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Introduction

In November, 2002, Greg Coulter, Plant Manager for BD in Broken Bow, contacted the Center for Rural Research & Development (CRRD) about conducting a community needs assessment survey in Broken Bow. The CRRD's Director, Kay Payne and Mr. Coulter met with the Broken Bow City Council on November 22, 2002 to discuss the surveying process. Mr. Coulter explained that no City funds would be used to have the survey conducted, but that the business community would secure funding for the research. The Council approved the project and a committee of interested local citizens was formed. Kay met with the committee on February 20, 2003 to explain the surveying process and to compile questions appropriate to Broken Bow's needs. The questionnaire was finalized and at a meeting on March 20, Kay met with the committee to discuss logistics of the delivery and pickup process. The City provided a listing of all households to be surveyed within the city limits and the immediate surrounding rural area.

Methodology

The questionnaire was divided into seven areas of interest including: 1) Community, 2) Community/Recreation Center, 3) Business and Economic Development, 4) Education, 5) Day Care, 6) Housing, and 7) Demographics. The questionnaires were hand-delivered by adult volunteers to all residences within Broken Bow's city limits as well as to the surrounding rural areas between March 29 and 30. The volunteers returned to pick up the questionnaires, sealed in envelopes, between April 2 and 3. A copy of the questionnaire and cover letter may be found in the Appendix.

The response rate for the questionnaires was excellent. Of the 1,605 occupied households within the city limits, questionnaires were picked up from 1,032, for a response rate of 64.3%. Broken Bow's estimated vacancy rate was 10.7%. In the rural area, 214 questionnaires were delivered and 140 picked up for a response rate of 65.4%. The combined response rate for the whole Broken Bow area totaled 64.6%, with 1,175 surveys returned out of a possible 1,819.

Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In City Limits</th>
<th>Outside Limits</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>2,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Vacancies</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Deliverable</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Returned</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>*1,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*includes 3 unknown
Community
The survey had several questions using categories of 1=definitely, 2=probably, 3=probably not, and 4=definitely not. If respondents were unable to rate the statement, they could also check a "don't know/no opinion" category. The four choices for the items were then averaged to arrive at an overall rating for each statement.

Broken Bow residents were emphatic about having the City enforce regulations for the clean up of vacant or dilapidated houses and lots and for the removal of tires, appliances, and nonfunctional vehicles within the city limits. They favored regulations against open burning within the city limits and believed the City had an adequate number of meeting rooms. Locals thought the City should not consolidate police services with the county.

Broken Bow residents thought the 1% City sales tax should continue after 2005. The averaged response was 2.0 which consisted of 807 responses definitely or probably favoring its continuation and 219 either definitely or probably opposed to it. Another 149 either "didn't know" or did not answer the question. Respondents thought the best use for the sales tax revenue was for maintaining infrastructure, such as streets, sewer, water, etc. They also favored using the tax for community development and for recreational facilities, though not as strongly. Residents did not favor raising the sales tax by 1/2%, nor did they think that hiring a professional City Manager was a good idea for the tax revenue.
The next portion of the Community segment of the questionnaire asked residents to rate 19 community aspects with ratings of excellent = 1, good = 2, fair = 3, or poor = 4. If respondents were unable to rate the statement, they could also check a "no opinion/don't know" category. The four choices for the items were averaged to give an overall rating for each statement. Broken Bow's library services, fire protection, and medical facilities were all highly rated. Several other amenities received good ratings, such as the quality of the water supply, the recycling center, utility services, the City park, and the rescue squad. Many other aspects were considered in a more average range of ratings, including: street lighting, the waste pond, law enforcement interaction with the public, downtown parking, utility rates, city government, and building code enforcement. Three ratings were in the fair range; they were the camping facilities, zoning regulations and enforcement, and control of loose pets. The lowest rated item, which came in at a poor rating was for air quality.

The general appearance/condition of:

- the Municipal Bldg: 2.0
- the highway entrances to town: 2.3
- the community: 2.3
- the residential areas: 2.4
- Local organizations' efforts toward community betterment: 2.6
- streets: 2.7
- sidewalks: 2.9
- the swimming pool: 3.0
- vacant houses & lots: 3.4

The appearance or condition of eight local areas ranged from good to fair. The Municipal Building received a good rating. Ratings in an "average" range included the highway entrances to town and the appearance of the community and residential areas. The remaining ratings were all in the "fair" range. These included the condition of streets and sidewalks, the condition of the swimming pool, and the appearance of vacant houses and lots. Organizations' efforts toward community betterment also received a fair rating.
When asked if four community projects were needed in Broken Bow, respondents most strongly agreed with the need for street paving and sidewalk reconstruction. They also supported a Community Center, but support was not strong for bike trails.

44. If any funding for the 4 projects listed above can be acquired from state and federal sources, how should Broken Bow fund its share? (Darken as many as apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
<th>Probably</th>
<th>Probably Not</th>
<th>Definitely Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-wide Fund Raising Events</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Contributions</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Foundations</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Sales Tax</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keno funds</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property tax</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not fund</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To obtain funding for some projects from state or federal sources, matching funds are sometimes required. Broken Bow residents' most preferred way of providing this match was through community-wide fund raising events, at 59%. This was followed by private contributions and private foundations. Using the City sales tax for these projects was chosen by 43% and just over a third chose bonds as a source. Keno funds garnered only 29% of the citizens and very few were willing to have their property taxes raised to provide match.

When local residents were asked how they felt about Broken Bow (using a five point scale of very positive=1 to very negative=5), they were only mildly positive with a rating of 2.47. Several demographic variables were analyzed to determine how widespread this attitude was. There were statistically significant differences (at the 95% level of confidence) in attitudes. Women had more positive attitudes than those who filled out their survey together, widowed individuals were more positive than those who were married or single. Older residents were more positive than anyone younger than age 75; those with graduate degrees were more positive than those with high school diplomas or college degrees. Laborers were less positive than most other professions and those living in the city limits were also less positive than those living outside the City. Even household size was significant, households of 3 or 4 were less positive than households of one. Two variables showed no difference: the number of years the householder had lived in the area and the level of income the household reported.
A follow-up question to the community’s rating asked why they felt the way they did. Positive comments about Broken Bow included the size of the community, how it was a good place to live and raise families, and how it had good people, businesses, and medical facilities. Negative comments mentioned the poor air quality, lack of job opportunities, lack of entertainment for youth, dying businesses, and the need for community clean-up.

Respondents could also, the end of the questionnaire, make comments they thought would help the community. These comments, coupled with comments made about why locals gave the ratings they did about the City, were peppered negative comments about air quality. The more negative the rating for the City, the greater the percent of negative comments made about air quality. For example, only 5% of the residents who were very positive about the town made any negative comments about air quality whereas 68% of those who were very negative about the City made negative comments about air quality. Overall, 238 out of 722 community rating comments (33%) were negative about air quality. Additional comments were made on 354 questionnaires; again one-third of these comments mentioned poor air quality. A list of all comments may be found in the appendix.

46. Why do you feel that way?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nice, small community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great place to live and raise families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good people, businesses, medical facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But, major air quality problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor air quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of job opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of entertainment for youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dying businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for community clean-up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please feel free to make any additional comments that you think would help our community:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q46 Town Rating</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Positive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Negative</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Negative</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Comments</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community/Recreation Center

The second segment of the questionnaire concerned a community/recreation center. Residents were first asked if the supply of facilities and programs were adequate for different age groups. Ratings were only slightly positive for preschool, elementary, and senior citizens. And the ratings for adults and junior/senior high age students were all in the "probably not" adequate range.

For the size of our town, is there an adequate supply of recreational facilities/programs for:

- 47. preschool children.
- 48. elementary school children.
- 51. senior citizens.
- 50. adults.
- 49. jr./sr. high school age.

- 2.3
- 2.4
- 2.7
- 2.8

1.0 Definitely
2.0 Probably
3.0 Probably Not
4.0 Definitely Not
If a new community center is built, what should it have? The four highest ratings were for an area for after school and weekend activities for youth, a large multipurpose room, an indoor walking track, and kitchen facilities. Other somewhat important amenities included a gymnasium, an exercise room with equipment, a smaller meeting room, a swimming pool, a location for volunteer groups, and locker rooms. Two items were not supported, a whirlpool/sauna and racquetball courts.

Should a new Community Center have:

58. area for after school & weekend activ. for youth . . .
53. large multipurpose rm. .
52. an indoor walking track . .
54. kitchen facilities . .
59. gymnasium for basketball, volleyball, aerobics . .
56. exercise room/equip. . . .
55. a smaller meeting rm . . .
62. a swimming pool . .
63. location for vol. groups . .
57. locker rooms . . .
60. whirlpool/sauna . .
61. racquetball courts . .

When asked if they would contribute to a fund drive for a new community/recreation center, 60% either definitely (23%) or probably (37%) thought they would. Only 23% were not supportive and another 16% either didn't know or omitted the question.

A profile of more likely donors may be found in the appendix.

Business & Economic Development

Business and economic development comprised the next segment of the survey. Locals thought that economic development should focus on all five areas asked. The highest rated area was in attracting new business and industry. Next was supporting the creation of new, small business. Residents also favored developing an economic development plan in order to create jobs. The remaining two areas were to promote tourism and support expanding businesses already in operation.

Should economic development focus on:

66. attracting new business/industry? . . .
67. supporting the creation of new, small business? . .
69. developing an economic development plan for job creation? . .
68. promoting tourism? . .
65. supporting the expansion of existing businesses? . .
The general attitude of business owners and employees received a 2.3 rating, closer to good than fair. Local merchants encouraging trade was mediocre at a 2.4.

Retail operating hours also received a "middle of the road" rating while the quality and quantity of local job opportunities was only fair.

The next question in this segment asked for what hourly wages residents would be willing to work locally. These figures were projected to the entire surveyed area by dividing the results by .645, which was the response rate for the survey. For full-time work, $6.00 per hour might attract 77 locals, but $8.00 per hour might find as many as 351 applying for work. This number rose to 485 full-time workers at $9.00 per hour, and to 656 employees at $10.00 per hour. If an employer paid $12 or more per hour, as many as 972 might apply.

One hundred ninety-two households were willing to work part-time for $6 per hour. This rose to 491 who were willing to work part-time for $8.00 or less per hour. At $10.00, 598 people might be willing to take a part-time job locally but raising part-time salaries over $10 would attract very few additional workers.

Some retail leakage occurred in Broken Bow. Twelve percent reported spending more than 50% of their purchases out of town and another 23% said they spent quite a bit (between 30% and 50%) out of town.
The final question in the business and economic development section asked for the most important reasons purchases were made out of town. More than half of the citizens said they purchased out of town because the goods or services were not available locally. Others said better selection or better prices affected their purchase decisions.

Education

The fourth category of questions concerned education. Here, residents rated six questions on an excellent to poor scale. The first three questions regarding the adequacy of school facilities, the curriculum, and the quality of the teaching staff all received ratings in the good range. The remaining three questions received ratings between good and fair. These included the relationship between the community and school personnel, using the school for community programs, and the availability for post-secondary opportunities.

There were statistically significant differences of opinion between those who had children in school and those who did not. In all six instances, those with children in the school system gave lower ratings than those without school age children.

Anywhere from 24% to 31% of the citizens either marked "don't know" or did not answer these questions.

Residents felt the school should develop more partnerships with other districts, such as for distance learning. They did not think that classes were too large, nor did they support consolidation or a levy override. Those with children in the system were more negative than those without about consolidation issues, but were neutral about a levy override. Those without children did not support an override.
To determine the viability of consolidation and a levy override, the definitely and probably responses were combined into a yes response while those probably not and definitely not in support were counted as no votes.

If these two issues came to a vote, those who did not voice an opinion could make a crucial difference in how these issues turned out. Another point to make is that people, not households vote, so actual voting may vary somewhat.

Using a five point scale, Broken Bow residents were asked if there were too many or not enough extracurricular school activities. Overall, respondents said that there were somewhat too many activities, with a 2.5 overall response. Those with children in school also thought there were slightly too many activities, with a 2.8 rating. Just over one in four households had children in the school system.

Day Care

A total of 254 households reported children age 12 or younger. Of these, 112 used child care on a regular basis. Most of these child care users, 82, said it was very or somewhat difficult to find quality, affordable child care.

For parents with children in the school system, the media used most often for school information was the school calendar, at 81%; the school newsletter was also used as a source by 77%. Those without children in school used the newspaper more often than any other source for school information, followed by the radio public affairs show.
Housing, Within the City Limits

The majority of Broken Bow's residents within the city limits lived in houses, although 9% lived in apartments, and 5% lived in mobile homes or in public or assisted housing. While 39% of the homes were in good condition, 22% needed some minor repairs, 27% needed moderate repairs and 12% needed major repairs.

### Households by Type

- **House**: 86% (854 households)
- **Apartment**: 9% (89 households)
- **Mobile Home**: 1% (9 households)
- **Public/Assisted**: 4% (39 households)

### Condition of Residences

- **Good**: 39%
- **Minor Repair <$1k, 22%**
- **Moderate to $5k, 27%**
- **Major Repair >$5k, 12%**

### Residential Ownership

- **Residential owners outpaced renters by more than four to one.**

#### Housing Payments

- **Mortgages**:
  - Payment Range: $70 - 1,420
  - Median Payment: $490
  - Number: n=317
- **Rent**:
  - Payment Range: $52 - 1,800
  - Median Payment: $260
  - Number: n=181
- **Utilities**:
  - Payment Range: $29 - 3,000
  - Median Utilities Payment: $170
  - Number: n=648
- **Utility Payments**:
  - Median Payment: $170
  - Number: n=144
- **Mortgage + Rent + Utilities**:
  - Median Payment: $660
  - Number: n=181

### Disability

- **220 homes** met the needs of the disabled, more than one in five. Also, 180 householders spent more than half of their income towards rent or mortgage plus utilities.

Residential owners outpaced renters by more than four to one. The 317 owners who reported mortgages on their homes made payments ranging from $70 to $1,420 per month. The median mortgage payment in the City of Broken Bow was $490 per month. Utility payments ranged from $29 to $3,000 monthly for homes, with a median utility payment of $170. The median combined mortgage plus utility payment totaled $660.

One hundred eighty-one of the 221 renters paid anywhere from $52 to $1,800 per month for housing; their median payment was $260. Utility payments varied from $15 to $600 with a median amount of $170. The combined median rent plus utility payment totaled $430 per month.
Of the 1,032 residences within the city, the largest need was for window replacement or repair. Two hundred thirty-nine home owner and another 68 renter occupied dwellings needed this type of repair. Residences needing exterior painting totaled 266 (207+59). This was followed by needs for new roof/shingles, bathroom improvements, door replacement/repairs, wall and ceiling finishes, insulation/weatherization, etc.

When Broken Bow residents were asked what type of housing was needed, affordable housing for middle-income families topped the list. This was followed by needs for three-bedroom dwellings and houses to rent. Respondents were not as positive about the needs for other types of housing.

Questions were asked exclusively of householders renting their homes. Eighty-one percent of the rental housing presently in Broken Bow did meet the local needs. Even though many rentals presently in town did meet local needs, 86 renters said they preferred to own instead of rent.
Renters were asked the maximum amount they could afford to pay per month for rent. Renters who preferred to continue renting reported they could pay a median amount of $250 per month; the median amount for renters preferring to own was $300 per month.

The 86 renters who preferred to own their residences were asked five follow-up questions about possible barriers to owning. Sixty-four renters stated that they definitely or probably lacked the down payment for a home. A total of 48 thought their credit rating created a barrier while 36 thought the lack of available housing created a problem. Twenty-seven felt that lot/building site availability was a barrier. Most of these renters, 73, were interested in government-backed loans that required no down payment.

Questions were directed solely to respondents who owned their dwellings. The first question asked if owners would be willing to apply for cost sharing assistance to rehabilitate their homes. A total of 268 owners were either definitely or probably interested in this option. They were next asked how much they could afford to pay back on a rehabilitation loan. Owners able to pay back at least $50 per month totaled 180 (88+27+65). Of these 180, 52 (37+4+11) met the low- to moderate-income guidelines.
The final question answered exclusively by homeowners was to list when their home was built. A third of the homes in Broken Bow were built before 1940. In the 1950s through the 1970s from 97 to 123 homes were built each decade. In the 1980s, only 46 homes were built, and in the last 13 years, only 27 new homes were constructed.

Even though only 34% of Broken Bow’s homes were built before 1940, lower income residents lived in 45% of homes of this vintage, which included 48 residences.

Demographics

Twice as many women as men participated in the survey, although many couples filled out the questionnaire together. Married couples represented the majority of respondents and widows comprised another 18%.

One hundred ninety-one households (126+47+18) had someone who was handicapped. When comparing those who were handicapped with the homes that were accommodating to the handicapped, 83 households with handicapped occupants did not have homes that met their needs.

The largest single respondent age group was the 45 to 54 age range followed by the next younger and next older age groupings. Those of retirement age or older reached 33%. Almost all householder answering the question, 95%, had at least a high school education. Sixty-one percent had taken at least some college and 37% had at least one college degree.
Fifteen percent of Broken Bow area householders had lived in the area five years or less. The main reason for moving to the area was for a job opportunity. Others came for retirement or for a variety of other reasons.

Seventy percent of Broken Bow households had at least one person who knew how to operate a computer and 63% of the households had computers. Forty-eight percent of the households were connected to the Internet.

About one-third of the respondents were retired. Another fifth were professionals, followed by those working in labor, at 14%. Service workers comprised another 8%.

The majority of respondents did not commute outside of the area to arrive at work, although 251 persons from 191 households did report working outside of the Broken Bow area.
To determine eligibility for federal funding, respondents must answer a question regarding income. Income guideline amounts for households are supplied by federal sources for each county. Even though 1,032 households within the city limits responded to the questionnaire, 945 revealed their incomes. A total of 53.5%, or 506 out of 945 responding households reported incomes above the income threshold while 46.5% (439/945) were below the threshold guidelines. The next step is to calculate the number of persons, as opposed to households, within the income threshold. A total of 58.8% of individuals did not meet the guidelines and 41.2% did meet them. Broken Bow did not meet the eligibility requirements to apply for some types of federal funding since at least 51% of the respondents must be below the income guidelines.

However, certain segments of the community did meet the LMI for households. Further analysis can be done to determine if the number of persons in these areas also meet the income guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Size/Income</th>
<th>In City Above Threshold</th>
<th>In City Below Threshold</th>
<th>Total Above Threshold</th>
<th>Total Below Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/$23,850</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/$27,250</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/$30,650</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/$34,100</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/$36,800</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/$39,550</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/$42,250-8/$45,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hhds</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Persons</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limitations

The listing of household addresses was a limiting factor in this research process. A City list of addresses used for reading electric meters didn’t always correspond with households. Some households had more than one meter and, in a few instances, more than one household was connected to one meter. The City cleaned the list to the best of its ability, but some minor additions or omissions may have been made. Also, the lists used for the surrounding rural areas were duplicative. All attempts were made to eliminate these duplications in calculating the total number of households in the Broken Bow area.
Conclusions

### Community Strengths

- Support for:
  - enforcing cleanup and removal regulations
  - regulations banning open burning
  - continuing the city sales tax, to be used for:
    - maintaining infrastructure
    - community development
    - recreational facilities
- Good ratings for:
  - library
  - fire protection
  - medical facilities/services
  - quality of the water supply
  - recycling center
  - utility services
  - city parks
- The condition of the Municipal Building
- Projects supported included:
  - street paving
  - sidewalk reconstruction
  - a community center
- Community-wide fund raising for projects

### Community/Recreation Facilities Strengths

- Support for these amenities in a center:
  - after school and weekend activities for youth
  - large multipurpose room
  - indoor walking track
  - kitchen facilities
  - gym
  - exercise room/equipment
  - smaller meeting room
  - swimming pool
  - location for volunteer groups
- Many residents were willing to contribute to a fund drive for a new center

### Community Challenges

- A lack of support for:
  - consolidating police services with the county
  - raising the city sales tax to 1 1/2%
  - hiring a City Manager
- Lower ratings for:
  - air quality
  - control of loose pets
  - zoning enforcement
  - camping facilities
- The condition or appearance of:
  - streets
  - sidewalks
  - the swimming pool
  - vacant houses and lots
- Attitudes about the community
- Many unsolicited comments regarding the poor air quality

### Community/Rec Facilities Challenges

- Recreational facilities/programs for all age groups, but especially for adults and junior/senior high schoolers
- A lack of support for a whirlpool/sauna and racquetball courts

### Business & Economic Dev. Strengths

- Support for:
  - focusing economic development on attracting and supporting new and established businesses
  - an economic development plan for economic development
  - promoting tourism
- An available local labor force willing to work at modest wages

### Business & Economic Dev. Challenges

- Some merchant attitudes
- Retail operating hours
- The quality and availability of local jobs
- Even though many goods and services were purchased locally, some out-shopping still occurred
- The majority of out-shopping took place because the goods or services were not available locally; selection and price were also factors
### Conclusions, continued

#### Education Strengths
- School facilities
- Curriculum
- Quality of the teaching staff
- Support for developing more partnerships for sharing resources
- Usage of the school calendar and newsletter

#### Education Challenges
- Relationship between the community and school personnel
- Using the facilities for community purposes
- Availability of post-secondary opportunities
- Lack of knowledge about or support for:
  - school consolidation
  - a levy override for education
- A perception of somewhat too many extracurricular activities

#### Day Care Strengths
- Many parents thought it was difficult to find quality, affordable child care

#### Day Care Challenges
- Many parents thought it was difficult to find quality, affordable child care

#### Housing Strengths (within City Limits)
- Many of Broken Bow's present rentals met renters' housing needs
- Interest from many households to apply for government-backed loans requiring no down payment
- Support from many homeowners to apply for cost sharing assistance for home rehabilitation and an ability to pay back loans

#### Housing Challenges (within City Limits)
- Several homes needed moderate to major repairs for their residences, including:
  - window replacement/repair
  - exterior painting
  - shingles/roofs, etc
- Several householders paid more than 50% of their incomes for housing
- Several handicapped person's homes did not meet their needs
- There was a need for:
  - affordable housing for middle-income families
  - three bedroom dwellings
- Many renters preferred to own, but:
  - lacked the down payment
  - could afford only $300 per month
  - had credit rating barriers
- Many lower income residents interested in rehabilitation lived in old dwellings

#### Demographic Strengths
- Large middle-age population
- Fairly well educated
- Large percentage of computer literacy
- Many residents lived and worked locally

#### Demographic Challenges
- Large retired population
- Low- to moderate-income guidelines not met
Appendix
64. Would you contribute to a fund drive for a new community/recreation center?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>More Likely</th>
<th>Less Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>No difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Married, Single, Divorced</td>
<td>Widowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Generally, the younger, the more likely</td>
<td>and the older, the less likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in City</td>
<td>&lt;1, 6-10</td>
<td>&gt;20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Generally, the more educated, the more likely</td>
<td>and the less educated, the less likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocation</td>
<td>All other professions</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>No difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Size</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Higher income</td>
<td>Lower income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>