

## Lowest Scoring Community Survey Items March 5, 2003

### Background

The tables below show the percent responding “yes” to items included in each of the five community survey item groups (e.g., Physical Activity Facilities, Biking/Walking, etc.). The percentages are shown for the seven community types as well as for the total sample and they do not take into account the population within each community. In order to point out the areas where communities are performing the worst, only the items with fewer than 25% saying “yes” are listed below.

### Differences in Physical Activity Facilities Across Community Types

	Econ Devel Sub- urb (n=45)	Grow- th Comm (n=32)	Resid Sub- Urb (n=38)	Resort Retire Artist (n=29)	Rural Econ Ctr (n=42)	Small Rural Comm (n=26)	Urban Ctr (n=27)	TOTAL (N=239)
Provides: Bicycle helmets, etc.	13%	19%	11%	10%	14%	15%	7%	13%
Improved: On or off road bikeways	22%	19%	5%	14%	12%	4%	22%	14%
*Improved: Lighting of streets	31%	13%	13%	14%	29%	8%	<b>44%</b>	22%
*Improved: School-based gyms	<b>27%</b>	9%	8%	3%	10%	8%	15%	12%
Improved: Indoor courts	4%	0%	3%	3%	5%	0%	15%	4%
*Adult access: Universities	9%	0%	13%	3%	10%	0%	<b>30%</b>	9%
Adult access: Corporate facility	7%	0%	8%	0%	2%	4%	15%	5%
*Adult access: State/MDC facility	22%	13%	8%	14%	19%	15%	<b>41%</b>	18%

### Differences in Biking/Walking Regulations Across Community Types

	Econ Devel Sub- urb (n=45)	Grow- th Comm (n=32)	Resid Sub- Urb (n=38)	Resort Retire Artist (n=29)	Rural Econ Ctr (n=42)	Small Rural Comm (n=26)	Urban Ctr (n=27)	TOTAL (N=239)
Regulation: Include bikeways	9%	9%	11%	7%	2%	0%	4%	6%
Regulation: Include walkways	22%	13%	16%	7%	10%	12%	30%	15%
Regulation: Connect cul-de-sacs	11%	6%	13%	3%	14%	12%	7%	10%
*Regulation: Prohibit cul-de-sacs	4%	0%	5%	<b>10%</b>	<b>14%</b>	0%	4%	6%
*Bike/walkways: Bridges, roads	<b>36%</b>	9%	13%	3%	12%	4%	19%	15%
*Bike/walkways: To & within parks	18%	9%	13%	0%	5%	4%	<b>33%</b>	12%
*Bike/walkways: To shopping ctrs	<b>13%</b>	0%	<b>16%</b>	3%	2%	4%	<b>11%</b>	8%
*Bike/walkways: Along waterways	<b>18%</b>	3%	11%	0%	2%	4%	<b>19%</b>	8%
*Bike/walkways: To public trans	<b>16%</b>	13%	11%	3%	7%	4%	<b>19%</b>	10%
*Bike parking at public trans hubs	40%	6%	16%	21%	12%	0%	<b>48%</b>	21%
*Policy: Lighting on ped/bikepaths	20%	0%	8%	7%	12%	0%	<b>30%</b>	11%
Policy: Security on ped/bikepaths	13%	6%	3%	14%	14%	0%	11%	9%
*Speed bumps	<b>31%</b>	13%	8%	10%	10%	19%	<b>33%</b>	18%
Raised crossings	9%	3%	5%	7%	5%	0%	15%	6%
*Neckdowns	13%	3%	3%	7%	2%	0%	<b>33%</b>	8%

\* = Statistically significant difference exists across community types.

Note: Where the chi-square test was significant, the highest number(s) within a row are underlined and bolded. This does not indicate that those numbers are significantly higher than other numbers in that row.

### Differences in Promotions/Education/Events Across Community Types

	Econ Devel Sub- urb (n=45)	Grow- th Comm (n=32)	Resid Sub- Urb (n=38)	Resort Retire Artist (n=29)	Rural Econ Ctr (n=42)	Small Rural Comm (n=26)	Urban Ctr (n=27)	TOTAL (N=239)
*Maps/signs: Along sidewalks	4%	<u>19%</u>	3%	<u>17%</u>	5%	0%	<u>15%</u>	8%
*Maps/signs: In parks	<u>36%</u>	13%	18%	21%	10%	23%	<u>37%</u>	22%
*Maps/signs: Newspaper	<u>20%</u>	6%	0%	<u>21%</u>	10%	15%	<u>19%</u>	13%
*Maps/signs: Cablevision	<u>20%</u>	6%	5%	<u>21%</u>	<u>19%</u>	4%	<u>22%</u>	14%
*Maps/signs: Internet/web site	<u>24%</u>	3%	13%	<u>21%</u>	10%	8%	15%	14%
Maps/signs: On city/town greens	7%	9%	5%	10%	12%	8%	11%	9%
*Education: Pedestrian safety	<u>29%</u>	6%	18%	17%	17%	23%	7%	18%
*Education: Sports safety	<u>36%</u>	9%	18%	17%	24%	8%	19%	20%
*Campaign: Physical activity	22%	0%	18%	14%	19%	19%	<u>30%</u>	18%
*Campaign: Healthy weight	<u>18%</u>	0%	<u>18%</u>	7%	12%	<u>15%</u>	11%	12%
*Campaign: CVD, stroke, diabetes	<u>29%</u>	9%	21%	14%	21%	19%	<u>33%</u>	21%

### Differences in Youth-Related Items Across Community Types

	Econ Devel Sub- urb (n=45)	Grow- th Comm (n=32)	Resid Sub- Urb (n=38)	Resort Retire Artist (n=29)	Rural Econ Ctr (n=42)	Small Rural Comm (n=26)	Urban Ctr (n=27)	TOTAL (N=239)
*Bike/walkways: Around schools	29%	22%	18%	7%	17%	19%	<u>37%</u>	21%
*Have "Walk to School" programs	<u>13%</u>	0%	3%	3%	<u>17%</u>	4%	<u>15%</u>	8%
*Youth access: Universities	11%	3%	5%	3%	2%	0%	<u>22%</u>	7%
Youth access: Corporate facility	4%	3%	8%	0%	2%	4%	19%	5%
*Youth access: State/ MDC facility	18%	3%	8%	10%	14%	27%	<u>41%</u>	16%

### Differences in Nutrition-Related Items Across Community Types

	Econ Devel Sub- urb (n=45)	Grow- th Comm (n=32)	Resid Sub- Urb (n=38)	Resort Retire Artist (n=29)	Rural Econ Ctr (n=42)	Small Rural Comm (n=26)	Urban Ctr (n=27)	TOTAL (N=239)
Education: Choosing hlthy foods	20%	13%	21%	17%	14%	8%	22%	17%
Education: Preparing hlthy foods	18%	13%	21%	17%	17%	12%	22%	17%
Education: Growing fruits/vegs	13%	9%	3%	7%	5%	4%	15%	8%
*Provide space for comm. gardens	24%	22%	32%	14%	14%	4%	<u>56%</u>	23%
*Require healthy labels on menus	4%	3%	0%	3%	<u>12%</u>	0%	0%	4%
*Collab to promote healthy eating	<u>11%</u>	3%	5%	7%	<u>14%</u>	4%	0%	7%
Campaign: 5+ fruits/vegs a day	16%	0%	18%	7%	14%	12%	15%	12%
*Campaign: Diet and health	<u>22%</u>	6%	16%	7%	12%	15%	<u>26%</u>	15%

\* = Statistically significant difference exists across community types.

Note: Where the chi-square test was significant, the highest number(s) within a row are underlined and bolded. This does not indicate that those numbers are significantly higher than other numbers in that row.