	Working artist studio space (4.18)	Pet shop (3.57)

Table B457. How Likely Would the Following Amenities or Activities Be In Bringing You Downtown by Years in Cary (In Descending Mean Order).

0-1 (n=16)	2-5 (n=68)	6-10 (n=101)	Over 10 (n=201)	Native (n=9)
Cafes/restaurants (8.00)	Cafes/restaurants (7.45)	Cafes/restaurants (7.62)	Cafes/restaurants (7.20)	Farmer's Market (6.33)
Shopping (7.69)	Festivals (7.23)	Shopping (6.92)	Outdoor performances (6.25)	Cafes/restaurants (6.00)
Festivals (7.44)	Outdoor performances (7.20)	Festivals (6.72)	Festivals (6.21)	Shopping (5.56)
Outdoor performances (7.13)	Concerts (6.74)	Outdoor performances (6.63)	Shopping (6.11)	Festivals (5.22)
Concerts (6.81)	Shopping (6.41)	Concerts (6.37)	Preserve/reuse historic building (5.87)	Outdoor performances (5.22)
Preserve/reuse historic building (6.81)	Farmer's Market (5.68)	Farmer's Market (6.08)	Farmer's Market (5.77)	Bars/pubs (5.22)
Ice cream/yogurt shop (6.75)	Museums (5.58)	Preserve/reuse historic building (5.91)	Concerts (5.70)	Concerts (5.11)
Bars/pubs (6.69)	Bars/pubs (5.57)	Museums (5.79)	Ice cream/yogurt shop (5.47)	Grocery store (4.44)
Farmer's Market (6.56)	Preserve/reuse historic building (5.51)	Ice cream/yogurt shop (5.75)	Historical walking tour (5.27)	Coffee shop (4.22)
Historical walking tour (6.31)	Ice cream/yogurt shop (5.46)	Public art (5.43)	Museums (5.24)	Museums (4.11)
Museums (6.19)	Coffee shop (5.32)	Historical walking tour (5.30)	Coffee shop (5.14)	Ice cream/yogurt shop (4.11)
Public art (5.81)	Public art (5.20)	Coffee shop (5.23)	Public art (4.91)	Preserve/reuse historic building (4.00)
Coffee shop (5.81)	Historical walking tour (5.12)	Art exhibition space (5.11)	Art exhibition space (4.77)	Historical walking tour (3.56)
Art exhibition space (5.63)	Art exhibition space (4.90)	Gallery Crawl (4.93)	Bars/pubs (4.63)	Public art (3.33)
Gallery Crawl (5.50)	Gallery Crawl (4.75)	Bars/pubs (4.77)	Gallery Crawl (4.43)	Gallery Crawl (3.11)
Working artist studio space (4.94)	Working artist studio space (4.30)	Working artist studio space (4.53)	Working artist studio space (3.98)	Pet shop (3.00)
Pet shop (4.75)	Pet shop (4.01)	Pet shop (4.08)	Pet shop (3.67)	Art exhibition space (2.44)
Grocery store (4.38)	Grocery store (3.42)	Grocery store (3.72)	Grocery store (3.49)	Working artist studio space (2.44)

Table B458. How Likely Would the Following Amenities or Activities Be In Bringing You Downtown by Zip Code (In Descending Mean Order).

27511 (n=92)	27513 (n=113)	27518 (n=66)	27519 (n=112)
Cafes/restaurants (6.77)	Cafes/restaurants (7.61)	Cafes/restaurants (7.36)	Cafes/restaurants (7.56)
Festivals (6.18)	Outdoor performances (6.97)	Festivals (6.29)	Outdoor performances (6.81)
Outdoor performances (5.97)	Festivals (6.76)	Shopping (6.29)	Festivals (6.75)
Shopping (5.94)	Shopping (6.75)	Outdoor performances (6.05)	Shopping (6.51)
Farmer's Market (5.81)	Concerts (6.33)	Concerts (5.65)	Concerts (6.38)
Concerts (5.73)	Preserve/reuse historic building (5.97)	Farmer's Market (5.55)	Preserve/reuse historic building (6.24)
Preserve/reuse historic building (5.59)	Farmer's Market (5.92)	Museums (5.38)	Museums (5.94)
Ice cream/yogurt shop (5.28)	Ice cream/yogurt shop (5.92)	Public art (5.36)	Farmer's Market (5.91)
Museums (5.27)	Coffee shop (5.56)	Preserve/reuse historic building (5.28)	Historical walking tour (5.71)
Historical walking tour (5.03)	Historical walking tour (5.27)	Ice cream/yogurt shop (5.26)	Ice cream/yogurt shop (5.70)
Public art (4.68)	Museums (5.27)	Art exhibition space (5.17)	Public art (5.51)
Coffee shop (4.66)	Bars/pubs (5.25)	Historical walking tour (5.06)	Coffee shop (5.51)
Bars/pubs (4.60)	Public art (4.98)	Bars/pubs (5.02)	Art exhibition space (5.10)
Art exhibition space (4.59)	Gallery Crawl (4.79)	Coffee shop (4.82)	Gallery Crawl (4.90)
Gallery Crawl (4.28)	Art exhibition space (4.78)	Gallery Crawl (4.51)	Bars/pubs (4.86)
Working artist studio space (3.98)	Working artist studio space (4.30)	Working artist studio space (4.14)	Working artist studio space (4.43)
Grocery store (3.89)	Pet shop (4.12)	Pet shop (3.50)	Pet shop (4.00)
Pet shop (3.72)	Grocery store (3.61)	Grocery store (3.47)	Grocery store (3.44)

Barriers to Residential Recycling Crosstabulations

Table B459. Barriers to Residential Recycling by Age (In Descending Mean Order).

18-25 (n=33)	26-55 (n=252)	56-65 (n=57)	Over 65 (n=45)
Not sure which items can recycle (2.53)	Recycling cart/bin too small (3.31)	Recycling cart/bin too small (3.53)	Not sure which items can recycle (2.33)
Don't remember to recycle (2.35)	Not sure which items can recycle (2.55)	Not sure which items can recycle (2.19)	Recycling cart/bin too small (2.18)
Recycling cart/bin too small (2.19)	Don't recycle items I want (1.98)	Need additional cart/bin (2.00)	Don't recycle items I want (1.67)
Recycling not available (2.12)	Need additional cart/bin (1.79)	Too busy/don't have time (1.67)	Need additional cart/bin (1.49)
Recycling not important to me (1.94)	Don't remember to recycle (1.69)	Don't recycle items I want (1.49)	Don't remember to recycle (1.44)
Preparing items too much trouble (1.88)	Too busy/don't have time (1.68)	Don't remember to recycle (1.41)	Recycling not available (1.31)
Too busy/don't have time (1.85)	Preparing items too much trouble (1.57)	Preparing items too much trouble (1.38)	Preparing items too much trouble (1.29)
No room for carts/bins (1.71)	Recycling not important to me (1.36)	Recycling not important to me (1.33)	Too busy/don't have time (1.20)
Don't recycle items I want (1.39)	Recycling not available (1.26)	No room for carts/bins (1.17)	Recycling costs too much (1.20)
Need additional cart/bin (1.32)	No room for carts/bins (1.15)	Recycling not available (1.17)	Recycling not important to me (1.16)
Recycling costs too much (1.18)	Recycling costs too much (1.12)	Recycling costs too much (1.17)	No room for carts/bins (1.16)

Table B460. Barriers to Residential Recycling by Education (In Descending Mean Order).

HS/Some College (n=152)	College Degree (n=217)	PhD/JD/MD (n=19)
Recycling cart/bin too small (2.69)	Recycling cart/bin too small (3.39)	Recycling cart/bin too small (3.00)
Not sure which items can recycle (2.65)	Not sure which items can recycle (2.34)	Not sure which items can recycle (1.90)
Don't remember to recycle (1.97)	Don't recycle items I want (1.94)	Don't remember to recycle (1.74)
Too busy/don't have time (1.76)	Need additional cart/bin (1.92)	Recycling not important to me (1.58)
Don't recycle items I want (1.70)	Too busy/don't have time (1.54)	Too busy/don't have time (1.37)
Preparing items too much trouble (1.65)	Don't remember to recycle (1.46)	Don't recycle items I want (1.37)
Recycling not important to me (1.58)	Preparing items too much trouble (1.46)	No room for carts/bins (1.11)
Need additional cart/bin (1.56)	Recycling not available (1.23)	Need additional cart/bin (1.11)
Recycling not available (1.44)	Recycling not important to me (1.20)	Preparing items too much trouble (1.00)
No room for carts/bins (1.24)	Recycling costs too much (1.15)	Recycling not available (1.00)
Recycling costs too much (1.11)	No room for carts/bins (1.13)	Recycling costs too much (1.00)

Table B461. Barriers to Residential Recycling by Gender (In Descending Mean Order).

Male (n=181)	Female (n=210)
Recycling cart/bin too small (2.77)	Recycling cart/bin too small (3.37)
Not sure which items can recycle (2.38)	Not sure which items can recycle (2.53)
Too busy/don't have time (1.85)	Need additional cart/bin (1.93)
Don't remember to recycle (1.82)	Don't recycle items I want (1.89)
Don't recycle items I want (1.74)	Don't remember to recycle (1.57)
Preparing items too much trouble (1.65)	Too busy/don't have time (1.46)
Recycling not important to me (1.54)	Preparing items too much trouble (1.43)
Need additional cart/bin (1.52)	Recycling not available (1.37)
Recycling not available (1.26)	No room for carts/bins (1.26)
Recycling costs too much (1.15)	Recycling not important to me (1.23)
No room for carts/bins (1.13)	Recycling costs too much (1.13)

Table B462. Barriers to Residential Recycling by Housing Type (In Descending Mean Order).

Single Family (n=312)	Apartment (n=39)	Townhouse/Condo (n=39)
Recycling cart/bin too small (3.27)	Not sure which items can recycle (2.78)	Not sure which items can recycle (2.90)
Not sure which items can recycle (2.34)	Recycling not available (2.73)	Recycling cart/bin too small (2.51)
Don't recycle items I want (1.84)	Don't remember to recycle (2.68)	Don't remember to recycle (2.13)
Need additional cart/bin (1.80)	Too busy/don't have time (2.50)	Don't recycle items I want (2.03)
Don't remember to recycle (1.48)	Recycling cart/bin too small (2.10)	Too busy/don't have time (2.00)
Too busy/don't have time (1.47)	Preparing items too much trouble (2.05)	Preparing items too much trouble (1.92)
Preparing items too much trouble (1.40)	No room for carts/bins (1.80)	Recycling not important to me (1.49)
Recycling not important to me (1.30)	Recycling not important to me (1.75)	Recycling not available (1.41)
No room for carts/bins (1.12)	Need additional cart/bin (1.49)	Need additional cart/bin (1.41)
Recycling costs too much (1.12)	Don't recycle items I want (1.39)	Recycling costs too much (1.13)
Recycling not available (1.07)	Recycling costs too much (1.23)	No room for carts/bins (1.08)

Table B463. Barriers to Residential Recycling by Income (In Descending Mean Order).

0-\$45,000 (n=49)	\$45,001-\$75,000 (n=61)	\$75,001-\$100,000 (n=55)	\$100,001-\$150,000 (n=78)	Over \$150,000 (n=67)
Not sure which items (2.98)	Recycling cart too small (2.74)	Recycling cart too small (3.20)	Recycling cart too small (3.36)	Recycling cart too small (3.65)
Don't remember to recycle (2.63)	Not sure which items (2.05)	Not sure which items (2.48)	Not sure which items (2.53)	Not sure which items (2.60)
Too busy/don't have time (2.26)	Don't remember to recycle (2.03)	Don't recycle items I want (2.31)	Need additional cart (1.85)	Don't recycle items I want (1.82)
Recycling cart too small (2.22)	Too busy/don't have time (1.67)	Need additional cart (1.80)	Don't recycle items I want (1.83)	Need additional cart (1.73)
Preparing items is trouble (1.94)	Need additional cart (1.61)	Too busy/don't have time (1.61)	Too busy/don't have time (1.72)	Don't remember to recycle (1.54)
Recycling not important (1.90)	Preparing items is trouble (1.58)	Preparing items is trouble (1.57)	Preparing items is trouble (1.46)	Too busy/don't have time (1.37)
Recycling not available (1.90)	Don't recycle items I want (1.48)	Don't remember to recycle (1.55)	Don't remember to recycle (1.44)	Preparing items is trouble (1.34)
Don't recycle items I want (1.44)	Recycling not important (1.45)	Recycling not available (1.46)	Recycling not important (1.29)	No room for carts/bins (1.15)
Need additional cart (1.37)	Recycling not available (1.45)	No room for carts/bins (1.20)	Recycling not available (1.23)	Recycling not important (1.13)
No room for carts/bins (1.26)	Recycling costs too much (1.25)	Recycling costs too much (1.14)	No room for carts/bins (1.22)	Recycling costs too much (1.10)
Recycling costs too much (1.16)	No room for carts/bins (1.23)	Recycling not important (1.13)	Recycling costs too much (1.15)	Recycling not available (1.00)

Table B464. Barriers to Residential Recycling by Race (In Descending Mean Order).

Caucasian (n=283)	Asian (n=37)	African-American (n=30)	Hispanic (n=21)	Other (n=7)
Recycling cart too small (3.24)	Not sure which items (2.92)	Recycling cart too small (3.03)	Not sure which items (3.41)	Recycling not available (2.14)
Not sure which items (2.34)	Recycling cart too small (2.82)	Don't remember to recycle (2.60)	Too busy/don't have time (2.68)	Recycling cart too small (1.86)
Don't recycle items I want (1.89)	Too busy/don't have time (2.34)	Recycling not available (2.53)	Don't remember to recycle (2.62)	Not sure which items (1.57)
Need additional cart (1.87)	Preparing items is trouble (2.31)	Not sure which items (2.10)	Recycling cart too small (2.24)	Preparing items is trouble (1.57)
Don't remember to recycle (1.50)	Don't remember to recycle (2.10)	Too busy/don't have time (1.97)	Recycling not available (2.09)	Recycling costs too much (1.57)
Too busy/don't have time (1.44)	Don't recycle items I want (1.95)	Preparing items is trouble (1.80)	Recycling not important (1.82)	Don't remember to recycle (1.00)
Preparing items is trouble (1.36)	Need additional cart (1.41)	No room for carts/bins (1.73)	Don't recycle items I want (1.81)	Recycling not important (1.00)
Recycling not important (1.32)	Recycling not important (1.31)	Recycling not important (1.63)	Preparing items is trouble (1.71)	Too busy/don't have time (1.00)
Recycling not available (1.15)	No room for carts/bins (1.31)	Need additional cart (1.57)	Need additional cart (1.29)	No room for carts/bins (1.00)
No room for carts/bins (1.11)	Recycling costs too much (1.21)	Don't recycle items I want (1.37)	No room for carts/bins (1.27)	Need additional cart (1.00)
Recycling costs too much (1.08)	Recycling not available (1.15)	Recycling costs too much (1.20)	Recycling costs too much (1.19)	Don't recycle items I want (1.00)

Table B465. Barriers to Residential Recycling by Years in Cary (In Descending Mean Order).

0-1 (n=16)	2-5 (n=65)	6-10 (n=99)	Over 10 (n=202)	Native (n=9)
Recycling cart too small (2.94)	Not sure which items (3.27)	Recycling cart too small (2.96)	Recycling cart too small (3.26)	Not sure which items (3.67)
Need additional cart (2.50)	Recycling cart too small (2.97)	Not sure which items (2.53)	Not sure which items (2.18)	Preparing items is trouble (3.22)
Recycling not available (2.25)	Don't remember to recycle (2.35)	Don't recycle items I want (1.79)	Don't recycle items I want (1.79)	Too busy/don't have time (3.00)
Not sure which items (1.50)	Too busy/don't have time (2.16)	Don't remember to recycle (1.78)	Need additional cart (1.71)	Don't recycle items I want (2.44)
Preparing items is trouble (1.31)	Don't recycle items I want (2.06)	Too busy/don't have time (1.71)	Don't remember to recycle (1.45)	Don't remember to recycle (2.33)
Too busy/don't have time (1.25)	Preparing items is trouble (1.82)	Need additional cart (1.69)	Too busy/don't have time (1.40)	Recycling not important (1.89)
Recycling costs too much (1.25)	Need additional cart (1.72)	Preparing items is trouble (1.55)	Preparing items is trouble (1.37)	Recycling cart too small (1.89)
Recycling not important (1.06)	Recycling not important (1.55)	Recycling not available (1.46)	Recycling not important (1.33)	No room for carts/bins (1.67)
Don't remember to recycle (1.00)	Recycling not available (1.43)	Recycling not important (1.37)	No room for carts/bins (1.17)	Recycling not available (1.67)
No room for carts/bins (1.00)	No room for carts/bins (1.33)	No room for carts/bins (1.15)	Recycling not available (1.13)	Need additional cart (1.67)
Don't recycle items I want (1.00)	Recycling costs too much (1.21)	Recycling costs too much (1.13)	Recycling costs too much (1.11)	Recycling costs too much (1.11)

Table B466. Barriers to Residential Recycling by Zip Code (In Descending Mean Order).

27511 (n=90)	27513 (n=112)	27518 (n=64)	27519 (n=110)
Recycling cart/bin too small (3.03)	Recycling cart/bin too small (2.93)	Recycling cart/bin too small (3.42)	Recycling cart/bin too small (3.04)
Not sure which items can recycle (2.54)	Not sure which items can recycle (2.27)	Not sure which items can recycle (2.31)	Not sure which items can recycle (2.55)
Need additional cart/bin (1.93)	Don't remember to recycle (1.81)	Need additional cart/bin (2.02)	Don't recycle items I want (1.87)
Don't remember to recycle (1.85)	Don't recycle items I want (1.77)	Don't recycle items I want (1.91)	Need additional cart/bin (1.57)
Too busy/don't have time (1.81)	Too busy/don't have time (1.72)	Too busy/don't have time (1.37)	Too busy/don't have time (1.46)
Preparing items too much trouble (1.71)	Need additional cart/bin (1.62)	Recycling not available (1.37)	Don't remember to recycle (1.45)
Don't recycle items I want (1.66)	Preparing items too much trouble (1.52)	Don't remember to recycle (1.35)	Preparing items too much trouble (1.41)
Recycling not available (1.50)	Recycling not important to me (1.35)	Preparing items too much trouble (1.35)	Recycling not important to me (1.30)
Recycling not important to me (1.42)	Recycling not available (1.35)	Recycling not important to me (1.29)	No room for carts/bins (1.10)
No room for carts/bins (1.24)	No room for carts/bins (1.26)	Recycling costs too much (1.12)	Recycling costs too much (1.09)
Recycling costs too much (1.22)	Recycling costs too much (1.13)	No room for carts/bins (1.11)	Recycling not available (1.02)

Ideas to Expand Residential Recycling Crosstabulations

Table B467. Impact of Ideas to Expand Residential Recycling Service by Age (In Descending Mean Order).

18-25 (n=34)	26-55 (n=255)	56-65 (n=57)	Over 65 (n=44)
Financial incentive (4.38)	Collect recycling weekly (5.21)	Collect recycling weekly (5.21)	Collect recycling weekly (3.71)
More recycling education (3.77)	Financial incentive (4.44)	Larger carts/bins (3.79)	More recycling education (3.47)
Collect recycling weekly (3.21)	Larger carts/bins (3.61)	More recycling education (3.40)	Larger carts/bins (2.64)
Send electronic reminders (2.77)	More recycling education (3.59)	Financial incentive (3.36)	Financial incentive (1.96)
Larger carts/bins (2.47)	Send electronic reminders (2.37)	Additional cart/bin (2.31)	Ease home cart placement rules (1.78)
Not requiring item cleaning (2.29)	Recycle food waste (2.18)	Send electronic reminders (2.02)	Additional cart/bin (1.68)
Make recycling available (1.91)	Additional cart/bin (1.90)	Ease home cart placement rules (1.60)	Not requiring item cleaning (1.36)
Recycle food waste (1.74)	Not requiring item cleaning (1.71)	Not requiring item cleaning (1.52)	Send electronic reminders (1.31)
Ease home cart placement rules (1.71)	Ease home cart placement rules (1.47)	Recycle food waste (1.50)	Recycle food waste (1.18)
Additional cart/bin (1.62)	Make recycling available (1.33)	Make recycling available (1.18)	Make recycling available (1.00)

Table B468. Impact of Ideas to Expand Residential Recycling Service by Education (In Descending Mean Order).

HS/Some College (n=153)	College Degree (n=217)	PhD/JD/MD (n=19)
Collect recycling weekly (4.26)	Collect recycling weekly (5.32)	Collect recycling weekly (4.26)
Financial incentive (4.03)	Financial incentive (3.90)	Financial incentive (4.05)
More recycling education (3.32)	Larger carts/bins (3.80)	Larger carts/bins (3.47)
Larger carts/bins (2.84)	More recycling education (3.78)	More recycling education (3.00)
Send electronic reminders (2.17)	Send electronic reminders (2.36)	Recycle food waste (2.73)
Not requiring item cleaning (1.77)	Additional cart/bin (2.16)	Additional cart/bin (1.37)
Recycle food waste (1.66)	Recycle food waste (2.03)	Send electronic reminders (1.21)
Additional cart/bin (1.61)	Not requiring item cleaning (1.67)	Not requiring item cleaning (1.21)
Ease home cart placement rules (1.50)	Ease home cart placement rules (1.57)	Ease home cart placement rules (1.21)
Make recycling available (1.32)	Make recycling available (1.33)	Make recycling available (1.00)

Table B469. Impact of Ideas to Expand Residential Recycling Service by Gender (In Descending Mean Order).

Male (n=182)	Female (n=211)
Collect recycling weekly (4.48)	Collect recycling weekly (5.12)
Financial incentive (3.91)	Financial incentive (4.03)
Larger carts/bins (3.24)	More recycling education (3.90)
More recycling education (3.15)	Larger carts/bins (3.54)
Send electronic reminders (2.16)	Send electronic reminders (2.27)
Recycle food waste (1.79)	Recycle food waste (2.03)
Additional cart/bin (1.76)	Additional cart/bin (2.02)
Not requiring item cleaning (1.63)	Not requiring item cleaning (1.75)
Ease home cart placement rules (1.56)	Ease home cart placement rules (1.53)
Make recycling available (1.30)	Make recycling available (1.34)

Table B470. Impact of Ideas to Expand Residential Recycling Service by Housing Type (In Descending Mean Order).

Single Family (n=313)	Apartment (n=39)	Townhouse/Condo (n=39)
Collect recycling weekly (5.15)	Financial incentive (4.75)	Financial incentive (4.46)
Financial incentive (3.79)	More recycling education (3.38)	Collect recycling weekly (4.00)
Larger carts/bins (3.67)	Collect recycling weekly (3.13)	More recycling education (3.62)
More recycling education (3.57)	Send electronic reminders (2.63)	Larger carts/bins (2.54)
Send electronic reminders (2.11)	Make recycling available (2.45)	Send electronic reminders (2.41)
Additional cart/bin (1.99)	Larger carts/bins (2.21)	Not requiring item cleaning (1.90)
Recycle food waste (1.97)	Not requiring item cleaning (1.85)	Recycle food waste (1.59)
Not requiring item cleaning (1.64)	Ease home cart placement rules (1.85)	Ease home cart placement rules (1.56)
Ease home cart placement rules (1.51)	Additional cart/bin (1.74)	Additional cart/bin (1.39)
Make recycling available (1.15)	Recycle food waste (1.70)	Make recycling available (1.10)

Table B471. Impact of Ideas to Expand Residential Recycling Service by Income (In Descending Mean Order).

0-\$45,000 (n=49)	\$45,001-\$75,000 (n=61)	\$75,001-\$100,000 (n=55)	\$100,001-\$150,000 (n=79)	Over \$150,000 (n=68)
Financial incentive (4.98)	Collect recycling weekly (4.60)	Collect recycling weekly (5.36)	Collect recycling weekly (4.98)	Collect recycling weekly (5.74)
Collect recycling weekly (3.41)	Financial incentive (4.42)	More recycling education (4.34)	More recycling education (3.69)	Larger carts/bins (4.25)
More recycling education (3.18)	More recycling education (3.37)	Financial incentive (4.34)	Larger carts/bins (3.58)	Financial incentive (4.02)
Send electronic reminders (2.55)	Larger carts/bins (3.16)	Larger carts/bins (3.45)	Financial incentive (3.54)	More recycling education (3.31)
Larger carts/bins (2.44)	Send electronic reminders (2.16)	Send electronic reminders (2.46)	Send electronic reminders (1.99)	Send electronic reminders (2.43)
Not requiring item cleaning (2.29)	Ease home cart rules (1.87)	Recycle food waste (2.02)	Recycle food waste (1.99)	Additional cart/bin (2.18)
Recycle food waste (1.98)	Additional cart/bin (1.71)	Not requiring item cleaning (1.89)	Additional cart/bin (1.85)	Recycle food waste (1.90)
Make recycling available (1.75)	Not requiring item cleaning (1.66)	Additional cart/bin (1.89)	Ease home cart rules (1.45)	Not requiring item cleaning (1.69)
Additional cart/bin (1.70)	Recycle food waste (1.55)	Ease home cart rules (1.43)	Not requiring item cleaning (1.40)	Ease home cart rules (1.59)
Ease home cart rules (1.47)	Make recycling available (1.34)	Make recycling available (1.43)	Make recycling available (1.35)	Make recycling available (1.13)

Table B472. Impact of Ideas to Expand Residential Recycling Service by Race (In Descending Mean Order).

Caucasian (n=284)	Asian (n=39)	African-American (n=30)	Hispanic (n=22)	Other (n=7)
Collect recycling weekly (5.09)	Collect recycling weekly (5.08)	Financial incentive (4.83)	Financial incentive (4.77)	More recycling education (3.43)
Financial incentive (3.69)	Financial incentive (5.05)	Collect recycling weekly (3.20)	Collect recycling weekly (3.73)	Collect recycling weekly (3.29)
Larger carts/bins (3.50)	More recycling education (4.51)	Larger carts/bins (3.03)	More recycling education (3.32)	Financial incentive (2.14)
More recycling education (3.46)	Larger carts/bins (3.44)	Send electronic reminders (2.97)	Larger carts/bins (3.00)	Larger carts/bins (2.14)
Send electronic reminders (2.03)	Send electronic reminders (2.72)	More recycling education (2.80)	Send electronic reminders (2.36)	Make recycling available (2.14)
Additional cart/bin (1.96)	Not requiring item cleaning (2.56)	Ease home cart rules (2.10)	Recycle food waste (2.36)	Send electronic reminders (1.29)
Recycle food waste (1.88)	Recycle food waste (1.80)	Additional cart/bin (2.00)	Make recycling available (2.14)	Not requiring item cleaning (1.00)
Not requiring item cleaning (1.55)	Additional cart/bin (1.62)	Not requiring item cleaning (1.97)	Additional cart/bin (1.77)	Ease home cart rules (1.00)
Ease home cart rules (1.46)	Ease home cart rules (1.49)	Recycle food waste (1.97)	Ease home cart rules (1.67)	Additional cart/bin (1.00)
Make recycling available (1.19)	Make recycling available (1.33)	Make recycling available (1.80)	Not requiring item cleaning (1.64)	Recycle food waste (1.00)

Table B473. Impact of Ideas to Expand Residential Recycling Service by Years in Cary (In Descending Mean Order).

0-1 (n=16)	2-5 (n=68)	6-10 (n=99)	Over 10 (n=201)	Native (n=9)
Collect recycling weekly (4.31)	Financial incentive (4.31)	Collect recycling weekly (5.10)	Collect recycling weekly (5.02)	Financial incentive (4.89)
Financial incentive (3.25)	Collect recycling weekly (4.15)	Financial incentive (4.24)	Financial incentive (3.74)	More recycling education (4.11)
More recycling education (2.94)	More recycling education (3.93)	Larger carts/bins (3.58)	Larger carts/bins (3.53)	Collect recycling weekly (3.44)
Additional cart/bin (2.88)	Larger carts/bins (3.41)	More recycling education (3.57)	More recycling education (3.44)	Ease home cart rules (2.33)
Make recycling available (2.25)	Send electronic reminders (2.31)	Send electronic reminders (2.44)	Send electronic reminders (2.18)	Recycle food waste (2.11)
Larger carts/bins (2.00)	Recycle food waste (2.29)	Recycle food waste (2.01)	Additional cart/bin (2.01)	Not requiring item cleaning (1.22)
Send electronic reminders (1.50)	Not requiring item cleaning (1.90)	Not requiring item cleaning (1.88)	Recycle food waste (1.79)	Send electronic reminders (1.11)
Recycle food waste (1.25)	Ease home cart rules (1.74)	Additional cart/bin (1.73)	Not requiring item cleaning (1.60)	Additional cart/bin (1.11)
Not requiring item cleaning (1.13)	Additional cart/bin (1.72)	Ease home cart rules (1.42)	Ease home cart rules (1.54)	Larger carts/bins (1.00)
Ease home cart rules (1.00)	Make recycling available (1.52)	Make recycling available (1.36)	Make recycling available (1.17)	Make recycling available (1.00)

Table B474. Impact of Ideas to Expand Residential Recycling Service by Zip Code (In Descending Mean Order).

27511 (n=91)	27513 (n=112)	27518 (n=64)	27519 (n=112)
Collect recycling weekly (4.69)	Collect recycling weekly (4.77)	Collect recycling weekly (4.80)	Collect recycling weekly (4.90)
Financial incentive (4.61)	Financial incentive (4.10)	Larger carts/bins (4.03)	Financial incentive (3.89)
More recycling education (3.45)	More recycling education (3.35)	More recycling education (3.40)	More recycling education (3.80)
Larger carts/bins (3.20)	Larger carts/bins (3.24)	Financial incentive (2.88)	Larger carts/bins (3.42)
Send electronic reminders (2.70)	Send electronic reminders (2.11)	Additional cart/bin (2.26)	Send electronic reminders (2.16)
Recycle food waste (1.76)	Not requiring item cleaning (1.96)	Recycle food waste (2.19)	Recycle food waste (1.96)
Not requiring item cleaning (1.75)	Additional cart/bin (1.96)	Send electronic reminders (1.86)	Additional cart/bin (1.80)
Additional cart/bin (1.66)	Recycle food waste (1.82)	Ease home cart placement rules (1.82)	Not requiring item cleaning (1.37)
Make recycling available (1.41)	Ease home cart placement rules (1.71)	Not requiring item cleaning (1.60)	Ease home cart placement rules (1.31)
Ease home cart placement rules (1.37)	Make recycling available (1.33)	Make recycling available (1.53)	Make recycling available (1.00)

Support for Paying Higher Monthly Fee for Solid Waste Service for Recycling Service Expansion Crosstabulations

Table B475. Support for Paying a Higher Monthly Fee for Solid Waste Service for Recycling Service Expansion by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Extremely Supportive 9	% Above 5
18-25	33	2.33	57.6	6.1	9.1	0.0	27.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
26-55	255	3.62	38.0	7.5	6.3	3.1	22.0	6.7	8.6	2.7	5.1	23.1
56-65	58	3.60	43.1	5.2	3.4	3.4	19.0	8.6	6.9	5.2	5.2	25.9
Over 65	46	2.83	56.5	2.2	8.7	4.3	13.0	2.2	6.5	4.3	2.2	15.2

Table B476. Support for Paying a Higher Monthly Fee for Solid Waste Service for Recycling Service Expansion by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Extremely Supportive 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	154	2.85	53.9	7.1	5.8	1.3	16.2	5.2	5.2	1.3	3.9	15.6
College Degree	218	3.72	34.9	6.4	6.9	4.6	24.8	6.4	8.7	4.1	3.2	22.4
PhD/JD/MD	19	4.47	42.1	0.0	5.3	0.0	10.5	5.3	10.5	5.3	21.1	42.2

Table B477. Support for Paying a Higher Monthly Fee for Solid Waste Service for Recycling Service Expansion by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Extremely Supportive 9	% Above 5
Male	185	3.21	45.9	7.6	5.4	3.2	20.0	5.9	4.9	2.7	4.3	17.8
Female	211	3.58	40.3	5.2	7.1	2.8	21.8	5.7	9.5	3.3	4.3	22.8

Table B478. Support for Paying a Higher Monthly Fee for Solid Waste Service for Recycling Service Expansion by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Extremely Supportive 9	% Above 5
Single Family	314	3.60	39.2	6.7	6.4	3.5	21.0	6.7	8.3	3.8	4.5	23.3
Apartment	40	2.65	60.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	22.5	5.0	2.5	0.0	2.5	10.0
Townhouse/Condo	39	2.80	53.8	5.1	10.3	0.0	20.5	0.0	5.1	0.0	5.1	10.2

Table B479. Support for Paying a Higher Monthly Fee for Solid Waste Service for Recycling Service Expansion by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Extremely Supportive 9	% Above 5
0-\$45,000	51	2.28	64.7	3.9	7.8	0.0	17.6	2.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	6.0
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	3.45	48.4	1.6	4.8	0.0	21.0	4.8	12.9	3.2	3.2	24.1
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	3.30	37.5	12.5	10.7	7.1	12.5	3.6	10.7	0.0	5.4	19.7
\$100,001-\$150,000	79	3.81	35.4	7.6	3.8	2.5	26.6	5.1	10.1	5.1	3.8	24.1
Over \$150,000	68	4.12	29.4	7.4	5.9	2.9	23.5	11.8	8.8	4.4	5.9	30.9

Table B480. Support for Paying a Higher Monthly Fee for Solid Waste Service for Recycling Service Expansion by Race.

Race	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Extremely Supportive 9	% Above 5
Caucasian	285	3.56	41.1	6.0	6.7	3.2	20.4	5.3	8.8	3.5	5.3	22.9
Asian	39	2.72	56.4	5.1	7.7	2.6	12.8	7.7	2.6	2.6	2.6	15.5
African-American	30	3.00	46.7	10.0	0.0	3.3	26.7	6.7	6.7	0.0	0.0	13.4
Hispanic	22	3.41	40.9	9.1	4.5	4.5	22.7	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	18.0
Other	7	3.29	42.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	57.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table B481. Support for Paying a Higher Monthly Fee for Solid Waste Service for Recycling Service Expansion by Voter Status.

Voter Status	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Extremely Supportive 9	% Above 5
Registered	352	3.48	41.8	6.3	6.0	3.4	20.7	6.3	8.2	3.1	4.3	21.9
Not Registered	42	2.79	52.4	7.1	9.5	0.0	21.4	2.4	0.0	2.4	4.8	9.6

Table B482. Support for Paying a Higher Monthly Fee for Solid Waste Service for Recycling Service Expansion by Voted in 2013 Local Elections.

Voting Action	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Extremely Supportive 9	% Above 5
Voter	230	3.66	39.6	5.2	6.1	3.0	22.6	6.1	8.7	3.5	5.2	23.5
Nonvoter	163	3.07	47.2	8.0	6.7	3.1	18.4	5.5	5.5	2.5	3.1	16.6

Table B483. Support for Paying a Higher Monthly Fee for Solid Waste Service for Recycling Service Expansion by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Extremely Supportive 9	% Above 5
0-1	16	4.38	37.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	25.0
2-5	66	3.08	43.9	10.6	6.1	3.0	24.2	3.0	4.5	0.0	4.5	12.0
6-10	101	3.76	36.6	5.0	6.9	3.0	22.8	7.9	9.9	5.0	3.0	25.8
Over 10	204	3.26	45.6	6.4	6.9	3.4	17.6	5.9	7.8	2.5	3.9	20.1
Native	9	3.33	55.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	11.1	0.0	0.0	11.1	22.2

Table B484. Support for Paying a Higher Monthly Fee for Solid Waste Service for Recycling Service Expansion by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Mean	Not Supportive At All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Extremely Supportive 9	% Above 5
27511	91	3.11	48.4	4.4	5.5	3.3	24.2	3.3	5.5	4.4	1.1	14.3
27513	113	3.20	49.6	5.3	4.4	2.7	20.4	3.5	6.2	2.7	5.3	17.7
27518	66	3.56	40.9	7.6	4.5	3.0	21.2	7.6	6.1	1.5	7.6	22.8
27519	112	3.89	32.1	6.3	10.7	3.6	17.9	9.8	11.6	3.6	4.5	29.5

Age Crosstabulations

Table B485. Age by Education.

Education	n	18-25	26-55	56-65	Over 65
HS/Some College	157	18.5	54.1	12.1	15.3
College Degree	215	2.8	70.2	17.7	9.3
PhD/JD/MD	19	0.0	89.5	5.3	5.3

Table B486. Age by Gender.

Gender	n	18-25	26-55	56-65	Over 65
Male	185	10.8	62.7	16.2	10.3
Female	212	7.1	67.0	13.2	12.7

Table B487. Age by Housing Type.

Housing	n	18-25	26-55	56-65	Over 65
Single Family	313	5.8	66.1	16.6	11.5
Apartment	41	29.3	65.9	0.0	4.9
Townhouse/Condo	38	10.5	55.3	13.2	21.1

Table B488. Age by Income.

Income	n	18-25	26-55	56-65	Over 65
0-\$45,000	51	37.3	49.0	3.9	9.8
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	9.7	53.2	16.1	21.0
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	1.8	58.9	16.1	23.2
\$100,001-\$150,000	78	3.8	66.7	23.1	6.4
Over \$150,000	68	2.9	85.3	10.3	1.5

Table B489. Age by Race.

Race	n	18-25	26-55	56-65	Over 65
Caucasian	287	5.9	63.8	16.4	13.9
Asian	38	27.6	48.3	10.3	13.8
African-American	29	10.5	81.6	7.9	0.0
Hispanic	22	13.6	77.3	9.1	0.0
Other	7	28.6	57.1	14.3	0.0

Table B490. Age by Registered Voter.

Voter Status	n	18-25	26-55	56-65	Over 65
Registered	350	7.7	64.0	15.7	12.6
Not Registered	44	18.2	70.5	6.8	4.5

Table B491. Age by Voter in 2013 Local Elections.

Voter Status	n	18-25	26-55	56-65	Over 65
Voter	228	6.1	60.1	18.4	15.4
Nonvoter	165	12.7	70.9	9.7	6.7

Table B492. Age by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	18-25	26-55	56-65	Over 65
0-1	16	18.8	62.5	12.5	6.3
2-5	67	11.9	76.1	4.5	7.5
6-10	101	7.9	79.2	6.9	5.9
Over 10	203	7.4	54.2	22.7	15.8
Native	8	12.5	62.5	0.0	25.0

Education Crosstabulations

Table B493. Education by Age.

Age	n	HS/Some College	College Degree	PhD/JD/MD
18-25	35	82.9	17.1	0.0
26-55	253	33.6	59.7	6.7
56-65	58	32.8	65.5	1.7
Over 65	45	53.3	44.4	2.2

Table B494. Education by Housing Type.

Housing	n	HS/Some College	College Degree	PhD/JD/MD
Single Family	313	32.9	61.0	6.1
Apartment	39	59.0	41.0	0.0
Townhouse/Condo	39	74.4	25.6	0.0

Table B495. Education by Income.

Income	n	HS/Some College	College Degree	PhD/JD/MD
0-\$45,000	53	83.0	17.0	0.0
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	56.5	40.3	3.2
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	35.7	64.3	0.0
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	23.8	72.6	3.8
Over \$150,000	68	14.7	69.1	16.2

Table B496. Education by Race.

Race	n	HS/Some College	College Degree	PhD/JD/MD
Caucasian	286	40.2	54.5	5.2
Asian	39	12.8	82.1	5.1
African-American	31	51.6	48.4	0.0
Hispanic	21	71.4	28.6	0.0
Other	7	57.1	42.9	0.0

Table B497. Education by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	HS/Some College	College Degree	PhD/JD/MD
0-1	16	50.0	50.0	0.0
2-5	67	38.8	56.7	4.5
6-10	99	42.4	52.5	5.1
Over 10	203	36.0	58.6	5.4
Native	9	88.9	11.1	0.0

Table B498. Education by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	HS/Some College	College Degree	PhD/JD/MD
27511	93	48.4	49.5	2.2
27513	110	45.5	50.9	3.6
27518	6	27.3	68.2	4.5
27519	113	33.6	58.4	8.0

Housing Type Crosstabulations

Table B499. Housing Type by Age.

Age	n	Single Family	Apartment	Townhouse/Condo
18-25	34	52.9	35.3	11.8
26-55	255	81.2	10.6	8.2
56-65	57	91.2	0.0	8.8
Over 65	46	78.3	4.3	17.4

Table B500. Housing Type by Education.

Education	n	Single Family	Apartment	Townhouse/Condo
HS/Some College	155	66.5	14.8	18.7
College Degree	217	88.0	7.4	4.6
PhD/JD/MD	19	100.0	0.0	0.0

Table B501. Housing Type by Income.

Income	n	Single Family	Apartment	Townhouse/Condo
0-\$45,000	50	46.0	24.0	30.0
\$45,001-\$75,000	61	59.0	27.9	13.1
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	76.8	8.9	14.3
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	91.3	2.5	6.3
Over \$150,000	68	100.0	0.0	0.0

Table B502. Housing Type by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Single Family	Apartment	Townhouse/Condo
0-1	16	43.8	37.5	18.8
2-5	69	62.3	24.6	13.0
6-10	99	73.7	12.1	14.1
Over 10	203	91.1	3.0	5.9
Native	9	77.8	11.1	11.1

Table B503. Housing Type by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Single Family	Apartment	Townhouse/Condo
27511	90	75.6	10.0	14.4
27513	114	80.7	12.3	7.0
27518	66	80.3	15.2	4.5
27519	112	82.1	6.3	11.6

Income Crosstabulations

Table B504. Income by Age.

Age	n	0-\$45,000	\$45,001-\$75,000	\$75,001-\$100,000	\$100,001-\$150,000	Over \$150,000
18-25	31	61.3	19.4	3.2	9.7	6.5
26-55	201	12.4	16.4	16.4	25.9	28.9
56-65	46	4.3	21.7	19.6	39.1	15.2
Over 65	37	13.5	35.1	35.1	13.5	2.7

Table B505. Income by Education.

Education	n	0-\$45,000	\$45,001-\$75,000	\$75,001-\$100,000	\$100,001-\$150,000	Over \$150,000
HS/Some College	128	34.4	27.3	15.6	14.8	7.8
College Degree	175	5.1	14.3	20.6	33.1	26.9
PhD/JD/MD	16	0.0	12.5	0.0	18.8	68.8

Table B506. Income by Housing Type.

Housing	n	0-\$45,000	\$45,001-\$75,000	\$75,001-\$100,000	\$100,001-\$150,000	Over \$150,000
Single Family	243	9.5	14.8	17.7	30.0	28.0
Apartment	36	33.3	47.2	13.9	5.6	0.0
Townhouse/Condo	36	41.7	22.2	22.2	13.9	0.0

Table B507. Income by Race.

Race	n	0-\$45,000	\$45,001-\$75,000	\$75,001-\$100,000	\$100,001-\$150,000	Over \$150,000
Caucasian	225	14.2	17.3	16.9	29.3	22.2
Asian	26	10.5	15.8	26.3	21.1	26.3
African-American	38	34.6	38.5	15.4	0.0	11.5
Hispanic	19	26.3	15.8	15.8	26.3	15.8
Other	4	25.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	25.0

Table B508. Income by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	0-\$45,000	\$45,001-\$75,000	\$75,001-\$100,000	\$100,001-\$150,000	Over \$150,000
0-1	10	50.0	20.0	0.0	30.0	0.0
2-5	54	20.4	18.5	25.9	16.7	18.5
6-10	83	16.9	20.5	13.3	24.1	25.3
Over 10	162	12.3	19.1	17.3	29.0	22.2
Native	9	22.2	22.2	33.3	11.1	11.1

Table B509. Income by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	0-\$45,000	\$45,001-\$75,000	\$75,001-\$100,000	\$100,001-\$150,000	Over \$150,000
27511	73	31.5	23.3	17.8	19.2	8.2
27513	88	13.6	22.7	17.0	28.4	18.2
27518	54	7.4	18.5	22.2	25.9	25.9
27519	95	14.7	13.7	14.7	25.3	31.6

Race Crosstabulations

Table B510. Race by Age.

Age	n	Caucasian	Asian	African-American	Hispanic	Other
18-25	34	50.0	11.8	23.5	8.8	5.9
26-55	249	73.5	12.4	5.6	6.8	1.6
56-65	56	83.9	5.4	5.4	3.6	1.8
Over 65	44	90.9	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0

Table B511. Race by Education.

Education	n	Caucasian	Asian	African-American	Hispanic	Other
HS/Some College	155	74.2	3.2	10.3	9.7	2.6
College Degree	212	73.6	15.1	7.1	2.8	1.4
PhD/JD/MD	17	88.2	11.8	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table B512. Race by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Caucasian	Asian	African-American	Hispanic	Other
Single Family	306	78.8	11.1	4.6	4.6	1.0
Apartment	41	43.9	7.3	29.3	12.2	7.3
Townhouse/Condo	36	80.6	5.6	8.3	2.8	2.8

Table B513. Race by Income.

Income	n	Caucasian	Asian	African-American	Hispanic	Other
0-\$45,000	51	62.7	7.8	17.6	9.8	2.0
\$45,001-\$75,000	60	65.0	10.0	16.7	5.0	3.3
\$75,001-\$100,000	55	69.1	18.2	7.3	5.5	0.0
\$100,001-\$150,000	79	83.5	10.1	0.0	6.3	0.0
Over \$150,000	67	74.6	14.9	4.5	4.5	1.5

Table B514. Race by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Caucasian	Asian	African-American	Hispanic	Other
0-1	16	81.3	0.0	12.5	0.0	6.3
2-5	66	59.1	10.6	13.6	12.1	4.5
6-10	97	64.9	16.5	5.2	11.3	2.1
Over 10	198	84.8	7.1	6.1	1.5	0.5
Native	9	55.6	22.2	22.2	0.0	0.0

Table B515. Race by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	Caucasian	Asian	African-American	Hispanic	Other
27511	90	80.0	4.4	7.8	6.7	1.1
27513	112	71.4	8.0	13.4	4.5	2.7
27518	62	80.6	8.1	3.2	4.8	3.2
27519	110	70.9	17.3	6.4	4.5	0.9

Registered Voter Crosstabulations

Table B516. Registered Voter by Age.

Age	n	Registered	Not Registered
18-25	35	77.1	22.9
26-55	255	87.8	12.2
56-65	58	94.8	5.2
Over 65	46	95.7	4.3

Table B517. Registered Voter by Education.

Education	n	Registered	Not Registered
HS/Some College	158	84.8	15.2
College Degree	218	91.7	8.3
PhD/JD/MD	19	94.7	5.3

Table B518. Registered Voter by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Registered	Not Registered
Single Family	314	92.4	7.6
Apartment	41	73.2	26.8
Townhouse/Condo	39	84.6	15.4

Table B519. Registered Voter by Income.

Income	n	Registered	Not Registered
0-\$45,000	53	69.8	30.2
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	90.3	9.7
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	94.6	5.4
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	93.8	6.3
Over \$150,000	68	94.1	5.9

Table B520. Registered Voter by Years in Cary.

Years in Cary	n	Registered	Not Registered
0-1	16	81.3	18.8
2-5	68	82.4	17.6
6-10	100	84.0	16.0
Over 10	204	94.1	5.9
Native	9	100.0	0.0

Voted in 2013 Local Elections Crosstabulations

**Table B521. Voted in 2013 Local Elections
by Age.**

Age	n	Voter	Nonvoter
18-25	35	40.0	60.0
26-55	254	53.9	46.1
56-65	58	72.4	27.6
Over 65	46	76.1	23.9

**Table B522. Voted in 2013 Local Elections
by Education.**

Education	n	Voter	Nonvoter
HS/Some College	158	51.9	48.1
College Degree	217	62.7	37.3
PhD/JD/MD	19	57.9	42.1

**Table B523. Voted in 2013 Local Elections
by Housing Type.**

Housing	n	Voter	Nonvoter
Single Family	313	60.7	39.3
Apartment	41	48.8	51.2
Townhouse/Condo	39	53.8	46.2

**Table B524. Voted in 2013 Local Elections
by Income.**

Income	n	Voter	Nonvoter
0-\$45,000	53	39.6	60.4
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	61.3	38.7
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	62.5	37.5
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	67.5	32.5
Over \$150,000	68	50.0	50.0

**Table B525. Voted in 2013 Local Elections
by Years in Cary.**

Years in Cary	n	Voter	Nonvoter
0-1	16	37.5	62.5
2-5	68	45.6	54.4
6-10	100	57.0	43.0
Over 10	203	64.5	35.5
Native	9	66.7	33.3

Years in Cary Crosstabulations

Table B526. Years in Cary by Age.

Age	n	0-1	2-5	6-10	Over 10	Native
18-25	35	8.6	22.9	22.9	42.9	2.9
26-55	256	3.9	19.9	31.3	43.0	2.0
56-65	58	3.4	5.2	12.1	79.3	0.0
Over 65	46	2.2	10.9	13.0	69.6	4.3

Table B527. Years in Cary by Education.

Education	n	0-1	2-5	6-10	Over 10	Native
HS/Some College	157	5.1	16.6	26.8	46.5	5.1
College Degree	218	3.7	17.4	23.9	54.6	0.5
PhD/JD/MD	19	0.0	15.8	26.3	57.9	0.0

Table B528. Years in Cary by Gender.

Gender	n	0-1	2-5	6-10	Over 10	Native
Male	185	2.7	19.5	24.9	51.4	1.6
Female	214	5.1	15.4	25.7	50.9	2.8

Table B529. Years in Cary by Housing Type.

Housing	n	0-1	2-5	6-10	Over 10	Native
Single Family	315	2.2	13.7	23.2	58.7	2.2
Apartment	42	14.3	40.5	28.6	14.3	2.4
Townhouse/Condo	39	7.7	23.1	35.9	30.8	2.6

Table B530. Years in Cary by Income.

Income	n	0-1	2-5	6-10	Over 10	Native
0-\$45,000	52	9.6	21.2	26.9	38.5	3.8
\$45,001-\$75,000	62	3.2	16.1	27.4	50.0	3.2
\$75,001-\$100,000	56	0.0	25.0	19.6	50.0	5.4
\$100,001-\$150,000	80	3.8	11.3	25.0	58.8	1.3
Over \$150,000	68	0.0	14.7	30.9	52.9	1.5

Table B531. Years in Cary by Race.

Race	n	0-1	2-5	6-10	Over 10	Native
Caucasian	288	4.5	13.5	21.9	58.3	1.7
Asian	39	0.0	17.9	41.0	35.9	5.1
African-American	30	6.7	30.0	16.7	40.0	6.7
Hispanic	22	0.0	36.4	50.0	13.6	0.0
Other	7	14.3	42.9	28.6	14.3	0.0

Table B532. Years in Cary by Zip Code.

Zip Code	n	0-1	2-5	6-10	Over 10	Native
27511	93	4.3	11.8	21.5	59.1	3.2
27513	114	4.4	12.3	20.2	58.8	4.4
27518	66	3.0	16.7	18.2	62.1	0.0
27519	112	3.6	27.7	35.7	32.1	0.9

Appendix C

Town Government Staff Interaction

14. Town Government Staff – Please tell us specifically what you recall about this interaction (for responses below 5).
- Poor response time.
 - Wanted a street light installed.
 - Unable to give the answer I need.
 - Problems with getting permit to build a deck.
 - All work related.
 - The guy was a jerk about cutting down a tree that was blocking views. Tree being cut down was fine, but the Town worker was not at all friendly.
 - Person was not at all knowledgeable.
 - Employee refused to let me into recycling location for no reason. I have been there several times and have never had a problem with workers letting me in. She has denied me twice.
 - While the Town was maintaining a road, a rock hit my grandmother's window and broke it. The Town would do nothing about it.
 - The Police do not do community outreach. They are trash.

Appendix D

Streets/Roads That Need Attention

6. Can you provide specific examples of streets and roads (# of times mentioned) that need more attention (for responses below 5)?
- Maynard Road (10) – potholes, rough pavement
 - Cary Parkway (9) – potholes, uneven pavement
 - High House Road (5) – potholes, construction
 - Chatham Street (3) – potholes
 - Kildaire Farm Road (3) – potholes
 - Walnut Street (3) – slow repaving, rough pavement
 - Adderley Street (2) – potholes
 - Carpenter Road (2) – potholes, rough pavement
 - Davis Drive (2) – needs a traffic light (Macarthur Park), construction
 - Morrisville Parkway (2) – potholes, rough pavement
 - Roads in general (2) – potholes and cracks
 - Old Apex Road – potholes, rough pavement
 - Dixon Avenue – rough pavement
 - Evans Road – rough pavement, poor markings
 - Gentlewoods Drive – pavement never repaired after water line break
 - Glasgow Road – uneven pavement
 - Harrison Road – rough pavement
 - Jenks Carpenter Road – rough pavement
 - North Salem Street – potholes
 - Norwell Avenue – rough pavement
 - Old part of Cary – potholes
 - Powers Ferry Road – potholes
 - Preston – potholes, rough pavement

Appendix E

Public Areas That Need Attention

5. Can you provide specific examples of public areas that need more attention (for responses below 5)?
 - Stone Creek Village – construction
 - Penny – median and curbs need to be painted so it is easier to see
 - US 1 – landscaping
 - Downtown Cary – too many accidents
 - Maynard – concrete divider flattened a tire
 - Lochmere subdivision – need more curbside sweeping

Appendix F

Town Parks & Recreation or Cultural Program Participation

21. Please tell me which program (# of comments) you or a member of your household most frequently participated in and where?

- Art and art class (19)
Location: Cary Arts Center, Bond Park
- Camps (12)
Location: Bond Park, Mill Park, Community Center, Hemlock Bluffs, Paige Walker, Herb Young
- Festivals/events (11)
Location: Koka Booth, Community Center, Bond Park, Cary Art Center, numerous locations
- Baseball/T-Ball (9)
Location: Bond Park, numerous locations
- Basketball (9)
Location: Community Center, numerous locations
- Lazy Daze (9)
Location: Downtown, Bond Park
- Sports/athletics (9)
Location: Bond Park, Community Center, USA Complex, numerous locations
- Senior citizen activities (7)
Location: Senior Center
- Concerts/movies (4)
Location: Koka Booth, Bond Park, Cary Art Center
- Plays (4)
Location: Koka Booth, Cary Arts Center
- Softball (4)
Location: Bond Park, Annie Jones Park, numerous locations
- Christmas Festival (3)
Location: Bond Park, Community Center
- Spring Daze (3)
Location: Bond Park
- Youth sports/activities (3)
Location: Community Center, Bond Park
- Classes (2)
Location: Community Center, numerous locations
- Dance/ballet (2)
Location: Downtown, Bond Park
- Tennis (2)
Location: Cary Tennis Center
- YMCA
Location: Downtown
- Football
Location: Cary Academy
- 5K Race
Location: Downtown
- Student volunteer - Parks
Location: High House, Bond Park
- Sertoma Series
Location: Bond Park

- Sledding
Location: Bond Park
- Pickleball
Location: Bond Park
- Leadership
Location: Bond Park
- Safety Town
Location: Community Center
- Nature Center
Location: Stevens Nature Center
- Skating
Location: Numerous locations
- Swim meet
Location: Numerous locations

Appendix G

Reasons for Low Ratings (Below 3) for Quality of Life in Cary

2. Please tell us which aspects of the quality of life in Cary seem worse?
 - Increased traffic.
 - School busing problems and not controlling growth.
 - Growth increases, but the roads, jobs, businesses do not improve with growth.
 - The Town is trying to be something it is not.
 - Overpopulation.
 - Crime.
 - Services provided are not as good. Cary has lost focus on its citizens.
 - Too much development. Cary is more of a family area and needs to stay that way.
 - Overdevelopment and traffic.
 - Police don't do their jobs.
 - Too much development, money being wasted on bad stuff like signs. Cary needs to keep some of its history.
 - Schools and education.
 - Trying to price people out – housing costs are too high.
 - Growth and development are getting out of control.
 - Building on Davis and High House is unreal.
 - Cutting down trees and building too many buildings.
 - The traffic that occurs because of construction at High House and Davis.
 - Not controlling growth and development.
 - Too crowded – causing high traffic volume.
 - Out of control construction on Davis Drive and High House.
 - Overgrowth and Cary is not keeping up with it.

Appendix H

Most Important Issue Facing the Town

3. What do you feel is the one most important issue facing the Town of Cary? (# of comments)
- Growth/managing growth. (93)
 - None/No issues/can't think of anything. (54)
 - Traffic. (53)
 - Schools. (41)
 - Overdevelopment. (35)
 - Not sure. (26)
 - Overpopulation. (23)
 - Streets/roads. (23)
 - Downtown revitalization. (18)
 - High taxes. (14)
 - Crime. (12)
 - Budget/spending. (10)
 - Infrastructure. (7)
 - Public transportation. (5)
 - Housing. (4)
 - Too many multi-family housing units. (4)
 - Town is boring/more entertainment. (4)
 - Housing density. (3)
 - Losing Cary's charm/small town feel. (3)
 - Water supply or quality. (3)
 - Affordable housing. (3)
 - Poor traffic circles/patterns. (3)
 - Downtown parking. (2)
 - Economy. (2)
 - Jobs/unemployment. (2)
 - More activities for kids/teens. (2)
 - Need sidewalks. (2)
 - Traffic lights. (2)
 - Saving the trees.
 - Cost of living.
 - Water rates.
 - Land use.
 - Drug problem.
 - Government.
 - Lake Jordan should not have motor boats where our water comes from.
 - Police should not target young adults.
 - Need more recycling options to go green.
 - Maintaining good customer service.
 - The people who have been elected – Wake County School Board.
 - Cell phone towers.
 - Electronic signs are a waste of money.
 - Need a swimming pool in town for kids.
 - Homeowners association doesn't do anything about trucks and trailers in the yard. It looks like trash and blocks driveway and services.
 - Privacy of personal information.

- Cary is perfect if it stays the way it is.
- Overly strict zoning has become a big issue.
- Blind spots from shrubbery on roadsides.
- Parking downtown and make it more people friendly.
- Planning future developments – focusing on improving the value of homes in the area instead of overpopulation. Every place is crowded such as YMCA.
- City borders are very bad. You cannot really tell people where you live without confusion – due to Apex address in the Town of Cary.
- Should be able to turn left everywhere, get rid of left turn regulations.
- Hard to get across Town due to train crossing. Spend less money on art and focus on a way to go under the railroad to stop blocking traffic. It is only going to get worse.
- Planning and development of the area.
- I am legally blind and I do not feel the Town makes information easily available for me. I would like to go to more events around Town but miss out because I am unaware.
- Greenway connections – connect with Morrisville.
- Pollution – Lake Crabtree, you can't eat the fish.
- Relax the restrictions on signage throughout Cary. It hurts small business throughout the area.
- Allowing too much into Cary – Dave & Busters at the mall and strip joint. Bringing negative people into the area.
- Maintaining and staying in-tune for what's best for the Town.
- Police pull people over for petty things like vanity license plate covers. The police are parking empty police cars in parking lots to give a false sense of security.
- More outreach in diversity.
- Too many stoplights – need to get rid of some and stop putting up more.
- Mayor Weinbrecht did not do a good job.
- Slow with development, fast with growth.
- Doing great with new developments.
- Department of Transportation. There are dangerous roads, bad lines, signs, no lighting, and bad curves.

Appendix I

Well Informed on Town Government Aspects Services, Projects, Issues, and Programs That Come to Mind

26. Overall, how well informed do you feel about Town government services, projects, issues, and programs affecting you? What specific projects, activities, or issues came to mind why you decided on that rating? (Rating)
- Nothing, very well informed. (Rated 8)
 - Walnut Street, schools. (Rated 5)
 - Schools. (Rated 5)
 - Redevelopment plan. (Rated 7)
 - More information in general. (Rated 3)
 - Not sure what is going on. It doesn't seem very public. (Rated 4)
 - For those who don't seek it, it's not openly publicized well. (Rate 2)
 - I don't really look for information. (Rated 4)
 - If I didn't receive the newspaper, then I would have not known about the work going on. (Rated 4)
 - More emails. (Rated 3)
 - Parks & Recreation doing a good job of bringing in different things. (Rated 7)
 - Cary Art Center – script is very ugly. Need more public opinion. (Rated 7)
 - There are many ways to convey information. (Rated 7)
 - I have issues with building going on down the street – I felt it was what the government wanted not citizens. (Rated 6)
 - BUD. (Rated 7)
 - Not informed because I have not been looking at the information. (Rated 5)
 - I do not seek out information. (Rated 4)
 - Personal lack of being informed. No fault of the Town. Just don't keep up with the local news and information. (Rated 3)
 - I just don't look at the information available. Busy with school and work. (Rated 3)
 - I don't feel information is put out for residents to easily find. I never see or hear anything about Cary. (Rated 1)
 - Just don't feel informed. (Rated 3)
 - I don't feel enough information is provided. (Rated 5)
 - I don't feel informed due to lack of information provided to me. (Rated 3)
 - I don't feel informed due to my lack of keeping myself informed. (Rated 3)
 - I don't keep up with it, it is my own fault. (Rated 2)
 - I do not keep up with information. (Rated 1)
 - I never know about events or programs in Cary, need better or more advertisement. (Rated 3)
 - I don't feel at all informed, don't know of any Town government information. (Rated 3)
 - Just not very well informed politically. (Rated 3)
 - Head start and trying to make Cary look like Apex. (Rated 1)
 - Too busy. (Rated 2)
 - Husband is involved with Town. (Rated 8)
 - Cary town center and Maynard. (Rated 2)
 - I do not seek out information. (Rated 3)
 - I just don't seek out information. It is not the Town's fault. I do not read the flyers about issues. (Rated 3)
 - I might see a sign on the side of the road for a hearing or meeting that I had never heard about. (Rated 3)
 - I just don't take time to inform myself. (Rated 1)

- BUD and newspaper – not in-depth enough. (Rated 4)
- I miss out on a lot; I find out after the fact. (Rated 4)
- Cultural Center refurbishing – I only know because I drive through the area. (Rated 4)
- Geo-policing – neighborhood schools and Cary need to be a voice. (Rated 4)
- I'm not into that. (Rated 3)
- It is my own fault I don't keep up with it – too busy. (Rated 3)
- I have to seek out information. (Rated 3)
- I just don't get involved with this stuff. (Rated 3)
- BUD and that is it. (Rated 3)
- Things not available. (Rated 3)
- I have a busy schedule. (Rated 3)
- I don't seek it out. (Rated 3)
- I don't find much in the Cary paper. (Rated 3)
- I don't look. (Rated 3)
- I can't put my finger on the actual event. (Rated 3)
- I don't pay much attention. (Rated 3)
- I don't look for the information. (Rated 2)
- I am too busy; my own fault I am not informed. (Rated 2)
- I do not seek it out. (Rated 2)
- I do not receive papers or have the internet. (Rated 2)
- I do not look into anything. (Rated 2)
- I have been having issues lately; my husband is sick. (Rated 1)
- Mail out programs offered. (Rated 1)
- I don't track anything. (Rated 1)
- Don't have cable. (Rated 1)
- I don't look for information. (Rated 1)
- Need more of it in the paper – more details like old and new, who was arrested, etc., newsletters. (Rated 1)
- I don't know about anything; I never see information about what's going on around the Town. (Rated 1)

Appendix J

Satisfaction With Making Information Available to Citizens Services, Projects, Issues, and Programs That Come to Mind

27. How satisfied are you with the Town of Cary making information available to citizens about important Town services, projects, issues, and programs? What specific projects, activities, or issues came to mind why you decided on that rating? (Rating)
- Website, cable. (Rated 7)
 - Timing. (Rated 7)
 - Website not user friendly. (Rated 1)
 - Hard to find planning information. (Rated 8)
 - Hard to find information – would like flyers about each. (Rated 4)
 - Pretty sure its there, just not sure where. (Rated 4)
 - I use the website. Find a way to post events publicly like signs along the road. (Rated 7)
 - You really have to hunt for the information. (Rated 4)
 - If I had not read the newspaper, then I would not have known about the changes in trying to improve recycling and the general public wouldn't know. (Rated 4)
 - Events and Cary Art Center, paving, taxes issues, and overall issues with Town Council decisions. (Rated 3)
 - Need more on recreation. (Rated 7)
 - Controversy. (Rated 7)
 - Not really seen enough, but have not had the chance. (Rated 5)
 - Bad marketing, it needs more pop. Advertise more with posters or casual signs throughout public areas. (Rated 1)
 - More brochures. (Rated 5)
 - Should keep information updated on Facebook and send more informational brochures/flyers out with mailings. (Rated 5)
 - Development of the area. (Rated 8)
 - Lack of information about programs. (Rated 4)
 - I do not know where to find information. (Rated 3)
 - Send out more information via postal mail. (Rated 4)
 - I would like to see more advertisements for business downtown to bring more people to the downtown area and keep businesses in business. (Rated 5)
 - I use to get regular mailings that my husband would read to me (legally blind) and now I get nothing and I don't know of anything going on in Cary unless I hear from someone else. (Rated 2)
 - I do not see very much Town information. (Rated 1)
 - I never see anything that would let me know about something going on in the area. (Rated 1)
 - The news needs to elaborate on Town Council meetings. (Rated 1)
 - I just can't think of any currently. (Rated 4)
 - Should send out post cards for proposed projects or issues. (Rated 3)

Appendix K

Satisfaction With Opportunities to Participate in Decision Making Services, Projects, Issues, and Programs That Come to Mind

28. How satisfied are you with the opportunities the Town gives you to participate in the decision-making process. What specific projects, activities, or issues came to mind why you decided on that rating? (Rating)
- Forums – vision for the future. (Rated 6)
 - I know they hold public meetings when they are going to implement new changes – if you don't read the newspaper, you wouldn't know. (Rated 7)
 - When they are voting on taxes, approving programs and projects. (Rated 3)
 - Roads. (Rated 6)
 - Making decisions without really thinking of the Town members. (Rated 1)
 - Never tried. (Rated 5)
 - I do not know of any opportunities. (Rated 1)
 - I don't know of opportunities. (Rated 3)
 - No assisted living areas anymore. Putting up hotels and fountains instead of necessities. (Rated 1)
 - Bradford development – the fact that the Town goes with the developer not the citizens. (Rated 7)
 - The Town makes up their minds before they ever ask for the resident's feelings or their opinions. (Rated 3)
 - I know of the opportunities available, but the opinion of citizens is not actually listened to – the Town has already made the decision prior to asking citizens. (Rated 5)
 - Don't know of any. (Rated 3)
 - Town Council doesn't care – makes decisions before ever speaking with residents. (Rated 1)
 - I am not aware of opportunities. (Rated 1)
 - Didn't know. (Rated 3)
 - Need more. (Rated 1)
 - The Town does what they want. (Rated 5)
 - Downtown. (Rated 3)

Appendix L

Specific Actions the Town Could Take to Improve Satisfaction with Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Issues

12. Could you please tell us specific actions the Town could take to make you more satisfied with parks, recreation, and cultural resources?
- Need a large dog park area.
 - Need mountain bike outlets.
 - Camps should be a full day not half day for working families.
 - Need more dog parks.
 - Need a community swimming pool – the YMCA is too far away.
 - Dog parks need to be watched more. People do not keep an eye on their pets and there is not enough shade.
 - Spending too much on parks and greenways.
 - Great dog park, but should have a webcam for police to keep an eye out. Webcam accessible from Cary website so others can see also.
 - Need more parks in the newer areas.
 - Events, recreational children's programs are five times more expensive than surrounding areas. Need to make prices more reasonable so lower income families can also participate. Children's football at \$360 a season is too much.
 - Cary should have a magazine like Play More the Durham magazine.
 - Keep more parks, save mature trees and keep the area green. Homeowners should not be allowed to cut down trees without the Town's permission.
 - I do not agree that you should have to pay to use dog parks.
 - Make changes considering those who make less money.

Appendix M

Specific Actions the Town Could Take to Improve Satisfaction with Environmental Protection

7. Could you please tell us specific actions the Town could take to make you more satisfied with the Town is doing with environmental protection?
- Manage erosion.
 - Too restrictive with recycling.
 - I would like to see them push recycling more.
 - I am really concerned about the drinking water.
 - Black Creek yard runoff.
 - Pretty sure they don't collect recycling anymore at my house.
 - Limit development.
 - More trees.
 - Town Council has to take the citizen's wishes over the developers, including the Planning Board.
 - Business complexes should have recycling that does not cost anything or as much. I own a company of 20+ people and I am an avid recycler.
 - Waste drop off is not large enough for the amount of citizens in Cary.
 - My apartment does not do recycling. Recycling should be made available everywhere. Water is way overpriced in Cary.
 - Jordan Lake is not good drinking water – dogs have passed away.
 - Recycle items that don't get picked up should not be left to blow all over town.
 - Working ahead rather than waiting for problems – work year-round.
 - Should have different bins for recycling.

Appendix N

Specific Actions the Town Could Take to be More Effective with Keeping Cary the Best Place to Live, Work, and Raise a Family

8. 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?
- They are too political.
 - Council has jaded views.
 - Clearing too much land, overdevelopment, too much growth.
 - Be more cooperative, need to be more bipartisan.
 - Schooling due to overcrowding, need to make education a priority.
 - Need more schools.
 - Stop spending all the money on rich neighborhoods.
 - Budgeting is a big issue. Don't waste tax money on useless things.
 - More safety to downtown area, more parking and lighting.
 - I don't feel they keep residents informed enough.
 - Overcrowding in the area. You cannot enjoy family outings due to overcrowding. Cary cannot handle all of the people coming in.
 - Schools have no real security. Children need to be looked after better.
 - Where they spend the money.
 - They do what makes the Town look good but does not do what works for the residents.
 - Instead of using money for building hotels and movie theaters, use it to purchase land for future public use.

Appendix O

Specific Actions the Town Could Take to Improve Satisfaction with Transportation

10. Could you please tell us specific actions the Town could take to make you more satisfied with transportation?

- Need more bike lanes.
- Bike lanes are not safe.
- Need more jogging lanes.
- Need more sidewalks.
- I do not like blinking/flashing lights for turning traffic.
- With growth increasing, traffic is getting worse. Lanes need to be widened or lights need to function to allow a large amount of traffic flow with limited stopping.
- Pamlico and Maynard need a traffic light.
- I do not like the roundabouts, I need more information on transportation.
- Bike lanes that are being added are awful (Academy).
- Need to work faster, I don't like the roundabouts.
- Traffic in and out of high schools – Green Hope.
- Need more bike lanes.
- It is the improvements I don't like – roundabouts.
- Traffic lights – straight lights go first rather than left. Seem to catch all the red lights.
- Better use of money on planning. The money could be used on roads such as Preston and Crossroads. The money spent on two roundabouts was not necessary.
- Roads can't handle the growth and several lights need to be synchronized.
- C-Tran should fund itself and bike lanes are not a big deal.
- Need better synchronization of lights.
- Need more sidewalks so kids do not have to cross main high traffic areas to get to downtown.
- More marked bike lanes, larger bike areas, and safer bike areas. I am not familiar with bus service, you never hear about it.
- Traffic flow due to overgrowth.
- Bike lanes are not safe.
- Keep the roads up to the population. Roads have become overcrowded.
- Synchronize traffic lights.
- More bike lanes are needed throughout Cary.
- No advertisement about bus service. I have lived in Cary 33 years and I still know very little about C-Tran.
- Davis Drive needs to be widened.
- Railroad blocks traffic from getting across Town in a decent amount of time. Need to raise the rail line for through traffic or go underground.
- Bike trails have gone overboard.
- More stops for C-Tran so people do not have to walk so much between stops.
- More bike lanes and transportation in the newer areas.
- More bike lanes in my area (27519). I was not aware the Town was working on these transportation efforts.
- Bikes should not be allowed on parkways, it slows traffic.
- C-Tran schedule full for pickups when I call to schedule a pickup. I rely on C-Tran because I am blind.
- Bike lanes needed.
- Need to connect all greenways to help promote healthy living.

- Cary is amazing and I have nothing negative to say other than to make sure to keep up with widening roads to handle traffic.
- Synchronizing traffic lights better and more C-Tran buses.
- Lanes need to be doubled because of all the growth.
- I don't care for roundabouts.
- Major streets need to be widened.
- Blinking yellow lights are problems. There is not enough education on how they work.
- Outdated transportation systems – need more street lights at night, more dangerous curve signs, lights need to be synchronized so you are not waiting at a light for 10 minutes. Transportation needs a lot of work.
- Don't see any real public transportation available in Cary.
- Need more bike lanes in Town.

Appendix P

Specific Actions the Town Could Take to Improve Satisfaction with Planning and Development

11. Could you please tell us specific actions the Town could take to make you more satisfied with planning and development?
- Timing.
 - They don't consider everything as the population grows, like schools and traffic.
 - Reduce the number of apartments to reduce the amount of people. More people bring in more money but also cost for developing.
 - The Town is growing too quickly.
 - Places are getting overdeveloped like Davis Drive.
 - Limit the amount of development.
 - As schools are added, traffic needs to be considered.
 - It takes a long time for things to get done.
 - Less apartments and more homes. The roads can't handle the traffic.
 - New construction on High House and Davis – it is already congested.
 - Crowded – the planning process is not sufficient.
 - I want to keep more greenways.
 - Roads can't handle the growth.
 - Way too fast growth, too many apartments.
 - The center median is a terrible idea. Traffic planning has not been well thought out.
 - Planning of the roads was not thought through very well.
 - Cary is now overgrown with multi-unit housing, over expanding. Cary use to have no debt seven or eight years ago and mostly family homes. Cary is getting out of control.
 - Roundabouts are a waste of money.
 - The roads cannot handle the growth.
 - Put in a parking deck instead of a three million dollar fountain.
 - I feel money is not properly being used for downtown revitalization. Need new planning and development.
 - Roads and traffic. Insufficient roads.
 - Not enough schools for high school students. Need to build schools to hold Cary's fast growth.
 - Tax money is being wasted on development instead of simply keeping up the Town. Schools are overcrowded. Children are not getting a proper education.
 - Take care of what is already in place. Stop adding more. Housing, schools, roads, water and sewer – none of these are able to handle the overdevelopment. No need for more housing or people.
 - Planning the traffic circles was a horrible idea – should not plan on using traffic circles anywhere else in Cary.
 - There are too many multi-use apartments/housing. Cary is looking overloaded. For example, Chapel Hill Road 54 – can't widen road and they are putting up a huge complex. Traffic can't handle this.
 - Need to slow growth, schools are overcrowded.
 - Schools cannot handle growth. Need to make sure school overcrowding is included in the planning.
 - Too much building, leave more green area and trees.
 - Empty buildings that could be used as a crisis center. Also immigration.
 - Growing too fast.
 - Not using money wisely.

- Too much growth – only so much can fit in a space.
- Killing open space to build malls.
- Stop cramming people into small spaces. It is taking away from the Town's character.
- Because of huge construction that doesn't fit in with the community.
- Too political – growth is such a big problem.
- Davis and High House development is not nice.
- They need a new planner. It looks like they have no plans and are just winging it.

Appendix Q

Specific Actions the Town Could Take to Improve Satisfaction with Downtown Revitalization

9. Could you please tell us specific actions the Town could take to make you more satisfied with downtown revitalization?
- No parking. (10)
 - Add a parking deck. (2)
 - Poor timing and undefined execution.
 - Spending too much money and parking.
 - Too restrictive changes do not include the common folks.
 - They need a large central draw of attention and then additional places to go along with it.
 - Keep it small with things of interest.
 - Would like to see more fine dining.
 - Way too much change – ideas keep changing.
 - Not doing as much as they said.
 - Parking problems and need more to do.
 - Should have started 10 years ago, need to be like Apex.
 - Ideas are great.
 - Put more emphasis on the Art Museum.
 - Wasting money on old houses to use as shops. For example - \$750,000 with \$2,000 rent.
 - Be more cost conscious, spending a lot of money downtown.
 - This is the first I have heard of revitalization.
 - Restaurants open later for dinners would be better.
 - Not much going on downtown, I go to Raleigh. I hope Cary keeps downtown calm and family-friendly.
 - Bad road designs – one starts and just becomes another one. It makes no sense.
 - Nothing really, just do not see much.
 - Spending too much to create something that never existed.
 - Money is not being spent wisely on downtown.
 - No parking prevents visits to downtown. It has become a nightmare. Stop putting attention on things that are a waste of taxpayer's money. Putting in a theater with no parking.
 - Downtown area needs better planning. Very poor revitalization, nothing to draw people downtown.
 - I do not see anything entertaining downtown. It looks dull and no action. Need some life brought into it.
 - More accessibility, horrible parking – parking two blocks away from theater is the worst idea.
 - Speed things up – it is taking too long.
 - Get rid of the ugly statues downtown, they do not add any beauty to the area. They are tasteless.
 - Forcing small business out, keep them in place.
 - Downtown needs to keep its historical look and businesses. Do not add buildings that overshadow old town buildings. Downtown is losing its old town feel.
 - Traffic circles are a horrible idea.
 - Can't say that I see anything about downtown being vibrant. It definitely needs a lot of work with more shops and entertainment.
 - I live half mile from downtown and I worry this may affect my living. I also worry the current small businesses in downtown will be shut down.
 - Not impressive. Needs more events and life brought to the area.
 - Roundabout are a waste of money.

- They are doing a great job but it needs parking. With young children is it hard to have to walk long distances with how spread out the downtown area is.
- Spent too much money – nothing has been provided for area.
- Nothing to do or compare to Raleigh.
- Do without hotels and movie theater – more unique ideas.
- Moving too slow – Apex is far greater.
- There is a large investment there for things that are not necessary. Limit large buildings.
- Sidewalks are horrible.
- Hotel is going to cause too much traffic. Should put a park in instead. Traffic would be hard for walking and having so many strangers makes us feel unsafe.
- They are taking way too long in this process – need to take some pointers from downtown Apex.

Appendix R

What Drew Respondent to Visit Downtown

24. What drew you to visit downtown in the last year?

- Shops/shopping. (74)
- Restaurants. (65)
- Visiting the area/pleasure. (48)
- Art/Art Center. (43)
- Library. (35)
- Business/work. (35)
- Driving/passing through. (32)
- Post Office. (17)
- Drug store/Ashworth. (14)
- Lazy Daze. (13)
- Church. (11)
- Events. (11)
- Live around the area. (11)
- Festivals. (10)
- Parades/Christmas parade. (8)
- Bakery. (6)
- Quaint/historic feel. (6)
- Concerts. (5)
- Salon/hair cut. (3)
- Town government. (3)
- Train station. (3)
- Tree lighting. (3)
- Concerts. (2)
- Farmer's Market. (2)
- Sports. (2)
- Jewelry store.
- Doctor's office.
- Community Center.
- Theater.
- Everything.
- Wine bar.
- Fair.
- Music lessons.
- Paint store.
- Recycling.
- Just moved here, no time yet.
- Coffee shop.
- Vendor at holiday shop during Christmas.
- Volunteering.
- Bus station.
- Cary Creative Center.
- Everything, I love downtown, doing a great job.
- Campaign.
- Classes.

Appendix S

Why Respondent Did Not Visit Downtown Last Year

24. Why did you not visit downtown in the last year?

- No interest/don't like it. (16)
- Schedule/work/too busy. (12)
- Nothing down there. (9)
- No reason. (8)
- No parking. (6)
- Go to Raleigh downtown. (4)
- New to area and have not had a chance to check out downtown area. (3)
- Out of the way. (2)
- Retired and elderly.
- There is a mall near my house.
- I don't drive.
- Restaurants are horrible.
- Not aware of revitalization but will be checking area out soon.
- I drive through and love what I see.
- Construction.
- Not familiar with downtown.
- I am closer to downtown Apex.
- I go to other places that offer more.

Appendix T

Amenities That Bring People Downtown - Other

25. Other?

- Parking is an issue. (13)
- Family events and activities. (6)
- Make it more like downtown Apex. (4)
- Recreation park. (3)
- Draw young people downtown/nightlife. (3)
- More events/street fairs. (3)
- New/bigger library. (3)
- Bakery. (2)
- Keep the older original businesses. (2)
- More handicap accessibility. (2)
- Movie theater. (2)
- Needs to be more like Apex. (2)
- Wine shop – there needs to be several new places not just one or two. All need to happen at once or places will go out of business during the process.
- I do not like the large bank that was added.
- There are so many other options rather than going downtown.
- There really isn't room for much. If they widened roads, it would take away from the historic part.
- Get rid of rentals.
- Not at an age to really do many things downtown. I prefer to stay closer to home.
- Whole Food store.
- Park should be a greenspace and no hotels. I heard hotels may be going up in park development.
- Tattoo shop.
- All great ways to draw a family downtown; I can't wait to see the changes.
- Downtown is for younger generation, seniors do not typically visit downtown. Nothing could draw me to downtown.
- Ice rink.
- All activities.
- Swimming pool and downtown park.
- All great ideas just nothing that would pull me to the downtown area. I work out of town and mostly go to other places for convenience.
- Dog park.
- Galaxy like place again. Bring unique attractions will bring more people in.
- Entertainment.
- Environmental space and more for teens.
- More cafes.
- Anything at all - shops.
- Community center and outdoor amphitheatre.
- All are great ideas just make sure the funding is prioritized.
- Drive-in theater and wine shop.
- Park – more green area not more buildings.
- All great ideas.
- Charity walks.
- Parking deck.
- Dunkin Donuts.

- Kid's museum.
- Need better advertising for events.
- Nothing would really bring me downtown, very busy.
- Less police.
- Keep it for small businesses.
- I live close to Apex.
- Too far for me.
- Plays.
- Free live music.
- Winery.
- Not attractive – dress it up for Christmas.
- Night life, comedy club.
- Antiques.
- Higher quality restaurants.
- Have festivals when it is cooler – not in July or August.
- There really is not a design for pedestrians.
- Art Center classes are too pricey – lower cost of activities.
- Cupcake shop.
- It seems centered on older people.
- Traffic needs to be fixed first.
- More open area.

Appendix U

Barriers to Recycling – Other

39. Other barriers to recycling that you face. Please specify?

- More examples of what is recyclable and what is not, can use photographs in brochure.
- Not sure on all the rules.
- Offer bins without a fee.
- Trash pickup should move to every other week and recycling to weekly.
- Have more recycled items than garbage. Need larger bin or weekly pickup.
- Too picky with bundling and what can be recycled.
- Recycling bin is too large and takes up too much storage room. I never use the large bin, only use smaller bin for easier transfer.
- Bundling sticks restrictions and certain recycling bags are not acceptable.
- None – everything is great.
- Recycling is too picky, should accept everything recyclable and supply multiple bins for separation if needed.
- Bundle sticks must be smaller than 4 inches or they will not take them. Also the same rules for recycling must apply to all.
- A larger bin or weekly pickups would be great.
- More recycling than garbage. More frequent pickups would be great for recycling and already have the largest bin.
- Not enough room in recycling with small bin and every other week pickup. I would like to have a bigger bin or weekly pickup.
- Recycling is amazing. I could not ask for better service.
- Recycling at my parent's home is great. I have not seen or heard of issues.
- Not picked up often enough.
- I am not sure which items can and cannot be recycled – need brochures sent out or list information on website with recycle information.
- None, recycling is very good.
- Either a larger bin or more frequent pickups.
- More pickups weekly.
- Need more frequent pickups.
- Weekly pickups – every other week is not enough for all the recycling my family does.
- More frequent pickups. My bin is always overflowing.
- I currently use the largest recycling bin and I still end up having to throw some recyclable items away due to lack of room. More frequent pickups would work best.
- Extra recycling bins cost too much.
- Apartment does not do curbside recycling. I bring mine to a recycling bin.
- I live in an apartment with no curbside pickup.
- Not knowing what the Town does with recycling items.
- Bin is large and it still gets too full.
- Having to drive the overflow to the landfill.
- I was not issued a bin.
- Pickup paint and oil from house.
- Have a make-up day for missed days when someone forgets to set the bin out – waiting two more weeks does not work.

Appendix V

Items to Recycle – Other

39. The Town doesn't recycle the kinds of things I want to recycle. Please specify?

- Batteries. (8)
- Plastic bags. (8)
- Styrofoam. (8)
- Electronics. (7)
- Cardboard boxes. (5)
- Egg cartons. (5)
- Paint. (5)
- Pizza boxes. (5)
- Light bulbs. (4)
- Yard waste. (3)
- Appliances. (2)
- Medications. (2)
- Televisions. (2)
- Motor oil. (2)
- Small metal objects. (2)
- Used cooking oil.
- Cellophane and plastic wrap.
- Compost.
- Certain plastics.
- Shredded paper.
- Grocery bags.
- Hazardous waste pickup.
- Very proud of recycling.
- Loose leaf paper.
- Milk cartons.
- Phone books.

Appendix W

Ideas to Help Recycle More

40. Other ideas for helping you recycle more. Please specify?

- Collect recycling twice a week.
- Would like to recycle cans.
- Specific drop off for hazardous waste.
- Knock on door when coming through.
- More recycling in public places and labeling it.
- Bundling sticks needs to be less restricted.
- Would prefer paperless bills.
- Too picky – plastic egg crates.
- Hazardous materials pickup day.
- Homeowners association will not allow composting.
- A list of recyclable items.
- Go back to the truck garbage guys and not robots.
- Offer recycling for business complexes – I own a business.
- Paying extra for recycling really pushes people not to recycle as much.
- Don't raise the cost.

Appendix X

Statistical Significance of the Town's Service Dimensions

Service Dimension	Sample Size 2012/2014	t-value	Statistical Significance
Town Government: Courteous	84/94	.17	No
Town Government: Professionalism	84/94	.21	No
Town Government: Promptness of Response	82/93	.01	No
Town Government: Helpful	83/94	.42	No
Town Government: Knowledgeable	83/94	.76	No
Town Government: Overall Quality of Customer Service	83/96	.95	No
Maintenance of Streets and Roads	402/402	.16	No
Cleanliness and Appearance of Parks	387/399	.95	No
Cleanliness and Appearance of Greenways	381/391	.22	No
Cleanliness and Appearance of Median/Roadsides	402/401	.31	No
Cleanliness and Appearance of Streets	401/402	.57	No
Police Department: Courteous	124/118	2.11	Yes
Police Department: Response Time	76/77	1.18	No
Police Department: Competence	116/118	1.97	No
Police Department: Fairness	117/117	2.12	Yes
Police Department: Problem Solving	110/116	2.49	Yes
Fire Department: Competence	40/46	.04	No
Fire Department: Courteous	41/46	.02	No
Fire Department: Fairness	40/46	.07	No
Fire Department: Problem Solving	36/46	.52	No
Fire Department: Response Time	24/37	1.54	No
Parks & Recreation: Ease of Registration	91/106	1.35	No
Parks & Recreation: Program Quality	91/110	1.35	No
Parks & Recreation: Facility Quality	96/111	.76	No
Parks & Recreation: Overall Experience	93/111	2.24	Yes
Parks & Recreation: Instructor Quality	73/82	1.64	No
Parks & Recreation: Cost or Amount of Fee	68/92	.71	No
Cary Overall as a Place to Live	400/402	.28	No
Quality of Life in Cary	398/398	.39	No
How Safe Do You Feel In Cary Overall	397/398	1.08	No
How Safe Do You Feel in Your Home Neighborhood	397/398	.21	No
How Safe Do You Feel in Public Places Around Cary	397/398	4.31	Yes
Cary Municipal Tax Rate	394/395	5.13	Yes
How Informed Respondents Feel About the Town Government	400/398	2.81	Yes
Satisfaction with Cary Making Information Available to Citizens	398/399	2.17	Yes
Satisfaction with Opportunities to Participate in Decision Making	395/396	3.64	Yes
Solid Waste Services: Curbside Christmas Tree Collection	158/176	.67	No
Solid Waste Services: Curbside Garbage Collection	375/380	.68	No
Solid Waste Services: Curbside Yard Waste Collection	297/320	.56	No
Solid Waste Services: Curbside Recycling Collection	374/373	1.26	No
Solid Waste Services: Curbside Loose Leaf Collection	277/310	1.37	No
Focus Area: Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources	394/401	2.62	Yes
Focus Area: Environmental Protection	396/400	.86	No
Focus Area: Best Place to Live, Work, and Raise a Family	389/402	3.50	Yes
Focus Area: Transportation	396/401	1.18	No
Focus Area: Planning & Development	392/401	1.82	No
Focus Area: Downtown Revitalization	390/402	1.70	No