
**INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY
AND BUSINESS RESEARCH
TECHNICAL REPORT SERIES**

*Ford County Citizen Survey:
Survey Analysis*

by

Henry Schwaller, IV

Kansas Center for Community Economic Development

Charles E. Krider, Co-Director

Institute for Public Policy and Business Research
The University of Kansas

October 1991

Report No. 11

Forward

The Kansas Center for Community Economic Development (KCCED) is funded by a grant from the Economic Development Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce. KCCED is a joint university center between the Institute for Public Policy and Business Research at the University of Kansas and the Kansas Center for Rural Initiatives at Kansas State University. The statements, findings, and conclusions of this report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Government, the University of Kansas, or any other individual or organization.

Special thanks to the staff at the Kansas Center for Community Economic Development and the Institute for Public Policy and Business Research that provided assistance with this analysis: Dr. Larry Hoyle, Director of Information Processing; Dan Roehler, Coordinator - Strategic Planning; Doug LaTessa, Graduate Assistant; Genna Ott, Assistant Director; and Charles E. Krider, Co-Director. KCCED also wishes to thank the Dodge City/Ford County Development Corporation and Robert Wetmore, Agency Director, High Plains Publishers, Inc. for their assistance with this survey

Henry Schwaller, IV
Kansas Center for Community Economic Development
The University of Kansas

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Kansas Center for Community Economic Development, in conjunction with the Dodge City/Ford County Development Corporation and High Plains Publishers, conducted a community attitude survey of the citizens of Ford county. The purpose of the survey was to provide supplemental data for the strategic planning process underway in Ford county.

Survey participants were randomly selected from an area-wide telephone directory. The number of names selected in the county was balanced between small towns and rural areas. Of the 700 individuals chosen to participate in the survey, 545 (or 77.9%) responded.

Overall, key findings from the survey include the following:

- The four economic development strategies most frequently rated as "critical"/"important" to fostering growth in Ford county were retaining/expanding business (89.5%); attracting new business (88.0%); development of public infrastructure systems (81.6%); and improving highway/rail access (80.4%).
- Those strategies most commonly rated as "unimportant" were seeking outside sources for aid (8.3%); tourism (8.2%); and strengthening the meat packing industry (7.6%).
- Twenty-six percent of respondents were engaged in farming or an agriculture-related field, with a greater percentage of county residents -- as compared to Dodge City residents -- engaged in ag-related fields.
- Respondents strongly to somewhat agreed with the following statements - "industries in the community have as much an obligation to the community as the community has to the industry," (90.3%); "in general, a strong work ethic exists in Ford county," (63.1%); "temporary property tax breaks should be available to support new businesses (60.3%); and "establish a local sales tax on goods and services purchased in Ford county to give local property tax relief" (57.8%).
- Those statements most strongly disagreed with were "establish a local sales tax on goods and services purchased in Ford county to support economic development," (28.1%) and "establish a local sales tax on goods and services purchased in Ford county to carry out special capital improvements," (28.1%). A sales tax dedicated for the purpose of property tax relief was also strongly disagreed with, as indicated by 18.9 percent of respondents. Keeping in mind that this statement was also one which was commonly agreed with, this shows that the community is divided -- in terms of support -- for this concept.
- In terms of overall satisfaction, over forty-four percent of respondents were satisfied

with the K-8 public schools and the high schools. On the other hand, Dodge City Community College (DCCC) received a relatively high rating of satisfaction *and* dissatisfaction from respondents. Forty-seven percent were satisfied, but a significant number of respondents -- nine percent -- expressed strong dissatisfaction with DCCC.

- Availability of new homes and housing for seniors was rated "good" to "excellent" by 41.3 and 40.8 percent of respondents, respectively. Those housing issues which were considered "poor" were the availability of single family rentals (15.7%) and low income housing (13.1%).

- Sixty-nine percent rated quality of life in Ford county as "good" to "excellent," and the greatest strengths for the county were the colleges (65.3%), tourism (59.1%), K-12 schools (58.0%); and local events and activities (55.5%). However, earlier responses to other questions about tourism and education revealed that respondents did not consider them to be as important as other economic development strategies or as satisfactory as other educational providers.

- Those quality of life items receiving the highest percentage of "poor" ratings were water-based recreation (62.3%) and recreational facilities (30.3%).

- In terms of health care strengths, over sixty-seven percent of respondents rated the ambulance and health care providers as "good" to "excellent." Those items receiving the majority of the "poor" ratings were the hospital and health care costs.

- Sixty percent of survey respondents support the concept of a publicly funded recycling program, but most (65.4%) are not willing to pay more than \$5 a month for it.

INTRODUCTION

Background

The Kansas Center for Community Economic Development (KCCED) at the University of Kansas, in conjunction with the Dodge City/Ford County Development Corporation and High Plains Publishers, conducted a community attitude survey in Ford county. This survey represents one of the many steps within the community strategic planning process underway in Ford county. The Dodge City/Ford County Development Corporation received a Community Strategic Planning Grant from the State of Kansas in January 1991. The Corporation subsequently chose KCCED to facilitate the planning process and began the process in September 1991.

Two types of data are collected during the strategic planning process: secondary economic data and community attitude data. Data collection, such as community attitude data, is a critical component of the economic development planning process for two reasons. First, it taps into individual and community-wide opinions about the economic and social changes taking place in a community. In other words, it broadens the base of opinion as to the key issues that the process should target. Second, it identifies those economic development strategies which the community is most likely to support and encourage.

The purpose of this survey was to examine the community's feeling and opinions about the following economic development issues in Ford county:

- Economic development strategies
- Agriculture
- Business environment
- Human capital
- Housing issues
- Quality of life
- Health care
- Environment

Procedures

KCCED developed the Ford County Citizen Survey with the members of the strategic planning Steering Committee. The survey was administered by High Plains Publishers in a four step process:

1. *List generation.* Survey participants were randomly selected from an area-wide telephone directory. The number of names selected in the county was balanced between small towns and rural areas, and the initial list included 525 residents of Dodge City and 175 from the county.
2. *Initial mailing.* A copy of the survey, with a cover letter from the strategic planning Steering Committee, was sent to the 700 randomly selected individuals.

Also enclosed in the mailing was a \$2.00 bill to serve as an incentive to participate in the survey.

3. *Follow-up.* A 5"x7" postcard was mailed to all receiving the questionnaire. The card notified the recipient that they would be receiving a call from telemarketing personnel to answer any questions the recipient might have.
4. *Collection and preparation.* Surveys were collected and responses were encoded on a computer disk file to be sent to KCCED.

RESULTS

A. Demographic Data

Survey respondents were first asked a series of background questions relating to their place of residence, length of residence in Ford county, employment status, age, gender, and education (Tables 1-7). Residents of Dodge City comprised 64.4 percent of the total sample, while the majority of the other respondents lived in rural areas outside of a city (10.6%), Bucklin (8.1%), and Spearville (7.2%). Most respondents (61.6%) have lived in Ford county for more than twenty years.

Over sixty-seven percent of respondents were employed (or self-employed), and most worked full-time (92.4%). In terms of age, individuals who were 66 years of age or older represented 29.9 percent of the total sample, while middle-aged persons -- those who were 26-45 years old -- comprised 36.2 percent of the total. The vast majority of respondents were also male (72%).

Sixty-one percent had completed some education beyond high school, such as trade/technical school, college, or graduate work. On the other hand, only 12.8 percent did not complete high school.

Table 1
Place of Residence of Survey Respondents:
Total Sample

<u>Location:</u>	<u>N¹</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Bellefont	3	0.6%
Bucklin	44	8.1
Dodge City	351	64.4
Ford	27	5.0
Kingsdown	14	2.6
Spearville	39	7.2
Wilroads Gardens	6	1.1
Windthorst	2	0.4
Wright	1	0.2
Rural Area	58	10.6
TOTAL	545	

¹number of persons responding to question

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.*

Table 2
Length of Residence in Ford County: Total Sample

<u>Years:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
< 1	5	0.9%
1-5	71	13.1
6-10	55	10.1
11-20	77	14.2
> 20	334	61.6

TOTAL 542

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.*

Table 3
Employment Status: Total Sample

<u>Status:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Employed	257	47.4%
Self-employed	107	19.7
Retired	156	28.8
Student	6	1.1
Not employed	16	3.0

TOTAL 542

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.*

Table 4
Type of Employment Held by Respondents

<u>Type:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Full-time	328	92.4%
Part-time	27	7.6
TOTAL	355	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.*

Table 6
Gender of Respondents

<u>Gender:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Male	381	72.0%
Female	148	28.0
TOTAL	529	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.*

Table 5
Age Range of Respondents

<u>Range:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0-25	23	4.2%
26-35	99	18.2
36-45	98	18.0
46-55	78	14.3
56-65	83	15.3
66 and older	163	29.9
TOTAL	544	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.*

Table 7
Highest Level of Educational Attainment

<u>Level:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
No formal education	3	0.6%
Elementary	34	6.4
Some high school	31	5.8
High school	141	26.4
Tech/trade school	47	8.8
Some college	118	22.1
Assoc.degree	26	4.9
College degree	68	12.7
Grad. work	67	12.5
TOTAL	535	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.*

In the next sections, the responses of survey participants are presented across eight categories of economic development issues. The results are condensed into those areas of greatest and least concern/importance/strength, as rated by respondents, and are tabulated by age group (0-35, 36-55, and 56 and older), residence (Dodge City and rest of county), and the total sample. In-depth data results are presented in **Appendices 1-6**.

The purpose of presenting data by each distinct group is to demonstrate unique needs within each group. As a result, the community strategic planning exercise can target the those specific group needs, in addition to the needs of the community as a whole.

B. Economic Development Strategies

Survey participants were asked to rate the importance of eighteen economic development strategies to diversify and foster economic growth in Ford county. The top four strategies, in terms of being rated as "critical", are presented in **Table 8**. Overall, the retention and expansion of existing businesses was

most commonly rated as a critical strategy. For the 0-35 age group, however, the attraction of new business was rated as the most critical economic development strategy (as chosen by 57% of the group). Other strategies most frequently mentioned included improving highway/rail access, development of public infrastructure systems, regional health care center, starting/helping new businesses, and expanding agri-business opportunities.

When "critical" and "important" responses were combined, the rankings changed slightly (Table 9). While retention/expansion of existing businesses remained the most critical strategy, regional health care center dropped from the list and a well-skilled workforce was added. Rankings for the other strategies were also subsequently altered. On the other hand, those strategies believed to be least important were seeking outside sources of aid and grants, tourism, strengthening meat packing, and retirement industry/facilities for seniors (Table 10).

Table 8
Economic Development Strategies Rated "Critical" By Respondents:
Rank and Percentage Response By Category (Top Four Strategies)

<u>Strategies:</u>	<u>Total Sample:</u>	<u>Dodge City:</u>	<u>County:</u>	<u>Age Group:</u>		
				<u>0-35:</u>	<u>36-55:</u>	<u>56 and up:</u>
Retain/expand bus.	1 (50.6)	1 (56.5)	1 (39.6)	2 (49.6)	1 (64.0)	1 (40.7)
Attract new bus.	2 (49.2)	2 (54.5)	2 (39.1)	1 (57.0)	2 (58.3)	2 (37.9)
Improve hiway/rail	3 (35.9)	3 (35.2)	3 (37.2)	3 (38.5)	4 (36.6)	4 (33.9)
Reg.health care ctr.						3 (36.0)
Bus.start ups					3 (40.2)	
Infra.devo.	4 (32.0)			4 (36.9)		
Expand ag.bus.		4 (27.2)	4 (34.1)			

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 9
Economic Development Strategies Rated "Critical" to "Important"
By Respondents: Rank and Percentage Response by Category (Top Four Strategies)

<u>Strategies:</u>	<u>Total Sample:</u>	<u>Dodge City:</u>	<u>County:</u>	<u>Age Group:</u>		
				<u>0-35:</u>	<u>36-55:</u>	<u>56 and up:</u>
Retain/expand bus.	1 (89.5)	1 (91.2)	1 (86.3)	2 (92.6)	1 (93.1)	1 (84.9)
Attract new bus.	2 (88.0)	2 (90.9)	2 (82.7)	1 (95.0)	2 (91.4)	3 (82.2)
Improve hiway/rail	4 (80.4)		3 (82.6)			2 (82.2)
Infra.devo.	3 (81.6)	4 (83.3)			4 (84.9)	
Skilled workforce		3 (85.7)		4 (87.5)	3 (86.3)	4 (80.3)
Expand ag.bus.			4 (81.4)			
Bus.start-ups				3 (88.3)		

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 10
Economic Development Strategies Most Commonly Rated
"Unimportant" by Respondents

<u>Strategies:</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Sample:</u>	<u>Dodge</u> <u>City:</u>	<u>County:</u>	<u>Age Group:</u>		
				<u>0-35:</u>	<u>36-55:</u>	<u>56 and up:</u>
State/fed.grants/aid	8.3%	8.1%		5.8%		12.7%
Tourism	8.2		11.5	9.1	6.3	
Streng.meat pcking.	7.6	8.3			5.7	10.4
Retirement indust.					5.7	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.*

C. Agriculture

Two questions relating to the agricultural base of Ford county were asked of the survey participants. The first question asked respondents if they were engaged in farming or an agriculture-related field. Survey results showed that 143 persons (26.2% of the total sample) were engaged in an agriculture-related field. As expected, a greater percentage of persons living in the county -- as compared to those living in Dodge City -- were involved with an ag-related field (44.3% and 16.2%, respectively). The 36-55 age group was more likely to be engaged in an ag-related field (30.7%), and those age 0-35 were least likely (19.7%).

The second question related to agriculture sought further information from those who indicated that they were engaged in an ag-related field, asking them to list the top three agricultural services needed in Ford county. All responses are listed in **Appendix 7**.

D. Business Environment

Survey respondents were most likely to strongly agree with the following statement: "industries in the community have as much an obligation to the community as the community has to the industry" (**Table 11**). Other statements which participants strongly agreed with were: "establish a local sales tax on goods and services purchased in Ford county to give property tax relief," and "temporary local property tax breaks should be available to support new businesses...[and] business expansion...[and] existing businesses." Results changed slightly when "strongly agree" and "agree" percentages were combined: the statement "in general, a strong 'work ethic' exists in Ford county" was added, and the rankings for all statements subsequently changed (**Table 12**).

Those statements which were most often "strongly disagree[d]" with were: "establish a local sales tax on goods and services purchased in Ford county to support economic development...[and] give property tax relief...[and] carry out special capital improvements," and "incentives using public money should be used to encourage new and expanding businesses and industries" (**Table 13**).

Table 11
Business Environment in Ford County - Statements Rated
"Strongly Agree" By Respondents: Rank and Percentage
Response By Category (Top Four Statements)

<u>Attitudes:</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Sample:</u>	<u>Dodge</u> <u>City:</u>	<u>County:</u>	<u>Age Groups:</u>		
				<u>0-35:</u>	<u>36-55:</u>	<u>56 and up:</u>
Industry Obligation	1 (62.2)	1 (61.2)	1 (64.0)	1 (58.3)	1 (61.4)	1 (64.7)
Local sales tax for: prop. tax relief	2 (29.1)	2 (31.4)	2 (24.7)	3 (20.7)		2 (37.7)
Prop. tax breaks for: new business	3 (23.4)	4 (23.5)	3 (23.1)	2 (25.6)	2 (35.6)	4 (13.0)
retaining business	4 (22.0)	3 (25.5)	4 (15.6)	4 (19.8)	3 (29.3)	3 (17.8)
expanding business					4 (26.3)	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 12
Business Environment in Ford County - Statements Rated
"Strongly Agree" to "Agree" by Respondents:
Rank and Percentage Response By Category (Top Four Statements)

<u>Attitudes:</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Sample:</u>	<u>Dodge</u> <u>City:</u>	<u>County:</u>	<u>Age Groups:</u>		
				<u>0-35:</u>	<u>36-55:</u>	<u>56 and up:</u>
Industry Obligation	1 (90.3)	1 (90.0)	1 (90.9)	4 (58.3)	1 (88.9)	1 (89.4)
Strong work ethic	2 (63.1)	3 (59.0)	2 (70.8)	2 (60.8)	3 (68.6)	3 (60.0)
Prop. tax break for: new business	3 (60.3)	2 (64.5)	4 (52.2)	1 (68.6)	2 (70.7)	
expanding business		4 (58.8)		3 (60.0)	4 (65.7)	
retaining business						4 (50.0)
Local sales tax for: prop. tax relief	4 (57.8)		3 (56.6)			2 (62.7)

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 13
Business Environment in Ford County - Statements
Most Commonly Rated "Strongly Disagree" By Respondents

<u>Attitudes:</u>	<u>Total Sample:</u>	<u>Dodge City:</u>	<u>County:</u>	<u>0-35:</u>	<u>Age Group:</u>	
					<u>36-55:</u>	<u>56 and up:</u>
Local Sales tax for:						
cap. improvements	28.1	26.6	30.9	23.3	29.9	29.3
eco.devo.support	28.1	25.7	32.4	20.8	26.4	33.2
prop.tax relief	18.9	19.6		14.0	23.6	
Public incent.for bus.			18.4			

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

E. Human Capital

Respondents' assessment of the various educational providers differed by location and age group. St. Mary's college was most frequently given a "very satisfied" rating by the total sample (13.6%), residents of Dodge City (15.2%), residents age 36-55 (14.7%), and residents age 56 and older (14.4%) (Table 14). County residents most commonly favored K-8 public schools (18.8%), while residents age 0-35 preferred pre-schools (14.2%). Other schools in the top four -- those given a "very satisfied" rating -- were Dodge City Community College (DCCC), K-8 private schools, and high schools.

Results changed when "very satisfied" to "satisfied" ratings were combined (Table 15). K-8 public schools were most commonly chosen by the total sample (51.1%), county residents (61.2%), and residents age 36-55 (60.5%). DCCC was most frequently chosen by Dodge City residents (47.9%) and residents age 0-35, while residents age 56 and older chose the high school (46.0%).

DCCC received the greatest percentage of "dissatisfied" responses: 9 percent of the total sample, 9.9 percent of Dodge City residents, 7.2 percent of county residents, 10.3 percent of residents age 0-35, 8.9 percent of residents age 36-55, and 8.3 percent of residents age 56 and older. Interestingly, residents age 0-35 were also more likely to have favorably rated DCCC; however, their negative feelings were higher than the other age groups.

Table 14
Education Providers Rated "Very Satisfied" By Respondents:
Rank and Percentage By Category (Top Four Providers)

<u>Providers:</u>	<u>Total</u>		<u>Dodge</u>		<u>County:</u>		<u>0-35:</u>		<u>Age Group:</u>		<u>56 and up:</u>	
	<u>Sample:</u>		<u>City:</u>						<u>36-55:</u>			
St. Mary's college	1	(13.6)	1	(15.2)			3	(10.4)	1	(14.7)	1	(14.4)
Pre-school	2	(12.0)	4	(8.6)	2	(18.7)	1	(14.2)	2	(11.2)	4	(11.4)
K-8, public	3	(11.2)			1	(18.8)	2	(13.4)	4	(9.3)	3	(11.6)
DCCC	4	(10.0)	2	(9.3)	4	(11.4)	4	(9.4)	3	(9.5)		
K-8, private			3	(9.2)								
High School					3	(15.2)					2	(12.0)

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.*

Table 15
Education Providers Rated "Very Satisfied" to "Satisfied"
By Respondents: Rank and Percentage By Category (Top Four Providers)

<u>Providers:</u>	<u>Total</u>		<u>Dodge</u>		<u>County:</u>		<u>0-35:</u>		<u>Age Group:</u>		<u>56 and up:</u>	
	<u>Sample:</u>		<u>City:</u>						<u>36-55:</u>			
K-8, public	1	(51.1)	2	(46.0)	1	(61.2)	2	(46.2)	1	(60.5)	2	(45.9)
DCCC	2	(47.1)	1	(47.9)	3	(45.5)	1	(50.4)	3	(50.0)	4	(42.7)
High School	3	(44.5)			2	(55.4)	4	(33.9)	4	(49.7)	1	(46.0)
St. Mary's college	4	(42.4)	3	(44.7)							3	(43.3)
Pre-school			4	(40.3)	4	(44.0)	3	(38.4)	2	(52.4)		

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.*

Table 16
Education Providers Most Commonly Rated "Dissatisfied" By Respondents

<u>Providers:</u>	<u>Total</u>		<u>Dodge</u>		<u>County:</u>		<u>0-35:</u>		<u>Age Group:</u>		<u>56 and up:</u>	
	<u>Sample:</u>		<u>City:</u>						<u>36-55:</u>			
DCCC		9.0		9.9		7.2		10.3		8.9		8.3

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.*

F. Housing Issues

Availability of senior housing was considered "excellent" by participants, and it was most frequently chosen by all age groups and residents (Table 18). New home availability ranked second, in terms of "excellent" ratings, and other housing which received this rating included single family housing, financing, mobile home parks, and apartments.

Combined "excellent" to "good" ratings changed the results: new home availability was chosen most often by the total sample (41.3%), county residents (33.5%), and residents age 0-35 (45.8%) (Table 18). Senior housing was most commonly picked by Dodge City residents (46.0%) and residents age 36-55, while residents age 56 and older listed single family housing (35.7%). Conversely, single family rentals and low income housing were most frequently rated as "poor" by survey participants (Table 19).

Table 17
Housing Availability - Items Rated "Excellent" By Respondents:
Rank and Percentage By Category

<u>Availability:</u>	<u>Total Sample:</u>		<u>Dodge City:</u>		<u>County:</u>		<u>0-35:</u>		<u>Age Group:</u>		<u>36-55:</u>		<u>56 and up:</u>	
Senior Housing	1	(11.7)	1	(14.3)	1	(6.7)	1	(11.0)	1	(17.1)	1	(7.8)		
New Homes	2	(9.1)	2	(10.7)	2	(6.1)	2	(10.2)	2	(11.2)	2	(6.9)		
Sing.fam.housing	3	(7.0)	3	(9.0)	4	(3.4)	3	(6.0)	3	(9.4)	3	(5.6)		
Financing	4	(5.7)	4	(7.3)			4	(5.1)	4	(6.4)	4	(5.5)		
Mobile home parks					4	(3.4)								
Apartments					3	(3.8)			4	(6.4)				

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 18
Housing Availability - Items Rated "Excellent" to "Good" By Respondents:
Rank and Percentage By Category

<u>Availability:</u>	<u>Total Sample:</u>		<u>Dodge City:</u>		<u>County:</u>		<u>0-35:</u>		<u>Age Group:</u>		<u>36-55:</u>		<u>56 and up:</u>	
New Homes	1	(41.3)	2	(45.6)	1	(33.5)	1	(45.8)	2	(46.5)	3	(34.9)		
Senior Housing	2	(40.9)	1	(46.0)	2	(31.4)	2	(40.7)	1	(48.3)	2	(35.3)		
Sing.fam.housing	3	(32.1)	3	(38.0)					3	(42.1)	1	(35.7)		
Mobile home parks	4	(28.5)			3	(25.9)			4	(32.8)	4	(26.1)		
Financing			4	(31.3)			3	(34.8)						
Apartments					4	(23.6)	4	(33.4)						

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 19
Housing Availability - Items Most Commonly Rated "Poor" By Respondents

<u>Availability:</u>	<u>Total Sample:</u>		<u>Dodge City:</u>		<u>County:</u>		<u>0-35:</u>		<u>Age Group:</u>		<u>36-55:</u>		<u>56 and up:</u>	
Sing.fam.rentals		15.7		18.2		11.0		22.2		16.4				11.7
Low income housing		13.1												

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

G. Quality of Life

Three questions relating to the quality of life in Ford county were given to survey participants. In the first, respondents were asked to rate the overall quality of life in the county (Table 20). Sixty-nine percent rated Ford county "good" to "excellent" in this area, with the vast majority (60.4%) choosing "good". Only 4.3 percent rated Ford county "poor" in this category. County residents were more likely to rate quality of life "good" to "excellent" than Dodge City residents. The same was true for older residents: older participants were more positive about quality of life in Ford county.

When asked to compare the present quality of life in Ford county to that of ten years ago (Table 21). Most respondents generally agreed that it had remained about the same, with the remainder more likely to rate it worse rather than better. Older residents and Dodge City residents were more apt to rate quality of life worse.

Eleven quality of life aspects of Ford county were listed, and participants were asked to rate each one. Respondents could add their own comments under the category of "other," and those responses are listed in Appendix 8. Colleges in Ford county its greatest asset, according to the total sample (13.6%), Dodge City residents (15.0%), and those survey participants who were 56 years old and older (16.9%) (Table 22). County residents most often rated schools (11.5%) as the best aspect of the county, while residents age 0-35 chose the environment (40%). Ford county residents age 36-55 most frequently picked local events and activities (10.0%). Other strengths also chosen were tourism, cultural arts, and "other".

When "excellent" and "good" responses were combined, Ford county colleges were most often listed, except for those residents age 0-35 (Table 23). This age group chose the environment as the greatest aspect.

Water-based recreation, recreation facilities, retail shopping, and economic development activities were most frequently rated "poor" by survey respondents (Table 24). Overall, recreation -- both water-based and facilities -- were considered the weakest aspect of Ford county's quality of life.

Table 20
Overall Quality of Life in Ford County:
Responses By Total Sample, Location, and Age Category

	Total Sample		Dodge City		County		Age 0-35		Age 36-55		Age > 56	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Excellent	46	9.0	23	6.9	23	12.8	9	7.6	14	8.2	23	10.3
Good	309	60.4	196	58.9	113	63.1	66	55.9	96	56.1	147	65.9
Fair	135	26.4	95	28.5	40	22.3	34	28.8	53	31.0	48	21.5
Poor	22	4.3	19	5.7	3	1.7	9	7.6	8	4.7	5	2.2

Source: Ford County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 21
Changes in Quality of Life in Ford County

	<u>Total Sample</u>		<u>Dodge City</u>		<u>County</u>		<u>Age 0-35</u>		<u>Age 36-55</u>		<u>Age > 56</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Better	102	19.6	65	19.1	37	20.6	30	25.4	23	13.5	49	21.2
Worse	158	30.4	115	33.8	43	23.9	27	22.9	52	30.4	79	34.2
Same	260	50.0	160	47.1	100	55.6	61	51.7	96	56.1	103	44.6

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.*

Table 22
**Quality of Life Aspects of Ford County Rated "Excellent" By Respondents:
 Rank and Percentage Response By Category**

<u>Aspects:</u>	<u>Total Sample:</u>		<u>Dodge City:</u>		<u>County:</u>		<u>0-35:</u>		<u>Age Group: 36-55:</u>		<u>56 and up:</u>	
Colleges	1	(13.6)	1	(15.0)	2	(10.9)	3	(13.3)	2	(9.4)	1	(16.9)
Tourism	2	(10.5)	2	(11.6)	4	(8.5)	2	(14.2)	1	(10.0)	2	(8.9)
Environment	3	(8.8)			3	(9.6)	1	(40.0)	3	(8.8)	3	(8.7)
Local Events	4	(8.1)	3	(10.1)					1	(10.0)		
Cultural Arts			4	(9.7)							4	(8.3)
Schools					1	(11.5)						
Other							4	(12.5)				

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.*

Table 23
**Quality of Life Aspects of Ford County Rated "Excellent" to "Good" By Respondents:
 Rank and Percentage Response By Category**

<u>Aspects:</u>	<u>Total Sample:</u>		<u>Dodge City:</u>		<u>County:</u>		<u>0-35:</u>		<u>Age Group: 36-55:</u>		<u>56 and up:</u>	
Colleges	1	(65.3)	1	(66.5)	1	(62.9)	2	(65.8)	1	(67.0)	1	(63.5)
Tourism	2	(59.1)	2	(63.3)			4	(57.5)	2	(62.4)		
Schools	3	(58.0)	4	(55.5)	2	(62.6)	3	(58.5)	4	(55.0)	2	(60.1)
Local Events	4	(55.5)	3	(56.1)	3	(54.5)			3	(57.1)	3	(58.8)
Environment					4	(51.4)	1	(77.5)			4	(57.8)

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.*

Table 24
Quality of Life Aspects Most Commonly Rated "Poor" By Respondents

<u>Aspects:</u>	<u>Total Sample:</u>	<u>Dodge City:</u>	<u>County:</u>	<u>0-35:</u>	<u>Age Group: 36-55:</u>	<u>56 and up:</u>
Water Recreation	62.3	63.7	59.7	67.2	71.9	52.1
Recreation	30.3	33.3	24.4	48.7	33.5	17.7
Retail Shopping	19.9	22.4	15.3	31.7		10.4
Other	18.5	20.3	16.0	31.3	27.5	
Eco.Devo.Activities					25.5	10.5

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

H. Health Care

The greatest health care asset in Ford county is its ambulance, according to the total sample and each of the five categories (**Table 25**). The next health care item most commonly rated as "excellent" was health care providers. The hospital, elder care, and other health care facilities were also frequently rated "excellent." When "excellent" to "good" appraisals were combined, the ambulance and health care providers remained the first and second ranked items, respectively (**Table 26**). The rankings of the other three items changed slightly. **Table 27** shows that respondents were least satisfied with the hospital and, not surprisingly, health care costs.

Table 25
Health Care Services Rated "Excellent" By Respondents:
Rank and Percentage Response By Category

<u>Item</u>	<u>Total:</u>	<u>Dodge City:</u>	<u>County:</u>	<u>Age 0-35</u>	<u>Age 36-55</u>	<u>Age 56 and up:</u>
Ambulance	1 (25.6)	1 (25.2)	1 (26.4)	1 (16.9)	1 (22.2)	1 (32.7)
HC providers	2 (15.5)	2 (18.5)	2 (9.9)	2 (14.7)	2 (12.5)	2 (18.3)
Hospital	3 (10.6)	4 (11.4)	3 (9.0)		4 (8.8)	3 (13.5)
Elder care	3 (10.6)	3 (12.1)	4 (7.9)	4 (9.3)	3 (10.6)	4 (11.3)
Other facilities				3 (9.5)		

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 26
Top Four Health Care Services Rated "Excellent" to "Good" By Respondents:
Rank and Percentage Response By Category

Item	Total:		Dodge City:		County:		Age 0-35		Age 36-55		Age 56 and up:	
	Rank	(%)	Rank	(%)	Rank	(%)	Rank	(%)	Rank	(%)	Rank	(%)
Ambulance	1	(71.3)	1	(68.5)	1	(76.4)	2	(59.3)	1	(68.9)	1	(79.3)
HC providers	2	(66.9)	2	(67.6)	2	(65.7)	1	(64.2)	2	(64.9)	2	(69.7)
Other facilities	3	(54.7)	3	(54.6)	4	(55.0)	3	(50.0)	3	(59.0)	4	(54.0)
Hospital	4	(52.3)	4	(50.6)	3	(55.3)	4	(42.3)			3	(57.4)
Elder care									4	(53.0)		

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 27
Health Care Services Most Commonly Rated "Poor" By Respondents Regarding Business Environment in Ford County

Item	Total:	Dodge City:		County:		Age 0-35		Age 36-55		Age 56 and up:	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Hospital	16.6	18.0	14.1	21.2	18.2	13.0					
HC costs	41.8	41.7	41.9	42.7	43.6	39.8					

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

I. Environment: Recycling

Sixty percent of respondents support the concept of a publicly funded recycling program, but most (65.2%) are not willing to spend more than \$5 a month for it (Tables 28-29). Dodge City residents and residents age 0-35 were more supportive of the concept of publicly funded recycling and were slightly more willing to pay more than \$5 a month for it.

Table 28
Percentage of Respondents Supporting Publicly Funded Recycling in Ford County: Responses By Total Sample, Location, and Age Category

	Total Sample		Dodge City		County		Age 0-35		Age 36-55		Age >56	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	273	59.1	191	64.1	82	50	77	70	88	55.7	108	55.7
No	189	40.9	107	35.9	82	50	33	30	70	44.3	86	44.3

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 29

Cost that Respondents are Willing to Pay for Recycling in Ford County:
Responses By Total Sample, Location, and Age Category

	<u>Total Sample</u>		<u>Dodge City</u>		<u>County</u>		<u>Age 0-35</u>		<u>Age 36-55</u>		<u>Age > 56</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
< \$5	178	65.4	123	64.4	55	67.9	44	57.1	57	64.8	77	72.0
\$5-10	88	32.4	62	32.5	26	32.1	30	39.0	29	33.0	29	27.1
> \$10	6	2.2	6	3.1	0	0.0	3	3.9	2	2.3	1	0.9

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.*

CONCLUSION

Strategic planning efforts enjoy greater success when a broad array of individual ideas, opinions, and attitudes are utilized in the process. Therefore, a survey of Ford county residents attempted to draw upon commonly held attitudes and beliefs about the economic strengths and weaknesses of the community.

Several key findings emerged from the survey:

- Respondents were more likely to support an economic development strategy which retained/expanded business, attracted new business, developed a well-skilled workforce, and/or developed public infrastructure systems. They were less likely to support seeking outside sources for aid, tourism, and strengthening the meat packing industry.
- Twenty-six percent of respondents were engaged in farming or an agriculture-related field. County residents and residents age 36-55 were more likely to be employed in an ag-related field.
- Respondents strongly to somewhat agreed that: a) industry has an obligation to the community, b) a strong work ethic exists in the county, and c) property tax abatements should be used to lure new businesses. Respondents were less likely to strongly agree with the statement that a strong work ethic exists in Ford county.
- Survey participants strongly disagreed with the concept of establishing local sales taxes on goods and services purchased in Ford county to support economic development or carry out special capital improvements.
- In terms of overall satisfaction, over forty-four percent of respondents were satisfied with the K-8 public schools and the high schools. Even though Dodge City Community College (DCCC) received a relatively high rating of satisfaction, a significant number of respondents also expressed strong dissatisfaction with DCCC. Younger residents -- those age 0-35 -- and Dodge City residents tended to express greater dissatisfaction with DCCC than the other categories.
- Availability of new homes and housing for seniors was rated "good" to "excellent" by 41.3 and 40.8 percent of respondents, respectively. Those housing issues which were considered "poor" were the availability of single family rentals (15.7%) and low income housing (13.1%). Single family rentals were a greater concern for residents age 0-35 and those living in Dodge City.
- Although respondents listed tourism, colleges, and K-12 schools as the greatest strengths for the county, earlier responses to other questions about tourism and education revealed seemingly contradictory feelings. Respondents considered tourism as one of the least

important economic development strategies, and a significant percentage expressed strong dissatisfaction with the community college.

- Those quality of life items receiving the highest percentage of "poor" ratings were water-based recreation, recreation, retail shopping, economic development activities, and other items, as listed by respondents. On the issues of recreation facilities, residents age 0-35 were more likely to rate them as poor, in comparison with the other age groups. Residents age 36-55 were more concerned with water-based recreation, relative to the other age groups.

- While the ambulance and health care providers were considered the best of several health care items, the hospital and health care costs were most likely to be rated as poor. Dodge City residents and those age 0-35 were more critical of the hospital.

- Fifty-nine percent of survey respondents support the concept of a publicly funded recycling program, but most (65.4%) are not willing to pay more than \$5 a month for it. Younger residents -- those age 0-35 -- and those living in Dodge City were more supportive of publicly-funded recycling, relative to their counterparts. The older age cohorts were also more likely to support a smaller cost for such a program.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

Ford County Citizen Survey: Responses for Total Sample

Table 1
Economic Development Strategies -
Relative Importance to Ford County's Economic Growth: Total Sample

Strategy:	N	Important		Unimportant		DK
		1	2	3	4	
Retain/expand bus.	522	50.6%	38.9%	7.5%	0.8%	2.3%
Attract new bus.	520	49.2	38.8	9.0	0.8	2.1
Improve highway/rail	524	35.9	44.5	15.5	2.1	2.1
Infrastructure devo.	518	32.0	49.6	14.1	1.4	2.9
Bus.start-ups	515	31.8	44.7	16.5	2.9	4.1
Skilled workforce	519	31.6	52.4	11.4	1.5	3.1
Reg.health care cntr.	520	31.3	42.1	20.4	3.5	2.7
Expand.ag-business	517	29.6	49.1	17.2	1.7	2.3
Bus./govt.cooperation	511	28.2	46.8	18.2	2.7	4.1
State/fed.grants/aid	515	25.8	37.1	23.1	8.3	5.6
Conservation pgms.	514	25.7	45.7	23.7	1.9	2.9
Coop.w/communities	520	25.6	46.7	24.0	1.9	1.7
Improve bus.financing	517	21.3	44.1	24.0	3.5	7.2
Commercial/retail.devo.	512	18.4	44.5	27.9	2.5	6.6
Improve.exist.firms	517	18.0	46.2	26.1	4.1	5.6
Tourism	522	17.8	35.8	35.2	8.2	2.8
Retirement indust.	522	17.4	41.0	34.5	5.4	1.7
Streng.meat packing	516	16.3	40.3	31.8	7.6	4.1

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 2
Attitudes Regarding
Business Environment in Ford County: Total Sample

Statement:	N	Agree		Disagree		DK
		1	2	3	4	
Industry obligation	526	62.2%	28.1%	5.1%	0.8%	3.8%
Local sales tax for:						
prop.tax relief	523	29.1	28.7	17.6	18.9	5.7
eco.devo.support	520	12.5	25.8	26.9	28.1	6.7
cap.improvements	519	10.0	26.8	24.5	28.1	10.6
Prop.tax breaks for:						
new business	526	23.4	36.9	20.3	12.5	6.8
retaining business	531	22.0	33.1	22.8	13.9	8.1
expanding business	519	16.0	39.7	23.7	13.7	6.9
Public incent.for bus.	516	13.6	36.4	27.3	15.7	7.0
Strong work ethic	517	7.4	55.7	22.2	4.6	10.1

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 3
Satisfaction With Educational
Providers in Ford County: Total Sample

Provider:	N	Satisfied		Dissatisfied		DK
		1	2	3	4	
St. Mary's college	486	13.6 %	28.8 %	2.7 %	1.9 %	53.1 %
Pre-school	491	12.0	29.5	3.1	2.0	53.4
K-8, public	489	11.2	39.9	9.2	2.9	36.8
DCCC	491	10.0	37.1	9.8	9.0	34.2
K-8, private	470	8.9	16.8	2.1	1.3	70.9
High school	488	8.8	35.7	11.3	4.7	39.5
AVTS	476	6.9	28.2	7.6	3.6	53.8

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 4
Housing Availability
in Ford County: Total Sample

Availability of:	N	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	DK
Senior housing	506	11.7 %	29.2 %	17.4 %	7.1 %	34.6 %
New homes	506	9.1	32.2	22.7	4.5	31.4
Single fam. housing	502	7.0	25.1	23.3	8.8	35.9
Financing	509	5.7	20.8	21.2	12.6	39.7
Apartments	510	4.3	22.9	26.3	7.1	39.4
Mobile home parks	503	3.6	24.9	20.9	8.0	42.7
Low income housing	502	3.2	18.5	19.5	13.1	45.6
Single fam. rentals	510	2.7	17.8	23.9	15.7	39.8

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 5
Overall Quality of Life
in Ford County: Total Sample

Rating:	N	Percent
Excellent	46	9.0 %
Good	309	60.4
Fair	135	26.4
Poor	22	4.3
TOTAL	512	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 6
Changes in Quality of Life
in Ford County: Total Sample

<u>Community has become:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Better	102	19.6%
Worse	158	30.4
About the same	260	50.0
TOTAL	520	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 7
Quality of Life Aspects of Ford County: Total Sample

<u>Aspect:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>DK</u>
Colleges	509	13.6%	51.7%	21.2%	4.1%	9.4%
Tourism	504	10.5	48.6	29.0	4.8	7.1
Environment	509	8.8	43.6	35.2	8.6	3.7
Local events	506	8.1	47.4	32.6	7.1	4.7
Cultural arts	506	7.5	34.6	33.2	8.5	16.2
Schools	502	7.4	50.6	25.1	6.4	10.6
Retail shopping	512	6.1	37.5	34.2	19.9	2.3
Other	119	5.9	7.6	15.1	18.5	52.9
Industry	498	3.4	44.0	39.0	9.0	4.6
Recreation	509	2.6	22.0	39.7	30.3	5.5
Water rec.	509	1.2	7.3	19.3	62.3	10.0
Eco.devo.activ.	493	0.8	15.4	38.3	17.6	27.8

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 8
Health Care in Ford County: Total Sample

<u>Item:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>DK</u>
Ambulance	508	25.6%	45.7%	9.6%	0.6%	18.5%
HC providers	502	15.5	51.4	24.1	4.2	4.8
Hospital	511	10.6	41.7	28.2	16.6	2.9
Elder care	509	10.6	36.1	21.2	5.9	26.1
Other facil.	497	7.4	47.3	25.4	3.8	16.1
HC costs	491	2.0	12.6	35.2	41.8	8.4

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 9
Percentage of Respondents Supporting
Publicly Funded Recycling in Ford County:
Total Sample

<u>Support:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	273	59.1%
No	189	40.9
TOTAL	463	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.*

Table 10
Cost That Respondents are Willing to
Pay for Recycling in Ford County: Total Sample

<u>Monthly</u> <u>Amount:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
< \$5	178	65.4%
\$5-10	88	32.4
> \$10	6	2.2
TOTAL	272	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.*

APPENDIX 2

Ford County Citizen Survey:
Responses of County Residents

Table 1
Economic Development Strategies -
Relative Importance to Ford County's Economic Growth: County Residents

Strategy:	N	Important		Unimportant		DK
		1	2	3	4	
Retain/expand bus.	194	39.6%	46.7%	8.8%	1.1%	3.8%
Attract new bus.	179	39.1	43.6	12.3	1.7	3.4
Improve highway/rail	183	37.2	45.4	13.7	1.1	2.7
Expand.ag-business	182	34.1	47.3	13.7	1.6	3.3
Coop.w/communities	182	33.0	47.3	17.6	0.5	1.6
Infrastructure devo.	181	32.0	46.4	16.6	1.1	3.9
Reg.health care cntr.	182	29.7	42.3	20.9	4.9	2.2
Bus.start-ups	180	26.1	45.0	16.1	5.6	7.2
Bus./govt.cooperation	177	24.9	47.5	19.8	2.8	5.1
Skilled workforce	182	24.7	56.0	12.1	2.7	4.4
State/fed.grants/aid	180	23.9	32.2	27.8	8.9	7.2
Conservation pgms.	180	22.8	46.1	26.1	1.1	3.9
Improve bus.financing	179	20.1	41.3	25.7	5.0	7.8
Streng.meat packing	178	19.1	36.0	33.7	6.2	5.1
Improve.exist.firms	179	17.3	43.6	27.4	3.9	7.8
Retirement indust.	182	16.5	42.3	31.9	7.1	2.2
Commercial/retail.devo.	178	14.6	41.6	30.9	3.9	9.0
Tourism	182	11.5	26.9	45.1	11.5	4.9

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 2
Attitudes Regarding
Business Environment in Ford County: County Residents

Statement:	N	Agree		Disagree		DK
		1	2	3	4	
Industry obligation	186	64.0%	26.9%	3.8%	1.1%	4.3%
Local sales tax for:						
prop.tax relief	182	24.7	31.9	19.8	17.6	6.0
eco.devo.support	182	9.3	20.3	31.9	32.4	6.0
cap.improvements	181	6.6	24.9	31.5	30.9	6.1
Prop.tax breaks for:						
new business	182	23.1	29.1	26.9	14.3	6.6
retaining business	186	15.6	31.2	28.0	17.2	8.1
expanding business	181	12.2	37.6	27.6	17.7	5.0
Public incent.for bus.	179	13.4	33.0	30.7	18.4	4.5
Strong work ethic	178	5.1	65.7	15.7	3.4	10.1

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 3
Satisfaction With Educational
Providers in Ford County: County Residents

Provider:	N	Satisfied		Dissatisfied		DK
		1	2	3	4	
K-8, public	165	18.8%	42.4%	7.3%	2.4%	29.1%
Pre-school	166	18.7	25.3	1.2	0.6	54.2
High school	164	15.2	40.2	7.9	5.5	31.1
DCCC	167	11.4	34.1	9.6	7.2	37.7
AVTS	157	10.8	28.0	4.5	3.8	52.9
St.Mary's college	164	10.4	27.4	2.4	2.4	57.3
K-8, private	155	8.4	17.4	0.6	0.6	72.9

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 4
Housing Availability in Ford County: County Residents

Availability of:	N	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	DK
Senior housing	178	6.7%	24.7%	20.8%	6.7%	41.0%
New homes	179	6.1	27.4	21.2	5.6	39.7
Apartments	182	3.8	19.8	20.9	7.1	48.4
Mobile home parks	178	3.4	22.5	22.5	5.1	46.6
Single fam.housing	178	3.4	18.0	25.8	6.2	46.6
Single fam.rentals	181	2.8	17.1	22.1	11.0	47.0
Financing	180	2.8	15.0	23.3	13.3	45.6
Low income housing	180	2.2	11.7	19.4	16.7	50.0

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 5
Overall Quality of Life in Ford County:
County Residents

Rating:	N	Percent
Excellent	23	12.8%
Good	113	63.1
Fair	0	22.3
Poor	3	1.7
TOTAL	179	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 6
Changes in Quality of Life in Ford County:
County Residents

Community has become:	N	Percent
Better	37	20.6 %
Worse	43	23.9
About the same	100	55.6
TOTAL	180	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.*

Table 7
Quality of Life Aspects of Ford County: County Residents

Aspect:	N	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	DK
Schools	174	11.5	51.1	20.7	5.7	10.9
Colleges	175	10.9 %	52.0 %	21.7 %	2.3 %	13.1 %
Environment	177	9.6	44.1	31.6	8.5	6.2
Tourism	177	8.5	42.9	33.9	3.4	11.3
Retail shopping	177	6.2	41.2	33.3	15.3	4.0
Local events	178	4.5	50.0	32.6	3.9	9.0
Other	50	4.0	4.0	18.0	16.0	58.0
Cultural arts	176	3.4	36.4	31.8	9.1	19.3
Industry	175	2.9	46.9	37.1	5.7	7.4
Recreation	176	2.8	25.0	39.2	24.4	8.5
Water rec.	176	0.6	8.0	17.0	59.7	14.8
Eco.devo.activ.	172	0.6	13.4	40.7	14.5	30.8

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.*

Table 8
Health Care in Ford County: County Residents

Item:	N	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	DK
Ambulance	178	26.4 %	50.0 %	10.7 %	0.6 %	12.4 %
HC providers	172	9.9	55.8	23.3	4.7	6.4
Hospital	177	9.0	46.3	29.4	14.1	1.1
Elder care	178	7.9	37.1	29.8	3.9	21.3
Other facil.	171	7.0	48.0	25.1	2.9	17.0
HC costs	167	1.8	9.0	38.3	41.9	9.0

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.*

Table 9
Percentage of Respondents Supporting
Publicly Funded Recycling in Ford County:
County Residents

<u>Support:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	82	50%
No	82	50
TOTAL	164	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.*

Table 10
Cost That Respondents are Willing to
Pay for Recycling in Ford County: County
Residents

<u>Monthly</u> <u>Amount:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
< \$5	55	67.9%
\$5-10	26	32.1
TOTAL	81	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.*

APPENDIX 3

Ford County Citizen Survey:
Responses of Dodge City Residents

Table 1
Economic Development Strategies --
Relative Importance to Ford County's Economic Growth: City Residents

Strategy:	N	Important		Unimportant		DK
		1	2	3	4	
Retain/expand bus.	340	56.5%	34.7%	6.8%	.6%	1.5%
Attract new bus.	341	54.5	36.4	7.3	.3	1.5
Skilled workforce	337	35.3	50.4	11.0	.9	2.4
Improve highway/rail	341	35.2	44.0	16.4	2.6	1.8
Bus.start-ups	335	34.9	44.5	16.7	1.5	2.4
Reg.health care cntr.	338	32.2	42.0	20.1	2.7	3.0
Infrastructure devo.	337	32.0	51.3	12.8	1.5	2.4
Bus./govt.cooperation	334	29.9	46.4	17.4	2.7	3.6
Expand.ag-business	335	27.2	50.1	19.1	1.8	1.8
Conservation pgms.	334	27.2	45.5	22.5	2.4	2.4
State/fed.grants/aid	335	26.9	39.7	20.6	8.1	4.8
Improve bus.financing	338	21.9	45.6	23.1	2.7	6.8
Coop.w/communities	338	21.6	46.4	27.5	2.7	1.8
Tourism	340	21.2	40.6	30.0	6.5	1.8
Commercial/retail.devo.	334	20.4	46.1	26.3	1.8	5.4
Improve.exist.firms	338	18.3	47.6	25.4	4.1	4.4
Retirement indust.	340	17.9	40.3	35.9	4.4	1.5
Streng.meat packing	338	14.8	42.6	30.8	8.3	3.6

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 2
Attitudes Regarding
Business Environment in Ford County: City Residents

Statement:	N	Agree			Disagree		DK
		1	2	3	4		
Industry obligation	340	61.2%	28.8%	5.9%	.6%	3.5%	
Local sales tax for:							
prop.tax relief	341	31.4	27.0	16.4	19.6	5.6	
eco.devo.support	338	14.2	28.7	24.3	25.7	7.1	
cap.improvements	338	11.8	27.8	20.7	26.6	13.0	
Prop.tax breaks for:							
new business	344	23.5	41.0	16.9	11.6	7.0	
retaining business	345	25.5	34.2	20.0	12.2	8.1	
expanding business	338	18.0	40.8	21.6	11.5	8.0	
Public incent.for bus.	337	13.6	38.3	25.5	14.2	8.3	
Strong work ethic	339	8.6	50.4	25.7	5.3	10.0	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 3
Satisfaction With Educational
Providers in Ford County: City Residents

Provider:	N	Satisfied		Dissatisfied		DK
		1	2	3	4	
St. Mary's college	322	15.2	29.5	2.8	1.6	50.9
DCCC	324	9.3	38.6	9.9	9.9	32.4
K-8, private	315	9.2	16.5	2.9	1.6	69.8
Pre-school	325	8.6	31.7	4.0	2.8	52.9
K-8, public	324	7.4%	38.6%	10.2%	3.1%	40.7%
High school	324	5.6	33.3	13.0	4.3	43.8
AVTS	319	5.0	28.2	9.1	3.4	54.2

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 4
Housing Availability
in Ford County: City Residents

Availability of:	N	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	DK
Senior housing	328	14.3%	31.7%	15.5%	7.3%	31.1%
New homes	327	10.7	34.9	23.5	4.0	26.9
Single fam.housing	324	9.0	29.0	21.9	10.2	29.9
Financing	329	7.3	24.0	20.1	12.2	36.5
Apartments	328	4.6	24.7	29.3	7.0	34.5
Mobile home parks	325	3.7	26.2	20.0	9.5	40.6
Low income housing	322	3.7	22.4	19.6	11.2	43.2
Single fam.rentals	329	2.7	18.2	24.9	18.2	35.9

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 5
Overall Quality of Life
in Ford County: City Residents

Rating:	N	Percent
Excellent	23	6.9%
Good	196	58.9
Fair	95	28.5
Poor	19	5.7
TOTAL	333	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 6
Changes in Quality of Life
in Ford County: City Residents

Community has become:	N	Percent
Better	65	19.1%
Worse	115	33.8
About the same	160	47.1
TOTAL	340	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 7
Quality of Life Aspects of Ford County: City Residents

Aspect:	N	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	DK
Colleges	334	15.0%	51.5%	21.0%	5.1%	7.5%
Tourism	327	11.6	51.7	26.3	5.5	4.9
Local events	328	10.1	46.0	32.6	8.8	2.4
Cultural arts	330	9.7	33.6	33.9	8.2	14.5
Environment	332	8.4	43.4	37.0	8.7	2.4
Other	69	7.2	10.1	13.0	20.3	49.3
Retail shopping	335	6.0	35.5	34.6	22.4	1.5
Schools	328	5.2	50.3	27.4	6.7	10.4
Industry	323	3.7	42.4	39.9	10.8	3.1
Recreation	333	2.4	20.4	39.9	33.3	3.9
Water rec.	333	1.5	6.9	20.4	63.7	7.5
Eco.devo.activ.	321	.9	16.5	37.1	19.3	26.2

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 8
Health Care in Ford County: City Residents

<u>Item:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>DK</u>
Ambulance	330	25.2%	43.3%	9.1%	.6%	21.8%
HC providers	330	18.5	49.1	24.5	3.9	3.9
Elder care	331	12.1	35.6	16.6	6.9	28.7
Hospital	334	11.4	39.2	27.5	18.0	3.9
Other facil.	326	7.7	46.9	25.5	4.3	15.6
HC costs	324	2.2	14.5	33.6	41.7	8.0

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 9
Percentage of Respondents Supporting
Publicly Funded Recycling in Ford County:
City Residents

<u>Support:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	191	64.1%
No	107	35.9
TOTAL	298	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 10
Cost That Respondents are Willing to
Pay for Recycling in Ford County: City
Residents

<u>Monthly</u> <u>Amount:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
< \$5	123	64.4%
\$5-10	62	32.5
> \$10	6	3.1
TOTAL	191	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

APPENDIX 4

Ford County Citizen Survey:
Responses of Participants Age 0-35

Table 1
Economic Development Strategies -
Relative Importance to Ford County's Economic Growth:
Residents Age 0-35

Strategy:	N	Important		Unimportant		DK
		1	2	3	4	
Attract new bus.	122	57.0%	38.0%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Retain/expand bus.	121	49.6	43.0	6.6	0.0	0.8
Improve highway/rail	122	38.5	40.2	17.2	3.3	0.8
Infrastructure devo.	122	36.9	45.1	15.6	1.6	0.8
Bus.start-ups	122	35.0	53.3	10.8	0.8	0.0
Skilled workforce	120	31.7	55.8	10.8	1.7	0.0
Conservation pgms.	120	30.8	44.2	21.7	2.5	0.8
Reg.health care cntr.	121	28.9	37.2	29.8	3.3	0.8
State/fed.grants/aid	120	27.5	44.2	20.8	5.8	1.7
Expand.ag-business	120	24.2	47.5	25.0	2.5	0.8
Improve bus.financing	121	23.1	46.3	23.1	4.1	3.3
Bus./govt.cooperation	120	20.8	54.2	19.2	4.2	1.7
Coop.w/communities	121	19.8	42.1	33.9	3.3	0.8
Streng.meat packing	120	19.2	35.8	40.0	5.0	0.0
Improve.exist.firms	121	17.4	43.8	30.6	5.0	3.3
Commercial/retail.devo.	120	16.7	48.3	28.3	2.5	4.2
Tourism	122	15.7	34.7	40.5	9.1	0.0
Retirement indust.	121	16.5	40.5	38.0	4.1	0.8

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 2
Attitudes Regarding
Business Environment in Ford County: Residents Age 0-35

Statement:	N	Agree			Disagree		DK
		1	2	3	4		
Industry obligation	120	58.3%	0.0%	35.8%	5.0%	0.8%	
Prop.tax breaks for:							
new business	121	25.6	43.0	19.0	4.1	8.3	
retaining business	121	19.8	35.5	24.8	8.3	11.6	
expanding business	120	12.5	47.5	25.0	8.3	6.7	
Local sales tax for:							
prop.tax relief	121	20.7	32.2	26.4	14.0	6.6	
eco.devo.support	120	10.8	25.8	38.3	20.8	4.2	
cap.improvements	120	8.3	28.3	29.2	23.3	10.8	
Public incent.for bus.	120	12.5	43.3	25.8	11.7	6.7	
Strong work ethic	120	5.8	55.0	27.5	6.7	5.0	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 3
Satisfaction With Educational
Providers in Ford County: Residents Age 0-35

Provider:	N	Satisfied		Dissatisfied		DK
		1	2	3	4	
K-8, public	119	13.4%	32.8%	8.4%	2.5%	42.9%
Pre-school	120	14.2	24.2	2.5	3.3	55.8
St. Mary's college	115	10.4	22.6	2.6	2.6	61.7
DCCC	117	9.4	41.0	5.1	10.3	34.2
AVTS	115	7.0	22.6	2.6	1.7	66.1
K-8, private	112	8.0	10.7	0.9	0.0	80.4
High school	115	4.3	29.6	6.1	0.9	59.1

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 4
Housing Availability
in Ford County: Residents Age 0-35

Availability of:	N	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	DK
Senior housing	118	11.0%	29.7%	21.2%	2.5%	35.6%
New homes	118	10.2	35.6	28.0	6.8	19.5
Single fam.housing	117	6.0	23.1	32.5	11.1	27.4
Financing	118	5.1	29.7	20.3	20.3	24.6
Apartments	117	2.6	30.8	36.8	8.5	21.4
Mobile home parks	117	0.0	26.5	25.6	12.0	35.9
Low income housing	117	0.0	19.7	19.7	14.5	46.2
Single fam.rentals	117	0.0	18.8	32.5	22.2	26.5

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 5
Overall Quality of Life
in Ford County: Residents Age 0-35

Rating:	N	Percent
Excellent	9	7.6%
Good	66	55.9
Fair	34	28.8
Poor	9	7.6
TOTAL	118	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 6
Changes in Quality of Life
in Ford County: Residents Age 0-35

Community has become:	N	Percent
Better	30	25.4%
Worse	27	22.9
About the same	61	51.7
TOTAL	118	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 7
Quality of Life Aspects of Ford County: Residents Age 0-35

Aspect:	N	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	DK
Environment	120%	40.0%	37.5%	13.3%	9.2%	0.0%
Tourism	120	14.2	43.3	33.3	5.0	4.2
Colleges	120	13.3	52.5	18.3	6.7	9.2
Other	16	12.5	6.3	25.0	31.3	25.0
Cultural arts	120	7.5	23.3	35.0	14.2	20.0
Schools	118	6.8	51.7	19.5	6.8	15.3
Local events	120	5.8	41.7	40.8	10.0	1.7
Industry	116	4.3	50.9	33.6	9.5	1.7
Retail shopping	120	4.2	30.8	33.3	31.7	0.0
Recreation	119	2.5	12.6	35.3	48.7	0.8
Eco.devo.activ.	119	1.7	10.1	38.7	19.3	30.3
Water rec.	119	1.7	5.0	20.2	67.2	5.9

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 8
Health Care in Ford County: Residents Age 0-35

<u>Item:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>DK</u>
Ambulance	118	16.9%	42.4%	0.0%	11.9%	28.8%
HC providers	116	14.7	50.0	28.4	2.6	4.3
Other facil.	116	9.5	40.5	30.2	2.6	17.2
Elder care	118	9.3	30.5	16.9	2.5	40.7
Hospital	118	7.6	34.7	33.1	21.2	3.4
HC costs	117	2.6	12.8	35.9	42.7	6.0

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 9
Percentage of Respondents Supporting
Publicly Funded Recycling in Ford County:
Residents Age 0-35

<u>Support:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	77	70%
No	33	30
TOTAL	110	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 10
Cost That Respondents are Willing to
Pay for Recycling in Ford County:
Residents Age 0-35

<u>Monthly</u> <u>Amount:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
< \$5	44	57.1%
\$5-10	30	39.0
> \$10	3	3.9
TOTAL	77	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

APPENDIX 5

Ford County Citizen Survey:
Responses of Participants Age 36-55

Table 1
Economic Development Strategies -
Relative Importance to Ford County's Economic Growth: Residents Age 36-55

Strategy:	N	Important		Unimportant		DK
		1	2	3	4	
Retain/expand bus.	175	64.0%	29.1%	5.1%	0.6%	1.1%
Attract new bus.	175	58.3	33.1	8.0	0.0	0.6
Bus.start-ups	174	40.2	43.7	13.8	1.7	0.6
Improve highway/rail	172	36.6	42.4	19.2	1.7	0.0
Bus./govt.cooperation	173	35.3	44.5	17.9	1.2	1.2
Expand.ag-business	174	34.5	50.0	13.8	1.1	0.6
Skilled workforce	175	33.7	52.6	10.3	0.6	2.9
Infrastructure devo.	172	32.0	52.9	13.4	0.6	1.2
State/fed.grants/aid	175	31.4	39.4	23.4	4.6	1.1
Reg.health care cntr.	174	27.1	46.6	21.8	3.4	1.1
Improve bus.financing	172	26.7	45.3	23.3	1.7	2.9
Coop.w/communities	175	25.7	51.4	21.1	1.1	0.6
Commercial/retail.devo.	174	24.7	44.3	28.2	0.6	2.3
Conservation pgms.	173	23.7	47.4	26.0	1.2	1.7
Tourism	174	23.0	37.4	32.2	6.3	1.1
Improve.exist.firms	175	22.9	48.6	21.1	3.4	4.0
Streng.meat packing	174	17.2	47.7	27.0	5.7	2.3
Retirement indust.	175	11.4	44.6	38.3	5.7	0.0

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 2
Attitudes Regarding
Business Environment in Ford County: Residents Age 36-55

Statement:	N	Agree		Disagree		DK
		1	2	3	4	
Industry obligation	171	61.4%	27.5%	5.8%	0.6%	4.7%
Prop.tax breaks for:						
new business	174	35.6	35.1	16.7	9.2	3.4
retaining business	174	29.3	32.8	23.0	9.8	5.2
expanding business	175	26.3	39.4	20.0	9.7	4.6
Local sales tax for:						
prop.tax relief	174	23.6	31.0	17.2	23.6	4.6
eco.devo.support	174	13.2	28.7	27.6	26.4	4.0
cap.improvements	174	10.3	27.0	25.3	29.9	7.5
Public incent.for bus.	173	22.0	37.6	23.7	12.7	4.0
Strong work ethic	172	9.9	58.7	19.2	4.1	8.1

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 3
Satisfaction With Educational
Providers in Ford County: Residents Age 36-55

Provider:	N	Satisfied		Dissatisfied		DK
		1	2	3	4	
St. Mary's college	170	14.7%	32.9%	3.5%	1.8%	47.1%
Pre-school	170	11.2	41.2	2.9	1.8	42.9
DCCC	168	9.5	40.5	11.9	8.9	29.2
K-8, public	172	9.3	51.2	15.1	2.9	21.5
K-8, private	166	9.0	24.1	3.0	1.8	62.0
High school	173	8.1	41.6	19.7	6.4	24.3
AVTS	164	4.3	33.5	9.8	4.9	47.6

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 4
Housing Availability
in Ford County: Residents Age 36-55

Availability of:	N	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	DK
Senior housing	170	17.1%	31.2%	14.7%	7.6%	29.4%
New homes	170	11.2	35.3	23.5	4.7	25.3
Single fam.housing	171	9.4	32.7	19.9	9.4	28.7
Financing	171	6.4	25.7	26.3	11.7	29.8
Apartments	171	6.4	22.8	25.7	7.0	38.0
Mobile home parks	171	5.3	27.5	20.5	6.4	40.4
Low income housing	169	5.3	22.5	21.9	10.7	39.6
Single fam.rentals	171	4.1	18.1	22.8	16.4	38.6

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 5
Overall Quality of Life
in Ford County: Residents Age 36-55

Rating:	N	Percent
Excellent	14	8.2%
Good	96	56.1
Fair	53	31.0
Poor	8	4.7
TOTAL	171	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 6
Changes in Quality of Life
in Ford County: Residents Age 36-55

Community has become:	N	Percent
Better	23	13.5%
Worse	52	30.4
About the same	96	56.1
TOTAL	171	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 7
Quality of Life Aspects of Ford County: Residents Age 36-55

Aspect:	N	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	DK
Tourism	170	10.0%	52.4%	25.9%	5.9%	5.9%
Local events	170	10.0	47.1	32.9	8.2	1.8
Colleges	170	9.4	57.6	23.5	2.9	6.5
Environment	171	8.8	39.2	43.3	6.4	2.3
Schools	171	7.0	48.0	32.2	7.0	5.8
Cultural arts	170	6.5	36.5	36.5	9.4	11.2
Retail shopping	170	5.3	31.8	38.8	24.1	0.0
Other	40	2.5	12.5	15.0	27.5	42.5
Industry	167	2.4	41.3	43.7	10.8	1.8
Recreation	170	0.6	20.0	43.5	33.5	2.4
Water rec.	171	0.6	7.6	14.6	71.9	5.3
Eco.devo.activ.	165	0.0	17.6	37.0	25.5	20.0

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 8
Health Care in Ford County: Residents Age 36-55

<u>Item:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>DK</u>
Ambulance	167	22.2%	46.7%	10.2%	1.2%	19.8%
HC providers	168	12.5	52.4	27.4	4.8	3.0
Elder care	170	10.6	42.4	17.6	5.3	24.1
Hospital	170	8.8	43.5	27.1	18.2	2.4
Other facil.	168	6.0	53.0	24.4	5.4	11.3
HC costs	163	0.6	11.7	37.4	43.6	6.7

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 9
Percentage of Respondents Supporting
Publicly Funded Recycling in Ford County:
Residents Age 36-55

<u>Support:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	88	55.7%
No	70	44.3
TOTAL	158	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 10
Cost That Respondents are Willing to
Pay for Recycling in Ford County: Residents
Age 36-55

<u>Monthly</u> <u>Amount:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
< \$5	57	64.8%
\$5-10	29	33.0
> \$10	2	2.3
TOTAL	88	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

APPENDIX 6

Ford County Citizen Survey:
Responses of Participants Age 56 and older

Table 1
Economic Development Strategies -
Relative Importance to Ford County's Economic Growth: Residents Age 56 and Older

Strategy:	N	Important		Unimportant		DK
		1	2	3	4	
Retain/expand bus.	226	40.7%	44.2%	9.7%	1.3%	4.0%
Attract new bus.	224	37.9	43.8	12.1	1.8	4.5
Reg.health care cntr.	225	36.0	41.3	14.2	3.6	4.9
Improve highway/rail	230	33.9	48.3	11.7	1.7	4.3
Skilled workforce	224	29.9	50.4	12.5	2.2	4.9
Infrastructure devo.	224	29.5	49.6	13.8	1.8	5.4
Expand.ag-business	223	28.7	49.3	15.7	1.8	4.5
Coop.w/communities	224	28.6	45.5	21.0	1.8	3.1
Bus./govt.cooperation	218	26.6	44.5	17.9	3.2	7.8
Conservation pgms.	221	24.4	45.2	23.1	2.3	5.0
Bus.start-ups	221	23.5	40.7	21.7	5.0	9.0
Retirement indust.	226	22.6	38.5	29.6	5.8	3.5
State/fed.grants/aid	220	20.5	31.4	24.1	12.7	11.4
Improve bus.financing	224	16.1	42.0	25.0	4.5	12.5
Tourism	227	15.0	35.2	34.8	9.3	5.7
Improve.exist.firms	221	14.5	45.7	27.6	4.1	8.1
Commercial/retail.devo.	218	14.2	42.7	27.5	4.1	11.5
Streng.meat packing	222	14.0	36.9	31.1	10.4	7.7

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 2
Attitudes Regarding
Business Environment in Ford County: Residents Age 56 and Older

Statement:	N	Agree		Disagree		DK
		1	2	3	4	
Industry obligation	235	64.7%	24.7%	4.7%	1.3%	4.7%
Local sales tax for:						
prop.tax relief	228	37.7	25.0	13.2	18.0	6.1
eco.devo.support	226	12.8	23.5	20.4	33.2	10.2
cap.improvements	225	10.7	25.8	21.3	29.3	12.9
Prop.tax breaks for:						
new business	231	13.0	35.1	23.8	19.5	8.7
retaining business	236	17.8	32.2	21.6	19.9	8.5
expanding business	224	9.8	35.7	25.9	19.6	8.9
Public incent.for bus.	223	7.6	31.8	30.9	20.2	9.4
Strong work ethic	225	6.2	53.8	21.8	4.0	14.2

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 3
Satisfaction With Educational
Providers in Ford County: Residents Age 56 and Older

Provider:	N	Satisfied		Dissatisfied		DK
		1	2	3	4	
St. Mary's college	201	14.4%	28.9%	2.0%	1.5%	53.2%
High school	200	12.0	34.0	7.0	5.5	41.5
K-8, public	198	11.6	34.3	4.5	3.0	46.5
Pre-school	201	11.4	22.9	3.5	1.5	60.7
DCCC	206	10.7	32.0	10.7	8.3	38.3
K-8, private	192	9.4	14.1	2.1	1.6	72.9
AVTS	197	9.1	26.9	8.6	3.6	51.8

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 4
Housing Availability
in Ford County: Residents Age 56 and Older

Availability of:	N	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	DK
Senior housing	218	7.8%	27.5%	17.4%	9.2%	38.1%
New homes	218	6.9	28.0	19.3	3.2	42.7
Single fam.housing	214	5.6	30.1	21.0	7.0	46.3
Financing	220	5.5	12.3	17.7	9.1	55.5
Mobile home parks	215	4.2	21.9	18.6	7.0	48.4
Apartments	222	3.6	18.9	21.2	6.3	50.0
Single fam.rentals	222	3.2	17.1	20.3	11.7	47.7
Low income housing	216	3.2	14.8	17.6	14.4	50.0

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 5
Overall Quality of Life
in Ford County: Residents Age 56 and Older

Rating:	N	Percent
Excellent	23	10.3%
Good	147	65.9
Fair	48	21.5
Poor	5	2.2
TOTAL	223	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 6
Changes in Quality of Life
in Ford County: Residents Age 56 and Older

Community has become:	N	Percent
Better	49	21.2%
Worse	79	34.2
About the same	103	44.6
TOTAL	231	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 7
Quality of Life Aspects of Ford County: Residents Age 56 and Older

Aspect:	N	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	DK
Colleges	219	16.9%	46.6%	21.0%	3.7%	11.9%
Tourism	214	8.9	48.6	29.0	3.7	9.8
Environment	218	8.7	49.1	27.5	7.8	6.9
Cultural arts	216	8.3	39.4	29.6	4.6	18.1
Schools	213	8.0	52.1	22.5	5.6	11.7
Local events	216	7.9	50.9	27.8	4.6	8.8
Retail shopping	222	7.7	45.5	31.1	10.4	5.4
Other	63	6.3	4.8	12.7	9.5	66.7
Recreation	220	4.1	28.6	39.1	17.7	10.5
Industry	215	3.7	42.3	38.1	7.4	8.4
Water rec.	219	1.4	8.2	22.4	52.1	16.0
Eco.devo.activ.	209	1.0	16.7	39.2	10.5	32.5

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 8
Health Care in Ford County: Residents Age 56 and Older

<u>Item:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>DK</u>
Ambulance	223	32.7%	46.6%	8.1%	0.4%	12.1%
HC providers	218	18.3	51.4	19.3	4.6	6.4
Hospital	223	13.5	43.9	26.5	13.0	3.1
Elder care	221	11.3	34.4	26.2	8.1	19.9
Other facil.	213	7.5	46.5	23.5	3.3	19.2
HC costs	211	2.8	13.3	33.2	39.8	10.9

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 9
Percentage of Respondents Supporting Publicly Funded Recycling in Ford County: Residents Age 56 and Older

<u>Support:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	108	55.7%
No	86	44.3
TOTAL	194	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

Table 10
Cost That Respondents are Willing to Pay for Recycling in Ford County: Residents Age 56 and Older

<u>Monthly Amount:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
< \$5	77	72.0%
\$5-10	29	27.1
> \$10	1	0.9
TOTAL	107	

Source: *Ford County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1991.

APPENDIX 7

Answer to Question III A. - "What agricultural services are needed in Ford county?"

Large wells.
 All well drillers and well service are 50 miles away. I drilled new well, all money went to Garden City.
 Better banks.
 Farm interest in Edwards County.
 Access to trade area overseas.
 Job placement.
 Consulting services.
 Quality control services.
 Machinery.
 Financing.
 Farm management.
 Not to overtax property.
 A better grain price - more in line with inflation.
 Improvement of market structure.
 Better understanding between agricultural and business organizations.
 Better information.
 Ability - available government programs.
 We are satisfied with all services that are available.
 Stable financing.
 Conservation practices.
 Education in water and soil management.
 Livestock.
 Grain.
 Business.
 More competitive financing for ag related businesses.
 Study value added business and create climate for these businesses
 Equipment sales/service.
 Grain/livestock merchandising outlet elevators, feedyards.
 Ag. consulting services.
 We have good services available.
 Promote Servi-tech.
 Develop other markets for our products, such as grain products, Inc.
 Develop Dodge City as an agri-market center for wheat, corn, milo, beans.
 Better programs.
 Meat packing.
 Extension service.
 Cattle: dairy farms.
 Farming equipment industries
 Implement dealers.

Research.
 Education.
 Services in place are adequate.
 Market services.
 More agriculture industry.
 Adequate Labor
 An agency to watch/record water usage
 Keeping a good county agent after current one retires
 More water.
 Good marketing system for better quality carcasses
 Lower taxes
 Better wheat prices
 Water conservation
 Technical advice
 Marketing of ag products
 Competitive financing
 Stop irrigation usages
 Regulate use of irrigated water
 Expand agri-business oportunities
 Electric motor repair company for large and small motors and phase converters with an exchange program.
 Information
 More money for grain crops
 Some type of grain marketing club
 Better education regarding market skills and programs
 Processing plants for local products other than and in additiona to meats
 Tax break on our property that doesn't produce enough income to make a profit
 Repair availability
 Additional value added businesses
 Better parts serives in stores farm
 Reasonably prices mechanics
 Chile
 Rail service
 Feed
 Grain processing
 Market
 Farm stores
 Soil conservation
 Good farm to market roads
 Local grain markets on TV
 Up the wheat price
 More grain processing plants

Ag loans for young farmers
Tree trimming not butchering
Fair prices for produce
More outlets for markets
Get the federal gov. out of the farm business
Price is needed
Cooperative - coop
Equitable taxes
Minimum tillage/conservation programs
Quality water (2)
Charges assessed for misuse of irrigation
Better prices
Grain marketing
Financial assistance
Less government interference
Tax incentives
Improve road/hazards
Regulate use of pesticides
Business/govt cooperation
Irrigation pump repair company
Credit
Tax relief for land owners
Banks - money
Additional sources of ag. financing
Better roads
Better enforced brand laws for the whole state
Onions
Marketing options
Terrace relief funds
Businesses willing to carry stock, parts, etc.
Low cost consulting services
Control br.... weed
Methanol plant
Better prices
Sale auction cattle
Transportation for products
Proper use and handling of chemical training courses
Water
Better financing
Education
Develop conservation programs
Good ag. bank
Road in county
Better transportation of grain
Access to repair parts on Saturday afternoons
Grain handling facilities
Service men come to farm

Better understanding between city folk and
country folk
Tomatos
Better soil practices
Competitive markets
Competitive sale barns (cattle)
Take care of county ditches
Good roads

APPENDIX 8

Answer to Question VII - Quality of Life - B12 (Other)

Tourism: Need to go to Branson, MO and study methods of tourism growth.

1 - Parent involvement in schools.

1 - Churches.

4 - Crime.

4 - Social structure.

4 - No place to go.

4 - Trash and litter.

4-0 - Smells bad.

4 - Youth programs.

4 - Restaurants terrible!

4 - Law enforcement.

4 - Street repair.

4 - Smell.

4 - Single life.

Need baseball complex.

4 - Taxes (property)

4 - Small park off trailer park or apartment complexes.

4 - Handicapped facilities - enforce handicap parking areas - rails in restrooms.

4 - Public safety. Until recently, I seldom locked the doors of my home, even when we were away. Now I have to.

1 - Agriculture.

3 - Law enforcement.

4 - Police department poor; Sheriff Department good.

1 - Library facilities.

4 - Medical.

1 - Churches. Good choice of competent physicians.

1 - Private schools.

APPENDIX 9

Copy of Survey Instrument

FORD COUNTY CITIZEN SURVEY

Your opinions about the future of Ford County and your attitude about the county are very important. We need your help to identify critical county issues that will need to be addressed by the communities in Ford County as we move into the 21st Century. Your response to this survey is greatly appreciated.

OPTIONAL INFORMATION: If we need to clarify any of your answers or comments on this survey, we would like to contact you. This information is optional and will be **STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL**. Thank you.

Name _____ Address _____
City _____ Zip Code _____ Telephone _____

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Personal and Social Characteristics

A. Place of Residence

1. Where is your household located? (choose one)

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> a. Bellefont | <input type="checkbox"/> e. Ford | <input type="checkbox"/> i. Windthorst |
| <input type="checkbox"/> b. Bloom | <input type="checkbox"/> f. Kingsdown | <input type="checkbox"/> j. Wright |
| <input type="checkbox"/> c. Bucklin | <input type="checkbox"/> g. Spearville | <input type="checkbox"/> k. Rural area, outside of a city |
| <input type="checkbox"/> d. Dodge City | <input type="checkbox"/> h. Wilroads Gardens | |

2. How long have you lived in Ford County? (choose one)

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> a. Less than one year | <input type="checkbox"/> c. 6 - 10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> e. More than 20 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> b. 1 - 5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> d. 11 - 20 years | |

B. Employment Status

1. Your present employment status is? (choose one)

- | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> a. Employed | <input type="checkbox"/> c. Retired | <input type="checkbox"/> e. Not employed |
| <input type="checkbox"/> b. Self-employed | <input type="checkbox"/> d. Student | |

2. If employed or self-employed, is your present employment full- or part-time?

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> a. Full-time | <input type="checkbox"/> b. Part-time |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|

C. Other Personal and Social Characteristics

1. Which age category do you belong to?

- | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 0 - 25 | <input type="checkbox"/> 36 - 45 | <input type="checkbox"/> 56 - 65 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 26 - 35 | <input type="checkbox"/> 46 - 55 | <input type="checkbox"/> 66 and older |

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION (continued)

2. Your sex? ___ a. Male ___ b. Female

3. What is your highest level of education?

- | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| ___ a. No formal education | ___ d. Completed high school | ___ g. Associate degree |
| ___ b. Elementary (grades 1-8) | ___ e. Technical/trade school | ___ h. College graduate |
| ___ c. Some high school (9-11) | ___ f. Some college (> 4 yrs.) | ___ i. 4+ yrs. college
(graduate work) |

II. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Strategies

A. Rate the importance of the following community economic development strategies and efforts to Ford County's economic stability and growth. Please indicate CRITICAL/VERY IMPORTANT, IMPORTANT, SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT, UNIMPORTANT, or DON'T KNOW.

		Critical/Very Important	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant	Don't Know
a.	Retaining and expanding business/industry.....	1	2	3	4	0
b.	Attracting new business/industry.....	1	2	3	4	0
c.	Starting and helping new businesses.....	1	2	3	4	0
d.	Tourism, build on "Boot Hill" tradition.....	1	2	3	4	0
e.	Strengthening the Meat Packing Industry.....	1	2	3	4	0
f.	Cooperating with Neighboring Communities.....	1	2	3	4	0
g.	Retirement Industry/Facilities for Seniors.....	1	2	3	4	0
h.	Expand Agri-business Opportunities	1	2	3	4	0
i.	Business and Government Cooperation.....	1	2	3	4	0
j.	Development of Conservation Programs.....	1	2	3	4	0
k.	Regional Health Care Center.....	1	2	3	4	0
l.	Improve Efficiency of Existing Firms.....	1	2	3	4	0
m.	Commercial and Retail Development or Redevelopment.....	1	2	3	4	0
n.	Seek outside sources, increased aid and grants from state and federal government.....	1	2	3	4	0
o.	Well-skilled workforce.....	1	2	3	4	0

II. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES (continued)

	Critical/Very Important	Somewhat Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Don't Know	
p. Development of public infrastructure systems (roads, bridges, sewers, water treatment facilities, industrial parks, gas, electric).....	1	2	3	4	0
q. Improve highway and rail access.....	1	2	3	4	0
r. Improve access to business financing.....	1	2	3	4	0

III. AGRICULTURE

A. Are you engaged in farming or an agriculture-related field?

___ yes ___ no

If yes, what agricultural services are needed in Ford County? List the top three.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

Comments _____

IV. BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT

A. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements by indicating the response that comes closest to your own feelings.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Undecided
1. In general, a strong "work ethic" exists in Ford County.....	1	2	3	4	0
2. Industries in the community have as much an obligation to the community as the community has to the industry.....	1	2	3	4	0
3. Temporary local property tax breaks should be available to support new businesses.....	1	2	3	4	0
4. Temporary local property tax breaks should be available to retain existing businesses.....	1	2	3	4	0

IV. BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT (continued)

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Undecided
5. Temporary local property tax breaks should be available to support business expansion.....	1	2	3	4	0
6. Incentives using public money should be used to encourage new and expanding businesses and industries.....	1	2	3	4	0
7. Establish a local sales tax on goods and services purchased in Ford County to support economic development.....	1	2	3	4	0
8. Establish a local sales tax on goods and services purchased in Ford County to give property tax relief.....	1	2	3	4	0
9. Establish a local sales tax on goods and services purchased in Ford County to carry out special capital improvements.....	1	2	3	4	0

V. HUMAN CAPITAL: Education and Workforce Issues

A. Tell us how satisfied you are with the following educational services as they currently exist. Indicate NA for not applicable if you have not used the service.

	Very Satisfied	Satis.	Dissatis.	Very Dissatis.	NA
1. Pre-school Education.....	1	2	3	4	0
2. K-8 Public School System....	1	2	3	4	0
3. K-8 Private School System....	1	2	3	4	0
4. High School (9-12).....	1	2	3	4	0
5. Vocational Education.....	1	2	3	4	0
6. Dodge City Community College.....	1	2	3	4	0
7. St. Mary of the Plains College..	1	2	3	4	0

B. What things would you add, delete, or change about the educational system in Ford County? Be as specific as you can with your comments.

VI. HOUSING ISSUES

A. Please rate the following aspects of housing availability in Ford County. Rate availability EXCELLENT, GOOD, FAIR, POOR or DON'T KNOW.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know
1. Availability of apartments.....	1	2	3	4	0
2. Availability of single family rentals.....	1	2	3	4	0
3. Availability of mobile home parks.....	1	2	3	4	0
4. Availability of low income housing.....	1	2	3	4	0
5. Availability of single family housing.....	1	2	3	4	0
6. Availability of housing for seniors.....	1	2	3	4	0
7. Availability of new homes.....	1	2	3	4	0
8. Availability of financing for housing.....	1	2	3	4	0

VII. QUALITY OF LIFE: Image and Spirit

A. Rate the quality of life in Ford County.

___ 1. Excellent ___ 2. Good ___ 3. Fair ___ 4. Poor

B. Rate the following aspects of Ford County.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know
1. Industry.....	1	2	3	4	0
2. Schools (K-12).....	1	2	3	4	0
3. Colleges.....	1	2	3	4	0
4. Environment.....	1	2	3	4	0
5. Tourism.....	1	2	3	4	0
6. Local Events/Activities.....	1	2	3	4	0
7. Cultural Art Programs.....	1	2	3	4	0
8. Retail Shopping.....	1	2	3	4	0
9. Recreation Facilities.....	1	2	3	4	0
10. Water-based Recreation.....	1	2	3	4	0
11. Economic Development Activities.....	1	2	3	4	0
12. Other _____	1	2	3	4	0

C. Over the past ten years (or since you have lived here) would you say that your community has become a BETTER place to live, WORSE, or STAYED ABOUT THE SAME.

___ 1. Better ___ 2. Worse ___ 3. About the same

VII. QUALITY OF LIFE (continued)

D. If there were two things you could add, delete or change about your community, what would they be? Be as specific as you can with your comments.

1. _____

2. _____

E. If there were two things you could add, delete or change about Ford County, what would they be? Be as specific as you can with your comments.

1. _____

2. _____

VIII. HEALTH CARE

A. Rate the following health care items in Ford County either EXCELLENT, GOOD, FAIR, POOR or DON'T KNOW.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know
1. Health care providers.....	1	2	3	4	0
2. Hospital.....	1	2	3	4	0
3. Other health care facilities.....	1	2	3	4	0
4. Ambulance.....	1	2	3	4	0
5. Elder care.....	1	2	3	4	0
6. Health care costs.....	1	2	3	4	0

IX. ENVIRONMENT

A. Rank the following water resource issues in Ford County in order of importance (#1 is highest).

___ 1. Water supply ___ 4. Recreational water

___ 2. Water quality ___ 5. Other_____

___ 3. Flood prevention/control

IX. ENVIRONMENT (contined)

B. Should Ford County have a publicly funded recycling program?

___ 1. Yes ___ 2. No

C. If yes, would you be willing to pay

___ 1. under \$5 a month
___ 2. \$5-10 a month
___ 3. \$10 or more a month

X. OTHER COMMENTS

Are there any other issues that should be addressed in a strategic plan for economic development for Ford County? Please comment.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this survey. This survey will be used to plan for the future of Ford County. Your input was greatly appreciated and will enhance the planning effort.