

FINAL Survey Analysis: Investing Federal Funds

June 7, 2021

In May 2021, PGA worked with Disaster Management and key county officials/department heads to create a survey gathering resident feedback about prioritization of investment for spending federal American Rescue Plan Act funds. This report relays the findings of this unscientific survey.

Creation/promotion

PGA constructed the survey via Survey Monkey. It was promoted in several ways, including:

- Multiple dedicated emails to various email subscription lists the county holds
- Official county social media channels
- **#ClackCo Monthly** lead story
- A media release
- Dedicated webpage, linked from the front page of www.clackamas.us

The survey was open from May 3 through May 31. Spanish-language and Russian-language versions were also deployed (both opened slightly later than the English version, due to translation turnaround time). Those results are available at the end of this report.

Responses

A total of 3,621 people took the English survey. When eliminating those who indicated they lived outside #ClackCo or skipped such questions, respondents totaled **3,280**. Results are based on this figure.

Similarly, 45 people took the Spanish-language version, and 11 people took the Russian-language version. Eliminating individuals as detailed above, those numbers decreased to 32 and 9, respectively. These numbers are obviously quite low, so please keep this in mind when reviewing results.

No individual could take the survey twice on the same browser from the same link. It is possible for the same person to take the survey multiple times, but availability to do so was limited.

Lastly, please note that the percentage detailed for each answer/finding below are based on the total number of people **who answered that specific question**, not the total amount of survey respondents.

Issues/Errors

Question #1 sought to measure residents' opinions about the general direction of the county, similar to a question from PGA's biennial community survey. However, in transferring this question to an online version – rather than being posed over the phone – the answer choices did not match the previous surveys, which caused a fatal flaw in the collected data. The Survey Master does not consider that data to be reliable in any way, nor should it be used for comparing to previous years' answers. Hence, results of that question do not appear below.

Key findings – English-Language Survey

- Question #4 provided respondents with “a list of investments the county is considering related to ***economic recovery***,” asking them to indicate whether each choice was “very valuable, somewhat valuable, not too valuable, or not at all valuable” to our community.

Responses are below, listed from highest-to-lowest when combining the “very valuable” and “somewhat valuable” responses:

- Supporting county-based businesses that are under 20 employees, **88.55%**
 - Supporting county-based farms (both agriculture and livestock), **85.34%**
 - Supporting county-based restaurants, **84.59%**
 - Supporting nonprofits that work to assist those in need, **83.07%**
 - Expanding job training programs, **80.76%**
 - Addressing gaps in child care, **75.18%**
 - Supporting county-based businesses, regardless of type, service, or size, **74.98%**
 - Supporting county-based businesses that are minority-owned, **69.55%**
 - Enhancing affordable high-speed broadband for businesses and employers, **60.86%**
 - Enhancing programs that restore tourism throughout the county, **54.92%**
- Question #5 provided respondents with “a list of investments the county is considering related to ***future disaster preparedness***,” with the same answer choices (in terms of value) listed above.

Responses are below, listed from highest-to-lowest when combining the “very valuable” and “somewhat valuable” responses:

- Ensuring first responders' ability to safely respond to emergencies/disasters in Clackamas County, **95.64%**
 - Supporting continuation/resiliency of 911 services during disasters, **94.11%**
 - Supporting available emergency services for impacted residents (e.g. shelters, food, supplies, and other basic needs), **93.93%**
 - Improving wildfire mitigation, **93.92%**
 - Improving emergency communications during disasters, **92.98%**
 - Investing in disaster-resilient roads and bridges, **92.90%**
 - Investing in disaster-resilient clean water infrastructure, **92.81%**
 - Establishing/improving emergency evacuation routes, **87.19%**
 - Supporting nonprofits that work to assist those in need, **83.14%**
 - Supporting available emergency shelters for animals/livestock, **77.76%**
 - Enhancing affordable high-speed broadband for all residents, **71.82%**
- Using the same answer choices (in terms of value), residents were also asked about “two potential investments Clackamas County is considering to make sure we are able to keep important public services and employees.”

Responses are below, combining the “very valuable” and “somewhat valuable” responses:

- Restoring lost revenue to county services, such as road maintenance, parks and recreation, health clinics, and tourism, **83.73%**
- Providing “premium pay” (e.g., additional dollars on top of normal income) to essential county workers who support the county’s pandemic response, **65.34%**
- Respondents were also asked their level of agreement on statements regarding the county’s responses to the three recent emergencies being “**strong**.” Answers below, combining the “strongly agree” and “somewhat agree:”
 - #ClackCo **wildfires** response being strong, **83.12%**
 - #ClackCo **COVID-19** response being strong, **71.16%**
 - #ClackCo **ice storm** response being strong, **70.98%**
- When asked which of the county’s five strategic priorities is most valued when thinking about their quality of life, a plurality of residents selected ***Ensure Safe, Healthy and Secure Communities*** (43.17%). The four other choices ranged from ~12.2-17.6%.
- Several demographic questions were posed. Nearly 57% of respondents identified as living within a city’s limits inside Clackamas County.

Key findings – Spanish-Language Survey

- Again, please note that the following results are based on a survey respondent universe of **only 32 people**.
- For simple comparison’s sake to the results of the English-language responses, below please find a table detailing answers to Question #4, which provided respondents with “a list of investments the county is considering related to ***economic recovery***,” asking them to indicate whether each choice was “very valuable, somewhat valuable, not too valuable, or not at all valuable” to our community. The figures below represent the adding of “very valuable” and “somewhat valuable” together.

Answer choice	Spanish-language responses	English-language responses
Expanding job training programs	93.75% (tie-1)	80.76% (5)
Addressing gaps in child care	93.75% (tie-1)	75.18% (6)
Supporting county-based businesses that are minority-owned	87.51% (3)	69.55% (8)
Supporting county-based restaurants	84.38% (tie-4)	84.59% (3)
Supporting nonprofits that work to assist those in need	84.38% (tie-4)	83.07% (4)
Supporting county-based farms (both agriculture and livestock)	83.87% (6)	85.34% (2)
Supporting county-based businesses that are under 20 employees	81.25% (7)	88.55% (1)
Supporting county-based businesses, regardless of type, service, or size	75.01% (8)	74.98% (7)
Enhancing affordable high-speed broadband for businesses and employers	71.88% (9)	60.86% (9)
Enhancing programs that restore tourism throughout the county	68.75% (10)	54.92% (10)

- Below please find a table detailing answers to Question #5, “a list of investments the county is considering related to ***future disaster preparedness***,” them to indicate whether each choice was “very valuable, somewhat valuable, not too valuable, or not at all valuable” to our community. The figures below represent the adding of “very valuable” and “somewhat valuable” together.

Answer choice	Spanish-language responses	English-language responses
Supporting available emergency services for impacted residents (e.g. shelters, food, supplies, and other basic needs)	100% (tie-1)	93.93% (3)
Improving wildfire mitigation	100% (tie-1)	93.92% (4)
Investing in disaster-resilient clean water infrastructure	100% (tie-1)	92.81% (7)
Ensuring first responders' ability to safely respond to emergencies/disasters in Clackamas County	96.88% (tie-4)	95.64% (1)
Improving emergency communications during disasters	96.88% (tie-4)	92.98% (5)
Supporting available emergency shelters for animals/livestock	96.88% (tie-4)	77.76% (10)
Supporting continuation/resiliency of 911 services during disasters	93.76% (tie-7)	94.11% (2)
Investing in disaster-resilient roads and bridges	93.76% (tie-7)	92.90% (6)
Establishing/improving emergency evacuation routes	93.76% (tie-7)	87.19% (8)
Supporting nonprofits that work to assist those in need	93.76% (tie-7)	83.14% (9)
Enhancing affordable high-speed broadband for all residents	90.63% (11)	71.82% (11)

- Similar to the English-language findings, ***Ensure Safe, Healthy and Secure Communities*** was the most popular choice (51.6%) when respondents were asked which of the county's five strategic priorities was most valued when thinking about their quality of life.
- A greater percentage of Spanish-language respondents (28.1%) cited the wildfires as having the most significant impact on them versus the English responses (15.6%).
- More than 65% of respondents identified as living within a city's limits inside Clackamas County, while nearly 19% reported being in an unincorporated area.

Key findings – Russian-Language Survey

- Again, please note that the following results are based on a survey respondent universe of **only 9 people**.
- For simple comparison’s sake to the results of the English-language responses, below please find a table detailing answers to Question #4, which provided respondents with “a list of investments the county is considering related to ***economic recovery***,” asking them to indicate whether each choice was “very valuable, somewhat valuable, not too valuable, or not at all valuable” to our community. The figures below represent the adding of “very valuable” and “somewhat valuable” together.

Answer choice	Russian-language responses	English-language responses
Supporting county-based businesses that are under 20 employees	100% (tie-1)	88.55% (1)
Supporting county-based farms (both agriculture and livestock)	100% (tie-1)	85.34% (2)
Supporting county-based restaurants	100% (tie-1)	84.59% (3)
Supporting county-based businesses, regardless of type, service, or size	100% (tie-1)	74.98% (7)
Enhancing affordable high-speed broadband for businesses and employers	87.5% (tie-5)	60.86% (9)
Enhancing programs that restore tourism throughout the county	87.5% (tie-5)	54.92% (10)
Expanding job training programs	75% (tie-7)	80.76% (5)
Supporting nonprofits that work to assist those in need	75% (tie-7)	83.07% (4)
Addressing gaps in child care	62.5% (9)	75.18% (6)
Supporting county-based businesses that are minority-owned	37.5% (10)	69.55% (8)

- Below please find a table detailing answers to Question #5, “a list of investments the county is considering related to ***future disaster preparedness***,” them to indicate whether each choice was “very valuable, somewhat valuable, not too valuable, or not at all valuable” to our community. The figures below represent the adding of “very valuable” and “somewhat valuable” together.

Answer choice	Russian-language responses	English-language responses
Ensuring first responders' ability to safely respond to emergencies/disasters in Clackamas County	100% (tie-1)	95.64% (1)
Improving emergency communications during disasters	100% (tie-1)	92.98% (5)
Investing in disaster-resilient roads and bridges	100% (tie-1)	92.90% (6)
Investing in disaster-resilient clean water infrastructure	100% (tie-1)	92.81% (7)
Supporting available emergency services for impacted residents (e.g. shelters, food, supplies, and other basic needs)	88.88% (5)	93.93% (3)
Supporting continuation/resiliency of 911 services during disasters	87.5% (6)	94.11% (2)
Improving wildfire mitigation	75% (tie-7)	93.92% (4)
Establishing/improving emergency evacuation routes	75% (tie-7)	87.19% (8)
Supporting nonprofits that work to assist those in need	62.5% (tie-9)	83.14% (9)
Supporting available emergency shelters for animals/livestock	62.5% (tie-9)	77.76% (10)
Enhancing affordable high-speed broadband for all residents	62.5% (tie-9)	71.82% (11)

- ***Ensure Safe, Healthy and Secure Communities*** was the most popular choice (55.5%) when respondents were asked which of the county’s five strategic priorities was most valued when thinking about their quality of life.
- Seventy-five percent (75%) of Russian-language respondents cited COVID as having the most significant impact on them.
- All nine respondents identified as living within a city’s limits inside Clackamas County.