
**Institute for Public Policy and Business Research
Technical Report Series**

*Sherman County Citizen Survey:
Survey Analysis*

by

Genna M. Ott
Assistant Director

Kansas Center for Community Economic Development
Charles E. Krider, Co-Director

Anthony L. Redwood, Executive Director
Institute for Public Policy and Business Research
The University of Kansas

October 1992

Report No. 15

Foreword

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; Charles E. Krider, Co-Director; and, Shakura Jackson, Secretary, IPPBR. KCCED also wishes to thank Larry McCants and the Goodland Economic Development Corporation for their assistance in administering the survey and overseeing the data entry. A special thanks goes to Deb Wieggers, Secretary, First National Bank of Goodland, for entering the survey information into the computer.

*Genna M. Ott, Assistant Director
Kansas Center for Community Economic Development
The University of Kansas*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	iii
Introduction	1
Results	2
Conclusion	14
Appendix 1	17
Appendix 2	23
Appendix 3	24
Appendix 4	28
Appendix 5	30
Appendix 6	33
Appendix 7	46

List of Tables

Table 1	Place of Residence of Survey Respondents	2
Table 2	Length of Residence in Sherman County	2
Table 3	Employment Status	2
Table 4	Type of Employment Held by Respondents	2
Table 5	Age Range of Respondents	3
Table 6	Gender of Respondents	3
Table 7	Highest Level of Educational Attainment	3
Table 8	Economic Development Strategies: Relative Importance to Sherman County's Economic Growth	5
Table 9	Business Environment in Sherman County Ratings for Selected Items	5
Table 10	Local Economic Development Activities: Relative Importance to Sherman County's Economic Growth and Stability	6

Table 11	Human Capital Strategies: Relative Importance to Sherman County's Economic Growth	7
Table 12	Satisfaction with School Programs in Sherman County	8
Table 13	Satisfaction with School Facilities in Sherman County	8
Table 14	Infrastructure in Sherman County Ratings for Selected Items	9
Table 15	Overall Quality of Life in Sherman County	10
Table 16	Changes in Quality of Life in Sherman County	10
Table 17	Quality of Life Aspects of Sherman County	11
Table 18	Housing Availability and Quality in Sherman County Ratings for Selected Items	12
Table 19	Health Care Services in Sherman County Ratings for Selected Items	12
Table 20	Assisted Living Centers Need in Sherman County	13

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Kansas Center for Community Economic Development, in conjunction with the Goodland Economic Development Corporation, conducted a community attitude survey of the citizens of Sherman county. The purpose of the survey was to provide supplemental data for the strategic planning process underway in Sherman county.

Participation in the survey was not random; rather participation was open to those who wanted to respond. The surveys were distributed in the local newspapers, the *Goodland Daily News* and the *Country Advocate*, to enhance accessibility and promote participation throughout the county. Approximately 141 citizens of Sherman County chose to participate by returning a completed survey to the Goodland Economic Development Corporation. Proportionally, more citizens over the age of 45 and more citizens with college degrees or graduate level work chose to participate in the survey. Consequently, the results of the survey can not be interpreted as representative of the entire Sherman County population.

Key findings from the survey include the following:

Economic Development Strategies/Activities

- The most critical economic development strategies (rated "critical"/"important") to fostering growth in Sherman County were retaining/expanding business/industry (90%), attracting new business/industry (88%), diversifying the local economy (80%), accessing financing for small business (74%), helping business start-ups (72%), and expanding agri-business opportunities (72%).
- Those strategies most often rated as "unimportant" were: offering temporary property tax breaks to businesses (11%), providing technical assistance to businesses (8%), and, accessing financing for existing business (7%).
- Business/government cooperation (85%), business/education cooperation (82%), and local organization for economic development (79%) were considered the three most important economic development activities to Sherman County's economic development and growth.

Business Environment

- The three greatest areas of strength for Sherman County's business environment were quality of existing firms (69%), business commitment to the community (62%), and work ethic (57%).
- Those items that were considered weaknesses of the business environment were environment to generate new ideas (34%), potential to attract new business (33%), and ability to develop new ideas (31%).

Human Capital/Education

- Preparing young people for the workforce (59%) and having a productive workforce (56%) were rated the two most critical human capital strategies by the respondents.
- Levels of satisfaction with education providers was highest for vocational/technical school (77%), followed by K-6 through elementary (73%), and pre-school (65%).
- The respondents were least satisfied with educational programs for adult worker retraining with only 37 percent responding "satisfied" to "very satisfied".
- The satisfaction responses for the educational facilities indicate a need to improve the elementary and junior high facilities, with 35 percent responding "dissatisfied" to "very dissatisfied".

Infrastructure

- Water availability (85%), access to airport (83%), water quality (77%), sewer/water treatment facilities (66%), and communications technology (64%) were the most frequently rated "excellent" to "good" infrastructure items in Sherman County.
- The appearance of city entrances (79%), county roads/bridges (62%), and city streets (50%) were the three most frequently rated "fair" to "poor" by the respondents.

Quality of Life

- The respondents consider the quality of life to be good in Sherman County with 76 percent rating it as "good" to "excellent". Only three percent considered it "poor". Additionally, over half of the respondents stated that the quality of life in their communities had remained about the same over the last 10 years.
- Those quality of life items receiving the highest percentage of "poor" ratings were industry (32%), economic development (27%), recreation (13%) and tourism (11%).
- Overall, few respondents rated housing in Sherman County as "excellent". Those items considered "good" were quality of owned housing (42%) and availability of mobile home parks (38%) and housing for seniors (31%). Quality of rental housing (31%) and availability of single family rentals (23%) and new homes (23%) were the items most frequently considered "poor".
- Health care services, in general, were considered "good" for Sherman County. The major problem was considered health care costs with 33 percent responding "poor". The respondents also felt that a need existed for assisted living centers for seniors with 26 percent responding "great" and 15 percent responding "very great".

Commitment/Capacity

- Over 65 written comments were made that indicated a concern for commitment capacity issues in Sherman County such as leadership, organization, cooperation and government.

INTRODUCTION

Background

The Kansas Center for Community Economic Development (KCCED) at the University of Kansas, in conjunction with the Goodland Economic Development Corporation conducted a community attitude survey in Sherman County. This survey represents one of the many steps within the community strategic planning process underway in Sherman County. The strategic planning process began for Sherman County in the Fall of 1991. The process was strengthened when the Goodland Economic Development Corporation received a Community Strategic Planning Grant from the State of Kansas in 1992. The Corporation subsequently chose KCCED to facilitate the planning process.

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.

Procedures

KCCED developed the Sherman County Citizen Survey with input from the Board of Directors for the Goodland Economic Development Corporation (**Appendix 1**). The survey was administered by the Goodland Economic Development Corporation through dissemination in the local newspapers, the *Goodland Daily News* and the *Country Advocate*. The results were converted to computer format by staff at the First National Bank of Goodland. The data was then sent to KCCED at the University of Kansas for analysis.

Responses were received from 141 citizens of Sherman County. It should be noted that the survey sample was not randomly drawn. Because the survey sample was not a random sample, the results can NOT be interpreted as representative of the entire Sherman County population. Rather, the results represent those who respond to this type of survey.

Nonetheless, the survey did provide a mechanism to gain public input into the strategic planning process regarding the community's feeling and opinions about the economic development issues in Sherman County. The following report discusses the combined results of the responses received, covering the following areas:

- Demographic data on the survey respondents,
- Business environment and economic development strategies,
- Agriculture,
- Human capital,
- Infrastructure,
- Quality of life issues, and
- Other comments.

RESULTS

A. Demographic Data

Survey respondents were first asked a series of background questions relating to their place of residence, length of residence in Sherman County, employment status, age, gender, and education (Tables 1-7). Residents of Goodland comprised 73 percent of the total sample, while the majority of the other respondents lived in rural areas outside of a city (22%). Most respondents (79%) have lived in Sherman County for more than ten years.

Over seventy percent of respondents were employed (or self-employed), and most worked full-time (59%). In terms of age, individuals who were 65 years of age or older represented 29.1 percent of the total sample, while those who were 25-44 years old comprised 26 percent of the total. No responses were received by anyone under the age of 25. More females than males responded with 51.8 percent female and 44 percent male.

Sixty-five percent had completed some education beyond high school, such as trade/technical school, college, or graduate work. On the other hand, only 9 percent did not complete high school.

Table 1
Place of Residence of Survey Respondents

<u>Location:</u>	<u>N¹</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Edson	3	2.1%
Goodland	103	73.0
Kanorado	2	1.4
Ruleton	2	1.4
Rural Area	31	22.0
TOTAL	141	

¹number of persons responding to question
Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 3
Employment Status

<u>Status:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Employed	60	42.6%
Self-employed	36	25.5
Employed/self-emp	4	2.8
Retired	40	28.4
Not employed	1	.7
TOTAL	141	

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 2
Length of Residence in Sherman County

<u>Years:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0 - 2	5	3.5%
3 - 10	25	17.7
10+	111	78.7
TOTAL	141	

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 4
Type of Employment Held by Respondents

<u>Type:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Full-time	83	58.9%
Part-time	9	6.4
No Response	49	34.8
TOTAL	141	

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 5
Age Range of Respondents

<u>Range:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0-24	0	0.0%
25-34	12	8.5
35-44	24	17.0
45-54	39	27.7
55-64	23	16.3
65 and older	41	29.1
No Response	2	1.4
TOTAL	141	

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 6
Gender of Respondents

<u>Gender:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Male	62	44.0%
Female	73	51.8
No Response	6	4.3
TOTAL	141	

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 7
Highest Level of Educational Attainment

<u>Level:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Elementary	6	4.3%
Some high school	6	4.3
High school	32	22.7
Tech/trade school	11	7.8
Some college	31	22.0
Assoc.degree	3	2.1
College degree	10	7.1
Grad. work	37	26.2
No response	5	3.5
TOTAL	141	

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

According to the *1990 Census of the Population*, U.S. Bureau of the Census, nine percent of Sherman County's over 25 population had college degrees and four percent had graduate degrees. Table 7 shows that seven percent and 27 percent of the survey respondents have college degrees and graduate work, respectively. Therefore, the higher-educated population of Sherman County is over-represented in the survey responses. Also over-represented is the older population of Sherman County. According to the U.S. Census, 39 percent of Sherman County's population is over 45; the survey population has 73 percent over 45. The breakdown for residents in Goodland versus the county, however, is proportionally consistent with the Census figures. In 1990, about 72 percent of Sherman County's population lived in Goodland according to U.S. Census figures. Seventy-three percent of the survey responses received indicated residence in Goodland.

As previously mentioned, the results of the survey do not represent the entire population of Sherman County. By looking at the demographic data of the respondents, it can be concluded that the older, more educated population's views and opinions are over-represented in the results. This must be considered when looking at the rest of the report.

B. Business Environment and Economic Development Strategies

Survey participants were asked to rate the importance of eleven economic development strategies to diversify and foster economic growth in Sherman County (**Table 8**). The top six strategies, in terms of being rated as "critical" (or #1), were:

- retaining and expanding business/industry (65%);
- attracting new business/industry (58%);
- diversify the local economy (42%);
- helping business start-ups (34%);
- providing small business assistance (34%); and
- expand agri-business opportunities (34%).

When #1 and #2 rankings are combined for the various strategies, the top six strategies -- in terms of percentage support -- change slightly to:

- retaining and expanding business/industry (90%);
- attracting new business/industry (88%);
- diversifying the local economy (80%);
- access to financing for small businesses (74%);
- helping business start-ups (72%); and,
- expand agri-business opportunities (72%).

Those strategies most rated as "unimportant" (or #4) by the respondents were:

- offering temporary property tax breaks to businesses (11%);
- technical assistance to businesses (8%); and
- access to financing for existing business (7%).

Those strategies that the respondents knew the least about, as indicated by a "Don't know" response or "No response", were technical assistance to businesses (18%), temporary property tax breaks to businesses (16%), and access to financing for existing business (12%).

Survey respondents were asked to rate eight items in Sherman County for their quality (**Table 9**). The top three items based on their combined "Excellent" and "Good" ratings were:

- quality of existing firms (69%);
- business commitment to the community (62%); and,
- work ethic (57%).

The items that were most frequently rated "Poor" by the respondents were:

- environment to generate new ideas (34%);
- potential to attract new business (33%); and,
- ability to develop new ideas (31%).

The survey respondents overwhelmingly knew the least about "business tax structure" with 36 percent indicating no response to that item or a "Don't know" response.

Six local economic development activities were analyzed for their relative importance to Sherman County's economic growth and stability (**Table 10**). All six activities were overwhelmingly regarded by the majority of the respondents as important to Sherman County. The top three activities rated "Critical/Very Important" were:

- business/education cooperation (42%);
- business/government cooperation (40%); and,
- seek outside sources, increased aid/grants from state/fed. gov'ts (40%).

Table 8
Economic Development Strategies:
Relative Importance to Sherman County's Economic Growth

<u>Strategy:</u>	<u>Critical/Important</u>		<u>Unimportant</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Retain/expand business/industry	65.2%	24.8%	2.1%	0.7%	7.1%
Attract new business/industry	58.2	29.8	7.1	0.7	4.3
Helping business start-ups	34.0	38.3	14.2	3.5	9.9
Providing small business assistance	34.0	34.8	16.3	4.3	10.6
Expand agri-business opportunities	34.0	37.6	15.6	2.8	9.9
Temporary property tax breaks to businesses	15.6	29.8	27.0	11.3	16.3
Diversify local economy	41.8	37.6	5.7	3.5	11.3
Technical assistance to businesses	15.6	36.2	22.7	7.8	17.7
Access to small business financing	32.6	41.1	12.1	3.5	10.6
Access to start-up financing	31.2	40.4	14.2	3.5	10.6
Access to existing business financing	29.8	38.3	12.8	7.1	12.1

Total=N=141

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"
Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 9
Business Environment in Sherman County
Ratings for Selected Items

<u>Items:</u>	<u>Excellent</u>		<u>Poor</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Work ethic	9.2%	47.5%	24.1%	12.8%	6.4%
Quality of existing firms	5.0	63.8	20.6	5.7	5.0
Business commitment to the community	16.3	46.1	19.1	9.2	9.2
Community support for starting a business	5.0	29.1	33.3	23.4	9.2
Business tax structure	1.4	15.6	30.5	17.0	35.5
Ability to develop new ideas	4.3	14.9	40.4	31.2	9.2
Potential to attract new business	14.2	17.7	30.5	32.6	5.0
Environment to generate new ideas	5.7	18.4	33.3	34.0	8.5

Total=N=141

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"
Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 10
Local Economic Development Activities:
Relative Importance to Sherman County's Economic Growth and Stability

<u>Strategy:</u>	<u>Critical/Important</u>		<u>Unimportant</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Cooperating with neighboring communities	25.5%	51.1%	12.1%	2.8%	8.5%
Business/gov't cooperation	40.4	44.7	5.0	2.1	7.8
State/Federal grants/aid	39.7	36.2	11.3	5.0	7.8
Local public funding for economic development	22.0	45.4	14.9	5.0	12.8
Local organization for economic development	39.0	40.4	9.9	2.1	8.5
Business/education cooperation	41.8	40.4	8.5	1.4	7.8

Total=N=141

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

When #1 and #2 ratings are combined, the three most important activities for economic growth and stability were:

- business/government cooperation (85%);
- business/education cooperation (82%); and,
- local organization for economic development (79%).

Among the economic development strategies, opinions had not been formed most often on local public funding for economic development, with 13 percent indicating they did not know how important this was to Sherman County's economic growth and stability.

C. Agriculture

Two questions relating to the agricultural base of Sherman 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 43 persons (31%) were engaged in farming or an agriculture-related field. The second sought further information, asking respondents to list the top three agricultural services needed in Sherman County (**Appendix 2**). Around 40 comments were received. Three comments indicated satisfaction with services available. The four areas that received the most comments were:

- expansion of agricultural industry (value-added, machine and fabrication shops, manufacturing),
- infrastructure (roads, elevators, feedlots, rail),
- business environment for agriculture (taxes and prices), and
- commitment/capacity issues (cooperation and organization).

D. Human Capital

Six human capital strategies were rated for their relative importance to Sherman County's economic growth (Table 11). Preparing young people for the workforce (59%) and having a productive workforce (56%) were rated the two most critical strategies by the respondents. All six strategies were considered important to very important by the majority of the respondents. The respondents had the least formed opinions about strategies to improve adult workers' skills with five percent "Don't know" response.

The respondents were also asked to rate their satisfaction with seven categories of educational providers and four categories of educational facilities in Sherman County (Table 12 and Table 13). The respondents were the most satisfied with the vocational/technical school in Sherman County. The vocational/technical school received a "very satisfied" rating from 32 percent and a "satisfied" rating from 45 percent. When the "very satisfied" and "satisfied" ratings are combined, the top three school program providers, in terms of satisfaction, were:

- vocational/technical school (77%);
- elementary (K-6) (73%); and,
- pre-school (65%).

The survey shows that the respondents were most dissatisfied (#3 and #4 rating) with retraining adult workers (25%), junior high (20%), and high school (19%). The survey also shows that quite a few respondents had no opinion on the adult education program providers in Sherman County; this was indicated by the "don't know" percentages on adult basic skills/literacy (36%) and retraining adult workers (38%). The satisfaction responses for the educational facilities indicate a need to improve the elementary and junior high facilities with 35 percent responding "dissatisfied" to "very dissatisfied".

Table 11
Human Capital Strategies:
Relative Importance to Sherman County's Economic Growth

Strategy:	Critical/Important		Unimportant		DK
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Well-skilled workforce	43.3%	44.7%	7.8%	1.4%	2.8%
Productive workforce	56.0	37.6	2.1	0.7	3.5
Improving adult workers' skills	31.9	47.5	14.2	1.4	5.0
Preparing young people for the workforce	58.9	34.0	3.5	0.7	2.8
Employer-provided job training	37.6	45.4	12.1	0.7	4.3
Job training for low skilled/unemployed	36.9	41.8	16.3	0.7	4.3

Total=N=141

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 12
Satisfaction With School
Programs in Sherman County

<u>Provider:</u>	<u>Satisfied</u>		<u>Dissatisfied</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Pre-school	13.5%	51.8%	4.3%	0.7%	29.8%
Elementary (K-6)	12.1	61.0	5.7	0.0	21.3
Junior high (7-8)	12.8	45.4	16.3	3.5	22.0
High school (9-12)	12.1	46.1	13.5	5.7	22.7
Voc/Tech school	31.5	45.4	3.5	2.8	17.0
Adult basic skills/ literacy	11.3	35.5	11.3	6.4	35.5
Retraining adult workers	5.0	32.6	19.1	5.7	37.6

Total=N=141

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 13
Satisfaction With School
Facilities in Sherman County

<u>Provider:</u>	<u>Satisfied</u>		<u>Dissatisfied</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Pre-school	14.2%	51.8%	7.8%	1.4%	24.8%
Elementary and junior high	9.9	37.6	27.7	7.8	17.0
High school	11.3	56.7	15.6	2.8	13.5
Adult/other	9.9	52.5	10.6	0.7	26.2

Total=N=141

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

E. Infrastructure

The citizen survey asked respondents to rate the quality of eleven infrastructure items in Sherman County (Table 14). The five items that the respondents most frequently rated "excellent" to "good" (combined #1 and #2 percent) were:

- water availability (85%);
- access to airport (83%);
- water quality (77%);
- sewer/water treatment facilities (66%); and,
- communications technology (64%).

While the majority of respondents considered seven of the eleven items to be good quality or better, three items were rated "fair" to "poor" by over half of the respondents. Those items were:

- appearance of city entrances (79%);
- county roads/bridges (62%); and,
- city streets (50%).

Flood prevention/control was the fourth item not considered "excellent" to "good" by a majority of the respondents. It was also the item that the respondents were least likely to have an opinion on as indicated by the 17 percent "Don't know" response.

Table 14
Infrastructure in Sherman County
Ratings for Selected Items

<u>Items:</u>	<u>Excellent</u>				<u>Poor</u>	<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>		
Appearance of city entrances	1.4%	12.8%	26.2%	53.2%	6.4%	
County roads/bridges	1.4	23.4	44.7	17.7	12.8	
City streets	5.0	39.0	39.0	11.3	5.7	
Rail/highway access	12.1	38.3	34.8	9.2	5.7	
Sewer/water treatment facilities	7.8	58.2	17.0	1.4	15.6	
Water quality	26.2	51.1	9.9	5.7	7.1	
Water availability	27.0	58.2	6.4	1.4	7.1	
Flood prevention/control	7.8	35.5	32.6	7.1	17.0	
Sites for new businesses	17.7	44.0	25.5	5.7	7.1	
Access to airport	26.2	56.7	9.9	3.5	3.5	
Communications technology	13.5	50.4	16.3	5.7	14.2	

Total=N=141

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

F. Quality of Life

Three questions relating to the quality of life in Sherman County were given to survey participants. In the first, respondents were asked to rate the overall quality of life in the county (**Table 15**). The majority (76%) rated Sherman County "good" to "excellent" in this area, with 60 percent choosing "good". Only three percent rated Sherman County's quality of life "poor". Additionally, 50 percent of the respondents stated that the quality of life in their communities had remained about the same over the last ten years (**Table 16**).

Thirteen quality of life aspects of Sherman County were listed, and participants were asked to rate each one (**Table 17**). Ten of the thirteen items were rated "excellent" to "good" by at least half of the respondents. Those ten items considered as strengths for the county were:

- environment (77%);
- K-12 schools (69%);
- cultural arts (67%).
- hotels/restaurants (65%);
- senior activities (62%);
- local events (60%).
- neighborhood safety (60%).
- day care (57%);
- recreation (56%); and,
- retail shopping (50%).

Those items receiving the most negative -- or "poor" -- ratings were:

- industry (32%);
- economic development (27%);
- recreation (13%); and,
- tourism (11%).

The respondents most frequently did not rate day care (23%), senior activities (21%), economic development (15%), neighborhood safety (11%) and tourism (11%).

Table 15
Overall Quality of Life
in Sherman County

<u>Rating:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Excellent	38	27.0%
Good	68	48.2
Fair	21	14.9
Poor	4	2.8
No response	10	7.1
TOTAL	141	

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 16
Changes in Quality of Life
in Sherman County

<u>Community</u> <u>has become:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Better	29	20.6%
Worse	31	22.0
About the same	71	50.4
No response	10	7.1
TOTAL	141	

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 17
Quality of Life Aspects of Sherman County

<u>Provider:</u>	<u>Excellent</u>			<u>Poor</u>	
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>DK</u>
Industry	3.5%	18.4	41.1%	31.9%	5.0%
Schools (K-12)	7.1	61.7	20.6	2.1	8.5
Environment	26.2	50.4	15.6	2.1	5.7
Tourism	6.4	37.6	34.8	10.6	10.6
Local events	12.1	48.2	27.7	4.3	7.8
Cultural arts	17.0	49.6	20.6	3.5	9.2
Retail shopping	7.8	42.6	35.5	8.5	5.7
Recreation	13.5	42.6	24.1	12.8	7.1
Economic development	2.1	26.2	29.8	27.0	14.9
Hotels/restaurants	14.9	50.4	27.0	4.3	3.5
Day care	8.5	48.9	17.0	2.8	22.7
Senior activities	19.1	43.3	10.6	6.4	20.6
Neighborhood safety	12.8	46.8	22.0	7.1	11.3

Total=N=141

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Eleven items relating to housing availability and quality for Sherman County were rated by the respondents (**Table 18**). Overall, few respondents rated housing in Sherman County as "excellent" and around one-third of the respondents did not know what the availability or quality of the various housing items were. The top three items considered "good" were:

- quality of owned housing (42%);
- mobile home parks (38%); and,
- housing for seniors (31%).

The three items most frequently rated as "poor" for Sherman County by the respondents were:

- quality of rental housing (31%);
- single family rentals (23%); and,
- new homes (23%).

Table 18
Housing Availability and Quality in Sherman County
Ratings for Selected Items

<u>Availability of:</u>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>DK</u>
Apartments	2.1%	14.9%	30.5%	19.9%	32.6%
Single family rentals	0.0	12.1	32.6	22.7	32.6
Mobile home parks	3.5	37.6	22.0	5.0	31.9
Low income housing	1.4	21.3	27.7	12.1	37.6
Single family housing	1.4	26.2	34.8	7.8	29.8
Housing for seniors	4.3	30.5	27.0	6.4	31.9
Medium-priced homes	2.8	26.2	26.2	19.9	24.8
New homes	3.5	23.4	19.9	22.7	30.5
Financing for housing	1.4	19.6	29.1	11.3	39.0
<u>Quality of:</u>					
Rental housing	0.0	3.8	31.9	31.2	29.1
Owned-housing	4.3	41.8	25.5	2.8	25.5

Total=N=141

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Seven health care items in Sherman County were assessed by survey participants (Table 19). In general, health care services in Sherman County were considered "good". The area that stands out as poor is health care costs with 33 percent responding "poor" and 34 percent responding "fair".

The survey also sought input as to the need for assisted living centers for seniors (Table 20). A little over 40 percent of the respondents felt that there was a "very great" to "great" need for the living centers while around 27 percent indicated that they did not know what the need was.

Table 19
Health Care Services in Sherman County
Ratings for Selected Items

<u>Item:</u>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>DK</u>
HC Providers	10.6	46.8	22.7	9.2	10.6
Hospital	19.1	46.8	17.7	7.8	8.5
Other facilities	7.1	56.0	12.8	4.3	19.9
Ambulance	18.4	37.6	14.9	9.9	19.1
Nursing homes	19.1	48.9	7.8	4.3	19.8
Senior care costs	13.5	48.9	11.3	2.8	23.4
Health care costs	2.1	14.2	34.0	32.6	17.0

Total=N=141

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 20
Assisted Living Centers Need
in Sherman County

<u>Need</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Very Great	21	14.9%
Great	36	25.5
Some	40	28.4
Little	5	3.5
Don't Know	39	27.7

TOTAL 141

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

G. Other Comments

The survey also gave respondents the opportunity to submit written comments in the following three areas:

- two things you would add, delete or change about Sherman County (**Appendix 3**);
- issues that should be addressed in a strategic plan (**Appendix 4**); and,
- new business, service or activity you would like to see in Sherman County (**Appendix 5**).

These comments cover a wide range of issues and concerns and a list is included in the above mentioned appendices.

When asked about things they would change (**Appendix 3**), the following economic development themes emerged: new business development, attract new business, increase job opportunities and diversify the economy. The comments were also concerned with the business environment in Sherman County and that it did not support or welcome new businesses.

However, the greatest number of comments addressed the area of commitment to and capacity for economic development. Over 65 comments were received in this area, which is concerned with issues of organization, cooperation, and attitudes. A strong sentiment exists that the community is divided and is not working together. A positive attitude about the county as well as a progressive one was mentioned as something that is needed. The respondents would like to see better cooperation within the county to spend tax dollars in a better manner. For example, several comments mentioned combining the sheriff and police department. Overall, a concern about the leadership of the county emerged - leadership at the city, the county, the Chamber, and the hospital.

Another area of concern was the appearance of Goodland and the "Y". Thirteen comments specifically mentioned the "Y" as an area that needs improvement (see infrastructure issues in Appendix 3). The need to improve the entrances into the city as well as the general appearance of the city was found in twelve comments (see quality of life issues in Appendix 3).

Comments about issues that should be addressed in the strategic plan (**Appendix 4**) were dominated by commitment/capacity and business environment issues. Once again a concern that the community was not "working together" was found. A concern also was found about the environment for new businesses and the need to create more jobs.

Input was also received on what new business, service or activity the respondents would like to see (**Appendix 5**). Many comments were received that mentioned having any kind of new business as long as it was positive growth and the business could make it on their own. The respondents would like to see a steakhouse, a discount store, a fast food restaurant, and a grocery super-store. Recreational activities and facilities for young people was also important.

CONCLUSION

Strategic planning efforts are most successful when a broad array of individual ideas, opinions, and attitudes are utilized in the process. Therefore, a survey of Sherman 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 economic development strategies which retained/expanded business, attracted new business, or diversified the local economy. Support was less likely for temporary tax breaks to businesses, technical assistance to businesses and access to financing for existing business.
- Quality of existing firms, business commitment to the community and the local work ethic were considered assets of Sherman County's business environment. The environment to generate new ideas, the potential to attract new business and the ability to develop new ideas, were considered areas of weakness.
- Cooperation between business, government and education were considered critical to economic growth and stability.
- Human capital strategies are considered critical to the county's economic growth, with "Preparing young people for the workforce" and "Having a productive workforce" two most critical strategies. While the vocational/technical school received high satisfaction ratings, respondents indicated that attention is needed on educational programs for retraining adult workers and on junior high and high school programs. In terms of education facilities, dissatisfaction was greatest with the elementary and junior high facilities in the county.
- Water - availability, quality and treatment - was considered an infrastructure strength for Sherman County by the respondents. The survey results indicate that work is needed on the appearance of city entrances, county roads/bridges and city streets.
- Overall, those responding to the survey consider the quality of life to be good in Sherman County and that it has been that way for the last ten years. The respondents were pleased with most of the quality of life aspects for Sherman County. Those aspects they considered most negative were industry, economic development, recreation and tourism.
- Availability and quality of housing was considered "good" to "fair." The quality of rental housing and availability of single family rentals and new homes were most frequently rated "poor".
- In general, health care services were considered good with health care costs standing out as "poor". A "great" to "very great" need for assisted living centers for seniors was indicated by around 40 percent of the respondents.
- Written comments indicate a concern over commitment capacity issues for Sherman County such as leadership, organization, cooperation and government.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

SHERMAN COUNTY CITIZEN SURVEY

Your opinions about the future of Sherman 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 Sherman 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. Edson | <input type="checkbox"/> d. Ruleton |
| <input type="checkbox"/> b. Goodland | <input type="checkbox"/> e. rural area outside of a city |
| <input type="checkbox"/> c. Kanorado | |

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

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> a. 0 - 2 years | <input type="checkbox"/> b. 3 - 10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> c. 10 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 | <input type="checkbox"/> f. Seeking employment |

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"/> a. 0 - 24 | <input type="checkbox"/> c. 35 - 44 | <input type="checkbox"/> e. 55 - 64 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> b. 25 - 34 | <input type="checkbox"/> d. 45 - 54 | <input type="checkbox"/> f. 65 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. BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT: Ability to encourage business development.

A. Rate the importance of the following strategies to improve the business environment in Sherman County.

	Critical/Very Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant	Don't Know
1. Retaining and expanding business/industry..	1	2	3	4	0
2. Attracting new business/industry.....	1	2	3	4	0
3. Helping business start-ups.....	1	2	3	4	0
4. Providing small business assistance.....	1	2	3	4	0
5. Expand agri-business opportunities.....	1	2	3	4	0
6. Offering temporary property tax breaks to businesses.....	1	2	3	4	0
7. Diversifying the local economy.....	1	2	3	4	0
8. Technical assistance to businesses.....	1	2	3	4	0
9. Access to financing for small businesses...	1	2	3	4	0
10. Access to financing for start-ups.....	1	2	3	4	0
11. Access to financing for existing business..	1	2	3	4	0

B. How would you rate the following items in Sherman County?

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know
1. Work ethic in Sherman County.....	1	2	3	4	0
2. Quality of existing firms.....	1	2	3	4	0
3. Commitment/obligation of business to the community.....	1	2	3	4	0
4. Community support for starting a new business.....	1	2	3	4	0
5. Business tax structure.....	1	2	3	4	0
6. Ability to develop new ideas.....	1	2	3	4	0
7. Potential to attract new businesses.....	1	2	3	4	0
8. Environment to generate new ideas.....	1	2	3	4	0

IV. INFRASTRUCTURE: County and city investments in roads, bridges, sewers, etc.

A. Rate the quality of the following infrastructure items in Sherman County.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know
1. Appearance of city entrances.....	1	2	3	4	0
2. County roads, bridges.....	1	2	3	4	0
3. City streets.....	1	2	3	4	0
4. Rail/highway access.....	1	2	3	4	0
5. Sewers/water treatment facilities.....	1	2	3	4	0
6. Water quality.....	1	2	3	4	0
7. Water availability.....	1	2	3	4	0
8. Flood prevention/control.....	1	2	3	4	0
9. Sites for new businesses.....	1	2	3	4	0
10. Access to airport.....	1	2	3	4	0
11. Communications technology.....	1	2	3	4	0

VI. QUALITY OF LIFE: Positive artistic, cultural, recreational, and "home town" environment.

A. Rate the quality of life in Sherman County.

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

B. Rate the following aspects of Sherman 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. Environment.....	1	2	3	4	0
4. Tourism.....	1	2	3	4	0
5. Local events/activities.....	1	2	3	4	0
6. Cultural art programs.....	1	2	3	4	0
7. Retail shopping.....	1	2	3	4	0
8. Recreation facilities.....	1	2	3	4	0
9. Economic development activities.....	1	2	3	4	0
10. Hotels and restaurants.....	1	2	3	4	0
11. Day care for children.....	1	2	3	4	0
12. Activities for seniors.....	1	2	4	4	0
13. Neighborhood safety.....	1	2	3	4	0
14. 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

VI. QUALITY OF LIFE (continued)

D. Please rate the following aspects of HOUSING AVAILABILITY AND QUALITY in Sherman County.

	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 medium priced homes for purchase.....	1	2	3	4	0
8. Availability of new homes.....	1	2	3	4	0
9. Availability of financing for housing....	1	2	3	4	0
10. Quality of rental housing.....	1	2	3	4	0
11. Quality of owned housing.....	1	2	3	4	0

E. Please rate the following HEALTH CARE ITEMS in Sherman County.

	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. Nursing homes.....	1	2	3	4	0
6. Senior care services.....	1	2	3	4	0
7. Health care costs.....	1	2	3	4	0

	Very Great	Great	Some	Little	Don't Know
F. 1. How much need is there for assisted living centers for seniors?.....	1	2	3	4	0

VII. LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

A. Rate the importance of the following activities to Sherman County's economic stability and growth.

	Critical/Very Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant	Don't Know
1. Cooperating with neighboring communities.....	1	2	3	4	0
2. Business and government cooperation..	1	2	3	4	0
3. Seek outside sources, increased aid/grants from state/federal government...	1	2	3	4	0
4. Local public funding for economic development activities.....	1	2	3	4	0
5. Local organization for economic development.....	1	2	3	4	0
6. Business and education cooperation.....	1	2	3	4	0

VIII. OTHER COMMENTS

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

1. _____

2. _____

B. Are there any other issues that should be addressed in a strategic plan for economic development for Sherman County?

C. What new business, service or activity would you most like to see in Sherman County?

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

Results of the survey will be printed in the Goodland Daily News and will be presented in a public meeting to be announced at a later date.

APPENDIX 2¹

Answer to Question II C. "If yes (engaged in farming or an agriculture-related field), what agricultural services are needed in Sherman County? List the top three."

Expansion of Agriculture

- Value - added processing.
- Machine & fabrication shops.
- Machine shop.
- New industry of packaging small seeds and grains.
- Small agricultural manufacturing businesses.
- Discover new ways to use agricultural products.
- Food processors, so we can diversify and distribute end products.
- Welding shop.
- Pump and well and engine services.
- End products, not just raw goods, tire sales & repairs.

Infrastructure

- Improved roads to bring grain to market.
- More feedlots as an outlet for our gain.
- Improved roads.
- More storage.
- Better rail rates.
- Elevators.
- We could use more feedlots.
- Good roads.

Business Environment

- Better prices on commodities.
- Lower taxes.
- Livestock market.
- Better prices.
- Ways to get better prices.
- Less taxes.
- Let's let up on the taxpayers.

Commitment/Capacity

- Push 4H Club more.
- Help.
- More cooperation from both city and rural.
- More respect.
- Need knowledgeable management.
- Support groups for struggling farmers.

Financing

- Grants from the State are funded by us.
- When we match the funds we are taxed again.
- Available financing for young farmers.
- Banks.

Environment

- Means to prevent water runoff waste in irrigation.
- County support for local environmental issues.

Education

- More computer classes for farmers.

Good/Nothing Needed

- Good at the time, always need more ag related services.
- None.
- Services are good.

¹Comments were edited for spelling, style and format and then grouped into categories.

APPENDIX 3¹

Answer to Question VIII A. "If there were two things you could add, delete or change about Sherman County, what would they be? Be as specific as you can with your comments."

Business Environment

- Change to Central time.
- Change to Central time.
- I've always felt Central Time would put us in "Sync" with the rest of Kansas.
- Be competitive. Colby seems to attract new businesses.
- Be able to keep business who wanted to locate here but for some reason went elsewhere.
- Too many business people don't want competition coming to town.
- Take away some of the benefits the farmers receive.
- People not associated with agriculture and pay taxes enrich the farmer.
- Availability of higher paying jobs.
- Wages need to be higher.
- Decent wages to workers. Like Henry Ford during depression.

Economic Development Strategies

- More factories such as Nemechek Cabinets.
- More business to attract customers from around the area as well as off the interstate.
- Develop tourism, take advantage of highway traffic.
- More small industry to diversify employment opportunity.
- We have an Industrial Park, let's get some industry in it.
- Go after new companies and business.
- Encourage new business.
- A big industry that is unrelated to agriculture.
- Let more businesses come in to Goodland.

Economic Development Strategies (cont)

- Need more independent locally owned businesses.
- Attract more business.
- New business.
- More small business/industry.
- Obtain new industry and assist with the expansion of existing industry.
- Add diversified economic base to the present, mainly agricultural.
- They are too concerned in trying to make this an industrial town.
- Change attitudes of business to one of service instead of just profits.
- New eating places on main street, such as Mexican - Steak House.
- Bulldoze the grocery stores and put in a Dillons Superstore.
- Get new stores (Walmart, Dillons), more competition and better prices.
- Provide jobs to retain our youth.
- More employment for young people after finishing college or before college.
- Increase job opportunities.
- Jobs for young adults to keep more younger people in Sherman County.
- City and county need to purchase everything locally.

Human Capital/Education

- New high school and junior high buildings, media/storm shelters at all 3 grade schools.
- Make the grade schools safe with storm shelters.
- New gym for junior high and shelters for grade schools.

¹Comments were edited for spelling, style and format and then grouped into categories.

Human Capital/Education (cont)

We need more support for improvement of school facilities.

Improve middle school education facility.

Build a new high school to attract better learning and better teachers.

Quit rejecting additions to the schools; the children are the future.

Provide tornado shelters for children and educators near the schools.

Build a fence around the lagoon at west school.

Improve school facilities especially junior high.

Cut administration in USD 352 to 1 Superintendent and 1 principal for 3 grade schools.

School system - get top notch administrators.

Better quality educators are needed.

Develop labor skills for low income people.

Infrastructure

"Y."

Improvement of the Y entrance to Goodland.

Do something about the Y entrance.

Do something about the "Y."

Change the "Y."

Fix up the "Y."

Remove the "Y" and make a direct entry and exit to Caldwell and main street.

Change the "Y" and make 17th st. a connection for a nice entry.

The "Y" is a mess.

Fix east leg of Y.

Do something about the E I-70 entrance to Goodland, the "Y", etc.

Improve the "Y."

Improve the "Y."

Better rail system - businesses need cheap transportation for incoming and outgoing products.

Build a larger grandstand at the fairgrounds.

Infrastructure (cont)

Improve roads including Highway 24. Change staff responsible.

Improve access to downtown.

Keep the road going to the city dumps cleaner and paved.

Quality of Life

Housing availability must improve to attract new business.

Better fishing.

Enclosed swimming pool.

Enclosed swimming pool.

An indoor swimming pool.

Change the GAC to a "Y" and do more for kids, enclosed swimming pool.

Add more recreation activities for teens.

Add a recreation facility similar to Disney World or Silver Dollar City.

County financed recreation facility (GAC is too expensive.).

A new playground "Topside Territory."

Don't spend money on unnecessary things. Old buildings can be modernized and renovated.

The town should be cleaned up, so it does not look so junky.

Entrance to Goodland. Cluttered business grounds and unkept yards.

Improve the entrances to Goodland.

Get busy on entrances.

Delete weeds in vacant lots, cracks in sidewalks.

Cut down the trees and bushes on the corners of the corner lots.

Work more on noxious weeds in both the city and county.

Set up and enforce housing codes whereby people would be unable to junk-up the neighborhood.

More beautification in entrances, airport, and lower cost homes.

Something should be done about replacing some of the dead trees.

Work more closely with the city.

Clean up junk.

Quality of Life (cont)

Delete chemical insecticides, pesticides, etc.; use safer deterrents.

Strict water control use to avoid rationing in future.

Use the good medical center more.

Change staff at the hospital.

Change how the hospital is run. Change staff at the hospital.

Overhaul hospital and board.

Bring in another medical doctor and surgeon.

Improve ambulance service with qualified and competent paid employees.

Better rapport with the hospital - Good Samaritan and between city and county government.

More for older people.

Cut down crime rate, eradicate drugs.

Less crime and vandalism.

Help for children with parents with drug and alcohol problems.

Provide a safer education environment for the children.

Commitment/Capacity

Put in a decent radio station.

Get our T.V. home!! We need our own news and local programs.

We need better local paper coverage of community events.

That not only merchants rule the town.

Less reliance on government to solve our problems.

Spend taxpayers money better than presently done on city building and police station.

Need all new committeemen. They are interested in how things will help them instead of Goodland.

Get more young people as commissioners and not let any person serve on a board.

Listen to the people they were the one's we put in office (politicians).

Commitment/Capacity (cont)

The City Government is the same "Good ole Boys." They don't want any change or competition.

Our city and county commission are not serving all of the public.

Stop catering to those individuals who expect preferential treatment because of name.

The governing bodies should take a more active role in developing recycling program.

Business and government work together to bring in new jobs/industry.

Commissioners stop spending tax payers money on everything.

Remove a handful of men out of a strangle hold so Goodland can breath.

Taxpayers, we are supporting all programs that appear on the surface.

A city government that can work together.

Hire a county manager.

Combine Sheriff and Police. Sheriff should be head of both. Eliminate Police chief.

Need a trustworthy police department (not referring to sheriff department).

Unify the police force.

Eliminate drug problem and improve police force.

Combine county and city police and sheriff dept.

Have police-local officials treat youth with more respect.

The law enforcement needs to be more strict.

Combine law enforcement agencies and cut costs.

Elect the "Economic Development" committee every two years.

Change staff at the Chamber of Commerce.

Change staff at the Chamber of Commerce.

Chamber director should be an elected position.

Get rid of Chamber of Commerce.

Change staff at the Chamber.

Commitment/Capacity (cont)

Chamber of Commerce go after businesses a lot more aggressively.

Change staff at the Chamber. Anyone in this job should promote Goodland not himself.

Change staff at the Chamber.

Adventure more.

Learn more.

Encourage more open and positive attitudes.

Be more progressive - not as conservative.

Goodland is not a friendly town for outsiders.

A more positive attitude.

The attitude of many of the business people in Goodland drives people to Colby.

Welcome newcomers and encourage their participation in community activities.

Negative community attitude would be deleted.

Change attitudes of people who don't want us to progress.

Stop using "Letters to the Editor" as a forum to cause rift in the community.

Need more cooperation when starting family businesses.

There is a cohesive element lacking in all of us to get anything done.

Need more citizens involved in community planning and volunteer force.

Bring all group working on behalf of Goodland.

Favoritism - names with money have more influence.

Chamber, city, county, and school government work together.

Community operates for benefit of only a few people.

More cooperation with city.

Being responsible for our own community instead of relying on others.

Better cooperation of the different factions for the good of the county.

Wish there was a more positive attitude - run into a lot of negative people who block change.

Commitment/Capacity (cont)

People in government that are for improvement of development of business in Goodland.

More agreeable; work together.

If younger, get involved more.

Better communications with farm and businesses and appreciation for each.

Get some new fans and younger people.

The County and City Commissions, Chamber and Economic Development should work together.

Try to get more of the younger generation to come in.

Community support the officials they have elected.

Stop local businessmen from discouraging new businesses.

Financial

Help small businesses no matter how small. Get them grants and low interest loans.

Create an economic growth fund to fund new jobs in the county.

Things Are Okay - No Change Needed

I think everything is well taken care of.

We chose Goodland out of four towns to retire in, and are very happy with our choice.

All areas have been pretty well covered.

APPENDIX 4¹

Answer to questions VIII B. "Are there any other issues that should be addressed in a strategic plan for economic development for Sherman County?"

Business Environment

Help to small businesses.

Lower rates - taxes, hospital, doctors, etc.
Airlines have a special to Denver or Salina.

The downtown merchants need to be more willing to experience competition.

I feel new business should be allowed to come into town.

Use our tax dollars for residents not for bribes for new businesses.

Do not overtax, things could go back to the dirty 30's.

Find new businesses that have the money to start on their own.

Quit keeping new business from coming to town.

Competition is good.

Encourage growth.

The local businessmen need to be less fearful of competition.

Why do new business and industry go to Colby instead of Goodland?

Economic Development Strategies

When attracting new industry, show the Vo-Tech can train or retrain workforce.

Have an informed committee to meet with potential new business people.

Any type of industry that would provide a number of jobs.

More jobs in Goodland to keep the younger people in town.

Encourage new businesses rather than protecting the ones already here. Bring more people here to shop.

More industry to keep youth here and encourage new families to relocate.

Economic Development Strategies (cont)

Sherman County is becoming older, cater to the retired like a Sun City of the Mid-West.

Getting new businesses - jobs that don't completely rely on wheat crop.

New business which is not agriculture related.
K-Mart or variety store.

Know what resources we already have and attract businesses.

Stop trying to make Goodland a big city.

Diversify from agriculture base.

Diversification of industrial base to stabilize economy when agriculture has bad year.

Encourage more small businesses to locate here.

Concentrate on business and industry that would be able to pay better wages.

Cooperate with other cities in area to attract large businesses.

Human Capital/Education

Ask teachers for input on the schools--don't have punitive measures against them if they speak up.

New gym for junior high.

Our schools in comparison with others are far behind in many areas.

Improve the school system facilities.

School system should have long term plan for facilities.

Infrastructure

Curb & gutter on Cattle trail, traffic lights
17th, 8th, 10th/Main & 8th/Caldwell.

Main street improvement.

Direct route from Hwy. 24 to downtown.

¹Comments edited for spelling, style and format and then grouped into categories.

Infrastructure (cont)

City/County Sanitation Dept. should be initiated to haul refuse and monitor what is being disposed.

I think that our airport expansion should be in the plan.

Quality of Life

Protect the environment; industry needs to work with environment.

Swimming pool available year around to all citizens.

New built-in swimming pool for year around use.

Provide more recreational facilities.

Long term water usage plan.

Strengthen and expand hospital and medical services.

Seek improvement in the running of the hospital and school system.

Grocery stores to expand.

County needs to help in responsibility in quality of life.

Commitment/Capacity

New leadership in City Commission, School Board, Chamber Office.

More cooperation between city and rural. Support our town more.

More accountability for spending by city and county government, lower local taxes.

Get others besides businessmen to plan for community and county; ask for volunteers.

Consideration of having a director of Economic Development full time or at least part time.

Make sure the people representing economic growth are not just in it for their betterment.

Strategic planning committee should be composed of a mix of people. Newspaper sensitive to rural residents.

Change staff at the Chamber with a high-powered, business-oriented person, identify 3 goals and stop wasting time.

Renovate the Chamber--personnel change. Need stability.

Commitment/Capacity (cont)

Need a person in chamber office who understands the ag problems.

Yes, change staff at the Chamber.

Economic Development--seems to be an individual making deals with prospective businesses.

Better local and area newspaper coverage.

We need to stop fighting among ourselves and band together for the good of the county.

The newspaper stinks.

The main issue is to work together and see what things start happening.

This survey is good. There should be more input from the public.

Follow advise of numerous surveys you have done.

Need to stress pulling together.

People need to work together for the county not to benefit themselves.

Agencies should work together to make Goodland a progressive growing community.

Any strategic plan for economic growth should be voted on by taxpayers.

All this development costs us and we derive nothing in return.

Planners need to understand that we are operating with a false economy.

Individuals willing to help new industries.

Financial

Obtain a source of money to be ongoing for economic development.

Loans for businesses other than agriculture.

APPENDIX 5¹

Answer to Question VIII C. "What new business, service or activity would you like to see in Sherman County?"

Industrial/Manufacturing

Industrial.
Industry to employ many employees.
Manufacturing company, truck lines.
Factory manufacturing jobs.
Get an avionic repair at the airport.
Trucking, any business not agriculture related and not affected by agriculture.
Flour mill.
Industry - any type.
I would like to see more small manufacturing companies.
Light manufacturing (no pollutants, employ several heads of households).
Fiber optics and more high tech businesses to complement the agriculture.
Manufacturing, tourism, airport expansion.
Retain and improve on ones we have.
Agriculture related manufacturing.
More cattle feeding.
More industrial small family businesses of a specialized nature.

Eating Establishment

Steak house.
Put in a Sirloin Stockade.
Steak house.
Steak house.
Steak house.
Steak house.
Good steak house.
Nice steak house.
A steak house - so we don't drive to Colby.
New steak house.
Sizzlin Steak.
Sirloin Stockade.
Steak house or something similar.

Eating Establishment (cont)

Sirloin Stockade or Bonanza.
Steak house, Red Lobster.
Good table service restaurant with "atmosphere."
A good restaurant on the "strip," not just a fast food outlet.
Long John Silvers, steak house.
Long John Silvers.
Long John Silvers.
Long John Silvers, Sirloin Stockade and other cafes.
An Arby's fast food service.
Arby's or Burger King.
Better restaurants.

Retail/Grocery Store

Dodge auto dealer, convenience store on 17th.
Wal-Mart.
Wal-Mart.
Wal-Mart.
Different kinds of stores like K-Mart and more lumber yards.
K-Mart or Dillons.
K-Mart.
K-Mart, Wal-Mart.
Big Sears store, K-Mart.
Wal-Mart.
Wal-Mart, London Fog and others.
Dillons.
Grocery replacement to replace Safeway.
Would like to see Dillons to help keep food prices reasonable.
More availability to purchase clothing for children.
Would like to see more shops and service.
Cabello's or Gart Brothers.

¹Comments have been edited for spelling, style and format and then grouped into categories.

Retail/Grocery Store (cont)

- A shoe store.
- A health food store.
- Another grocery store, Payless Shoes, craft store.
- Music store, sports store.

Recreation

- Need more activities for kids. GAC is too expensive.
- New public swimming pool.
- Public indoor swimming pool.
- Trail rides, stock smoky with fish for the kids.
- More participation in library, art center, activity center, museum.
- Youth teen club or low-cost activities.
- Activity for teenagers besides sports, like music, somewhere to go.
- More activities for young people.
- More activities for youth.
- Indoor swimming pool and bicycle path, lumber yard, center for youth.
- Skating rink, other activities for teens such as a teen center.
- Roller skating rink.
- Rodeos, better newspaper, local TV station.
- Home owned carnival, entertainment concerts.

Environment

- We need a recycling plant. Farmers should put back all of the hedge rows around the fields.
- Clean up and do something about entrances.
- Feed lots, financial help for ones with dead trees.
- Animal shelter.
- Help from county or city with dead trees in city.

Quality of Life Services

- Social Security office is open so seldom and is not available but 1/2 day a month. This is inadequate.
- An educational tutoring service.
- The vo-tech could offer classes at night.
- A day care center.

Quality of Life Services (cont)

- More help for seniors who wish to stay in their own homes.
- Another nursing home or a place for intermediate care.
- Full-time county run ambulance service.
- A family renting project and broader development of services.
- Better transportation (bus, public transport).
- Need more doctors who live in Goodland, more cultural arts & library services.
- More advertising etc. on buying at home.

Other

- Any new business that creates jobs, does not pollute and requires no assistance.
- New businesses to bring more families in to take up empty houses.
- Any that can make it on their own.
- Positive growth that would dictate and demand all kinds of new business.
- Something other than agricultural related.
- Return graduates to Goodland.
- Any new business that would bring more jobs and people to our country.
- The more the better - competition encourages change.
- I would welcome any new business and company that would employ the local.
- New business places that will help our farmers.
- Anything that will bring people here to shop and work.
- Anything that brings in more improvement and money.
- No cooperation of power people here. "No more fish plants."
- Buy here - keep what we have.
- The parades that Goodland puts on are pathetic.
- Put people back to work year around.
- Don't turn away any industry or business.
- There too many long time business's that do not want competition.
- Jobs for young couples.
- Need non-agricultural businesses.
- More competition among businesses.

Other (cont)

Give benefits to the businessmen in Gld. here now.

We need something that is not agriculture related.

Something sizeable that would provide more jobs.

City/county get more involved.

Take care of existing businesses. With growth businesses will come.

APPENDIX 6
Sherman County Survey Results by Place of Residence
Goodland vs County¹

Table 1a
Economic Development Strategies:
Relative Importance to Sherman County's Economic Growth
Goodland Residents

<u>Strategy:</u>	<u>Critical/Important</u>		<u>Unimportant</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Retain/expand business/industry	64.1%	24.3%	2.9%	1.0%	7.7%
Attract new business/industry	58.3	30.1	5.8	1.0	4.8
Helping business start-ups	32.0	39.8	14.6	2.9	10.7
Providing small business assistance	35.9	33.0	14.6	3.9	12.7
Expand agri-business opportunities	33.0	38.8	15.5	1.9	10.7
Temporary property tax breaks to businesses	14.6	35.0	28.2	6.8	15.5
Diversify local economy	41.7	38.8	4.9	1.9	12.6
Technical assistance to businesses	17.5	36.9	19.4	7.8	18.4
Access to small business financing	29.1	46.6	9.7	2.9	11.7
Access to start-up financing	28.2	46.6	11.7	2.9	10.7
Access to existing business financing	30.1	38.8	11.7	6.8	12.6

Total=N=103

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

¹County residents are those residents that do not reside in Goodland. "County" includes responses from Edson, Kanorado, Ruleton and rural.

Table 1b
Economic Development Strategies:
Relative Importance to Sherman County's Economic Growth
County Residents

<u>Strategy:</u>	<u>Critical/Important</u>		<u>Unimportant</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Retain/expand business/industry	68.4%	26.3%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%
Attract new business/industry	57.9	28.9	10.5	0.0	2.6
Helping business start-ups	39.5	34.2	13.2	5.3	7.9
Providing small business assistance	28.9	39.5	21.1	5.3	5.2
Expand agri-business opportunities	36.8	34.2	15.8	5.3	7.9
Temporary property tax breaks to businesses	18.4	15.8	23.7	23.7	18.5
Diversify local economy	42.1	34.2	7.9	7.9	7.9
Technical assistance to businesses	10.5	34.2	31.6	7.9	15.8
Access to small business financing	42.1	26.3	18.4	5.3	7.9
Access to start-up financing	39.5	23.7	21.1	5.3	10.6
Access to existing business financing	28.9	36.8	15.8	7.9	10.6

Total=N=38

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 2a
Business Environment in Sherman County
Ratings for Selected Items
Goodland Residents

<u>Items:</u>	<u>Excellent</u>			<u>Poor</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>		
Work ethic	10.7%	47.6%	23.3%	9.7%	8.7%	
Quality of existing firms	5.8	65.0	17.5	5.8	5.9	
Business commitment to the community	18.4	45.6	17.5	8.7	9.7	
Community support for starting a business	5.8	32.0	33.0	19.4	9.8	
Business tax structure	1.0	16.5	31.1	13.6	37.8	
Ability to develop new ideas	2.9	15.5	46.6	26.2	8.7	
Potential to attract new business	16.5	21.4	29.1	29.1	3.8	
Environment to generate new ideas	5.8	23.3	35.0	28.2	7.8	

Total=N=103

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 2b
Business Environment in Sherman County
Ratings for Selected Items
County Residents

<u>Items:</u>	<u>Excellent</u>			<u>Poor</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>		
Work ethic	5.3%	47.4%	26.3%	21.1%	0.0%	
Quality of existing firms	2.6	60.5	28.9	5.3	2.6	
Business commitment to the community	10.5	47.4	23.1	10.5	7.9	
Community support for starting a business	2.6	21.1	34.2	34.2	7.9	
Business tax structure	2.6	13.2	28.9	26.3	29.0	
Ability to develop new ideas	7.9	13.2	23.7	44.7	10.5	
Potential to attract new business	7.9	7.9	34.2	42.1	7.9	
Environment to generate new ideas	5.3	5.3	28.9	50.0	10.6	

Total=N=38

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 3a
Local Economic Development Activities:
Relative Importance to Sherman County's Economic Growth and Stability
Goodland Residents

<u>Strategy:</u>	<u>Critical/Important</u>		<u>Unimportant</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Cooperating with neighboring communities	24.3%	49.5%	13.6%	2.9%	9.7%
Business/gov't cooperation	38.8	44.7	5.8	1.0	9.7
State/Federal grants/aid	37.9	38.8	11.7	3.9	7.8
Local public funding for economic development	23.3	43.7	14.6	4.9	13.6
Local organization for economic development	41.7	38.8	9.7	1.9	7.7
Business/education cooperation	43.7	38.8	6.8	1.9	8.7

Total=N=103

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 3b
Local Economic Development Activities:
Relative Importance to Sherman County's Economic Growth and Stability
County Residents

<u>Strategy:</u>	<u>Critical/Important</u>		<u>Unimportant</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Cooperating with neighboring communities	28.9%	55.3%	7.9%	2.6%	5.2%
Business/gov't cooperation	44.7	44.7	2.6	5.3	2.6
State/Federal grants/aid	44.7	28.9	10.5	7.9	7.9
Local public funding for economic development	18.4	50.0	15.8	5.3	10.6
Local organization for economic development	31.6	44.7	10.5	2.6	10.5
Business/education cooperation	36.8	44.7	13.2	0.0	5.2

Total=N=38

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 4a
Human Capital Strategies:
Relative Importance to Sherman County's Economic Growth
Goodland Residents

<u>Strategy:</u>	<u>Critical/Important</u>		<u>Unimportant</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Well-skilled workforce	45.6%	44.7%	5.8%	1.0%	2.9%
Productive workforce	55.3	40.8	0.0	0.0	3.9
Improving adult workers' skills	35.0	46.6	12.6	1.0	4.9
Preparing young people for the workforce	57.3	35.0	2.9	1.0	3.9
Employer-provided job training	40.8	43.7	10.7	1.0	3.9
Job training for low skilled/unemployed	37.9	45.6	10.7	1.0	4.9

Total=N=103

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 4b
Human Capital Strategies:
Relative Importance to Sherman County's Economic Growth
County Residents

<u>Strategy:</u>	<u>Critical/Important</u>		<u>Unimportant</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Well-skilled workforce	36.8%	44.7%	13.2%	2.6%	2.6%
Productive workforce	57.9	28.9	7.9	2.6	2.6
Improving adult workers' skills	23.7	50.0	18.4	2.6	5.3
Preparing young people for the workforce	63.2	31.6	5.3	0.0	0.0
Employer-provided job training	28.9	50.0	15.8	0.0	5.3
Job training for low skilled/unemployed	34.2	31.6	31.6	0.0	2.6

Total=N=38

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 5a
Satisfaction With School
Programs in Sherman County
Goodland Residents

<u>Provider:</u>	<u>Satisfied</u>		<u>Dissatisfied</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Pre-school	16.5%	50.5%	3.9%	1.0%	28.2%
Elementary (K-6)	13.6	61.2	3.9	0.0	21.4
Junior high (7-8)	14.6	47.6	12.6	3.9	21.4
High school (9-12)	13.6	48.5	10.7	4.9	22.3
Voc/Tech school	33.0	42.7	2.9	2.9	18.5
Adult basic skills/ literacy	13.6	34.0	10.7	6.8	34.9
Retraining adult workers	6.8	33.0	16.5	4.9	38.8

Total=N=103

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 5b
Satisfaction With School
Programs in Sherman County
County Residents

<u>Provider:</u>	<u>Satisfied</u>		<u>Dissatisfied</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Pre-school	5.3%	55.3%	5.3%	0.0%	34.2%
Elementary (K-6)	7.9	60.5	10.5	0.0	21.0
Junior high (7-8)	7.9	39.5	26.3	2.6	23.7
High school (9-12)	7.9	39.5	21.1	7.9	23.7
Voc/Tech school	26.3	52.6	5.3	2.6	13.1
Adult basic skills/ literacy	5.3	39.5	13.2	5.3	36.9
Retraining adult workers	0.0	31.6	26.3	7.9	34.2

Total=N=38

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 6a
Satisfaction With School
Facilities in Sherman County
Goodland Residents

<u>Provider:</u>	<u>Satisfied</u>		<u>Dissatisfied</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Pre-school	14.6%	52.4%	6.8%	1.9%	24.3%
Elementary and junior high	10.7	35.0	31.1	7.8	15.6
High school	13.6	57.3	14.6	2.9	11.7
Adult/other	9.7	54.4	8.7	1.0	26.2

Total=N=103

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.*

Table 6b
Satisfaction With School
Facilities in Sherman County
County Residents

<u>Provider:</u>	<u>Satisfied</u>		<u>Dissatisfied</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Pre-school	13.2%	50.0%	10.5%	0.0%	26.3%
Elementary and junior high	7.9	44.7	18.4	7.9	21.1
High school	5.3	55.3	18.4	2.6	18.4
Adult/other	10.5	47.4	15.8	0.0	26.3

Total=N=38

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.*

Table 7a
Infrastructure in Sherman County
Ratings for Selected Items
Goodland Residents

<u>Items:</u>	<u>Excellent</u>			<u>Poor</u>	<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Appearance of city entrances	1.9%	14.6%	24.3%	52.4%	6.8%
County roads/bridges	1.9	23.3	47.6	10.7	16.5
City streets	6.8	37.9	37.9	12.6	4.9
Rail/highway access	11.7	43.7	29.1	9.7	5.8
Sewer/water treatment facilities	9.7	58.3	17.5	1.9	12.6
Water quality	27.2	49.5	11.7	5.8	5.8
Water availability	30.1	55.3	7.8	1.0	5.8
Flood prevention/control	8.7	35.0	35.9	5.8	14.6
Sites for new businesses	19.4	43.7	25.2	5.8	5.9
Access to airport	27.2	56.3	8.7	3.9	3.9
Communications technology	13.6	51.5	17.5	2.9	14.5

Total=N=103

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 7b
Infrastructure in Sherman County
Ratings for Selected Items
County Residents

<u>Items:</u>	<u>Excellent</u>			<u>Poor</u>	<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Appearance of city entrances	0.0%	7.9%	31.6%	55.3%	5.3%
County roads/bridges	0.0	23.7	36.8	36.8	2.6
City streets	0.0	42.1	42.1	7.9	7.9
Rail/highway access	13.2	23.7	50.0	7.9	5.3
Sewer/water treatment facilities	2.6	57.9	15.8	0.0	23.7
Water quality	23.7	55.3	5.3	5.3	10.5
Water availability	18.4	65.8	2.6	2.6	10.5
Flood prevention/control	5.3	36.8	23.7	10.5	23.7
Sites for new businesses	13.2	44.7	26.3	5.3	10.6
Access to airport	23.7	57.9	13.2	2.6	2.6
Communications technology	13.2	47.4	13.2	13.2	13.1

Total=N=38

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 8
Overall Quality of Life
in Sherman County
Goodland vs. County Residents

<u>Rating:</u>	<u>Goodland</u>		<u>County</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Excellent	29	28.2%	9	23.7%
Good	51	49.5	17	44.7
Fair	13	12.6	8	21.1
Poor	3	2.9	1	2.6
No response	7	6.8	3	7.9
TOTAL	103	100.0	38	100.0

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 9
Changes in Quality of Life
in Sherman County
Goodland vs. County Residents

<u>Community</u> <u>has become:</u>	<u>Goodland</u>		<u>County</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Better	20	19.4%	9	23.7%
Worse	23	22.3	8	21.1
About the same	55	53.4	16	42.1
No Response	5	4.9	5	13.2
TOTAL	103	100.0	38	100.0

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 10a
Quality of Life Aspects of Sherman County
Goodland Residents

Provider:	Excellent			Poor	
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>DK</u>
Industry	4.9%	19.4	35.9%	34.0%	5.9%
Schools (K-12)	7.8	64.1	17.5	1.9	8.7
Environment	25.2	50.5	16.5	1.9	5.9
Tourism	6.8	37.9	35.0	9.7	10.7
Local events	13.6	49.5	23.3	4.9	8.7
Cultural arts	18.4	50.5	19.4	3.9	7.7
Retail shopping	9.7	45.6	30.1	8.7	5.9
Recreation	16.5	41.7	23.3	11.7	5.9
Economic development	2.9	27.2	30.1	26.2	13.6
Hotels/restaurants	13.6	52.4	25.2	4.9	3.9
Day care	6.8	55.3	14.6	2.9	20.4
Senior activities	19.4	47.6	10.7	4.9	17.5
Neighborhood safety	14.6	48.5	22.3	3.9	10.7

Total=N=103

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 10b
Quality of Life Aspects of Sherman County
County Residents

Provider:	Excellent			Poor	
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>DK</u>
Industry	0.0%	15.8	55.3%	26.3%	2.6%
Schools (K-12)	5.3	55.3	28.9	2.6	7.9
Environment	28.9	50.0	13.2	2.6	5.3
Tourism	5.3	36.8	34.2	13.2	10.5
Local events	7.9	44.7	39.5	2.6	5.2
Cultural arts	13.2	47.4	23.7	2.6	13.2
Retail shopping	2.6	34.2	50.0	7.9	5.3
Recreation	5.3	44.7	26.3	15.8	7.9
Economic development	0.0	23.7	28.9	28.9	18.4
Hotels/restaurants	18.4	44.7	31.6	2.6	2.6
Day care	13.2	31.6	23.7	2.6	29.0
Senior activities	18.4	31.6	10.5	10.5	29.0
Neighborhood safety	7.9	42.1	21.1	15.8	13.1

Total=N=38

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 11a
Housing Availability and Quality in Sherman County
Ratings for Selected Items
Goodland Residents

<u>Availability of:</u>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>DK</u>
Apartments	2.9%	15.5%	31.1%	15.5%	34.9%
Single family rentals	0.0	12.6	33.0	18.4	35.9
Mobile home parks	2.9	39.8	21.4	3.9	32.0
Low income housing	1.9	23.3	30.1	8.7	36.0
Single family housing	1.9	27.2	34.0	5.8	31.1
Housing for seniors	4.9	32.0	29.1	3.9	30.1
Medium-priced homes	1.0	30.1	25.2	20.4	23.3
New homes	2.9	23.3	19.4	25.2	29.1
Financing for housing	1.9	19.4	29.1	11.7	37.9
<u>Quality of:</u>					
Rental housing	0.0	7.8	35.0	29.1	28.2
Owned-housing	5.8	44.7	22.3	2.9	24.3

Total=N=103

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"
 Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.*

Table 11b
Housing Availability and Quality in Sherman County
Ratings for Selected Items
County Residents

<u>Availability of:</u>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>DK</u>
Apartments	0.0%	13.2%	28.9%	31.6%	26.4%
Single family rentals	0.0	10.5	31.6	34.2	23.7
Mobile home parks	5.3	31.6	23.7	7.9	31.6
Low income housing	0.0	15.8	21.1	21.1	42.1
Single family housing	0.0	23.7	36.8	13.2	26.4
Housing for seniors	2.6	26.3	21.1	13.2	36.8
Medium-priced homes	7.9	15.8	28.9	18.4	29.0
New homes	5.3	23.7	21.1	15.8	34.2
Financing for housing	0.0	18.4	28.9	10.5	42.1
<u>Quality of:</u>					
Rental housing	0.0	7.9	23.7	36.8	31.6
Owned-housing	0.0	34.2	34.2	2.6	29.0

Total=N=38

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"
 Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.*

Table 12a
Health Care Services in Sherman County
Ratings for Selected Items
Goodland Residents

<u>Item:</u>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>DK</u>
HC Providers	11.7%	44.7%	20.4%	11.7%	11.6%
Hospital	20.4	48.5	18.4	3.9	8.7
Other facilities	7.8	59.2	9.7	4.9	18.5
Ambulance	20.4	37.9	15.5	7.8	18.4
Nursing homes	19.4	51.5	8.7	3.9	16.5
Senior care costs	16.5	47.6	13.6	1.9	20.4
Health care costs	2.9	16.5	32.0	32.0	16.5

Total=N=103

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 12b
Health Care Services in Sherman County
Ratings for Selected Items
County Residents

<u>Item:</u>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>DK</u>
HC Providers	7.9%	52.6%	28.9%	2.6%	7.9%
Hospital	15.8	42.1	15.8	18.4	7.9
Other facilities	5.3	47.4	21.1	2.6	23.7
Ambulance	13.2	36.8	13.2	15.8	21.1
Nursing homes	18.4	42.1	5.3	5.3	29.0
Senior care costs	5.3	52.6	5.3	5.3	31.6
Health care costs	0.0	7.9	39.5	34.2	18.5

Total=N=38

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 13
Assisted Living Centers Need
in Sherman County
Goodland vs. County Residents

<u>Need</u>	<u>Goodland</u>		<u>County</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Very Great	17	16.5%	4	10.5%
Great	26	25.2	10	26.3
Some	30	29.1	10	26.3
Little	4	3.9	1	2.6
Don't Know	26	25.2	13	34.2
TOTAL	103	100.0	38	100.0

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

APPENDIX 7
Sherman County Survey Results by Age Categories¹

Table 1a
Economic Development Strategies:
Relative Importance to Sherman County's Economic Growth
Residents Age 25-44

<u>Strategy:</u>	<u>Critical/Important</u>		<u>Unimportant</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Retain/expand business/industry	66.7%	27.8%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%
Attract new business/industry	52.8	38.9	5.6	0.0	2.8
Helping business start-ups	33.3	33.3	25.0	2.8	5.6
Providing small business assistance	25.0	47.2	19.4	2.8	5.6
Expand agri-business opportunities	27.8	36.1	27.8	2.8	5.6
Temporary property tax breaks to businesses	13.9	27.8	41.7	8.3	8.4
Diversify local economy	50.0	36.1	2.8	5.6	5.6
Technical assistance to businesses	16.7	38.9	25.0	11.1	8.4
Access to small business financing	44.4	33.3	13.9	2.8	5.6
Access to start-up financing	38.9	36.1	19.4	0.0	5.6
Access to existing business financing	38.9	33.3	19.4	2.8	5.6

Total=N=36

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

¹Age categories for the purpose of this analysis are: 25-44, 45-64, and 65 and older. Two respondents did not indicate their ages and therefore their responses could not be used for this appendix. No one under the age of 25 responded to the survey.

Table 1b
Economic Development Strategies:
Relative Importance to Sherman County's Economic Growth
Residents Age 45-64

<u>Strategy:</u>	<u>Critical/Important</u>		<u>Unimportant</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Retain/expand business/industry	67.7%	27.4%	0.0%	1.6%	3.2%
Attract new business/industry	64.5	22.6	8.1	1.6	3.2
Helping business start-ups	41.9	38.7	9.7	4.8	4.8
Providing small business assistance	43.5	30.6	14.5	6.5	4.8
Expand agri-business opportunities	41.9	32.3	12.9	4.8	8.0
Temporary property tax breaks to businesses	19.4	29.0	22.6	16.1	12.9
Diversify local economy	41.9	40.3	8.1	3.2	6.4
Technical assistance to businesses	21.0	30.6	25.8	8.1	14.6
Access to small business financing	35.5	45.2	6.5	6.5	6.4
Access to start-up financing	35.5	41.9	9.7	6.5	6.4
Access to existing business financing	35.5	41.9	4.8	9.7	8.1

Total=N=62

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 1c
Economic Development Strategies:
Relative Importance to Sherman County's Economic Growth
Residents Age 65 and Older

<u>Strategy:</u>	<u>Critical/Important</u>		<u>Unimportant</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Retain/expand business/industry	58.5%	19.5%	7.3%	0.0%	14.6%
Attract new business/industry	51.2	34.1	7.3	0.0	7.3
Helping business start-ups	22.0	41.5	12.2	2.4	22.0
Providing small business assistance	26.8	31.7	17.1	2.4	22.0
Expand agri-business opportunities	29.3	43.9	9.8	0.0	17.1
Temporary property tax breaks to businesses	9.8	31.7	22.0	7.3	29.2
Diversify local economy	34.1	34.1	4.9	2.4	24.4
Technical assistance to businesses	7.3	43.9	14.6	2.4	31.7
Access to small business financing	19.5	39.0	19.5	0.0	22.0
Access to start-up financing	19.5	39.0	17.1	2.4	21.9
Access to existing business financing	14.6	36.6	19.5	4.9	24.4

Total=N=41

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.*

Table 2a
Business Environment in Sherman County
Ratings for Selected Items
Residents Age 25-44

Items:	Excellent				DK
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	Poor <u>4</u>	
Work ethic	11.1%	47.2%	27.3%	11.1%	2.8%
Quality of existing firms	0.0	77.8	13.9	5.6	2.8
Business commitment to the community	19.4	41.7	25.0	8.3	5.6
Community support for starting a business	2.8	30.6	41.7	22.2	2.8
Business tax structure	2.8	13.9	38.9	19.4	25.0
Ability to develop new ideas	2.8	13.9	41.7	33.3	8.4
Potential to attract new business	5.6	13.9	30.6	41.7	8.4
Environment to generate new ideas	0.0	13.9	38.9	36.1	11.1

Total=N=36

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 2b
Business Environment in Sherman County
Ratings for Selected Items
Residents Age 45-64

Items:	Excellent				DK
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	Poor <u>4</u>	
Work ethic	4.8%	51.6%	29.0%	12.9%	1.6%
Quality of existing firms	3.2	59.7	29.0	4.8	3.2
Business commitment to the community	9.7	53.2	19.4	12.9	4.8
Community support for starting a business	4.8	24.2	30.6	35.5	4.8
Business tax structure	0.0	14.5	32.3	24.2	29.0
Ability to develop new ideas	1.6	14.5	43.5	37.1	3.2
Potential to attract new business	16.1	17.7	27.4	37.1	1.6
Environment to generate new ideas	8.1	14.5	33.9	41.9	1.6

Total=N=62

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 2c
Business Environment in Sherman County
Ratings for Selected Items
Residents Age 65 and Older

<u>Items:</u>	<u>Excellent</u>		<u>Poor</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Work ethic	14.6%	39.0%	14.6%	14.6%	17.1%
Quality of existing firms	12.2	58.5	14.6	7.3	7.3
Business commitment to the community	22.0	41.5	12.2	4.9	19.5
Community support for starting a business	4.9	36.6	29.3	7.3	22.0
Business tax structure	2.4	19.5	22.0	4.9	51.2
Ability to develop new ideas	9.8	17.1	34.1	19.5	19.5
Potential to attract new business	17.1	19.5	36.6	19.5	7.3
Environment to generate new ideas	7.3	26.8	29.3	19.5	17.1

Total=N=41

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 3a
Local Economic Development Activities:
Relative Importance to Sherman County's Economic Growth and Stability
Residents Age 25-44

<u>Strategy:</u>	<u>Critical/Important</u>		<u>Unimportant</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Cooperating with neighboring communities	33.3%	33.3%	16.7%	8.3%	8.4%
Business/gov't cooperation	52.8	38.9	2.8	0.0	5.6
State/Federal grants/aid	52.8	25.0	11.1	2.8	8.4
Local public funding for economic development	16.7	41.7	25.0	5.6	11.2
Local organization for economic development	41.7	44.4	5.6	0.0	8.4
Business/education cooperation	47.2	38.9	2.8	2.8	8.4

Total=N=36

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 3b
Local Economic Development Activities:
Relative Importance to Sherman County's Economic Growth and Stability
Residents Age 45-64

<u>Strategy:</u>	<u>Critical/Important</u>		<u>Unimportant</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Cooperating with neighboring communities	24.2%	59.7%	11.3%	0.0%	4.8%
Business/gov't cooperation	40.3	45.2	4.8	3.2	6.4
State/Federal grants/aid	41.9	37.1	9.7	8.1	3.2
Local public funding for economic development	27.4	53.2	8.1	4.8	6.4
Local organization for economic development	40.3	41.9	9.7	3.2	4.8
Business/education cooperation	40.3	45.2	8.1	1.6	4.8

Total=N=62

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 3c
Local Economic Development Activities:
Relative Importance to Sherman County's Economic Growth and Stability
Residents Age 65 and Older

<u>Strategy:</u>	<u>Critical/Important</u>		<u>Unimportant</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Cooperating with neighboring communities	19.5%	56.1%	7.3%	2.4%	14.7%
Business/gov't cooperation	26.8	51.2	7.3	2.4	12.2
State/Federal grants/aid	24.4	43.9	14.6	2.4	14.7
Local public funding for economic development	19.5	34.1	17.1	4.9	25.4
Local organization for economic development	31.7	36.6	14.6	2.4	14.6
Business/education cooperation	36.6	36.6	14.6	0.0	13.2

Total=N=41

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 4a
Human Capital Strategies:
Relative Importance to Sherman County's Economic Growth
Residents Age 25-44

<u>Strategy:</u>	<u>Critical/Important</u>		<u>Unimportant</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Well-skilled workforce	33.3%	52.8%	11.1%	2.8%	0.0%
Productive workforce	44.4	52.8	2.8	0.0	0.0
Improving adult workers' skills	30.6	44.4	22.2	2.8	0.0
Preparing young people for the workforce	47.2	41.7	5.6	2.8	2.8
Employer-provided job training	36.1	44.4	19.4	0.0	0.0
Job training for low skilled/unemployed	30.6	38.9	25.0	2.8	2.8

Total=N=36

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"
Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 4b
Human Capital Strategies:
Relative Importance to Sherman County's Economic Growth
Residents Age 45-64

<u>Strategy:</u>	<u>Critical/Important</u>		<u>Unimportant</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Well-skilled workforce	48.4%	41.9%	6.5%	1.6%	1.6%
Productive workforce	72.6	22.6	1.6	1.6	1.6
Improving adult workers' skills	37.1	48.4	11.3	1.6	1.6
Preparing young people for the workforce	71.0	27.4	1.6	0.0	0.0
Employer-provided job training	37.1	48.4	11.3	1.6	1.6
Job training for low skilled/unemployed	38.7	40.3	17.7	0.0	3.2

Total=N=62

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"
Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 4c
Human Capital Strategies:
Relative Importance to Sherman County's Economic Growth
Residents Age 65 and Older

Strategy:	Critical/Important		Unimportant		DK
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Well-skilled workforce	43.9%	41.5%	7.3%	0.0%	7.3%
Productive workforce	41.5	46.3	2.4	0.0	10.1
Improving adult workers' skills	24.4	48.8	12.2	0.0	14.6
Preparing young people for the workforce	51.2	36.6	4.9	0.0	7.3
Employer-provided job training	39.0	41.5	7.3	0.0	12.2
Job training for low skilled/unemployed	39.0	46.3	7.3	0.0	7.3

Total=N=41

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 5a
Satisfaction With School
Programs in Sherman County
Residents Age 25-44

Provider:	Satisfied		Dissatisfied		DK
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Pre-school	5.6%	55.6%	5.6%	2.8%	30.5%
Elementary (K-6)	8.3	61.1	5.6	0.0	25.0
Junior high (7-8)	5.6	44.4	8.3	5.6	36.2
High school (9-12)	5.6	44.4	11.1	5.6	33.3
Voc/Tech school	11.1	63.9	5.6	2.8	16.7
Adult basic skills/ literacy	2.8	47.2	8.3	5.6	36.2
Retraining adult workers	2.8	25.0	19.4	5.6	47.2

Total=N=36

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 5b
Satisfaction With School
Programs in Sherman County
Residents Age 45-64

<u>Provider:</u>	<u>Satisfied</u>		<u>Dissatisfied</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Pre-school	14.5%	48.4%	4.8%	0.0%	32.2%
Elementary (K-6)	11.3	69.4	4.8	0.0	14.5
Junior high (7-8)	14.5	48.4	22.6	4.8	9.7
High school (9-12)	11.3	51.6	19.4	4.8	12.9
Voc/Tech school	40.3	41.9	3.2	4.8	9.6
Adult basic skills/ literacy	8.1	38.7	14.5	3.2	35.5
Retraining adult workers	1.6	35.5	27.4	3.2	32.2

Total=N=62

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 5c
Satisfaction With School
Programs in Sherman County
Residents Age 65 and Older

<u>Provider:</u>	<u>Satisfied</u>		<u>Dissatisfied</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Pre-school	19.5%	51.2%	2.4%	0.0%	26.9%
Elementary (K-6)	17.1	46.3	7.3	0.0	29.3
Junior high (7-8)	17.1	41.5	12.2	0.0	29.3
High school (9-12)	19.5	39.0	7.3	4.9	29.3
Voc/Tech school	36.6	31.7	2.4	0.0	29.3
Adult basic skills/ literacy	24.4	19.5	9.8	9.8	36.6
Retraining adult workers	12.2	34.1	7.3	7.3	29.1

Total=N=41

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 6a
Satisfaction With School
Facilities in Sherman County
Residents Age 25-44

<u>Provider:</u>	<u>Satisfied</u>		<u>Dissatisfied</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Pre-school	8.3%	47.2%	8.3%	5.6%	30.6%
Elementary and junior high	5.6	33.3	25.0	13.9	22.2
High school	5.6	58.3	11.1	5.6	19.5
Adult/other	2.8	58.3	8.3	2.8	27.8

Total=N=36

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 6b
Satisfaction With School
Facilities in Sherman County
Residents Age 45-64

<u>Provider:</u>	<u>Satisfied</u>		<u>Dissatisfied</u>		<u>DK</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Pre-school	14.5%	54.8%	8.0%	0.0%	22.6%
Elementary and junior high	8.1	38.7	30.6	9.7	12.9
High school	9.7	61.3	17.7	3.2	7.6
Adult/other	9.7	61.3	8.1	0.0	21.0

Total=N=62

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 6c
Satisfaction With School
Facilities in Sherman County
Residents Age 65 and Older

Provider:	Satisfied		Dissatisfied		DK
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Pre-school	19.5%	48.8%	7.3%	0.0%	24.4%
Elementary and junior high	17.1	36.6	26.8	0.0	19.6
High school	19.5	46.3	17.1	0.0	17.1
Adult/other	17.1	34.1	14.6	0.0	34.2

Total=N=41

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 7a
Infrastructure in Sherman County
Ratings for Selected Items
Residents Age 25-44

Items:	Excellent				Poor	DK
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>		
Appearance of city entrances	2.8%	8.3%	38.9%	47.2%	2.8%	
County roads/bridges	2.8	25.0	44.4	25.0	2.8	
City streets	2.8	38.9	38.9	19.4	0.0	
Rail/highway access	13.9	36.1	41.7	8.3	0.0	
Sewer/water treatment facilities	2.8	69.4	11.1	2.8	13.9	
Water quality	13.9	61.1	13.9	8.3	2.8	
Water availability	5.6	77.8	8.3	0.0	8.3	
Flood prevention/control	5.6	38.9	33.3	8.3	13.9	
Sites for new businesses	5.6	52.8	33.3	8.3	0.0	
Access to airport	11.1	66.7	19.4	2.8	0.0	
Communications technology	8.3	50.0	27.8	8.3	5.6	

Total=N=36

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 7b
Infrastructure in Sherman County
Ratings for Selected Items
Residents Age 45-64

Items:	Excellent				DK
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Appearance of city entrances	0.0%	8.1%	24.2%	61.3%	6.5%
County roads/bridges	1.6	25.8	50.0	14.5	8.0
City streets	1.6	33.9	45.2	12.9	6.4
Rail/highway access	12.9	40.3	35.5	8.1	3.2
Sewer/water treatment facilities	6.5	50.0	25.8	0.0	17.7
Water quality	30.6	48.4	9.7	6.5	4.8
Water availability	35.5	53.2	6.5	1.6	3.2
Flood prevention/control	9.7	30.6	35.5	8.1	16.1
Sites for new businesses	19.4	45.2	22.6	3.2	9.6
Access to airport	27.4	54.8	8.1	6.5	3.2
Communications technology	11.3	54.8	14.5	6.5	12.9

Total=N=62

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"
Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 7c
Infrastructure in Sherman County
Ratings for Selected Items
Residents Age 65 and Older

Items:	Excellent				DK
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
Appearance of city entrances	2.4%	24.4%	19.5%	43.9%	9.8%
County roads/bridges	0.0	19.5	39.0	17.1	25.4
City streets	12.2	48.8	26.8	2.4	9.8
Rail/highway access	9.8	36.6	29.3	9.8	14.6
Sewer/water treatment facilities	14.6	58.5	9.8	2.4	14.6
Water quality	26.8	48.8	7.3	2.4	14.6
Water availability	29.3	51.2	4.9	2.4	12.2
Flood prevention/control	4.9	41.5	26.8	4.9	22.0
Sites for new businesses	24.4	34.1	24.4	7.3	9.8
Access to airport	34.1	53.7	4.9	0.0	7.3
Communications technology	19.5	43.9	9.8	2.4	24.4

Total=N=41

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"
Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 8
Overall Quality of Life
in Sherman County
by Age Categories

<u>Rating:</u>	<u>25-44</u>		<u>45-64</u>		<u>65 and Older</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Excellent	8	22.2%	16	25.8%	14	34.1%
Good	18	50.0	30	48.4	20	48.8
Fair	6	16.7	11	17.7	3	7.3
Poor	2	5.6	0	0.0	1	2.4
No response	2	5.6	5	8.1	3	7.3
TOTAL	36	100.0	62	100.0	41	100.0

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.*

Table 9
Changes in Quality of Life
in Sherman County
Goodland vs. County Residents

<u>Community</u> <u>has become:</u>	<u>25-44</u>		<u>45-64</u>		<u>65 and Older</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Better	8	22.2%	9	14.5%	12	29.3%
Worse	7	19.4	18	29.0	5	12.2
About the same	19	52.8	30	48.4	21	51.2
No Response	2	5.6	5	8.1	3	7.3
TOTAL	36	100.0	62	100.0	41	100.0

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.*

Table 10a
Quality of Life Aspects of Sherman County
Residents Age 25-44

Provider:	Excellent			Poor	
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>DK</u>
Industry	2.8%	16.7	50.0%	30.6%	0.0%
Schools (K-12)	2.8	72.2	19.4	2.8	2.8
Environment	27.8	50.0	16.7	5.6	0.0
Tourism	2.8	38.9	30.6	19.4	8.4
Local events	8.3	44.4	33.3	11.1	2.8
Cultural arts	11.1	47.2	30.6	8.3	2.8
Retail shopping	2.8	38.9	50.0	8.3	0.0
Recreation	8.3	41.7	25.0	22.2	2.8
Economic development	0.0	25.0	41.7	22.2	11.1
Hotels/restaurants	11.1	66.7	16.7	5.6	0.0
Day care	8.3	38.9	27.8	8.3	16.7
Senior activities	16.7	30.6	11.1	5.6	36.1
Neighborhood safety	25.0	47.2	22.2	2.8	2.8

Total=N=36

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 10b
Quality of Life Aspects of Sherman County
Residents Age 45-64

Provider:	Excellent			Poor	
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>DK</u>
Industry	1.6%	16.1	35.5%	40.3%	6.5%
Schools (K-12)	8.1	61.3	21.0	1.6	8.1
Environment	32.3	53.2	9.7	0.0	4.8
Tourism	4.8	37.1	37.1	9.7	11.3
Local events	9.7	56.5	25.8	0.0	8.1
Cultural arts	16.1	51.6	21.0	0.0	11.3
Retail shopping	3.2	43.5	38.7	11.3	3.2
Recreation	11.3	38.7	32.3	11.3	6.5
Economic development	0.0	25.8	24.2	35.5	14.6
Hotels/restaurants	12.9	45.2	32.3	6.5	3.2
Day care	6.5	54.8	14.5	0.0	24.2
Senior activities	17.7	51.6	12.9	4.8	12.9
Neighborhood safety	6.5	51.6	21.0	9.7	11.3

Total=N=62

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 10c
Quality of Life Aspects of Sherman County
Residents Age 65 and Older

Provider:	Excellent			Poor	
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	DK
Industry	7.3%	24.4	43.9%	17.1%	7.3%
Schools (K-12)	9.8	56.1	17.1	2.4	14.7
Environment	17.1	48.8	19.5	2.4	12.2
Tourism	12.2	36.6	36.6	2.4	12.2
Local events	19.5	39.0	26.8	2.4	12.2
Cultural arts	22.0	51.2	12.2	2.4	12.2
Retail shopping	19.5	46.3	17.1	4.9	12.2
Recreation	22.0	48.8	12.2	4.9	12.2
Economic development	7.3	29.3	29.3	14.6	19.5
Hotels/restaurants	22.0	46.3	24.4	0.0	7.3
Day care	12.2	46.3	12.2	2.4	26.8
Senior activities	24.4	41.5	7.3	9.8	17.1
Neighborhood safety	12.2	39.0	22.0	7.3	19.5

Total=N=41

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 11a
Housing Availability and Quality in Sherman County
Ratings for Selected Items
Residents Age 25-44

Availability of:	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	DK
Apartments	2.8%	5.6%	41.7%	19.4%	30.6%
Single family rentals	0.0	13.9	33.3	30.6	22.2
Mobile home parks	11.1	36.1	19.4	2.8	30.6
Low income housing	2.8	19.4	25.0	8.3	44.5
Single family housing	5.6	25.0	44.4	8.3	16.7
Housing for seniors	5.6	30.6	30.6	0.0	33.4
Medium-priced homes	2.8	30.6	30.6	22.2	13.9
New homes	0.0	19.4	19.4	38.9	22.3
Financing for housing	2.8	11.1	41.7	2.8	41.7
Quality of:					
Rental housing	0.0	5.6	41.7	30.6	22.2
Owned-housing	5.6	38.9	36.1	2.8	16.7

Total=N=36

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 11b
Housing Availability and Quality in Sherman County
Ratings for Selected Items
Residents Age 45-64

<u>Availability of:</u>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>DK</u>
Apartments	0.0%	14.5%	32.3%	24.2%	29.0%
Single family rentals	0.0	6.5	33.9	29.0	30.6
Mobile home parks	0.0	38.7	24.2	8.1	29.0
Low income housing	1.6	16.1	35.5	12.9	33.9
Single family housing	0.0	24.2	32.3	11.3	32.3
Housing for seniors	6.5	30.6	22.6	9.7	30.7
Medium-priced homes	1.6	24.2	25.8	22.6	25.9
New homes	4.8	17.7	27.4	17.7	32.3
Financing for housing	1.6	19.4	21.0	19.4	38.8
<u>Quality of:</u>					
Rental housing	0.0	0.0	32.3	35.5	32.3
Owned-housing	3.2	50.0	16.1	3.2	27.5

Total=N=62

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 11c
Housing Availability and Quality in Sherman County
Ratings for Selected Items
Residents Age 65 and Older

<u>Availability of:</u>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>DK</u>
Apartments	4.9%	24.4%	17.1%	12.2%	41.5%
Single family rentals	0.0	19.5	26.8	7.3	46.3
Mobile home parks	2.4	39.0	17.1	2.4	39.0
Low income housing	0.0	31.7	17.1	14.6	36.6
Single family housing	0.0	29.3	29.3	2.4	39.0
Housing for seniors	0.0	31.7	26.8	7.3	34.2
Medium-priced homes	4.9	26.8	19.5	14.6	34.1
New homes	4.9	36.6	7.3	17.1	34.2
Financing for housing	0.0	26.8	31.7	7.3	34.1
<u>Quality of:</u>					
Rental housing	0.0	22.0	24.4	22.0	31.7
Owned-housing	4.9	31.7	29.3	2.4	31.7

Total=N=41

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 12a
Health Care Services in Sherman County
Ratings for Selected Items
Residents Age 25-44

<u>Item:</u>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>DK</u>
HC Providers	13.9%	55.6%	16.7%	8.3%	5.6%
Hospital	19.4	50.0	19.4	2.8	8.4
Other facilities	11.1	55.6	13.9	2.8	16.7
Ambulance	13.9	41.7	16.7	5.6	22.2
Nursing homes	25.0	44.4	5.6	0.0	25.0
Senior care costs	11.1	41.7	11.1	0.0	36.2
Health care costs	0.0	2.8	50.0	36.1	11.2

Total=N=36

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 12b
Health Care Services in Sherman County
Ratings for Selected Items
Residents Age 45-64

<u>Item:</u>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>DK</u>
HC Providers	8.1%	41.9%	30.6%	11.3%	8.0%
Hospital	11.3	50.0	24.2	12.9	1.6
Other facilities	6.5	61.3	11.3	4.8	16.1
Ambulance	14.5	35.5	17.7	16.1	16.1
Nursing homes	19.4	48.4	6.5	9.7	16.1
Senior care costs	14.5	54.8	9.7	4.8	16.1
Health care costs	1.6	19.4	27.4	35.5	16.1

Total=N=62

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 12c
Health Care Services in Sherman County
Ratings for Selected Items
Residents Age 65 and Older

<u>Item:</u>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>DK</u>
HC Providers	12.2%	48.8%	12.2%	7.3%	19.5%
Hospital	31.7	39.0	7.3	2.4	19.5
Other facilities	4.9	51.2	12.2	4.9	26.8
Ambulance	26.8	39.0	7.3	4.9	21.9
Nursing homes	14.6	53.7	12.2	0.0	19.5
Senior care costs	14.6	46.3	14.6	2.4	22.0
Health care costs	4.9	17.1	26.8	26.8	24.4

Total=N=41

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.

Table 13
Assisted Living Centers Need
in Sherman County
By Age Categories

<u>Need</u>	<u>25-44</u>		<u>45-64</u>		<u>65 and Older</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Very Great	2	5.6%	13	21.0%	6	14.6%
Great	10	27.8	20	32.3	6	14.6
Some	8	22.2	14	22.6	17	41.5
Little	3	8.3	1	1.6	1	2.4
Don't Know	13	36.1	14	22.5	8	26.8
TOTAL	36	100.0	62	100.0	41	100.0

Note: DK="Don't know" or "No response"

Source: *Sherman County Citizen Survey*, KCCED/KU, Fall 1992.