



Economic and Community Development State Service Alignment Consultation RESULTS – ANNOTATED QUESTIONNAIRE

<u>Introduction</u>: Oregon state government is moving from a system where local communities adjust priorities to fit within existing bureaucratic structures to one where government adjusts its structure to support and address local priorities. In an October 2013 consultation, the State of Oregon invited members of Oregon's Kitchen Table to identify barriers to better alignment of local and state programs and then ask you to envision a new system. Oregon's Kitchen Table and public opinion research firm Davis, Hibbitts & Midghall, Inc. (DHM Research) worked with the State of Oregon to develop the content of the consultation. Members who took part in the consultation were then given the opportunity to engage further in the alignment process and were invited to participate in in-person events held across the state's five regions during December 2014.

1,036 members of Oregon's Kitchen Table participated—612 existing members and 424 new members who joined as a result of the targeted outreach to individuals and organizations involved in economic and community development. 885 members of Metro's Opt In panel also participated.

<u>Definitions</u>: Community development is a broad term describing the work of involved citizens and professionals to build stronger and more resilient local communities. Economic development generally refers to the sustained, concerted actions of policy makers and community members to increase the standard of living and economic health of a specific area.

PART I (Evaluation of Current State and/or Regional Services)

State agencies work among themselves and with local government, private industry, and non-profit partners to deliver economic and community development services to Oregonians.

1. How aware are you about efforts of state agencies in your region or industry to deliver community and economic development services? (Very aware, somewhat aware, not very aware, not at all aware.)

				Existing OKT	Opt In			
	State Total (N=424)	State (N=612)	Metro Region (N=885)					
Very aware	43%	56%	47%	33%	49%	46%	15%	11%
Somewhat aware	41%	30%	50%	46%	41%	38%	46%	41%
Not too aware	12%	9%	3%	16%	10%	13%	30%	36%
Not at all aware	3%	5%	0%	4%	0%	3%	9%	13%





2. (f very or somewhat aware to Q1) Describe the source(s) of your awareness.

(i very or serriew				Γ Members	S) or your	awai criess	Existing OKT	Opt In
	State Total (N=337)	Central (N=35)	Eastern (N=35)	Metro (N=100)	Southern (N=32)	Valley (N=135)	State (N=360)	Metro Region (N=419)
Personal experience/ Job	56%	57%	49%	53%	31%	65%	37%	31%
Friends/Family/ Colleagues	15%	14%	14%	18%	9%	13%	15%	14%
Online/Internet/ e-mails	12%	6%	11%	11%	13%	15%	15%	17%
Media/News- unspecified	12%	0%	9%	19%	13%	10%	18%	22%
Newspaper- general	8%	6%	17%	10%	0%	7%	26%	21%
Regional Solutions Team	6%	11%	11%	2%	16%	4%	1%	0%
Business Oregon	5%	0%	9%	7%	9%	4%	1%	2%
ODOT	5%	9%	6%	4%	3%	4%	0%	1%
Public meetings	4%	3%	11%	1%	9%	2%	7%	6%
Oregonian	4%	0%	0%	10%	0%	1%	8%	15%
Other	4% or less	9% or less	9% or less	5% or less	9% or less	4% or less	7% or less	9% or less

3. Have you partnered with a state agency in an economic or community development project in the past two years? (If YES proceed to Q4; if NO proceed to Q10)

				Existing OKT	Opt In			
	State Total (N=424)	Central (N=43)	State (N=612)	Metro Region (N=885)				
Yes	52%	67%	67%	40%	62%	53%	15%	9%
No	48%	33%	33%	60%	38%	47%	85%	91%





4. (If YES to Q3) Please briefly describe the project and your involvement.

11 120 10 20) 11	Cuse Direct			T Members	odi ilivolve		Existing OKT	Opt In
	State Total (N=210)	Central (N=26)	Eastern (N=24)	Metro (N=52)	Southern (N=21)	Valley (N=87)	State (N=87)	Metro Region (N=71)
ODOT	16%	23%	13%	10%	10%	21%	6%	4%
Business/economic development/ retention	13%	0%	25%	13%	24%	11%	9%	4%
Business Oregon	9%	4%	8%	10%	14%	8%	5%	7%
Transportation planning	8%	8%	17%	4%	14%	7%	1%	10%
Water/sewer project	8%	4%	13%	0%	29%	8%	2%	6%
Housing (Unspecified)	7%	8%	8%	8%	5%	7%	8%	3%
DEQ	5%	8%	4%	6%	10%	3%	0%	1%
Food services	4%	0%	4%	4%	0%	6%	5%	1%
Grant writing/ planning	4%	4%	13%	2%	0%	3%	1%	1%
Regional Solutions Member	3%	12%	0%	0%	0%	5%	2%	1%
Other	3% or less	4% or less	8% or less	6% or less	5% or less	3% or less	5% or less	6% or less

5. (If YES to Q3) During the project, did you or others involved have to repeat similar processes or duplicate your efforts? An example of duplication is filling out two forms for two different state agencies with the same information. (If YES proceed to Q6; if NO proceed to Q7)

		New OKT Members							
	State Total (N=222)	Central (N=29)	Eastern (N=24)	State (N=90)	Metro Region (N=76)				
Yes	25%	24%	25%	24%	38%	22%	24%	26%	
No	75%	76%	75%	76%	63%	78%	76%	74%	





6. (If YES to Q5) Please describe your experience.

			New OK	Γ Members			Existing OKT	Opt In
	State Total (N=40)	Central (N=5)	Eastern (N=4)	Metro (N=7)	Southern (N=7)	Valley (N=17)	State (N=19)	Metro Region (N=16)
Duplicate forms/ paperwork/reports/ information	53%	100%	25%	57%	43%	47%	53%	44%
Overlap/Too many agencies/committees	30%	40%	0%	43%	43%	24%	26%	6%
Duplication of work/redundancy-general	23%	0%	0%	43%	0%	35%	26%	13%
Poor communication	18%	0%	25%	29%	29%	12%	26%	6%
Time management	15%	0%	75%	14%	14%	6%	21%	0%
Unclear regulations/guidelines	10%	20%	0%	0%	0%	18%	5%	0%
Complexity of grants	10%	0%	25%	0%	14%	12%	21%	6%
Inconsistency	8%	0%	0%	0%	14%	12%	0%	6%
Other	1% or less	1% or less	1% or less	1% or less	1% or less	1% or less	16% or less	13% or less

7. (If YES to Q3) At any point during the project, was there a service gap between what you needed and what you received, or was your experience fragmented or disjointed? (If YES proceed to Q8; if

NO proceed to Q9)

			Existing OKT	Opt In				
	State Total (N=222)	Central (N=29)	Eastern (N=24)	Metro (N=55)	Southern (N=24)	Valley (N=90)	State (N=90)	Metro Region (N=76)
Yes	33%	28%	38%	35%	42%	30%	44%	33%
No	67%	72%	63%	65%	58%	70%	56%	67%





8. (If YES to Q7) Please describe the service gap or the fragmented/disjointed experience.

			New OKT	Members			Existing OKT	Opt In
	State Total (N=64)	Central (N=7)	Eastern (N=8)	Metro (N=16)	Southern (N=9)	Valley (N=24)	State (N=36)	Metro Region (N=20)
Lack of communication	20%	29%	0%	25%	33%	17%	14%	10%
Funding/grant process	16%	14%	38%	13%	0%	17%	6%	5%
Insufficient funding	13%	14%	13%	13%	11%	13%	11%	5%
Negotiating (general)	11%	0%	13%	6%	22%	13%	8%	10%
Paperwork requirements	8%	0%	13%	13%	11%	4%	3%	10%
Negotiations between state/local/federal	8%	14%	13%	13%	11%	0%	3%	10%
Cooperation with ODOT	8%	0%	0%	6%	0%	17%	3%	5%
Time frames	6%	0%	13%	13%	0%	4%	0%	5%
Slow responsiveness of state agency	5%	0%	13%	6%	0%	4%	3%	5%
Lack of expertise/ knowledge	5%	29%	0%	0%	0%	4%	3%	0%
Other	5% or less	14% or less	13% or less	6% or less	11% or less	8% or less	11% or less	5% or less

9. (If YES to Q3) How responsive and cooperative were the state agencies you dealt with in helping your local community or your industry to meet its priorities?

		New OKT Members									
Response Category	State Total (N=222)	Central (N=29)	State (N=90)	Metro Region (N=76)							
Very responsive	56%	62%	38%	65%	46%	57%	41%	47%			
Somewhat responsive	39%	34%	58%	31%	50%	38%	40%	38%			
Not too responsive	3%	0%	0%	4%	4%	4%	16%	11%			
Not at all responsive	1%	3%	4%	0%	0%	1%	3%	4%			
Don't know	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%			

10. How effectively do you feel the state helps regions and industries meet their economic and community development priorities?

			Existing OKT	Opt In				
Response Category	State Total (N=424)	Central (N=43)	State (N=612)	Metro Region (N=885)				
Very effective	8%	9%	3%	8%	21%	6%	2%	3%
Somewhat effective	62%	60%	53%	62%	59%	65%	54%	51%
Not very effective	27%	23%	42%	26%	15%	28%	38%	36%
Not at all effective	3%	7%	1%	6%				
Don't know	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	





11. Why?

i.wny?			New OK	Γ Members			Existing OKT	Opt In
	State Total (N=342)	Central (N=32)	Eastern (N=36)	Metro (N=106)	Southern (N=31)	Valley (N=141)	State (N=524)	Metro Region (N=668)
Lack of support from state government in the community/area	14%	25%	41%	8%	23%	8%	15%	12%
System/process is effective	11%	0%	3%	15%	10%	13%	6%	7%
Funding/lack of funds	10%	9%	19%	9%	6%	10%	9%	8%
Too much regulation/ Red tape	10%	9%	9%	8%	13%	10%	6%	7%
Lack of economic development/economy could be improved	8%	16%	6%	13%	6%	3%	5%	10%
Lack of communication/poor communication	5%	3%	6%	5%	3%	5%	3%	1%
Limited resources	4%	0%	9%	4%	0%	6%	2%	2%
Misappropriation of funding	4%	3%	0%	5%	3%	4%	2%	5%
Lack of state wide unity/ separation between east and west	3%	3%	6%	2%	16%	1%	5%	3%
Other	3% or less	13% or less	6% or less	6% or less	10% or less	4% or less	6% or less	5% or less
No concerns/ issues	4%	16%	3%	5%	0%	1%	2%	2%
Not aware of what the state is doing to help/state needs to promote services	7%	3%	3%	8%	6%	9%	12%	15%





PART II (Suggestions for Improvement and Response to Priorities)

12. Help us envision the most efficient delivery systems for economic and community development programs to meet the needs of your community or industry sector. What could the state do to improve the way these services are currently delivered?

improve the way t	icse serv	ices are co		T Members			Existing OKT	Opt In
	State Total (N=347)	Central (N=30)	Eastern (N=34)	Metro (N=110)	Southern (N=31)	Valley (N=142)	State (N=511)	Metro Region (N=681)
Community/public/ local involvement	20%	43%	29%	16%	13%	16%	24%	19%
Better/more communication	12%	17%	15%	7%	16%	14%	9%	10%
More funding	8%	17%	9%	8%	13%	6%	8%	5%
Less regulation/ Red Tape	7%	13%	0%	5%	0%	12%	5%	6%
Improve fiscal management /wasteful spending	6%	10%	9%	10%	3%	2%	5%	5%
Help the local economy/economy	5%	17%	12%	6%	3%	1%	3%	3%
More jobs/support for jobs	5%	7%	6%	9%	3%	2%	3%	4%
Regional service teams	5%	3%	15%	2%	6%	5%	1%	0%
Streamline/Simplify processes	5%	10%	0%	6%	6%	3%	2%	2%
Collaborate with businesses/local businesses	4%	3%	6%	9%	0%	1%	2%	3%
More help/support for education	4%	7%	3%	5%	3%	3%	6%	4%
Road infrastructure/ Infrastructure	4%	3%	0%	4%	6%	5%	3%	3%
Outreach programs	3%	3%	6%	5%	0%	3%	2%	2%
Advertise/media	3%	0%	3%	3%	10%	3%	4%	6%
Online/email etc.	3%	10%	3%	5%	0%	1%	4%	4%
Consolidate agencies/ programs	3%	3%	0%	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%
Other	3% or less	7% or less	6% or less	5% or less	6% or less	3% or less	4% or less	5% or less





13. Oregon has created Regional Solutions Committees throughout the state to advance the integration and alignment process and establish <u>regional priorities</u>. Based on the zip code you entered when you signed up for Oregon's Kitchen Table, how well do <u>these priorities</u> match with your own sense of the needs of your community or industry?

		New OKT Members							
Response Category	State Total (N=424)	Central (N=43)	Eastern (N=36)	Metro (N=136)	Southern (N=39)	Valley (N=179)	State (N=612)	Metro Region (N=885)	
Match very well	29%	37%	39%	21%	33%	31%	22%	18%	
Match somewhat well	50%	51%	44%	54%	54%	45%	53%	52%	
Do not match very well	18%	7%	17%	21%	10%	20%	20%	23%	
Do not match at all	4%	5%	0%	4%	3%	4%	4%		
Don't know	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%		

Match WELL comments

aten <u>welle</u> comments				Existing OKT	Opt In			
	State Total (N=142)	Central (N=14)	Eastern (N=9)	Metro (N=44)	Southern (N=17)	Valley (N=58)	State (N=250)	Metro Region (N=237)
Good list/sounds good	15%	7%	22%	20%	12%	12%	9%	12%
Goals are too broad	12%	0%	33%	14%	12%	10%	15%	22%
Improve transportation	11%	21%	0%	9%	12%	10%	2%	5%
More business growth/less regulation	11%	0%	0%	0%	24%	19%	8%	1%
Job growth	10%	14%	11%	9%	18%	7%	7%	8%
Education/Better education	8%	14%	11%	16%	0%	3%	13%	7%
Need action/implementation	6%	0%	0%	7%	18%	3%	4%	7%
Environment/Environmentally safe	5%	7%	0%	5%	12%	3%	8%	12%
Better order of priority list/ need to prioritize/dislike list	5%	7%	44%	2%	6%	0%	10%	8%
Limited funding/not enough funding	5%	14%	0%	0%	0%	9%	2%	0%
Improve infrastructure	4%	7%	0%	5%	12%	2%	5%	3%
Job training/better skills	4%	0%	0%	2%	0%	9%	9%	5%
Not relatable to my community	4%	0%	33%	2%	6%	2%	5%	3%
Water issues	4%	14%	11%	0%	12%	2%	3%	0%
Other	4% or less	14% or less	11% or less	5% or less	6% or less	5% or less	6% or less	4% or less





NO Match comments

Water comments			Existing OKT	Opt In				
	State Total (N=74)	Central (N=4)	Eastern (N=5)	T Members Metro (N=25)	Southern (N=3)	Valley (N=37)	State (N=119)	Metro Region (N=186)
Environment/environmentally safe	16%	0%	0%	20%	33%	16%	8%	8%
Not relatable to my community	15%	25%	40%	4%	0%	19%	13%	6%
Goals are too broad	14%	0%	20%	20%	0%	11%	18%	26%
Improve transportation	14%	0%	20%	12%	100%	8%	3%	4%
Affordable housing	12%	75%	20%	0%	33%	11%	3%	2%
Better order of priority list/need to prioritize/dislike list	12%	25%	20%	16%	0%	8%	17%	18%
Too much focus on development/less development	12%	0%	0%	16%	0%	14%	7%	11%
Forest/wilderness preservation	11%	0%	0%	8%	67%	11%	5%	
Education/better education	9%	0%	20%	12%	0%	8%	10%	
Improve quality of life	9%	0%	0%	12%	33%	8%	5%	
Improve infrastructure	8%	0%	0%	8%	0%	11%	3%	
Other	8% or less	25% or less	20% or less	16% or less	67% or less	8% or less	9% or less	

14. Would you like to participate in a regional meeting to comment on a draft plan to align state economic and community development programs? This plan would be developed based in part on the responses to this survey.

		New OKT Members						Opt In
Response Category	State Total (N=424)	Central (N=39)	Eastern (N=29)	Metro (N=169)	Southern (N=41)	Valley (N=108)	State (N=36)	Metro Region (N=20)
Yes	71%	70%	81%	65%	69%	73%	56%	39%
No	29%	30%	19%	35%	31%	27%	44%	61%





The following questions are asked for demographic purposes only.

15. Occupation: please check all that apply:

	New OKT Members							Opt In
Response Category	State Total (N=424)	Central (N=78)	Eastern (N=55)	Metro (N=1,351)	Southern (N=134)	Valley (N=299)	State (N=36)	Metro Region (N=20)
Citizen with no direct relationship with a government agency or advocacy group	17%	21%	8%	24%	21%	11%	55%	60%
Industry professional/Business owner	17%	19%	11%	22%	18%	13%	13%	15%
Service provider	16%	14%	19%	15%	10%	17%	9%	5%
Public administrator or manager	21%	19%	28%	15%	23%	25%	6%	2%
Appointed official	6%	7%	3%	5%	18%	5%	3%	1%
Elected official	8%	9%	17%	3%	10%	11%	2%	1%
Professional Advocate/Lobbyist	6%	2%	3%	10%	3%	5%	3%	1%
Other occupation	34%	33%	31%	29%	36%	39%	32%	28%

16. Employer

		New OKT Members							
	State Total (N=380)	Central (N=37)	Eastern (N=35)	Metro (N=115)	Southern (N=32)	Valley (N=161)	State (N=546)	Metro Region (N=731)	
City employee	16%	11%	17%	15%	19%	17%	3%	3%	
Self-employed	9%	16%	3%	11%	9%	7%	13%	14%	
County employee	9%	11%	17%	4%	13%	9%	3%	2%	
ODOT	8%	11%	11%	3%	6%	11%	0%		
Retired	7%	8%	9%	4%	6%	9%	25%		
Housing	2%	3%	0%	2%	3%	3%	1%		
Transportation	2%	3%	0%	2%	3%	3%	1%		
Economic development	2%	0%	9%	1%	6%	2%	0%		
State employee	2%	3%	0%	2%	0%	2%	1%		
Other	1% or less	3% or less	9% or less	3% or less	3% or less	2% or less	6% or less		

17. Gender

		New OKT Members						
Response Category	State Total (N=422)	Central (N=43)	Eastern (N=35)	Metro (N=136)	Southern (N=38)	Valley (N=170)	State (N=612)	Metro Region
Male	52%	53%	51%	56%	58%	48%	39%	54%
Female	48%	47%	49%	44%	42%	52%	61%	46%