Additional Data

This page intentionally left blank.

Service Rating by Age of Respondent

The tables and charts on the following pages display the service rating cross referenced with the age of respondent. The low number of responses in certain categories and age groups should be considered when using these numbers and figures.

Each table includes the number of ratings by age group as well as a percent based on the total number of opinions within that age group. The number of respondents who selected "No Opinion" is listed and the percent is calculated out of the total number of respondents in that age group.

Police Protection	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Excellent	3	75.0%	86	66.7%	137	79.2%	72	71.3%	15	65.2%	326	72.8%
Good	1	25.0%	40	31.0%	34	19.7%	24	23.8%	8	34.8%	112	25.0%
Average/Fair	0	0.0%	3	2.3%	1	0.6%	4	4.0%	0	0.0%	8	1.8%
Poor	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.6%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.4%
Very Poor	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total Opinions	4	100%	129	100%	173	100%	101	100%	23	100%	448	100%
No Opinion	1	20.0%	4	3.0%	2	1.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	1.5%

Figure 1
Rating of Police Protection by Age of Respondent



*Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.

Traffic Enforcement in Your Neighborhood												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Excellent	2	50.0%	54	41.5%	84	51.5%	42	45.2%	6	31.6%	197	46.1%
Good	2	50.0%	53	40.8%	48	29.4%	36	38.7%	6	31.6%	152	35.6%
Average/Fair	0	0.0%	16	12.3%	18	11.0%	10	10.8%	7	36.8%	52	12.2%
Poor	0	0.0%	5	3.8%	11	6.7%	4	4.3%	0	0.0%	20	4.7%
Very Poor	0	0.0%	2	1.5%	2	1.2%	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	6	1.4%
Total Opinions	4	100%	130	100%	163	100%	93	100%	19	100%	427	100%
No Opinion	1	20.0%	4	3.0%	10	5.8%	7	7.0%	3	13.6%	25	5.5%

Figure 2
Rating of Traffic Enforcement by Age of Respondent



Fire Protection	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Excellent	2	100%	73	67.0%	130	81.8%	63	67.0%	11	50.0%	288	71.3%
Good	0	0.0%	31	28.4%	26	16.4%	26	27.7%	11	50.0%	103	25.5%
Average/Fair	0	0.0%	5	4.6%	3	1.9%	4	4.3%	0	0.0%	12	3.0%
Poor	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	1	0.2%
Very Poor	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total Opinions	2	100%	109	100%	159	100%	94	100%	22	100%	404	100%
No Opinion	3	60.0%	23	17.4%	14	8.1%	8	7.8%	1	4.3%	49	10.8%

Figure 3
Rating of Fire Protection by Age of Respondent



*Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.

Ambulance/EMS

	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Excellent	2	66.7%	70	72.9%	117	81.8%	67	76.1%	17	81.0%	283	76.7%
Good	1	33.3%	20	20.8%	23	16.1%	21	23.9%	4	19.0%	77	20.9%
Average/Fair	0	0.0%	5	5.2%	3	2.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	2.2%
Poor	0	0.0%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%
Very Poor	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total Opinions	3	100%	96	100%	143	100%	88	100%	21	100%	369	100%
No Opinion	2	40.0%	36	27.3%	29	16.9%	11	11.1%	2	8.7%	80	17.8%

Figure 4
Rating of Ambulance/EMS by Age of Respondent



Building Department	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Excellent	0	0.0%	39	42.4%	52	42.3%	30	45.5%	1	14.3%	127	42.6%
Good	2	100%	29	31.5%	43	35.0%	25	37.9%	6	85.7%	108	36.2%
Average/Fair	0	0.0%	15	16.3%	23	18.7%	8	12.1%	0	0.0%	46	15.4%
Poor	0	0.0%	5	5.4%	4	3.3%	2	3.0%	0	0.0%	11	3.7%
Very Poor	0	0.0%	4	4.3%	1	0.8%	1	1.5%	0	0.0%	6	2.0%
Total Opinions	2	100%	92	100%	123	100%	66	100%	7	100%	298	100%
No Opinion	3	60.0%	37	28.7%	47	27.6%	27	29.0%	10	58.8%	131	30.5%

Figure 5
Rating of Building Department by Age of Respondent



Property Maintenance Enforcement												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Excellent	0	0.0%	30	33.7%	38	30.4%	23	32.9%	4	36.4%	100	32.4%
Good	0	0.0%	27	30.3%	35	28.0%	26	37.1%	7	63.6%	99	32.0%
Average/Fair	0	0.0%	21	23.6%	33	26.4%	12	17.1%	0	0.0%	69	22.3%
Poor	1	100%	6	6.7%	13	10.4%	6	8.6%	0	0.0%	26	8.4%
Very Poor	0	0.0%	5	5.6%	6	4.8%	3	4.3%	0	0.0%	15	4.9%
Total Opinions	1	100%	89	100%	125	100%	70	100%	11	100%	309	100%
No Opinion	4	80.0%	40	31.0%	45	26.5%	26	27.1%	7	38.9%	127	29.1%

Figure 6
Rating of Property Maintenance Enforcement by Age of Respondent



Village Hall Administration												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Excellent	0	0.0%	40	44.4%	54	40.3%	39	47.0%	7	38.9%	145	42.6%
Good	1	100%	33	36.7%	50	37.3%	32	38.6%	10	55.6%	132	38.8%
Average/Fair	0	0.0%	12	13.3%	24	17.9%	6	7.2%	1	5.6%	46	13.5%
Poor	0	0.0%	3	3.3%	4	3.0%	4	4.8%	0	0.0%	11	3.2%
Very Poor	0	0.0%	2	2.2%	2	1.5%	2	2.4%	0	0.0%	6	1.8%
Total Opinions	1	100%	90	100%	134	100%	83	100%	18	100%	340	100%
No Opinion	4	80.0%	41	31.3%	35	20.7%	13	13.5%	3	14.3%	99	22.6%

Figure 7
Rating of Village Hall Administration by Age of Respondent



Orange C.A.R.E.S.

	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Excellent	0	-	25	61.0%	37	51.4%	20	46.5%	3	42.9%	88	51.8%
Good	0	-	12	29.3%	26	36.1%	20	46.5%	4	57.1%	66	38.8%
Average/Fair	0	-	2	4.9%	5	6.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	4.1%
Poor	0	-	1	2.4%	2	2.8%	2	4.7%	0	0.0%	5	2.9%
Very Poor	0	-	1	2.4%	2	2.8%	1	2.3%	0	0.0%	4	2.4%
Total Opinions	0	-	41	100%	72	100%	43	100%	7	100%	170	100%
No Opinion	5	100%	88	68.2%	95	56.9%	43	50.0%	9	56.3%	249	59.4%

Figure 8
Rating of Orange C.A.R.E.S. by Age of Respondent



Snow Removal for Seniors												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Excellent	0	-	20	55.6%	33	52.4%	21	44.7%	2	50.0%	78	49.4%
Good	0	-	12	33.3%	22	34.9%	21	44.7%	2	50.0%	62	39.2%
Average/Fair	0	-	1	2.8%	3	4.8%	2	4.3%	0	0.0%	6	3.8%
Poor	0	-	1	2.8%	4	6.3%	1	2.1%	0	0.0%	7	4.4%
Very Poor	0	-	2	5.6%	1	1.6%	2	4.3%	0	0.0%	5	3.2%
Total Opinions	0	-	36	100%	63	100%	47	100%	4	100%	158	100%
No Opinion	4	100%	92	71.9%	101	61.6%	43	47.8%	12	75.0%	259	62.1%

Figure 9
Rating of Snow Removal for Seniors by Age of Respondent



*Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.

Trash Removal	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Excellent	4	66.7%	76	56.3%	102	59.0%	68	67.3%	12	60.0%	269	59.5%
Good	2	33.3%	48	35.6%	61	35.3%	26	25.7%	8	40.0%	155	34.3%
Average/Fair	0	0.0%	10	7.4%	10	5.8%	5	5.0%	0	0.0%	25	5.5%
Poor	0	0.0%	1	0.7%	0	0.0%	2	2.0%	0	0.0%	3	0.7%
Very Poor	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total Opinions	6	100%	135	100%	173	100%	101	100%	20	100%	452	100%
No Opinion	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.6%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.4%

Figure 10
Rating of Trash Removal by Age of Respondent



Curbside Recycling Pickup	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Excellent	3	60.0%	81	62.3%	103	62.0%	70	68.6%	14	66.7%	279	63.1%
Good	2	40.0%	41	31.5%	54	32.5%	28	27.5%	7	33.3%	142	32.1%
Average/Fair	0	0.0%	7	5.4%	9	5.4%	4	3.9%	0	0.0%	20	4.5%
Poor	0	0.0%	1	0.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.2%
Very Poor	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total Opinions	5	100%	130	100%	166	100%	102	100%	21	100%	442	100%
No Opinion	0	0.0%	4	3.0%	8	4.6%	1	1.0%	2	8.7%	15	3.3%

Figure 11
Rating of Curbside Recycling Pickup by Age of Respondent



*Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.

Leaf Pickup	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Excellent	1	33.3%	62	56.4%	82	56.9%	38	51.4%	5	50.0%	197	55.3%
Good	2	66.7%	35	31.8%	41	28.5%	32	43.2%	5	50.0%	119	33.4%
Average/Fair	0	0.0%	11	10.0%	20	13.9%	4	5.4%	0	0.0%	36	10.1%
Poor	0	0.0%	1	0.9%	1	0.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	0.8%
Very Poor	0	0.0%	1	0.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%
Total Opinions	3	100%	110	100%	144	100%	74	100%	10	100%	356	100%
No Opinion	2	40.0%	22	16.7%	31	17.7%	23	23.7%	6	37.5%	87	19.6%

Figure 12
Rating of Leaf Pickup by Age of Respondent



Branch Clipping

	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Excellent	1	33.3%	58	53.7%	79	56.0%	36	52.9%	4	40.0%	186	54.4%
Good	2	66.7%	38	35.2%	42	29.8%	27	39.7%	5	50.0%	117	34.2%
Average/Fair	0	0.0%	10	9.3%	17	12.1%	4	5.9%	1	10.0%	33	9.6%
Poor	0	0.0%	1	0.9%	3	2.1%	1	1.5%	0	0.0%	5	1.5%
Very Poor	0	0.0%	1	0.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%
Total Opinions	3	100%	108	100%	141	100%	68	100%	10	100%	342	100%
No Opinion	2	40.0%	23	17.6%	30	17.5%	26	27.7%	5	33.3%	89	20.6%

Figure 13
Rating of Branch Clipping by Age of Respondent



Delivery of Wood Chips and Leaf Humus												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Excellent	1	100%	46	62.2%	63	64.3%	28	60.9%	3	60.0%	148	63.2%
Good	0	0.0%	21	28.4%	29	29.6%	15	32.6%	2	40.0%	69	29.5%
Average/Fair	0	0.0%	5	6.8%	6	6.1%	3	6.5%	0	0.0%	15	6.4%
Poor	0	0.0%	2	2.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.9%
Very Poor	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total Opinions	1	100%	74	100%	98	100%	46	100%	5	100%	234	100%
No Opinion	4	80.0%	52	41.3%	66	40.2%	45	49.5%	10	66.7%	182	43.8%

Figure 14
Rating of Delivery of Wood Chips and Leaf Humus by Age of Respondent



Park Maintenance												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Excellent	0	0.0%	39	37.5%	58	50.0%	29	47.5%	5	41.7%	138	44.5%
Good	4	100%	56	53.8%	50	43.1%	25	41.0%	7	58.3%	147	47.4%
Average/Fair	0	0.0%	9	8.7%	8	6.9%	6	9.8%	0	0.0%	24	7.7%
Poor	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.6%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%
Very Poor	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total Opinions	4	100%	104	100%	116	100%	61	100%	12	100%	310	100%
No Opinion	1	20.0%	24	18.8%	49	29.7%	30	33.0%	4	25.0%	113	26.7%

Figure 15
Rating of Park Maintenance by Age of Respondent



Street Snow Removal												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Excellent	1	25.0%	43	32.6%	64	38.1%	43	47.3%	6	35.3%	161	37.5%
Good	0	0.0%	54	40.9%	65	38.7%	39	42.9%	10	58.8%	175	40.8%
Average/Fair	1	25.0%	20	15.2%	24	14.3%	7	7.7%	1	5.9%	57	13.3%
Poor	1	25.0%	14	10.6%	7	4.2%	2	2.2%	0	0.0%	25	5.8%
Very Poor	1	25.0%	1	0.8%	8	4.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	2.6%
Total Opinions	4	100%	132	100%	168	100%	91	100%	17	100%	429	100%
No Opinion	1	20.0%	2	1.5%	5	2.9%	8	8.1%	1	5.6%	18	4.0%

Figure 16
Rating of Street Snow Removal by Age of Respondent



Street Cleaning	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Excellent	1	25.0%	36	31.6%	55	39.0%	31	39.7%	5	33.3%	132	36.0%
Good	1	25.0%	53	46.5%	53	37.6%	31	39.7%	9	60.0%	155	42.2%
Average/Fair	2	50.0%	21	18.4%	24	17.0%	16	20.5%	1	6.7%	67	18.3%
Poor	0	0.0%	4	3.5%	4	2.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	2.2%
Very Poor	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	3.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	1.4%
Total Opinions	4	100%	114	100%	141	100%	78	100%	15	100%	367	100%
No Opinion	1	20.0%	15	11.6%	27	16.1%	17	17.9%	4	21.1%	67	15.4%

Figure 17
Rating of Street Cleaning by Age of Respondent



Street Maintenance/Repairs	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Excellent	1	25.0%	35	28.7%	42	25.0%	28	28.0%	4	22.2%	114	26.6%
Good	1	25.0%	42	34.4%	66	39.3%	37	37.0%	12	66.7%	165	38.5%
Average/Fair	2	50.0%	35	28.7%	44	26.2%	30	30.0%	2	11.1%	117	27.3%
Poor	0	0.0%	4	3.3%	11	6.5%	4	4.0%	0	0.0%	21	4.9%
Very Poor	0	0.0%	6	4.9%	5	3.0%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	12	2.8%
Total Opinions	4	100%	122	100%	168	100%	100	100%	18	100%	429	100%
No Opinion	1	20.0%	7	5.4%	7	4.0%	4	3.8%	2	10.0%	22	4.9%

Figure 18
Rating of Street Maintenance/Repairs by Age of Respondent



This page intentionally left blank.

Favorite Qualities by Age of Respondent

The tables and charts on the following pages display the qualities respondents enjoy most about living in Orange Village cross referenced with the age of respondent. The low number of responses in certain categories and age groups should be considered when using these numbers and figures.

The first spread presents all of the selections by age group. These charts present the percent of question respondents that selected that particular quality as a favorite.

The following pages display the numbers and percents for each individual quality by all the age groups. All charts are displayed in the same format so they are comparable across all qualities.

Figure 19
Summary of Favorite Qualities by Age of Respondent




100%
80%
60%
40%
20%
0%
22.2%
20.4%
28.7%
6.5%
54.6%
5.6%
57.4%
38.0%
52.8%
5.6%
46.3%
40.7%
3.7%
6.5%
70 to 84 years
17.4%
21.7%
39.1%
8.7%
60.9%
8.7%
43.5%
21.7%
56.5%
8.7%
52.2%
30.4%
0.0%
0.0%
85+ years
18.8%
23.5%
30.0%
20.3%
37.8%
6.3%
47.4%
54.8%
53.3%
7.0%
30.0%
42.3%
3.4%
3.8%
Village-wide
Access to Downtown
Available Lot Size
Home Value Retention
Proximity to Work
Proximity to Shopping
Value for Real Estate Taxes
Convenience to Highways
School System
Sense of Safety and Security
Cost of Homes
Village Services
Semi-Rural Character
Value for Income Tax
Other

Access to Downtown												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	0	0.0%	21	15.4%	35	19.8%	24	22.2%	4	17.4%	89	18.8%
No	6	100%	115	84.6%	142	80.2%	84	77.8%	19	82.6%	384	81.2%
Total Responses	6	100%	136	100%	177	100%	108	100%	23	100%	473	100%

Figure 20
Favorite Quality: Access to Downtown by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Available Lot Size												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	2	33.3%	36	26.7%	41	23.2%	22	20.4%	5	21.7%	111	23.5%
No	4	66.7%	99	73.3%	136	76.8%	86	79.6%	18	78.3%	361	76.3%
Total Responses	6	100%	135	100%	177	100%	108	100%	23	100%	473	100%

Figure 21
Favorite Quality: Available Lot Size by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Home Value Retention												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	1	16.7%	43	31.6%	56	31.6%	31	28.7%	9	39.1%	142	30.0%
No	5	83.3%	93	68.4%	121	68.4%	77	71.3%	14	60.9%	331	70.0%
Total Responses	6	100%	136	100%	177	100%	108	100%	23	100%	473	100%

Figure 22
Favorite Quality: Home Value Retention by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Proximity to Work												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	2	33.3%	40	29.4%	42	23.7%	7	6.5%	2	8.7%	96	20.3%
No	4	66.7%	96	70.6%	135	76.3%	101	93.5%	21	91.3%	377	79.7%
Total Responses	6	100%	136	100%	177	100%	108	100%	23	100%	473	100%

Figure 23
Favorite Quality: Proximity to Work by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Proximity to Shopping												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	3	50.0%	38	27.9%	58	32.8%	59	54.6%	14	60.9%	179	37.8%
No	3	50.0%	98	72.1%	119	67.2%	49	45.4%	9	39.1%	294	62.2%
Total Responses	6	100%	136	100%	177	100%	108	100%	23	100%	473	100%

Figure 24
Favorite Quality: Proximity to Shopping by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Value for Real Estate Taxes Paid												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	0	0.0%	7	5.1%	13	7.3%	6	5.6%	2	8.7%	30	6.3%
No	6	100%	129	94.9%	164	92.7%	102	94.4%	21	91.3%	443	93.7%
Total Responses	6	100%	136	100%	177	100%	108	100%	23	100%	473	100%

Figure 25
Favorite Quality: Value for Real Estate Taxes Paid by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Convenience to Highways												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	2	33.3%	59	43.4%	82	46.3%	62	57.4%	10	43.5%	224	47.4%
No	4	66.7%	77	56.6%	95	53.7%	46	42.6%	13	56.5%	249	52.6%
Total Responses	6	100%	136	100%	177	100%	108	100%	23	100%	473	100%

Figure 26
Favorite Quality: Convenience to Highways by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

School System	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	4	66.7%	103	75.7%	103	58.2%	41	38.0%	5	21.7%	259	54.8%
No	2	33.3%	33	24.3%	74	41.8%	67	62.0%	18	78.3%	214	45.2%
Total Responses	6	100%	136	100%	177	100%	108	100%	23	100%	473	100%

Figure 27
Favorite Quality: School System by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Sense of Safety and Security												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	4	66.7%	75	55.1%	92	52.0%	57	52.8%	13	56.5%	252	53.3%
No	2	33.3%	61	44.9%	85	48.0%	51	47.2%	10	43.5%	221	46.7%
Total Responses	6	100%	136	100%	177	100%	108	100%	23	100%	473	100%

Figure 28
Favorite Quality: Sense of Safety and Security by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Cost of Homes												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	0	0.0%	11	8.1%	13	7.3%	6	5.6%	2	8.7%	33	7.0%
No	6	100%	125	91.9%	164	92.7%	102	94.4%	21	91.3%	440	93.0%
Total Responses	6	100%	136	100%	177	100%	108	100%	23	100%	473	100%

Figure 29
Favorite Quality: Cost of Homes by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Village Services												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	0	0.0%	27	19.9%	44	24.9%	50	46.3%	12	52.2%	142	30.0%
No	6	100%	109	80.1%	133	75.1%	58	53.7%	11	47.8%	331	70.0%
Total Responses	6	100%	136	100%	177	100%	108	100%	23	100%	473	100%

Figure 30
Favorite Quality: Village Services by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Semi-Rural Character												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	4	66.7%	47	34.6%	86	48.6%	44	40.7%	7	30.4%	200	42.3%
No	2	33.3%	89	65.4%	91	51.4%	64	59.3%	16	69.6%	273	57.7%
Total Responses	6	100%	136	100%	177	100%	108	100%	23	100%	473	100%

Figure 31
Favorite Quality: Semi-Rural Character by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Value for Income Taxes Paid												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	0	0.0%	4	2.9%	7	4.0%	4	3.7%	0	0.0%	16	3.4%
No	6	100%	132	97.1%	170	96.0%	104	96.3%	23	100%	457	96.6%
Total Responses	6	100%	136	100%	177	100%	108	100%	23	100%	473	100%

Figure 32
Favorite Quality: Value for Income Taxes Paid by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Other												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	0	0.0%	3	2.2%	7	4.0%	7	6.5%	0	0.0%	18	3.8%
No	6	100%	133	97.8%	170	96.0%	101	93.5%	23	100%	455	96.2%
Total Responses	6	100%	136	100%	177	100%	108	100%	23	100%	473	100%

Figure 33
Favorite Quality: Other Responses by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

This page intentionally left blank.

Least Favorite Qualities by Age of Respondent

The tables and charts on the following pages display the qualities respondents enjoy least about living in Orange Village cross referenced with the age of respondent. The low number of responses in certain categories and age groups should be considered when using these numbers and figures.

The first spread presents all of the selections by age group. These charts present the percent of question respondents that selected that particular quality as a least favorite.

The following pages display the numbers and percents for each individual quality by all the age groups. All charts are displayed in the same format so they are comparable across all qualities.

Figure 34
Summary of Least Favorite Qualities by Age of Respondent




100%
80%
60%
40%
20%
0%
14.3%
10.4%
10.4%
15.8%
6.5%
27.3%
10.4%
6.5%
2.6%
18.2%
7.8%
3.9%
14.3%
20.8%
70 to 84 years


100%
80%
60%
40%
20%
0%
30.0%
0.0%
10.0%
0.0%
10.0%
10.0%
0.0%
0.0%
0.0%
20.0%
10.0%
20.0%
0.0%
20.0%
85+ years


100%
80%
60%
40%
20%
0%
10.4%
6.2%
14.0%
7.6%
9.0%
23.5%
5.6%
4.2%
1.7%
13.4%
6.2%
8.4%
27.5%
24.6%
Village-wide


Access to Downtown
Available Lot Size
Home Value Retention
Proximity to Work
Proximity to Shopping
Value for Real Estate Taxes
Convenience to Highways
School System
Sense of Safety and Security
Cost of Homes
Village Services
Semi-Rural Character
Value for Income Tax
Other

Access to Downtown												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	2	33.3%	10	8.3%	11	7.6%	11	14.3%	3	30.0%	37	10.4%
No	4	66.7%	110	91.7%	133	92.4%	66	85.7%	7	70.0%	320	89.6%
Total Responses	6	100%	120	100%	144	100%	77	100%	10	100%	357	100%

Figure 35
Least Favorite Quality: Access to Downtown by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Available Lot Size												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	0	0.0%	8	6.7%	6	4.2%	8	10.4%	0	0.0%	22	6.2%
No	6	100%	112	93.3%	138	95.8%	69	89.6%	10	100%	335	93.8%
Total Responses	6	100%	120	100%	144	100%	77	100%	10	100%	357	100%

Figure 36
Least Favorite Quality: Available Lot Size by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Home Value Retention												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	0	0.0%	17	14.2%	24	16.7%	8	10.4%	1	10.0%	50	14.0%
No	6	100%	103	85.8%	120	83.3%	69	89.6%	9	90.0%	307	86.0%
Total Responses	6	100%	120	100%	144	100%	77	100%	10	100%	357	100%

Figure 37
Least Favorite Quality: Home Value Retention by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Proximity to Work												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	1	16.7%	8	6.7%	6	4.2%	12	15.8%	0	0.0%	27	7.6%
No	5	83.3%	112	93.3%	138	95.8%	64	84.2%	10	100%	329	92.4%
Total Responses	6	100%	120	100%	144	100%	76	100%	10	100%	356	100%

Figure 38
Least Favorite Quality: Proximity to Work by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Proximity to Shopping												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	0	0.0%	9	7.5%	17	11.8%	5	6.5%	1	10.0%	32	9.0%
No	6	100%	111	92.5%	127	88.2%	72	93.5%	9	90.0%	325	91.0%
Total Responses	6	100%	120	100%	144	100%	77	100%	10	100%	357	100%

Figure 39
Least Favorite Quality: Proximity to Shopping by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Value for Real Estate Taxes Paid												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	2	33.3%	25	20.8%	35	24.3%	21	27.3%	1	10.0%	84	23.5%
No	4	66.7%	95	79.2%	109	75.7%	56	72.7%	9	90.0%	273	76.5%
Total Responses	6	100%	120	100%	144	100%	77	100%	10	100%	357	100%

Figure 40
Least Favorite Quality: Value for Real Estate Taxes Paid by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Convenience to Highways												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	0	0.0%	2	1.7%	10	6.9%	8	10.4%	0	0.0%	20	5.6%
No	6	100%	118	98.3%	134	93.1%	69	89.6%	10	100%	337	94.4%
Total Responses	6	100%	120	100%	144	100%	77	100%	10	100%	357	100%

Figure 41
Least Favorite Quality: Convenience to Highways by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

School System												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	0	0.0%	3	2.5%	7	4.9%	5	6.5%	0	0.0%	15	4.2%
No	6	100%	117	97.5%	137	95.1%	72	93.5%	10	100%	342	95.8%
Total Responses	6	100%	120	100%	144	100%	77	100%	10	100%	357	100%

Figure 42
Least Favorite Quality: School System by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Sense of Safety and Security												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	0	0.0%	1	0.8%	3	2.1%	2	2.6%	0	0.0%	6	1.7%
No	6	100%	119	99.2%	141	97.9%	75	97.4%	10	100%	351	98.3%
Total Responses	6	100%	120	100%	144	100%	77	100%	10	100%	357	100%

Figure 43
Least Favorite Quality: Sense of Safety and Security by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Cost of Homes												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	1	16.7%	18	15.0%	13	9.0%	14	18.2%	2	20.0%	48	13.4%
No	5	83.3%	102	85.0%	131	91.0%	63	81.8%	8	80.0%	309	86.6%
Total Responses	6	100%	120	100%	144	100%	77	100%	10	100%	357	100%

Figure 44
Least Favorite Quality: Cost of Homes by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Village Services												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	0	0.0%	7	5.8%	8	5.6%	6	7.8%	1	10.0%	22	6.2%
No	6	100%	113	94.2%	136	94.4%	71	92.2%	9	90.0%	335	93.8%
Total Responses	6	100%	120	100%	144	100%	77	100%	10	100%	357	100%

Figure 45
Least Favorite Quality:Village Services by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Semi-Rural Character												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	0	0.0%	11	9.2%	14	9.7%	3	3.9%	2	20.0%	30	8.4%
No	6	100%	109	90.8%	130	90.3%	74	96.1%	8	80.0%	327	91.6%
Total Responses	6	100%	120	100%	144	100%	77	100%	10	100%	357	100%

Figure 46
Least Favorite Quality: Semi-Rural Character by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Value for Income Taxes Paid												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	2	33.3%	36	30.0%	49	34.0%	11	14.3%	0	0.0%	98	27.5%
No	4	66.7%	84	70.0%	95	66.0%	66	85.7%	10	100%	259	72.5%
Total Responses	6	100%	120	100%	144	100%	77	100%	10	100%	357	100%

Figure 47
Least Favorite Quality: Value for Income Taxes Paid by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Other												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	3	50.0%	35	29.2%	32	22.2%	16	20.8%	2	20.0%	88	24.6%
No	3	50.0%	85	70.8%	112	77.8%	61	79.2%	8	80.0%	269	75.4%
Total Responses	6	100%	120	100%	144	100%	77	100%	10	100%	357	100%

Figure 48
Least Favorite Quality: Other Responses by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

This page intentionally left blank.

Facility Use by Age of Respondent

The tables and charts on the following pages display the frequency of use for various community facilities cross referenced with the age of respondent. The low number of responses in certain categories and age groups should be considered when using these numbers and figures.

Wooddell Room	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Often	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	1.2%	6	6.3%	1	5.9%	10	2.4%
Sometimes	0	0.0%	7	5.6%	21	13.0%	15	15.6%	5	29.4%	51	12.1%
Rarely	0	0.0%	15	12.1%	19	11.7%	11	11.5%	1	5.9%	46	10.9%
Never	5	100%	102	82.3%	120	74.1%	64	66.7%	10	58.8%	312	73.9%
Total Responses	5	100%	124	100%	162	100%	96	100%	17	100%	422	100%

Figure 49
Facility Use: Wooddell Room by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Orange Community Park (as a whole)												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Often	1	20.0%	29	22.5%	39	23.2%	14	14.0%	1	5.6%	86	19.7%
Sometimes	0	0.0%	47	36.4%	51	30.4%	22	22.0%	3	16.7%	128	29.3%
Rarely	1	20.0%	27	20.9%	35	20.8%	19	19.0%	3	16.7%	8	1.8%
Never	3	60.0%	26	20.2%	43	25.6%	45	45.0%	11	61.1%	135	30.9%
Total Responses	5	100%	129	100%	168	100%	100	100%	18	100%	437	100%

Figure 50
Facility Use: Orange Community Park (as a whole) by Age of Respondent



Community Garden												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Often	0	0.0%	9	7.0%	7	4.5%	4	4.3%	0	0.0%	24	5.8%
Sometimes	1	20.0%	4	3.1%	12	7.6%	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	18	4.3%
Rarely	1	20.0%	7	5.5%	12	7.6%	2	2.2%	0	0.0%	24	5.8%
Never	3	60.0%	108	84.4%	126	80.3%	86	92.5%	15	100%	348	84.1%
Total Responses	5	100%	128	100%	157	100%	93	100%	15	100%	414	100%

Figure 51
Facility Use: Community Garden by Age of Respondent



*Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.

Chipping/Putting Green												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Often	0	0.0%	4	3.1%	2	1.3%	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	8	1.9%
Sometimes	1	20.0%	10	7.9%	8	5.0%	6	6.3%	0	0.0%	26	6.2%
Rarely	0	0.0%	12	9.4%	10	6.3%	4	4.2%	0	0.0%	26	6.2%
Never	4	80.0%	101	79.5%	140	87.5%	84	88.4%	15	100%	357	85.6%
Total Responses	5	100%	127	100%	160	100%	95	100%	15	100%	417	100%

Figure 52
Facility Use: Chipping/Putting Green by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Dubyak Baseball Field (White Drive)												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Often	0	0.0%	7	5.5%	2	1.3%	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	11	2.7%
Sometimes	1	20.0%	13	10.2%	12	7.5%	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	27	6.5%
Rarely	0	0.0%	4	3.1%	12	7.5%	4	4.3%	0	0.0%	20	4.8%
Never	4	80.0%	103	81.1%	134	83.8%	87	93.5%	14	100%	357	86.0%
Total Responses	5	100%	127	100%	160	100%	93	100%	14	100%	415	100%

Figure 53
Facility Use: Dubyak Baseball Diamond by Age of Respondent



Hazlett Baseball Field (Pike Drive)												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Often	0	0.0%	6	4.7%	2	1.3%	2	2.1%	0	0.0%	10	2.4%
Sometimes	1	20.0%	15	11.7%	12	7.6%	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	29	7.0%
Rarely	0	0.0%	11	8.6%	13	8.2%	7	7.4%	0	0.0%	31	7.5%
Never	4	80.0%	96	75.0%	131	82.9%	84	89.4%	15	100%	344	83.1%
Total Responses	5	100%	128	100%	158	100%	94	100%	15	100%	414	100%

Figure 54
Facility Use: Hazlett Baseball Field by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Basketball Court	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Often	0	0.0%	3	2.4%	2	1.3%	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	6	1.5%
Sometimes	1	20.0%	10	7.9%	4	2.5%	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	18	4.4%
Rarely	0	0.0%	7	5.5%	5	3.1%	3	3.3%	0	0.0%	15	3.6%
Never	4	80.0%	107	84.3%	149	93.1%	85	94.4%	15	100%	372	90.5%
Total Responses	5	100%	127	100%	160	100%	90	100%	15	100%	411	100%

Figure 55
Facility Use: Basketball Court by Age of Respondent



Fitness Stations												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Often	0	0.0%	7	5.5%	3	1.9%	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	11	2.7%
Sometimes	1	20.0%	9	7.0%	11	6.9%	4	4.3%	0	0.0%	26	6.3%
Rarely	0	0.0%	13	10.2%	18	11.3%	4	4.3%	1	6.7%	36	8.7%
Never	4	80.0%	99	77.3%	128	80.0%	83	90.2%	14	93.3%	341	82.4%
Total Responses	5	100%	128	100%	160	100%	92	100%	15	100%	414	100%

Figure 56
Facility Use: Fitness Stations by Age of Respondent



Football/Soccer Field	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Often	0	0.0%	8	6.3%	3	1.9%	3	3.3%	0	0.0%	14	3.4%
Sometimes	1	20.0%	10	7.9%	2	1.3%	2	2.2%	0	0.0%	15	3.7%
Rarely	0	0.0%	13	10.2%	7	4.5%	2	2.2%	0	0.0%	22	5.4%
Never	4	80.0%	96	75.6%	143	92.3%	83	92.2%	15	100%	355	87.4%
Total Responses	5	100%	127	100%	155	100%	90	100%	15	100%	406	100%

Figure 57
Facility Use: Football/Soccer Field by Age of Respondent



Paved Trails												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Often	1	20.0%	33	25.4%	33	19.8%	10	10.2%	2	11.1%	83	19.1%
Sometimes	0	0.0%	30	23.1%	41	24.6%	16	16.3%	3	16.7%	94	21.6%
Rarely	0	0.0%	22	16.9%	29	17.4%	13	13.3%	1	5.6%	65	14.9%
Never	4	80.0%	45	34.6%	64	38.3%	59	60.2%	12	66.7%	193	44.4%
Total Responses	5	100%	130	100%	167	100%	98	100%	18	100%	435	100%

Figure 58
Facility Use: Paved Trails by Age of Respondent



Picnic Pavilions												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Often	0	0.0%	11	8.6%	5	3.1%	2	2.1%	1	6.3%	20	4.7%
Sometimes	0	0.0%	20	15.6%	26	16.0%	7	7.4%	0	0.0%	57	13.5%
Rarely	1	20.0%	28	21.9%	28	17.3%	9	9.5%	1	6.3%	69	16.3%
Never	4	80.0%	69	53.9%	103	63.6%	77	81.1%	14	87.5%	277	65.5%
Total Responses	5	100%	128	100%	162	100%	95	100%	16	100%	423	100%

Figure 59
Facility Use: Picnic Pavilions by Age of Respondent



Tot Lot Playground												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Often	0	0.0%	13	10.4%	9	5.5%	4	4.3%	0	0.0%	27	6.5%
Sometimes	1	20.0%	20	16.0%	28	17.2%	13	14.0%	0	0.0%	64	15.4%
Rarely	0	0.0%	16	12.8%	21	12.9%	11	11.8%	0	0.0%	49	11.8%
Never	4	80.0%	76	60.8%	105	64.4%	65	69.9%	15	100%	275	66.3%
Total Responses	5	100%	125	100%	163	100%	93	100%	15	100%	415	100%

Figure 60
Facility Use: Tot Lot Playground by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Volleyball Court												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Often	0	0.0%	4	3.1%	1	0.6%	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	6	1.4%
Sometimes	1	20.0%	9	7.1%	7	4.3%	1	1.1%	1	6.3%	20	4.8%
Rarely	0	0.0%	10	7.9%	7	4.3%	3	3.3%	0	0.0%	20	4.8%
Never	4	80.0%	104	81.9%	147	90.7%	87	94.6%	15	93.8%	369	88.9%
Total Responses	5	100%	127	100%	162	100%	92	100%	16	100%	415	100%

Figure 61
Facility Use: Volleyball Court by Age of Respondent



Sledding Hill												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Often	1	20.0%	28	21.9%	3	1.9%	3	3.2%	0	0.0%	35	8.3%
Sometimes	0	0.0%	28	21.9%	14	8.6%	3	3.2%	0	0.0%	46	11.0%
Rarely	0	0.0%	11	8.6%	20	12.3%	5	5.3%	0	0.0%	37	8.8%
Never	4	80.0%	61	47.7%	125	77.2%	84	88.4%	15	100%	302	71.9%
Total Responses	5	100%	128	100%	162	100%	95	100%	15	100%	420	100%

Figure 62
Facility Use: Sledding Hill by Age of Respondent



This page intentionally left blank.

Desired Facilities by Age of Respondent

The tables and charts on the following pages display the facilities respondents desire most referenced with the age of respondent. The low number of responses in certain categories and age groups should be considered when using these numbers and figures.

The first spread presents all of the selections by age group. These charts present the percent of question respondents that selected that particular facility as the most desired.

The following pages display the numbers and percents for each individual quality by all the age groups. All charts are displayed in the same format so they are comparable across all qualities.

Figure 63
Desired Facilities by Age of Respondent




100%
80%
60%
40%
20%
0%
28.6%
48.3%
44.0%
82.6%
50.0%
38.5%
30.0%
48.3%
56.3%
56.0%
29.4%
70 to 84 years
25.0%
33.3%
50.0%
57.1%
25.0%
25.0%
25.0%
50.0%
57.1%
50.0%
0.0%
85+ years*
30.5%
53.7%
42.4%
70.6%
44.7%
46.1%
30.7%
32.9%
54.6%
62.0%
23.3%
Village-wide
Bocce Ball Court
Dog Park
Tennis Court
Permanent Restroom Facilities
New Playground Equipment
Other Improvements
Sprinkle Park
Horseshoe Pit
Improved Tot Lot Surface
Additional Trails
Shelter by Sledding Hill

Bocce Ball Court												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	1	33.3%	15	23.1%	24	39.3%	6	28.6%	1	25.0%	47	30.5%
No	2	66.7%	50	76.9%	37	60.7%	15	71.4%	3	75.0%	107	69.5%
Total Responses	3	100%	65	100%	61	100%	21	100%	4	100%	154	100%

Figure 64
Desired Facility: Bocce Ball Court by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Dog Park												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	1	33.3%	37	50.0%	49	60.5%	14	48.3%	1	33.3%	102	53.7%
No	2	66.7%	37	50.0%	32	39.5%	15	51.7%	2	66.7%	88	46.3%
Total Responses	3	100%	74	100%	81	100%	29	100%	3	100%	190	100%

Figure 65
Desired Facility: Dog Park by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Tennis Court												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	1	25.0%	30	40.0%	29	45.3%	11	44.0%	2	50.0%	73	42.4%
No	3	75.0%	45	60.0%	35	54.7%	14	56.0%	2	50.0%	99	57.6%
Total Responses	4	100%	75	100%	64	100%	25	100%	4	100%	172	100%

Figure 66
Desired Facility: Tennis Court by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Permanent Restroom Facilities												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	1	33.3%	61	70.1%	62	67.4%	38	82.6%	4	57.1%	166	70.6%
No	2	66.7%	26	29.9%	30	32.6%	8	17.4%	3	42.9%	69	29.4%
Total Responses	3	100%	87	100%	92	100%	46	100%	7	100%	235	100%

Figure 67
Desired Facility: Permanent Restroom Facilities by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

New Playground Equipment												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	1	33.3%	25	34.7%	39	54.2%	14	50.0%	1	25.0%	80	44.7%
No	2	66.7%	47	65.3%	33	45.8%	14	50.0%	3	75.0%	99	55.3%
Total Responses	3	100%	72	100%	72	100%	28	100%	4	100%	179	100%

Figure 68
Desired Facility: New Playground Equipment by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Other Improvements												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	0	0.0%	36	44.4%	41	53.2%	10	38.5%	1	25.0%	88	46.1%
No	3	100%	45	55.6%	36	46.8%	16	61.5%	3	75.0%	103	53.9%
Total Responses	3	100%	81	100%	77	100%	26	100%	4	100%	191	100%

Figure 69
Desired Facility: Other Improvements by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Sprinkle Park												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	1	33.3%	16	27.6%	18	34.6%	6	30.0%	1	25.0%	42	30.7%
No	2	66.7%	42	72.4%	34	65.4%	14	70.0%	3	75.0%	95	69.3%
Total Responses	3	100%	58	100%	52	100%	20	100%	4	100%	137	100%

Figure 70
Desired Facility: Sprinkle Park by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Horseshoe Pit												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	0	0.0%	19	25.7%	21	35.0%	14	48.3%	2	50.0%	56	32.9%
No	3	100%	55	74.3%	39	65.0%	15	51.7%	2	50.0%	114	67.1%
Total Responses	3	100%	74	100%	60	100%	29	100%	4	100%	170	100%

Figure 71
Desired Facility: Horseshoe Pit by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Improved Tot Lot Surface												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	2	50.0%	39	45.9%	55	62.5%	18	56.3%	4	57.1%	118	54.6%
No	2	50.0%	46	54.1%	33	37.5%	14	43.8%	3	42.9%	98	45.4%
Total Responses	4	100%	85	100%	88	100%	32	100%	7	100%	216	100%

Figure 72
Desired Facility: Improved Tot Lot Surface by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Additional Trails												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	1	33.3%	46	65.7%	35	62.5%	14	56.0%	2	50.0%	98	62.0%
No	2	66.7%	24	34.3%	21	37.5%	11	44.0%	2	50.0%	60	38.0%
Total Responses	3	100%	70	100%	56	100%	25	100%	4	100%	158	100%

Figure 73
Desired Facility: Additional Trails by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

Shelter by Sledding Hill												
	18 to 29 years		30 to 54 years		55 to 69 years		70 to 84 years		85+ years		Village-wide	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	1	33.3%	14	23.3%	11	22.0%	5	29.4%	0	0.0%	31	23.3%
No	2	66.7%	46	76.7%	39	78.0%	12	70.6%	3	100%	102	76.7%
Total Responses	3	100%	60	100%	50	100%	17	100%	3	100%	133	100%

Figure 74
Desired Facility: Shelter by Sledding Hill by Age of Respondent



**Indicates an unreliably low number of responses.*

This page intentionally left blank.

Facility Rating by Home Street

The tables on the following pages display the rating of various community facilities cross referenced with the respondent's home street for those who entered that information in the survey. The low number of responses in certain categories and age groups should be considered when using these numbers and figures.

Each spread includes all of the responses across both pages. Only raw numbers are displayed to showcase the low number of responses on each individual street. The responses are sorted with the streets with most respondent households listed at the top.

Rate the Following Services: Police Protection

	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Street Unreported	169	49	2	2	0	2	224
Lander Road	33	11	1	0	0	1	46
Brainard Road	12	5	0	0	0	0	17
Jackson Drive	8	8	0	0	0	1	17
Harvard Road	10	4	0	0	0	0	14
Blossom Lane	8	3	1	0	0	0	12
Pike Drive	6	3	1	0	0	0	10
Stonebrooke Oval	7	2	0	0	0	0	9
Stonebrooke Drive	7	1	0	0	0	0	8
Emery Road	6	1	0	0	0	0	7
N. Hilltop Road	5	1	0	0	0	0	6
Hidden Valley Drive	3	2	0	0	0	0	5
Orangetree Drive	3	2	0	0	0	0	5
Orangewood Drive	1	2	0	0	0	2	5
W. Ash Lane	3	1	1	0	0	0	5
White Oak Trail	4	1	0	0	0	0	5
Woodcrest Drive	3	2	0	0	0	0	5
E. Orange Hill Circle	2	2	0	0	0	0	4
Miles Road	3	1	0	0	0	0	4
Orangedale Road	2	1	0	0	0	1	4
Acorn Trail	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Cambridge Court	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Orange Meadow Lane	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Orchard Circle	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
W. Meadow Lane	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
W. Orange Hill Circle	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
Wild Cherry Oval	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
East Meadow Lane	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Orange Hill Circle	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Pinecrest Drive	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
W. Woodcrest Drive	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Beacon Hill	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Beechmont Trail	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Chestnut Court	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Continued on next page.

Rate the Following Services: Police Protection							
	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Fairview Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Honey Belle Oval	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Laurel Circle	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Murcott circle	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Nob Hill Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
S. Hilltop Road	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Sterncrest Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Valencia Circle	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
W. Jackson	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Walnut Court	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Waterford Court	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	326	112	8	2	0	7	455

Rate the Following Services: Traffic Enforcement in Your Neighborhood

	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Street Unreported	96	69	30	10	5	11	221
Lander Road	22	14	4	4	0	2	46
Brainard Road	6	7	3	1	0	0	17
Jackson Drive	4	9	3	1	0	0	17
Harvard Road	7	6	0	1	0	0	14
Blossom Lane	3	4	4	0	0	0	11
Pike Drive	4	5	0	0	0	1	10
Stonebrooke Oval	4	4	1	0	0	0	9
Stonebrooke Drive	3	3	0	1	0	1	8
Emery Road	5	1	1	0	0	0	7
N. Hilltop Road	2	3	1	0	0	1	7
Hidden Valley Drive	2	2	0	0	1	0	5
Orangewood Drive	1	2	0	0	0	2	5
W. Ash Lane	3	1	1	0	0	0	5
White Oak Trail	3	2	0	0	0	0	5
Woodcrest Drive	2	2	0	0	0	1	5
E. Orange Hill Circle	0	3	0	0	0	1	4
Miles Road	1	1	2	0	0	0	4
Orangedale Road	2	1	0	0	0	1	4
Orangetree Drive	1	1	0	0	0	2	4
Orchard Circle	3	1	0	0	0	0	4
Acorn Trail	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Cambridge Court	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Orange Meadow Lane	1	1	0	0	0	1	3
W. Meadow Lane	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Wild Cherry Oval	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
East Meadow Lane	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Murcott circle	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Orange Hill Circle	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Pinecrest Drive	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
W. Orange Hill Circle	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
W. Woodcrest Drive	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Beacon Hill	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Beechmont Trail	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Continued on next page.

Rate the Following Services: Traffic Enforcement in Your Neighborhood							
	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Chestnut Court	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Fairview Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Honey Belle Oval	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Laurel Circle	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Nob Hill Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
S. Hilltop Road	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Sterncrest Drive	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Valencia Circle	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
W. Jackson	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Walnut Court	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Waterford Court	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	197	152	52	20	6	25	452

Rate the Following Services: Fire Protection

	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Street Unreported	155	48	2	1	0	17	223
Lander Road	29	7	2	0	0	8	46
Brainard Road	12	4	0	0	0	1	17
Jackson Drive	8	5	2	0	0	2	17
Harvard Road	8	4	1	0	0	1	14
Blossom Lane	7	3	0	0	0	2	12
Pike Drive	5	3	0	0	0	1	9
Stonebrooke Oval	5	2	0	0	0	2	9
Emery Road	6	0	0	0	0	1	7
N. Hilltop Road	5	2	0	0	0	0	7
Stonebrooke Drive	5	0	0	0	0	2	7
Hidden Valley Drive	3	2	0	0	0	0	5
Orangetree Drive	2	2	0	0	0	1	5
Orangewood Drive	1	3	0	0	0	1	5
W. Ash Lane	3	1	1	0	0	0	5
White Oak Trail	2	0	2	0	0	1	5
Woodcrest Drive	3	2	0	0	0	0	5
E. Orange Hill Circle	0	3	0	0	0	1	4
Miles Road	1	1	0	0	0	2	4
Orangedale Road	1	1	0	0	0	2	4
Orchard Circle	2	1	0	0	0	1	4
Acorn Trail	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Orange Meadow Lane	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
W. Meadow Lane	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
W. Orange Hill Circle	0	1	1	0	0	1	3
Wild Cherry Oval	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Cambridge Court	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
East Meadow Lane	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Murcott circle	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Pinecrest Drive	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
W. Woodcrest Drive	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Beacon Hill	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Beechmont Trail	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Chestnut Court	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Continued on next page.

Rate the Following Services: Fire Protection							
	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Fairview Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Honey Belle Oval	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Laurel Circle	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Nob Hill Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Orange Hill Circle	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
S. Hilltop Road	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Sterncrest Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Valencia Circle	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
W. Jackson	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Walnut Court	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Waterford Court	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	288	103	12	1	0	49	453

Rate the Following Services: Ambulance/EMS							
	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Street Unreported	150	32	4	0	0	33	219
Lander Road	28	4	3	0	0	10	45
Brainard Road	13	1	0	0	0	3	17
Jackson Drive	7	5	1	0	0	4	17
Harvard Road	7	5	0	0	0	1	13
Blossom Lane	7	2	0	0	0	3	12
Pike Drive	6	2	0	0	0	1	9
Stonebrooke Oval	4	3	0	0	0	2	9
Stonebrooke Drive	4	1	0	0	0	3	8
Emery Road	5	0	0	0	0	2	7
N. Hilltop Road	5	2	0	0	0	0	7
Hidden Valley Drive	2	2	0	0	0	1	5
Orangetree Drive	3	1	0	0	0	1	5
Orangewood Drive	2	1	0	0	0	2	5
W. Ash Lane	3	1	0	0	0	1	5
White Oak Trail	2	0	0	0	0	3	5
Woodcrest Drive	4	1	0	0	0	0	5
E. Orange Hill Circle	1	2	0	0	0	1	4
Miles Road	1	1	0	0	0	2	4
Orangedale Road	1	1	0	0	0	2	4
Orchard Circle	2	1	0	0	0	1	4
Acorn Trail	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Orange Meadow Lane	2	0	0	0	0	1	3
W. Meadow Lane	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
W. Orange Hill Circle	0	2	0	0	0	1	3
Wild Cherry Oval	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Cambridge Court	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
East Meadow Lane	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Murcott circle	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Orange Hill Circle	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Pinecrest Drive	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
W. Woodcrest Drive	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Beacon Hill	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Beechmont Trail	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Continued on next page.

Rate the Following Services: Ambulance/EMS							
	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Chestnut Court	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Fairview Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Honey Belle Oval	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Laurel Circle	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Nob Hill Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
S. Hilltop Road	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Sterncrest Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Valencia Circle	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
W. Jackson	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Walnut Court	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Waterford Court	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	283	77	8	1	0	80	449

Rate the Following Services: Building Department

	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Street Unreported	62	53	24	5	5	62	211
Lander Road	18	7	2	1	0	16	44
Jackson Drive	4	7	3	2	0	1	17
Brainard Road	4	4	1	0	1	5	15
Harvard Road	3	3	2	0	0	4	12
Blossom Lane	4	3	1	0	0	3	11
Pike Drive	4	2	0	0	0	3	9
Stonebrooke Drive	3	1	1	0	0	3	8
Stonebrooke Oval	2	4	0	0	0	2	8
Emery Road	2	2	1	0	0	2	7
N. Hilltop Road	1	1	2	0	0	3	7
Hidden Valley Drive	0	2	0	0	0	3	5
Orangewood Drive	0	1	2	0	0	2	5
W. Ash Lane	1	2	1	0	0	1	5
White Oak Trail	1	0	1	0	0	3	5
Woodcrest Drive	2	2	0	1	0	0	5
E. Orange Hill Circle	0	2	0	0	0	2	4
Miles Road	0	1	1	0	0	2	4
Orangetree Drive	1	0	0	0	0	3	4
Orangedale Road	1	1	0	0	0	1	3
Orchard Circle	1	1	0	0	0	1	3
W. Meadow Lane	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
W. Orange Hill Circle	0	1	0	0	0	2	3
Wild Cherry Oval	0	2	0	1	0	0	3
Acorn Trail	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Cambridge Court	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
East Meadow Lane	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Murcott circle	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Orange Meadow Lane	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Pinecrest Drive	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
W. Woodcrest Drive	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Beacon Hill	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Beechmont Trail	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Chestnut Court	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

Continued on next page.

Rate the Following Services: Building Department							
	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Fairview Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Honey Belle Oval	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Laurel Circle	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Nob Hill Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Orange Hill Circle	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
S. Hilltop Road	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Sterncrest Drive	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Valencia Circle	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
W. Jackson	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Walnut Court	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Waterford Court	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	127	108	46	11	6	131	429

Rate the Following Services: Property Maintenance Enforcement

	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Street Unreported	50	44	37	14	11	55	211
Lander Road	12	8	6	4	1	14	45
Jackson Drive	1	6	4	3	0	3	17
Brainard Road	6	2	1	1	0	6	16
Harvard Road	0	6	3	0	0	5	14
Blossom Lane	2	1	1	1	0	6	11
Pike Drive	3	1	3	0	0	2	9
Stonebrooke Oval	1	2	4	0	1	1	9
Emery Road	1	4	0	0	0	2	7
N. Hilltop Road	1	0	1	0	0	5	7
Stonebrooke Drive	4	0	1	0	0	2	7
Hidden Valley Drive	0	2	0	0	1	2	5
W. Ash Lane	1	2	1	0	0	1	5
White Oak Trail	1	1	1	0	0	2	5
Woodcrest Drive	0	3	0	1	1	0	5
E. Orange Hill Circle	0	2	0	0	0	2	4
Miles Road	0	1	1	0	0	2	4
Orangedale Road	1	1	0	0	0	2	4
Orangetree Drive	0	1	0	0	0	3	4
Orangewood Drive	1	2	0	1	0	0	4
Orchard Circle	1	0	1	0	0	2	4
Acorn Trail	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Orange Meadow Lane	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
W. Meadow Lane	2	0	0	0	0	1	3
W. Orange Hill Circle	1	0	0	1	0	1	3
Wild Cherry Oval	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
Cambridge Court	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
East Meadow Lane	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Murcott circle	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Pinecrest Drive	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
W. Woodcrest Drive	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Beacon Hill	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Beechmont Trail	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Chestnut Court	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

Continued on next page.

Rate the Following Services: Property Maintenance Enforcement							
	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Fairview Drive	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Honey Belle Oval	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Laurel Circle	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Nob Hill Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Orange Hill Circle	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
S. Hilltop Road	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Sterncrest Drive	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Valencia Circle	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
W. Jackson	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Walnut Court	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Waterford Court	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	100	99	69	26	15	127	436

Rate the Following Services: Village Hall Administration

	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Street Unreported	76	62	20	6	1	54	219
Lander Road	18	15	5	1	0	6	45
Jackson Drive	2	7	3	1	1	3	17
Brainard Road	6	1	2	0	1	6	16
Harvard Road	2	6	1	0	0	3	12
Blossom Lane	1	6	1	0	0	3	11
Pike Drive	4	4	1	0	0	0	9
Stonebrooke Oval	3	2	1	0	0	3	9
N. Hilltop Road	4	0	3	0	0	0	7
Stonebrooke Drive	2	1	0	1	0	3	7
Emery Road	3	3	0	0	0	0	6
Hidden Valley Drive	1	2	0	0	0	2	5
Orangewood Drive	0	3	0	1	0	1	5
W. Ash Lane	2	2	0	1	0	0	5
Woodcrest Drive	1	2	2	0	0	0	5
E. Orange Hill Circle	0	2	0	0	0	2	4
Miles Road	0	2	1	0	0	1	4
Orangedale Road	1	1	0	0	0	2	4
Orangetree Drive	2	1	0	0	0	1	4
Orchard Circle	1	0	1	0	0	2	4
White Oak Trail	1	1	2	0	0	0	4
Acorn Trail	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Orange Meadow Lane	1	1	0	0	0	1	3
W. Meadow Lane	2	0	0	0	0	1	3
W. Orange Hill Circle	1	0	1	0	1	0	3
Cambridge Court	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
East Meadow Lane	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Murcott circle	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Orange Hill Circle	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
Pinecrest Drive	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
W. Woodcrest Drive	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Beacon Hill	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Beechmont Trail	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Chestnut Court	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

Continued on next page.

Rate the Following Services: Village Hall Administration							
	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Fairview Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Honey Belle Oval	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Nob Hill Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
S. Hilltop Road	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Sterncrest Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Valencia Circle	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
W. Jackson	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Walnut Court	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Waterford Court	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Wild Cherry Oval	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total	145	132	46	11	6	99	439

Rate the Following Services: Orange C.A.R.E.S.[1]							
	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Street Unreported	45	29	2	4	2	126	208
Lander Road	15	4	0	1	0	25	45
Jackson Drive	2	7	0	0	1	6	16
Brainard Road	2	2	0	0	1	9	14
Blossom Lane	2	2	0	0	0	7	11
Harvard Road	1	4	0	0	0	5	10
Pike Drive	1	2	1	0	0	5	9
Stonebrooke Oval	2	3	1	0	0	3	9
N. Hilltop Road	1	1	0	0	0	5	7
Stonebrooke Drive	2	0	0	0	0	5	7
Emery Road	1	1	0	0	0	4	6
Orangewood Drive	0	1	0	0	0	4	5
W. Ash Lane	0	1	0	0	0	4	5
White Oak Trail	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Woodcrest Drive	0	2	0	0	0	3	5
Hidden Valley Drive	2	0	0	0	0	2	4
Miles Road	0	2	0	0	0	2	4
Orangedale Road	1	1	0	0	0	2	4
Orangetree Drive	1	0	0	0	0	3	4
Orchard Circle	1	0	1	0	0	2	4
E. Orange Hill Circle	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Orange Meadow Lane	0	1	0	0	0	2	3
W. Meadow Lane	1	0	0	0	0	2	3
Acorn Trail	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Cambridge Court	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
East Meadow Lane	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Murcott circle	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Pinecrest Drive	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
W. Orange Hill Circle	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
W. Woodcrest Drive	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Beacon Hill	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Chestnut Court	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Fairview Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Honey Belle Oval	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

Continued on next page.

Rate the Following Services: Orange C.A.R.E.S.[1]							
	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Laurel Circle	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Nob Hill Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Orange Hill Circle	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
S. Hilltop Road	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Sterncrest Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Valencia Circle	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
W. Jackson	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Walnut Court	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Waterford Court	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Wild Cherry Oval	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total	88	66	7	5	4	249	419

Rate the Following Services: Snow Removal for Seniors

	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Street Unreported	35	28	4	4	2	133	206
Lander Road	13	5	0	1	0	22	41
Jackson Drive	1	6	0	0	0	10	17
Brainard Road	3	1	0	0	0	10	14
Blossom Lane	1	0	0	1	1	8	11
Harvard Road	3	1	0	0	0	7	11
Stonebrooke Oval	2	3	0	0	0	4	9
Pike Drive	1	1	1	0	0	5	8
Emery Road	4	0	0	0	0	3	7
N. Hilltop Road	2	1	0	0	0	4	7
Stonebrooke Drive	1	1	0	0	0	4	6
Orangewood Drive	0	1	0	0	0	4	5
W. Ash Lane	2	1	0	0	0	2	5
Woodcrest Drive	0	1	0	0	0	4	5
E. Orange Hill Circle	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Hidden Valley Drive	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Miles Road	0	1	0	0	0	3	4
Orangedale Road	1	1	0	0	0	2	4
Orangetree Drive	1	1	0	0	0	2	4
Orchard Circle	0	0	1	0	0	3	4
White Oak Trail	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Orange Meadow Lane	0	1	0	0	0	2	3
W. Meadow Lane	2	0	0	0	0	1	3
Wild Cherry Oval	0	1	0	0	1	1	3
Acorn Trail	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Cambridge Court	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
East Meadow Lane	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Murcott circle	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Pinecrest Drive	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
W. Orange Hill Circle	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
W. Woodcrest Drive	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Beacon Hill	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Beechmont Trail	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Chestnut Court	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

Continued on next page.

Rate the Following Services: Snow Removal for Seniors							
	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Fairview Drive	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Honey Belle Oval	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Laurel Circle	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Nob Hill Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Orange Hill Circle	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
S. Hilltop Road	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Sterncrest Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Valencia Circle	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
W. Jackson	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Walnut Court	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Waterford Court	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	78	62	6	7	5	259	417

Rate the Following Services: Trash Removal

	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Street Unreported	130	80	11	2	0	0	223
Lander Road	28	14	3	1	0	0	46
Jackson Drive	6	8	3	0	0	1	18
Brainard Road	12	4	1	0	0	0	17
Harvard Road	10	4	0	0	0	0	14
Blossom Lane	6	5	0	0	0	0	11
Pike Drive	7	3	0	0	0	0	10
Stonebrooke Oval	5	4	0	0	0	0	9
Stonebrooke Drive	6	2	0	0	0	0	8
Emery Road	6	1	0	0	0	0	7
N. Hilltop Road	4	2	1	0	0	0	7
Hidden Valley Drive	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
Orangetree Drive	4	1	0	0	0	0	5
W. Ash Lane	2	2	1	0	0	0	5
White Oak Trail	3	1	1	0	0	0	5
Woodcrest Drive	4	1	0	0	0	0	5
E. Orange Hill Circle	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Miles Road	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Orangedale Road	2	1	0	0	0	1	4
Orangewood Drive	2	2	0	0	0	0	4
Orchard Circle	2	1	1	0	0	0	4
Cambridge Court	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Orange Meadow Lane	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
W. Meadow Lane	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
W. Orange Hill Circle	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
Acorn Trail	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
East Meadow Lane	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Murcott circle	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Orange Hill Circle	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Pinecrest Drive	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
W. Woodcrest Drive	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Wild Cherry Oval	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Beacon Hill	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Beechmont Trail	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Continued on next page.

Rate the Following Services: Trash Removal							
	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Chestnut Court	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Fairview Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Honey Belle Oval	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Laurel Circle	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Nob Hill Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
S. Hilltop Road	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Sterncrest Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Valencia Circle	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
W. Jackson	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Walnut Court	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Waterford Court	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	269	155	25	3	0	2	454

Rate the Following Services: Curbside Recycling Pickup

	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Street Unreported	136	73	12	0	0	5	226
Lander Road	27	16	1	1	0	1	46
Brainard Road	12	3	1	0	0	1	17
Jackson Drive	6	7	3	0	0	1	17
Harvard Road	10	3	1	0	0	0	14
Blossom Lane	6	4	0	0	0	1	11
Pike Drive	7	3	0	0	0	0	10
Stonebrooke Oval	6	3	0	0	0	0	9
Stonebrooke Drive	5	3	0	0	0	0	8
Emery Road	5	1	0	0	0	1	7
N. Hilltop Road	5	2	0	0	0	0	7
Hidden Valley Drive	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
Orangetree Drive	4	0	0	0	0	1	5
Orangewood Drive	4	1	0	0	0	0	5
W. Ash Lane	2	2	0	0	0	1	5
White Oak Trail	4	0	1	0	0	0	5
Woodcrest Drive	4	1	0	0	0	0	5
E. Orange Hill Circle	0	3	0	0	0	1	4
Miles Road	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Orangedale Road	2	1	0	0	0	1	4
Orchard Circle	3	1	0	0	0	0	4
Acorn Trail	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Cambridge Court	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Orange Meadow Lane	2	0	0	0	0	1	3
W. Meadow Lane	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Wild Cherry Oval	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
East Meadow Lane	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Murcott circle	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Pinecrest Drive	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
W. Orange Hill Circle	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
W. Woodcrest Drive	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Beacon Hill	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Beechmont Trail	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Chestnut Court	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Continued on next page.

Rate the Following Services: Curbside Recycling Pickup							
	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Fairview Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Honey Belle Oval	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Laurel Circle	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Nob Hill Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Orange Hill Circle	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
S. Hilltop Road	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Sterncrest Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Valencia Circle	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
W. Jackson	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Walnut Court	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Waterford Court	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	279	142	20	1	0	15	457

Rate the Following Services: Leaf Pickup							
	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Street Unreported	96	62	21	0	0	41	220
Lander Road	25	11	2	1	0	7	46
Jackson Drive	4	6	6	1	0	1	18
Brainard Road	3	3	1	0	0	7	14
Harvard Road	9	3	2	0	0	0	14
Blossom Lane	3	4	0	0	0	3	10
Pike Drive	2	3	0	1	0	4	10
Stonebrooke Oval	5	4	0	0	0	0	9
Stonebrooke Drive	5	2	1	0	0	0	8
Emery Road	4	0	0	0	0	2	6
N. Hilltop Road	3	1	0	0	0	2	6
Hidden Valley Drive	3	1	0	0	0	1	5
W. Ash Lane	2	2	0	0	0	1	5
White Oak Trail	3	1	0	0	0	1	5
Woodcrest Drive	3	1	0	0	0	1	5
E. Orange Hill Circle	1	2	0	0	0	1	4
Miles Road	1	1	1	0	0	1	4
Orangetree Drive	1	0	0	0	0	3	4
Orangewood Drive	1	2	0	0	0	1	4
Orchard Circle	1	0	0	0	0	3	4
Acorn Trail	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Orange Meadow Lane	2	0	0	0	0	1	3
Orangedale Road	1	0	0	0	0	2	3
W. Meadow Lane	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Wild Cherry Oval	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
Cambridge Court	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
East Meadow Lane	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Murcott circle	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Orange Hill Circle	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Pinecrest Drive	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
W. Orange Hill Circle	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
W. Woodcrest Drive	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Beacon Hill	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Beechmont Trail	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Continued on next page.

Rate the Following Services: Leaf Pickup							
	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Chestnut Court	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Fairview Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Honey Belle Oval	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Laurel Circle	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Nob Hill Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
S. Hilltop Road	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Sterncrest Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Valencia Circle	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
W. Jackson	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Walnut Court	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Waterford Court	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	197	119	36	3	1	87	443

Rate the Following Services: Branch Chipping

	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Street Unreported	94	56	17	4	0	42	213
Lander Road	23	12	2	0	0	7	44
Jackson Drive	4	7	5	0	0	0	16
Harvard Road	9	4	1	0	0	0	14
Brainard Road	3	3	1	0	0	6	13
Blossom Lane	1	3	0	0	0	6	10
Pike Drive	2	3	1	0	0	3	9
Stonebrooke Oval	5	4	0	0	0	0	9
Stonebrooke Drive	3	3	2	0	0	0	8
Emery Road	3	1	0	0	0	3	7
N. Hilltop Road	1	3	0	0	0	3	7
Hidden Valley Drive	2	0	0	0	0	3	5
W. Ash Lane	2	2	0	0	0	1	5
White Oak Trail	3	1	0	0	0	1	5
Woodcrest Drive	2	2	0	0	0	1	5
E. Orange Hill Circle	1	2	0	0	0	1	4
Miles Road	1	1	1	1	0	0	4
Orangetree Drive	1	0	0	0	0	3	4
Orangewood Drive	1	2	0	0	0	1	4
Orchard Circle	2	0	0	0	0	2	4
Acorn Trail	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
W. Meadow Lane	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
W. Orange Hill Circle	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
Wild Cherry Oval	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
Cambridge Court	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
East Meadow Lane	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Murcott circle	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Orange Hill Circle	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Orange Meadow Lane	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Orangedale Road	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Pinecrest Drive	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
W. Woodcrest Drive	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Beacon Hill	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Beechmont Trail	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Continued on next page.

Rate the Following Services: Branch Chipping							
	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Chestnut Court	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Fairview Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Honey Belle Oval	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Laurel Circle	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Nob Hill Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
S. Hilltop Road	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Sterncrest Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Valencia Circle	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
W. Jackson	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Walnut Court	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Waterford Court	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total	186	117	33	5	1	89	431

Rate the Following Services: Delivery of Wood Chips and Leaf Humus

	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Street Unreported	78	30	8	1	0	88	205
Lander Road	16	7	0	0	0	19	42
Jackson Drive	5	6	2	0	0	4	17
Harvard Road	7	4	1	0	0	2	14
Blossom Lane	1	2	1	0	0	6	10
Brainard Road	0	1	1	0	0	8	10
Pike Drive	2	4	0	0	0	3	9
Stonebrooke Oval	5	2	1	0	0	1	9
Emery Road	2	1	0	0	0	4	7
N. Hilltop Road	1	2	0	0	0	4	7
Stonebrooke Drive	4	0	0	0	0	3	7
Hidden Valley Drive	2	0	0	1	0	2	5
W. Ash Lane	1	1	0	0	0	3	5
White Oak Trail	2	0	0	0	0	3	5
Woodcrest Drive	1	1	1	0	0	2	5
E. Orange Hill Circle	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Miles Road	2	2	0	0	0	0	4
Orangetree Drive	1	0	0	0	0	3	4
Orangewood Drive	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Orchard Circle	1	1	0	0	0	2	4
Acorn Trail	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Orange Meadow Lane	1	1	0	0	0	1	3
W. Meadow Lane	2	0	0	0	0	1	3
W. Orange Hill Circle	1	1	0	0	0	1	3
Cambridge Court	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
East Meadow Lane	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Murcott circle	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Pinecrest Drive	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
W. Woodcrest Drive	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Wild Cherry Oval	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Beacon Hill	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Beechmont Trail	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Chestnut Court	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Fairview Drive	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

Continued on next page.

Rate the Following Services: Delivery of Wood Chips and Leaf Humus							
	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Honey Belle Oval	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Laurel Circle	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Nob Hill Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Orange Hill Circle	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Orangedale Road	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
S. Hilltop Road	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Sterncrest Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Valencia Circle	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
W. Jackson	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Walnut Court	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Waterford Court	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Total	148	69	15	2	0	182	416

Rate the Following Services: Park Maintenance

	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Street Unreported	67	67	13	1	0	60	208
Lander Road	17	13	3	0	0	10	43
Jackson Drive	3	8	3	0	0	2	16
Brainard Road	5	4	2	0	0	3	14
Harvard Road	5	7	0	0	0	2	14
Blossom Lane	1	5	1	0	0	4	11
Pike Drive	2	6	0	0	0	1	9
Stonebrooke Oval	4	3	0	0	0	2	9
Emery Road	2	1	0	0	0	4	7
N. Hilltop Road	4	2	0	0	0	1	7
Stonebrooke Drive	2	1	1	0	0	3	7
Hidden Valley Drive	2	1	0	0	0	2	5
W. Ash Lane	2	2	0	0	0	1	5
White Oak Trail	2	1	1	0	0	1	5
Woodcrest Drive	1	3	0	0	0	1	5
E. Orange Hill Circle	0	2	0	0	0	2	4
Miles Road	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Orangetree Drive	2	2	0	0	0	0	4
Orangewood Drive	0	2	0	0	0	2	4
Orchard Circle	2	0	0	0	0	2	4
Orange Meadow Lane	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
W. Meadow Lane	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Acorn Trail	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Cambridge Court	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
East Meadow Lane	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Murcott circle	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Orangedale Road	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Pinecrest Drive	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
W. Orange Hill Circle	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
W. Woodcrest Drive	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Wild Cherry Oval	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Beacon Hill	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Beechmont Trail	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Chestnut Court	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

Continued on next page.

Rate the Following Services: Park Maintenance							
	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Fairview Drive	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Honey Belle Oval	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Laurel Circle	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Nob Hill Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Orange Hill Circle	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
S. Hilltop Road	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Sterncrest Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Valencia Circle	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
W. Jackson	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Walnut Court	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Waterford Court	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	138	147	24	1	0	113	423

Rate the Following Services: Street Snow Removal

	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Street Unreported	77	83	33	16	8	7	224
Lander Road	20	13	4	3	1	4	45
Jackson Drive	4	11	1	0	1	0	17
Brainard Road	6	4	4	0	0	0	14
Harvard Road	2	9	1	0	0	2	14
Blossom Lane	3	6	0	1	0	1	11
Pike Drive	4	5	0	0	0	1	10
Stonebrooke Oval	4	3	1	1	0	0	9
Stonebrooke Drive	1	5	1	1	0	0	8
Emery Road	4	2	0	0	0	1	7
N. Hilltop Road	3	1	1	1	0	1	7
Hidden Valley Drive	3	1	1	0	0	0	5
W. Ash Lane	1	2	1	1	0	0	5
Woodcrest Drive	2	2	1	0	0	0	5
E. Orange Hill Circle	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Miles Road	0	3	1	0	0	0	4
Orangetree Drive	2	1	0	0	0	1	4
Orangewood Drive	0	2	1	0	1	0	4
Orchard Circle	3	1	0	0	0	0	4
White Oak Trail	1	2	1	0	0	0	4
Acorn Trail	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Orange Meadow Lane	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Orangedale Road	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
W. Meadow Lane	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
W. Orange Hill Circle	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
Cambridge Court	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
East Meadow Lane	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Murcott circle	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Orange Hill Circle	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Pinecrest Drive	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
W. Woodcrest Drive	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Wild Cherry Oval	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Beacon Hill	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Beechmont Trail	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Continued on next page.

Rate the Following Services: Street Snow Removal							
	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Chestnut Court	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Fairview Drive	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Honey Belle Oval	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Laurel Circle	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Nob Hill Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
S. Hilltop Road	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Sterncrest Drive	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Valencia Circle	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
W. Jackson	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Walnut Court	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Waterford Court	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	161	175	57	25	11	18	447

Rate the Following Services: Street Cleaning

	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Street Unreported	68	74	38	5	4	25	214
Lander Road	17	13	5	2	1	7	45
Jackson Drive	1	9	0	0	0	5	15
Harvard Road	1	5	3	0	0	5	14
Brainard Road	5	5	3	0	0	0	13
Blossom Lane	2	7	1	0	0	1	11
Pike Drive	3	5	1	0	0	1	10
Stonebrooke Oval	3	4	2	0	0	0	9
Stonebrooke Drive	3	3	1	0	0	1	8
Emery Road	4	2	0	0	0	1	7
N. Hilltop Road	2	2	2	0	0	1	7
Hidden Valley Drive	1	2	1	1	0	0	5
Orangewood Drive	1	1	2	0	0	1	5
W. Ash Lane	1	1	2	0	0	1	5
Woodcrest Drive	1	3	0	0	0	1	5
E. Orange Hill Circle	0	1	0	0	0	3	4
Miles Road	0	3	0	0	0	1	4
Orangetree Drive	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Orchard Circle	2	1	0	0	0	1	4
White Oak Trail	1	2	1	0	0	0	4
Acorn Trail	2	0	0	0	0	1	3
Cambridge Court	0	1	0	0	0	2	3
Orange Meadow Lane	0	1	1	0	0	1	3
Orangedale Road	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
W. Meadow Lane	1	0	0	0	0	2	3
East Meadow Lane	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Murcott circle	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Pinecrest Drive	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
W. Orange Hill Circle	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
W. Woodcrest Drive	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Wild Cherry Oval	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Beacon Hill	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Beechmont Trail	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Chestnut Court	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Continued on next page.

Rate the Following Services: Street Cleaning							
	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Fairview Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Honey Belle Oval	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Laurel Circle	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Nob Hill Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Orange Hill Circle	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
S. Hilltop Road	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Sterncrest Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Valencia Circle	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
W. Jackson	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Walnut Court	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Waterford Court	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	132	155	67	8	5	67	434

Rate the Following Services: Street Maintenance/Repairs

	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Street Unreported	51	80	56	13	9	12	221
Lander Road	16	16	7	3	1	3	46
Jackson Drive	2	6	8	0	1	0	17
Brainard Road	5	5	3	0	1	1	15
Harvard Road	1	8	3	1	0	1	14
Blossom Lane	4	3	5	0	0	0	12
Pike Drive	2	5	3	0	0	0	10
Stonebrooke Oval	3	4	2	0	0	0	9
Stonebrooke Drive	3	2	3	0	0	0	8
Emery Road	2	4	1	0	0	0	7
N. Hilltop Road	1	2	4	0	0	0	7
Hidden Valley Drive	2	2	1	0	0	0	5
Orangewood Drive	1	2	1	0	0	1	5
W. Ash Lane	1	1	3	0	0	0	5
White Oak Trail	1	1	3	0	0	0	5
Woodcrest Drive	1	2	2	0	0	0	5
E. Orange Hill Circle	0	2	2	0	0	0	4
Miles Road	0	3	0	1	0	0	4
Orangedale Road	2	1	0	0	0	1	4
Orangetree Drive	1	2	1	0	0	0	4
Orchard Circle	2	1	0	0	0	1	4
Acorn Trail	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Cambridge Court	0	1	1	0	0	1	3
Orange Meadow Lane	0	2	0	1	0	0	3
W. Meadow Lane	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
W. Orange Hill Circle	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
Wild Cherry Oval	0	1	1	1	0	0	3
East Meadow Lane	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Murcott circle	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Pinecrest Drive	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
W. Woodcrest Drive	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Beacon Hill	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Beechmont Trail	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Chestnut Court	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Continued on next page.

Rate the Following Services: Street Maintenance/Repairs							
	Excellent	Good	Average / Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion	Total
Fairview Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Honey Belle Oval	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Laurel Circle	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Nob Hill Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Orange Hill Circle	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
S. Hilltop Road	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Sterncrest Drive	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Valencia Circle	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
W. Jackson	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Walnut Court	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Waterford Court	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	114	165	117	21	12	22	451

COUNTY PLANNING