

THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
Kansas Center for Community Economic Development
Policy Research Institute
TECHNICAL REPORT SERIES

**Montgomery County
Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002**

Prepared by

Genna Hurd
Co-Director, KCCED

April 2003

Report No. 69

Charles Krider
Project Director, KCCED

Steven Maynard-Moody
Director, Policy Research Institute

Acknowledgements

This report was prepared by the Kansas Center for Community Economic Development (KCCED) with the Policy Research Institute at the University of Kansas. The KCCED is funded by a university center grant from Denver Regional Office of the Economic Development Administration (EDA), U.S. Department of Commerce. The statement, findings, conclusions, and recommendations are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the EDA, the U.S. Government, the University of Kansas, or any other individual or organization.

Special thanks and gratitude are extended to the non-resident workers in Montgomery County who took the time to participate in the survey. Special thanks also go to Chad Kniss and Don Haider-Markel with the Survey Research Center at the Policy Research Institute, the University of Kansas; to Charlotte Talley, with the Policy Research Institute for her assistance with organizing the open responses to the survey questions; and to Xanthippe Stevens, with the Policy Research Institute for her help with commuting pattern data and figures.

Prior to the non-resident worker survey, the KCCED and PRI also conducted focus groups and completed an economic trend report as part of the work with Montgomery County. We would also like to acknowledge and thank Susan Mercer and Luke Middleton for conducting the focus groups and writing that report (see Appendix A), which helped with the survey development. Special thanks also go to Luke Middleton and Dr. Charles Krider for developing the economic trend report (see Appendix B).

The Montgomery County Action Council (MCAC) applied for and received a grant from the Kansas Department of Commerce and Housing's community capacity-building program for this project. A copy of this report can be obtained by contacting: Montgomery County Action Council, PO Box 588, 2150 Enterprise Drive, Independence, KS 67301, (620) 331-3830.

Executive Summary

The Montgomery County Action Council (MCAC) contacted the Kansas Center for Community Economic Development (KCCED) with the Policy Research Institute (PRI) at the University of Kansas in 2001 for assistance with foundation research for the development of a long-term plan for attracting residents and improving the quality of life in Montgomery County. The KCCED proposed a three-part approach to the technical assistance: 1) focus groups, 2) analysis of population and employment trends, and 3) employee survey. KCCED began work on the project in January 2002 by conducting focus groups and analyzing trends. The purpose of the focus groups was to gain a better understanding of the issues, perceptions, and attitudes about the county; the findings from these groups were used to guide the survey questionnaire. The trend analysis report was used to gain a better understanding of the economic and demographic issues facing the county and thereby aid local leadership in identifying issues for the county. The information from this report was also used to help develop the survey questionnaire. Questionnaire development began in March 2002 with the Survey Research Center (SRC) at PRI working closely with MCAC to develop a survey for non-resident workers; the survey was finalized in July 2002. Non-resident workers in Montgomery County were given equal opportunity to respond to the survey from September - November of 2002. Data gathering was completed by January 2003 and survey analysis began at that time. This report presents the findings from that survey.

The purpose of this project is to identify areas that would enhance the attractiveness of Montgomery County as a place to live as well as work.

The aim of the survey was to determine why persons who work in Montgomery County choose not to live there.

The purpose of this study is to identify areas that would enhance the attractiveness of Montgomery County as a place to live as well as work. In keeping with the purpose, the survey sought to determine why persons who work in Montgomery County choose not to live there. This research issue necessitated surveying non-resident workers and it was anticipated that the survey population would not necessarily be positive in their opinions about the county. So these results should not be generalized beyond the group surveyed in this study – namely, non-residents who work in Montgomery County. It is also important to note that the intent of this study is not to criticize Montgomery County, but to identify opportunities to enhance the quality of life so that more persons will choose to live in the county as well as work there.

The survey asked questions about the respondents as well as what they think about Montgomery County – the county and its communities, local government, the

schools, housing, taxes, and existing businesses and services. The following is a brief summary of the major findings:

- People work in Montgomery County because of job related, company specific, or location reasons. Affordability (taxes and houses) is the main reason why they moved out of the county and do not live in the county.
- For many non-resident workers, it would take a major shift in orientation regarding “Place” to get them to move. The reasons given by the sense of place group have more to do with the positive aspects of where they currently live than the negative aspects of Montgomery County. The county has little control over their reasons for living where they live, which include “lived here all my life,” proximity to family, location of the family farm, or “just like living in Oklahoma.”
- Non-resident workers believe taxes are higher in Montgomery County and services are not necessarily better.
- Schools play an important part in the decision-making process about where to live and the perception is that public schools in Montgomery County need improvement.
- While jobs and businesses are considered major strengths for Montgomery County, a large number of respondents also consider employment opportunities a major problem. They are concerned about stability and wages as well as more opportunities.
- It appears more negative opinions are associated with Coffeyville than other parts of the county.

Issues for the County

- Taxes
- Housing
- The Schools
- More and Better Jobs
- Services for Youth to Dining and Shopping
- Appearance and Cleanliness
- Quality of Life Opportunities

A number of issues have emerged for Montgomery County and its communities. They are: 1) Cost of Living (taxes and housing), 2) Employment (jobs, wages, and stability), 3) Education (schools and the school system, two community colleges), 4) Services (for youth and singles to dining and shopping), 5) Infrastructure (from roads to appearance and cleanliness), and 6) Quality of Life Opportunities (cultural, entertainment, and recreational). These findings are a starting point to discuss changes needed, strengths to build on, and areas to focus on for the county. It is up to the local leadership to determine which issues can and need to be addressed at the local level.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Purpose	1
Focus Groups	2
Economic and Demographic Trends	2
Survey Methodology	3
Table A. Breakdown of Responses	4
Figure 1. Place of Residence by Workers Employed In Montgomery County, Kansas (2000 U.S. Census)	5
Table B. Survey Respondents vs. Workers In (2000 Census)	6
 Findings	7
About the Respondents	7
Demographics	7
Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Survey Respondents	9
Employment	10
Table 2. Employment Information of Survey Respondents	11
<i>Why Work in Montgomery County</i>	12
Table 3. Reasons Why Work in Montgomery County	13
Place of Residence	14
Table 4. Place of Residence of Survey Respondents	15
<i>Why Moved from Montgomery County</i>	16
Table 5. Why Moved from Montgomery County	17
<i>Why Do Not Live in Montgomery County</i>	18
Table 6. Reasons Why Do Not Live in Montgomery County	19
<i>Benefits about Current Area</i>	20
Table 7. Benefits about Area Currently Reside In	21
<i>Drawbacks about Current Area</i>	22
Table 8. Drawbacks about Area Currently Reside In	23
About the County	24
Strengths	24
Table 9. Strengths for Montgomery County	25
Problems Facing the County	26
Table 10. Problems Facing Montgomery County	27
Taxes	28
Table 11. Taxes in Kansas and Montgomery	29
Schools	30
Table 12. Grades for Public Schools (K-12)	31
Table 13. Community Colleges in Montgomery County: Presence and Awareness	32

Table of Contents (continued)

Local Government Services.....	32
Table 14. Quality of Local Government Services in Montgomery County	33
About the County and Its Cities.....	34
Housing	34
Table 15. Opinions about Montgomery County and Its Cities: Housing Prices and Selection	35
Jobs and Wages	36
Table 16. Opinions about Montgomery County and Its Cities: Jobs and Wages	37
Opportunities for Youth and Single People.....	38
Table 17. Opinions about Montgomery County and Its Cities: Satisfaction with Opportunities and Services for Youth and Single People	39
Quality of Life Issues.....	40
<i>Environment, Appearance, and Safety</i>	40
Table 18. Opinions about Montgomery County and Its Cities: Satisfaction with Quality of Life Issues (Environment, Appearance, & Safety)	41
<i>Dining and Shopping Choices</i>	42
Table 19. Opinions about Montgomery County and Its Cities: Satisfaction with Dining and Shopping Choices	43
<i>Recreation, Entertainment, and Health Care</i>	44
Table 20. Opinions about Montgomery County and Its Cities: Satisfaction with Quality of Life Issues (Recreation, Entertainment, & Health Care)	45
Conclusion	44
Recommendations for Improvement.....	44
General Comments.....	47
Final Thoughts.....	47
Table 21. Aspects of Life in Montgomery County that Need Improving	48
Table 22. Additional Comments Concerning Montgomery County	49
Appendix A. Montgomery County Worker Survey (Non-Resident).....	A
Appendix B. Recommendations to Improve Montgomery County.....	B

Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey: 2002

Introduction

The Montgomery County Action Council (MCAC) contacted the Kansas Center for Community Economic Development (KCCED) with the Policy Research Institute (PRI) at the University of Kansas in 2001 for assistance with foundation research for the development of a long-term plan for attracting residents and improving the quality of life in Montgomery County. The KCCED proposed a three-part approach to the technical assistance: 1) focus groups, 2) analysis of population and employment trends, and 3) employee survey. The MCAC applied for and received a grant from the Kansas Department of Commerce and Housing's community capacity-building program for this project. KCCED began work on the project in January 2002.

Three Part Approach

1. Focus Groups
2. Trend Analysis
3. Employee Survey

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to identify areas that would enhance the attractiveness of Montgomery County as a place to live as well as work. Consequently, the employee survey sought to determine why persons who work in Montgomery County choose not to live in the county. This research issue necessitated surveying non-resident workers and it was anticipated that the survey population would not necessarily be positive in their opinions about the county. Undoubtedly current residents of Montgomery County would have a more positive perception of the county. So these results should not be generalized beyond the group surveyed in this study – namely, non-residents who work in Montgomery County. It is also important to note that the purpose of this study is not to criticize Montgomery County, but to identify opportunities to enhance the quality of life so that more persons will choose to live in the county as well as work there. This is an important issue if Montgomery County is to receive the full benefit of job creation by also increasing its population. A community that chooses not to address such issues risks creating jobs that will be filled by non-residents.

The purpose of this study is to identify areas that would enhance the attractiveness of Montgomery County as a place to live as well as work.

Focus Groups

In late January 2002, staff from PRI conducted four focus groups, two each in Coffeyville and Independence with county residents and non-resident workers. The purpose of the focus groups was to gain a better understanding of the issues, perceptions, and attitudes about the county.

Input from the focus groups was used to develop the survey for non-resident workers in Montgomery County.

Specifically, the focus groups sought to answer three questions:

1. Why do non-resident workers commute?
2. Why do resident workers live in the county?
3. What can the county do to halt population decline and encourage population growth?

A report was prepared in February based on the focus groups and looked at the following areas.

- Characteristics of desirable communities,
- Impressions and perceptions of Montgomery County (taxes and housing),
- Other important aspects of Montgomery County (environment, education, entertainment and culture, health care, community resources for children and teens),
- Commuting to the County,
- Strengths of Montgomery County,
- Promoting Montgomery County, and
- Recommendations for action.

The findings from the focus groups were used to guide the survey questionnaire for Part 3 of the project. (See **Appendix A** for the survey questionnaire.)

Economic and Demographic Trends

A trend analysis report was completed and a presentation was made to the MCAC board in March 2002. This report looked at trends for population, employment, earnings and income, retail, agriculture, education, and taxes. Montgomery County was compared to Kansas, U.S., and selected counties (Crawford, Labette, Neosho, and Wilson counties in Kansas and Washington County in Oklahoma).

The trend analysis was used to gain a better understanding of the economic and demographic environment in the county.

The trend analysis found declining population levels for the last several decades with the population getting older. The education level of the work force (those over 25) was found to be not as high as expected given two community colleges in the county. Property tax levels in the county were higher than surrounding Kansas counties and much higher than rates in neighboring Oklahoma. Employment levels in the county have been growing overall, but not in those sectors typically thought to drive an economy. An increasing percentage of the work force is employed in Service and Retail industries, while employment in Farming, Manufacturing, Wholesale, and Government sectors have been shrinking. It was also observed that the per capita income for the county is low and is getting lower over time compared to the state average. Average wage per job in the county was found to fare well compared to surrounding Kansas counties but is considerably lower than state averages as well as wages found just over the border in Oklahoma. On the positive side, Montgomery County's employment base was found to be large and fairly diverse with a variety of firms ranging from the small to those employing many hundreds. For further information about economic trends for Montgomery County, this report can be accessed at <http://www.ku.edu/pri/resrep/pdf/r59.pdf>.

The trend analysis found a declining population, lower than expected education level, high property tax levels, changing work force, and lower wages than surrounding areas.

Survey Methodology

The Survey Research Center (SRC) at PRI started developing the survey instrument based on input from the focus groups and the MCAC board. Development of the survey began in March 2002 with the survey instrument finalized by July (see **Appendix A**). Work was started by MCAC in July to gather contact information on employers in the county. In September, SRC sent out 1,233 surveys to 172 companies/employers in Montgomery County. Surveys were mailed to each employer proportionally based on the number of workers employed. One firm responded to say that they had NO non-county residents workers; therefore, the eligible total surveys were 1,219 surveys and 171 companies (**Table A**).

The Survey Research Center at KU worked with MCAC and local employers to administer the survey.

In October, the MCAC sent out a letter to all companies/employers in the county reminding them of the survey and asking for their participation. They also publicized the survey in the local newspapers and through local meetings during September and October. Following the letter sent out by MCAC, two employers contacted SRC and requested additional surveys. As of November 2002, the SRC received and entered 178 surveys (from 59 companies). **Table A** illustrates the breakdown of those surveys based on company size and gives response rates based

on companies represented and by surveys returned.¹ The overall response rate for the survey presented in **Table A** is 14.4 percent; however, further analysis of the data revealed that nine of 178 surveys had respondents that indicated their place of residence as “Montgomery County.” Those surveys were therefore deleted from the dataset bringing the number of valid surveys to 169 and an overall response rate to 13.9 percent. *This response rate is a best estimate because the number of non-resident workers employed by the companies was never determined.*

The response rate is a best estimate because the number of non-resident workers employed by the companies was never determined.

Table A. Breakdown of Responses
Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey: 2002

Company Size	<u>Companies</u>		Response	<u>Surveys</u>		Response
	Sent	Received	Rate	Sent	Received	Rate
100+ Employees	26	21	80.8%	370	109	29.5%
50 - 99 Employees	12	2	16.7%	120	7	5.8%
25 - 49 Employees	32	11	34.4%	224	22	9.8%
10 - 24 Employees	101	25	24.8%	505	37	7.3%
Total	171	59	34.5%	1219	175	14.4%

Source: Survey Research Center, Policy Research Institute, the University of Kansas, 2002.

Based on the number of respondents and the distribution on question responses, the margin of error for the survey is plus or minus 5 to 8 percent.² Although this is a large margin of error, the survey itself was still a random sample with standard procedures followed to reduce bias.³

¹ Three surveys had the case-ID removed; therefore, **Table A** is the breakdown of response rates from the other 175 surveys.
² The margin of error is based on the total number of survey responses and the distribution of responses to specific questions. There is really no margin of error for a survey, just for specific questions; thus, a range is provided.
³ This bias statement is based on the fact that all potential employees working in the county, but living outside the county, had an equal chance to participate in the survey.

**Table B.
Survey Respondents vs. Workers In (2000 Census)**

Survey Results			2000 Census Commuting Patterns		
County	Number	% Total	County	Number	% Total
KANSAS	93	55.0%	KANSAS	1,876	54.9%
Labette	55	32.5%	Labette	867	25.4%
Wilson	19	11.2%	Wilson	343	10.0%
Chautauqua	5	3.0%	Chautauqua	214	6.3%
Elk	3	1.8%	Elk	104	3.0%
Neosho	3	1.8%	Neosho	106	3.1%
Allen	1	0.6%	Allen	4	0.1%
Cherokee	1	0.6%	Cherokee	31	0.9%
Coffey	1	0.6%	Coffey	-	0.0%
Crawford	1	0.6%	Crawford	34	1.0%
Greenwood	1	0.6%	Greenwood	-	0.0%
Osage	1	0.6%	Osage	-	0.0%
Sedgwick	1	0.6%	Sedgwick	39	1.1%
Shawnee	1	0.6%	Shawnee	1	0.0%
Other	-	0.0%	Other KS (17)	133	3.9%
OKLAHOMA	71	42.0%	OKLAHOMA	1,435	42.0%
Nowata	45	26.6%	Nowata	886	25.9%
Washington	20	11.8%	Washington	381	11.1%
Tulsa	2	1.2%	Tulsa	37	1.1%
Craig	1	0.6%	Craig	24	0.7%
Ochelata	1	0.6%	Ochelata	-	0.0%
Osage	1	0.6%	Osage	25	0.7%
Ottawa	1	0.6%	Ottawa	-	0.0%
Other	-	0.0%	Other OK (11)	82	2.4%
Missouri	-	0.0%	Missouri	36	1.1%
			6 Counties	36	
Other States	-	0.0%	Other States	71	2.1%
			7 States	71	
Don't Know	5	3.0%			
TOTAL	169	100.0%	TOTAL	3,418	100.0%

Source: Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003 and U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census.

Findings

The following survey results will first look at who the respondents were and then what they think about Montgomery County – the county and its communities, local government, the schools, housing, taxes, and existing businesses and services.⁴

About the Respondents

Demographics

The demographic characteristics of the Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey respondents are summarized in **Table 1**. The highlights follow. Where possible comparisons of the non-resident worker survey respondents are made with U.S. 2000 Census data for Montgomery County. This helps to gain a better understanding of the characteristics of the non-resident worker versus the resident worker in Montgomery County.

- Fifty-four percent of the survey respondents indicated that they are male and 46 percent indicated female (**Table 1**). According to the 2000 Census, 52.8 percent of the labor force for Montgomery County is female and 47.0 percent of the employed labor force is female.
- About one-fifth of the respondents said that their household income fell within the \$40,000 to \$49,999 range, followed by 15.7 percent in the \$30,000 to \$39,999 range, and 15.1 percent in the \$50,000 to \$59,999 range (**Table 1**). Almost 45 percent said that their household income was greater than \$50,000; while in the 2000 Census, 25 percent of Montgomery County households reported income of \$50,000 or greater. Five percent of the survey respondents indicated a household income under \$20,000. In Montgomery County, 40.9 percent of the households reported income in 1999 under \$25,000 (Census 2000).

When compared to 2000 Census county resident data, more non-resident workers came from households with a higher income and had a higher educational level than Montgomery County residents.

⁴ While the number of surveys analyzed was 169, the “N=” varies depending of the number of responses for a particular question. Percentages are based on the “N=” presented for each question.

- The education level of the survey respondents vary but the majority (almost 79 percent) have education beyond high school (**Table 1**). Only one person indicated that they had less than a high school education. This varies from the general over 25 population for Montgomery County, in which 18.7 percent indicated that they had less than a high school education (Census 2000).
- The age of the survey respondent ranges from 21 to 68 years with a median age of 41 years (**Table 1**). The majority of respondents fell within the ages of 25 to 54 with 33 percent in the 35 to 44-age range, 30 percent in the 45 to 54-age range and 22 percent in the 25 to 34-age range. A little over 38 percent the non-resident survey population fell within the 45 to 64-age range compared to 23.3 percent of Montgomery County's population (Census 2000).
- Almost 79 percent of the survey respondents indicated that they were married followed by 11 percent, which said that they were divorced (**Table 1**). For Montgomery County, 59 percent of their population is married followed by almost 20 percent indicating that they are single (Census 2000).
- Three percent of the survey respondents said that they were living with extended family (**Table 1**).
- Over 60 percent of the respondents marked that they had children under 18 living in the household with the number of children living at home ranging from one to five and median number being one child (**Table 1**). For Montgomery County residents, 32.5 percent of the households had individuals less than 18 years of age (Census 2000).
- Almost 94 percent of the respondents said their race was white or Caucasian (**Table 1**). In Montgomery County, 85.8 percent of the population indicated that they were white or Caucasian in the 2000 U.S. Census. A little over three percent of the non-resident workers surveyed identified himself or herself as Hispanic or Latino. This is about the same percentage of Montgomery County residents that consider themselves Hispanic or Latino (Census 2000).

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Survey Respondents
Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002

	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
MALE/FEMALE			MARITAL STATUS		
Male	87	54.0%	Married	131	78.9%
Female	74	46.0%	Widowed	3	1.8%
N = 161	161		Divorced	18	10.8%
HOUSEHOLD INCOME			Separated	1	0.6%
Under \$19,999	8	5.0%	Single	9	5.4%
\$20,000 - \$29,999	22	13.8%	Living with a Partner	4	2.4%
\$30,000 - \$39,999	25	15.7%	N = 166		
\$40,000 - \$49,999	33	20.8%	<i>Living with Extended Family:</i>		
\$50,000 - \$59,999	24	15.1%	Yes	5	3.0%
\$60,000 - \$69,999	15	9.4%	No	159	97.0%
\$70,000 - \$79,999	14	8.8%	N = 164		
\$80,000 and Over	18	11.3%	<i>Children under 18 living in household:</i>		
N = 159			None	61	38.9%
EDUCATION LEVEL			One	33	21.0%
Less than HS Degree	1	0.6%	Two	47	29.9%
High School or GED	34	20.5%	Three	14	8.9%
Some College	42	25.3%	More than Three	2	1.3%
2-yr Degree	23	13.9%	N = 157		
4-yr Degree	31	18.7%	Range =	Zero to 5 children	
Some Graduate School	15	9.0%	Mean =	1.14 child	
Graduate Degree	20	12.0%	Median =	1 child	
N = 166			ETHNICITY		
AGE RANGE			White or Caucasian	149	93.7%
18 - 24	6	3.8%	Black or African American	1	0.6%
25 - 34	34	21.8%	Asian	1	0.6%
35 - 44	52	33.3%	Nat. Amer./Alaskan Eskimo	6	3.8%
45 - 54	47	30.1%	Some other Race	2	1.3%
55 - 64	13	8.3%	N = 159		
Over 65	4	2.6%	<i>Do you consider yourself Hispanic or Latino:</i>		
N = 156			Yes	5	3.2%
Range =	21 to 68 years		No	151	96.8%
Mean =	43.03 years		N = 156		
Median =	41 years				

Source: Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Employment

Table 2 presents employment information about the non-resident workers responding to the survey. It reveals place of employment, number of employees where they work, years at current job, and, if married, where their partner works.

- Over half of those surveys (52.4 percent) listed their city of employment as Coffeyville (**Table 2**). Independence was the next largest destination of work with 30.1 percent saying they worked in or close to Independence.
- The majority of those surveyed worked for large companies (over 100 employees) with 25.8 percent saying their company had 100 to 249 employees and 25.2 percent working for companies with over 250 employees (**Table 2**).
- Many of those surveyed are relatively new employees to the company with 28.4 percent indicating that they have worked for their company for less than 2 years (**Table 2**). About one-quarter can be classified as long-term employees having worked for their company for over 10 years. The longevity of employment ranged from 1 month to 37 years with a mean of 7.58 years and a median of 5 years.
- For those respondents that said they were married or living with a partner, a little over 70 percent also said that their partner worked outside the home (**Table 2**). Almost 79 percent of those respondents indicated that their spouse or partner worked in Kansas. Thirty-six had spouses or partners that also worked in Montgomery County.

Over 80 percent surveyed worked either in Coffeyville or in Independence and over 50 percent worked for large companies (over 100 employees). These jobs are relatively new with only 25 percent indicating they had worked for their company over 10 years.

**Table 2. Employment Information of Survey Respondents
Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002**

	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT					
<i>City or Closest City to Work:</i>			<i>If married or living with a partner, do they work outside the home?</i>		
Coffeyville	87	52.4%	Yes	102	70.8%
Independence	50	30.1%	No	42	29.2%
Caney	13	7.8%	N = 144		
Cherryvale	11	6.6%			
Other Cities*	5	3.0%			
N = 166					
<i>Number of Employees Where You Work:</i>			<i>County and State Spouse or Partner Works In:</i>		
Less than 10	5	3.1%	KANSAS COUNTIES	81	78.6%
10 to 19	22	13.5%	Montgomery	36	
20 to 29	13	8.0%	Labette	22	
30 to 39	9	5.5%	Wilson	7	
40 to 49	7	4.3%	Elk	3	
50 to 99	24	14.7%	Neosho	2	
100 to 249	42	25.8%	Other**	11	
250 or More	41	25.2%	OKLAHOMA COUNTIES	22	21.4%
N = 163			Washington	14	
			Nowata	2	
			Tulsa	2	
			Other**	4	
			N = 103		
<i>Years at Current Employment:</i>					
Less than 1 year	6	3.6%			
1 to 2	41	24.8%			
2 to 5	48	29.1%			
5 to 10	29	17.6%			
10 to 20	31	18.8%			
20 to 30	8	4.8%			
More than 30	2	1.2%			
N = 165					
Range =	1 month to 37 years				
Mean =	7.58 years				
Median =	5 years				

***Other Cities** (1 each): travels (Coffeyville, Columbus, Pittsburg, Neosho, and Dewey, Oklahoma), Coffeyville & Ind. Park, Independence & Coffeyville, Independence, Coffeyville & Fredonia, and Wichita. Three indicated no city.
 ** **Other Kansas Counties** (1 each): Allen, Brown, Cherokee, Crawford, Greenwood, Johnson, Sedgwick, 15 county region in Southeast Kansas, 3 counties (Wilson, Montgomery, & Douglas), the same county and town we live in, and 48 states (truck driver). ** **Other Oklahoma Counties** (1 each): Osage, Oklahoma, and Oklahoma counties. **Other Oklahoma** also includes one county from Missouri: Barry County.

Source: Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Why Work in Montgomery County

The reasons given for working in Montgomery County were many and were categorized into three main areas: job related, company specific, and location (**Table 3**). Job related reasons included availability, opportunity, pay, longevity, and skills. Company specific reasons had to do with wanting to work for a particular company or that the person was transferred to Montgomery County by the company. Location reasons were mostly concerned with convenience – that Montgomery County was close to where the respondent already lived.

The respondents work in Montgomery County for job related, company specific, and location reasons.

Top 5 Reasons Why They Work in Montgomery County

1. Job Availability/Opportunity
2. Close to Where I Live, Convenient
3. Like the Job, Best Job
4. Good Company to Work For
5. Pay/Salary, More Money

Almost 66 percent of the respondents to this question indicated job related reasons with the greatest number (43) writing about the job availability and opportunity in Montgomery County (**Table 3**). Twenty-two persons talked about how much they liked their job and it being the best job they ever had. Along those lines, 17

respondents indicated that their company was a good company to work for and some even mentioned their company by name. Another positive reason for working in the county was its convenient location.

On the negative side of the reasons for working in the county would be the lack of job opportunities where the respondent currently lives and that they

“Had a great opportunity to work for a great business... also not many opportunities for jobs in Wilson County.”

had no choice (the company transferred them to Montgomery

County). A number also indicated that they have worked for the company for a long time and longevity kept them with the company and in the county.

“It’s where I found the job that I wanted within a reasonable drive from my home.”

**Table 3. Reasons Why Work in Montgomery County
Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002**

REASONS	Number	Number	Percent
Job Related		107	65.6%
Job Availability/Opportunity	43		
Like the Job, Best Job	22		
Pay/Salary, More Money	16		
Lack of Job Opportunities Where I Live	12		
Longevity, Worked a Long Time	10		
Expertise, Skills, Education	6		
Company		35	21.5%
Good Company to Work For	17		
Mention Specific Company	10		
Transferred by Company	10		
Location		32	19.6%
Close to Where I Live, Convenient	27		
Used to Live in Montgomery County	6		
Other		6	3.7%
Marriage and Spouse	4		
Other	2		
N = 163			

Please Note: Six surveys had no response; hence N = 163. Columns do not necessarily total because a person may have indicated more than one reason and/or some reasons may fall under the same major category.

Source: Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Place of Residence

The survey also asked a series of questions associated with the place of residence for the worker – what city and county they live in, if they have ever lived in Montgomery County and why they moved, the probability that they would move in the next couple of years, why they don't live in Montgomery County, and the benefits and drawbacks about where they currently live. Some of the place of residence data (county and state levels) was previously discussed and presented in the Introduction, which showed that the survey respondents' commuting patterns were consistent with 2000 Census commuting pattern data (**Table A**). Further analysis follows.

- Ninety-two respondents (54.4 percent) indicated that they reside in or near a city in Kansas (**Table 4**). The greatest number of commuters in Kansas came from Parsons followed by Edna and then Neodesha.
- Seventy-one respondents (42 percent) said that they resided in or near a city in Oklahoma (**Table 4**). Twenty-seven said they commuted from South Coffeyville followed by 16 commuters from Bartlesville.
- Fifty-five percent of the respondents resided in counties in Kansas while 42 percent resided in Oklahoma counties; three percent indicated no county of residence (**Table 4**).
- A little over half of the respondents (51 percent) had lived in Montgomery County (**Table 4**). For the majority of the respondents (83.3 percent), it is very unlikely (low to very low probability) that they will move. Twenty-eight respondents indicated that the probability was "high" or "very high" that they will move in the next year.

The survey respondents' commuting patterns are consistent with the 2000 Census commuting data.

**Table 4. Place of Residence of Survey Respondents
Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002**

	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
PLACE OF RESIDENCE BY CITY			PLACE OF RESIDENCE BY COUNTY		
Cities in Kansas:	92	54.4%	Counties in Kansas:	93	55.0%
Parsons	16		Labette	55	
Edna	15		Wilson	19	
Neodesha	13		Chautauqua	5	
Altamont	7		Elk	3	
Rural Labette County	4		Neosho	3	
Bartlett	3		Other (1 each)**	8	
Mound Valley	3		Counties in Oklahoma:	71	42.0%
Niotaze	3		Nowata	45	
Other (2 each)*	12		Washington	20	
Other (1 each)*	16		Tulsa	2	
Cities in Oklahoma:	71	42.0%	Other (1 each)**	4	
South Coffeyville	27		No County Given	5	3.0%
Bartlesville	16		N = 169		
Wann	5		Ever Live in Montgomery County:		
Delaware	4		Yes	84	50.9%
Nowata	4		No	81	49.1%
Lenapah	3		N = 165		
Other (2 each)*	6		Probability that will move in the next		
Other (1 each)*	6		couple of years:		
No City Given	6	3.6%	Very Low	101	60.1%
N = 169			Low	39	23.2%
Years at Current Address:			High	18	10.7%
Less than 1 year	7	4.3%	Very High	10	6.0%
1 to 2	29	17.7%	N = 168		
3 to 5	43	26.2%			
6 to 10	38	23.2%			
11 to 20	21	12.8%			
21 to 30	21	12.8%			
More than 30	6	3.7%			
N = 164					
			Range = 0.5 to 36 years		
			Mean = 9.25 years		
			Median = 6 years		

* **Other Kansas Cities** (2 each): Altoona, Chanute, Chetopa, Fredonia, Longton, and Oswego. * **Other Kansas Cities** (1 each): Benedict, Burlington, Chautauqua, Columbus, Dennis, Erie, Eureka, Havana, Humboldt, McCune, Overbrook, Rossville, rural Elk County, rural Wilson County, Valeda, and Wichita.

* **Other Oklahoma Cities** (2 each): Dewey, Ochelata, and rural Nowata County. * **Other Oklahoma Cities** (1 each): Copan, Miami, Oswasso, Pawhuska, Tulsa, and Welch.

** **Other Kansas Counties** (1 each): Allen, Cherokee, Coffey, Crawford, Greenwood, Osage, Sedgwick, and Shawnee. ** **Other Oklahoma Counties** (1 each): Craig, Ochelata, Osage, and Ottawa.

Source: Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Why Moved from Montgomery County

For those respondents indicating that they used to live in Montgomery County, the survey asked them why they moved. The results of their responses have been summarized in **Table 5** into seven main categories: affordability, lifestyle changes, educational, employment, services, environment, and location.

Affordability is the main reason why people have moved out of Montgomery County and why they do not live in the county.

Top 5 Reasons Why Moved from Montgomery County

1. Taxes (lower)
2. Housing, Land
3. Schools for Children
4. Got Married
5. (tie) Home – Family Reasons
Job Opportunities

Affordability plays a major role in why people moved out of Montgomery County with almost half of the respondents that have moved indicating it as a reason. Taxes are the main drain on affordability with 28 respondents mentioning them. The other affordability issue is housing (and land) with people finding it less expensive to live in another county or another state (Oklahoma). Both these reasons also

topped the list across all categories as to why people moved from the county.

Lifestyle changes also play a role in why the respondents had moved from the county. Lifestyle changes, listed by almost 30 percent of the

“Cheaper taxes and better schools in Oklahoma”

respondents that had moved, include getting married, home/family reasons, children, or returning to the family farm (**Table 5**). Nine respondents indicated that they moved for better schools for their children.

“Did not like the schools and wanted the small town life for my children to grow up in.”

**Table 5. Why Moved from Montgomery County
Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002**

REASONS FOR MOVING	Number	Number	Percent
Affordability		41	48.8%
Taxes (lower)	28		
Housing, Land	18		
Lifestyle Changes		25	29.8%
Got Married	8		
Home - Family Reasons	7		
Children	4		
Return to Family Farm	3		
Other	4		
Educational		12	14.3%
Schools for Children	9		
Attend School	3		
Employment		11	13.1%
Job Opportunities	7		
Spouse, Works or Close to	4		
Services		5	6.0%
Local Government (poor)	3		
Roads	2		
Environment		5	6.0%
Wanted Country, Rural Setting	4		
Crime	1		
Location		4	4.8%
To Live in Oklahoma	2		
Other	2		
N = 84			

Please Note: Eighty-five surveys had no response; hence N=84. Columns do not necessarily total because a person may have indicated more than one reason and/or some of the reasons may fall under the same major category.

Source: Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Why Do Not Live in Montgomery County

"Taxes are too high and the cost of housing is too high..."

The survey solicited reasons why the non-resident worker does not live in Montgomery County; 167 persons chose to respond to that question (Table 6). The reasons are quite similar to why persons moved from the county. The five main categories are: affordability, sense of place, availability of services, environment, and employment. Only two people indicated that they had no particular reason not to live in Montgomery County.

Affordability was the most frequently mentioned reason why the respondents do not live in Montgomery County with 58 percent mentioning an affordability issue (Table 6). Taxes and housing were cited as the number one and number two reasons why people do not live in Montgomery County.

Top 5 Reasons Why Do Not Live in Montgomery County

1. Taxes (higher)
2. Housing (affordability, availability, quality)
3. Education (schools, school system)
4. Home (like where I live, lived here all my life)
5. Proximity to Family

The second largest category for reasons why they do not live in the county was labeled "sense of place" and includes reasons involving home, proximity to family, family farm and like living in Oklahoma. Around one-third of the respondents mentioned a sense of place reason (Table 6). Reasons associated with "home" were mentioned by 27 respondents and ranked fourth overall. Home was described as "lived here all my life" or "like where I live – it's home." Proximity to family was also another major reason and ranked fifth overall for reasons.

"I like where I live now and it's closer to the family."

The third most mentioned category was availability of services with 32 percent of the respondents mentioning these kinds of reasons (Table 6). Education (schools and the school system) falls under this category and was the third highest-ranking reason why the respondents do not live in Montgomery County. Respondents were either not happy with the school or school system in Montgomery County or indicated that the school system where they currently lived was better.

"My parents are elderly and I want to stay close."

**Table 6. Reasons Why Do Not Live in Montgomery County
Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002**

REASONS	Number	Number	Percent
Affordability		97	58.1%
Taxes (higher)	55		
Housing (affordability, availability, quality)	37		
Cost of Living	5		
Sense of Place		56	33.5%
Home (Like Where I Live, Lived Here All My Life)	27		
Proximity to Family	17		
Family Farm	9		
Like Living in Oklahoma	4		
Want Larger City	3		
Availability of Services		54	32.3%
Education: Schools, School System	33		
Better and More Services, Access to Services	12		
Local Government	9		
Roads	5		
Environment		23	13.80%
Community's Reputation	8		
Crime	7		
Country, Rural Setting	7		
Pollution (Air Quality)	2		
Employment		22	13.20%
Spouse, Works or Close to	12		
Job Opportunities	7		
Business or Investments	4		
No Particular Reason		2	1.2%
N = 167			

Please Note: Two surveys had no response; hence N = 167. Columns do not necessarily total because a person may have indicated more than one reason and/or some reasons may fall under the same major category.

Source: Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Twenty-three surveys mentioned reasons dealing with the environment (**Table 6**). These reasons were either negative with regards to the county or positive with regards to where the respondent currently lives. For example, negative reasons included the city's bad reputation, high crime, and air quality while positive reasons included the person currently lived in a country, rural setting and wanted to stay there.

"We wanted to live in a more rural setting..."

Twenty-two surveys mentioned employment reasons as to why they do not live in Montgomery County (**Table 6**). The major reason under this category has to do with the person's spouse and the fact that where the person currently resides is close to or where their spouse works.

Benefits about Current Residence

The survey respondents were asked to list the benefits about the area where they currently live and their responses have been summarized in **Table 7**. These responses fall along many of the same categories and include (in order of frequency): sense of place, affordability, availability of services, environment, location, and employment. Two respondents mentioned that there were no benefits about the area they currently reside in.

The major benefit about the area that the respondents currently reside in is the sense of place of the area.

Top 5 Benefits About Area Currently Reside In

1. Taxes (lower)
2. Education (schools, school system)
3. Small Town
4. Country, Rural Setting
5. (tie) Home (close to family, friends)
Good Community

Sense of place benefits topped the list with almost 40 percent of the respondents mentioning it (**Table 7**). The next highest category was affordability with 29 percent followed by availability of services at 27 percent. The most frequently mentioned benefit was taxes under the affordability category, which was mentioned in 41 surveys. The

second most mentioned benefit to their current area was education (schools and school system); 32 surveys mentioned it. This was followed by the sense of place benefit of "small town" (28 surveys).

**Table 7. Benefits about Area Currently Reside In
Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002**

BENEFITS	Number	Number	Percent
<i>Sense of Place</i>		63	39.9%
Small Town	28		
Home - Close to Family, Friends	16		
Good Community, Supportive, Friendly	16		
Safe, No Crime, Clean	11		
<i>Affordability</i>		46	29.1%
Taxes (lower)	41		
Cost of Living	6		
Housing	6		
<i>Availability of Services</i>		42	26.6%
Education: Schools, School System	32		
Better and More Services	10		
Local government	3		
<i>Environment</i>		30	19.0%
Country, Rural Setting	18		
Peaceful, Quiet	8		
Scenic	3		
Agricultural	1		
<i>Location</i>		13	8.2%
Close to larger city	9		
General	5		
<i>Employment</i>		12	7.6%
Spouse, Works or Close to	5		
Job Market, Wages	5		
Access to Work	2		
<i>None</i>		2	1.3%
<i>N = 158</i>			

Please Note: Eleven surveys had no response; hence N=158. Columns do not necessarily total because a person may have indicated more than one benefit and/or the some of the benefits may fall under the same major category.

Source: Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

“Cost of living is cheaper, taxes, school system is better”

The environment was another strong category for benefits with 19 percent of the respondents listing reasons under this category (Table 7). The fourth highest-ranking reason could be found in this category

and that is the benefit of a country, rural setting. Home (close to family, friends) and good community (supportive, friendly) tied for the fifth most mentioned benefit; both of these benefits were categorized under sense of place.

“Its my hometown. Family also lives there. Its quiet + almost crime free.”

Drawbacks about Current Residence

Table 8 summarizes the survey responses to drawbacks about the area the respondents currently reside in. The drawbacks have been categorized into six areas: services, location, employment, sense of place,

The availability of services – shopping, dining, and medical – was the major drawback about the respondent’s home.

“I like it just fine.”

affordability, and environment. Twenty-six surveys (19 percent) indicated that their area had no drawbacks.

The main drawback about where the respondents currently live has to do with services; almost 32 percent of the respondents mentioned drawbacks that fall into this category (Table 8). The availability of services (such as shopping, dining, and medical) was the number one drawback for this category and for all categories with 19 surveys mentioned this. Roads were another major drawback that falls under this category.

Top 5 Drawbacks About Area Currently Reside In

1. Availability of Services (shopping, dining, medical)
2. Job Opportunities, Wages
3. Roads & Streets
4. (tie) Proximity/Drive to Work Taxes (too high)

“Inconvenience, most social and shopping activities involve substantial traveling”

Note that one of the major drawbacks about the respondent’s current area of residence was high taxes, which was also considered a drawback for Montgomery County. Obviously, taxes are an issue for people in Montgomery County and at home.

**Table 8. Drawbacks about Area Currently Reside In
Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002**

DRAWBACKS	Number	Number	Percent
Services		43	31.6%
Availability - Shopping, Dining, Medical	19		
Roads (Poor, Dirt, Gravel) & Streets	11		
Opportunities: Cultural, Recreational, Youth	8		
Electric Company, Utilities	5		
City Services	4		
Location		21	15.4%
Proximity to Work, Drive to Work	9		
Proximity to Shopping, Convenience	3		
Remote	5		
General (to airport, to highway, to Kansas)	4		
Sense of Place		14	10.3%
Too Small, Small Town Thinking	8		
Poor Socioeconomic Status	3		
Not Friendly	2		
Employment		13	9.6%
Job Opportunities, Wages	13		
Affordability		11	8.1%
Taxes - Too High	9		
Housing	2		
Environment		5	3.7%
Railroad Tracks	2		
Other	5		
None		26	19.1%
N = 136			

Please Note: Thirty-three surveys had no response; hence N=136. Columns do not necessarily total because a person may have indicated more than one drawback and/or some of the drawbacks may fall under the same major category.

Source: Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

The second major drawback category was location, which was mentioned in 21 surveys (**Table 8**). The most mentioned drawback in this category and was proximity to work, drive to work. The third highest category was sense of place, which included too small, poor socioeconomic status, not friendly, and too large. Around 10 percent of the respondents mentioned sense of place drawbacks.

“No opportunities for growth – lack of quality jobs – no cultural advantages or experiences”

The fourth highest drawback category was employment, which was mentioned by almost 10 percent of the respondents (**Table 8**). This category had the second most mentioned drawback in job opportunities and wages as

drawbacks for the area they currently reside in.

About the County

Strengths

The strengths for Montgomery County are summarized into six categories in **Table 9**; they are jobs/business, quality of life, availability of services, environment and recreational, location, and infrastructure.

Half of the respondents list strengths associated with jobs and businesses. These strengths include job availability and opportunity, the industrial base and number of businesses, retail and other shopping business, and banks.

Overall, the survey respondents consider jobs and businesses the major strength for Montgomery County.

Top 5 Strengths

1. People (good, supportive, involved)
2. Availability/Opportunity for Jobs/Business
3. Industrial Base
4. Retail/Shopping
5. Location

Quality of life strengths are mentioned in almost 43 percent of the surveys (**Table 9**). This category contains the most frequently mentioned strength for the county – the people, which were mentioned in 30 surveys. The respondents indicated that the people of Montgomery County were good, supportive, and involved and had a

good attitude and lots of pride.

Table 9. Strengths for Montgomery County*
Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002

STRENGTHS	Number	Number	Percent
<i>Jobs/Business</i>		63	50.0%
Availability/Opportunity	27		
Industrial Base/Businesses	19		
Retail/Shopping	16		
Banks	2		
<i>Quality of Life</i>		54	42.9%
People: Good, Supportive, Involved, Attitude	30		
Small Town	7		
Safe, No Crime	6		
Communities & their Activities	6		
Independence	3		
Clean	3		
<i>Availability of Services</i>		24	19.0%
Education: Schools, School System	9		
Colleges	8		
Policy, Fire & EMS	3		
Health Care	3		
Other	3		
<i>Environment/Recreational</i>		21	16.7%
Independence Park and Zoo	7		
Hunting and Fishing (Elk City Lake, Big Hill)	5		
Country, Rural Setting	4		
Other	5		
<i>Location</i>		13	10.3%
General, Proximity to Larger City	13		
<i>Infrastructure</i>		5	4.0%
Highways and Roads	5		
<i>None</i>		11	8.7%
<i>Don't Know</i>		10	7.9%
N = 126			

**Please Note: Strengths based on responses to two questions: Most Important Strength and Second Most Important Strength for Montgomery County. Forty-three surveys had no response for the "Most" question; hence N=126. Columns do not necessarily total because a person may have indicated more than one benefit and/or some of the benefits may fall under the same major category.*

Source: Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

The environment of Montgomery County was viewed as a strength by almost 17 percent of the respondents (**Table 9**). This would include the rural, country setting for the county and the recreational aspects that go along with that setting such as hunting and fishing. Seven people specifically mentioned the Independence Park and Zoo as a strength for the county. Location was also seen as a key strength for Montgomery County with 13 respondents touting the general location of county and its proximity to larger cities.

"The attitude of its residents. They seem to be more concerned and involved in its government and local social activities."

"Location. Montgomery County is centrally located between several large cities (Tulsa, Joplin, Wichita, Kansas City)."

Eleven surveys indicated that Montgomery County had no strengths and another 10 surveys did not know the strengths of the county (**Table 9**).

Problems Facing the County

Table 10 summarizes the problems facing the county according to the 150 non-resident workers that chose to answer that question. These problems fall into six categories: quality of life/sense of place, affordability/cost of living, business and employment, services, infrastructure, and environment. These non-residents felt that quality of life and sense of place issues were the county's biggest problem.

Topping that list was crime and drugs followed by welfare and poverty.

The cost of living in the county, its affordability, was the second most mentioned problem facing Montgomery County (**Table 10**). This category also contained the most frequently mentioned problem for the county, which was taxes. Taxes were mentioned by one-third of those commenting on problems.

Top 5 Problems Facing Montgomery County

1. Taxes
2. Employment – Jobs
3. Education – The Schools
4. Crime/Drugs
5. Welfare/Poverty

Table 10. Problems Facing Montgomery County*
Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002

PROBLEMS	Number	Number	Percent
Quality of Life/Sense of Place		73	48.7%
Crime/Drugs	19		
Welfare/Poverty	18		
Community Pride/ Attitude/Leadership	9		
Opportunities for Young People	8		
Declining Population	5		
Appearance/Cleanliness	4		
Teen Issues	3		
Coffeyville	3		
Other	6		
Affordability/Cost of Living		69	46.0%
Taxes	50		
Housing	17		
General Cost of Living	4		
Business and Employment		66	44.0%
Employment - Jobs	38		
Business and Industry Opportunities	11		
Business Loyalty - Retention	9		
The Economy	7		
Cessna	3		
Services		56	37.3%
Education: The Schools	22		
Retail/Grocery/Restaurant	11		
Local Politicians/Leadership	9		
Community Colleges	8		
City Government	7		
County Government	2		
Infrastructure		6	4.0%
Roads, Need 4-Lane, Traffic	6		
Environment		3	2.0%
Pollution (Air)	3		
Don't Know		6	4.0%
N = 150			

**Please Note: Problems based on responses to two questions: Most Important Problem and Second Most Important Problem facing Montgomery County. Nineteen surveys had no response for the "Most" question; hence N = 150. Columns do not necessarily total because a person may have indicated more than one problem and/or some of the problems may fall under the same major category.*

Source: Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

“Property taxes. Lots of people have moved to surrounding communities for lower property taxes.”

Business and employment was the third most mentioned problem category with 44 percent mentioning issues classified under this category (Table 10). This area had the second most mentioned problem overall – jobs. The respondents also felt that the county needed to address business and industry opportunities, business loyalty and retention issues. The vulnerability of Montgomery County due to the downturn in the economy, particularly dependence on Cessna, was a concern for the respondents.

Services are another main problem area for the county with 56 respondents mentioning problems that fall under this category (Table 10). Education and the schools top the list for this category and rank third overall as a problem for the county. Other areas of concern under services were availability of retail, grocery, and restaurants, local politicians and leadership, two community colleges, and government (city and county).

“For what skilled jobs there are, there is no real conveniently located source for either initial or extended technical education...”

Taxes

Anticipating that taxes would be a problem area for the county, the survey asked several questions specific to taxes. The opinion on whether taxes were high, average, or low compared to other places were sought; the results are displayed in Table 11. Very few non-residents workers surveyed thought that taxes were low in Kansas and in Montgomery County compared to other places. Eighty three percent thought that property taxes for Kansas were high compared to other places. Over half thought that the state income tax (59 percent) and the state sales tax (55 percent) were high comparably.

Eighty-three percent thought that property taxes for Kansas were high compared to other places. Around 87 percent thought that real estate taxes in Montgomery County were high compared to other places.

“Excessive taxes in a blue collar workforce...”

Around 87 percent of those with an opinion about real estate taxes labeled them high for Montgomery County compared to other places (Table 11). A little over 79 percent said that vehicle tax in Montgomery County was also high in comparison. Local sales tax for the county was the only area where the majority (56 percent) thought that the tax was average.

**Table 11. Taxes in Kansas and Montgomery County
Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002**

	Low	Average	High
<u>KANSAS TAXES</u>			
Property Taxes N = 147	2 1.4%	23 15.6%	122 83.0%
State Income Tax N = 145	5 3.4%	81 55.9%	59 40.7%
State Sales Tax N = 148	10 6.8%	83 56.1%	55 37.2%
<u>MONTGOMERY COUNTY TAXES</u>			
Real Estate Taxes N = 132	1 0.8%	16 12.1%	115 87.1%
Local Sales Tax N = 139	2 1.4%	78 56.1%	59 42.4%
Vehicle Tax N = 134	1 0.7%	27 20.1%	106 79.1%

Source: Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Schools

As previously mentioned, schools was an area of concern for the non-resident worker (**Table 10**). Opinions were solicited about the public schools (K-12) where the person currently lived along with the public schools in Montgomery County. The respondents were asked to assign a letter grade to the schools and their grades are presented in **Table 12**. In general, non-resident workers have a poor opinion about the schools in the county and a good opinion about the schools where they currently live.

Public schools (K-12) were graded higher for the area where the resident currently resides than schools in Montgomery County.

An average grade of 2.76 (with A = 4 and F = 0) was given by the 152 non-residents that graded the schools where they currently live (**Table 12**). Over 75 percent of those answering this question gave schools an "A" or "B". Only two respondents graded their local schools as failing.

Over half of the respondents had "no opinion" about the schools in Independence, Cherryvale, and Caney (**Table 12**). Coffeyville received the lowest grades for the county with a little over 40 percent giving Coffeyville's schools a "D" or "F." Caney's public schools were graded the highest with a GPA of 2.58.

Non-resident workers were also asked whether or not the presence of two community colleges in Montgomery County made the county more or less attractive. **Table 13** shows that almost 51 percent felt that the two community colleges made the county a more attractive place to live. A little over 23 percent thought the two community colleges made the county less attractive. Twenty-six percent of those answering this question were neutral about whether or not the community colleges added to the attractiveness of the county.

The respondents are split about the attractiveness of two community colleges in the county and their awareness of activities outside course offerings.

When asked about their awareness of activities taking place at the community colleges beyond course offerings, a little over half were not aware of other activities (**Table 13**). The response to awareness combined with attractiveness of the community colleges suggests that further efforts are needed to improve awareness of the community colleges and the benefits they offer.

Table 12. Grades for Public Schools (K-12)
Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002

	A	B	C	D	F		GPA
LETTER GRADE							
<i>for Public Schools (K-12)</i>							
<i>where currently live:</i>							
<i>N = 152</i>	37 24.3%	78 51.3%	27 17.8%	8 5.3%	2 1.3%		2.76
<i>for Public Schools (K-12)</i>							
<i>in Montgomery County:</i>							
	A	B	C	D	F	No Opinion	GPA
Coffeyville <i>N = 169</i>	1 0.6%	6 3.6%	29 17.2%	33 19.5%	35 20.7%	65 38.5%	1.09
Independence <i>N = 169</i>	2 1.2%	17 10.1%	40 23.7%	15 8.9%	7 4.1%	88 52.1%	1.90
Cherryvale <i>N = 169</i>	0 0.0%	23 13.6%	41 24.3%	6 3.6%	4 2.4%	95 56.2%	2.12
Caney <i>N = 169</i>	9 5.3%	31 18.3%	26 15.4%	7 4.1%	0 0.0%	96 56.8%	2.58

Source: Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

**Table 13. Community Colleges in Montgomery County
Presence and Awareness
Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002**

<i>Does the presence of the two community colleges in Independence and Coffeyville make the community a more attractive or less attractive place to live?</i>	<u>Attractive</u>		Neutral	<u>Less Attractive</u>	
	Much More	Somewhat		Somewhat	Much Less
	27 18.0%	49 32.7%	39 26.0%	16 10.7%	19 12.7%
N = 150					

<i>Are you aware of activities taking place at the community colleges beyond course offerings?</i>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
	73	79
	48.0%	52.0%
N = 152		

Source: Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Local Government Services

Non-resident workers' satisfaction with and opinions on quality of local government services were sought through the survey. **Table 14** shows that a large number of non-resident workers (43 percent) were neutral when it comes to satisfaction with government services in Montgomery County. For those that had an opinion about local government services, more were dissatisfied (32.4 percent) than were satisfied (24.3 percent).

Non-resident workers are mostly neutral when it comes to satisfaction with government services. For those with an opinion, more are dissatisfied than are satisfied.

The respondents were given the option of listing the government services that they are most satisfied with as well as those that they are least satisfied with. The results of those responses are summarized in **Table 14**. For services that they are most satisfied with, the most frequent response was a negative one with 16 people listing "none." Protection services were most frequently mentioned with police and fire standing out. The respondents were least satisfied with city government and management. Twenty surveys listed services classified under this category. Coffeyville was specifically mentioned in nine surveys.

**Table 14. Quality of Local Government Services in Montgomery County
Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002**

Satisfaction with Gov't Services in Montgomery County: N = 136	QUALITY OF SERVICES				
	Satisfied		Neutral	Dissatisfied	
	Very	Somewhat			Somewhat
	5	28	59	27	17
	3.7%	20.6%	43.4%	19.9%	12.5%

Aspect of Gov't Services MOST Satisfied With:

SERVICES	Number	Percent
Nothing	16	28.6%
Protection Services	14	25.0%
City Government	5	8.9%
County Government	4	7.1%
Roads	4	7.1%
Other	7	12.5%
N = 56		

Aspect of Gov't Services LEAST Satisfied With:

SERVICES	Number	Percent
City Government/Management	20	31.7%
Protection Services	11	17.5%
Economic Development	5	7.9%
Infrastructure - Roads	5	7.9%
County Government	2	3.2%
Other*	5	7.9%
All	2	3.2%
Nothing	4	6.3%
N = 63		

Please Note: Columns do not necessarily total because a person may have indicated more than one aspect and/or some of the aspects may fall under the same major category. The number of valid surveys returned = 169; however, N varies based on the number of missing data or surveys that indicated "no opinion" or "don't know."

Source: Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

About the County and Its Cities

The non-resident workers survey gathered opinions about Montgomery County and its four cities – Coffeyville, Independence, Cherryvale, and Caney – on housing, jobs and wages, opportunities for youth and single people, dining and shopping choices, and other quality of life areas. If the respondent had no opinion for any of these, they were asked to leave the area blank; therefore, “no opinion” was considered a valid response and is presented as such in the following tables. *Because most of the respondents were either “neutral” or had “no opinion” about the communities that they did not work in, the results presented in the following tables about a particular community are only the opinions of those respondents that work in that community.* Given the small number of responses for Cherryvale (11) and Caney (13), these results are not presented separately – only the results for Coffeyville and Independence are separated. However, the Cherryvale and Caney responses are included in the “Montgomery County” results.

Housing

The survey asked respondents if housing prices for rental housing and home ownership were higher or lower compared to where they currently live.

Table 15 shows that almost half (49 percent) of the respondents had no opinion about housing prices for Montgomery County. Around 40 percent of the respondents that worked in Independence (42.3 percent) or Coffeyville (39.6 percent) thought housing prices were higher than where they lived. A higher percentage of non-resident workers considered rental and home ownership housing prices higher in Independence than in Montgomery County or Coffeyville. Around 15 to 18 percent considered housing prices about the same as where they currently live.

A large number of non-residents have no opinion about housing prices. For those that do, more consider housing prices higher than lower than where they currently live.

Housing selection is considered worse in Montgomery County and its cities when compared to other areas. However, most respondents have no opinion about housing selection.

Table 15 also shows the respondents’ opinions about housing selection for rental and ownership compared to other areas. One-third to one-half of the respondents have no opinion about selection in the county and its two major cities. The respondents were least likely to have an opinion about housing selection for Montgomery County as a whole. For those with an opinion, more felt that rental housing selection was worse than felt it was better when compared to other areas. Around 19 percent considered rental selection about the same in Montgomery County and Coffeyville compared to where they currently live. A higher percentage of Coffeyville’s non-resident workers considered housing selection for both rental

**Table 15. Opinion about Montgomery County and Its Cities
Housing Prices and Selection
Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002**

Housing Issue	Montgomery County	Coffeyville	Independence
<i>Rental Housing Prices:*</i>			
Higher	26.6%	39.6%	42.3%
About the Same	17.8%	16.5%	15.4%
Lower	6.5%	7.7%	3.8%
No Opinion	49.1%	36.3%	38.5%
N=	169	91	52
<i>Housing Prices for Home Ownership:*</i>			
Higher	26.0%	34.1%	48.1%
About the Same	14.8%	18.7%	11.5%
Lower	10.1%	11.0%	1.9%
No Opinion	49.1%	36.3%	38.5%
N=	169	91	52
<i>Rental Housing Selection:**</i>			
Better	6.5%	4.4%	15.4%
About the Same	18.9%	18.7%	13.5%
Worse	16.6%	39.6%	34.6%
No Opinion	58.0%	37.4%	36.5%
N=	169	91	52
<i>Housing Selection for Ownership:**</i>			
Better	8.3%	6.6%	25.0%
About the Same	20.1%	24.2%	13.5%
Worse	15.4%	36.3%	25.0%
No Opinion	56.2%	33.0%	36.5%
N=	169	91	52

*Higher = "1" (much higher) + "2" (somewhat higher); **About the Same** = "3" (neither higher or lower)

Lower = "4" (somewhat lower) + "5" (much lower).

****Better** = "1" (much better) + "2" (somewhat better); **About the Same** = "3" (neither better or worse);

Worse = "4" (somewhat worse) + "5" (much worse).

Source: Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

and ownership worse than the percentages for the county and Independence with almost 40 percent for rental and 36 percent for ownership. Compared to where they currently live, almost 35 percent of Independence's non-resident worker respondents considered rental selection worse and 25 percent considered housing ownership selection worse. Still, 25 percent of Independence's non-resident workers thought housing selection for ownership was better than other areas.

Jobs and Wages

Table 16 summarizes the respondents opinions about job opportunities, job stability, and wages for Montgomery County and its two major cities compared to other areas. Sixteen percent thought that jobs opportunities were better in Montgomery County than other areas and almost 22 percent thought job opportunities were worse. Around 27 percent had no opinion about job opportunities for Coffeyville and Independence. Job opportunities were thought to be worse for Coffeyville by 37.4 percent of the Coffeyville respondents and 32.7 percent of the Independence respondents thought opportunities were worse in Independence than other places.

Over half of the respondents had no opinion about jobs and wages in Montgomery County compared to other areas. However, for those with an opinion, the opinions were more negative than positive.

A large number of respondents also had no opinion about job stability when compared to other areas (**Table 16**). Those with no opinion ranged from 53 percent for Montgomery County to 29 and 32 percent, respectively for Independence and Coffeyville. Few respondents thought that job stability was better in Montgomery County and its cities than other areas. Around 26 percent felt that stability was about the same as other areas for Coffeyville compared to 19 percent for Independence and 21 percent for Montgomery County as a whole. Thirty-nine percent of the non-resident Independence worker respondents thought job stability in Independence was worse than other areas; thirty-one percent of the Coffeyville non-resident workers felt the same about Coffeyville.

With regards to wages, again over half of the respondents had no opinion about wages for Montgomery County compared to other areas (**Table 16**). Wages were considered worse for Independence (42 percent) followed by Coffeyville (37 percent) and then the county (25 percent). Few considered wages better than other places.

**Table 16. Opinion about Montgomery County and Its Cities
Jobs and Wages
Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002**

Jobs and Wages*	Montgomery County	Coffeyville	Independence
<i>Job Opportunities:</i>			
Better	16.0%	20.9%	23.1%
About the Same	10.7%	14.3%	17.3%
Worse	21.9%	37.4%	32.7%
No Opinion	51.5%	27.5%	26.9%
N=	169	91	52
<i>Job Stability:</i>			
Better	6.5%	11.0%	13.5%
About the Same	21.3%	26.4%	19.2%
Worse	18.9%	30.8%	38.5%
No Opinion	53.3%	31.9%	28.8%
N=	169	91	52
<i>Wages:</i>			
Better	7.1%	12.1%	13.5%
About the Same	15.4%	24.2%	17.3%
Worse	25.4%	37.4%	42.3%
No Opinion	52.1%	26.4%	26.9%
N=	169	91	52

***Better** = "1" (much better) + "2" (somewhat better); About the Same = "3" (neither better or worse);
Worse = "4" (somewhat worse) + "5" (much worse).

Source: Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Opportunities for Youth and Single People

Most of the respondents were either neutral or had no opinion about opportunities and services for youth and single people.

The survey asked non-resident workers about their satisfaction with opportunities and services for youth and single people in Montgomery County and its key cities. People could indicate if they were satisfied, neutral, dissatisfied, or had no opinion about opportunities for young children (age 1 to 12), for teenagers (13 to 18), and for single people. They were also asked about their satisfaction with availability and quality of day care. The results are presented in **Table 17**.

A large number of survey respondents (from one-third to 58 percent) had no opinion about opportunities and services for youth and single people in Montgomery County and its key cities (**Table 17**). For those with a negative or positive opinion, with regards to opportunities for young children (age 1 to 12), more non-resident workers were dissatisfied than satisfied with opportunities except for Independence where 31 percent were satisfied compared to 10 percent dissatisfied. More non-resident workers were also dissatisfied than were satisfied with opportunities for teenagers and for single people. Of particular note is Coffeyville, in which almost 53 percent of their non-resident worker respondents were dissatisfied with opportunities for teenagers and 45 percent were dissatisfied with opportunities for single people. With regards to availability and quality of day care, a large number of non-resident workers had no opinion. However, if they did have an opinion, it was more likely to be negative than positive.

**Table 17. Opinion about Montgomery County and Its Cities
Satisfaction with Opportunities and Services for Youth and Single People
Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002**

Opportunity or Service*	Montgomery County	Coffeyville	Independence
<i>Opportunities for young children (age 1 to 12):</i>			
Satisfied	8.9%	13.2%	30.8%
Neutral	20.1%	9.9%	19.2%
Dissatisfied	21.3%	44.0%	9.6%
No Opinion	49.7%	33.0%	40.4%
N=	169	91	52
<i>Opportunities for teenagers (age 13 to 18):</i>			
Satisfied	5.3%	5.5%	17.3%
Neutral	15.4%	8.8%	17.3%
Dissatisfied	30.2%	52.7%	25.0%
No Opinion	49.1%	33.0%	40.4%
N=	169	91	52
<i>Opportunities for single people:</i>			
Satisfied	5.3%	4.4%	9.6%
Neutral	13.0%	12.1%	19.2%
Dissatisfied	29.0%	45.1%	25.0%
No Opinion	52.7%	38.5%	46.2%
N=	169	91	52
<i>Availability and quality of day care:</i>			
Satisfied	9.5%	8.8%	11.5%
Neutral	12.4%	17.6%	15.4%
Dissatisfied	20.1%	25.3%	30.8%
No Opinion	58.0%	48.4%	42.3%
N=	169	91	52

***Satisfied** = "1" (very satisfied) + "2" (somewhat satisfied); **Neutral** = "3" (neither satisfied or dissatisfied); **Dissatisfied** = "4" (somewhat dissatisfied) + "5" very dissatisfied

Source: Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Quality of Life Issues

Environment, Appearance, and Safety

The survey also asked a series of questions regarding satisfaction with quality of life issues concerning environment, appearance, and safety. Those opinions are presented in **Table 18**. With regards to the natural environment, around 61 percent either had no opinion or were neutral

Survey respondents more frequently expressed dissatisfaction with Coffeyville's natural environment, general appearance, traffic, quality of roads, and level of crime compared to other cities in the county.

for Montgomery County. For those with an opinion, 25 percent were satisfied compared to 13 percent dissatisfied. This same general pattern of satisfaction or neutrality was not found for Coffeyville. Almost 44 percent of those surveyed that worked in Coffeyville were dissatisfied with the natural environment in Coffeyville. On the flip side, a little over 44 percent that worked in Independence were satisfied with the natural environment in Independence.

With regards to general appearance, most respondents were either satisfied with Montgomery County's general appearance or were neutral/no opinion. Not quite 18 percent expressed dissatisfaction with the general appearance. However, over half of the respondents (57 percent) were dissatisfied with the general appearance of Coffeyville. On the positive side, around 48 percent were satisfied with the general appearance of Independence.

Traffic in Montgomery County and its key cities was not as much of an issue for non-resident workers with percent dissatisfaction with traffic ranging from 14 percent for the county to 30 percent for Coffeyville (**Table 18**). The quality of roads was more of an issue for the non-resident worker with 29 percent dissatisfied with quality of roads in Montgomery County. The respondents had the worst opinion of Coffeyville's roads with 66 percent dissatisfied.

Neither Coffeyville nor Independence fared well with its non-resident workers with regards to level of crime. Around 44 percent of the Coffeyville non-resident worker respondents were dissatisfied with the level of crime in Coffeyville and 40 percent of the non-resident Independence worker for Independence's level of crime (**Table 18**). In general, not that many respondents were satisfied with the level of crime for Montgomery County with only 9.5 percent satisfied.

**Table 18. Opinion about Montgomery County and Its Cities
Satisfaction with Quality of Life Issues (Environment, Appearance, & Safety)
Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002**

Quality of Life Issue*	Montgomery County	Coffeyville	Independence
<i>Natural Environment:</i>			
Satisfied	25.4%	17.6%	40.4%
Neutral	20.1%	14.3%	15.4%
Dissatisfied	13.0%	44.0%	7.7%
No Opinion	41.4%	24.2%	36.5%
N=	169	91	52
<i>General Appearance:</i>			
Satisfied	22.5%	12.1%	48.1%
Neutral	21.9%	14.3%	19.2%
Dissatisfied	17.8%	57.1%	9.6%
No Opinion	37.9%	16.5%	23.1%
N=	169	91	52
<i>Traffic:</i>			
Satisfied	25.4%	16.5%	36.5%
Neutral	23.1%	36.3%	17.3%
Dissatisfied	14.2%	29.7%	15.4%
No Opinion	37.3%	17.6%	30.8%
N=	169	91	52
<i>Quality of Roads:</i>			
Satisfied	20.1%	15.4%	28.8%
Neutral	15.4%	7.7%	28.8%
Dissatisfied	29.0%	65.9%	17.3%
No Opinion	35.5%	11.0%	25.0%
N=	169	91	52
<i>Level of Crime:</i>			
Satisfied	9.5%	14.3%	7.7%
Neutral	18.9%	17.6%	19.2%
Dissatisfied	29.6%	44.0%	40.4%
No Opinion	42.0%	24.2%	32.7%
N=	169	91	52

***Satisfied** = "1" (very satisfied) + "2" (somewhat satisfied); **Neutral** = "3" (neither satisfied or dissatisfied); **Dissatisfied** = "4" (somewhat dissatisfied) + "5" very dissatisfied

Source: Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Dining and Shopping Choices

Non-resident workers participating in the survey were also given the opportunity to express their opinion about the quality of restaurants, selection of restaurants, retail shopping, and grocery shopping. **Table 19** shows that more non-resident workers in Coffeyville had opinions about these areas than the Independence workers or the county in general.

In general, the respondents were more frequently dissatisfied than satisfied with dining and shopping choices for Montgomery County.

The respondents were more frequently dissatisfied with the selection of restaurants than with the quality of restaurants for Montgomery County and its two key cities (**Table 19**). Coffeyville appears to need the most work with quality and selection of restaurants with 55 percent of the respondents that worked in Coffeyville dissatisfied with quality and 65 percent with selection. However, more of the respondents that worked in Independence were satisfied than were dissatisfied with both the quality and selection of restaurants.

A little over one-third of the survey respondents were dissatisfied with retail shopping in Montgomery County and 62 percent of the respondents that worked in Coffeyville were dissatisfied with retail shopping in Coffeyville (**Table 19**). Not that many respondents indicated satisfaction with retail shopping but Independence was more frequently indicated with 31 percent satisfied.

With regard to grocery shopping for Montgomery County, the survey respondents were generally of no opinion or a neutral one. Forty percent of respondents that worked in Independence expressed dissatisfaction with Independence's grocery shopping and 34 percent of the respondents that worked in Coffeyville were dissatisfied with its grocery shopping.

**Table 19. Opinion about Montgomery County and Its Cities
Satisfaction with Dining and Shopping Choices
Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002**

Dining and Shopping*	Montgomery County	Coffeyville	Independence
<i>Quality of Restaurants:</i>			
Satisfied	16.0%	15.4%	30.8%
Neutral	20.1%	13.2%	19.2%
Dissatisfied	24.3%	54.9%	19.2%
No Opinion	39.6%	16.5%	30.8%
N=	169	91	52
<i>Selection of Restaurants:</i>			
Satisfied	16.0%	12.1%	34.6%
Neutral	9.5%	6.6%	7.7%
Dissatisfied	33.7%	64.8%	25.0%
No Opinion	40.8%	16.5%	32.7%
N=	169	91	52
<i>Retail Shopping:</i>			
Satisfied	10.7%	12.1%	30.8%
Neutral	15.4%	12.1%	15.4%
Dissatisfied	33.7%	61.5%	23.1%
No Opinion	40.2%	14.3%	30.8%
N=	169	91	52
<i>Grocery Shopping:</i>			
Satisfied	12.4%	22.0%	13.5%
Neutral	21.3%	26.4%	15.4%
Dissatisfied	24.9%	34.1%	40.4%
No Opinion	41.4%	17.6%	30.8%
N=	169	91	52

***Satisfied** = "1" (very satisfied) + "2" (somewhat satisfied); **Neutral** = "3" (neither satisfied or dissatisfied); **Dissatisfied** = "4" (somewhat dissatisfied) + "5" very dissatisfied

Source: Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Recreation, Entertainment, and Health Care

The survey also addressed the quality of life areas of recreational opportunities, cultural and entertainment opportunities, and quality of health care. Once again, most of the respondents had no opinion or were neutral in their satisfaction with these areas for Montgomery County (**Table 20**).

In general, the respondents had no opinion or were neutral about recreation, entertainment, and health care for Montgomery County and its key cities.

The survey respondents were most dissatisfied with Coffeyville's opportunities both recreational and cultural and entertainment (**Table 20**). The respondents were most satisfied with the recreational opportunities in Independence and were evenly split in their satisfaction and dissatisfaction regarding cultural and entertainment opportunities in Independence.

With regards to health care in Montgomery County, most of the respondents had no opinion or were neutral (**Table 20**). The respondents were most dissatisfied with Coffeyville, with 44 percent of the respondents working in Coffeyville expressing dissatisfaction with health care in that community compared to 26 percent of the Montgomery County respondents about the county and 23 percent of the Independence respondents about Independence.

Conclusion

Recommendations for Improvement

The survey respondents were given the opportunity to recommend aspects of life in Montgomery County that need improving. **Table 21** summarizes the responses given by the 100 respondents that chose to respond. Forty-seven respondents mentioned quality of life aspects that needed improvement with appearance and cleanliness followed by crime/drugs topping that list.

Respondents indicated that improvement is needed in quality of life aspects followed by services, business and employment, and affordability and cost of living.

**Table 20. Opinion about Montgomery County and Its Cities
Satisfaction with Quality of Life Issues (Recreation, Entertainment, & Health Care)
Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002**

Quality of Life Issues*	Montgomery		
	County	Coffeyville	Independence
<i>Recreational Opportunities:</i>			
Satisfied	14.8%	11.0%	34.6%
Neutral	20.7%	17.6%	15.4%
Dissatisfied	20.1%	45.1%	9.6%
No Opinion	44.4%	26.4%	40.4%
N=	169	91	52
<i>Cultural and Entertainment Opportunities:</i>			
Satisfied	11.2%	11.0%	23.1%
Neutral	14.8%	22.0%	15.4%
Dissatisfied	30.2%	44.0%	23.1%
No Opinion	43.8%	23.1%	38.5%
N=	169	91	52
<i>Quality of Health Care:</i>			
Satisfied	7.7%	12.1%	15.4%
Neutral	18.3%	20.9%	19.2%
Dissatisfied	26.0%	44.0%	23.1%
No Opinion	47.9%	23.1%	42.3%
N=	169	91	52

***Satisfied** = "1" (very satisfied) + "2" (somewhat satisfied); **Neutral** = "3" (neither satisfied or dissatisfied);
Dissatisfied = "4" (somewhat dissatisfied) + "5" very dissatisfied

Source: Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Aspects of Life that Need Improving in
Montgomery County

1. Employment: More and Better Jobs
2. Affordability: Taxes
3. Education: The Schools
4. Services: Retail/Grocery/Restaurants
5. Appearance and Cleanliness

Forty-three surveys recommended that improvements be made in services with education (schools) and retail/grocery/restaurant most frequently mentioned (Table 21). Business and employment aspects were recommended in 38 surveys. This area had the most frequently mentioned aspect for improvement

with 32 respondents recommending improvements be made in employment – more and better jobs. Affordability and the cost of living was also another area of concern with 28 respondents mentioning this; taxes topped this area.

The survey results show a number of areas that need improvement in the county in order to enhance the desirability of the county as a place to live and work.

“Visual appearance, repair roads, demolish abandoned run-down buildings and home”

Specific actions were recommended by the respondents to address some of these issues. They include issues categorized under quality of life, services, business and employment, cost of living, infrastructure, and environment.

“I wish that citizens of Coffeyville had more pride in their community. If they did perhaps the homes, yards, restaurants, attitudes, etc. would be cleaner and better.”

Under quality of life, recommendations were made that would 1) enhance the appearance of the community, 2) decrease crime and drugs, 3) decrease the number of people on welfare and living in poverty, 4) improve cultural,

recreational, and entertainment opportunities and activities, and 5) improve youth involvement and opportunities.

With regards to services, suggestions included ways to 1) create better schools, 2) increase and improve shopping opportunities (retail, grocery, restaurants), 3) combine community colleges, and 4) improve local government.

“Education and youth involvement. Keep the kids off the streets and interested in something besides drugs and trouble.”

For business and employment, the concern was with creating more and better jobs and increasing and strengthening the industrial base. Cost of living recommendations had to do with decreasing taxes and improving housing. Under infrastructure, suggestions were made to improve and maintain the roads. The main area for action under environment was to decrease (air) pollution. The specific

recommendations are presented in **Appendix B** and are a good starting point for discussion.

General Comments

“We need more opportunities and jobs to keep our young people in area...”

The respondents were given a last opportunity to give additional comments. Those comments are summarized in **Table 22** and show that the respondents reaffirmed their concern with

quality of life, services, affordability, and business and employment. The top comments dealt with (in order of frequency) taxes, roads, employment (more and better jobs), education (the schools), local government, and business opportunities (lack of industries, new businesses).

“Property taxes need lowered, roads need fixed, junk houses need cleaned up. Welfare system needs work... The wages offered are low especially when compared to property taxes.”

Most Mentioned General Comments

1. Taxes
2. Roads
3. Employment
4. (tie) Education
Local Government
Industries, New Businesses

Final Thoughts

The survey results offer concerns to be addressed for Montgomery County as well as strengths to be built upon by the county in order to encourage population and job growth. Here are some following final thoughts – points to be re-emphasized.

A comparison of the non-resident worker survey respondents with Census 2000 resident data showed that the worker commuting into Montgomery County is more educated and has a higher household income than the average Montgomery County resident (**Table 1**). Does this suggest that companies must bring in non-resident workers to fill the higher skilled (therefore higher paying) jobs in the county? Or does this indicate a person’s willingness to commute for higher paying jobs that better meet their educational level? Why is it that these higher paying jobs are attracting people to work in the county, but not to move to the county? **Tables 3, 5, and 6** offer some answers to those questions. People work in Montgomery County because of job related, company specific, or location reasons (**Table 3**). Affordability (taxes and housing) is the main reason why they moved out of the county or do not live in the county (**Tables 5 and 6**).

Why do people work but not live in Montgomery County?

Table 21. Aspects of Life in Montgomery County that Need Improving*
Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002

ASPECTS THAT NEED IMPROVING	Number	Number	Percent
Quality of Life		47	47.0%
Appearance/Cleanliness	12		
Crime/Drugs	10		
Welfare/Poverty	7		
Cultural and Entertainment Opportunities	6		
Opportunities for Young People	4		
Residents' Attitudes	3		
Other*	3		
Health Care	2		
Services		43	43.0%
Education: The Schools	17		
Retail/Grocery/Restaurant	15		
Combine Community Colleges	6		
City Government	3		
County Government	2		
Business and Employment		38	38.0%
Employment: More and Better Jobs	32		
Industry and Business Opportunities	6		
Affordability/Cost of Living		28	28.0%
Taxes	18		
Housing	9		
General Cost of Living	1		
Infrastructure		8	8.0%
Roads	8		
Environment		4	4.0%
Pollution (Air)	4		

N = 100

**Please Note: Sixty-nine surveys offered no response for any aspect of Montgomery County to focus on to improve; hence N = 100. Columns do not necessarily total because a person may have indicated more than one aspect for improvement and/or some of the improvements may fall under the same major category.*

Source: Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

Table 22. Additional Comments Concerning Montgomery County*
Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON	Number	Number	Percent
Quality of Life		27	61.4%
Appearance/Cleanliness	5		
Crime/Drugs	5		
Positive/Favorable	5		
Welfare/Poverty	3		
Opportunities for Young People	3		
Cultural and Entertainment			
Opportunities	2		
Perceptions/First Impressions	2		
Small Town Environment	2		
Services		21	47.7%
Education: The Schools	7		
Local Government	7		
Job Training Programs	3		
Retail/Grocery/Restaurant	2		
Community Colleges	2		
Affordability/Cost of Living		19	43.2%
Taxes	13		
Housing	6		
Business and Employment		15	34.1%
Employment: More and Better Jobs	8		
Business Opportunities - Lack of			
Industries, New Businesses	7		
Infrastructure		9	20.5%
Roads	9		
Coffeyville		5	11.4%
Negative Opinion	5		
Independence		2	4.5%
Need to Let Grow	2		
Environment		2	4.5%
Pollution (Air)	2		

N = 44

*Please Note: 125 surveys offered no additional comments concerning Montgomery County; hence N = 44. Columns do not necessarily total because a person may have indicated more than one comment and/or some of the comments may fall under the same major category.

Source: Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.

For many non-resident workers, it would take a major shift in orientation regarding "Place" to get them to move.

Sense of place benefits about the area they currently reside in were the most frequently mentioned benefits by the non-resident worker; these refer to the small town feel, that it is home (close to family and friends or grew up there), that the community is good, supportive, friendly, and that they feel safe (Table 7). Sense of place

also plays a major role as to why people do not live in Montgomery County (Table 6). The reasons given by this group have more to do with the positive aspect of where they currently live than the negative aspects of Montgomery County. Therefore, it may be hard to convince these non-residents to move to Montgomery County because the county has little control over these reasons, which include "lived here all my life," proximity to family, location of the family farm, or "just like living in Oklahoma." It would take a compelling change in orientation to convince these non-residents to move.

Affordability is an issue raised throughout by the respondents (Tables 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 15, 21, and 22). Over and over again, the non-resident worker is concerned about the cost of living in Montgomery County compared to where they currently live. They

Non-resident workers believe taxes are higher in Montgomery County and services are not necessarily better.

believe that taxes are higher, housing is higher, and services are not necessarily better. For those residents that lived in Montgomery County and moved, the number one reason given for why they moved was taxes (Table 5). This was also the top reason given for why they do not live in Montgomery County (Table 6). The top problem facing the county was taxes (Table 10). An overwhelming majority of non-resident workers (83 to 87 percent) consider property taxes in Kansas and Montgomery County to be "high" compared to other places. The second most frequently mentioned reason for why the respondent moved from the county and why they do not live in the county was another affordability issue – housing (Tables 5 and 6). While about half of the respondents had no opinion about housing prices in Montgomery County, around one-fourth considered housing prices for rentals and home ownership higher than where they currently lived (Table 15).

Schools play an important part in the decision-making process about where to live and the perception among many non-resident workers is that public schools in Montgomery County need improvement.

Over 60 percent of the non-resident workers responding to the survey had children under 18 living in the household (Table 1). This suggests that schools play an important part in their decision-making process about where to live. This is supported by other questions in the survey. The respondents list schools and the school system as a

major benefit about the area they currently reside in (Table 7) as well as a main reason why they do not live in Montgomery County (Table 6). Public schools (K-12) in Montgomery County and its four major cities were not graded as high as the public schools where the respondent currently lived (Table 12). Schools were the third most mentioned problem facing Montgomery County as well as the aspect of life in Montgomery County that needed

improving (**Tables 10 and 21**). Only nine respondents mentioned schools and the school system as a strength for the county (**Table 9**).

Overall, the survey respondents considered jobs and business as a major strength for Montgomery County (**Table 9**). Nonetheless, a large number of respondents also considered employment opportunities as a major problem facing the county (**Table 10**), indicating that work needs to continue regarding employment opportunities – creating and retaining jobs and improving wages. People expressed concerned about the loyalty of certain businesses to the county. When specifically asked their opinion about Montgomery County with regards to jobs and wages, a little over half of the respondents have no opinion about job opportunities, stability, and wages (**Table 16**). For those with an opinion, the opinion about jobs and wages were mostly negative – that is, more respondents considered job opportunities, stability, and wages worse than considered them better than other places.

While jobs and businesses are considered major strengths for Montgomery County, a large number of respondents also consider employment opportunities a major problem.

Taxes are considered high in Montgomery County compared to other areas and the respondents are not sure that services (education and local government) are any better.

While a number of respondents attributed high taxes in the county to having two community colleges, the respondents are split about the attractiveness of having two community colleges in the county (**Table 13**). The respondents were not all that aware about the activities of the colleges outside course offerings. These mixed responses about the community colleges could indicate

that further effort is needed to increase awareness and market the benefits of the colleges to the county.

Another area that jumps out is the quality of government services relative to the taxes paid (**Tables 6, 7, 14, 18, 21, and 22**). Falling under this category are schools, roads and streets, city services, crime and safety, cleanliness and appearance of the communities, local politicians and leadership, and recreational and cultural opportunities. As previously discussed, schools are a big drawback for the county. But also of concern is the quality of local government services. However, when specifically asked about satisfaction with the quality of local government services in Montgomery County, around 43 percent of the respondents that indicated a satisfaction level are neutral (**Table 14**). The respondents appear to be least satisfied with city government and management and most satisfied with protection services.

Finally, one last thought is offered on quality of life aspects. It appears that more negative opinions are associated with Coffeyville than other parts of the county (Tables 17, 18, 19, and 20). Survey respondents that worked in Coffeyville more frequently expressed dissatisfaction with Coffeyville's natural environment, general appearance, traffic, quality of roads, and level of crime compared to non-resident workers that worked elsewhere in the county (Table 18). Coffeyville was also specifically mentioned by name when talking about an aspect of government services that the respondent was least satisfied with (Table 14). Air pollution was also mentioned as a problem for the city along with crime and drugs and the schools. For those with an opinion about opportunities and services for youth and single people, Coffeyville also had more non-resident workers dissatisfied than were satisfied (Table 17). This pattern also held for quality of restaurants, selection of restaurants, retail shopping, and grocery shopping (Table 19) as well as recreational opportunities, cultural and entertainment opportunities, and quality of health care (Table 20). Granted a large number of respondents had no opinion one way or the other about the various quality of life aspects and service opportunities and activities for Montgomery County and its cities; however, those with an opinion tended to be unfavorable with regards to Coffeyville.

It appears more negative opinions are associated with Coffeyville than other parts of the county indicating that action is needed to address these concerns.

What can be learned from the Montgomery County non-resident worker survey? As previously mentioned, the findings are a starting point to discuss changes needed, strengths to build on, and areas to focus on for the county and its communities as the county looks to develop a strategy for growth. It is up to the local leadership to take this information and address those things that can and need to be addressed at the local level. Remember, these are findings from just one segment of Montgomery County – that of non-resident workers. Therefore, these findings need to be considered in the larger context for the county. However, a number of issues have emerged which need to be addressed; those issues are: cost of living (taxes and housing), employment (jobs, wages, and stability), education (schools and the school systems), services (for youth and singles to dining and shopping), infrastructure (from roads to appearance and cleanliness), and quality of life opportunities (cultural, entertainment, and recreational). These are issues that can be addressed and improvements can be made in these areas. As stated in the introductory purpose, a community that chooses *not* to address such issues risks creating jobs that will be filled by non-residents.

Issues to Be Addressed

- Taxes
- Housing
- The Schools
- More and Better Jobs
- Services for Youth to Dining and Shopping
- Appearance and Cleanliness
- Quality of Life Opportunities

Appendix A

Montgomery County Worker Survey (Non-Resident)

Montgomery County Worker Survey (for Non-Residents): 2002

For each question, please print your answer or circle the corresponding number.

A. In what city do you live? _____

B. In what county do you live? _____

C. About how many years have you lived at your current address? _____ (years)

D. In your opinion, what is the biggest benefit about the area in which you currently live?

E. In your opinion, what don't you like about the area in which you currently live?

1. Have you ever lived in Montgomery County, Kansas? 0 No 1 Yes

1a. (If yes) why did you move?

2. In what city do you work? (If you do not work in an incorporated city, please indicate the closest city.) _____

3. Are you currently?

- | | |
|------------|-------------------------|
| 1 Married | 4 Separated |
| 2 Widowed | 5 Single |
| 3 Divorced | 6 Living with a partner |

3a. Are you currently living with your extended family, such as your parents, grandparents, or other close relative?

- 0 No
1 Yes

3b. If you are married or living with a partner, does your spouse or partner work outside the home?

- 0 No
1 Yes

3c. If you are currently married or living with a partner who works outside the home, what county and state does your spouse or partner work in?

Montgomery County Worker Survey (for Non-Residents): 2002

For each question, please print your answer or circle the corresponding number.

4a. What is the probability that you will move in the next couple of years?

- 0 Very low
- 1 Low
- 2 High
- 4 Very high

4b. What is the probability that you will move to Montgomery County in the next couple of years?

- 0 Very low
- 1 Low
- 2 High
- 4 Very high

5a. Why don't you **live** in Montgomery County?

5b. Why do you **work** in Montgomery County?

6a. What do you consider **the most** important strength of Montgomery County?

6b. What do you consider **the second most** important strength of Montgomery County?

7a. What do you consider **the most** important problem facing Montgomery County?

7b. What do you consider **the second most** important problem facing Montgomery County?

Montgomery County Worker Survey (for Non-Residents): 2002

For each question, please print your answer or circle the corresponding number.

8a. How about **Kansas taxes** compared to other places, are taxes low, about average, or high for:

- a. Property taxes: 1 – low 2 – about average 3 – high
- b. State income tax: 1 – low 2 – about average 3 – high
- c. State sales tax: 1 – low 2 – about average 3 – high

8b. How about **Montgomery County, Kansas taxes** compared to other places, are taxes low, about average, or high for:

- a. Real Estate taxes: 1 – low 2 – about average 3 – high
- b. Local sales tax: 1 – low 2 – about average 3 – high
- c. Vehicle tax: 1 – low 2 – about average 3 – high

9a. Using a grading system, where A means “excellent performance” and F means “failing performance,” what letter grade would you assign to the public schools (K-12) **where you currently live?**

A B C D or F

9b. Using a grading system, where A means “excellent performance” and F means “failing performance,” what letter grade would you assign to the public schools (K-12) in Montgomery County, Kansas?

IF YOU HAVE NO OPINION ABOUT A PARTICULAR CITY, PLEASE LEAVE BLANK.

AREA	Coffeyville	Independence	Cherryvale	Caney
9b. Public School Performance	A B C D F	A B C D F	A B C D F	A B C D F

10. When you think about the **quality of local government services** in Montgomery County, are you:

- 1 Very satisfied
- 2 Somewhat satisfied
- 3 Neither satisfied or dissatisfied
- 4 Somewhat dissatisfied
- 5 Very dissatisfied

10a. With what aspect of local government services in Montgomery County are you **most satisfied?**

10b. With what aspect of local government services in Montgomery County are you **least satisfied?**

Montgomery County Worker Survey (for Non-Residents): 2002

For each question, please print your answer or circle the corresponding number.

For Montgomery County and its cities, please indicate if you are 1 Very Satisfied, 2 Somewhat satisfied, 3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 4 Somewhat dissatisfied, or 5 Very Dissatisfied with the following conditions.

IF YOU HAVE NO OPINION, PLEASE LEAVE BLANK.

1 = Very Satisfied **2 = Somewhat satisfied** **3 = Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied**
4 = Somewhat dissatisfied **5 = Very Dissatisfied** **Blank = No opinion**

AREA	Montgomery County	Coffeyville	Independence	Cherryvale	Caney
11a. Opportunities for young children (age 1 to 12)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
11b. Opportunities for teenage children (age 13 to 18)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
11c. Opportunities for single people	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
11d. Availability and Quality of Daycare	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Please continue with your input concerning your level of satisfaction on conditions in the Montgomery County and its cities. For each, please indicate if you are 1 Very Satisfied, 2 Somewhat satisfied, 3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 4 Somewhat dissatisfied, or 5 Very Dissatisfied.

IF YOU HAVE NO OPINION, PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

1 = Very Satisfied **2 = Somewhat satisfied** **3 = Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied**
4 = Somewhat dissatisfied **5 = Very Dissatisfied** **Blank = No opinion**

AREA	Montgomery County	Coffeyville	Independence	Cherryvale	Caney
12a. Natural environment	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
12b. General Appearance	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
12c. Traffic	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
12d. Quality of roads	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
12e. Level of crime	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Montgomery County Worker Survey (for Non-Residents): 2002

For each question, please print your answer or circle the corresponding number.

We would like to ask you two questions about housing prices for Montgomery County and its key cities compared to where you currently live. For each, please indicate if you think prices are 1 Much higher, 2 Somewhat higher, 3 Neither higher nor lower (about the same), 4 Somewhat lower, or 5 Much lower.

IF YOU HAVE NO OPINION, PLEASE LEAVE BLANK.

1 = Much higher 2 = Somewhat higher 3 = Neither higher nor lower (about the same)
4 = Somewhat lower 5 = Much lower Blank = No opinion

AREA	Montgomery County	Coffeyville	Independence	Cherryvale	Caney
13a. Rental Housing Prices	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
13b. Housing Prices for Home Ownership	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Now we would like to ask you a few questions comparing Montgomery County and its key cities to other areas. For each, please indicate if you think the conditions are 1 Much better, 2 Somewhat better, 3 Neither better or worse (about the same), 4 Somewhat worse, or 5 Much worse.

IF YOU HAVE NO OPINION, PLEASE LEAVE BLANK.

1 = Much better 2 = Somewhat better 3 = About the same
4 = Somewhat worse 5 = Much worse Blank = No opinion

AREA	Montgomery County	Coffeyville	Independence	Cherryvale	Caney
14a. Rental Housing Selection	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
14b. Housing Selection for Ownership	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
15a. Job Opportunities	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
15b. Job Stability	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
15c. Wages	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Montgomery County Worker Survey (for Non-Residents): 2002

For each question, please print your answer or circle the corresponding number.

For each Montgomery County and its cities, please indicate if you are 1 Very Satisfied, 2 Somewhat satisfied, 3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 4 Somewhat dissatisfied, or 5 Very Dissatisfied with the following conditions.

IF YOU HAVE NO OPINION, PLEASE LEAVE BLANK.

1 = Very Satisfied

2 = Somewhat satisfied

3 = Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

4 = Somewhat dissatisfied

5 = Very Dissatisfied

Blank = No opinion

AREA	Montgomery County	Coffeyville	Independence	Cherryvale	Caney
16a. Quality of restaurants	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
16b. Selection of restaurants	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
16c. Opportunities for retail shopping	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
16d. Opportunities for grocery shopping	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
16e. Opportunities for recreation	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
16f. Cultural and entertainment opportunities	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
16g. Quality of healthcare	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

17a. Montgomery County has Community Colleges in Independence and Coffeyville. Does the presence of these colleges make the county a more attractive or less attractive place to live?

- 1 Much more attractive
- 2 Somewhat more attractive
- 3 Neither more attractive or less attractive (about the same)
- 4 Somewhat less attractive
- 5 Much less attractive

17b. Are you aware of activities taking place at the Montgomery County Community Colleges beyond the regular courses being offered?

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

Montgomery County Worker Survey (for Non-Residents): 2002

For each question, please print your answer or circle the corresponding number.

18a. If you could improve any aspect of life in Montgomery County, on what would you focus?

18b. How would you improve this aspect of life in Montgomery County?

You are almost finished. We'd just like to ask you a few questions about yourself for statistical purposes. Again, your answers will be completely confidential.

19. About how many people are employed where you work in Montgomery County?

- | | | | |
|---|--------------|---|-------------|
| 1 | Less than 10 | 5 | 40 to 49 |
| 2 | 10 to 19 | 6 | 50 to 99 |
| 3 | 20 to 29 | 7 | 100 to 249 |
| 4 | 30 to 39 | 8 | 250 or more |

19a. About how many years have you worked at your current place of employment?

_____ (years)

20. How many children (18 and under), if any, currently live in your household?

21. What is your highest level of education?

- | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| 1 | Less than High School Degree | 5 | 4-yr Degree |
| 2 | High School Degree or GED | 6 | Some Graduate School |
| 3 | Some College | 7 | Graduate Degree |
| 4 | 2-yr Degree | | |

22. Which of the following income categories best describes your total combined household income for all of 2001? Please be sure to include income from welfare, Social Security, pensions, and investments, as well as any wages and salary, or any income from your own business.

- 1 Under \$19,999
- 2 \$20,000 - \$29,999
- 3 \$30,000 - \$39,999
- 4 \$40,000 - \$49,999
- 5 \$50,000 - \$59,999
- 6 \$60,000 - \$69,999
- 7 \$70,000 - \$79,999
- 8 \$80,000 and over

Montgomery County Worker Survey (for Non-Residents): 2002

For each question, please print your answer or circle the corresponding number.

23. In what year were you born? _____

24a. Do you consider yourself?

- 1 White or Caucasian
- 2 Black or African American
- 3 Asian
- 4 Native American/Alaskan Eskimo
- 5 Some other race

24b. Regardless of what race you answered, do you consider yourself Hispanic or Latino?

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

25. What is your gender?

- 0 Male
- 1 Female

That's all the questions we have for you. Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Have a good day!

26. Below please add any additional comments you would like to offer concerning Montgomery County.

PLEASE USE THE ATTACHED POSTAGE PAID ENVELOPE TO RETURN YOUR COMPLETED SURVEY TO THE SURVEY RESEARCH CENTER AT THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS.

Appendix B

Recommendations to Improve Montgomery County

HOW TO IMPROVE

QUALITY OF LIFE

Enhance the Appearance of the Community:

Develop a Community Pride campaign that promotes property ownership pride for both home and business.
Put resources (tax dollars) back into the community to clean up property, e.g. cut the grass, fix the roads, clean up people's yards.
Create ordinances (restrictions) on appearance for residential areas.
Start a beautification committee. Develop a program for exterior improvements in designated residential areas.
Create and/or enforce ordinances that improve the appearance of residential neighborhoods (e.g. restrict the parking of cars on front lawns.)
Develop a recognition program of people and places that take pride in homes of all economic ranges (e.g. homes that are smaller and in "not so nice" neighborhoods but are well-maintained.)
Clean up the trash and the old, delapidated housing.
Enforce the ordinances for minimal upkeep of property.

Decrease Crime and Drugs:

Give kids a safe place to hang out. Have more activities for youth.
Fund more law enforcement officers.
Pass (right to carry) concealed weapons.
Enforce laws and regulations inside and outside schools and restaurants.
Interview children about drug use and develop a program to address the problems.

Decrease the Number of People on Welfare and Living in Poverty:

Bring in better paying jobs into Montgomery County.
Change the welfare system through action and review of qualifications and programs that meets the needs of the community.
Develop work force training and placement programs for welfare recipients.
Set up job programs like they once had in the 1930's. Jobs could be developed for welfare recipients to work improving the community.

Improve cultural, recreational, and entertainment opportunities and activities.

Promote cultural diversity by developing programs or activities that increase cultural appreciation.
Let people use facilities for entertainment or rent them at a profit.
Find ways to improve the county to make it more appealing to outsiders through community events and facilities that provide cultural, recreational, and entertainment activities.
Enhance entertainment opportunities for single lifestyles other than bars.

Improve youth involvement and opportunities.

Get the community involved in events geared towards children and give the youth a place to go.
Provide more youth options for recreation and entertainment.
Fix up the park at Coffeyville, the bowling alley, movies, and skating to offer affordable activities for young people.
Create adult mentor opportunities with the youth in the community. Involve youth in the decision-making process to develop more entertainment opportunities and activities.

Appendix B. Recommendations to Improve Montgomery County*
Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002

HOW TO IMPROVE

SERVICES

Create Better Schools:

Improve the schools by looking at curriculum, facilities, and teachers.

Change leadership at the schools.

Improve discipline in the schools, higher pay for teachers.

Improve teachers' pay through incentives; survey children about drug use and develop a program to address the problems specific to that school's population; establish community support for other than sports; and set higher expectations for the schools and students.

Quit focusing about the building/facilities and concentrate more on the quality of teachers hired.

Increase and Improve Shopping Opportunities (Retail/Grocery/ Restaurants):

Create a downtown area in Coffeyville that people want to stop and shop at by building on the "western" history of Coffeyville.

Develop a recognition program of people and places that take pride in their businesses (e.g. restaurants that are clean and provide good food and good service and businesses that honor their products and give quality service.)

Build a mall that includes a chain restaurant.

Combine Community Colleges:

Consolidate the community colleges thereby eliminating the duplication of services and costs of administration.

Build a new campus near the new stadium north of Coffeyville. Make it a four-year college offering B.A.'s.

Eliminate one of the community colleges.

Convert the two community colleges into one 4-year college.

Improve Local Government:

Reorganize city government in Coffeyville.

Change management.

Make governmental agencies more accountable.

HOW TO IMPROVE

BUSINESS AND EMPLOYMENT

Create More and Better Jobs:

Combine the resources of CCC and ICC to offer better/more technical courses thus creating a highly skilled work force and at the same time attempt to attract companies that would utilize this work force.

Bring in better/higher paying jobs into Montgomery County.

Offer tax incentives for businesses that create new jobs.

Encourage newer industries to give best possible pay and do not worry about smaller, older businesses having to compete for employee wages. This will eventually bring more money into the community and smaller businesses will prosper.

Bring in industry that pays wages people can live on, not \$7.00/hour.

Hire and invest in an economic development program that attracts companies with good paying jobs, not part-time minimum wage jobs.

Recruit higher wage paying businesses for Caney and Independence.

Increase and Strengthen the Industrial Base:

Continue aggressive company recruitment.

Be more aggressive in attracting companies to the area. Sell a vision [for economic development to the county] and let the community and industry know how they can make the vision a reality.

Recruit businesses that improve wages in the community and increase the tax base.

Develop a policy for recruitment that works on bringing in businesses that will stay and be part of the community (e.g., Wal-Mart Distribution Center).

Improve the appearance of the city to attract more people and business.

Lower the tax rate to make the area more appealing to business.

Appendix B. Recommendations to Improve Montgomery County*
Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002

HOW TO IMPROVE

COST OF LIVING

Decrease Taxes:

Explore options for lowering taxes.

Eliminate one of the community colleges to lower taxes in the county.

Combine junior colleges and consolidate school districts.

Improve Housing:

Work with housing contractors to build homes. Develop incentives that encourage upgrading of existing housing.

Develop a recognition program of people and places that take pride in homes of all economic ranges (e.g. homes that are smaller and in "not so nice" neighborhoods but are well-maintained.)

Create more moderate priced housing (\$30,000 - \$70,000 range) in Montgomery County.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Improve and Maintain Roads:

Widen Highway 75 and 169 to four lanes to accommodate truck traffic.

ENVIRONMENT

Decrease Pollution (Air):

Re-zone the community and move industry (particularly polluting industry) outside the city rather than in the middle of town next to elementary schools.

Contain the odor [in Coffeyville.]

N = 79

*Please Note: Sixty-nine surveys offered no response for how to improve an aspect of life in Montgomery County. These suggestions are based on 100 survey responses.

Source: Montgomery County Non-Resident Worker Survey 2002, Policy Research Institute, KCCED, the University of Kansas, 2003.