

Fire Department

The performance of the Cary Fire Department was assessed with a set of six questions concerning contact with the Department and their service dimensions. These questions were only administered to those respondents who had contact with the Fire Department in the past two years. In this case, it was 11.8% (8.4% in 2008) or 47 respondents. The same 9-point grading scale from very poor (1) to excellent (9) was used to rate their performance.

The results shown in Tables 20-24 (placed in descending order of ratings) indicate that the Fire Department continues to have superior ratings with all dimensions earning a grade of A+ with the exception of *response time* which earned an A. There was a large mean increase this year for *courteous* and the grade improved from A to A+. The grades for *fairness*, *problem solving*, and *competence* remained unchanged at the A+ level. The only concern is the decrease in mean for *response time* from 8.87 to 8.61 and the resulting decline in grade from A+ to A. Overall, the Fire Department had the highest marks for any department with four A+ grades and one grade of A. However, the decline in *response time* is an area to monitor in the future.

Table 20. Fire Department: Courteous.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
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	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
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	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
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: Competence.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
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 24. Fire Department: Response Time.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
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, and years in Cary. The breakdowns for contact with the Fire Department are shown in Tables B127-B133 in Appendix B. They indicate the highest levels of contact (in order) with the Fire Department were for townhouse/condo dwellers (21.1%), \$70,001-\$100,000 income level (19.7%), and 56-65 age level (19.0%). The lowest levels of

contact were for Hispanics (0.0%), \$20,001-\$30,000 (4.3%), and Asians (4.8%).

Crosstabulations for the 5 service dimensions are shown in Tables B134-B168. The means were very high and consistent across the subgroups for *courteous* (B134-B140), *fairness* (B141-B147), *problem solving* (B148-B154), *competence* (B155-B161), and *response time* (B162-B168). There were only two marks not in the A range. These were a B given by 6-10 year residents and a B+ given by over \$100,000 income level for *response time*. However, the sample size was only 6 and 10, respectively.