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Interpreting the Maps

The maps on the following pages show the mean ratings for several questions by Zip Code.

If all Zip Codes on a map are the same color, then most residents in the community generally feel the same about that issue.

When reading the charts, please use the following color scheme as a guide:

- **DARK/LIGHT BLUE** shades indicate **POSITIVE** ratings. Shades of blue generally indicate agreement and a willingness of residents to fund an initiative.

- **OFF-WHITE/BEIGE** shades indicate a **NEUTRAL** rating. Shades of neutral generally indicate a neutral or “not sure” opinion about an issue.

- **ORANGE/RED** shades indicate **NEGATIVE** ratings. Shades of orange/red generally indicate disagreement and an unwillingness to fund an initiative.
Location of Survey Respondents

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Q1-01 Ratings of air quality

Perception
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Very Poor
- 1.8-2.6 Poor
- 2.6-3.4 Adequate
- 3.4-4.2 Good
- 4.2-5.0 Very Good
- No Response

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q1-02 Ratings of economic development and job creation

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)

Perception
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Very Poor
- 1.8-2.6 Poor
- 2.6-3.4 Adequate
- 3.4-4.2 Good
- 4.2-5.0 Very Good
- No Response

ETC INSTITUTE
Q1-03 Ratings of efforts to minimize the impacts of flooding

Perception
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Very Poor
- 1.8-2.6 Poor
- 2.6-3.4 Adequate
- 3.4-4.2 Good
- 4.2-5.0 Very Good
- No Response

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q1-04 Ratings of level of safety from crime in neighborhoods

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q1-05 Ratings of local governmental services

Perception
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

1.0-1.8 Very Poor
1.8-2.6 Poor
2.6-3.4 Adequate
3.4-4.2 Good
4.2-5.0 Very Good
No Response

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q1-06 Ratings of opportunities for health and fitness

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q1-07 Ratings of public education (K-12)

Perception
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

ETC INSTITUTE

1.0-1.8 Very Poor
1.8-2.6 Poor
2.6-3.4 Adequate
3.4-4.2 Good
4.2-5.0 Very Good
No Response

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q1-08 Ratings of recycling programs

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q1-09 Ratings of regional efforts to acquire and protect natural areas

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q1-10 Ratings of water quality in lakes, streams, and rivers

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q8 Ratings of the water quality in lakes, streams, rivers, and other waterways in the Kansas City area

Water Quality in Waterways
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8  Getting Much Better
- 1.8-2.6  Getting Somewhat Better
- 2.6-3.4  Staying About The Same
- 3.4-4.2  Getting Somewhat Worse
- 4.2-5.0  Getting Much Worse
- No Response

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q14-01 Willingness to use environmentally friendly products on lawn

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q14-02 Willingness to pick up trash in the community

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q14-03 Willingness to take household hazardous waste to a disposal facility

ETC INSTITUTE

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q14-04 Willingness to manage yard waste

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)

Willingness
Mean rating on a 4-point scale
- 1.0-1.75  Not Willing
- 1.75-2.5  Not Sure
- 2.5-3.25  Somewhat Willing
- 3.25-4.0  Very Willing
- No Response

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q14-05 Willingness to pick up and dispose of pet waste

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)

ETC INSTITUTE

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q14-06 Willingness to report illegal dumping

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q17-01 Agreement that the quality of local streams affects quality of life

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)

Agreement
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

1.0-1.8 Strongly Disagree
1.8-2.6 Disagree
2.6-3.4 Neutral
3.4-4.2 Agree
4.2-5.0 Strongly Agree
No Response

ETC INSTITUTE
Q17-02 Agreement that the quality of local streams affects property values

Agreement
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Disagree
- 1.8-2.6 Disagree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Agree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Agree
- No Response

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q17-03 Agreement that the quality of local streams affects drinking water quality

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q17-04 Agreement that it is important to improve the quality of water in lakes and streams in the community.

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed).
Q17-05 Agreement that residents have confidence in their community’s ability to address flooding related problems

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q17-06 Agreement that residents would be willing to pay more for a property in a community that focuses on protecting water quality by conserving natural areas
Q17-07 Agreement that residents would be willing to pay more in utilities to improve the quality of water in lakes and streams in the community where they live.
Q17-08 Agreement that residents would be willing to pay an increase in taxes to improve the quality of water in lakes and streams in the community where they live.

Agreement
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Disagree
- 1.8-2.6 Disagree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Agree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Agree
- No Response

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q17-09 Agreement that residents would support local government working with other cities and counties to improve water quality

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)

Agreement
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Disagree
- 1.8-2.6 Disagree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Agree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Agree
- No Response

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q17-10 Agreement that residents would support local government allocating resources to improve water quality

Agreement
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Disagree
- 1.8-2.6 Disagree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Agree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Agree
- No Response

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q17-11 Agreement that public entities should be doing more to directly implement protection and restoration of urban waterways

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q21-01 Support for providing incentives to residents and businesses to plant native flowers/grasses, rain gardens, or for water harvesting

Level of Support
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Not Supportive At All
- 1.8-2.6 Not Supportive
- 2.6-3.4 Not Sure
- 3.4-4.2 Supportive
- 4.2-5.0 Very Supportive
- No Response

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q21-02 Support for adopting ordinances that require developers to conserve natural areas

Level of Support
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

1.0-1.8 Not Supportive At All
1.8-2.6 Not Supportive
2.6-3.4 Not Sure
3.4-4.2 Supportive
4.2-5.0 Very Supportive
No Response

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q21-03 Support for adopting ordinances that require developers to preserve trees and open space during the building process
Q21-04 Support for adopting plans to restore urban waterways

Level of Support
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

1.0-1.8 Not Supportive At All
1.8-2.6 Not Supportive
2.6-3.4 Not Sure
3.4-4.2 Supportive
4.2-5.0 Very Supportive
No Response

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q21-05 Support for funding the restoration of urban waterways
Q21-06 Support for encouraging the development of sustainable practices to minimize negative impacts on waterways in the area

Level of Support
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Not Supportive At All
- 1.8-2.6 Not Supportive
- 2.6-3.4 Not Sure
- 3.4-4.2 Supportive
- 4.2-5.0 Very Supportive
- No Response

ETC INSTITUTE

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)
Q21-07 Support for purchasing land along stream corridors

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)

Level of Support
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Not Supportive At All
- 1.8-2.6 Not Supportive
- 2.6-3.4 Not Sure
- 3.4-4.2 Supportive
- 4.2-5.0 Very Supportive
- No Response

ETC INSTITUTE
Q21-08 Support for funding the restoration of stream corridor

Level of Support
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Not Supportive At All
- 1.8-2.6 Not Supportive
- 2.6-3.4 Not Sure
- 3.4-4.2 Supportive
- 4.2-5.0 Very Supportive
- No Response

2016 MARC Community Planning Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by ZIP Code (merged as needed)