



Town of Carrboro

Town Hall
301 W. Main St.
Carrboro, NC 27510

Meeting Agenda Board of Aldermen



Tuesday, January 22, 2019

7:00 PM

Board Chambers - Room 110

7:00-7:05

A. POETRY READING, RESOLUTIONS, PROCLAMATIONS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

7:05-7:10

B. ANNOUNCEMENT OF UPCOMING MEETINGS

7:10-7:15

C. REQUESTS FROM VISITORS AND SPEAKERS FROM THE FLOOR

7:15-7:25

D. CONSENT AGENDA

1. [19-36](#) Approval of January 8, 2019 Meeting Minutes
2. [19-33](#) Hurricane Florence Public Assistance Program.
PURPOSE: The purpose is to request permission from the Board of Aldermen for staff to proceed with the application process for federal funding through Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for damages resulting from Hurricane Florence.

Attachments: [SAA -Internal- DR-4393- Hurricane Florence \(003\)](#)

E. PUBLIC HEARING

7:25-7:40

1. [19-30](#) Public Hearing on a Land Use Ordinance Amendment Relating to Signage
- PURPOSE:** The purpose of this agenda item is for the Board of Aldermen to consider a text amendment to the Land Use Ordinance regarding signs for places of worship. A draft ordinance has been prepared. The Board of Aldermen must receive public input before reaching a decision on an amendment to the LUO.
- Attachments:** [Attachment A - Consistency Resolution-Signs](#)
[Attachment B - Draft LUO Text Signs for Places of Worship_ 1-15-2019](#)
[Attachment C - Comments Combined](#)

7:40-8:00

2. [19-31](#) Public Hearing on a Land Use Ordinance Amendment Relating to Community or Regional Utility Facilities
- PURPOSE:** The purpose of this agenda item is for the Board of Aldermen to consider a text amendment to the Land Use Ordinance relating to Community or Regional Utility Facilities. A draft ordinance has been prepared. The Board must receive public input before reaching a decision on the draft ordinance.
- Attachments:** [Attachment A - Consistency Resolution-Community or Regional Utility Facility](#)
[Attachment B - Draft Ordinance](#)
[Attachment C - Application](#)
[Attachment D - Comments Combined](#)

F. OTHER MATTERS**8:00-8:30**

1. [19-35](#) Presentation of the 2018 Town of Carrboro Biennial Citizen Survey Report
- PURPOSE:** The purpose of this item is for the Board receive the Town of Carrboro's 2018 Biennial Citizen Survey report.
- Attachments:** [Carrboro 2018 Biennial Survey Report \(2\).pdf](#)

G. PUBLIC HEARING**8:30-8:50**

1. [19-37](#) Public Hearing for Community Input on Town Budget for Upcoming FY 2019-20

PURPOSE: This is a public hearing to receive comments from the public regarding the upcoming budget for the Town beginning July 1, 2019.

H. OTHER MATTERS

8:50-9:10

1. [19-34](#) A Resolution Setting the Date for the 2019 Legislative Dinner and Discussion of Legislative Issues for the 2019 Session of the General Assembly

PURPOSE: The purpose of this item is to request that the Board of Aldermen set the date for the 2019 Legislative Dinner and to facilitate a discussion of legislative issues to present to our local delegation at the breakfast. The delegation may be able to pursue some of the issues presented during the upcoming session of the NC General Assembly.

Attachments: [Attachment A - Resolution Setting the Legislative Dinner and the 2019 Legislative Priorities for the Carrboro Board of Aldermen](#)
[Attachment B - Final Short Session Legislative Priorities 2018.pdf](#)
[Attachment C - 2019-2020 NCLM Advocacy Goals.pdf](#)

I. MATTERS BY BOARD MEMBERS

J. MATTERS BY TOWN MANAGER

K. MATTERS BY TOWN ATTORNEY

L. MATTERS BY TOWN CLERK



Town of Carrboro

Town Hall
301 W. Main St.
Carrboro, NC 27510

Agenda Item Abstract

File Number: 19-36

Agenda Date: 1/22/2019

File Type: Agendas

In Control: Board of Aldermen

Version: 1

Approval of January 8, 2019 Meeting Minutes



Town of Carrboro

Town Hall
301 W. Main St.
Carrboro, NC 27510

Agenda Item Abstract

File Number: 19-33

Agenda Date: 1/22/2019

File Type: Agendas

In Control: Board of Aldermen

Version: 1

TITLE:

Hurricane Florence Public Assistance Program.

PURPOSE: The purpose is to request permission from the Board of Aldermen for staff to proceed with the application process for federal funding through Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for damages resulting from Hurricane Florence.

DEPARTMENT: Fire-Rescue Department and Public Works Department

CONTACT INFORMATION: Susanna Schmitt Williams, Fire Chief, 919.918.7349, Heather Holley, Stormwater Specialist, 919.918.7426

INFORMATION: The Town sustained approximately \$630,000 in costs relating to Hurricane Florence. These cost estimations consist of FEMA qualifying categories of debris removal, emergency protective measures pre storm, road damages, facility and equipment damages, park damages, and personnel rates.

The FEMA Public Assistance (PA) Program allows for municipalities to submit for federal funding related to damages and mitigation efforts sustained from Hurricane Florence. This application begins the process to qualify for reimbursement and potential hazard mitigation funds to strengthen and fortify the Town for future events.

The applications require the governing body (Board of Aldermen) to designate an agent to facilitate the application process for the Town and to signify desire to proceed through the FEMA PA process. Additionally, the Applicant Disaster Assistance Agreement denotes the Town will abide by the requirements of the funding program throughout the application process and, if awarded funds, will adhere to requirements of the program.

FISCAL & STAFF IMPACT: The fiscal impact to the Town of Carrboro is \$630,000 in unexpected and unfunded expenditures for Hurricane Florence disaster mitigation should the Town opt not to pursue applying for FEMA funding. Staff impact has included one hour meetings once a week since mid-December and a small percentage of worktime spent on the application process gathering information. Staff are able to document and track hours working on the application and will be able to submit for funding reimbursement for administrative expenses to include: meetings, assembling documents, and administrative costs to support the claim. There is a cap of administrative cost reimbursement at 5% of the estimated claim.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Board of Aldermen proceed with granting


Agenda Date: 1/22/2019

File Type:Agendas

In Control: Board of Aldermen

Version: 1

permission for staff to proceed with the FEMA Public Assistance Program application process for Hurricane Florence and sign the Designation of Applicant Agent and Applicant Disaster Assistance Agreement.



North Carolina Department of Public Safety Division of Emergency Management

APPLICANT: Town of Carrboro

DISASTER: Hurricane Florence

FEMA- 4393-DR-NC

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE CFDA# 97.036

STATE – APPLICANT DISASTER ASSISTANCE AGREEMENT

This Agreement made by and between the State of North Carolina, Dept. of Public Safety, Division of Emergency Management (“the State”) and Town of Carrboro (“the Applicant”) shall be effective on the date signed by the State and the Applicant. It shall apply to all disaster assistance funds provided by or through the State to the Applicant as a result of the disaster called **Hurricane Florence**, and pursuant to the Disaster Declaration made by the President of the United States numbered FEMA - 4393 - DR-NC.

The designated representative of the Applicant (Applicant’s Agent) certifies that:

1. He/She has legal authority to apply for assistance on behalf of the Applicant pursuant to a resolution duly adopted or passed by the Applicant’s governing body.
2. The Applicant shall provide all necessary financial and managerial resources to meet the terms and conditions of receiving Federal and State disaster grant assistance.
3. The applicant shall use disaster assistance funds solely for the purpose for which these funds are provided and as approved by the Governor’s Authorized Representative (GAR).
4. The Applicant is aware of and shall comply with cost-sharing requirements of Federal and State disaster assistance: specifically that Federal assistance is limited to 75% of eligible expenditures, and that State assistance is limited to 25% of the eligible costs. Alternate projects selected by the Applicant may be eligible for only 75% of the approved Federal share of estimated eligible costs.
5. The Applicant shall provide the following completed documentation to the State:
 - Designation of Applicant’s Agent;
 - State-Applicant Disaster Assistance Agreement
 - Private Non-Profit Organization Certification (if required);
 - Summary of Documentation Form itemizing actual costs expended for large project payment requests;
 - Monthly Progress Reports;
 - Copies of Single Audit Reports as applicable.

If the Applicant fails to provide any of the above documentation, the State will be under no obligation to reimburse the Applicant for eligible expenses.

6. The Applicant shall establish and maintain a proper accounting system to record expenditures of disaster assistance funds in accordance with generally accepted accounting principals or as directed by the Governor's Authorized Representative. If applicable, the Applicant shall conduct audit(s) pursuant to the Single Audit Act of 1984, 31 U.S.C. §7501 et. seq., 44 C.F.R. Part 14, OMB Circular A-133, "Audits of States, Local Governments and Non-profit Organizations," and applicable North Carolina laws, rules and regulations.
7. The Applicant shall provide to the State monthly Progress Reports for all open large projects funded by State and Federal disaster assistance grants. The first Progress Report will be due on the 10th day of the first month following initiation of the project and subsequent Progress Reports will be due on the 10th day of each and every month thereafter until project completion. Forms and reporting requirements will be provided by the Governor's Authorized Representative.
8. The Applicant, its employees and agents, including consultants, contractors and subcontractors to be paid with funds provided under this Agreement, shall give State and Federal agencies designated by the Governor's Authorized Representative, full access to and the right to examine all records and documents related to the use of disaster assistance funds.
9. The Applicant shall return to the State, within thirty (30) days of a request by the Governor's Authorized Representative, any funds advanced to the Applicant that are not supported by audit or other Federal or State review of documentation maintained by the Applicant.
10. The Applicant shall comply with all applicable codes and standards in the completion of eligible work to repair or replace damaged public facilities.
11. The Applicant shall comply with all applicable provisions of Federal and State statutes, rules and regulations regarding the procurement of goods and services and regarding contracts for the repair and restoration of public facilities.
12. The Applicant shall begin and complete all items of work within the time limits established by the Governor's Authorized Representative and in accordance with applicable Federal and State statutes, rules and regulations.
13. The Applicant shall request a final inspection within ninety (90) days after completion of each and every large project funded under this Agreement, or within ninety (90) days after the expiration of the time limit established for each project under Paragraph 12 above, whichever occurs first. Applicant shall present all supporting documentation to State and/or Federal inspectors at the time of final inspection. **The State, as Grantee, reserves the right to conduct a final inspection of any large project after expiration of the ninety- (90) day period and to reimburse Applicant only for costs documented at the time of final inspection.**

14. The Applicant shall comply with all applicable Federal and State statutes, rules and regulations for publicly financed or assisted contracts including, but not limited to, non-discrimination, labor standard, and access by the physically handicapped.
15. The Applicant's Designated Agent shall execute and comply with the Lobbying Prohibition document incorporated herein as Attachment A.
16. The Applicant's Designated Agent shall execute and comply with the Statement of Assurances (SF 424D) document incorporated herein as Attachment B.
17. The Applicant shall not enter into cost-plus-percentage-of-cost contracts for debris removal, emergency protective measures, or completion of disaster restoration or repair work.
18. The Applicant shall not enter into contracts for which payment is contingent upon receipt of State or Federal funds.
19. The Applicant shall not enter into any contract with any entity that is debarred or suspended from participation in Federal Assistance. The State and/or FEMA will not be under any obligation to reimburse Applicant for payments made to a debarred or suspended contractor. Applicant may search for debarred or suspended contractors on the "Excluded Parties List System" (EPLS) at the following website: www.sam.gov.
20. The Applicant shall comply with the provisions of 42 U.S.C. §5155 (Section 312 of the Stafford Act) which prohibits duplication of benefits. Applicant shall notify State immediately if any other source of funds is available to offset disaster assistance provided pursuant to this Agreement. Applicant agrees that eligible costs under this Agreement will be reduced by duplicate benefits received from any other source.
21. The Applicant shall comply with all uniform grant administration requirements required by State and Federal statutes, rules and regulations, including but not limited to, the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency assistance Act, Public Law 93-288, as amended, Title 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations, applicable OMB Circulars, and policy guidance issued by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).
22. If the Applicant pays contractors, subcontractors or consultants with funds provided through this Agreement then the Applicant shall include language in all contracts that binds the contractor, subcontractor or consultant to the terms and conditions of this Agreement with the State. Contractual arrangements with contractors, subcontractors or consultants shall in no way relieve the Applicant of its responsibilities to ensure that all funds provided through this Agreement are administered in accordance with all State and Federal requirements.

FOR THE APPLICANT:

Date

56-6001194

Applicant's Federal Tax I.D.
Number (required)

BY: _____
Signature

Typed Name

Title

FOR THE STATE:

Date

BY: _____
Signature

Typed Name

Title

ATTACHMENT A

LOBBYING PROHIBITION

The undersigned certifies, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

- (a) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence either directly or indirectly an officer or employee of any State or Federal agency, a member of the N.C. Legislature, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.
- (b) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-L, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," in accordance with its instructions.
- (c) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all sub-awards at all tiers (including subcontracts, sub-grants, and contracts under grants, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all recipients of funds under this Agreement shall certify and disclose accordingly.

This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each failure.

Town of Carrboro

Name of Applicant

BY: _____

Signature of Applicant's Designated Agent

ATTACHMENT B-1

OMB Approval No. 0348-0042

ASSURANCES-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0042), Washington DC 20503

PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY

NOTE: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the Awarding Agency. Further, certain Federal assistance awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance, and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of the project costs) to ensure proper planning, management and completion of the project described in this application
2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States and, if appropriate, the State, through any authorized representative, access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the assistance; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.
3. Will not dispose of, modify the use of, or change the terms of the real property title, or other interest in the site and facilities without permission and instructions from the awarding agency. Will record the Federal interest in the title of real property in accordance with awarding agency directives and will include a covenant in the title of real property acquired in whole or in part with Federal assistance funds to assure non-discrimination during the useful life of the project.
4. Will comply by the requirements of the assistance awarding agency with regard to the drafting, review and approval of construction plans and specifications.
5. Will provide and maintain competent and adequate engineering supervision at the construction site to ensure that the complete work conforms with the approved plans and specifications and will furnish progress reports and such other information as may be required by the assistance awarding agency or State.
6. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.
7. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.
8. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§4728-2763) relating to prescribed standards for merit systems for programs funded under one of the 19 statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM's Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).
9. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. §§4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead-based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.
10. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to non-discrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§1681 1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. § 794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§ 6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) §§523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§290 dd-3 and 290 ee 3), as amended relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. §§3601 et seq.), as amended relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental, or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and, (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.

ATTACHMENT B-2

11. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal and federally-assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.
12. Will comply with the provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.
13. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. §§276a to 276a-7), the Copeland Act (40 U.S.C. 276c and 18 U.S.C. §874), and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. §§327-333) regarding labor standards for federally-assisted construction subagreements.
14. Will comply with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L.93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is \$10,000 or more.
15. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §§1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clean Air) Implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§7401 et seq.); (g) protection of under ground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended (P.L. 93-523); and, (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (P.L. 93-205).
16. Will comply with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. §§1271 et seq.) related to protecting components or potential components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.
17. Will assist the awarding agency in assuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. §470), EO 11593 (identification and protection of historic properties), and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. §§469a-1 et seq.).
18. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 and OMB Circular No. A-133, "Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations."
19. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations, and policies governing this program.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL	TITLE
APPLICANT ORGANIZATION	DATE SUBMITTED



Town of Carrboro

Town Hall
301 W. Main St.
Carrboro, NC 27510

Agenda Item Abstract

File Number: 19-30

Agenda Date: 1/22/2019

File Type: Agendas

In Control: Board of Aldermen

Version: 1

TITLE:

Public Hearing on a Land Use Ordinance Amendment Relating to Signage

PURPOSE: The purpose of this agenda item is for the Board of Aldermen to consider a text amendment to the Land Use Ordinance regarding signs for places of worship. A draft ordinance has been prepared. The Board of Aldermen must receive public input before reaching a decision on an amendment to the LUO.

DEPARTMENT: Planning

CONTACT INFORMATION: Christina Moon - 919-918-7325; Bob Hornik - 919-929-3905; Patricia McGuire - 919-918-7327

INFORMATION: Regulations relating to signage are provided for in Article XVII of the Land Use Ordinance. Section 15-272 describes those situations where signage is exempt from regulations such as residential property identification (address and owner names), governmental signs for information, traffic, directions, and church identification.

A draft ordinance has been prepared which, if adopted, would amend the LUO in two ways. First, the maximum size for church (bulletin board/identification/directional) signs would be increased from sixteen square feet to twenty-four square feet to better accommodate the need for visibility, particularly for churches in the more rural areas of the Town's jurisdiction. Second, additional language would be added to the use classification for churches (5.200) to provide a more inclusive description in the Table of Permissible Uses and in the subsection relating to signage. The expanded description would read, "churches, synagogues, temples and other places of worship."

The draft ordinance was referred to Orange County and presented to the Planning Board and Appearance Commission on December 6, 2018. Comments are provided (*Attachment C*). During its review of the item, the Planning Board noted an awkwardly worded phrase in the Table of Permissible Uses entry for churches. Staff researched the phrase and determined that it was a clerical error resulting from an amendment update. The attached updated version of the draft ordinance corrects this error. The Appearance Commission did not have a quorum and therefore did not comment on the item.

FISCAL & STAFF IMPACT: Public hearings involve staff and public notice costs associated with advisory board and Board of Aldermen review.

Agenda Date: 1/22/2019

File Type:Agendas

In Control: Board of Aldermen

Version: 1

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Board of Aldermen consider the attached resolution, finding consistency for the proposed Land Use Ordinance amendment (*Attachment A*) and the draft ordinance (*Attachment B*).

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING A STATEMENT EXPLAINING THE BOARD OF
ALDERMEN'S REASONS FOR ADOPTING AN AMENDMENT TO THE TEXT OF THE
CARRBORO LAND USE ORDINANCE (N.C. Gen. Stat. 160A-383)

WHEREAS, an amendment to the text of the Carrboro Land Use Ordinance has been proposed, which amendment is described or identified as follows: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE LAND USE ORDINANCE RELATING TO SIGNAGE.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Board of Aldermen of the Town of Carrboro Resolves:

Section 1. The Board has reviewed the draft amendment to the text of the Land Use Ordinance and concludes that the proposed amendment is:

_____ *Consistent* with the objectives of the Town's regulations for signs: to attract attention or communicate information.

_____ *Inconsistent* with current adopted plans. The proposed action is *inconsistent* with the comprehensive plan for the following reason(s):

_____ *Inconsistent* with the current adopted plans; however, because of the following changed circumstance(s), the Board of Aldermen's approval shall also be deemed an amendment to the existing adopted plan, _____, as described below.

Changed circumstance(s):

Amendment to current adopted plan:

Section 2. The Board of Aldermen's action is reasonable and in the public interest for the following reason(s):

The proposed text amendment which allows for larger identification and directional signs for certain use classifications in order to ensure visibility, reasonable and in the public interest.

Section 3. Therefore, the Carrboro Board of Aldermen has: approved / denied the proposed amendment to the text of the Carrboro Land Use Ordinance.

Section 4. This resolution becomes effective upon adoption.

Adopted by the Carrboro Board of Aldermen this 22nd day of January 2019.

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE LAND USE ORDINANCE RELATING TO SIGNAGE

****DRAFT 1-15-18****

THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN OF THE TOWN OF CARRBORO ORDAINS:

Section 1. Subsection 15-272(7), Signs Excluded From Regulation, is amended to read as follows:


(7) Bulletin boards, identification signs and directional signs for places of worship, that do not exceed one per abutting street and twenty-four square feet in area and that are not internally illuminated.

Section 2. Section 15-146, The Table of Permissible Uses, is amended by adding the term “places of worship” to the description of use category 5.200, as follows:

5.200 Churches, synagogues and temples, and other places of worship (including associated residential structures for religious personnel and associated buildings but not including elementary school or secondary school buildings).

Section 3. All provisions of any town ordinance in conflict with this ordinance are repealed.

Section 4. This ordinance shall become effective upon adoption.



TOWN OF CARRBORO

Planning Board

301 West Main Street, Carrboro, North Carolina 27510

R E C O M M E N D A T I O N

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 6, 2018

Land Use Ordinance Text Amendment Relating to Signage

Motion was made by Poulton and seconded by Clinton that the Planning Board of the Town of Carrboro recommends that the Board of Aldermen approve the draft ordinance with the following suggestion:.

That “places of worship and spiritual contemplation” be substituted for “house of worship” or “place of worship.”

VOTE:

AYES: (9) Clinton, Meyer, Whittemore, Adamson, Gaylord-Miles, Foushee, Poulton, Vance, Tiemann

ABSENT/EXCUSED: (2) Rosser, Petrin

NOES: (0)

ABSTENTIONS: (0)

Associated Findings

By a unanimous show of hands, the _____ membership indicated that no members have any financial interests that would pose a conflict of interest to the adoption of this amendment.

Motion was made by _____ and seconded by _____ that the _____ of the Town of Carrboro finds the proposed text amendment, _____ consistent with the objectives of the Town’s sign regulations which describes signs by their purpose to attract and communicate information.

Furthermore, the _____ of the Town of Carrboro finds the proposed text amendment, which allows for larger bulletin and identification signs for certain use classifications reasonable and in the public interest.

VOTE:

AYES: (9) Clinton, Meyer, Whittemore, Adamson, Gaylord-Miles, Foushee, Poulton, Vance, Tiemann

ABSENT/EXCUSED: (2) Rosser, Petrin

NOES: (0)

ABSTENTIONS: (0)

(Chair)

December 6, 2018

(Date)

ORANGE COUNTY PLANNING & INSPECTIONS DEPARTMENT

Craig N. Benedict, AICP, Director

Administration
(919) 245-2575
(919) 644-3002 (FAX)
www.orangecountync.gov



131 W. Margaret Lane
P O Box 8181
Hillsborough,
North Carolina, 27278



TRANSMITTAL DELIVERED VIA EMAIL

January 10, 2019

Christina Moon, AICP
Planning Administrator
Town of Carrboro
301 W. Main St.
Carrboro, NC 27510

SUBJECT: Joint Planning Review of Proposed Ordinance Amendments

Dear Tina:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the following Land Use Ordinance amendments received by us on December 21, 2018 and proposed for town public hearing on January 22, 2019:

- *An Ordinance Amending the Carrboro Land Use Ordinance relating to Signage.*
- *An Ordinance Amending the Carrboro Land Use Ordinance Relating to Community or Regional Utility Facilities.*

We have reviewed the amendments and find no inconsistency with the adopted *Joint Planning Area Land Use Plan*.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please let me know.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Perdita Holtz".

Perdita Holtz, AICP
Planning Systems Coordinator



Town of Carrboro

Town Hall
301 W. Main St.
Carrboro, NC 27510

Agenda Item Abstract

File Number: 19-31

Agenda Date: 1/22/2019

File Type: Agendas

In Control: Board of Aldermen

Version: 1

TITLE:

Public Hearing on a Land Use Ordinance Amendment Relating to Community or Regional Utility Facilities

PURPOSE: The purpose of this agenda item is for the Board of Aldermen to consider a text amendment to the Land Use Ordinance relating to Community or Regional Utility Facilities. A draft ordinance has been prepared. The Board must receive public input before reaching a decision on the draft ordinance.

DEPARTMENT: Planning

CONTACT INFORMATION: Christina Moon - 919-918-7325; Marty Roupe - 919-918-7333; Bob Hornik - 919-929-3905

INFORMATION: The Town has received a request from OWASA to consider a text amendment to the Land Use Ordinance to allow the construction of a new sodium permanganate facility to be placed near University Lake for improved water quality production (*Attachment C*). OWASA facilities are classified under use category 17.200 Community or Regional Utility Facilities. A draft ordinance has been prepared, that if adopted, would allow such facilities in the R-10 zoning district subject to specific performance standards.

The draft ordinance was referred to Orange County and presented to the Planning Board and the Environmental Advisory Board on December 6, 2018. Comments are provided (*Attachment D*). The applicant provided a presentation at the advisory board meeting explaining the need for and use of such a facility and will be prepared to provide a similar presentation at the public hearing, if desired.

FISCAL & STAFF IMPACT: Public hearings involve staff and public notice costs associated with advisory board and Board of Aldermen review. The applicant has submitted the appropriate review fees for a text amendment review.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Board of Aldermen consider adopting the attached resolution for consistency (*Attachment A*) and the draft ordinance (*Attachment B*).

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING A STATEMENT EXPLAINING THE BOARD OF
ALDERMEN'S REASONS FOR ADOPTING AN AMENDMENT TO THE TEXT OF THE
CARRBORO LAND USE ORDINANCE (N.C. Gen. Stat. 160A-383)

WHEREAS, an amendment to the text of the Carrboro Land Use Ordinance has been proposed, which amendment is described or identified as follows: A LAND USE ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT RELATING TO COMMUNITY OR REGIONAL UTILITY FACILITIES.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Board of Aldermen of the Town of Carrboro Resolves:

Section 1. The Board has reviewed the draft amendment to the text of the Land Use Ordinance and concludes that the proposed amendment is:

_____ *Consistent* with current adopted plans such as Carrboro Vision 2020, particularly the provisions under Section 5.20, Water, which encourage the Town of to work with OWASA to develop policies and infrastructure relating to water conservation.

_____ *Inconsistent* with current adopted plans. The proposed action is *inconsistent* with the comprehensive plan for the following reason(s):

_____ *Inconsistent* with the current adopted plans; however, because of the following changed circumstance(s), the Board of Aldermen's approval shall also be deemed an amendment to the existing adopted plan, _____, as described below.

Changed circumstance(s):

Amendment to current adopted plan:

Section 2. The Board of Aldermen's action is reasonable and in the public interest for the following reason(s):

The proposed text amendment which provides for improved water quality production is reasonable and in the public interest.

Section 3. Therefore, the Carrboro Board of Aldermen has: approved / denied the proposed amendment to the text of the Carrboro Land Use Ordinance.

Section 4. This resolution becomes effective upon adoption.

Adopted by the Carrboro Board of Aldermen this 22nd day of January 2019.

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE LAND USE ORDINANCE RELATING TO
COMMUNITY OR REGIONAL UTILITY FACILITIES

****DRAFT 11-20-18****

THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN OF THE TOWN OF CARRBORO ORDAINS:

Section 1. Section 15-146 (The Table of Permissible Uses) is amended by adding the letters “Z, S” opposite use classification 17.200 “Community or Regional Utility Facilities” under the R-10 Zoning District to indicate that this use is permissible in this district with a zoning permit or special use permit, subject to the supplementary use regulations in Subsection 15-172.1.

Section 2. Article XI (Supplementary Use Regulations) is amended by adding a new section 15-172.1 as follows:

- (a) Community or regional utility facilities that: i) support the production of a finished water supply, ii) are within 200 feet of a raw water source, and iii) are no larger than 2000 square feet in building area and no taller than 25 feet in height are allowed in the R-10 zoning district with a zoning permit, provided that such facility otherwise satisfies the requirements of the Carrboro Land Use Ordinance, including the outdoor lighting requirements in Section 15-242.5.
- (b) A community or regional utility facility that supports the production of a finished water supply that is larger or taller than the maximums stated above, or that cannot meet one or more of the provisions below, may be allowed in the R-10 Zoning District with a special use permit issued by the Board of Adjustment upon satisfaction of the considerations required by section 15-54.
- (c) At least one on-site parking space, shall be provided, with additional spaces as needed to accommodate the number of vehicles likely to be present at the facility on a regular basis.
- (d) The facility shall be surrounded by a Type A buffer on all sides unless: i) the facility is located more than 500 feet from any property boundary line, or ii) existing trees satisfy the definition of a Type A buffer, in which case such trees shall be identified on the site plan and shall be maintained in order to comply with this requirement.
- (f) A community or regional utility shall not generate any noise, smoke, odor, vibration, electrical interference, or other disturbance that is perceptible beyond the boundaries of the lot where the facility is located or that adversely affects the use of adjoining or neighboring properties.
- (g) No outdoor storage shall be permissible.
- (h) Any community or regional utility facility shall have signage identifying the operator of the facility and providing a telephone number or other contact information for the operator.

Section 3. Section 15-147 Use of the Designation Z, S, C, in Table of Permissible Uses is amended by adding a new subsection (s) that reads as follows:

(s) Notwithstanding the foregoing, the permit requirement for use classification 17.200 “Community or Regional Utility Facilities” in the R-10 Zoning District shall be determined by the supplementary use regulations in Section 15-172.1.


Section 4. All provisions of any town ordinance in conflict with this ordinance are repealed.

Section 5. This ordinance shall become effective upon adoption.

DRAFT

TOWN OF CARRBORO

LAND USE ORDINANCE AMENDMENT REQUEST



To the Board of Aldermen, the Planning Board, and the Appearance Commission, as appropriate, of the Town of Carrboro:

I (we), the undersigned do hereby respectfully make application and petition the Board of Aldermen to amend the Land Use Ordinance. In support of this application, the following facts are shown:

- 1) The Land Use Ordinance, at present, would allow (description/quote, page and number of section in question):

R-10 allows for residential use to allow persons who reside there a comfortable, healthy, safe and pleasant environment in which to live sheltered from incompatible and disruptive activities that properly belong in non-residential districts. (Sec. 15-135(a))

- 2) The proposed amendment to the Land Use Ordinance would allow (describe briefly intended change):

R-10 would allow utility uses if new building/use was less than 2000 square feet in size and within 200 feet of a raw water source and was used to support the production of finished water supply

- 3) State the reasons for the proposed amendment:

This change would allow for a new sodium permanganate facility to be placed near university lake and allow for improved finished water production and quality at the Jones Ferry Water Treatment plant that provides drinking water to Carrboro and Chapel Hill.

SIGNATURE:

Tad Taylor
applicant

VP
9/4/18


Tad Taylor
{print}

ADDRESS:

400 Jones Ferry Road, Carrboro NC 27510

TELEPHONE NUMBER:

919-537-4229



TOWN OF CARRBORO

Planning Board

301 West Main Street, Carrboro, North Carolina 27510

R E C O M M E N D A T I O N

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 4, 2018

Land Use Ordinance Text Amendment Relating to Community or Regional Utility Facilities

Mr. Vance did not participate in the discussion.

Motion was made by Adamson and seconded by Pouton that the Planning Board of the Town of Carrboro recommends that the Board of Aldermen approve the draft ordinance.

VOTE:

AYES: (8) Clinton, Meyer, Whittemore, Gaylord-Miles, Adamson, Foushee, Poulton, Tiemann

ABSENT/EXCUSED: (2) Petrin, Rosser

NOES: (0)

ABSTENTIONS: (1) Vance

Associated Findings

By a unanimous show of hands, the Planning Board membership participating in the discussion indicated that no members have any financial interests that would pose a conflict of interest to the adoption of this amendment.

Motion was made by Adamson and seconded by Gaylord-Miles that the Planning Board of the Town of Carrboro finds the proposed text amendment, is consistent with the provisions in *Carrboro Vision2020* to work with OWASA to develop policies and infrastructure relating to the use and production of the finished water supply.

Furthermore, the Planning Board of the Town of Carrboro finds the proposed text amendment, is reasonable in the public interest because it provides for improved water quality production.

VOTE:

AYES: (8) Clinton, Meyer, Whittemore, Gaylord-Miles, Adamson, Foushee, Poulton, Tiemann

ABSENT/EXCUSED: (2) Petrin, Rosser


NOES: (0)

ABSTENTIONS: (1) Vance

(Chair)

December 6, 2018

(Date)



TOWN OF CARRBORO

Environmental Advisory Board

301 West Main Street, Carrboro, North Carolina 27510

R E C O M M E N D A T I O N

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2018

Land Use Ordinance Text Amendment Relating to Community or Regional Utility Facilities

Motion was made by O'Connor and seconded by Sinclair that the Environmental Advisory Board of the Town of Carrboro recommends that the Board of Aldermen approve the draft ordinance, with the following recommendations:

Any facility should be held to applicable Town standards for stormwater management during both the construction phase and the operation of the new facility.

The energy consumption of the new facility and the existing pumping station should be at least net neutral.

VOTE:

AYES: (Turner, Sinclair, O'Connor)

ABSENT/EXCUSED: (0)

NOES: (0)

ABSTENTIONS: (0)

Associated Findings

By a unanimous show of hands, the Environmental Advisory Board membership indicated that no members have any financial interests that would pose a conflict of interest to the adoption of this amendment.

Motion was made by Sinclair and seconded by O'Connor that the Environmental Advisory Board of the Town of Carrboro finds the proposed text amendment, consistent with the provisions in *Carrboro Vision2020* to work with OWASA to develop policies and infrastructure relating to the use and production of the finished water supply.

Furthermore, the Environmental Advisory Board of the Town of Carrboro finds the proposed text amendment, is reasonable in the public interest because it provides for improved water quality production.

VOTE:

AYES: (O'Connor, Sinclair, Turner)

ABSENT/EXCUSED: (0)

NOES: (0)

ABSTENTIONS: (0)

For (Chair)

12-13-18

(Date)

ORANGE COUNTY PLANNING & INSPECTIONS DEPARTMENT

Craig N. Benedict, AICP, Director

Administration
(919) 245-2575
(919) 644-3002 (FAX)
www.orangecountync.gov



131 W. Margaret Lane
P O Box 8181
Hillsborough,
North Carolina, 27278



TRANSMITTAL DELIVERED VIA EMAIL

January 10, 2019

Christina Moon, AICP
Planning Administrator
Town of Carrboro
301 W. Main St.
Carrboro, NC 27510

SUBJECT: Joint Planning Review of Proposed Ordinance Amendments

Dear Tina:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the following Land Use Ordinance amendments received by us on December 21, 2018 and proposed for town public hearing on January 22, 2019:

- *An Ordinance Amending the Carrboro Land Use Ordinance relating to Signage.*
- *An Ordinance Amending the Carrboro Land Use Ordinance Relating to Community or Regional Utility Facilities.*

We have reviewed the amendments and find no inconsistency with the adopted *Joint Planning Area Land Use Plan*.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please let me know.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Perdita Holtz".

Perdita Holtz, AICP
Planning Systems Coordinator



Town of Carrboro

Town Hall
301 W. Main St.
Carrboro, NC 27510

Agenda Item Abstract

File Number: 19-35

Agenda Date: 1/22/2019

File Type: Agendas

In Control: Board of Aldermen

Version: 1

TITLE:

Presentation of the 2018 Town of Carrboro Biennial Citizen Survey Report

PURPOSE: The purpose of this item is for the Board receive the Town of Carrboro's 2018 Biennial Citizen Survey report.

DEPARTMENT: Town Clerk/Town Manager

CONTACT INFORMATION: Cathy Dorando, 919-918- 7309

INFORMATION: The survey was conducted by BKL Research and Consulting. This firm conducted the Town's first survey in 2016, as well. Just like in 2016, the survey proved to be an exciting venture in comprehensively gathering Carrboro citizen satisfaction, interest, and information.

The intent of the survey was to help understand the residents' satisfaction and perception of services that the Town provides and to gauge the staff's effectiveness of meeting the Board's priorities. The survey data may now be used as one of the tools that the Board uses in establishing budgetary priorities and making policy decisions.

The survey consisted of various core questions associated with rating town staff in all departments. Respondents were asked to respond to various subpart questions related to specific interactions within departments' functions. The survey examined other issues such as: business environment, environmental protection, transportation, planning and development, recreation, information dissemination, opportunities to participate in decision-making and citizen involvement barriers. Questions examined the respondent's years lived in Carrboro, years lived in their current home, how many more years they plan to call Carrboro home, age, gender, race, educational level, and income. The data was gathered via phone interviews by professional staff that were highly experienced in conducting municipal surveys.

Citizen opinion is an important factor in making the best decisions for the community. It is anticipated that this survey instrument will continue to be used as a biannual evaluation tool.

FISCAL & STAFF IMPACT: Funds were appropriated for the Comprehensive Community Survey in the FY 2019-20 Budget.

Agenda Date: 1/22/2019

File Type:Agendas

In Control: Board of Aldermen

Version: 1

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that the Board of Aldermen receive the report.

Town of Carrboro 2018 Biennial Citizen Survey Report

December 2018

Conducted by



PO Box 1174 Salem VA 24153 800-372-5443

**Town of Carrboro
2018 Biennial Citizen Survey
Executive Summary**

The overall results for the Town of Carrboro's 2018 Biennial Citizen Survey were very positive mirroring the results of the 2016 survey with a level of improvement. The respondents continued to give high marks for the level of service provided to them in Carrboro. A total of 400 residents were surveyed and the resulting margin of error was $\pm 5\%$. The telephone survey methodology included listed, unlisted, and wireless numbers in the sampling frame.

The Town Government staff received very high marks for the six service dimensions examined with no marks falling below B. There were high grades for *courteous* (A-), *professionalism* (A-), *knowledgeable* (B+), and *helpful* (B+). However, the grades for *promptness of response* and *overall quality of customer service* declined slightly from B+ to B this year.

The Town's rating for *maintenance of streets and roads* was relatively good earning a grade of B-. There was a level of improvement as the mean increased this year from 7.26 to 7.39. The major concerns mentioned by the respondents were potholes and flooding on several streets (Greensboro, Main, Homestead, Estes) and the need for sidewalks.

The cleanliness and appearance of public areas earned very solid marks. The grades for *parks* (A-), *greenways* (A-), *streets* (B), *median/roadsides* (B), and *sidewalks* (B) were very good. The grade for *greenways* improved (B+ to A-) while the grade for *streets* declined (B+ to B). There were several comments given for public areas needing attention especially the appearance of Greensboro Street.

The Carrboro Police Department continued to earn very strong marks from the respondents. The lowest grade given was an A- for this department. The impressive grades for the service dimensions were *courteous* (A), *response time* (A), *competence* (A-), *fairness* (A-), and *problem-solving* (A-). The grade for *courteous* has improved from an A- in 2016. The Carrboro Fire Department earned the highest marks for any department examined in the survey. The Department earned A+ grades for *courteous*, *response time*, *competence*, *fairness*, and *problem-solving*. The grade for *fairness* improved from an A. The Parks & Recreation Department also earned excellent ratings this year. The grades improved for *cost or amount of fee* (A to A+) and *instructor quality* (A- to A) while the grades were unchanged for *overall experience* (A) and *ease of registration* (A). However, the grades fell for *facility quality* and *program quality* both declining from A to A- this year.

The respondents were positive in their rating of Carrboro as a place to live giving the town a mean score of 7.87 (7.95 in 2016) on the 9-point scale. This would equate to a grade of B+ with 95.9% of the responses on the "desirable" side of the scale and only 2.1% on the "undesirable" side. The grade was unchanged from 2016. The respondents also perceived the quality of life in Carrboro as getting better. While most of the respondents (64.8%) perceived the quality of life as unchanged, the percentage on the "better" side of the scale exceeded the "worse" side (28.1% versus 7.1%). In 2016, the percentages were 25.4% versus 3.5%. When asked the most important issue facing Carrboro, the primary response was none/no issues (82 comments). For those naming issues, the key one was controlling growth. There were 52 comments concerning controlling growth/overcrowding along with 27 other comments on overdevelopment. Other key issues were the lack of affordable housing (46 comments), traffic (24 comments), rising cost of living (20 comments), and high taxes (19 comments). The top seven issues remained unchanged from 2016.

The respondents felt very safe in Carrboro in all areas of the town. The means for safe in Carrboro overall (8.29), in their home neighborhood (8.44), and in public places (8.33) were all very high reflecting the high perception of safety. All the means increased from 2016 indicating even higher perceived levels of safety in town.

Several barriers to citizen involvement in local government were examined. The most significant barrier was *too busy – don't have time* with a mean of 5.75 on a 9-point scale. Other less important barriers were *don't know about opportunities* (4.62) and *timing is inconvenient* (4.23). These top three barriers remain unchanged from 2016.

The top five major information sources (in order) used by the respondents were word-of-mouth, street signage, Carrboro's website, television, and Facebook. Other sources also utilized but somewhat less important were radio, Carrboro's email list service, Parks & Recreation Brochure, Twitter, and Instagram. Since 2016, there has been a rise in online and/or social media sources (Carrboro email list service, Twitter, Instagram, YouTube, and Next Door). The only exception was Facebook falling from 4th to 5th place as an information source. It was generally the traditional media sources that have declined (Raleigh News & Observer, Independent Weekly, The Daily Tarheel, Government Access Channel, and Herald Sun). The only exception was television that rose from 5th to 4th place overall.

Carrboro has generally been effective in its communication efforts with citizens. The respondents felt largely well informed about *government services, projects, issues, and programs that affect them*. The mean was 6.10 with 59.3% on the "informed" side of the scale versus 14.9% on the "uninformed" side. There was also a good level of satisfaction with *Carrboro making information available to citizens concerning important services, projects, issues, and programs* with a mean of 6.49 with 63.8% on the "satisfied" side of the scale versus 11.6% on the "dissatisfied" side. Finally, the respondents were also pleased with the *opportunities Carrboro gives them to participate in the decision-making process*. The mean was 6.37 with 60.7% on the "satisfied" side of the scale versus 10.9% on the "dissatisfied" side. All these means have improved slightly from 2016 indicating an uptick in communication efforts. Keep in mind, there was a significant number of respondents who indicated they did not seek information and it was their fault for not being informed. This will serve to lower the means for these questions regardless of the town's efforts.

Solid Waste Services continued to receive very high marks; although, two of the grades declined this year. The grades fell for *curbside garbage collection* (A to A-) and also *curbside bulk item collection* (A- to B+). While the grades were unchanged for *curbside yard waste collection* (B+) and *curbside loose leaf collection* (B+). There were 49.6% (50.9% in 2016) of the respondents who were not aware curbside recycling was provided by Orange County Waste Management and not Carrboro.

As for downtown, there were 89.9% (95.6% in 2016) of the respondents who had visited downtown in the past year. The three major reasons they visited downtown were for restaurants (109 comments), shopping (69 comments) and Weaver Street Market (48 comments). Other prominent reasons included conducting business (30 comments), fun/pleasure (29 comments), events/festivals (29 comments), and Farmer's Market (20 comments). Those who had not visited downtown indicated the major reason was they were too busy (10 comments). The respondents indicated the most effective amenity/activity to bring them downtown would be cafes/restaurants, festivals, Farmer's Market, Summer Streets/Closed Street, outdoor performances, shopping opportunities, and concerts in that order. These are the same top seven as in 2016 except that outdoor performances rated 3rd not the Farmer's Market. When asked about any other suggestions to bring people downtown, the respondents most frequently answered a library and more parking.

The Carrboro focus areas earned generally solid ratings; although, there were some areas of concern. The focus areas will be discussed in order of ranking. The highest level of satisfaction was with the *town being effective in keeping Carrboro the best place to live, work, and raise a family*. The mean was 7.30 with 81.4% on the “effective” side of the scale. The mean was virtually unchanged from 2016. There were also solid ratings for the overall job the town has done on *Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources*. The mean was 7.57 (7.56 in 2016) with 89.1% of the respondents on the “satisfied” side of the scale and this remains a grade of B. The respondents were generally satisfied with the job the town is doing on *environmental protection*. The mean was 7.14 (7.29 in 2016) with 84.0% on the “satisfied” side of the scale equating to a grade of C+. However, the grade has declined from a grade of B-. The respondents were also generally satisfied with the job the Town is doing on *transportation*. The mean was 7.00 (6.98 in 2016) with 82.5% on the “satisfied” side of the scale as the grade remains unchanged at the C+ level. The job the town has done on *parking* has improved. The mean was 6.74 (6.60 in 2016) with 76.8% on the “satisfied” side of the scale and the grade rose from a C- to a C this year. Finally, the job the Town is doing on *planning & development* has fallen to the lowest rated of the focus areas. The mean was 6.52 (6.61 in 2016) with 70.6% on the “satisfied” side of the scale and the grade remains a C-.

The respondents rated several new programs/services they would likely be willing to pay for in Carrboro. The highest rated or most likely to pay for would be affordable housing. Other programs/services rated higher (in order) include environmental sustainability, Human Services, fire services, and police services. In 2016, the highest rated program/service was also affordable housing. This was followed by festivals/Open Streets, environmental sustainability, fire services, and police services. The biggest changes were the decline in festivals/Open Streets and the increase in Human Services.

The large majority of respondents who use Wi-Fi perceived no problems with its availability in Carrboro. The only areas mentioned with any frequency as having availability issues were Weaver Street (16 comments), downtown area (6 comments), and Looking Glass Cafe (3 comments).

The Town earned relatively strong ratings for the job they are doing with senior citizens and citizens with disabilities and these means have improved this year. The mean for the job the Town is doing with seniors was 6.90 (6.63 in 2016) with 75.5% on the “satisfied” side of the scale. The mean for the job the Town is doing for citizens with disabilities was 6.91 (6.75 in 2016) with 75.4% on the “satisfied” side of the scale. The grade for both of these would be a C+ rising from a C in 2016. The mean for the job the town is doing for providing affordable housing also improved this year from 5.28 to 5.50 with the grade moving from an F to a D-. Even with the improvement, this would represent the lowest grade the town earned in the survey. Two new areas were rated this year in the survey. First, the satisfaction for the job the town does for developing land in Carrboro earned a mean of 6.37 translating to a grade of C-. Second, the job the town is doing on spacing and density garnered a mean of 6.45 and a grade of C- as well.

In summary, there are 27 graded core Carrboro service dimensions utilizing the grading format of very poor to excellent scaling. The overall mean for all service dimensions was 8.30 (8.24 in 2016). This mean equates to a very impressive grade of A- this year which is unchanged from 2016. Overall, the Town of Carrboro receives an excellent report card with 20 grades in the A range and 7 grades in the B range with no grades in the C range for the core service dimensions. Last year, it was 19 grades in the A range and 8 in the B range.

Town of Carrboro 2018 Biennial Citizen Survey Report

Methodology

The 2018 Town of Carrboro Biennial Citizen Survey was conducted from October 20th through November 18th. BKL Research administered the telephone survey to 400 residents of the Town of Carrboro. This resulted in a $\pm 5\%$ margin of error. Both listed, unlisted, and wireless telephone numbers within Carrboro census tracts were included in the sampling frame and contacted using a random selection process. Approximately 86.3% of the numbers contacted were wireless. A minimum of four callbacks was attempted on each number not screened from the sampling frame. The potential respondents were screened with regards to Carrboro residence and over the age of 18. The average survey completion time was between 18-22 minutes and the refusal rate was 24.7%.

The survey instrument consisted of 41 core questions with related subparts to several of the questions (Appendix A). 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 services. The survey also examined other issues including information sources, information dissemination, opportunities to participate in decision-making, citizen involvement barriers, and media usage. Another series of questions examined Board of Alderman focus areas in relation to issues including environmental protection, keeping Carrboro the best place to live, transportation, planning & development, parking, and parks & recreation. The respondents were also asked actions that could improve their dissatisfaction with these focus areas. There were questions examining new programs or increased services, downtown amenities/activities and satisfaction with the job the town is doing for senior citizens, citizens with disabilities, affordable housing, land development, and spacing/density. The respondents were primarily asked to use a 9-point scale. There were open-ended questions examining streets/roads and public areas needing attention, most important issues facing Carrboro, reasons for visiting downtown, Wi-Fi availability, internet access, and reasons for choosing to live in Carrboro. The survey also incorporated 13 demographic questions.

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

The demographic profiles of the sample are exhibited in Figures 1-7. The age profile of the sample is illustrated in Figure 1. A large percentage of the respondents (55.7%) fell under the age of 45 with the largest portion in the 26-35 (25.3%) age category. Figure 2 represents the number of years the respondents have lived in Carrboro. A slightly larger proportion (22.1%) lived in the town 2-5 years




Figure 1. Sample: Age Distribution.




Figure 2. Sample: Years Lived in Carrboro.

while 20.9% for 6-10 years and 19.8% for 11-20 years. There were 13.0% Carrboro natives. When asked how long they plan to stay in Carrboro, 53.3% plan to stay over 20 years while 20.8% plan to stay an additional 2-5 years (Figure 3).

The sample was also a highly educated group illustrated in Figure 4. A large percentage (26.6%) of the respondents earned a four-year college degree with 20.2% a graduate degree and 11.5% a PhD/JD/MD degree. There were also 5.9% currently enrolled in college. In terms of racial breakdown, Caucasians comprised 78.8% of the sample with 10.2% African-American, 4.5% Hispanic, and 3.1% Asian. The income levels of the sample are shown in Figure 6. A high




Figure 3. Sample: Years Continue to Live in Carrboro.




Figure 4. Sample: Educational Level.




Figure 5. Sample: Race.

proportion (33.2%) were in the 0-\$45,000 income category which is indicative of student population in the area. In addition, 22.5% earned between \$45,001-\$75,000 while 14.5% earned over \$150,000. In terms of gender, 50.6% of the sample were male and 49.4% were female (Figure 7). Most of the respondents (65.7%) resided in single-family homes, 18.7% were apartment dwellers, 11.7% lived in a townhouse/condominium/duplex, and 3.9% in a mobile home/other. Most respondents (64.7%) owned their residence as opposed to renting (35.3%). There were 11.8% who owned rental property in town reflecting 82.6% residential, 8.7% commercial, and 8.7% both. There were 90.1% of the respondents who were registered voters and 71.3% of those voted in the 2017 local elections.




Figure 6. Sample: Income.




Figure 7. Sample: Gender.

The major reasons the respondents chose to live in Carrboro (by percent of times mentioned) were education/UNC (17.6%), work (15.1%), family (12.1%), consider it home/native (11.3%), atmosphere/community feel (9.1%), and location (8.3%). In 2016, the major reasons were education/UNC (20.3%), atmosphere/community feel (15.2%), work (13.6%), family (11.7%), consider it home/native (6.4%), and location (5.7%). The ordering is essentially the same except atmosphere/community dropped from second to fifth this year.

In terms of internet access, 94.7% of the respondents have access to the internet. Those respondents with internet access were then asked where they had primary access. Most of them had primary access at home (77.7%) followed by cell phone (61.7%), work (44.5%), public place (22.3%), and school (13.7%). These percentages reflect that respondents may answer primary access in more than one location.

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. Although, questions using other similar scaling may be converted for comparison purposes. Grades tend to be easier to understand and use in setting goals.

As previously mentioned, the report will include selected crosstabulations expressly chosen by Carrboro 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 partition 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. Keep in mind that any of the crosstabulations with small sample sizes will have exceptionally high margins of error. For that reason, sample sizes of less than 10 respondents in a subgroup will not be discussed. 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, current student), housing (single family, apartment, townhouse/condo, other), income (0-\$45,000, \$45,001-\$100,000, \$100,001-\$150,000, over \$150,000), and years in Carrboro (0-1, 2-5, 6-10, over 10, native). For clarification, other housing includes mobile homes and any other living arrangement such as assisted living. College degree refers to a bachelor's and master's degree. All the tables are displayed in percentages unless otherwise stated.

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 23.3% (24.9% in 2016) or 93 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 show continued high ratings for the Town Government staff with no grade falling below the B level. Tables 2-7 placed in descending order of ratings show the means and grades for the individual service dimensions. The mean for *courteous* of 8.29 remained the highest earned by the staff and this equates to an impressive grade of A-. The mean was unchanged from 2016. In addition, *professionalism* also earned a grade of A- with a mean of 8.07 mostly unchanged from 2016. The grade for *knowledgeable* remained at the B+ level with the mean increasing slightly (7.93 to 8.00). The mean for *helpful* improved slightly from 7.82 to 7.86 this year with the grade remaining at the B+ level. Finally, the means declined slightly this year for *promptness of response* (7.86 to 7.78) and *overall quality of customer service* (7.79 to 7.72). This small decrease resulted in the grades falling from B+ to B as both these grades were borderline B+ grades. Overall, the Town Government staff continued to earn very high marks for all the service dimensions from those who had staff contact with four grades remaining unchanged while two grades declined slightly.

Table 2. Town Government Staff: Courteous.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	8.29	3.3	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	6.6	18.7	68.1	A-
16	8.29	2.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	3.0	0.0	7.0	18.0	68.0	A-

Table 3. Town Government Staff: Professionalism.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	8.07	3.3	1.1	0.0	0.0	2.2	5.5	4.4	25.3	58.2	A-
16	8.09	2.0	0.0	1.0	2.0	5.1	1.0	6.1	23.2	59.6	A-

Table 4. Town Government Staff: Knowledgeable.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	8.00	3.3	0.0	1.1	1.1	3.3	2.2	11.0	19.8	58.2	B+
16	7.93	2.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	7.0	2.0	9.0	17.0	59.0	B+

Table 5. Town Government Staff: Helpful.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	7.86	3.3	2.2	1.1	1.1	3.3	4.4	7.7	18.7	58.2	B+
16	7.82	2.0	0.0	3.0	2.0	8.0	1.0	10.0	19.0	55.0	B+

Table 6. Town Government Staff: Promptness of Response.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	7.78	3.3	2.2	0.0	2.2	6.7	4.4	6.7	15.6	58.9	B
16	7.86	2.0	0.0	2.0	1.0	10.0	0.0	8.0	25.0	52.0	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
18	7.72	3.2	1.1	0.0	4.3	5.4	4.3	8.6	21.5	51.6	B
16	7.79	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	5.9	2.9	12.7	24.5	48.0	B+

The respondents who gave lower scores (below 5) to any of the service dimensions were then asked their concerns or issues with the interaction. There were only 6 total comments with 2 comments focusing on slow response to an issue (Appendix C).

Streets and Roads

The *maintenance of streets and roads* was assessed using the same 9-point grading scale ranging from very poor (1) to excellent (9). Table 8 shows a solid rating with a mean of 7.39 and a grade of B-. The mean has improved from 7.26 in 2016 while the grade remained unchanged. There were only 4.1% of the responses on the “poor” side of the scale (below 5). It is important to keep in mind that streets and roads can be a challenging area for the town as it continues to experience elevated levels of growth and traffic. This makes this improving score even more notable.

Table 8. How Well Carrboro Maintains Streets and Roads.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	7.39	0.3	0.5	1.3	2.0	4.3	10.1	33.2	24.3	24.1	B-
16	7.26	0.5	0.5	1.0	2.2	7.4	10.6	29.7	28.5	19.6	B-

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) associated with that area (Appendix D). There were only four streets mentioned more than once. The area with the most comments was Greensboro Street with 6 comments. The major concerns were potholes and sidewalks. Main Street was mentioned 3 times for issues with potholes. Other streets mentioned twice were Homestead Road and Estes Drive Extension. The concerns were generally potholes for both and also flooding on Homestead Road. There were also two comments for most streets in town needing maintenance or being too narrow.

Cleanliness and Appearance of Public Areas

The cleanliness and appearance of public areas was assessed by a set of five questions. The questions examined the cleanliness and appearance of *streets*, *median/roadsides*, *parks*, *greenways*, and *sidewalks*. 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 high marks this year. The results shown in Tables 9-13 (placed in descending mean order) indicated the respondents overall were very satisfied with the public areas examined. The cleanliness and appearance of *parks* received the highest grade of A- with a mean of 8.10. This mean increased slightly from 8.06 with the grade remaining unchanged. There was improvement for *greenways* as the mean (7.85 to 8.07) and grade increased (B+ to A-) this year. However, there was a slight decline for *streets* with mean falling from 7.81 to 7.74 resulting in a grade reduction from B+ to B. The mean increased for *median/roadsides* slightly from 7.68 to 7.71 with the grade remaining unchanged (B). Finally, sidewalks were assessed for the first time this year and earned a solid grade of B with a mean of 7.71.

Table 9. Cleanliness and Appearance of Parks.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	8.10	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.0	4.1	4.1	13.7	30.4	47.2	A-
16	8.06	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	5.8	3.0	14.0	32.8	44.1	A-

Table 10. Cleanliness and Appearance of Greenways.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	8.07	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.0	5.0	3.7	14.4	29.9	46.5	A-
16	7.85	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.0	8.5	5.0	16.5	29.3	40.1	B+

Table 11. Cleanliness and Appearance of Streets.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	7.74	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.3	6.8	6.5	21.9	26.9	36.7	B
16	7.81	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	6.7	5.0	23.1	30.0	35.0	B+

Table 12. Cleanliness and Appearance of Median/Roadsides.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	7.71	0.8	0.5	0.3	0.3	6.0	6.8	22.1	27.6	35.7	B
16	7.68	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.7	7.9	7.4	23.1	26.6	34.0	B

Table 13. Cleanliness and Appearance of Sidewalks.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	7.71	0.5	0.3	0.3	1.3	6.0	6.5	22.4	27.2	35.5	B

Public Areas Needing Attention

The respondents who gave ratings below 5 were asked to give specific examples of public areas needing attention (Appendix E). The major concern was for Greensboro Street. North Greensboro was mentioned 3 times for litter, poor appearance, and upkeep. In addition, South Greensboro Street had 2 comments for needing sidewalks and litter issues. Estes Drive Extension earned 2 comments for needing sidewalks. There were also 2 comments that most streets in general need sidewalks and debris removal. The need for more lighting in parking lots also garnered 2 comments.

Police Department

The performance of the Carrboro 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 22.4% (30.7% in 2016) or 88 respondents. Table 14 indicates most of the respondents had contact with an officer (69.7%), followed by dispatcher (8.3%), animal control (5.5%), clerk (5.5%), and detective (4.6%). There was somewhat less contact with the chief (2.8%). The results in the table may represent multiple contacts with different Police personnel by the same individual.

Table 14. Police Department: Person Contacted.

Person Contacted	Number	Percentage
Officer	76	69.7
Dispatcher	9	8.3
Animal control	6	5.5
Clerk	6	5.5
Detective	5	4.6
Not sure	4	3.7
Chief	3	2.8

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 15-19). The Police again earned excellent grades this year from the respondents with all the grades A- or better. The highest rating was for *courteous*. The mean increased from 8.30 to 8.47 improving the grade from A- to A this year. However, the mean for *response time* declined from 8.54 to 8.43 while the grade remained at the A level. This was the only mean that decreased among the service dimensions. All the other service dimensions earned a grade of A- with means increasing for *competence* (8.28 to 8.38), *fairness* (8.23 to 8.33), and *problem-solving* (8.21 to 8.27). Overall, the Police continued to earn outstanding grades with a level of improvement including one of the grades increasing.

Table 15. Police Department: Courteous.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	8.47	0.0	0.0	2.3	1.1	2.3	1.1	8.0	5.7	79.5	A
16	8.30	2.4	0.0	1.6	2.4	0.0	2.4	4.0	13.7	73.4	A-

Table 16. Police Department: Response Time.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	8.43	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	1.6	9.5	7.9	76.2	A
16	8.54	1.1	0.0	1.1	1.1	2.2	1.1	1.1	11.8	80.6	A

Table 17. Police Department: Competence.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	8.38	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	4.6	4.6	9.2	5.7	74.7	A-
16	8.28	3.3	0.0	1.6	0.8	1.6	1.6	3.3	14.6	73.2	A-

Table 18. Police Department: Fairness.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	8.33	1.1	0.0	1.1	2.3	3.4	0.0	10.2	5.7	76.1	A-
16	8.23	3.2	0.0	1.6	0.8	2.4	1.6	4.8	13.7	71.8	A-

Table 19. Police Department: Problem-Solving.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	8.27	0.0	1.2	0.0	1.2	5.8	2.3	10.5	8.1	70.9	A-
16	8.21	3.3	0.0	1.6	0.8	3.3	1.6	4.1	12.3	73.0	A-

Fire Department

The performance of the Carrboro Fire Department was assessed with a set of six questions regarding contact with the Department and rating their service dimensions. This is the same set of questions used with the Police. 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 10.5% (12.3% in 2016) or 42 respondents. The same 9-point grading scale from very poor (1) to excellent (9) was used.

The results shown in Tables 20-24 (placed in descending mean order) indicate the Fire Department earned superior ratings again that have even improved. In the 2016 survey, all the grades with exception of *fairness* (A) were at the A+ level. This year the grade *fairness* also improved to an A+ with the mean increasing from 8.61 to 8.90. In fact, the means increased for all the service dimensions this year and now border on a perfect 9.00. Overall, the Fire Department continued to earn the highest marks for any department in Carrboro.

Table 20. Fire Department: Courteous.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	8.93	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.5	92.5	A+
16	8.71	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	3.9	90.2	A+

Table 21. Fire Department: Response Time.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	8.93	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	92.9	A+
16	8.70	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	2.5	92.5	A+

Table 22. Fire Department: Competence.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	8.93	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.5	92.5	A+
16	8.69	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	5.9	88.2	A+

Table 23. Fire Department: Fairness.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	8.90	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	90.0	A+
16	8.61	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	90.2	A

Table 24. Fire Department: Problem-Solving.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	8.88	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	7.5	90.0	A+
16	8.71	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	91.8	A+

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. The respondents were subsequently 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*. Again, the same 9-point grading scale from very poor (1) to excellent (9) was utilized.

The results showed that 20.6% (15.8% in 2016) or 82 of the respondents 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 youth/various sports, basketball, Christmas events, July 4th, camps, events/festivals/concerts, children's events, Open Streets, Music Festival, baseball/softball, tennis, and Spanish classes. These were the only activities mentioned more than twice.

The ratings for the six service dimensions examined for the Parks & Recreation and Cultural programs are shown in Tables 25-30 (placed in descending mean order). All the service dimensions continued to receive very high marks. The highest rated was *cost or amount of fee* (8.69) earning a grade of A+. The mean and grade have both increased from 8.45 (A) in 2016. However, the *overall experience* mean has decreased from 8.64 to 8.49; although, the grade remains at the A level. This was also true for *ease of registration* where the mean decreased (8.62 to 8.49) but the grade remained an A. As for *instructor quality*, the mean increased slightly (8.38 to 8.42) improving the grade from A- to A. On the other hand, there was a slight mean decrease for *facility quality* (8.44 to 8.40) and *program quality* (8.43 to 8.37) resulting in their grades falling from A to A- this year. Overall, Parks & Recreation continued to be very highly rated by the respondents with one A+ grade, three A grades, and two A-grades.

Table 25. Parks & Recreation: Cost or Amount of Fee.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	8.69	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.1	14.5	77.4	A+
16	8.45	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	13.2	17.0	66.0	A

Table 26. Parks & Recreation: Overall Experience.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	8.49	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	2.4	12.0	9.6	73.5	A
16	8.64	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.5	20.9	71.6	A

Table 27. Parks & Recreation: Ease of Registration.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	8.49	1.2	0.0	0.0	1.2	2.5	1.2	6.2	8.6	79.0	A
16	8.62	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	1.6	25.4	69.8	A

Table 28. Parks & Recreation: Instructor Quality.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	8.42	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	5.3	10.5	14.0	68.4	A
16	8.38	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	10.4	22.9	60.4	A-

Table 29. Parks & Recreation: Facility Quality.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	8.40	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	4.9	9.8	11.0	70.7	A-
16	8.44	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	1.5	13.6	16.7	66.7	A

Table 30. Parks & Recreation: Program Quality.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
18	8.37	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	2.4	6.0	10.7	6.0	73.8	A-
16	8.43	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.7	16.2	67.6	A

Carrboro Overall as a Place to Live

The respondents were asked to rate Carrboro overall as a place to live using a 9-point scale from very undesirable (1) to very desirable (9). Table 31 indicates that Carrboro was perceived as a very good place to live. Although not in a traditional grading scale format, if the mean (7.87) were converted to a grade, then the rating would be a B+. There were 95.9% of the responses on the “desirable” side of the scale (above 5) versus only 2.1% on the “undesirable” side (below 5). The mean has declined slightly from 2016 when the mean was 7.95 while the grade has remained unchanged.

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 3 comments and they focused on maintaining roads, high traffic, and high taxes.

Table 31. Carrboro Overall as a Place to Live.

Year	Mean	Very Undesirable 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Desirable 9	Grade
18	7.87	0.3	0.3	1.0	0.5	2.0	2.5	23.9	37.3	32.2	B+
16	7.95	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	3.5	5.2	18.8	36.5	35.8	B+

Carrboro as a Place to Live Crosstabulations

Crosstabulations for Carrboro as a place to live were conducted for age, education, gender, housing type, income, and years in Carrboro. The breakdowns are shown in Tables B1-B6 in Appendix B. The means for the subgroups were generally high and consistent with most grades falling in the B to B+ range. In fact, there were no grades that fell below B this year.

Quality of Life in Carrboro

The perception of the quality of life in Carrboro 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 large proportion of the respondents (64.8%) perceived the quality of life in Carrboro as the “same” over the past two years (Table 32). Keep in mind, higher means (above 3.00) indicate perceptions of an improvement in the quality of life and the mean for Carrboro was 3.24. This mean is virtually unchanged from 2016 when it was 3.26. The percentage on the “better” side of the scale (above the midpoint of 3) greatly exceeded the percentage on the “worse” side (below 3) by 28.1% to 7.1% (Figure 8). In 2016, the percentages were 25.4% versus 3.5% indicating slight increases in the “better” percentages as well as the “worse” percentages.




Figure 8. Quality of Life.

To gain more insight into those giving lower ratings, the respondents who answered with a rating below 3 were asked the reason for the low rating (Appendix G). There were 39 total responses given and the primary concerns were a higher cost of living (9 comments), traffic (4 comments), overcrowded (4 comments), construction (3 comments), parking (3 comments), and overdevelopment (3 comments).

Table 32. Quality of Life in Carrboro.

Year	Mean	Much Worse 1	Somewhat Worse 2	The Same 3	Somewhat Better 4	Much Better 5	% Below 3	% Above 3
18	3.24	0.5	6.6	64.8	24.5	3.6	7.1	28.1
16	3.26	0.0	3.5	71.1	20.9	4.5	3.5	25.4

Most Important Issue Facing Carrboro

An open-ended question asked respondents what they feel is the most important issue facing the Town of Carrboro (Appendix H). The most frequent comment was the respondent perceived none/no issues and this was mentioned 82 times (Table 33). These responses have a positive component considering that major issues did not come to mind immediately and speaks to the effectiveness of management in the town. However, the issue of growth was a concern to many respondents. There were 52 comments concerning controlling growth/overcrowding. In addition, the growth-related issue of overdevelopment/controlling development garnered 27 comments. This resulted in 79 total comments related to the growth concerns. Two other key issues besides growth were affordable housing (46 comments) and traffic (24 comments). Other concerns were the rising cost of living (20 comments), high taxes (19 comments), and parking (17 comments).

Table 33. Most Important Issue Facing Carrboro – 2018.

Important Issue	# Comments
None/no issues	82
Controlling growth/overcrowding	52
Affordable housing	46
Controlling development/overdevelopment	27
Traffic	24
Rising cost of living	20
High taxes	19
Parking	17
Not sure	12
No opinion	10
Retaining small-town feel	9
School quality	8
Maintaining infrastructure	8
Diversity	8
Crime	6
Homeless/poverty	5
Water drainage/flooding	5

There have been minimal changes since 2016 in the ordering of the most important issues facing Carrboro (Table 34). The top seven issues remain unchanged. However, the number of comments relating to the importance of the issues have changed. None/no issues declined from 121 to 82 comments. The number of comments have increased for controlling growth/overcrowding (44 to 52 comments), affordable housing (39 to 46 comments), high taxes (14 to 19 comments), parking (6 to 17 comments), and retaining small-town feel (6 to 9 comments) indicating a growing level of importance. Declining somewhat in importance were controlling development/overdevelopment (38 to 27 comments) and traffic (35 to 24 comments).

Table 34. Most Important Issue Facing Carrboro – 2016.

Important Issue	# Comments
None/no issues	121
Controlling growth/overcrowding	44
Affordable housing	39
Controlling development/overdevelopment	38
Traffic	35
Rising cost of living	18
High taxes	14
Need for more sidewalks/improve sidewalks	8
Crime	8
Jobs/economic development	8
Improving safety/widen for bike lanes	7
Diversity in the area	7
Parking	6
Retaining small-town feel	6
Homeless/poverty	5
Not sure	5

How Safe Residents Feel in Carrboro

The survey included a set of questions that examined the respondent's personal perceptions of safety in the Town of Carrboro. The survey included three separate questions to assess safety including safe in Carrboro overall, safe in their home neighborhood, and safe around various public places throughout town such as shopping, eating out, or at concerts.

The respondents were first asked how safe they feel in Carrboro 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 Carrboro overall (Table 35). The mean was 8.29 with an impressive 98.0% responding on the "safe" side (above 5) of the scale. This included 56.1% who answered they felt extremely safe in town. There was only 0.9% on the "unsafe" side (below 5) of the scale with 1.3% responding average levels for safety (Figure 9). Overall, there was an exceptionally high perception of safety in Carrboro. This represents a slight increase in safe perceptions from 2016 when the mean was 8.24.




Figure 9. Safe in Carrboro Overall.

Table 35. How Safe Do You Feel in Carrboro Overall.

Year	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
18	8.29	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.3	1.3	2.8	13.6	25.5	56.1	98.0
16	8.24	0.2	0.0	0.7	0.0	1.7	3.5	13.6	25.2	55.1	97.4

The respondents were next asked how safe they feel in their home neighborhood (Table 36). The perception of safety was even higher for their home neighborhood. The mean was an impressive 8.44. In this instance, there were 98.2% responding on the "safe" side of the scale (above 5) including 64.4% answering they felt extremely safe in their home neighborhood. The "unsafe" side of the scale (below 5) garnered only 1.3% of the responses with only 0.6% answering they felt average levels of safety (Figure 10). This mean has also increased from 2016 when it was 8.35.




Figure 10. Safe in Home Neighborhood.

Table 36. 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
18	8.44	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.6	2.0	9.3	22.5	64.4	98.2
16	8.35	0.2	0.2	0.7	0.2	3.0	1.5	7.4	24.4	62.2	95.5

Finally, the respondents were asked about how safe they feel in public places around Carrboro for activities around town such as shopping, eating out, or going to a concert (Table 37). This mean has improved this year from 8.10 to 8.33. The percentage of the “safe” side of the scale (above 5) was very high at 97.7%. This included 58.6% of the respondents who indicated they felt extremely safe in public places in Carrboro. There were only 0.6% who were on the “unsafe” side of the scale shown in Figure 11. Keep in mind, perceptions of safety in public places tend to earn somewhat lower ratings compared to the home neighborhood and overall in town making these results even more impressive.




Figure 11. Safe in Public Places.

In summary, Carrboro was regarded as a very safe place by the respondents for all areas examined. There was a very high percentage of responses in the extremely safe category for all three questions. All the perceptions of safety have even improved from 2016.

Table 37. How Safe Do You Feel in Public Places Around Carrboro (Shopping, Out to Eat, Concerts).

Year	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
18	8.33	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.0	1.8	3.0	11.6	24.5	58.6	97.7
16	8.10	0.5	0.0	0.2	0.0	4.0	3.5	16.5	21.5	52.8	94.3

How Safe Residents Feel in Carrboro Crosstabulations

Crosstabulations for this set of questions were conducted for age, education, gender, housing type, income, and years in Carrboro. The breakdowns for perceptions of safety in Carrboro overall, home neighborhood, and public places are shown in Tables B7-B24 in Appendix B. The means for the subgroups were generally high and consistent. There were no means that fell below 8.00 this year. For comparison, there were 6 means that fell below this mark in 2016.

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). In this instance, a higher mean indicates the source would be more of a barrier to citizen involvement.

Table 38 shows that the most significant overall barrier was *too busy – don't have time* with a mean of 5.75 with 54.4% of the responses on the "barrier" side of the scale (above 5). The other key barriers to involvement were *don't know about the opportunities* (4.62 with 40.0% on the "barrier" side) and *timing is inconvenient* (4.23 with 35.6% on the "barrier" side). These were the only three barriers where the mean exceeded 4.0. Several other potential barriers were less significant hindrances to involvement including *topics don't interest me* (3.32), *issues don't affect me* (3.26), *don't feel qualified to offer input* (2.66), *waste of time – one person cannot make a difference* (2.44), *don't understand government processes* (2.29), and *don't have transportation* (1.80). Compared to 2016, the top four barriers were identical. The only changes were *issues don't affect me* (6th to 5th) and *waste of time – one person can't make a difference* (8th to 7th) moved up one spot.

Table 38. Barriers to Involvement in Town Government (In Descending Mean Order) – 2018.

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	5.75	19.5	2.4	5.5	5.3	12.9	4.7	9.7	7.6	32.4	54.4
Don't know about opportunities	4.62	29.2	3.9	7.6	6.3	12.9	8.2	9.7	4.2	17.9	40.0
Timing is inconvenient	4.23	40.9	3.7	4.5	3.7	11.6	5.0	6.6	4.2	19.8	35.6
Topics don't interest me	3.32	43.9	7.1	8.4	4.2	17.1	3.9	6.1	2.6	6.6	19.2
Issues don't affect me	3.26	41.8	7.9	10.8	5.3	17.4	2.4	7.4	2.1	5.0	16.9
Don't feel qualified to offer input	2.66	59.2	4.7	6.3	3.9	13.9	2.4	2.6	1.1	5.8	11.9
Waste of time; one person can't make a difference	2.44	66.6	3.9	2.6	3.9	11.1	2.9	3.2	0.8	5.0	11.9
Don't understand government processes	2.29	63.7	3.9	9.5	2.1	14.5	0.5	3.4	0.5	1.8	6.2
Don't have transportation	1.80	82.9	1.1	1.8	1.1	5.0	3.2	1.6	0.8	2.6	8.2

Table 39. Barriers to Involvement in Town Government (In Descending Mean Order) – 2016.

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	5.47	32.5	0.2	1.0	1.0	10.9	3.7	7.9	9.4	33.3	54.3
Don't know about opportunities	3.81	51.1	0.7	3.7	1.7	14.9	1.5	3.7	2.5	20.1	27.8
Timing is inconvenient	2.58	70.7	1.0	2.5	0.2	8.9	1.2	5.2	3.2	6.9	16.5
Topics don't interest me	2.08	72.5	3.2	3.2	2.2	13.2	0.7	1.7	1.2	2.0	5.6
Don't feel qualified to offer input	2.07	76.7	1.7	1.2	1.5	11.9	0.7	1.0	0.5	4.7	6.9
Issues don't affect me	1.94	73.9	2.7	4.2	2.0	13.2	1.0	2.0	0.2	0.7	3.9
Don't understand government processes	1.70	82.1	1.0	3.0	1.0	10.2	0.5	0.5	0.2	1.5	2.7
Waste of time; one person can't make a difference	1.54	87.3	0.5	0.7	0.7	8.2	0.5	0.7	0.2	1.0	2.4
Don't have transportation	1.37	91.5	0.5	0.5	0.2	5.5	0.0	0.7	0.0	1.0	1.7

Barriers to Involvement Crosstabulations

Crosstabulations for the barriers to involvement in Town Government were conducted on age, education, gender, housing type, income, and years in Carrboro. The breakdowns are shown in Tables B25-B30 of Appendix B. Instead of examining each demographic variable separately, it would be more informative to examine each barrier in terms of its rating in each of the 23 subgroups with sample sizes of 10 or greater. The information sources will be discussed in order of overall ranking by the total sample. *Too busy, don't have time* was ranked as the top barrier to involvement rating 1st in 19 of the 23 subgroups. The barrier ranking second overall was *don't know about opportunities* and this barrier rated 2nd in 14 of the subgroups. This barrier did rank first for over 65 age group, apartment dwellers, other dwellers, and over \$150,000 income level. *Timing is inconvenient* generally ranked third for the total sample and did so in 13 of the subgroups. Its highest ranking was second for 26-55 age group, single family households, over \$150,000 income level, over 10-year residents, and native residents. *Topics don't interest me* was ranked fourth overall and did so in 13 of the subgroups and its highest rating was 2nd for current students. The impact of the remaining barriers was more limited. There were only two of these finishing in the top three barriers for any of the subgroups. *Issues don't affect me* which rated 3rd for current students and 0-1 year residents. *Don't have transportation* finished 3rd for over 65 age group.

Information Sources

The survey examined the respondent's usage of 20 information sources that Carrboro 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 (in order) were word-of-mouth (6.65), street signage (5.35), Carrboro's website (4.79), television (3.60), Facebook (3.46), and radio (3.44). These were the only information sources with a mean above 3.00. Overall, respondents primarily used three main information sources (word-of-mouth, street signage, and Carrboro's website) to obtain information, especially word-of-mouth. Although, it would seem logical that multiple other information sources invariably impact word of mouth.

The lesser used information sources with means between 2.00 and 3.00 were Carrboro's email list services (2.94), Parks & Recreation Brochure (2.67), Twitter (2.34), Instagram (2.27), Raleigh News & Observer (2.23), and Independent Weekly (2.09). The least used information sources of those examined in order were stream Board of Alderman (1.29), Herald Sun (1.35), and watch Board of Alderman television (1.43).

Table 40. Most Used Information Sources in 2018 (In Order of Usage).

Information Source	Mean	Never Use 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Frequently Use 9	% Above 5
Word-of-Mouth	6.65	3.6	2.6	3.6	2.8	16.7	10.8	18.0	17.7	24.2	70.7
Street signage	5.35	10.3	5.4	5.9	6.5	23.0	17.3	12.9	6.7	11.9	48.8
Carrboro's website	4.79	23.5	7.9	7.4	4.3	10.2	11.5	12.0	11.5	11.5	46.5
Television	3.60	41.7	6.6	6.6	7.4	9.0	9.5	7.2	4.3	7.7	28.7
Facebook	3.46	49.1	2.0	5.1	5.1	12.7	6.6	7.9	4.8	6.6	25.9
Radio	3.44	33.8	12.0	9.7	9.7	12.8	8.4	8.7	1.5	3.3	21.9
Town's email list services	2.94	62.6	2.3	3.8	2.3	5.9	5.9	5.1	3.6	8.5	23.1
Parks & Rec. Brochure	2.67	59.9	7.8	4.1	4.9	7.0	3.1	5.2	2.6	5.4	16.3
Twitter	2.34	71.7	1.5	3.3	2.3	5.4	4.3	6.6	2.6	2.3	15.8
Instagram	2.27	72.6	0.5	2.6	3.6	8.2	3.6	4.9	1.5	2.6	12.6
Raleigh News & Observer	2.23	71.6	2.0	5.1	3.6	7.2	2.3	1.8	1.8	4.6	10.5
Independent Weekly	2.09	70.9	6.9	6.1	1.8	4.1	2.0	2.0	2.8	3.3	10.1
Notify Me	1.96	79.0	0.5	1.5	4.1	5.9	2.3	3.1	2.3	1.3	9.0
YouTube	1.90	77.2	2.3	4.6	4.1	4.6	1.3	1.8	2.3	1.8	7.2
The Daily Tar Heel	1.86	74.7	5.6	6.4	2.6	3.8	1.8	2.3	1.0	1.8	6.9
Next Door	1.72	83.8	3.3	2.1	1.3	2.1	1.3	0.8	1.8	3.6	7.5
Govt. Access Channel	1.63	77.5	5.4	5.4	6.4	2.8	0.5	1.3	0.3	0.5	2.6
Homeowners' Association	1.62	81.2	5.9	3.1	2.6	2.1	1.5	0.8	0.8	2.1	5.2
Watch Board of Alderman TV	1.43	81.4	8.4	3.8	1.8	2.5	1.3	0.5	0.0	0.3	2.1
Herald Sun	1.35	88.5	3.8	2.6	0.8	1.0	1.5	1.3	0.3	0.3	3.4
Stream Board of Alderman	1.29	89.8	3.8	2.0	1.0	1.8	0.3	0.5	0.0	0.8	1.6

There have been changes in information sources since 2016 (Table 41). There were increases in usage for television (5th to 4th), Carrboro email list services (11th to 7th), Twitter (12th to 9th), Instagram (16th to 10th), YouTube (18th to 14th), and Next Door (20th to 16th). Outside of television, note the increases in online and social media as information sources. The information sources that decreased in usage include Facebook (4th to 5th), Raleigh News & Observer (7th to 11th), Independent Weekly (9th to 12th), The Daily Tarheel 10th to 15th), Government Access Channel (13th to 17th), and Herald Sun (15th to 20th). These reflect what would be referred to as traditional media sources mostly print related with the exception of Facebook.

Table 41. Most Used Information Sources in 2016 (In Order of Usage).

Information Source	Mean	Never Use 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Frequently Use 9	% Above 5
Word-of-Mouth	6.44	2.5	3.7	6.7	6.2	17.3	9.9	13.1	13.6	27.0	63.6
Street signage	4.69	20.5	8.1	8.4	6.9	16.0	8.1	15.1	6.9	9.9	40.0
Carrboro's website	3.99	39.8	5.2	6.2	4.4	9.6	6.9	9.6	8.9	9.4	34.8
Facebook	3.31	54.3	4.0	2.7	3.0	8.9	6.4	8.1	4.7	7.9	27.1
Television	3.27	42.7	9.4	10.6	5.9	10.6	4.9	6.2	2.5	7.2	20.8
Radio	2.95	47.4	11.4	5.9	7.4	11.6	4.9	4.4	3.5	3.5	16.3
Raleigh News & Observer	2.61	64.2	2.7	6.9	4.0	4.4	4.2	5.7	3.2	4.7	17.8
Parks & Rec. Brochure	2.51	59.8	6.7	7.9	4.9	7.2	3.2	5.4	2.7	2.2	13.5
Independent Weekly	2.46	68.6	4.7	4.0	3.5	3.0	2.5	3.7	4.4	5.7	16.3
The Daily Tar Heel	2.19	69.6	4.9	6.4	2.5	6.9	1.7	2.0	2.0	4.0	9.7
Town's email list services	2.10	74.8	3.2	3.5	2.2	5.9	2.7	2.2	1.2	4.2	10.3
Twitter	1.80	84.9	1.0	1.0	0.7	2.7	2.2	2.2	2.5	2.7	9.6
Govt. Access Channel	1.70	74.8	9.4	5.4	2.2	4.2	1.0	1.0	0.2	1.7	3.9
Notify Me	1.61	87.4	0.7	1.2	0.7	3.7	1.5	1.7	0.7	2.2	6.1
Herald Sun	1.55	85.2	2.7	4.2	1.0	2.7	0.7	0.2	1.2	2.0	4.1
Instagram	1.53	89.6	0.2	0.5	0.5	3.0	2.5	1.2	1.5	1.0	6.2
LinkedIn	1.48	90.4	0.0	0.2	0.2	4.2	2.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	5.0
YouTube	1.40	91.4	0.5	0.2	0.7	4.0	1.0	0.5	0.5	1.2	3.2
Homeowners' Association	1.27	93.3	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.7	0.0	0.7	0.5	0.7	1.9
Next Door	1.23	94.1	0.5	1.5	0.5	1.7	0.7	0.2	0.0	0.7	1.6

Carrboro'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 42 indicates the respondents felt relatively well informed about the matters that affect them. The mean was 6.10 with 59.3% on the “informed” side of the scale (above 5) versus 14.9% on the “uninformed” side or below 5 (Figure 12). This mean has improved from 6.00 in 2016 due to the fact the “uninformed” percentages fell from 20.4% to 14.9% this year. Keep in mind, this set of questions generally tend to earn lower means due to the number of respondents who are not seeking information. The respondent’s comments on projects, services, and issues that came to mind when deciding on their rating are shown in Appendix I. There were 52 total comments including 13 comments that the respondent was not actively seeking information along with 2 comments of being too busy. Again, this likely is what contributes to some of the respondents not feeling informed. There were also 13 comments concerning not seeing information made available and 3 comments of don’t know where to find information. In addition, there were 3 comments that information needs to be available in Spanish and 2 comments concerning the loss of the newspaper impacting how informed they feel.




Figure 12. Informed About Government Services.

Table 42. How Informed Do 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
18	6.10	5.8	0.5	3.8	4.8	25.8	12.1	20.7	12.6	13.9	59.3
16	6.00	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 *Carrboro 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 43 indicates a relatively high degree of satisfaction with Carrboro’s efforts with a mean of 6.49 up slightly from 6.45 in 2016. There were 63.8% on the “satisfied” side of the scale with 11.6% on the “dissatisfied” side (Figure 13). The respondent’s comments on projects, services, and issues that came to mind when they decided on their rating are shown in Appendix J. There were 45 total comments and the most common ones were the respondent has not seen information made available (12 comments) and the difficulty in finding information/have to look for it (5 comments). There were also 4 comments indicating the respondent was not actively seeking information. In addition, there




Figure 13. Town Making Information Available.

were 4 comments indicating the respondent did not know where to look for the information and 4 comments indicating information is available if you look for it. Finally, there were suggestions to make the information available in Spanish (2 comments) and for increased use of social media sources (2 comments).

Table 43. Satisfaction with Carrboro 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
18	6.49	2.5	1.0	3.8	4.3	24.6	8.1	21.3	14.7	19.7	63.8
16	6.45	3.0	1.0	2.7	1.0	31.6	10.4	13.4	18.2	18.7	60.7

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 44 shows a relatively high degree of satisfaction with a mean of 6.37 with 60.7% on the “satisfied” side of the scale versus 10.9% on the “dissatisfied” side (Figure 14). The mean was 6.35 in 2016. Appendix K shows the respondent’s comments on projects, services, and issues that came to mind when deciding on their rating. There were 37 total comments including 9 comments the respondent was unaware of any opportunities and 6 comments they had no interest in participating.




Figure 14. Opportunities to Participate in Decision Making.

There were also 4 comments calling for the town to provide more information while 4 other comments indicated there were opportunities available. Finally, 3 comments focused on the town not listening to citizens and 3 comments indicating the need for information in Spanish.

Table 44. 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
18	6.37	4.9	0.5	3.4	2.1	28.4	7.0	19.9	15.2	18.6	60.7
16	6.35	5.2	0.7	0.5	0.2	36.2	6.0	18.4	14.6	18.1	57.1

Resident Informed and Involved Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations on Carrboro keeping residents informed and involved about government projects, issues, and programs are shown in Tables B31-B42. Breakdowns were performed on age, education, gender, housing type, income, and years in Carrboro (Appendix B). Overall, there was a relatively high degree of consistency across the subgroups. However, those who felt the least informed (lower means) about government projects, issues, and programs were 0-1 year residents (4.62), current students (4.96), PhD/JD/MD degrees (5.52), apartment dwellers (5.53), 0-\$45,000 income level (5.56), and 18-25 age group (5.57). In terms of opportunities the town gives to participate in the decision-making process, the least satisfied were 0-1 year residents (5.08) and other dwellers (5.17).

Solid Waste Services

A set of questions was included in the survey to examine the respondent's satisfaction with four curbside solid waste collection services including *garbage collection*, *bulk item collection*, *yard waste collection*, and *loose leaf collection*. A 9-point scale from very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (9) was used to rate these curbside collection services. The solid waste services are discussed in order of ratings from highest to lowest mean rankings. The respondents were initially asked if they were aware that curbside recycling was provided by Orange County Waste Management and not the Town of Carrboro. There were 49.6% (50.9% in 2016) of the respondents who were not aware of this fact.

There was a very high level of satisfaction from the respondents who used *curbside garbage collection*. The mean was an impressive 8.22 (Table 45). Figure 15 shows the percentages on the "satisfied" side of the scale (above 5) were 96.4% with only 1.2% on the "dissatisfied" side (below 5). This was the highest mean for any of the curbside collections. However, the mean has fallen from 8.46 in 2016 largely due to the decline in very satisfied percentages (67.3% to 56.7%). Although not in a traditional grading format, this mean would convert to a grade of A- declining from an A in 2016.




Figure 15. Garbage Collection Satisfaction.

Table 45. Satisfaction with Curbside Garbage Collection (n=330).

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18	8.22	0.0	0.6	0.3	0.3	2.4	2.7	16.1	20.9	56.7	96.4
16	8.46	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.4	2.5	1.8	6.3	21.5	67.3	96.9

The town continued to earn very good marks for their *curbside bulk item collection*. This year, the mean for this collection service was 8.03 from the respondents who used the service (Table 46). Figure 16 shows there were 90.7% of the respondents were on the "satisfied" side of the scale. While the percentages on the "dissatisfied" side of the scale were only 5.8%. However, this mean has also fallen from 2016 when it was 8.22 as the "satisfied" side of the scale declined (94.6% to 90.7%). The *bulk item collection* mean would convert to a grade of B+ this year declining from an A- in 2016.




Figure 16. Bulk Item Collection Satisfaction.

Table 46. Satisfaction with Curbside Bulk Item Collection (n=160).

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18	8.03	1.3	1.3	1.9	1.3	3.8	1.9	11.9	16.9	60.0	90.7
16	8.22	1.8	0.0	1.8	0.9	0.9	3.6	6.3	21.6	63.1	94.6

The respondents were also satisfied with the town's *curbside yard waste collection* from the respondents who used this service. Although ranking somewhat lower than garbage and bulk item curbside services, the mean for this collection service was still very high at 7.88 (Table 47). Figure 17 shows there were 88.2% of the responses on the "satisfied" side of the scale versus only 4.5% on the "dissatisfied" side of the scale. However, this mean has also declined slightly from 2016 when it was 8.03. The grade this year would convert to a B+ which would be unchanged from 2016.




Figure 17. Yard Waste Collection Satisfaction.

Table 47. Satisfaction with Curbside Yard Waste Collection (n=202).

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18	7.88	1.5	1.0	0.5	1.5	7.4	3.5	13.4	16.3	55.0	88.2
16	8.03	0.6	0.6	0.6	1.9	5.2	5.2	9.7	18.7	57.4	91.0

Finally, the respondent's level of satisfaction with *curbside loose leaf collection* was rated highly by the respondents. The mean represented a very strong score at 7.84 (Table 48). Note the percentage on the "satisfied" side of the scale was 88.8% with only 5.9% on the "dissatisfied" side (Figure 18). The mean was virtually unchanged from 2016 (7.83). The mean for *loose leaf collection* would convert to a B+ which was the same as 2016.




Figure 18. Loose Leaf Collection Satisfaction.

Overall, there was a high level of satisfaction for all the curbside solid waste services with a slight decline including two of the grades falling from 2016 for *garbage collection* and *bulk item collection*.

Table 48. Satisfaction with Curbside Loose Leaf Collection (n=206).

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18	7.84	1.0	1.0	0.5	3.4	5.3	3.4	17.0	16.5	51.9	88.8
16	7.83	1.2	0.6	1.2	1.2	7.6	3.5	14.6	21.1	49.1	88.3

Solid Waste Services Crosstabulations

Crosstabulations were conducted for age, education, gender, housing type, income and years in Carrboro for the set of solid waste curbside services (Appendix B). The crosstabulations for the four curbside collection services are shown in Tables B43-B66. A large majority of the means were very high and consistent across the subgroups. The only means below 7.25 were 2-5 year residents (7.21)

for *curbside bulk item collection*. As for *curbside yard waste collection*, there were somewhat lower means for 2-5 year residents (7.10). Finally for *curbside loose leaf collection*, the only lower means were for over 2-5 year residents (7.16) and over 65 age group (7.24). Keep in mind, only subgroups with sample sizes of 10 or more are discussed.

Downtown Carrboro

A set of questions was included in the survey asking the respondents how Carrboro could create a more vibrant downtown area. The respondents were first asked if they had visited downtown in the past year and 89.9% (95.6% in 2016) indicated they had visited the area. Those who had visited downtown were then asked what drew them to downtown (Appendix L). There were 525 total comments (respondents may give more than one reason) and the key reason was restaurants with 109 total comments. In addition, shopping (69 comments) and Weaver Street Market (48 comments) were important draws to downtown. Other reasons included conducting business (30 comments), fun/pleasure (29 comments), events/festivals (29 comments), and Farmer's Market (20 comments). The top five reasons in 2016 were restaurants, Weaver Street Market, shopping, everything, and events/festivals. Those who had not visited downtown were then asked why (Appendix M). There were 34 total comments and the key reasons included too busy (10 comments), parking (8 comments), and no reason (6 comments).

The respondents were then asked to rate how effective various amenities/activities would be in bringing them to downtown Carrboro. 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 49 shows cafes/restaurants (6.67) would be the most likely amenity to attract the respondents to downtown. Festivals (6.15), Farmer's Market (5.96), Summer Streets/Closed Street (5.95), outdoor performances (5.84), shopping opportunities (5.79), and concerts (5.57) were also effective draws. Other amenities with slightly less effectiveness were grocery store (5.37), ice cream/yogurt shop (5.18), bars/pubs (5.15), additional art exhibition space (5.06), and public art (5.00). The amenities with the lowest means were pet shop (4.32), working artist studio space (4.70), and historical walking tour (4.74). There were 43 responses given to the "other" category for amenities/activities not mentioned (Appendix N). The most frequent were library (5 comments) and more parking (3 comments).

Table 49. The Likelihood of Amenities or Activities in Bringing Respondents to Downtown Carrboro in 2018 (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	6.67	11.0	0.5	0.8	3.1	14.6	7.9	13.6	13.0	35.5	70.0
Festivals	6.15	13.7	2.8	2.3	2.0	16.3	8.7	16.0	8.9	29.3	62.9
Farmer's Market	5.96	16.9	2.6	3.3	2.8	16.4	5.9	12.0	10.2	29.9	58.0
Summer Streets/Closed Street	5.95	15.6	1.8	3.1	2.1	17.4	9.2	15.1	10.8	24.9	60.0
Outdoor performances	5.84	15.3	3.1	3.1	2.3	17.3	11.2	15.3	8.9	23.5	58.9
Shopping opportunities	5.79	17.0	2.6	3.6	2.3	19.3	8.8	9.8	10.3	26.3	55.2
Concerts	5.57	18.6	2.3	2.8	3.6	22.4	6.4	13.5	8.4	22.1	50.4
Grocery store	5.37	20.5	5.1	6.1	2.3	17.4	6.4	10.0	6.9	25.3	48.6
Ice cream/yogurt shop	5.18	22.9	3.6	4.4	3.1	19.3	9.0	11.1	6.2	20.6	46.9
Bars/pubs	5.15	23.1	3.9	4.4	2.8	20.1	8.0	10.3	7.7	19.8	45.8
Additional art exhibition space	5.06	19.9	4.1	5.9	5.6	21.2	8.4	14.3	4.3	16.3	43.3
Public Art	5.00	22.1	3.9	5.4	2.8	22.6	11.1	10.5	4.6	17.0	43.2
Museums	4.91	22.1	5.1	4.6	3.6	24.9	9.3	9.0	5.4	15.9	39.6
Coffee shop	4.88	25.2	4.6	4.4	4.1	21.9	6.4	9.8	5.1	18.5	39.8
Art Walks	4.83	23.5	3.6	7.7	2.3	23.2	10.6	8.2	5.7	15.2	39.7
Historical walking tour	4.74	22.8	5.6	5.9	5.4	24.9	7.2	7.4	5.6	15.1	35.3
Working artist studio space	4.70	23.0	4.6	7.2	6.4	24.8	6.6	7.9	3.6	15.9	34.0
Pet shop	4.32	31.1	6.7	5.7	3.3	21.3	5.9	7.5	3.6	14.9	31.9

There have been a few changes in the amenities/activities since 2016 (Table 50). The amenities with the most significant increases in importance were Farmer's Market (5th to 3rd), grocery store (15th to 8th), ice cream/yogurt shop (12th to 9th), bars/pubs (14th to 10th), and coffee shop (16th to 14th). The ones with the most significant decreases were outdoor performance (3rd to 5th), museums (10th to 13th), art walks (8th to 15th), and historical walking tour (9th to 16th).

Table 50. The Likelihood of Amenities or Activities in Bringing Respondents to Downtown Carrboro in 2016 (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	6.07	16.0	1.7	3.0	2.2	17.3	6.2	11.1	14.1	28.4	59.8
Festivals	5.81	19.3	2.7	2.5	1.5	18.3	6.2	11.4	9.1	29.1	55.8
Outdoor performances	5.76	19.6	2.0	2.5	4.2	16.1	6.7	10.4	12.9	25.7	55.7
Summer Streets/Closed Street	5.69	20.1	3.0	3.0	2.5	19.4	5.5	6.9	11.9	27.8	52.1
Farmer's Market	5.56	19.8	3.0	2.7	3.2	21.5	5.0	9.4	12.6	22.8	49.8
Shopping opportunities	5.51	19.0	3.0	3.5	4.4	20.0	8.1	9.4	9.6	23.0	50.1
Concerts	5.39	23.7	1.7	3.0	4.2	17.3	7.2	9.6	10.6	22.7	50.1
Art Walks	5.13	24.3	3.0	3.7	3.5	21.5	5.9	10.9	6.7	20.5	44.0
Historical walking tour	5.10	23.3	3.7	2.2	4.2	24.0	5.2	11.1	9.7	16.6	42.6
Museums	5.07	23.7	3.0	4.2	3.0	22.5	6.2	12.8	8.9	15.8	43.7
Additional art exhibition space	5.00	25.7	4.2	4.2	2.2	20.7	6.7	8.6	8.9	18.8	43.0
Ice cream/yogurt shop	4.96	24.7	3.7	4.0	3.0	25.4	5.4	7.9	7.9	18.0	39.2
Public Art	4.96	24.5	4.5	4.0	2.2	22.3	7.7	10.6	8.7	15.6	42.6
Bars/pubs	4.94	27.4	3.0	4.0	4.4	18.8	5.9	8.9	9.9	17.8	42.5
Grocery store	4.81	24.3	5.2	4.2	3.0	25.2	6.9	10.1	6.4	14.6	38.0
Coffee shop	4.79	27.4	4.4	3.5	3.5	22.0	5.9	10.4	6.4	16.5	39.2
Working artist studio space	4.79	30.2	4.0	2.0	2.2	20.8	5.9	9.9	7.9	17.1	40.8
Pet shop	4.59	28.6	4.7	4.2	4.7	23.7	4.2	8.4	6.4	15.1	34.1

Carrboro Focus Areas

The survey included several questions examining focus areas for the town. The respondents were asked to rate the town's efforts in six focus areas including *environmental protection*; *keeping Carrboro the best place to live, work, and raise a family*; *transportation*; *planning & development*; *parking*; and *parks, recreation, & cultural issues*. A 9-point satisfaction scale was used for all the areas examined with the exception of a 9-point effectiveness scale used for *keeping Carrboro the best place to live, work, and raise a family*. The focus areas are listed in order of mean scores.

The highest rated of the focus areas was how effective the Board of Aldermen were in *keeping Carrboro the best place to live, work, and raise a family*. This question used a 9-point effectiveness scale ranging from very ineffective (1) to very effective (9). The respondents were very supportive of the town's efforts with a solid mean of 7.30 (Table 51). There were 81.4% of the responses on the "effective" side of the scale (above 5) with only 5.1% on the "ineffective" side (Figure 19). This mean is virtually unchanged from 2016 when it was 7.32. The respondents who gave the town a rating below 5 were asked what actions Carrboro could take to be more effective (Appendix O). There were 25 total suggestions and the two key areas for improvement were the town is too focused on development and not residents (5 comments) and the need for affordable housing (5 comments). In addition, there were also 3 comments stating taxes were too high.




Figure 19. Effective in Keeping Carrboro the Best Place to Live, Work, & Raise a Family.

Table 51. Effectiveness of Board of Aldermen in Working to Keep Carrboro 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
18	7.30	1.0	1.3	1.0	1.8	13.5	6.1	18.9	27.6	28.8	81.4
16	7.32	0.8	0.5	1.3	0.5	13.4	6.6	22.5	30.1	24.5	83.7

The job the town is doing with *parks, recreation, and cultural issues* earned very solid ratings. The respondents were asked to consider the quality/quantity of parks, greenways, and community centers; facilities distance; planning/building new parks, community centers, greenways, and trails. Table 52 shows positive results for the town with a mean was 7.57. There were 89.1% of the responses on the "satisfied" side of the scale (above 5) with only 2.3% on the "dissatisfied" side (Figure 20). Although not in a grading scale format, this would correspond to a grade of B. This year's rating was virtually unchanged from 2016 when it as 7.56 (B). The respondents who gave the town a rating below 5




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

(“dissatisfied” side) were asked what actions would make them more satisfied (Appendix P). There were 17 total suggestions and the key ones were more parks (4 comments), more community centers (2 comments), better trail connectivity (2 comments), and complete MLK Park (2 comments).

Table 52. 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
18	7.57	0.3	0.5	0.5	1.0	8.6	4.6	22.8	35.4	26.3	89.1
16	7.56	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.0	9.2	5.2	24.3	35.4	24.5	89.4

The respondents were mostly satisfied with the job the town is doing on *environmental protection* such as hybrid vehicles, open space/water preservation, sustainability, erosion control, stormwater, and litter reduction. The town earned a solid rating with a mean of 7.14 (Table 53). There were 84.0% of the responses on the “satisfied” side of the scale with only 4.1% on the “dissatisfied” side (Figure 21). The mean this year would equate to a C+ and this represents a slight decline from 2016 in both the mean and grade of 7.29 (B-). The respondents who gave the town a rating below 5 were asked what actions Carrboro could take to make them more satisfied in this area (Appendix Q). There were 30 total suggestions with 7 of those comments focusing on flooding/stormwater issues. In addition, there were 3 comments concerning the lack of availability of charging stations (3 comments).




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

Table 53. Satisfaction with the Overall 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
18	7.14	0.8	0.8	1.5	1.0	11.8	8.7	30.3	26.2	18.8	84.0
16	7.29	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	13.2	8.2	26.1	30.8	20.1	85.2

The respondents were generally satisfied with the town’s efforts on *transportation*. The respondents were asked to consider issues such as widening roads, creating pedestrian crossings, offering CH-Transit/Go Triangle bus service, synchronizing traffic lights, and adding bike lanes/greenways/sidewalks. Overall, the respondents were positive of Carrboro’s efforts on *transportation* with a mean of 7.00 (Table 54). There were 82.5% of the responses on the “satisfied” side of the scale with only 6.4% on the “dissatisfied” side (Figure 22). There was a very slight uptick in the mean of 6.98 in 2016 while the grade was unchanged (C+). The respondents who




Figure 22. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Transportation.

gave the town a rating below 5 were asked what actions Carrboro could take to make them more satisfied with *transportation* (Appendix R). There were 51 total comments and the key concern focused on bikes lanes in town. There were 23 comments for adding or improving the bike lanes throughout Carrboro. Two areas mentioned specifically were North Greensboro Street and South Weaver Street. Another key area of concern was to improve the sidewalks in town earning 11 comments. Several areas mentioned specifically were Main Street, Cheek Street, and Old Pittsboro Road. There were also 10 comments to improve public transportation in Carrboro, especially the bus service. There was a call to add more buses/run more often, run later in the day, and on Sunday. There were several other suggestions made by the respondents including adding pedestrian crossings (5 comments), widening roads (4 comments), traffic issues (3 comments), and poor use of roundabouts (3 comments).

Table 54. 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
18	7.00	1.8	0.8	1.3	2.5	11.2	11.5	29.3	22.1	19.6	82.5
16	6.98	0.5	0.0	1.5	1.7	17.9	14.9	20.8	22.8	19.9	78.4

The respondents were also generally satisfied with the job Carrboro has been doing on *parking within the town*. Table 55 shows the mean was 6.74. There were 76.8% on the “satisfied” side of the scale versus 11.4% on the “dissatisfied” side (Figure 23). This mean would correspond to a grade of C. It is important to note this area has shown a level of improvement from 2016 when the mean as 6.60. In addition, the grade has improved from C- to a C. This focus area is no longer the lowest rated of the focus areas as it was in the 2016 survey. The respondents who gave the town a rating below 5 were asked what actions Carrboro could take to make them more satisfied with *parking* (Appendix S). There were 59 total suggestions and 38 of those focused on adding more parking in town. This included 7 comments focusing specifically on parking in the downtown area. There were also 7 comments indicating new developments and building are taking too many parking spaces.




Figure 23. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Parking Within the Town.

Table 55. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Parking Within the Town.

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18	6.74	2.8	1.3	3.0	4.3	11.7	11.4	26.1	21.3	18.0	76.8
16	6.60	1.5	0.7	3.2	3.7	21.1	12.4	22.6	17.9	16.7	69.6

Finally, the respondents were asked to rate the job the town has been 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 respondents were relatively satisfied with Carrboro's efforts on *planning & development*, but there were some concerns. The mean for this focus area was 6.52 (Table 56). There were 70.6% on the "satisfied" side of the scale compared to 10.7% on the "dissatisfied" side (Figure 24). The mean would equate to only a grade of C-. This mean has fallen from 6.61 in 2016 while the grade remains unchanged. This now represents one of the lower ratings the town has earned in the survey. The respondents who gave the town a rating below 5 were asked what actions Carrboro could take to make them more satisfied with *planning & development* (Appendix T). There were 56 total suggestions and 21 of them focused on overdevelopment in Carrboro. There were also 10 comments indicating the need for more affordable housing. There were 5 comments for making sure the infrastructure can handle the growth. Other suggestions included concerns with Lloyd Farm decision (4 comments), schools (3 comments), traffic (3 comments), and the need for increased regulations placed on developers (3 comments).




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

Table 56. 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
18	6.52	2.8	0.5	2.3	5.1	18.5	13.1	24.9	19.0	13.6	70.6
16	6.61	1.8	0.5	2.0	3.8	20.7	13.3	23.3	20.5	14.1	71.2

Carrboro Focus Areas Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations for selected focus areas were conducted on age, education, gender, housing type, income, and years in Carrboro. The crosstabulations for focus areas are shown in Tables B67-B90 in Appendix B. The lowest level of support for the job the town is doing *keeping Carrboro the best place to live, work, and raise a family* was from PhD/JD/MD degrees (6.91) and 56-65 age group (6.94). The lowest levels of satisfaction for the town's efforts at *environmental protection* were from PhD/JD/MD degrees (6.60), current students (6.70), over \$150,000 income level (6.72), 2-5 year residents (6.84), and 56-65 age group (6.98). As for the job the town is doing for *transportation*, the lowest means were for current students (6.52), PhD/JD/MD degrees (6.59), over \$150,000 income level (6.67), and 2-5 year residents (6.73). Finally, the lowest levels of satisfaction for the job the town is doing with *parking* were from PhD/JD/MD degrees (6.30), current students (6.30), over \$150,000 income level (6.43), and over 10 year residents (6.53).

New Programs or Services

The survey asked the respondents how likely they would be willing to pay for new programs or increased services in town. There were 16 new programs and services examined on a 9-point scale that ranged from not likely at all (1) to extremely likely (9). Table 57 indicates that affordable housing was the program that garnered the most support from the respondents. The mean was 6.79 with 69.7% of the responses over the midpoint of 5. This program also earned the most support in 2016. There was also a high level of support for several other programs including environmental sustainability (6.54), Human Services (6.48), fire services (6.20), and police services (6.10).

There was a moderate level of support for festivals/Open Streets (5.81), sidewalks/greenways (5.75), and the Municipal Building (5.57). All of these had means over 5.50. Keep in mind, the means may not be exceptionally high for these new programs and services since they may be associated with tax increases by the respondents. Finally, the least support was for museums (5.08), visual arts (5.17), performing arts (5.20), and street maintenance (5.36).

Table 57. Willingness to Pay for New Programs or Increased Services in 2018 (In Order of Usage).

Program/Service	Mean	Not Likely At All 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Likely 9	% Above 5
Affordable housing	6.79	10.1	0.3	2.1	2.6	15.2	4.1	12.1	15.8	37.7	69.7
Environmental sustainability	6.54	12.4	0.5	1.6	2.1	14.2	7.5	12.7	18.1	30.8	69.1
Human Services	6.48	11.6	0.3	1.8	3.2	16.6	6.1	13.9	18.2	28.4	66.6
Fire services	6.20	12.1	1.3	3.1	2.3	20.9	6.2	10.9	19.9	23.3	60.3
Police services	6.10	13.4	1.3	2.3	3.4	20.1	7.0	12.1	17.5	22.9	59.5
Festivals/Open Streets	5.81	15.8	2.3	2.3	2.3	18.1	8.5	19.4	13.2	17.9	59.0
Sidewalks and greenways	5.75	16.2	3.1	2.3	3.6	17.7	9.7	15.9	10.5	21.0	57.1
Municipal Building	5.57	15.6	3.1	2.6	5.2	23.1	7.3	14.3	11.7	17.1	50.4
Park facilities	5.56	16.4	2.8	5.1	2.1	20.5	8.5	16.9	10.3	17.4	53.1
Transportation	5.52	14.2	2.1	5.7	4.9	26.7	7.8	10.4	10.4	17.9	46.5
Recreation programs	5.47	16.5	3.3	5.7	1.3	22.4	9.5	14.9	9.8	16.7	50.9
Parking	5.42	17.1	2.6	6.0	4.2	23.4	6.8	10.9	10.1	19.0	46.8
Street maintenance	5.36	15.6	3.8	5.1	4.1	23.1	10.3	14.6	8.7	14.6	48.2
Performing Arts	5.20	21.0	1.3	5.2	3.1	25.9	7.5	10.6	9.3	16.1	43.5
Visual Arts	5.17	20.5	2.3	5.2	2.8	26.4	7.0	10.9	9.3	15.5	42.7
Museums	5.08	21.4	1.6	5.2	4.9	24.0	8.5	11.4	9.3	13.7	42.9

Although affordable housing remains the most supported program again this year, there have been changes in the level of support for other programs and services since 2016 (Table 58). The ones rising in their level of support were environmental sustainability (3rd to 2nd), Human Services (10th to 3rd), park facilities (15th to 9th), and transportation (13th to 10th). The programs and services declining in support were festivals/Open Streets (2nd to 6th), recreation programs (6th to 11th), parking (8th to 12th), performing arts (9th to 14th), visual arts (12th to 15th), and museums (11th to 16th). The Municipal Building was included for the first time this year and it finished relatively high at 8th overall.

Table 58. Willingness to Pay for New Programs or Increased Services in 2016 (In Order of Usage).

Program/Service	Mean	Not Likely At All 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Likely 9	% Above 5
Affordable housing	6.39	12.4	1.7	2.7	1.5	19.7	4.5	10.4	12.9	34.1	61.9
Festivals/Open Streets	5.92	18.3	2.5	3.0	2.5	15.3	3.5	14.4	13.6	27.0	58.5
Environmental sustainability	5.91	16.2	3.0	2.0	2.2	20.9	4.7	12.4	13.2	25.4	55.7
Fire services	5.83	15.6	3.5	2.2	1.0	24.3	4.7	12.4	12.7	23.6	53.4
Police services	5.80	16.1	3.2	2.2	0.7	25.1	4.7	12.2	12.2	23.6	52.7
Recreation programs	5.73	18.3	2.2	2.5	1.7	20.0	6.7	14.6	11.9	22.0	55.2
Sidewalks and greenways	5.72	20.3	1.7	2.5	2.5	17.1	6.5	12.7	12.7	24.1	56.0
Parking	5.65	16.6	2.5	4.0	2.0	26.1	3.5	12.9	10.9	21.6	48.9
Performing Arts	5.64	19.8	4.0	2.2	2.0	20.0	4.2	10.4	13.1	24.3	52.0
Human Services	5.50	17.8	3.0	3.8	1.5	28.5	3.3	11.3	10.5	20.5	45.6
Museums	5.49	20.1	3.7	3.0	2.7	20.8	6.0	9.9	11.9	21.8	49.6
Visual Arts	5.44	20.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	20.0	5.9	12.1	11.9	20.0	49.9
Transportation	5.39	17.1	3.7	4.5	2.2	30.0	3.7	9.4	9.9	19.4	42.4
Street maintenance	5.12	22.3	2.5	3.7	5.5	19.9	7.4	15.1	10.2	13.4	46.1
Park facilities	5.04	24.5	2.2	3.0	3.5	21.8	7.9	13.6	11.1	12.4	45.0

Public Wi-Fi

A question was included concerning the availability of public Wi-Fi in Carrboro. Specifically, the respondents were asked if they had been anywhere in Carrboro where they would expect to be able to use public Wi-Fi but could not because it was not available. Overall, there were 399 total responses to this question (there could be more than one area mentioned). There were 320 respondents (263 in 2016) who indicated they could not think of any area(s) where they encountered problems with Wi-Fi availability (Appendix U). In addition, there was a group of respondents (24 comments) who indicated they don't use it/never tried Wi-Fi and 4 respondents who answered they were unaware of public Wi-Fi availability.

The only areas in Carrboro mentioned more than once without Wi-Fi availability were Weaver Street (16 comments), downtown area (6 comments), and Looking Glass Cafe (3 comments). Overall, most of the availability issues focused on the downtown Carrboro area.

Senior Citizens

The respondents were asked their level of satisfaction with the town's efforts for senior citizens. They were asked to consider aspects like sidewalks, transit bus service, senior housing, recreation centers/parks, communication, and assistance with trash collection. A 9-point scale from very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (9) was used to rate Carrboro's efforts.

The results indicate the respondents were largely satisfied with the *job the town has been doing for its senior citizens*. Table 59 shows the town earned a mean of 6.90. There were 75.5% on the "satisfied" side of the scale (above 5) versus only 5.2% on the "dissatisfied" side of the scale (Figure 25). If this mean were converted into a grade, then the mean would convert to a mark of C+. There has been a significant improvement from 2016 when the mean was 6.63 and the grade has improved from a C to a C+ this year. Note the percentage on the "satisfied" side of the scale has increased from 60.8% to 75.5% this year. The neutral percentages also dropped significantly from 35.4% to 19.4%.




Figure 25. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing for Senior Citizens.

Table 59. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing for Senior Citizens.

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18	6.90	0.9	0.3	1.1	2.9	19.4	9.7	26.3	20.6	18.9	75.5
16	6.63	1.5	0.6	1.5	0.3	35.4	3.5	19.0	21.3	17.0	60.8

Senior Citizen Crosstabulations

Crosstabulations were conducted on the job the town is doing for senior citizens on age, education, gender, housing type, income, and years in Carrboro. These are shown in Tables B91-B96 in Appendix B. The lowest levels of satisfaction were exhibited by over 65 age group (6.13) and 0-1 year residents (6.59).

Citizens with Disabilities

The respondents were also asked their level of satisfaction with the town’s efforts for citizens with disabilities. They were asked to consider aspects like parking, sidewalks, curb-cuts, transit bus service, inclusive recreation, accessible buildings/facilities, communication, and assistance with trash collection. A 9-point scale from very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (9) was used to rate Carrboro’s efforts.

The results indicate the respondents were also largely satisfied with the *job the town is doing for its citizens with disabilities*. The mean for this area has improved to 6.91 (Table 60). There were 75.4% on the “satisfied” side of the scale with only 5.2% on the dissatisfied” side on the scale (Figure 26). This mean would convert into a grade of C+. Both the mean and the grade have improved since 2016 when the mean was 6.75 and the grade a C. Note the percentage on the “satisfied” side of the scale improved from 61.1% to 75.4% and the neutral percentages fell from 36.5% to 19.5%. This helped to drive the uptick in the mean.




Figure 26. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing for Citizens with Disabilities.

Table 60. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing for Citizens with Disabilities.

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18	6.91	0.6	0.6	1.4	2.6	19.5	9.8	23.6	23.9	18.1	75.4
16	6.75	0.9	0.6	0.6	0.3	36.5	2.9	15.3	23.2	19.7	61.1

Citizens with Disabilities Crosstabulations

Crosstabulations were conducted on the job the town is doing for citizens with disabilities on age, education, gender, housing type, income, and years in Carrboro. These are shown in Tables B97-B102 in Appendix B. The lowest levels of satisfaction were from PhD/JD/MD degrees (6.44), over 65 income level (6.51), 0-1 year residents (6.54), and apartment dwellers (6.55).

Affordable Housing

The respondents were asked their level of satisfaction with the town's efforts to provide affordable housing in Carrboro by working with partners. Affordable housing would be housing occupied by persons with incomes under \$48,000 a year. Again, a 9-point scale from very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (9) was used to rate Carrboro's efforts.

The results were somewhat mixed in regards to the *job the town is doing in working with partners to provide affordable housing*. The mean for this area has improved to 5.50; however, it continues to be the lowest mean earned by Carrboro in the survey (Table 61). There were 51.1% on the "satisfied" side of the scale versus 26.3% on the "dissatisfied" side on the scale (Figure 27). This mean would convert to a grade of D-. As mentioned earlier, there has been a level of improvement from 2016 when the mean was 5.28 with a grade of F. It was positive the "satisfied" percentages increased (34.9% to 51.1%) while the neutral percentages fell (39.8% to 22.5%) driving the mean improvement.




Figure 27. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing for Affordable Housing.

Table 61. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing for Providing Affordable Housing.

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18	5.50	9.8	4.1	4.4	8.0	22.5	11.2	20.1	12.1	7.7	51.1
16	5.28	9.2	4.3	7.6	4.3	39.8	5.2	8.9	8.6	12.2	34.9

Affordable Housing Crosstabulations

Crosstabulations were conducted on the job the town is doing for providing affordable housing on age, education, gender, housing type, income, and years in Carrboro. These are shown in Tables B103-B108 in Appendix B. The lowest levels of satisfaction were from PhD/JD/MD degrees (4.55), apartment dwellers (4.78), other dwellers (4.86), and 0-\$45,000 income level (4.89).

Developing Land in Town

A new question this year asked the respondents their level of satisfaction with the town’s efforts regarding *developing the land within the town*. Again, a 9-point scale from very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (9) was used to rate Carrboro’s efforts.

The respondents indicated a level of satisfaction in regards to the *job the town is doing developing land within the town*. The mean was 6.37 (Table 62). There were 69.5% on the “satisfied” side of the scale versus 13.1% on the “dissatisfied” side on the scale (Figure 28). However, the mean would only equate to a grade of C-. Note that only 9.5% were very satisfied and the neutral percentage was somewhat high at 17.5%.




Figure 28. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing Developing Land.

Table 62. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Land Development.

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18	6.37	2.7	1.1	3.2	6.1	17.5	14.1	27.1	18.8	9.5	69.5

Spacing and Density in Town

Another new question this year asked the respondents their level of satisfaction with Carrboro’s efforts regarding spacing and density in town considering how people and development are situated in Carrboro. Again, a 9-point scale from very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (9) was used to rate Carrboro’s efforts.

The respondents indicated a level of satisfaction with *job the town is doing on spacing and density*. The mean was 6.45 (Table 63). There were 70.9% on the “satisfied” side of the scale versus 11.7% on the “dissatisfied” side (Figure 29). In addition, there was also a somewhat high neutral percentage at 17.5%. This mean would only equate to a C-.




Figure 29. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Spacing and Density.

Table 63. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Spacing and Density.

Year	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18	6.45	2.4	2.7	3.4	3.2	17.5	12.5	26.8	19.9	11.7	70.9

Summary and Potential Areas for Improvement

In conclusion, there are 27 graded core Carrboro service dimensions utilizing the grading format of very poor to excellent scaling. The overall mean for the core service dimensions was 8.30 which has improved from 8.24 in 2016. This mean translates to a very impressive grade of A- which unchanged from 2016. Overall, the Town of Carrboro receives an excellent report card with 20 grades in the A range and 7 grades in the B range with no grades in the C range for the core service dimensions. In fact, the lowest grade earned for a core dimension was the B- for the maintenance of streets and roads. Last year, it was 19 grades in the A range and 8 in the B range.

There were some potential areas for improvement for the town. Keep in mind, the ratings for the town are so strong overall that C range grades (average) would again be considered areas of concern. First, the ratings for the job the town has been doing for environmental protection (C+), transportation (C+), parking within the town (C), and planning & development (C-) were somewhat lower than most of the other ratings Carrboro earned. Other concerns were the lower grades for the job the town has been doing for senior citizens (C+), citizens with disabilities (C+), developing land within town (C-), spacing/density (C-), and affordable housing (D-). On the positive side, there has been a level of improvement since 2016 for several of these areas including transportation, parking, senior citizens, citizens with disabilities, and affordable housing. Second, Wi-Fi available appears to have issues in the downtown area, especially around Weaver Street. Third, the open-ended questions revealed a few other suggestions to improve Carrboro. There were concerns with litter and potholes around town, especially Greensboro Street and Main Street. There were also concerns about flooding and stormwater issues. The respondents continue to suggest adding sidewalks, improving bus service, and adding bike lanes. Finally, the most important issues facing Carrboro continued to be controlling growth/development, affordable housing, traffic, and the increasing cost of living.

Appendix A

Town of Carrboro 2018 Citizen Survey Instrument

Hello, my name is _____ and I am calling for the Town of Carrboro. This is the second comprehensive citizen survey that Carrboro has conducted. It is being offered in hopes that we can improve the services that the Town offers you. Your opinion is very important to Carrboro.

Are you a resident of the Town of Carrboro?

☐ 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 Carrboro 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 Carrboro you're finding undesirable?

2. In the past two years, do you feel that the quality of life in the Town of Carrboro 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 Carrboro seems worse?

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

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 Carrboro solid waste services. If you have not used any of the services respond with not applicable.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
	Very Dissatisfied								Very Satisfied	
4a. Curbside garbage collection	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA
4b. Curbside bulk item 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

5. Did you know that curbside recycling is a service that is provided by Orange County Solid Waste Management and not the Town of Carrboro?

☐ Yes

☐ No

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

	Very Poor				Average			Excellent
6a. Streets	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9
6b. Median and roadsides	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9
6c. Parks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9
6d. Greenways	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9
6e. Sidewalks	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 street name and then ask the problem)?

Area _____ Problem _____
 Area _____ Problem _____

7. How well does the Town of Carrboro maintain streets and roads with regard to paving, potholes, accessibility, 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 _____

8. Thinking about the town's environmental efforts such as hybrid vehicles, open space preservation, water conservation, sustainability, erosion control, stormwater, 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?

9. How effectively do you feel the Carrboro Board of Aldermen is working together to keep Carrboro 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?

10. Thinking now about the town's efforts with transportation like widening roads, creating additional pedestrian crossings, offering CH-Transit & GoTriangle 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, and making sure that the infrastructure 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. Next we'd like your opinion on how the town is doing with managing parking within the town. Using the same 9-point satisfaction scale, how satisfied would you say you are overall with the job the town is doing with parking?

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. We'd like your opinion on how the town is doing with recreation and parks 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?

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

☐ Yes (Continue) ☐ No (Skip to #16)

15. 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	
15a. Overall quality of customer service.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
15b. Promptness of response.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
15c. Professionalism.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
15d. Knowledgeable.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
15e. Courteous.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
15f. Helpful.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	

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

16. Have you had any contact with the Carrboro Police Department in the past two years?

☐ Yes (Continue) ☐ No (Skip to #19)

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

☐ Police Officer
 ☐ Clerk
 ☐ Dispatcher
 ☐ Orange County Animal Control
 ☐ Detective
 ☐ Chief
 ☐ Not Sure

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

	Very Poor				Average				Excellent	
18a. Courteous.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
18b. Fairness.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
18c. Competence.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
18d. Problem solving.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
18e. Response time.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA

19. Have you had contact with the Carrboro Fire Department in the past two years?

☐ Yes (Continue) ☐ No (Skip to #21)

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

	Very Poor				Average				Excellent	
20a. Courteous.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
20b. Fairness.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
20c. Competence.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
20d. Problem solving.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
20e. Response time.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA

21. Have you or anyone in your household participated in a Town of Carrboro Parks and Recreation Department Program in the past two years?

☐ Yes (Continue) ☐ No (Skip to #24)

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

Program _____ Location _____
 Program _____ Location _____

23. 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		
23a. Program quality.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
23b. Facility quality.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
23c. Cost or amount of fee.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	
23d. Overall experience.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
23e. Ease of registration.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
23f. Instructor or coach quality.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	

24. For each of the following, please indicate how likely you would be willing to pay for new programs or increase services. 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		
24a. Street maintenance.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
24b. Sidewalks and greenways.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
24c. Parks facilities.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
24d. Recreation programs.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
24e. Police.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
24f. Fire.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
24g. Visual Arts.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
24h. Performing Arts.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
24i. Museums.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
24j. Festivals and open streets.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
24k. Environmental sustainability.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
24l. Parking.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
24m. Affordable housing for persons with incomes under \$48,000 a year.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
24n. Human Services.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
24o. Transportation.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
24p. Municipal Buildings (renovation/new).....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		

25. Have you visited downtown Carrboro in the last year?

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

26. 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		
26a. Festivals.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
26b. Additional art exhibition space.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
26c. Concerts.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
26d. Working studio space for artists.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
26e. Outdoor performances.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
26f. Grocery store.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
26g. Farmer's Market.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
26h. Summer Streets/Closed Street.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
26i. Cafes and restaurants.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
26j. Historical walking tour.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
26k. Shopping opportunities.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		

26l. Public art.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
26m. Museums.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
26n. Pet shop.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
26o. Coffee shop.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
26p. Bars/Pubs.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
26q. Ice cream/Yogurt shop.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
26r. Art Walks.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
26s. Other?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

27. 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?

28. How satisfied are you with the Town of Carrboro 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?

29. 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?

30. 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	
30a. Don't know about opportunities.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
30b. Topics don't interest me.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
30c. Issues don't affect me.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
30d. Too busy, don't have time.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
30e. Timing of opportunities is inconvenient.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
30f. Don't have transportation.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
30g. Waste of time, 1 person can't make a difference.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
30h. Don't understand government processes.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
30i. Don't feel qualified to offer input.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
30j. Other.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	

31. Please indicate how much you use the following information sources that Carrboro 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
31a. Herald Sun	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31b. Raleigh News & Observer (CH News)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31c. Television	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31d. Radio	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31e. The town's website	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31f. The town's email list services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31g. Word of mouth (friends/neighbors)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31h. Carrboro Govt. Access Cable Channel	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31i. The Daily Tarheel	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31j. Street signage	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31k. Recreation and Parks Brochure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31l. Independent Weekly/Indy Week	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31m. Homeowner's association	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31n. Twitter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31o. Carrboro website "notify me"	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31p. Facebook	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31q. YouTube	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31r. Next Door	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31s. Instagram	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31t. Watch Board of Aldermen meetings on TV	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31u. Stream Board of Aldermen meetings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

32. Please tell us how safe you feel in Carrboro, 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

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

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

34. How about at public places around Carrboro, like when you're shopping, out to eat, or at a concert. 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

35. In last year or two, where have you been in Carrboro where you expected to be able to use public Wifi but couldn't because it wasn't available. Please specify.

36. Thinking about the town's efforts for senior citizens such as sidewalks, transit bus service, senior housing, recreation centers/parks, communications, and help with trash collection. How satisfied would you say you are overall with the job the town is doing for seniors? Use the same 9-point scale where 9 is very satisfied and 1 is very dissatisfied.

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

37. Thinking about the town's efforts for citizens who have disabilities such as parking, sidewalks, curb-cuts, transit bus service, inclusive recreation, accessible buildings and facilities, communications, and help with trash collection. How satisfied would you say you are overall with the job the town is doing for persons with disabilities? Use the same 9-point scale where 9 is very satisfied and 1 is very dissatisfied.

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

38. The Town of Carrboro works with partners to provide affordable housing in Carrboro which is housing for persons with income under \$48,000 a year. How satisfied are you with the job is doing regarding affordable housing? Use the same 9-point satisfaction scale.

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

39. Thinking about the town's efforts regarding development, how satisfied are you with the how the town is developing the land within the town?

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

40. Thinking about how people and developments are situated in the town, how satisfied are you with spacing and density. Using the nine point scale, very dissatisfied would mean that you feel the town is overcrowded with people and development.

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

41. Do you have access to the internet?

☐ Yes (Continue) ☐ No (Skip to #42)

If yes, then ask where do you have primary access to the internet?

☐ Home ☐ Cell phone ☐ Work ☐ School ☐ Public space

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

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

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

43. Considering your future plans, how many years do you see yourself living in Carrboro?

☐ 0-1 ☐ 2-5 ☐ 6-10 ☐ 11-20 ☐ More than 20

44. Why did you choose to live in Carrboro? _____

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

☐ Single family detached home ☐ Apartment ☐ Townhouse ☐ Condominium ☐ Mobile home ☐ Duplex

46. Do you rent or own?

☐ Rent

☐ Own

47. Do you own rental property in Carrboro?

☐ Yes (Continue)

☐ No (Skip to #48)

If yes, then ask if it is?

☐

Residential

☐

Commercial

☐

Both

48. 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

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

☐

High School
or less

☐

Some College
Technical

☐

Bachelors
Degree

☐

Masters
Degree

☐

Doctorate:
PhD, JD, MD

☐

Currently enrolled
college

50. May I ask your race?

☐

Caucasian

☐

African-

☐

Native-
American

☐

Asian-
American

☐

Hispanic/Latin

☐

Other

51. Are you a registered voter?

☐ Yes (Continue)

☐ No (Skip to #53)

52. Did you vote in the 2017 local elections this past fall?

☐ Yes

☐ No

53. 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

54. What is your gender identity? _____

That concludes our survey and we want to thank you for your valuable input.

Appendix B: Crosstabulations

Carrboro as a Place to Live Crosstabulations

Table B1. Rating Carrboro 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	37	7.89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	32.4	45.9	21.6	B+
26-55	263	7.92	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.4	1.9	1.9	24.7	41.1	29.7	B+
56-65	54	7.69	1.9	1.9	1.9	0.0	1.9	1.9	25.9	27.8	37.0	B
Over 65	38	7.68	0.0	0.0	5.3	2.6	5.3	10.5	10.5	13.2	52.6	B

Table B2. Rating Carrboro 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	138	7.76	0.0	0.0	0.7	1.4	4.3	2.9	23.9	38.4	28.3	B
College Degree	182	8.03	0.5	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	1.6	23.6	34.1	39.0	B+
PhD/JD/MD	45	7.82	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.4	0.0	26.7	46.7	22.2	B+
Current Student	23	7.70	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.0	30.4	30.4	26.1	B

Table B3. Rating Carrboro 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	197	7.74	0.5	0.0	1.0	0.5	2.0	3.0	29.4	37.1	26.4	B
Female	199	8.00	0.0	0.5	1.0	0.5	2.0	2.0	18.6	37.2	38.2	B+

Table B4. Rating Carrboro 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	255	7.93	0.4	0.4	0.8	0.4	1.6	2.0	22.4	37.3	34.9	B+
Apartment	73	7.70	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	2.7	5.5	30.1	35.6	24.7	B
Townhouse/Condo	37	7.89	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.0	2.7	21.6	43.2	29.7	B+
Other	23	7.83	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.7	0.0	26.1	30.4	34.8	B+

Table B5. Rating Carrboro 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	114	7.54	0.0	0.0	1.8	1.8	5.3	5.3	26.3	37.7	21.9	B
\$45,001-\$100,000	130	8.03	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	1.5	23.1	36.9	36.9	B+
\$100,001-\$150,000	49	7.86	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.1	30.6	40.8	24.5	B+
Over \$150,000	50	8.20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	20.0	32.0	46.0	A-

Table B6. Rating Carrboro as a Place to Live by Years in Carrboro.

Years in Carrboro	n	Mean	Very Undesirable 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Desirable 9	Grade
0-1	26	7.77	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	30.8	50.0	15.4	B
2-5	86	7.88	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	1.2	31.4	36.0	29.1	B+
6-10	82	7.96	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.2	28.0	39.0	30.5	B+
Over 10	145	7.86	0.7	0.7	2.8	0.0	1.4	2.1	20.0	35.9	36.6	B+
Native	51	7.71	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	5.9	7.8	15.7	31.4	35.3	B

How Safe Respondents Feel in Carrboro Overall Crosstabulations

Table B7. How Safe Respondents Feel in Carrboro Overall by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
18-25	37	8.35	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.4	13.5	21.6	59.5	100.0
26-55	265	8.29	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	3.4	11.7	27.9	55.1	98.1
56-65	53	8.17	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.0	17.0	28.3	50.9	96.2
Over 65	38	8.34	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	21.1	10.5	65.8	97.4

Table B8. How Safe Respondents Feel in Carrboro 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	140	8.34	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	3.6	14.3	18.6	61.4	97.9
College Degree	182	8.36	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	12.1	28.6	57.1	98.3
PhD/JD/MD	45	8.11	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	4.4	17.8	31.1	44.4	97.7
Current Student	23	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.0	13.0	34.8	39.1	99.9

Table B9. How Safe Respondents Feel in Carrboro Overall by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
Male	196	8.31	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	4.6	9.7	27.6	56.6	98.5
Female	199	8.28	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.5	17.6	23.6	55.8	97.5

Table B10. How Safe Respondents Feel in Carrboro 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	256	8.35	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.4	1.6	14.1	28.1	55.5	99.3
Apartment	73	8.03	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	6.8	15.1	24.7	49.3	95.9
Townhouse/Condo	37	8.38	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.0	5.4	8.1	16.2	67.6	97.3
Other	24	8.30	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	8.3	12.5	75.0	95.8

Table B11. How Safe Respondents Feel in Carrboro 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	115	8.17	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.9	4.3	13.9	27.0	52.2	97.4
\$45,001-\$100,000	132	8.37	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	1.5	13.6	22.0	60.6	97.7
\$100,001-\$150,000	49	8.45	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	14.3	20.4	63.3	100.0
Over \$150,000	50	8.26	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	14.0	38.0	46.0	98.0

Table B12. How Safe Respondents Feel in Carrboro Overall by Years in Carrboro.

Years in Carrboro	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
0-1	26	8.23	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.4	46.2	38.5	100.1
2-5	87	8.14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	8.0	16.1	20.7	52.9	97.7
6-10	82	8.43	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.2	6.1	36.6	54.9	98.8
Over 10	145	8.31	0.7	0.7	0.0	0.7	1.4	1.4	12.4	20.7	62.1	96.6
Native	51	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	21.6	17.6	58.8	100.0

How Safe Respondents Feel in Home Neighborhood Crosstabulations

Table B13. 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	37	8.54	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.0	5.4	21.6	70.3	97.3
26-55	265	8.42	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.8	2.6	9.1	23.4	63.0	98.1
56-65	53	8.51	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.3	26.4	62.3	100.0
Over 65	38	8.53	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	13.2	13.2	71.1	100.1

Table B14. 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	140	8.57	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.7	0.7	8.6	17.1	72.1	98.5
College Degree	182	8.47	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.5	2.2	8.2	22.5	65.4	98.3
PhD/JD/MD	45	8.16	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	2.2	17.8	31.1	46.7	97.8
Current Student	23	8.26	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.7	4.3	39.1	47.8	99.9

Table B15. 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	196	8.46	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	3.6	6.1	25.5	63.8	99.0
Female	199	8.42	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	1.0	0.5	12.6	19.6	64.8	97.5

Table B16. 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	256	8.52	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	2.0	8.6	23.4	65.6	99.6
Apartment	73	8.25	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	1.4	1.4	13.7	24.7	56.2	96.0
Townhouse/Condo	37	8.43	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.0	5.4	5.4	16.2	70.3	97.3
Other	24	8.63	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	4.2	12.5	79.2	95.9

Table B17. 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	115	8.32	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.9	1.7	10.4	25.2	59.1	96.4
\$45,001-\$100,000	132	8.52	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	2.3	9.1	20.5	67.4	99.3
\$100,001-\$150,000	49	8.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	6.1	14.3	77.6	100.0
Over \$150,000	50	8.38	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	12.0	32.0	54.0	100.0

Table B18. How Safe Respondents Feel in Home Neighborhood by Years in Carrboro.

Years in Carrboro	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
0-1	26	8.35	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	7.7	38.5	50.0	100.0
2-5	87	8.22	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	1.1	4.6	11.5	19.5	59.8	95.4
6-10	82	8.56	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.2	3.7	28.0	65.9	98.8
Over 10	145	8.53	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	11.0	20.7	66.9	100.0
Native	51	8.53	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	11.8	13.7	72.5	98.0

How Safe Respondents Feel in Public Places Around Carrboro Crosstabulations

Table B19. How Safe Respondents Feel in Public Places Around Carrboro by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
18-25	37	8.38	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.1	8.1	21.6	62.2	100.0
26-55	265	8.34	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	2.3	9.8	26.0	58.9	97.0
56-65	53	8.19	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	1.9	17.0	30.2	49.1	98.2
Over 65	38	8.37	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	18.4	10.5	65.8	100.0

Table B20. How Safe Respondents Feel in Public Places Around Carrboro by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	140	8.36	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	3.6	11.4	19.3	62.9	97.2
College Degree	182	8.41	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.6	10.4	24.2	62.1	98.3
PhD/JD/MD	45	8.13	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	2.2	15.6	40.0	40.0	97.8
Current Student	23	8.04	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.0	13.0	30.4	43.5	99.9

Table B21. How Safe Respondents Feel in Public Places Around Carrboro by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
Male	196	8.31	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	5.1	9.2	25.0	58.7	98.0
Female	199	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	2.0	1.0	13.6	24.1	58.8	97.5

Table B22. How Safe Respondents Feel in Public Places Around Carrboro by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
Single family	256	8.39	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.4	2.0	13.3	25.0	59.0	99.3
Apartment	73	8.03	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.5	5.5	9.6	28.8	49.3	93.2
Townhouse/Condo	37	8.54	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	2.7	2.7	21.6	70.3	97.3
Other	24	8.38	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	8.3	4.2	12.5	70.8	95.8

Table B23. How Safe Respondents Feel in Public Places Around Carrboro by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
0-\$45,000	115	8.16	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.5	7.0	8.7	25.2	54.8	95.7
\$45,001-\$100,000	132	8.46	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	1.5	13.6	19.7	64.4	99.2
\$100,001-\$150,000	49	8.45	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	14.3	20.4	63.3	100.0
Over \$150,000	50	8.38	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	8.0	40.0	50.0	100.0

Table B24. How Safe Respondents Feel in Public Places Around Carrboro by Years in Carrboro.

Years in Carrboro	n	Mean	Extremely Unsafe 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Extremely Safe 9	% Above 5
0-1	26	8.31	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.4	38.5	46.2	100.1
2-5	87	8.24	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.6	5.7	9.2	21.8	58.6	95.3
6-10	82	8.43	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.2	8.5	31.7	57.3	98.7
Over 10	145	8.39	0.7	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	2.1	11.7	22.1	62.8	98.7
Native	51	8.18	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	5.9	15.7	17.6	56.9	96.1

Barriers to Citizen Involvement Crosstabulations

Table B25. Barriers to Involvement in Town Government by Age (In Descending Mean Order).

18-25 (n=36)	26-55 (n=254)	56-65 (n=51)	Over 65 (n=36)
Too busy (6.75)	Too busy (6.27)	Too busy (4.29)	Don't know opportunities (4.39)
Don't know opportunities (6.58)	Timing inconvenient (4.49)	Don't know opportunities (4.08)	Too busy (3.11)
Topics don't interest me (5.53)	Don't know opportunities (4.47)	Timing inconvenient (3.00)	Don't have transportation (3.03)
Timing inconvenient (5.36)	Topics don't interest me (3.27)	Issues don't affect me (2.57)	Timing inconvenient (2.97)
Issues don't affect me (5.14)	Issues don't affect me (3.18)	Topics don't interest me (2.43)	Issues don't affect me (2.72)
Don't feel qualified (4.92)	Don't feel qualified (2.55)	Waste of time (1.98)	Topics don't interest me (2.64)
Waste of time (4.33)	Waste of time (2.35)	Don't feel qualified (1.69)	Don't feel qualified (2.47)
Don't understand process (3.78)	Don't understand process (2.23)	Don't understand process (1.63)	Don't understand process (1.76)
Don't have transportation (3.22)	Don't have transportation (1.43)	Don't have transportation (1.57)	Waste of time (1.40)

Table B26. Barriers to Involvement in Town Government by Education (In Descending Mean Order).

HS/Some College (n=134)	College Degree (n=175)	PhD/JD/MD (n=42)	Current Student (n=23)
Too busy (6.01)	Too busy (5.55)	Too busy (5.31)	Too busy (6.96)
Don't know opportunities (5.49)	Don't know opportunities (4.11)	Don't know opportunities (4.07)	Topics don't interest me (5.04)
Timing inconvenient (5.15)	Timing inconvenient (3.71)	Timing inconvenient (3.93)	Issues don't affect me (4.91)
Topics don't interest me (3.79)	Topics don't interest me (2.92)	Issues don't affect me (2.74)	Don't know opportunities (4.65)
Issues don't affect me (3.78)	Issues don't affect me (2.77)	Topics don't interest me (2.57)	Timing inconvenient (3.48)
Don't feel qualified (3.40)	Don't feel qualified (2.14)	Don't feel qualified (2.38)	Waste of time (3.26)
Waste of time (3.30)	Don't understand process (1.81)	Waste of time (2.19)	Don't feel qualified (3.13)
Don't understand process (2.92)	Waste of time (1.70)	Don't understand process (2.14)	Don't understand process (2.74)
Don't have transportation (2.40)	Don't have transportation (1.28)	Don't have transportation (1.69)	Don't have transportation (2.04)

Table B27. Barriers to Involvement in Town Government by Gender (In Descending Mean Order).

Male (n=190)	Female (n=189)
Too busy (5.63)	Too busy (5.86)
Don't know opportunities (4.35)	Don't know opportunities (4.86)
Timing inconvenient (3.85)	Timing inconvenient (4.59)
Topics don't interest me (3.29)	Topics don't interest me (3.33)
Issues don't affect me (3.17)	Issues don't affect me (3.32)
Don't feel qualified (2.42)	Don't feel qualified (2.92)
Waste of time (2.25)	Waste of time (2.65)
Don't understand process (2.07)	Don't understand process (2.51)
Don't have transportation (1.51)	Don't have transportation (2.06)

Table B28. Barriers to Involvement in Town Government by Housing Type (In Descending Mean Order).

Single Family (n=246)	Apartment (n=70)	Townhouse/Condo (n=36)	Other (n=23)
Too busy (5.89)	Don't know opportunities (5.71)	Too busy (6.58)	Don't know opportunities (5.44)
Timing inconvenient (4.19)	Too busy (5.14)	Don't know opportunities (5.53)	Too busy (5.04)
Don't know opportunities (4.09)	Timing inconvenient (4.37)	Timing inconvenient (4.53)	Topics don't interest me (4.04)
Topics don't interest me (3.06)	Don't feel qualified (4.19)	Issues don't affect me (4.03)	Timing inconvenient (3.96)
Issues don't affect me (2.94)	Issues don't affect me (3.89)	Topics don't interest me (3.81)	Don't feel qualified (3.57)
Don't feel qualified (2.17)	Topics don't interest me (3.76)	Waste of time (2.75)	Issues don't affect me (3.48)
Waste of time (2.09)	Don't understand process (3.34)	Don't feel qualified (2.67)	Don't have transportation (3.44)
Don't understand process (1.92)	Waste of time (3.20)	Don't understand process (2.31)	Waste of time (3.30)
Don't have transportation (1.39)	Don't have transportation (2.53)	Don't have transportation (1.92)	Don't understand process (3.13)

Table B29. Barriers to Involvement in Town Government by Income (In Descending Mean Order).

0-\$45,000 (n=115)	\$45,001-\$100,000 (n=125)	\$100,001-\$150,000 (n=47)	Over \$150,000 (n=48)
Too busy (5.95)	Too busy (5.69)	Too busy (5.47)	Don't know opportunities (2.90)
Don't know opportunities (5.48)	Don't know opportunities (4.56)	Don't know opportunities (3.79)	Timing inconvenient (2.90)
Timing inconvenient (4.60)	Timing inconvenient (4.22)	Timing inconvenient (3.70)	Too busy (2.83)
Topics don't interest me (4.24)	Issues don't affect me (3.10)	Topics don't interest me (2.87)	Topics don't interest me (2.31)
Issues don't affect me (4.15)	Topics don't interest me (2.95)	Issues don't affect me (2.36)	Waste of time (1.96)
Don't feel qualified (4.08)	Don't feel qualified (2.14)	Don't feel qualified (2.04)	Issues don't affect me (1.79)
Waste of time (3.54)	Don't understand process (1.93)	Waste of time (1.98)	Don't feel qualified (1.76)
Don't understand process (3.32)	Waste of time (1.89)	Don't understand process (1.75)	Don't understand process (1.26)
Don't have transportation (2.82)	Don't have transportation (1.37)	Don't have transportation (1.28)	Don't have transportation (.93)

Table B30. Barriers to Involvement in Town Government by Years in Carrboro (In Descending Mean Order).

0-1 (n=26)	2-5 (n=82)	6-10 (n=80)	Over 10 (n=137)	Native (n=50)
Too busy (6.27)	Too busy (6.31)	Too busy (5.75)	Too busy (5.59)	Too busy (5.10)
Don't know opportunities (5.62)	Don't know opportunities (5.71)	Don't know opportunities (4.41)	Timing inconvenient (4.18)	Timing inconvenient (4.46)
Issues don't affect me (5.35)	Timing inconvenient (4.44)	Timing inconvenient (4.00)	Don't know opportunities (3.96)	Don't know opportunities (4.34)
Topics don't interest me (5.23)	Topics don't interest me (3.82)	Topics don't interest me (2.90)	Topics don't interest me (3.12)	Issues don't affect me (2.96)
Timing inconvenient (4.19)	Don't feel qualified (3.78)	Issues don't affect me (2.89)	Issues don't affect me (2.86)	Topics don't interest me (2.66)
Don't feel qualified (3.50)	Issues don't affect me (3.74)	Don't feel qualified (2.10)	Don't feel qualified (2.34)	Don't have transportation (2.50)
Waste of time (3.19)	Waste of time (2.94)	Waste of time (2.06)	Waste of time (2.26)	Waste of time (2.22)
Don't understand process (2.73)	Don't understand process (2.93)	Don't understand process (2.05)	Don't understand process (2.08)	Don't feel qualified (2.16)
Don't have transportation (2.12)	Don't have transportation (2.11)	Don't have transportation (1.30)	Don't have transportation (1.52)	Don't understand process (1.96)

Carrboro's Efforts at Keeping Residents Informed Crosstabulations

Table B31. How Informed Do 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	37	5.57	5.4	2.7	2.7	0.0	40.5	13.5	29.7	2.7	2.7	48.6
26-55	264	6.22	4.5	0.4	4.5	4.9	23.9	12.5	19.7	14.4	15.2	61.8
56-65	54	6.00	7.4	0.0	3.7	7.4	25.9	11.1	16.7	11.1	16.7	55.6
Over 65	38	6.12	10.5	0.0	0.0	2.6	23.7	10.5	26.3	13.2	13.2	63.2

Table B32. How Informed Do 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	140	6.07	6.4	0.0	2.9	1.4	31.4	11.4	23.6	10.0	12.9	57.9
College Degree	182	6.46	5.5	1.1	3.3	4.4	17.6	10.4	20.9	17.6	19.2	68.1
PhD/JD/MD	44	5.52	2.3	0.0	4.5	15.9	31.8	18.2	18.2	4.5	4.5	45.4
Current Student	23	4.96	8.7	0.0	8.7	4.3	43.5	21.7	8.7	4.3	0.0	34.7

Table B33. How Informed Do 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	194	6.06	4.1	0.5	5.2	4.6	27.8	12.9	19.6	13.9	11.3	57.7
Female	201	6.13	7.5	0.5	2.5	5.0	23.9	11.4	21.4	11.4	16.4	60.6

Table B34. How Informed Do 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	255	6.34	3.1	0.8	3.9	5.5	23.1	11.0	21.6	15.7	15.3	63.6
Apartment	73	5.53	11.0	0.0	1.4	4.1	31.5	20.5	20.5	1.4	9.6	52.0
Townhouse/Condo	37	5.87	13.5	0.0	5.4	2.7	18.9	8.1	21.6	16.2	13.5	59.4
Other	24	5.75	8.3	0.0	4.2	0.0	41.7	8.3	16.7	8.3	12.5	45.8

Table B35. How Informed Do 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	115	5.56	9.6	0.0	4.3	2.6	33.0	19.1	17.4	4.3	9.6	50.4
\$45,001-\$100,000	131	6.48	0.8	1.5	3.1	5.3	25.2	9.9	21.4	16.8	16.0	64.1
\$100,001-\$150,000	48	6.79	2.1	0.0	4.2	2.1	18.8	10.4	20.8	20.8	20.8	72.8
Over \$150,000	50	6.48	4.0	0.0	2.0	10.0	12.0	10.0	32.0	16.0	14.0	72.0

Table B36. How Informed Do Respondents Feel About Government Services, Projects, Issues, and Programs That Affect Them by Years in Carrboro.

Years in Carrboro	n	Mean	Not at All Informed 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Very Well Informed 9	% Above 5
0-1	26	4.62	19.2	0.0	3.8	3.8	46.2	3.8	23.1	0.0	0.0	26.9
2-5	87	5.63	8.0	0.0	5.7	4.6	29.9	17.2	19.5	4.6	10.3	51.6
6-10	82	6.32	2.4	0.0	3.7	6.1	26.8	7.3	23.2	20.7	9.8	61.0
Over 10	145	6.37	6.2	1.4	3.4	4.1	20.0	9.0	19.3	17.2	19.3	64.8
Native	51	6.65	0.0	0.0	2.0	3.9	19.6	23.5	23.5	7.8	19.6	74.4

Carrboro's Efforts at Involving Citizens in Decisions Crosstabulations

Table B37. 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	37	6.05	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	48.6	8.1	27.0	8.1	5.4	48.6
26-55	256	6.47	3.9	0.8	2.7	2.0	27.3	8.2	19.5	17.2	18.4	63.3
56-65	53	6.19	7.5	0.0	9.4	1.9	24.5	0.0	20.8	15.1	20.8	56.7
Over 65	38	6.50	10.5	0.0	2.6	0.0	21.1	7.9	15.8	10.5	31.6	65.8

Table B38. 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	139	6.16	5.0	0.0	2.2	2.2	36.7	5.8	23.0	10.1	15.1	54.0
College Degree	179	6.75	5.0	0.6	5.0	1.1	17.9	5.6	17.3	21.8	25.7	70.4
PhD/JD/MD	40	5.95	2.5	2.5	0.0	5.0	40.0	10.0	22.5	7.5	10.0	50.0
Current Student	22	5.73	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	50.0	18.2	18.2	9.1	0.0	45.5

Table B39. 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	190	6.28	3.7	1.1	4.7	1.6	29.5	7.4	22.1	14.2	15.8	59.5
Female	196	6.44	6.1	0.0	2.0	2.6	27.6	6.6	17.9	16.3	20.9	61.7

Table B40. 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	250	6.58	3.2	0.8	4.4	2.8	22.4	6.8	20.4	19.2	20.0	66.4
Apartment	70	6.03	2.9	0.0	1.4	0.0	45.7	11.4	21.4	5.7	11.4	49.9
Townhouse/Condo	36	6.53	8.3	0.0	2.8	0.0	25.0	2.8	19.4	16.7	25.0	63.9
Other	24	5.17	20.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	41.7	4.2	16.7	4.2	12.5	37.6

Table B41. 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	112	5.85	6.3	0.0	0.9	2.7	42.9	10.7	17.0	8.9	10.7	47.3
\$45,001-\$100,000	129	6.69	3.1	0.8	3.9	1.6	21.7	6.2	24.0	16.3	22.5	69.0
\$100,001-\$150,000	46	6.76	4.3	0.0	4.3	0.0	21.7	6.5	17.4	21.7	23.9	69.5
Over \$150,000	50	6.72	6.0	2.0	6.0	2.0	8.0	4.0	26.0	24.0	22.0	76.0

Table B42. Satisfaction with Opportunities the Town Gives to Participate in the Decision-Making Process by Years in Carrboro.

Years in Carrboro	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-1	25	5.08	8.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	64.0	4.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	24.0
2-5	83	6.06	3.6	1.2	2.4	1.2	42.2	7.2	18.1	9.6	14.5	49.4
6-10	79	6.72	3.8	0.0	2.5	1.3	22.8	5.1	24.1	21.5	19.0	69.7
Over 10	144	6.56	6.3	0.7	5.6	2.1	17.4	5.6	20.1	18.8	23.6	68.1
Native	51	6.55	3.9	0.0	2.0	0.0	29.4	11.8	17.6	13.7	21.6	64.7

Solid Waste: Curbside Garbage Collection Crosstabulations

Table B43. Satisfaction with Curbside Garbage Collection by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18-25	23	7.96	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.7	17.4	13.0	56.5	95.6
26-55	222	8.23	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.5	2.7	1.4	17.1	23.0	55.0	96.5
56-65	49	8.29	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	12.2	20.4	61.2	95.8
Over 65	31	8.19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	9.7	12.9	12.9	61.3	96.8

Table B44. Satisfaction with Curbside Garbage Collection by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	111	8.03	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	1.8	4.5	24.3	21.6	46.8	97.2
College Degree	157	8.38	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	2.5	1.3	12.1	19.7	63.7	96.8
PhD/JD/MD	38	8.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	5.3	5.3	13.2	23.7	50.0	92.2
Current Student	15	8.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	20.0	73.3	100.0

Table B45. Satisfaction with Curbside Garbage Collection by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Male	168	8.19	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	3.6	1.8	13.7	25.6	54.2	95.3
Female	161	8.24	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6	1.2	3.7	18.6	16.1	59.0	97.4

Table B46. 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	244	8.28	0.0	0.8	0.4	0.4	2.0	2.5	12.3	21.3	60.2	96.3
Apartment	39	7.97	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	2.6	33.3	17.9	43.6	97.4
Townhouse/Condo	26	8.19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	15.4	19.2	57.7	92.3
Other	12	7.92	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	25.0	33.3	33.3	99.9

Table B47. Satisfaction with Curbside Garbage Collection by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-\$45,000	75	7.92	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	2.7	4.0	25.3	25.3	41.3	95.9
\$45,001-\$100,000	118	8.31	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	3.4	2.5	11.9	19.5	61.9	95.8
\$100,001-\$150,000	43	8.37	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.6	23.3	62.8	97.7
Over \$150,000	49	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	16.3	20.4	59.2	97.9

Table B48. Satisfaction with Curbside Garbage Collection by Years in Carrboro.

Years in Carrboro	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-1	16	8.19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	31.3	18.8	50.0	100.1
2-5	57	7.91	0.0	1.8	0.0	1.8	3.5	1.8	24.6	19.3	47.4	93.1
6-10	68	8.41	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	11.8	23.5	61.8	97.1
Over 10	137	8.29	0.0	0.7	0.7	0.0	1.5	4.4	11.7	19.0	62.0	97.1
Native	46	8.11	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	4.3	17.4	23.9	50.0	95.6

Solid Waste: Curbside Bulk Item Collection Crosstabulations

Table B49. Satisfaction with Curbside Bulk Item Collection by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18-25	10	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	20.0	70.0	100.0
26-55	107	8.09	0.0	1.9	1.9	0.9	3.7	1.9	10.3	20.6	58.9	91.7
56-65	27	7.67	7.4	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	22.2	11.1	55.6	88.9
Over 65	13	7.92	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	7.7	0.0	15.4	0.0	69.2	84.6

Table B50. Satisfaction with Curbside Bulk Item Collection by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	46	8.44	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	10.9	10.9	73.9	97.9
College Degree	84	8.01	0.0	1.2	1.2	2.4	4.8	2.4	13.1	19.0	56.0	90.5
PhD/JD/MD	20	7.35	0.0	5.0	10.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	15.0	20.0	45.0	80.0
Current Student	4	8.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	100.0

Table B51. Satisfaction with Curbside Bulk Item Collection by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Male	83	7.82	1.2	2.4	2.4	0.0	6.0	1.2	13.3	22.9	50.6	88.0
Female	76	8.24	1.3	0.0	1.3	2.6	1.3	2.6	10.5	10.5	69.7	93.3

Table B52. Satisfaction with Curbside Bulk Item 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	136	8.01	1.5	1.5	2.2	1.5	2.2	1.5	12.5	18.4	58.8	91.2
Apartment	10	8.40	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	70.0	100.0
Townhouse/Condo	11	8.18	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	0.0	0.0	9.1	72.7	81.8
Other	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table B53. Satisfaction with Curbside Bulk Item Collection by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-\$45,000	19	8.00	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	15.8	10.5	63.2	94.8
\$45,001-\$100,000	70	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	5.7	1.4	8.6	15.7	67.1	92.8
\$100,001-\$150,000	22	7.82	0.0	4.5	4.5	0.0	0.0	4.5	13.6	18.2	54.5	90.8
Over \$150,000	23	7.57	0.0	4.3	4.3	4.3	0.0	0.0	21.7	21.7	43.5	86.9

Table B54. Satisfaction with Curbside Bulk Item Collection by Years in Carrboro.

Years in Carrboro	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-1	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-5	19	7.21	0.0	0.0	10.5	0.0	10.5	15.8	5.3	15.8	42.1	79.0
6-10	34	8.41	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	2.9	23.5	67.6	94.0
Over 10	78	8.09	1.3	2.6	1.3	0.0	2.6	0.0	15.4	14.1	62.8	92.3
Native	27	8.04	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	18.5	14.8	59.3	92.6

Solid Waste: Curbside Yard Waste Collection Crosstabulations

Table B55. Satisfaction with Curbside Yard Waste Collection by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18-25	8	8.63	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	75.0	100.0
26-55	141	7.99	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.0	8.5	2.8	12.1	19.1	55.3	89.3
56-65	36	7.47	5.6	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	8.3	22.2	11.1	47.2	88.8
Over 65	16	7.31	0.0	6.3	0.0	6.3	18.8	0.0	6.3	6.3	56.3	68.9

Table B56. Satisfaction with Curbside Yard Waste Collection by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	48	8.31	2.1	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	2.1	12.5	10.4	70.8	95.8
College Degree	114	7.88	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.9	9.6	3.5	14.0	18.4	51.8	87.7
PhD/JD/MD	30	7.33	3.3	0.0	3.3	0.0	13.3	6.7	13.3	20.0	40.0	80.0
Current Student	6	8.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	16.7	66.7	100.1

Table B57. Satisfaction with Curbside Yard Waste Collection by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Male	107	7.66	1.9	1.9	0.9	0.9	8.4	4.7	15.9	15.9	49.5	86.0
Female	94	8.11	1.1	0.0	0.0	2.1	6.4	2.1	10.6	17.0	60.6	90.3

Table B58. 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	175	7.92	1.7	1.1	0.6	0.0	6.3	4.0	14.3	17.1	54.9	90.3
Apartment	12	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	8.3	8.3	75.0	91.6
Townhouse/Condo	9	7.44	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	22.2	0.0	0.0	11.1	55.6	66.7
Other	2	6.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0

Table B59. Satisfaction with Curbside Yard Waste Collection by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-\$45,000	25	8.00	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	12.0	16.0	60.0	92.0
\$45,001-\$100,000	82	8.11	0.0	1.2	0.0	1.2	6.1	2.4	13.4	15.9	59.8	91.5
\$100,001-\$150,000	33	7.46	3.0	3.0	0.0	3.0	9.1	6.1	15.2	9.1	51.5	81.9
Over \$150,000	35	8.00	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	2.9	5.7	14.3	25.7	48.6	94.3

Table B60. Satisfaction with Curbside Yard Waste Collection by Years in Carrboro.

Years in Carrboro	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-1	2	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
2-5	21	7.10	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.0	9.5	14.3	19.0	33.3	76.1
6-10	47	8.30	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	4.3	4.3	6.4	17.0	66.0	93.7
Over 10	104	7.83	1.0	1.9	1.0	1.9	6.7	2.9	14.4	16.3	53.8	87.4
Native	26	8.00	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	19.2	15.4	57.7	92.3

Solid Waste: Curbside Loose Leaf Collection Crosstabulations

Table B61. Satisfaction with Curbside Loose Leaf Collection by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18-25	9	8.56	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0	77.8	100.0
26-55	142	7.92	0.0	0.7	0.7	3.5	5.6	2.8	15.5	19.7	51.4	89.4
56-65	36	7.61	5.6	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	5.6	25.0	13.9	47.2	91.7
Over 65	17	7.24	0.0	5.9	0.0	5.9	17.6	5.9	5.9	5.9	52.9	70.6

Table B62. Satisfaction with Curbside Loose Leaf Collection by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	54	8.20	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	18.5	16.7	59.3	98.2
College Degree	116	7.82	0.0	0.9	0.0	4.3	7.8	3.4	17.2	14.7	51.7	87.0
PhD/JD/MD	26	7.50	0.0	3.8	3.8	0.0	7.7	3.8	15.4	26.9	38.5	84.6
Current Student	5	7.80	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	80.0

Table B63. Satisfaction with Curbside Loose Leaf Collection by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Male	108	7.62	0.9	1.9	0.9	4.6	5.6	3.7	21.3	13.0	48.1	86.1
Female	97	8.06	1.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	5.2	3.1	12.4	20.6	55.7	91.8

Table B64. 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	178	7.86	1.1	1.1	0.6	2.8	3.9	3.9	17.4	17.4	51.7	90.4
Apartment	10	8.60	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	80.0	100.0
Townhouse/Condo	10	7.50	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	20.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	60.0	70.0
Other	4	7.25	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	75.0

Table B65. Satisfaction with Curbside Loose Leaf Collection by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-\$45,000	25	8.00	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	16.0	8.0	64.0	92.0
\$45,001-\$100,000	84	8.04	0.0	1.2	0.0	1.2	6.0	2.4	16.7	17.9	54.8	91.8
\$100,001-\$150,000	32	7.50	0.0	0.0	3.1	6.3	6.3	6.3	21.9	12.5	43.8	84.5
Over \$150,000	39	7.82	0.0	2.6	0.0	5.1	0.0	5.1	17.9	23.1	46.2	92.3

Table B66. Satisfaction with Curbside Loose Leaf Collection by Years in Carrboro.

Years in Carrboro	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-1	1	9.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
2-5	19	7.16	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	15.8	15.8	15.8	15.8	31.6	79.0
6-10	47	8.30	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	2.1	4.3	10.6	17.0	63.8	95.7
Over 10	107	7.74	0.9	1.9	0.9	4.7	4.7	1.9	17.8	16.8	50.5	87.0
Native	29	8.00	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	20.7	17.2	55.2	93.1

**Carrboro Focus Area: Effectiveness in Keeping Carrboro the Best Place
To Live, Work, and Raise a Family Crosstabulations**

Table B67. Effectiveness of Board of Aldermen in Working to Keep Carrboro 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	37	7.68	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.8	2.7	16.2	48.6	21.6	89.1
26-55	258	7.35	0.8	1.6	0.8	1.6	14.3	4.3	19.0	27.9	29.8	81.0
56-65	53	6.94	3.8	0.0	1.9	5.7	13.2	7.5	18.9	22.6	26.4	75.4
Over 65	39	7.33	0.0	2.6	2.6	0.0	7.7	15.4	20.5	15.4	35.9	87.2

Table B68. Effectiveness of Board of Aldermen in Working to Keep Carrboro 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	139	7.54	0.7	0.7	0.7	1.4	12.2	5.0	17.3	25.2	36.7	84.2
College Degree	179	7.27	0.6	2.2	0.6	1.7	14.0	6.7	17.9	29.1	27.4	81.1
PhD/JD/MD	42	6.91	2.4	0.0	0.0	2.4	19.0	7.1	26.2	28.6	14.3	76.2
Current Student	23	7.04	0.0	0.0	8.7	0.0	13.0	0.0	26.1	39.1	13.0	78.2

Table B69. Effectiveness of Board of Aldermen in Working to Keep Carrboro 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	193	7.27	0.5	1.6	1.6	1.6	13.0	6.7	19.7	29.5	25.9	81.8
Female	198	7.33	1.5	1.0	0.5	2.0	14.1	5.6	17.7	25.8	31.8	80.9

Table B70. Effectiveness of Board of Aldermen in Working to Keep Carrboro 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	251	7.29	1.2	2.0	1.6	2.0	12.0	5.2	19.1	26.7	30.3	81.3
Apartment	71	7.38	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.3	8.5	22.5	35.2	21.1	87.3
Townhouse/Condo	37	7.30	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	24.3	5.4	16.2	24.3	29.7	75.6
Other	24	7.42	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	20.8	4.2	8.3	25.0	37.5	75.0

Table B71. Effectiveness of Board of Aldermen in Working to Keep Carrboro 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	115	7.27	0.0	1.7	1.7	0.9	13.9	7.8	20.0	27.0	27.0	81.8
\$45,001-\$100,000	130	7.50	2.3	0.0	0.0	1.5	9.2	6.9	21.5	23.1	35.4	86.9
\$100,001-\$150,000	48	7.40	0.0	4.2	0.0	2.1	10.4	4.2	14.6	37.5	27.1	83.4
Over \$150,000	49	7.22	0.0	2.0	2.0	4.1	10.2	2.0	22.4	38.8	18.4	81.6

Table B72. Effectiveness of Board of Aldermen in Working to Keep Carrboro the Best Place to Live, Work, and Raise a Family by Years in Carrboro.

Years in Carrboro	n	Mean	Very Ineffective 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Effective 9	% Above 5
0-1	26	7.27	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.2	11.5	11.5	38.5	19.2	80.7
2-5	86	7.20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.1	4.7	24.4	29.1	19.8	78.0
6-10	79	7.32	2.5	0.0	1.3	2.5	13.9	0.0	20.3	31.6	27.8	79.7
Over 10	143	7.28	0.7	3.5	1.4	2.8	9.1	7.0	18.2	25.9	31.5	82.6
Native	51	7.53	2.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	9.8	7.8	13.7	19.6	43.1	84.2

Carrboro Focus Area: Satisfaction with Environmental Protection Crosstabulations

Table B73. 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	36	7.19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	16.7	38.9	30.6	8.3	94.5
26-55	257	7.13	0.4	1.2	1.6	1.6	12.5	6.2	32.3	25.3	19.1	82.9
56-65	52	6.98	3.8	0.0	3.8	0.0	7.7	13.5	25.0	26.9	19.2	84.6
Over 65	39	7.44	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.4	10.3	17.9	28.2	28.2	84.6

Table B74. 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	138	7.35	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.3	10.1	27.5	30.4	19.6	87.9
College Degree	177	7.19	0.6	0.6	1.1	1.7	10.7	6.8	35.0	23.7	19.8	85.3
PhD/JD/MD	42	6.60	0.0	4.8	4.8	2.4	16.7	9.5	23.8	23.8	14.3	71.4
Current Student	23	6.70	4.3	0.0	4.3	0.0	8.7	13.0	30.4	34.8	4.3	82.5

Table B75. 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	190	7.19	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	10.0	8.4	30.5	27.4	19.5	85.8
Female	198	7.09	0.5	0.5	2.0	1.0	13.6	8.6	30.3	25.3	18.2	82.4

Table B76. 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	250	7.14	1.2	1.2	1.6	0.8	10.8	8.8	30.0	24.8	20.8	84.4
Apartment	71	7.18	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	11.3	9.9	32.4	28.2	15.5	86.0
Townhouse/Condo	35	7.20	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	11.4	5.7	31.4	37.1	11.4	85.6
Other	24	7.04	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	4.2	29.2	25.0	16.7	75.1

Table B77. 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	113	7.21	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	11.5	9.7	35.4	27.4	15.0	87.5
\$45,001-\$100,000	129	7.40	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	9.3	11.6	28.7	27.1	22.5	89.9
\$100,001-\$150,000	46	7.07	2.2	2.2	2.2	0.0	15.2	0.0	30.4	26.1	21.7	78.2
Over \$150,000	50	6.72	2.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	6.0	6.0	36.0	26.0	12.0	80.0

Table B78. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Environmental Protection by Years in Carrboro.

Years in Carrboro	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-1	25	7.16	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	40.0	24.0	16.0	80.0
2-5	83	6.84	0.0	2.4	1.2	1.2	15.7	10.8	32.5	25.3	10.8	79.4
6-10	80	7.04	0.0	0.0	3.8	3.8	11.3	3.8	36.3	26.3	15.0	81.4
Over 10	143	7.31	1.4	0.7	1.4	0.0	7.0	12.6	26.6	25.9	24.5	89.6
Native	51	7.31	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.7	3.9	23.5	31.4	23.5	82.3

Carrboro Focus Area: Satisfaction with Transportation Crosstabulations

Table B79. 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	37	7.00	0.0	0.0	2.7	8.1	5.4	18.9	18.9	27.0	18.9	83.7
26-55	261	7.03	1.5	0.4	1.5	1.5	12.3	9.6	32.2	23.0	18.0	82.8
56-65	53	6.83	5.7	3.8	0.0	1.9	5.7	13.2	26.4	20.8	22.6	83.0
Over 65	37	7.16	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.4	13.5	16.2	18.9	16.2	29.7	81.0

Table B80. 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	138	7.10	0.7	0.0	0.7	2.2	13.0	10.9	31.9	20.3	20.3	83.4
College Degree	179	7.12	1.7	0.6	1.7	3.4	7.8	11.2	26.8	25.7	21.2	84.9
PhD/JD/MD	44	6.59	4.5	2.3	2.3	0.0	11.4	15.9	31.8	18.2	13.6	79.5
Current Student	23	6.52	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	26.1	13.0	30.4	21.7	4.3	69.4

Table B81. 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	194	6.96	2.1	0.0	1.5	3.1	9.3	13.4	30.9	23.7	16.0	84.0
Female	198	7.07	1.5	1.5	0.5	2.0	13.1	9.6	27.8	20.7	23.2	81.3

Table B82. 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	251	7.03	2.0	0.8	2.0	2.0	9.6	10.0	31.9	21.5	20.3	83.7
Apartment	73	6.95	1.4	0.0	0.0	2.7	12.3	16.4	30.1	21.9	15.1	83.5
Townhouse/Condo	37	7.16	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.8	16.2	21.6	27.0	21.6	86.4
Other	23	6.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.0	26.1	4.3	8.7	21.7	26.1	60.8

Table B83. 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	114	6.90	0.9	0.0	0.0	3.5	15.8	14.0	29.8	21.1	14.9	79.8
\$45,001-\$100,000	130	7.30	1.5	0.8	1.5	2.3	4.6	11.5	27.7	23.1	26.9	89.2
\$100,001-\$150,000	47	7.15	4.3	0.0	4.3	0.0	4.3	6.4	31.9	25.5	23.4	87.2
Over \$150,000	49	6.67	2.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	16.3	18.4	24.5	22.4	12.2	77.5

Table B84. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Transportation by Years in Carrboro.

Years in Carrboro	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-1	26	6.96	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.1	11.5	23.1	30.8	11.5	76.9
2-5	85	6.73	0.0	1.2	2.4	4.7	15.3	10.6	36.5	15.3	14.1	76.5
6-10	80	7.18	1.3	0.0	0.0	3.8	7.5	11.3	31.3	27.5	17.5	87.6
Over 10	145	6.99	3.4	1.4	2.1	1.4	9.7	10.3	26.9	21.4	23.4	82.0
Native	50	7.30	2.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	8.0	14.0	22.0	26.0	26.0	88.0

Carrboro Focus Area: Satisfaction with Parking Crosstabulations

Table B85. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Parking by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18-25	37	6.97	2.7	0.0	5.4	0.0	5.4	8.1	35.1	32.4	10.8	86.4
26-55	260	6.73	1.9	1.5	3.1	5.0	11.9	13.8	25.4	17.7	19.6	76.5
56-65	53	6.70	5.7	1.9	0.0	5.7	9.4	5.7	32.1	24.5	15.1	77.4
Over 65	39	6.74	2.6	0.0	5.1	2.6	20.5	7.7	15.4	25.6	20.5	69.2

Table B86. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Parking by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	139	7.04	2.2	0.0	1.4	3.6	15.1	5.8	25.9	23.0	23.0	77.7
College Degree	180	6.69	2.2	2.8	3.9	4.4	8.3	12.8	27.2	22.2	16.1	78.3
PhD/JD/MD	43	6.30	2.3	0.0	2.3	9.3	14.0	23.3	25.6	14.0	9.3	72.2
Current Student	23	6.30	4.3	0.0	8.7	0.0	17.4	17.4	21.7	17.4	13.0	69.5

Table B87. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Parking by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Male	194	6.76	2.6	1.0	3.6	5.2	8.8	12.9	26.3	22.2	17.5	78.9
Female	199	6.73	3.0	1.5	2.5	3.5	14.6	9.5	26.1	20.6	18.6	74.8

Table B88. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Parking by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Single family	252	6.74	3.2	2.0	3.6	4.4	7.9	11.5	28.2	20.6	18.7	79.0
Apartment	72	6.83	0.0	0.0	1.4	4.2	18.1	15.3	25.0	19.4	16.7	76.4
Townhouse/Condo	37	6.70	2.7	0.0	2.7	5.4	13.5	13.5	21.6	27.0	13.5	75.6
Other	24	6.67	4.2	0.0	4.2	0.0	29.2	0.0	16.7	25.0	20.8	62.5

Table B89. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Parking by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-\$45,000	113	6.71	0.9	0.0	2.7	5.3	19.5	8.8	26.5	22.1	14.2	71.6
\$45,001-\$100,000	131	7.07	0.8	1.5	3.1	3.1	9.2	12.2	23.7	22.1	24.4	82.4
\$100,001-\$150,000	48	6.63	4.2	2.1	2.1	4.2	12.5	16.7	16.7	22.9	18.8	75.1
Over \$150,000	49	6.43	2.0	2.0	6.1	6.1	6.1	14.3	36.7	18.4	8.2	77.6

Table B90. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing on Parking by Years in Carrboro.

Years in Carrboro	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-1	26	6.81	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	23.1	19.2	7.7	30.8	15.4	73.1
2-5	86	6.77	1.2	0.0	2.3	3.5	16.3	12.8	27.9	23.3	12.8	76.8
6-10	81	6.78	1.2	0.0	4.9	4.9	6.2	19.8	28.4	17.3	17.3	82.8
Over 10	144	6.53	6.3	2.8	3.5	4.2	9.7	6.9	28.5	19.4	18.8	73.6
Native	50	7.20	0.0	2.0	0.0	8.0	12.0	6.0	18.0	24.0	30.0	78.0

Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing for Senior Citizens Crosstabulations

Table B91. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing for Senior Citizens by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18-25	37	6.87	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	29.7	8.1	24.3	21.6	16.2	70.2
26-55	227	6.97	0.4	0.0	0.4	2.6	20.7	7.9	28.2	20.7	18.9	75.7
56-65	46	7.28	0.0	0.0	2.2	4.3	4.3	13.0	26.1	28.3	21.7	89.1
Over 65	38	6.13	5.3	2.6	5.3	5.3	18.4	15.8	18.4	10.5	18.4	63.1

Table B92. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing for Senior Citizens by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	136	6.93	0.0	0.0	0.7	2.9	20.6	10.3	30.1	14.7	20.6	75.7
College Degree	157	6.93	1.9	0.6	1.9	2.5	16.6	8.9	22.9	24.2	20.4	76.4
PhD/JD/MD	32	6.84	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.1	21.9	15.6	25.0	15.6	18.8	75.0
Current Student	20	6.65	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	25.0	5.0	30.0	35.0	0.0	70.0

Table B93. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing for Senior Citizens by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Male	167	6.89	1.2	0.6	1.2	2.4	18.0	9.0	29.3	21.0	17.4	76.7
Female	182	6.92	0.5	0.0	1.1	3.3	20.3	10.4	23.6	20.3	20.3	74.6

Table B94. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing for Senior Citizens by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Single family	224	6.93	1.3	0.0	1.3	3.1	17.	8.9	28.1	21.4	18.8	77.2
Apartment	63	6.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	27.	11.1	28.6	19.0	11.1	69.8
Townhouse/Condo	36	7.00	0.0	2.8	0.0	2.8	22.2	5.6	22.2	16.7	27.8	72.3
Other	23	7.00	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	21.7	13.0	13.0	21.7	26.1	73.8

Table B95. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing for Senior Citizens by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-\$45,000	106	6.64	0.9	0.9	0.9	5.7	19.8	11.3	29.2	16.0	15.1	71.6
\$45,001-\$100,000	120	7.10	0.0	0.0	2.5	1.7	16.7	8.3	28.3	18.3	24.2	79.1
\$100,001-\$150,000	38	7.00	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.7	5.3	18.4	31.6	18.4	73.7
Over \$150,000	42	7.10	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	19.0	23.8	28.6	14.3	85.7

Table B96. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing for Senior Citizens by Years in Carrboro.

Years in Carrboro	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-1	22	6.59	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	36.4	9.1	22.7	22.7	9.1	63.6
2-5	74	6.78	0.0	0.0	1.4	1.4	29.7	9.5	20.3	18.9	18.9	67.6
6-10	73	7.07	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	15.1	13.7	32.9	19.2	17.8	83.6
Over 10	129	6.88	1.6	0.8	0.8	2.3	20.2	8.5	24.0	23.3	18.6	74.4
Native	49	7.06	2.0	0.0	4.1	8.2	2.0	8.2	30.6	18.4	26.5	83.7

Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing for Citizens with Disabilities Crosstabulations

Table B97. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing for Citizens with Disabilities by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18-25	37	6.97	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	24.3	8.1	27.0	27.0	13.5	75.6
26-55	228	6.90	0.9	0.4	1.8	3.1	19.7	7.0	25.0	24.1	18.0	74.1
56-65	44	7.27	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	4.5	25.0	20.5	27.3	20.5	93.3
Over 65	37	6.51	0.0	2.7	2.7	2.7	29.7	10.8	16.2	16.2	18.9	62.1

Table B98. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing for Citizens with Disabilities by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	135	7.04	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.7	20.0	11.1	23.7	22.2	20.7	77.7
College Degree	157	6.94	0.6	1.3	1.9	3.2	16.6	10.2	21.7	24.2	20.4	76.5
PhD/JD/MD	32	6.44	3.1	0.0	0.0	6.3	25.0	9.4	25.0	21.9	9.4	65.7
Current Student	20	6.70	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	25.0	0.0	35.0	35.0	0.0	70.0

Table B99. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing for Citizens with Disabilities by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Male	167	6.92	0.6	0.6	1.8	3.0	17.4	10.8	22.8	25.7	17.4	76.7
Female	180	6.92	0.6	0.6	1.1	2.2	21.1	8.9	24.4	22.2	18.9	74.4

Table B100. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing for Citizens with Disabilities by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Single family	221	6.99	0.5	0.5	2.3	3.2	15.8	9.0	25.3	24.0	19.5	77.8
Apartment	64	6.55	1.6	0.0	0.0	1.6	29.7	10.9	26.6	20.3	9.4	67.2
Townhouse/Condo	36	6.83	0.0	2.8	0.0	2.8	25.0	8.3	16.7	25.0	19.4	69.4
Other	23	7.35	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.7	8.7	8.7	34.8	26.1	78.3

Table B101. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing for Citizens with Disabilities by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-\$45,000	108	6.87	0.0	0.9	1.9	2.8	19.4	10.2	25.0	23.1	16.7	75.0
\$45,001-\$100,000	119	6.99	0.8	0.0	0.8	1.7	18.5	12.6	24.4	20.2	21.0	78.2
\$100,001-\$150,000	38	6.90	2.6	0.0	2.6	2.6	21.1	2.6	13.2	42.1	13.2	71.1
Over \$150,000	41	7.02	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.9	14.6	9.8	29.3	26.8	14.6	80.5

Table B102. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing for Citizens with Disabilities by Years in Carrboro.

Years in Carrboro	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-1	22	6.54	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.9	0.0	31.8	18.2	9.1	59.1
2-5	75	6.81	0.0	0.0	1.3	1.3	28.0	8.0	22.7	22.7	16.0	69.4
6-10	71	6.99	1.4	0.0	0.0	2.8	15.5	12.7	23.9	28.2	15.5	80.3
Over 10	130	6.95	0.0	1.5	0.8	3.8	19.2	6.2	26.2	22.3	20.0	74.7
Native	48	7.08	2.1	0.0	6.3	0.0	4.2	22.9	12.5	27.1	25.0	87.5

Satisfaction with Job the Town is Doing in Providing Affordable Housing Crosstabulations

Table B103. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing in Providing Affordable Housing by Age.

Age	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
18-25	32	6.09	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	21.9	12.5	34.4	15.6	3.1	65.6
26-55	226	5.50	11.5	4.0	4.9	7.5	19.5	11.1	19.5	13.3	8.8	52.7
56-65	47	5.55	6.4	6.4	6.4	8.5	17.0	17.0	19.1	10.6	8.5	55.2
Over 65	31	5.00	6.5	3.2	0.0	16.1	51.6	3.2	12.9	3.2	3.2	22.5

Table B104. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing in Providing Affordable Housing by Education.

Education	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
HS/Some College	130	5.75	12.3	1.5	2.3	7.7	20.0	6.2	24.6	16.2	9.2	56.2
College Degree	150	5.58	6.7	6.7	3.3	8.7	22.0	15.3	16.7	11.3	9.3	52.6
PhD/JD/MD	31	4.55	6.5	3.2	16.1	12.9	35.5	16.1	9.7	0.0	0.0	25.8
Current Student	21	5.00	19.0	0.0	9.5	0.0	23.8	9.5	28.6	9.5	0.0	47.6

Table B105. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing in Providing Affordable Housing by Gender.

Gender	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Male	164	5.35	11.0	4.9	4.3	7.9	22.0	14.6	18.3	9.8	7.3	50.0
Female	173	5.67	8.7	3.5	4.0	8.1	23.1	8.1	22.0	14.5	8.1	52.7

Table B106. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing in Providing Affordable Housing by Housing Type.

Housing	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
Single family	214	5.78	5.1	4.7	6.1	7.0	21.0	12.6	21.5	12.1	9.8	56.
Apartment	64	4.78	20.3	1.6	1.6	15.6	20.3	9.4	20.3	10.9	0.0	40.6
Townhouse/Condo	33	5.61	12.1	0.0	0.0	3.0	42.4	6.1	12.1	15.2	9.1	42.5
Other	22	4.86	22.7	9.1	0.0	4.5	18.2	9.1	18.2	9.1	9.1	45.5

Table B107. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing in Providing Affordable Housing by Income.

Income	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-\$45,000	107	4.89	18.7	3.7	4.7	8.4	23.4	7.5	18.7	12.1	2.8	41.1
\$45,001-\$100,000	116	6.10	6.9	4.3	2.6	6.0	15.5	10.3	25.0	15.5	13.8	64.6
\$100,001-\$150,000	37	5.65	2.7	8.1	2.7	5.4	29.7	18.9	13.5	10.8	8.1	51.3
Over \$150,000	37	5.57	2.7	0.0	5.4	16.2	24.3	21.6	18.9	8.1	2.7	51.3

Table B108. Satisfaction with the Job the Town is Doing in Providing Affordable Housing by Years in Carrboro.

Years in Carrboro	n	Mean	Very Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Very Satisfied 9	% Above 5
0-1	21	5.48	9.5	0.0	4.8	0.0	42.9	0.0	33.3	9.5	0.0	42.8
2-5	69	5.12	11.6	5.8	2.9	8.7	29.0	10.1	18.8	10.1	2.9	41.9
6-10	67	5.66	10.4	1.5	4.5	9.0	17.9	1.9	23.9	13.4	7.5	46.7
Over 10	129	5.43	10.1	5.4	4.7	8.5	20.9	14.7	14.0	12.4	9.3	50.4
Native	49	6.04	6.1	2.0	6.1	8.2	16.3	8.2	26.5	12.2	14.3	61.2

Appendix C

Town Government Staff Interaction

Town Government Staff – Please tell us specifically what you recall about this interaction (for responses below 5).

- The people I spoke with regarding a toxic smell from my roof work for 8 weeks did not care at all about my problem.
- Chris Clark did a wonderful job in Public Works.
- They did not get back with me on what is going on with the project on Roberts Street.
- They made me take out a platform to install a hot tub and had to put in a concrete pad.
- Staff is very helpful.
- Great mayor.

Appendix D

Streets/Roads That Need Attention

Can you provide specific examples of streets and roads (# of comments) that need more attention (for responses below 5)?

- Greensboro Street (6) – potholes, needs sidewalks
- Main Street (3) – potholes
- Homestead Road (2) – flooding, potholes
- Estes Drive Extension (2) – potholes
- Most streets (2) – too narrow, maintenance
- Ruth Street – needs to be paved
- High School Road – potholes
- At Wendys downtown – better lines needed on road at branch off to the BP
- 15-501 – potholes
- Food Lion area – potholes, rough road
- Old Fayetteville Road – potholes
- Hillsborough Street – potholes, needs sidewalks
- Loraine Street – potholes
- Dairyland Road – potholes
- Lilac Drive – maintenance needed
- Keith Road – maintenance needed
- Rock Haven Road – potholes
- Robert Street – road washes out
- Bypass – needs paving, uneven pavement at manholes
- Culbreth Road – potholes
- Across from Rise Biscuits – sinkhole
- Accessibility of sidewalks

Appendix E

Public Areas That Need Attention

Can you provide specific examples of public areas (# of comments) that need more attention (for responses below 5)?

- North Greensboro (3) – litter, poor appearance, upkeep
- South Greensboro (2) – add sidewalks, litter
- Estes Drive Extension (2) – add sidewalks
- Most streets (2) – glass debris, add sidewalks
- Parking lots (2) – need more lighting
- Jones Ferry Road – flood damage
- Sidewalks – tree roots, clearing of snow, cracked areas
- Poplar Street – sidewalks need work
- Downtown – debris, parking
- Piedmont Electric
- Most areas – add sidewalks, mowing
- Not enough parks
- Maple Avenue – leaf pickup
- Sweet Bay Place – leaf pickup
- Purple Leaf Place – leaf pickup
- Carr Mill Mall – towing cars
- Smith Level Road – litter
- Snow removal is slow

Appendix F

Town Parks & Recreation or Cultural Program Participation

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

- Youth/various sports (12)
Location: Numerous locations, downtown, parks
- Basketball (8)
Location: Recreation Center, numerous locations
- Christmas Events (6)
Location: Downtown
- July 4th (6)
Location: Downtown
- Camps (5)
Location: Numerous locations, Wilson Park, Anderson Park
- Events/festivals/concerts (5)
Location: Downtown, Century Center, Weaver Street
- Children's events (5)
Location: Numerous locations; Century Center, Carrboro Elementary
- Open Streets (5)
Location: Downtown
- Music Festival (4)
Location: Downtown
- Baseball/softball (3)
Location: Wilson Park, numerous locations
- Tennis (3)
Location: Numerous locations
- Spanish classes (3)
Location: Century Center
- Senior programs (2)
Location: Numerous locations
- Zumba classes (2)
Location: Community Center
- Aquatics Program (2)
Location: Homestead Aquatics Center
- Youth Camps (2)
Location: Numerous locations
- Fishing program (2)
Location: Anderson Park
- Art (2)
Location: Century Center
- Marathon (2)
Location: Numerous locations
- Soccer (2)
Location: Numerous locations
- Halloween (2)
Location: Town Commons
- Karate/Tai Chi (2)
Location: Community Center, Century Center

- Volleyball (2)
Location: Middle School
- Dancing
Location: Downtown
- Climbing Club
Location: Recreation Center
- Family Fun
Location: Century Center
- Carrboro Day
Location: Downtown
- Theater Camp
Location: Art Center
- Babysitting classes
Location: Century Center
- Gymnastics
Location: Century Center
- CPR Class
Location: Fire Department
- Yoga
Location: School
- Bingo
Location: Century Center
- Frisbee
Location: Anderson Park

Appendix G

Reasons for Low Ratings (Below 3) for Quality of Life in Carrboro

Please tell us which aspects of the quality of life in Carrboro seem worse? (# of comments)

- Cost of living (9)
- Overcrowded (4)
- Traffic (4)
- Parking (3)
- Overdevelopment (3)
- Construction (3)
- High taxes (2)
- Affordable housing (2)
- Rental property needs to be maintained better
- Carrboro has gone downhill since I was younger but currently still desirable
- The area has become over-priced, over-built, and is horrible when UNC is in session
- Quicken the pace of development and should have put in a CVS at Weaver Street
- It has lost its small-town feel; I will be moving when I am able; Carrboro use to be the best place to live
- Got annexed to Carrboro and property taxes went up \$3,000 and all the neighborhoods annexed were against it
- Should not have approved Lloyd Farm
- Redid old roads in our neighborhood and they are already cracking again
- The town does not care about people who ride bikes or walk, they care about the rich

Appendix H

Most Important Issue Facing the Town

What do you feel is the one most important issue facing the Town of Carrboro? (# of comments)

- None/no issues (82)
- Controlling growth/overcrowding (52)
- Affordable housing (46)
- Overdevelopment (27)
- Traffic (24)
- Rising cost of living (20)
- High taxes (19)
- Parking (17)
- Not sure/don't know (12)
- No opinion (10)
- Retain the small-town feel (9)
- School quality (8)
- Maintaining infrastructure (8)
- Diversity (8)
- Crime (6)
- Homeless/poverty (5)
- Water drainage/flooding (5)
- Affordable senior housing (4)
- Town trying to change its name (4)
- Keep greenspace (4)
- More bike lanes/trails (3)
- Preserving historical parts of town (3)
- Jobs (3)
- Cutting down too many trees (3)
- Lloyd Shopping Center and impact on the area (3)
- Improve sidewalks (2)
- Need more bike lanes (2)
- Drugs (2)
- I have not lived here long enough to know (2)
- Too much politics (2)
- Need more public transportation (2)
- Racial issues (2)
- There is too much restrictions on businesses (2)
- Water issues (2)
- Getting a library (2)
- Support/retaining local businesses (2)
- Economic development (2)
- Need more sidewalks (2)
- Utility costs are high
- Coming together as a town
- Mail not delivered in a timely manner
- State legislature
- Library has only one return
- Operates as a bubble
- Revitalization

- Water main breaks
- Services going down
- Growth in commercial revenue
- Clean parks for younger kids
- Need more small businesses
- Retail is limited; need more shopping
- Teacher pay
- More hiking trails
- A vision for moving forward
- Increase the tax base
- Maintain residential housing base
- Diversify tax base
- Google fiber needed
- Closer recycling centers
- Student population
- Lack of services – grocery store needed on my side of town
- Increase the budget for local musicians
- I am blind and need a way to get around town; can't use the shuttle or do the paperwork
- Lack of connectivity
- Walking access to downtown from all areas
- Need fresh new politicians
- Need high-speed internet to rural areas of Carrboro
- Accessible flex space for light manufacturing companies
- Speeding on South Greensboro Street
- Wages of unskilled workers
- Need more walkability
- Transportation
- Need to widen roads
- Healthcare
- Lack of commercial development
- Privacy
- Splitting up property
- Planning for the future
- Street maintenance
- Be more respectful to citizens who have been here for a long time
- Keep Main Street four lanes and don't add bike lanes
- Sidewalks need improvement for seniors and disabled
- Lack of shopping
- Balancing development between rich and poor
- Diversify tax base
- Roads
- Land use
- New construction
- Repairs to school due to hurricane
- Water bill

Appendix I

Well Informed on Town Government Aspects Services, Projects, Issues, and Programs That Come to Mind

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 when you decided on that rating?

- I don't really know how to rate this. I'm sure the information is out there, I just don't keep up with it. (Rated 5)
- Voting. (Rated 4)
- Politics. (Rated 7)
- Never given enough information. (Rated 4)
- I drive by and wonder what is going on. (Rated 4)
- I never see information on anything. (Rated 4)
- I have not looked. (Rated 1)
- I don't have time to inform myself. (Rated 3)
- I am sure the information is available, I just don't keep up with any of it. (Rated 5)
- I never see any information. (Rated 1)
- I don't look for information, it is my own fault. (Rated 3)
- I always hear about things after the fact. (Rated 1)
- I don't see information regarding most issues. (Rated 4)
- I don't know anything, I don't receive information. (Rated 1)
- Everything, I don't know where to find information. (Rated 1)
- It is my own fault, I don't look. (Rated 3)
- Need information in Spanish. (Rated 5)
- The lack of a newspaper has impacted how informed I am. The town needs a good informative paper again. (Rated 4)
- It is my own fault, I don't seek information. (Rated 3)
- My own fault, I don't look for it. I have no interest. (Rated 1)
- I don't see anything. (Rated 3)
- I don't easily see information and I don't really look for it. (Rated 4)
- It is my own fault. I have no interest and no time. (Rated 2)
- Increase in taxes and taking over of personal property for roads and sidewalks. (Rated 4)
- No information easily visible. (Rated 4)
- Hard to read in English, I don't understand. (Rated 1)
- It is my own fault but don't look for it. (Rated 4)
- I don't know where to look for any information. (Rated 4)
- Spanish information needs to be available. (Rated 1)
- No interest. (Rated 1)
- I mostly don't see information on anything going on in Carrboro. (Rated 4)
- I am on the email list for updates. (Rated 6)
- Questions are answered quickly. (Rated 8)
- Infrastructure projects. (Rated 6)
- In general, I don't hear much, but what I do hear is at work. (Rated 5)
- I could not tell you. The information isn't easy to come by. (Rated 3)
- I am not interested in any. (Rated 2)
- I don't really pay attention. (Rated 1)
- I don't know of any. (Rated 5)
- It is my fault. (Rated 5)

- I don't have time to look it up. (Rated 6)
- Rotting trees which are a hazard and they will not cut them down. (Rated 4)
- Parking availability. (Rated 5)
- Does not affect me specifically. (Rated 6)
- I don't read the local newspaper. (Rated 3)
- Since the newspaper went away, we don't know where to look. (Rated 3)
- Never hear from them. (Rated 1)
- Changes in community issues. (Rated 4)
- Need to be more informed. (Rated 6)
- Trying to get information beforehand when it affects decision making. (Rated 4)
- Development and zoning. (Rated 1)
- School renovation. (Rated 4)

Appendix J

Satisfaction with Making Information Available to Citizens Services, Projects, Issues, and Programs That Come to Mind

How satisfied are you with the Town of Carrboro making information available to citizens about important town services, projects, issues, and programs? What specific projects, activities, or issues came to mind when you decided on that rating?

- No information at all. (Rated 1)
- Need a central location for one place to do all with a summary sheet. (Rated 4)
- Excellent senior citizen programs. (Rated 8)
- You have to really look for it. (Rated 4)
- Emails pertaining to Florence. (Rated 9)
- I am not tuned into the website. (Rated 4)
- Hard to determine what is going on. (Rated 4)
- Not sure where to look. (Rated 5)
- I never see the information. (Rated 1)
- I never see information and just hear about it later. (Rated 1)
- Unaware of much. (Rated 1)
- I don't see information regarding most issues. (Rated 3)
- I don't know about anything and I am not sure how to find information. (Rated 1)
- Don't know where to find information. (Rated 3)
- Need information in Spanish. (Rated 5)
- Information in general on roundabout and shopping center in my area. (Rated 4)
- Not as proactive with providing information. (Rated 3)
- I don't see information, not a lot available. (Rated 4)
- I don't know where to look. (Rated 5)
- Hard to find information in Spanish. (Rated 1)
- Probably plenty of information available, just not interested. (Rated 9)
- Need to make information more public and accessible in all areas. (Rated 4)
- Nothing specific. (Rated 5)
- The Twitter updates talk about everything. (Rated 8)
- There is some information accessible but you really have to look for it. (Rated 3)
- Social media needs to be used more, that is the avenue I check the most. (Rated 5)
- You really have to search for the information if you want to know. (Rated 3)
- They provide the information, I just don't look at it. (Rated 5)
- The information is there for residents. They just need to do their part and look for it. (Rated 8)
- Need more information on the web, not printed. (Rated 3)
- I think the information is out there. (Rated 5)
- Do holiday notifications. (Rated 7)
- I don't feel it is readily available. (Rated 3)
- I would like to know what day leaf pickup is. (Rated 4)
- It is out there if you look for it. (Rated 7)
- They are not making an effort. (Rated 3)
- Don't know about them. (Rated 3)
- The information is difficult to access online. (Rated 4)
- Board of Alderman online meetings are awesome. (Rated 9)
- Not hitting all age groups. (Rated 2)
- Community issues. (Rated 6)
- Not informed about 203 Greensboro project. (Rated 4)

- Waiting too long to put out information. (Rated 3)
- Ten-year plan around the airport still in the works. (Rated 1)
- Schools and trash. (Rated 4)

Appendix K

Satisfaction with Opportunities to Participate in Decision Making Services, Projects, Issues, and Programs That Come to Mind

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 when you decided on that rating?

- They give the opportunities, I just don't participate. (Rated 7)
- I don't know about the opportunities. (Rated 4)
- Lack of interest. (Rated 5)
- Not providing enough information. (Rated 3)
- I have no interest. (Rated 1)
- I never know of opportunities for anything. (Rated 1)
- I don't see information on anything. (Rated 4)
- Unaware of any. (Rated 1)
- Don't know of any. (Rated 1)
- I don't know of any. (Rated 3)
- Unaware and unqualified. (Rated 1)
- I am uninformed and unaware of any. (Rated 1)
- Need information in Spanish. (Rated 5)
- I am unaware of any opportunities in general. (Rated 1)
- They don't listen to homeowners or residents and don't really care how it affects the individuals impacted by the actions the town takes. (Rated 1)
- I don't understand English. (Rated 1)
- I would love to volunteer and be more involved. Would love more information. (Rated 1)
- They don't want to actually listen to the resident's opinions. (Rated 3)
- The town does not listen. They have made their mind up before the meetings. There was a school issue where the parents want a say in changes that will be made but they don't actually listen to the parents. (Rated 1)
- There are many opportunities for meetings to be involved. (Rated 8)
- Town Meetings give us a place to be involved. (Rated 7)
- They don't make you aware of much to give you the ability to be involved. (Rated 2)
- Seems okay. No specifics came to mind. (Rated 5)
- If you can figure out what's going on before it ends, you can get involved. (Rated 5)
- They provide the information, I just don't look at it. (Rated 5)
- I see notifications all the time online about different things going on. (Rated 7)
- There is a lack of information. (Rated 4)
- I don't often get involved. (Rated 5)
- I would be interested in participating. (Rated 5)
- I see invitations for zoning. (Rated 8)
- I am given the opportunity, but I just don't participate. (Rated 7)
- The town makes it hard to participate if you don't come to meetings and sit down. They hold the meetings at certain times of the day and the bus stops running at 8:00 and the meetings go on until 10:00 sometimes. (Rated 1)
- Feels like restricted participants. (Rated 2)
- I participated but it was not the outcome I hoped for. (Rated 3)
- Years ago, we had an easement issue and were not given a fair chance. (Rated 4)
- Roundabout. (Rated 3)
- Put out information in Spanish. (Rated 4)

Appendix L

What Drew Respondent to Visit Downtown Carrboro

What drew you to visit downtown in the last year? (# of comments)

- Restaurants (109)
- Shopping (69)
- Weaver Street Market (48)
- Conduct business (30)
- Fun/pleasure (29)
- Events/Festivals (29)
- Farmer's Market (20)
- I live in or near downtown area (18)
- Everything (16)
- Atmosphere (14)
- I work downtown (14)
- Grocery store (13)
- Family time (12)
- Walkability/exercise (12)
- Music/Music Festival (11)
- Bars (9)
- Nothing specifically (8)
- Meet friends (7)
- Coffee shop (4)
- Gym (4)
- Art Center (3)
- Mall (2)
- Ice cream (2)
- Pharmacy (2)
- Library (2)
- Open Streets (2)
- Hair Salon/Barber (2)
- Sports (2)
- Bank (2)
- Cat's Cradle (2)
- Doctor/dentist (2)
- Volunteer downtown (2)
- Cafés (2)
- Location (2)
- Pokémon Go (2)
- Brewery/Steel String Brewery
- Diversity
- Franklin Street
- Art Walk
- Food Co-op
- Yoga
- Church
- Carrboro Square
- Southern States
- Community Center

- Park
- Food Truck Rodeo
- Bike accessibility
- Hardware store
- Always clean
- Outdoor space
- Town Commons
- Fruit stand

Appendix M

Why Respondent Did Not Visit Downtown Carrboro Last Year

Why did you not visit downtown in the last year? (# of comments)

- I am too busy (10)
- Parking (8)
- No reason (6)
- I don't get out often (4)
- Go to Raleigh (3)
- Disabled (2)
- Don't drive

Appendix N

Amenities That Bring People Downtown - Other

Other? (# of comments)

- Library (5)
- More parking (3)
- Brewery/distillery (2)
- Nothing else is needed (2)
- Affordable restaurants (2)
- More diverse retail
- Small budget movie theater
- More vendors needed
- Need a shop with everyday items
- Home décor store
- Reduce parking regulations
- A lot of turnover of small businesses in the area
- Carrboro's Common Stage event
- Healthy food choices for family
- Bojangles
- Chick-fil-A
- Music
- Bigger, more development
- Keep the Farmer's Market
- Basketball court
- Outdoor athletic area
- Creative ways to use Town Commons space
- Need more tables in Weaver Street Market area
- Bagel shop
- Starbucks
- Better connection between Carrboro and Chapel Hill
- Close Weaver Street Market on Saturdays
- Support the local businesses and stop the food trucks from coming in during events so the small restaurants will get the business to keep them going
- Have a place where musicians can practice
- Fabric shop
- Hobby store
- Bookstore
- Vegan ice cream
- Pet supply store

Appendix O

Specific Actions the Town Could Take to be More Effective with Keeping Carrboro the Best Place to Live, Work, and Raise a Family

Could you please tell us specific actions the town could take to be more effective with keeping Carrboro the best place to live, work, and raise a family?

- Taxes are too high. (Rated 4)
- Focus on existing residents, not new development. (Rated 1)
- High property taxes, something needs to change. Taxing people out of the area. (Rated 6)
- We need more commercial development in the area and the town is not allowing it. (Rated 4)
- Only putting up expensive housing no one can afford. (Rated 4)
- They are more concerned about big money than family living. (Rated 3)
- The area focuses less on long-term residents and more on students. It is no longer affordable to families. (Rated 5)
- Move faster on developments. (Rated 5)
- High taxes are pushing people and families out. (Rated 1)
- Lloyd rezoning. The town caved in to the developers. Not very considerate of residents and the effects. (Rated 3)
- They have lost focus on families. (Rated 2)
- They are very ineffective for poor families. (Rated 1)
- Focus on affordable housing. (Rated 5)
- Need a fresh outlook. The town is not a family friendly and is more focused on developers than what the town really needs. (Rated 4)
- They are not focusing on locals and making the area affordable for people to live or raise a family. (Rated 3)
- Cost of living and taxes are high for lower income. (Rated 6)
- They are not visible. Don't know what they are doing. We ask for a meeting for input for the road maintenance plan in our neighborhood. They met one time and have put us off since on decisions. (Rated 5)
- The town does not include all people. Discriminates against working and poor people. (Rated 2)
- Could be honest and not so pro-developers. (Rated 2)
- It is okay for younger age but what are they doing for seniors. Emphasis is always on the younger age. (Rated 3)
- Way too much time passing proclamations. (Rated 2)
- They voted for Lloyd Farm and ignored the concerns of citizens. (Rated 4)
- Need timers at meetings. (Rated 4)
- Need to be open minded and look at the big picture on how everyone is affected. (Rated 5)
- Too much building going on with giant houses and extreme growth. Tearing down small homes and replacing with bigger ones. (Rated 2)

Appendix P

Specific Actions the Town Could Take to Improve Satisfaction with Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Issues

Could you please tell us specific actions the town could take to make you more satisfied with parks, recreation, and cultural resources?

- Need more resources. (Rated 4)
- Park near Town Hall keeps flooding. (Rated 5)
- Preserve the trees. (Rated 4)
- A skateboard park is needed. (Rated 5)
- Need better trail connectivity so no driving is needed. (Rated 4)
- Need better connectivity to Chapel Hill. Need shelters so kids can have some shade from the sun. (Rated 7)
- Need more for younger children. (Rated 7)
- Parks & Recreation programs are very few these days. About 20 years ago, Carrboro had a lot more to offer kids. (Rated 3)
- Downtown only has one parklike area. Not enough parks throughout town. (Rated 2)
- Need more parks and community centers. The present centers are not very clean and need to be better maintained. (Rated 5)
- Good programs. (Rated 8)
- MLK Park has been planning for a long time but nothing started. (Rated 7)
- Need more parks, greenways, trails, and less cement. (Rated 7)
- MLK Park not developed. (Rated 4)
- Need a Duke Park like in Durham; it is fantastic. (Rated 6)
- Improve the community centers, the parks are fine. (Rated 8)
- Sidewalks will help. (Rated 8)

Appendix Q

Specific Actions the Town Could Take to Improve Satisfaction with Environmental Protection

Could you please tell us specific actions the town could take to make you more satisfied with the job the town is doing with environmental protection?

- Need to improve water runoff. (Rated 5)
- More open space needed. (Rated 4)
- Erosion control. (Rated 6)
- More erosion control around construction and more ways to deal with ice on the roads other than salt. (Rated 3)
- Picking up litter after flooding. (Rated 4)
- Water pours into yards all the time. (Rated 1)
- Cutting down too many trees. (Rated 3)
- Stronger cooperation with Chapel Hill is needed. (Rated 9)
- The electric charging stations are poor. (Rated 2)
- Stormwater and flooding. I am not sure what can be done but with the increase in growth, this needs to be addressed quickly. (Rated 4)
- In a heavy rainstorm, the Harris Teeter parking lot gets light flooding. (Rated 7)
- An opportunity was missed with the Lloyd Farm development on valuable land in Carrboro, they should have gone a different route. (Rated 3)
- Stormwater and flooding. There is a disconnect on how to manage. Town worried too much about downstream residents not upstream. (Rated 1)
- Very little greenspace. (Rated 3)
- Need charging stations for electric vehicles. (Rated 6)
- Need more research on recent water main break. (Rated 6)
- They could do more. (Rated 9)
- More should be done with solar power when building. (Rated 6)
- Huge water leak recently. (Rated 6)
- Infrastructure and flooding issues. (Rated 3)
- They could be doing more in terms of water conservation. (Rated 6)
- Need more solar. (Rated 7)
- Nothing seems to be getting done. (Rated 5)
- Abandoned property just sits there. (Rated 3)
- No public charging stations for electric cars. Duke Energy makes it easy to do a solar cell on your roof. (Rated 7)
- Spend more time investing in biking, walking, and using the bus. (Rated 2)
- A little more pro-residents and less pro-developers. (Rated 1)
- Done more smartly. (Rated 7)
- Town requires retention ponds that are expensive to maintain. The town should help with expenses. (Rated 2)
- Not taking citizens seriously on stormwater and flooding. Keep greenspace available. (Rated 4)

Appendix R

Specific Actions the Town Could Take to Improve Satisfaction with Transportation

Could you please tell us specific actions the town could take to make you more satisfied with transportation?

- Need more bike lanes and sidewalks. (Rated 4)
- Need more bike lanes. (Rated 4)
- Need more bike lanes and public transportation options. (Rated 4)
- The roundabouts are ridiculous. (Rated 6)
- The buses are great but need more sidewalks. (Rated 6)
- Need more bike lanes. (Rated 6)
- Need lighting on back roads and boost in public transportation. (Rated 4)
- Need bike lanes. (Rated 1)
- Very congested Weaver Street area. (Rated 6)
- Need better connectivity for bike lanes. (Rated 8)
- Need more bike lanes. (Rated 5)
- The one-way roads, we need alternative routes. Too much traffic. Need more sidewalks and bike lanes. (Rated 2)
- More bike lanes needed. (Rated 7)
- Need more bike paths on main roads, it is very dangerous. Roads need to be widened to handle the traffic flow. (Rated 4)
- South Greensboro needs connecting sidewalks. (Rated 7)
- Too much traffic and bike lanes are not safe. (Rated 4)
- The sidewalk ends at Main Street near the gym. Cheek Street sidewalk down to Johnny's on Main needs to be continued. (Rated 3)
- North Greensboro roundabout was not a good idea, it made it worse. Also, the bike lane just disappears at roundabout and will make bike usage harder. (Rated 5)
- Need wider sidewalks. Not bike friendly at all. (Rated 8)
- They widen the roads behind my house and cut into my property. The road is on top of my house making my house unsellable. (Rated 1)
- Bike lanes needed on South Weaver Street Market area (Rated 6)
- Need more bike lanes and widen them. (Rated 5)
- Disconnected sidewalks throughout the area as well as bike lanes. Past the car wash in front of the detail shop needs a sidewalk. (Rated 4)
- Very slow on planning and action on sidewalks and street widening. It takes 30 years to see a new sidewalk. (Rated 1)
- Need more bike lanes. (Rated 6)
- Not as much as needed. (Rated 4)
- Not enough public transportation. (Rated 7)
- The bus service could be better. (Rated 7)
- Main Street and Greensboro Street are backed up. (Rated 5)
- Need more pedestrian crossings. (Rated 4)
- Roads don't need to be widened but pedestrian crossings need to be improved. (Not rated)
- The buses should run more and later. (Rated 8)
- Not enough street lighting and hard to see pedestrians. (Rated 7)
- Need more bike paths. It is dangerous with no sidewalks. (Rated 3)
- I would like Sunday bus service. (Rated 8)
- Roundabouts were not a good idea. (Rated 6)

- There is no safe bike path for kids. On Weaver Street there is no bike path or pedestrian crossing on both sides. (Rated 5)
- Old Pittsboro Road needs more sidewalks. (Rated 1)
- The Board fights things that make it safe for people. The town is falling behind. (Rated 1)
- Improve bike lanes, they just disappear. Need separation for bike lanes for safety. (Rated 3)
- Drivers do not slow down for pedestrians and lights not synchronized. (Rated 1)
- More public transportation is needed. (Rated 7)
- There haven't been many changes. More pedestrian crossings are needed around 54. (Rated 3)
- More buses are needed within the town and more modes of transportation involving small vehicles. (Rated 4)
- The intersection of West Poplar and Main Street is dangerous. (Rated 7)
- More bike lanes and widen Estes Drive Extension. (Rated 5)
- The buses run infrequently and is inconvenient. (Rated 5)
- Need more public transportation services. (Rated 3)
- Create more bike lanes and sidewalks. (Rated 7)
- Need to synchronize lights better, take too long to change. (Rated 2)
- Need bridges for pedestrian crossing across highways. (Rated 7)

Appendix S

Specific Actions the Town Could Take to Improve Satisfaction with Parking Within the Town

Could you please tell us specific actions the town could take to make you more satisfied with parking?

- Not enough public parking. (Rated 4)
- Need more parking options. (Rated 5)
- Need more parking. (Rated 4)
- Don't care for paid parking; there is less space with more building. (Rated 4)
- More parking lots with good lighting. (Rated 3)
- Need more lighting. (Rated 4)
- Parking lots are a mess and it hurts business. (Rated 1)
- The downtown area needs more parking. (Rated 3)
- Add more parking. (Rated 1)
- Need additional parking near the downtown area. (Rated 3)
- I would rate this lower if they put the library over a current parking lot. (Rated 7)
- Just provide more parking. (Rated 1)
- The empty lot near Weaver Street could be used for parking. (Rated 4)
- Need to add a parking lot. (Rated 4)
- Not sure, but hard to find parking. (Rated 4)
- Need better signs that show parking spots. (Rated 7)
- The lot at Greenbridge development area gave parking to Chapel Hill and I don't understand that. (Rated 4)
- The Open Eye parking lot closing down was bad for the area. (Rated 4)
- Something needs to be done. Not sure what at this point. (Rated 3)
- Hard to find street parking on Franklin Street, especially during busy hours of the day. (Rated 4)
- There was too much build up and not enough private parking. Too late now. (Rated 1)
- Open more spots. There are plenty of spots but they say not public parking. (Rated 4)
- Need to open more public parking in any open lots. (Rated 3)
- There is no parking most of the time. We need parking areas. (Rated 1)
- More partnerships with the small businesses in town. (Rated 3)
- They are taking away all of the parking. I am not sure what they can do but they need to keep some parking so it is easy to go places. (Rated 4)
- No parking and place to add parking. (Rated 1)
- Lack of available parking. Only 3 hours in the parking deck is not enough time. (Rated 3)
- The open lot behind Tyler's could be made into parking. (Rated 3)
- More lots should be available such as the one by Roberson Street. (Rated 4)
- We need parking downtown and the only space to go is up. (Rated 3)
- Need a plan for developing parking like a garage. (Rated 2)
- Increase public parking. (Rated 5)
- They don't think downtown parking is important. (Rated 3)
- It is nice that parking is free, but not enough of it. (Rated 6)
- Parking can be a pain and it keeps me from doing activities. (Rated 7)
- Need more parking along Weaver Street. (Rated 4)
- Out-of-towners are taking the parking spots. Need more areas to park. (Rated 3)
- Not enough public parking. (Rated 4)
- Downtown parking is difficult. (Rated 6)
- Very excited about the downtown library, but concerned about parking. (Rated 6)
- It is hard to park downtown due to limited spots. (Rated 7)

- Not adding enough parking for new developments. (Rated 6)
- In Chapel Hill they have underground parking. (Rated 9)
- Never enough parking. (Rated 8)
- Not enough. (Rated 5)
- Downtown is not easy to park. (Rated 6)
- Don't let people park at certain places. (Rated 3)
- What parking? What happens when the new library goes up? (Rated 8)
- The town has 2,000 parking spaces available. They are focused on building new parking which is not needed. (Rated 1)
- Designate public parking with signage and be clear where visitors can park. (Rated 4)
- They are not maintaining my street. (Rated 1)
- Old parking is going away and not building new parking. (Rated 4)
- Not enough parking and keep building. The deck at Hampton Inn is full all the time. (Rated 2)
- Need more places to park. (Rated 6)
- Horrible parking. (Rated 1)
- No allowances for parking and not enforcing the time limits on Weaver Street and Main Street. (Rated 1)
- Parking is still an issue. (Rated 7)
- Need more parking. (Rated 2)

Appendix T

Specific Actions the Town Could Take to Improve Satisfaction with Planning and Development

Could you please tell us specific actions the town could take to make you more satisfied with planning and development?

- Too much building going on. (Rated 4)
- Developers jumping through too many hoops. (Rated 3)
- The department is horrible. (Rated 3)
- Need more infrastructure before building. (Rated 2)
- Will allow anyone to work without question. (Rated 1)
- Roads are overcrowded. (Rated 5)
- Too much cement. Cut back on building, need stricter building requirements. (Rated 4)
- The rate of development and infrastructure being able to handle it and overcrowding of schools in the future. (Rated 4)
- Manage development better. It is starting to get crowded. I love the area but it's getting developed quicker than the infrastructure can handle. (Rated 3)
- I don't see information on how they are doing so I am not sure. (Rated 5)
- Diversity with high-quality rent areas that are subsidized. (Rated 5)
- The suburban neighborhoods are hard to get in and out of because of the one-way roads and lack of alternative routes. (Rated 4)
- Too much construction. (Rated 4)
- Stop cramming houses behind houses. Hampton Inn area needs to stay the way it is. (Rated 5)
- Too many high price housing developments. We need more nice affordable housing and commercial developments. (Rated 3)
- Need a road put in or a redirection coming in from Chapel Hill. (Rated 5)
- Growing too quickly and not putting in affordable housing. (Rated 4)
- Too much development and not enough affordable housing. (Rated 4)
- Lloyd Farm decision was bad for the area. (Rated 1)
- Too much construction. (Rated 4)
- I am worried about too much traffic. Need thicker walls on developments. (Rated 3)
- Need housing for lower income families and individuals with disabilities. (Rated 5)
- Make the developers handle infrastructure. Carrboro has done a poor job with forward thinking. (Rated 1)
- There is too much business development. Keeping the small-town feel should have been a priority. (Rated 1)
- Don't over-commercialize the area. Keep small mom & pop shops. (Rated 8)
- High-cost housing developments. (Rated 5)
- Too many commercial businesses that are overcrowding and undervaluing the residential areas. (Rated 5)
- Need more spread out development and stop focusing on one side of Carrboro. (Rated 4)
- Too rapid growth. Schools can't handle the growth. In 10 years, it will be out of control. (Rated 1)
- The rent is not affordable. Only developers get incentives. There has been a lot of increase in big businesses that are not compatible with the town. We are losing the small-town feel. (Rated 3)
- Have the schools in place before more people. (Rated 5)
- Too much traffic. (Rated 4)
- Carrboro is expanding too much to become a big city. (Rated 1)
- With the new buildings, walkability is important. (Rated 7)
- Getting too much development. (Rated 5)
- Not as scenic, too many high rises. (Rated 7)

- Big money coming in from outside Carrboro driving normal families out of town. (Rated 4)
- Larger corporations need to pay more money in taxes to expand and develop. (Rated 5)
- Infrastructure issues. (Rated 5)
- Lack of a library downtown and don't touch Charles Herman Wilson park. (Rated 6)
- Too many restrictions. (Rated 4)
- Properties get split. (Rated 4)
- Lloyd Farm decision was a failure. Bad for economic development and bad for affordable housing. (Rated 1)
- Fire them all and hire new staff. (Rated 2)
- Deal with drainage issues from McDougle School. (Rated 4)
- Lloyd Farm area putting up another grocery store is not needed. (Rated 4)
- Lloyd Farm issues. (Rated 5)
- They have created room for a wide range of small businesses. (Rated 3)
- There is lots of planning but no action. New buildings have gone up with no occupants. (Rated 4)
- They don't look at all the issues when developing new land, they see dollars. (Rated 4)
- They rezoned against citizen wishes across from Carrboro Plaza. (Rated 5)
- Should not pave Bowling Green and leave it natural. (Rated 5)
- Not supporting the natural environment or affordable housing. (Rated 4)
- Carrboro is not an urban area and building over six stories do not belong. (Rated 7)
- Need to listen better. (Rated 8)
- Things are out of control with extreme growth of high rises. The prices keep rising for the middle income. (Rated 1)

Appendix U

Places in Carrboro Where Wi-Fi is not Available

In the last year, where have you been in Carrboro where you expected to be able to use public Wi-Fi but couldn't because it wasn't available? (# of comments)

- Nowhere/not an issue (320)
- Do not use it/never tried (24)
- Weaver Street area (16)
- Downtown (6)
- Unaware it was available (4)
- Looking Glass Café (3)
- Restaurants downtown (2)
- Very slow/not reliable/spotty (2)
- Plaza area (2)
- Century Center (2)
- Carr Mill Mall
- Bus stop near the railroad
- Town Wi-Fi is awful
- Rise Biscuits
- Eastern edge of Main Street
- Everywhere
- Near library
- Town Hall
- Cat's Cradle
- Orange County Social Club
- Willow Creek Shopping Center
- Behind Fire Department around the civic club
- Outer perimeters of Carrboro
- Police Station
- Anywhere outside of Main Street and North Greensboro Street
- Wilson Park
- Anderson Park
- Art Center



Town of Carrboro

Town Hall
301 W. Main St.
Carrboro, NC 27510

Agenda Item Abstract

File Number: 19-37

Agenda Date: 1/22/2019

File Type: Agendas

In Control: Board of Aldermen

Version: 1

TITLE:

Public Hearing for Community Input on Town Budget for Upcoming FY 2019-20

PURPOSE: This is a public hearing to receive comments from the public regarding the upcoming budget for the Town beginning July 1, 2019.

DEPARTMENT: Town Manager and Finance

CONTACT INFORMATION: David Andrews, Town Manager; and Arche McAdoo, Finance Officer

INFORMATION: The Board of Aldermen is required to adopt an annual operating budget ordinance by July 1st. As part of the budget development process, the Board holds a public hearing at the beginning of the process to receive comments from residents about Town services. These comments are considered in developing the recommended operating and capital budgets for FY 2019-20.

A notice of this public hearing was advertised in local newspaper and on the Town's website. The advertisement notifies residents of a public hearing to receive public input and invites residents to submit written comments about the budget for the upcoming year. Residents may also email their comments to the Town Clerk via the Town's website (townofcarrboro.org). Residents will have another opportunity to speak about the Town Manager's Recommended Budget for FY 2019-20 at a public hearing planned for Tuesday, May 28, 2019.

The Board of Aldermen is also requested to provide comments, suggestion and inputs to the Town Manager on needs or service improvements they consider important in developing the manager's recommended budget for FY 2019-20.

FISCAL & STAFF IMPACT: None

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Board of Aldermen hold a public hearing to receive community comments for the upcoming budget year and provide input to the Town Manager on needs and service improvements to consider when developing the budget for FY 2019-20.



Town of Carrboro

Town Hall
301 W. Main St.
Carrboro, NC 27510

Agenda Item Abstract

File Number: 19-34

Agenda Date: 1/22/2019

File Type: Agendas

In Control: Board of Aldermen

Version: 1

TITLE:

A Resolution Setting the Date for the 2019 Legislative Dinner and Discussion of Legislative Issues for the 2019 Session of the General Assembly

PURPOSE: The purpose of this item is to request that the Board of Aldermen set the date for the 2019 Legislative Dinner and to facilitate a discussion of legislative issues to present to our local delegation at the breakfast. The delegation may be able to pursue some of the issues presented during the upcoming session of the NC General Assembly.

DEPARTMENT: Town Clerk

CONTACT INFORMATION: Cathy Dorando

INFORMATION: The 2019 Regular Session of the General Assembly will reconvene on Wednesday, January 30, 2019.

Wednesday, February 6, 2019 at 6:00 p.m. has been suggested as the date and time for the legislative dinner. The dinner will take place in the Town Hall Board Room.

In previous years, the Board of Aldermen has developed a package of legislative issues to discuss with the delegation. Occasionally, this package has included a piece of local legislation that the Board of Aldermen would like to get passed. The 2018 short session goals are attached for information.

The NCLM adopted their 2019-20 Municipal Advocacy Goals in November and those goals are also attached for information.

FISCAL & STAFF IMPACT: N/A

RECOMMENDATION: Town staff recommends that the Board approve the resolution setting a date for the 2019 Legislative Dinner and discuss the resolution establishing a list of legislative issues/priorities to discuss with our local delegation and, where appropriate, to propose local legislation in the upcoming session of the General Assembly.

A RESOLUTION SETTING THE 2019 LEGISLATIVE DINNER AND THE 2019 LEGISLATIVE
PRIORITIES FOR THE CARRBORO BOARD OF ALDERMEN

Section 1. The Legislative Dinner is scheduled for February 6, 2019 at 6:00 p.m.

Section 2. The Board provides the following comments and/or the following legislative priorities:

Section 3. This resolution is effective immediately upon adoption.



Town of Carrboro SHORT SESSION 2018

Proposed State and Federal Legislative Priorities

STATE ADVOCACY GOALS

Affordable Housing/Tax Credits

- Support for Restoration of State Housing Tax Credits and Opportunity Tax Credits (or similar) as may be proposed during the session.
- Support for other affordable housing finance strategies.

Criminal Justice

- Apply to join the Pretrial Justice Institute's 3DaysCount initiative. Goals of 3DaysCount is to help states reduce unnecessary arrests by expanding the use of citations or summons, replace money bail with non-financial restrictive conditions, restrict detention to the small number of people for whom no condition or combination of conditions can reasonably assure appearance in court and public safety, and reduce disparity within the pretrial justice system
- Amend the Law Enforcement Recordings/No Public Records law (SL 2016-88; House Bill 972) to provide local governments and law enforcement agencies with greater flexibility in the disclosure and release of dashboard and body-worn camera recordings.
- Actively support strengthening of gun control laws, especially with regard to municipal and governmental properties, including parks and greenways, school properties, and college and university campuses.

Environment

- Develop a building code that matches what climate change science is calling for to avert runaway climate change
- Support NC Clean Path Initiatives
- Expand Mass Transit;
- Divest From Fossil Fuels;
- Let Dangerous Nuclear Power Plants Close; and
- Ban fracking.
- Transition to 100% Renewable Energy



Town of Carrboro SHORT SESSION 2018

Proposed State and Federal Legislative Priorities

- Transfer renewable technologies to historically low emission per capita countries.
- Reject All New Fossil Fuel Infrastructure;
- Hold Corporate Polluters Accountable and Make Them Pay;
- Oppose offshore drilling

Finance

- Support legislation to exempt menstrual products from sales tax.
- Support greater municipal authority for the expenditure of Tourism Development Funds to meet local needs.

Infrastructure/Utilities/Transportation

- Support removal the 10% cap on total state funding for a commuter rail or light rail project (N.C.G.S. 136-189.10(3)g)
- Support legislative efforts to expand of municipal broadband.
- Support legislation to protect Jordan Lake as a drinking water supply.
- Support for state or federal money that could help with extreme flooding that Carrboro has been experiencing in recent years.

LGBTQ

- Oppose any religious freedom bill that allows discrimination against the LGBTQ community.
- Seek repeal of the Magistrates Recusal for Civil Ceremonies law (SL 2015-75; Senate Bill 2).
- Support legislation that establishes statewide protections for LGBTQ citizens related to sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression in the areas of housing, employment and public accommodation.

Medicaid Expansion/Mental Health Services/Access to Healthcare

- Actively support increased funding of services and staffing for mental health needs.



Town of Carrboro SHORT SESSION 2018

Proposed State and Federal Legislative Priorities

- Support Gov. Cooper's proposal to legislature requesting additional funding so public schools and colleges can make building safety improvements and hire school-based nurses, psychologists and police officers.

Municipal Authority

- Oppose legislation that further erodes municipal authority.
- Oppose legislation that removes authority of municipalities to determine election schedules.
- Support local authority to ban the use of thin, single-use plastic bags by retailers and stores (or be able to levy a use tax on them).
- Allow Home Rule in N.C.

Social Justice

- Support the removal of Silent Sam Statue on UNC's Campus.



Town of Carrboro SHORT SESSION 2018

Proposed State and Federal Legislative Priorities

FEDERAL ADVOCACY GOALS

Environment

- Oppose legislation that would eliminate the EPA, as well as including efforts to limit greenhouse-gas emissions, limit the Clean Power Plan, or reduce rules imposed on oil, gas, and coal sectors.
- Support NC Clean Path Initiatives
- Take action to address NC's (U.S.) responsibility for the carbon that it has put into the atmosphere by bringing CO2 back to a safe level below 350 ppm in time for a 90% probability of success in averting runaway climate change. Do so in a manner that is equitable towards nations that have not built their economies by dumping carbon into our shared atmosphere. Some actions include:
 - Transition to 100% Renewable Energy
 - Transfer renewable technologies to historically low emission per capita countries.
 - Reject All New Fossil Fuel Infrastructure;
 - Hold Corporate Polluters Accountable and Make Them Pay;
 - Fight the Trump Plan to Open up the Atlantic Ocean for Oil and Gas Drilling (including support for H.R. 2242 Keep It in the Ground Act of 2017) ;
 - Expand Mass Transit;
 - Divest From Fossil Fuels;
 - Let Dangerous Nuclear Power Plants Close; and
 - Ban fracking.

Equality/Social Justice

- College for all Act (H.R. 1880);
- Raise the Wage Act (H.R. 15) (Thank you for co-sponsoring!);
- Equal Access to Abortion Coverage in Health Insurance (H.R. 771) (Thank you for co-sponsoring!);
- Automatic Voter Registration Act (H.R. 2840);



Town of Carrboro SHORT SESSION 2018

Proposed State and Federal Legislative Priorities

- Justice is Not For Sale Act of 2017 (H.R. 3227);

Finance

- Support the passage of the federal e-fairness legislation.
- Support for state or federal money that could help with extreme flooding that Carrboro has been experiencing in recent years.
- Specific to David Price, would like us to discuss ability to reprogram CDBG funds in our small business loan program for greater flexibility to meet economic development needs; would like assurances that Post Office will collaborate with local government to enable more ideal egress/ingress, traffic flow, etc. in light of potential development opportunities and conversations with DOT
- Defund war;
- Repeal tax cuts for the rich and replace with a progressive tax system that significantly increases taxes on the obscene wealth concentration by the richest people and corporations;
- Tax and Dividend on fossil fuels;
- Financial Trading transaction tax (H.R. 1144 Inclusive Prosperity Act);
- No more fossil fuel subsidies;
- Justice is Not For Sale Act of 2017 (H.R. 3227);

Gun Control

- Actively support strengthening of gun laws.

Healthcare

- Oppose healthcare reform efforts that would fully repeal the Affordable Care Act or discriminate against people with pre-existing conditions or drop coverage of children under the age of 26.
- Support single payer health care (Thank you for co-sponsoring H.R. 676 Medicare for all Act);
- Equal Access to Abortion Coverage in Health Insurance (H.R. 771) (Thank you for co-sponsoring!);



Town of Carrboro SHORT SESSION 2018

Proposed State and Federal Legislative Priorities

- Work with Bernie Sanders to introduce in the House a Federal Jobs Guarantee program.
<https://www.commondreams.org/news/2018/04/23/embracing-sort-bold-thinking-we-need-sanders-introduce-plan-guarantee-every-american>

Trade/Human Rights

- Oppose any trade agreements (including the Trans Pacific Partnership) that include investor-state dispute arbitration and which undermine the ability of governments to enact laws to protect human rights, labor and environmental standards. (2014 Resolution Against Trade Agreements that Undermine the Ability of Governments to Enact and Enforce Laws to Protect Human Rights, Labor and the Environment provided as agenda item attachment)
- Reform ICE procedures: No secret police force. Federal marshals are enough. Raise bar very, very high for detention/deportation—violent criminal fugitives, high-volume drug trafficking, human trafficking, etc. Require greater transparency, notice of action to local government, notification of families, quality due process, etc for any action related to arrest/detention action.
- Full protection/expansion of DACA. Better yet, full protection of Dreamers, period.



2019-2020 MUNICIPAL ADVOCACY GOALS

- Seek legislation to ensure that the amount of Powell Bill funds appropriated by the state are sustained and distributions to municipalities are increased and grow over time.
- Seek legislation to boost funding availability for public transit and transportation programs.
- Seek legislation that provides additional tools and financial resources for addressing the affordable housing crisis.
- Seek legislation granting local governments the authority to build broadband infrastructure and to partner with private internet service providers using long-term infrastructure leases.
- Seek legislation to alter the current statutes governing distribution of local sales taxes by requiring a one-year delay in implementation when a county or the legislature changes its method of distributing sales tax revenue.
- Seek legislation to provide municipalities with authority for additional locally-controlled revenue options and flexibility in the use of those options, including – but not limited to – city-only sales tax, city occupancy taxes, prepared meals taxes, and impact fees for transportation.
- Seek legislation that supports adequate, fair school funding between state and county in all school systems across the state by repealing municipal authority to fund schools.
- Support legislation which defends the fiscal integrity of the Local Government Employees' Retirement System and its defined benefit structure, promotes reasonable pension reforms that are prospective in nature, and meets the needs of local employees, employers, and retirees.
- Support legislation that will provide sufficient funding at the state level for incentive programs such as a competitive film incentive program, state historic preservation tax credits, and the Main Street Solutions fund necessary to grow jobs and the economy.



- Seek legislation to provide additional grant funding to municipalities for equipment and facility needs for public safety (fire, police, ems).
- Oppose legislation that shifts to taxpayers the costs of overseeing development and completing development-initiated infrastructure.
- Support measures, such as additional funding, to enhance cities' ability to meet federal and state stormwater control mandates.
- Oppose legislation that interferes with local management or ownership of local assets.
- Seek changes to the law governing the disclosure and release of law enforcement recordings to clarify that disclosure to a municipal manager is allowed and to allow disclosure to a city or town council or citizen review board in a closed session and under confidentiality agreements.
- Only support legislation providing additional post-employment benefits to public employees that includes a funding mechanism to fully support the cost and liability of the benefit and support the study of existing post-employment benefits, such as special separation allowance programs, to ensure that the liability of providing the benefit isn't solely borne by the last employer.
- Support legislation to revise the current methods of determining economic needs that are used by the state to allocate funds so that additional areas of the state in need may benefit from increased economic development, jobs, and see more entrepreneurial innovation.
- Support a system of spirituous liquor sales that maintains a local referendum about the decision to sell, preserves local control over the location and density of outlets, and preserves the local revenue stream.