

## Cleanliness and Appearance of Public Areas

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

The results shown in Tables 10-13 (placed in descending order by ratings) indicated the respondents were satisfied with the cleanliness and appearance of the Town's public areas. The grades have improved for all public areas examined in the survey. The cleanliness and appearance of *parks* earned the highest mark of A- (Table 10). In addition, the grade for cleanliness and appearance of *greenways* improved from B to B+ this year (Table 11). The cleanliness and appearance of *streets* and *median/roadsides* both earned grades of B improving from B- in 2006 (Tables 12 and 13). Overall, the means increased for cleanliness and appearance of *parks*, *greenways*, *streets*, and *median/roadsides* and the grades improved for all four of these public areas. The means also represent the highest earned to date for these public areas.

**Table 10. Cleanliness and Appearance of Parks.**

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

**Table 11. Cleanliness and Appearance of Greenways.**

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

**Table 12. Cleanliness and Appearance of Streets.**

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

**Table 13. Cleanliness and Appearance of Median/Roadsides.**

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

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

### Public Areas Crosstabulations

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