TABLE OF CONTENTS

• Demographics
• Travel Restrictions
• Workstyle Impacts
• Business Impacts
• Desired Congressional Actions
• Other Impacts
• Methodology
• Statistical Notes
• Appendix
DEMOGRAPHICS
THE GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION OF RESPONDENTS’ ORGANIZATIONS ARE STATISTICALLY THE SAME BETWEEN WAVE 1 AND WAVE 2.

Census Region
Wave 1 - n = 783, Wave 2 - n = 738

- New England: Wave 1 = 4%, Wave 2 = 4%
- Middle Atlantic: Wave 1 = 8%, Wave 2 = 7%
- East North Central: Wave 1 = 13%, Wave 2 = 15%
- West North Central: Wave 1 = 7%, Wave 2 = 7%
- South Atlantic: Wave 1 = 18%, Wave 2 = 17%
- East South Central: Wave 1 = 6%, Wave 2 = 5%
- West South Central: Wave 1 = 14%, Wave 2 = 13%
- Mountain: Wave 1 = 14%, Wave 2 = 14%
- West: Wave 1 = 15%, Wave 2 = 16%

For an analysis of trends by region, please refer to the report for Wave 1.

Q13. In which state is your organization headquartered?
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CONSISTENT WITH WAVE 1, MORE THAN HALF (53%) OF RESPONDENTS INDICATE THERE ARE 25 OR FEWER FULL-TIME EQUIVALENTS AT THEIR ORGANIZATION. THE MEDIAN FIRM SIZE IS ALSO IDENTICAL BETWEEN THE TWO TIME SERIES.

- The largest organization in Wave 1 reported 11,000 FTEs compared to 10,000 in Wave 2.
- Although the average number of FTEs in Wave 2 (124) is larger than in Wave 1 (107), the median is the exact same (23), indicating that some very large firms are skewing the average size. Therefore, the median is a more helpful metric to use in this analysis.
- Throughout this report meaningful, statistically significant differences between firm size are noted.

### Number of FTEs at Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Wave 1</th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 10</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 25</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 50</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 200</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 to 500</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 or more</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median = 23 (Wave 1 and Wave 2)

Wave 1 - n = 783, Wave 2 – n = 738

Q14. How many full-time equivalent employees (FTEs) do you have? If you are not sure, please provide your best estimate.
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TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS
Although 82% of firms indicated they do not normally travel internationally, among those that do, nearly all have restricted travel for training / events / conferences and air travel.

* NOTE: Although the same question was asked in Wave 1 and Wave 2, two response options were displayed slightly differently between the two waves, likely causing the differences shown in the graph. In Wave 1, “None of the above” and “We don’t normally travel internationally” were combined as one option while in Wave 2 they were separated. Despite this change, the trend is the same in terms of the top restrictions imposed.

- As detailed on the following slide there are some statistically significant differences by firm size.
  - Generally speaking, the larger the firm size, the more likely employees are to travel internationally, and therefore, are more likely to report restricting all forms of international travel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Travel Restrictions Due to COVID-19*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1 - n = 783, Wave 2 - n = 733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel for training / events / conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1: 35%, Wave 2: 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1: 34%, Wave 2: 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client-related travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1: 22%, Wave 2: 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of mass transit (trains, busses, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1: 21%, Wave 2: 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car rentals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1: 15%, Wave 2: 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of ground transportation (Uber, Lyft, taxi, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1: 14%, Wave 2: 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1: 3%, Wave 2: 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above / We don't normally travel internationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1: 60%, Wave 2: 82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2. As a result of COVID-19, which of the following, if any, has your company restricted or prohibited regarding international travel? Select All That Apply.
Q2. As a result of COVID-19, which of the following, if any, has your company restricted or prohibited regarding international travel?

Select All That Apply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 25</th>
<th>26 to 50</th>
<th>51 to 200</th>
<th>201 to 500</th>
<th>501 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air travel</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel for training / events / conferences</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client-related travel</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of mass transit (trains, busses, etc.)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car rentals</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of ground transportation (Uber, Lyft, taxi, etc.)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above / We don't normally travel internationally</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicates significantly higher percentage
Indicates significantly lower percentage
COMPARED TO WAVE 1, MORE FIRMS HAVE IMPLEMENTED SOME TYPE OF DOMESTIC TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS (79% UP FROM 71%). THIS HAS LED TO AN INCREASE IN RESTRICTIONS OF ALL TYPES OF TRAVEL.

- As detailed on the following slide there are some statistically significant differences by firm size.
  - The larger the firm size, the more likely an organization has restricted travel for training / events / conferences, air travel and use of mass transit.
  - Smaller firms are more likely to have restricted use of ground transportation compared to larger firms.

Domestic Travel Restrictions Due to COVID-19
Wave 1 - n = 778, Wave 2 - n = 733

- Travel for training / events / conferences: Wave 1 = 66%, Wave 2 = 73%
- Air travel: Wave 1 = 52%, Wave 2 = 62%
- Client-related travel: Wave 1 = 31%, Wave 2 = 44%
- Use of mass transit (trains, busses, etc.): Wave 1 = 27%, Wave 2 = 38%
- Use of ground transportation (Uber, Lyft, taxi, etc.): Wave 1 = 15%, Wave 2 = 29%
- Car rentals: Wave 1 = 15%, Wave 2 = 28%
- Other: Wave 1 = 7%, Wave 2 = 3%
- None of the above: Wave 1 = 29%, Wave 2 = 21%

Q3. As a result of COVID-19, which of the following, if any, has your company restricted or prohibited regarding domestic travel? Select All That Apply
DOMESTIC TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS DUE TO COVID-19
BY FIRM SIZE (FTE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel for training / events / conferences</th>
<th>Total 0 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 25</th>
<th>26 to 50</th>
<th>51 to 200</th>
<th>201 to 500</th>
<th>501 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel for training / events / conferences</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air travel</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client-related travel</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of mass transit (trains, buses, etc.)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of ground transportation (Uber, Lyft, taxi, etc.)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car rentals</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicates significantly higher percentage

Indicates significantly lower percentage

Q3. As a result of COVID-19, which of the following, if any, has your company restricted or prohibited regarding domestic travel? Select All That Apply.
WORKSTYLE IMPACTS
Although the percentage of firms that have changed their leave policy is nearly the same (48% versus 46% in Wave 1), there has been a shift towards providing various types of paid leave instead of unpaid leave.

- More firms are providing emergency paid leave compared to Wave 1 (32% versus 23%) and/or have increased the number of paid leave hours provided to employees (10% versus 6%).
- As detailed on the following slide there are some statistically significant differences by firm size.
  - The larger the firm size, the more likely the firm is to provide emergency paid leave and/or increase the number of paid leave hours for employees.
  - Firms with more than 200 employees are also more likely to encourage employees to donate their paid leave to others who need it.
  - Many firms noted in the “other” comments that they are allowing employees to borrow leave or go into a negative leave balance.
Q5. Which of the following, if any, has your company implemented regarding its leave policy? Select All That Apply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 25</th>
<th>26 to 50</th>
<th>51 to 200</th>
<th>201 to 500</th>
<th>501 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency paid leave for those who become sick, must self-quarantine, or care for others</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency unpaid leave for those who become sick, must self-quarantine, or care for others</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging employees to donate their paid leave to others who need it</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased the number of paid leave hours to each employee</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased the number of unpaid leave hours to each employee</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We already have an unrestricted leave policy</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THERE HAS BEEN A SIGNIFICANT INCREASE IN THE PERCENTAGE OF FIRMS THAT HAVE IMPLEMENTED SOME TYPE OF TELEWORK POLICY (93% UP FROM 80% IN WAVE 1). AS A RESULT, THERE HAS BEEN A LARGE INCREASE IN FIRMS MANDATING EMPLOYEES WORK FROM HOME (28% UP FROM 8%).

- More firms are also requiring certain employees work from home due to potential exposure / health reasons (12% up from 7%).
- As detailed on the following slide there are some statistically significant differences by firm size.
  - Firms with between 51 and 500 FTEs are more likely to be mandating work from home, while smaller firms with 25 or fewer employees are more likely to be allowing employees to work from home as needed.
  - Firms with more than 200 FTEs are more likely to be encouraging all employees to work from home, if possible.
## TELEWORK / WORK FROM HOME POLICY BY FIRM SIZE (FTE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 25</th>
<th>26 to 50</th>
<th>51 to 200</th>
<th>201 to 500</th>
<th>501 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We are allowing employees to work from home as needed</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are encouraging all employees to work from home, if possible, but it’s not mandatory</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are requiring certain employees to work from home due to potential exposure / health reasons</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have made it mandatory to work from home until otherwise notified</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have not changed our policy; it is business as usual</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Compared to Wave 1, more firms have implemented various methods of working with clients to ensure work continuation. Social distancing (84% up from 77%) and allowing virtual work (84% up from 73%) still top the list.

- More firms are also limiting access to offices, project/construction sites, and group meetings (68% up from 52%), and implementing site restrictions (37% up from 23%).
- As detailed on the following slide there are some statistically significant differences by firm size.
  - Generally speaking, the larger the firm size, the more likely the firm has implemented all methods.
### METHODS OF WORKING WITH CLIENTS TO ENSURE WORK CONTINUATION BY FIRM SIZE (FTE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 25</th>
<th>26 to 50</th>
<th>51 to 200</th>
<th>201 to 500</th>
<th>501 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allowing virtual-work opportunities</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring social distancing to reduce risk factors</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limiting access to offices, project and construction sites, and group meetings</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focusing on meeting and project site hygiene</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing onsite engagement (as permitted within travel policies)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing site restrictions</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Indicates significantly higher percentage**
- **Indicates significantly lower percentage**

Q6. In which of the following ways, if any, are you working with your client counterparts to ensure projects can be executed and work can continue? Select All That Apply.
BUSINESS IMPACTS
SIMILAR TO WAVE 1, VERY FEW ORGANIZATIONS (5%) REPORT PROBLEMS WITH PUBLIC CLIENTS DUE TO PROTECTIVE MEASURES CONFLICTING WITH CONTRACT TERMS.

- Although percentages vary by firm size, the differences are not statistically significant:
  - 0 to 10 FTEs = 4% “Yes”
  - 11 to 25 FTEs = 5%
  - 26 to 50 FTEs = 4%
  - 51 to 200 FTEs = 8%
  - 201 to 500 FTEs = 0%
  - 501 or more FTEs = 5%

Q7. Has your company experienced problems with public clients when protective measures may conflict with contract terms?
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BETWEEN WAVE 1 AND WAVE 2 THERE HAS BEEN A LARGE INCREASE IN THE PERCENTAGE OF FIRMS (24% UP TO 40%) REPORTING DELAYS IN RFPS/RFQS OR AWARDS DUE TO COVID-19.

- As firm size increases, so too does the percentage of firms reporting delays:
  - 0 to 10 FTEs = 27% “Yes”
  - 11 to 25 FTEs = 36%
  - 26 to 50 FTEs = 45%
  - 51 to 200 FTEs = 48%
  - 201 to 500 FTEs = 61%
  - 501 or more FTEs = 73%
- The percentage of firms experiencing delays not only increased overall between the two waves, but also increased for each firm size group.

**Delays in RFPS/RFQs or Awards Due to COVID-19**

Wave 1 - n = 787, Wave 2 - n = 720

- **Yes**
  - Wave 1: 24%
  - Wave 2: 40%
- **No**
  - Wave 1: 76%
  - Wave 2: 60%

Q9. Is your firm experiencing delays in the issuance of RFPs/RFQs or awards as a result of COVID-19?
Between Wave 1 and Wave 2 there has been a large increase in the percentage of firms (44% up to 58%) reporting project delays or cancellations due to COVID-19.

- As firm size increases, so too does the percentage of firms reporting delays/cancellations, with the exception of the largest firm size category:
  - 0 to 10 FTEs = 49% “Yes”
  - 11 to 25 FTEs = 55%
  - 26 to 50 FTEs = 59%
  - 51 to 200 FTEs = 67%
  - 201 to 500 FTEs = 91%
  - 501 or more FTEs = 68%

- The percentage of firms experiencing delays/cancellations not only increased overall between the two waves, but also increased for each firm size group, with the exception of the largest firm size category where it stayed about the same.

Q8. Is your firm experiencing project delays or cancellations as a result of COVID-19?
DESIRED CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS
NEARLY 9 OUT OF 10 FIRMS (87%) REPORT RECEIVING NO ASSISTANCE FROM CREDITORS AT THIS TIME, OR AT LEAST ARE NOT AWARE OF ANY.

As detailed on the following slide there are some statistically significant differences by firm size:

- Firms with more than 500 FTEs are more likely to report receiving assistance of any kind.
- Firms with between 51 and 500 FTEs are also more likely to report receiving assistance regarding increasing amounts of existing credit lines and offers of new credit lines.

Q10. Which of the following, if any, are your creditors doing to assist your organization with managing the financial challenges related to COVID-19? Select All That Apply

- Offering interest only payments: 2%
- Deferring payments for up to 30 days: 1%
- Deferring payments for up to 60 days: 1%
- Deferring payments for up to 90 days: 1%
- Incre. amount of existing credit line(s): 4%
- Offering new credit lines / loans: 6%
- Other: 2%
- Don’t know: 36%
- None of the above: 51%

* Not asked in Wave 1
Q10. Which of the following, if any, are your creditors doing to assist your organization with managing the financial challenges related to COVID-19? Select All That Apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistance</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 25</th>
<th>26 to 50</th>
<th>51 to 200</th>
<th>201 to 500</th>
<th>501 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offering interest only payments</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferring payments for up to 30 days</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferring payments for up to 60 days</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferring payments for up to 90 days</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing the amount of your existing credit line(s)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering new credit lines / loans</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Indicates significantly higher percentage
- Indicates significantly lower percentage
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Nearly half (47%) of firms believe Congress should delay payment of the company's share of Social Security payroll taxes, while nearly as many favor increasing interest deductibility for businesses (44%).

Steps Congress Should Take to Mitigate Cash Flow Problems*
Wave 2 - n = 717

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delay payment of business share of Social Security payroll taxes</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase interest deductibility for businesses</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand net operating loss rules</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not asked in Wave 1
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SAMPLE VERBATIM COMMENTS REGARDING “OTHER” STEPS CONGRESS CAN TAKE TO MITIGATE CASH FLOW CHALLENGES:

**No Interest Loans**

“Zero to low interest loans for payroll purposes for small businesses that cannot absorb paid leave, sick, etc. for extended period of time and are having their projects put on hold because of the virus.”

“Provide interest free loans to small business to float for a year (30% of their revenue).”

**Tax Credits/Deductions**

“Allow deduction of salaries for employees in areas with mandatory shelter at home rules.”

“Expand eligibility of refundable tax credits, as needed, with fewer restrictions.”

**Grants to Cover Payroll**

“Make cash available immediately and easily to offset payroll and benefit costs to allow retention of staff.”

“Provide grants to small businesses to continue paying staff.”

**Direct Payments / Unemployment to Employees**

“Pay for employees if they get furloughed.”

“Pay the affected staff directly.”

“Make state unemployment insurance mandatory and immediate so we can furlough workers and not worry about them having some income.”
### STEPS CONGRESS SHOULD TAKE TO MITIGATE CASH FLOW PROBLEMS BY FIRM SIZE (FTE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allow businesses to delay payment of their share of Social Security payroll taxes</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 25</th>
<th>26 to 50</th>
<th>51 to 200</th>
<th>201 to 500</th>
<th>501 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase interest deductibility for businesses</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand net operating loss rules</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td><strong>34%</strong></td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td><strong>27%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td><strong>22%</strong></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td><strong>23%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td><strong>32%</strong></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td><strong>12%</strong></td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates significantly higher percentage

*Indicates significantly lower percentage

Q11. Congress has passed legislation to provide help to certain firms impacted by the costs of new family/medical leave requirements with refundable tax credits. What additional measures should Congress adopt to help mitigate against cash flow problems? Select All That Apply.
OTHER IMPACTS
WHEN ASKED TO DESCRIBE ANY OTHER BUSINESS ISSUES THAT ORGANIZATIONS ARE EXPERIENCING RELATED TO COVID-19 RESPONDENTS ANSWERS FELL INTO SEVERAL MAIN CATEGORIES:

- Loss of productivity / efficiency due majority of staff working from home.
- Challenges related with staff having varied Internet speed / efficiency / access.
- Challenges with distracted staff.
- Many report that projects which weren’t already underway are being delayed. Anxiety expressed regarding any future work.
- Banks are inundated with requests; firms are uncertain of response time.
- Many commented that cash flow challenges are top of mind. There is uncertainty that clients will pay in a timely manner.
- Concerns about the timing of government assistance - will it be in time before my firm runs out of cash; will the process be “impossible?”
- Anxiety and concern over the economy.
METHODOLOGY – WAVE 1

- The Institute for Association and Nonprofit Research (IFANR) invited individuals from among the database list of member companies provided by the American Council of Engineering Companies (ACEC) to participate in this survey. One invitation was sent per member company.
- Data collection occurred on March 17 and 18, 2020.
- A total of 3,456 invitations were emailed, although 294 bounced and 17 opted-out, resulting in a total of 3,145 potential respondents.
- Individuals who did not respond to the first email were sent one follow-up reminder.
- In all, 794 individuals responded to the email invitations for an overall response rate of 25%.
- Individuals could respond using a laptop/desktop computer, tablet or smartphone; 12% of respondents completed the survey using a mobile device.
- Throughout the report for Wave 1 meaningful, statistically significant differences are noted by geographic region.
METHODOLOGY – WAVE 2

• The Institute for Association and Nonprofit Research (IFANR) invited individuals from among the database list of member companies provided by the American Council of Engineering Companies (ACEC) to participate in this survey. One invitation was sent per member company.
  • Data collection occurred on March 24 and 25, 2020.
  • A total of 3,438 invitations were emailed, although 298 bounced and 20 opted-out, resulting in a total of 3,120 potential respondents.
  • Individuals who did not respond to the first email were sent one follow-up reminder.
  • In all, 738 individuals responded to the email invitations for an overall response rate of 24%.
• Individuals could respond using a laptop/desktop computer, tablet or smartphone; 11% of respondents completed the survey using a mobile device.
• Throughout this report meaningful, statistically significant differences are noted by number of FTEs.
STATISTICAL NOTES

- Statistically significant differences are evaluated at a 95% confidence interval (for a description of tests used, please see the Appendix).
- There is no margin of sampling error as this was a census of all individuals in the ACEC database.
- Although every effort was taken to minimize survey bias, there is no way to completely eliminate all sources of potential bias. Sources of potential bias include, but are not limited to, the following:
  - Non-response bias
  - Confounding bias
  - Question wording bias
  - Question order bias
  - Habituation
  - Sponsor bias
  - Confirmation bias
F-test
When the mean is displayed for a row variable, MarketSight first runs an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) using an F-test. Doing so tests the hypothesis that the means of multiple normally distributed populations, all having the same variance, are equal.

MarketSight tests whether or not the row variable’s means are equal to one another for all columns in the crosstab. Rejecting the test hypothesis implies that at least one of the column means is significantly different from the others.

Fisher’s Least Significant Difference (LSD) test
If the statistics option to “Correct for Type I errors in all comparisons” is disabled, MarketSight will run Fisher’s LSD test for both Pairwise tests and Contrast tests of means. MarketSight only runs Fisher’s LSD test if the ANOVA F-test first rejects the null hypothesis that all column means are equal to one another.

Fisher’s LSD test is a relatively powerful test because it uses the pooled variance estimate from the F-test, thus taking advantage of the increased sample size of all columns in the crosstab. Pooling the variance is valid because MarketSight explicitly tests for equality of variance among all columns prior to running the associated F-test.

Although the test is more powerful than either the Tukey HSD or Scheffé tests, it is more susceptible to Type I error when running multiple simultaneous tests.
TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR MEANS (CONT)

**Scheffé test**
If the statistics option to “Correct for Type I errors in all comparisons” is enabled, MarketSight will run the Scheffé test for Contrast tests of means. MarketSight only runs the Scheffé test if the ANOVA F-test first rejects the null hypothesis that all column means are equal to one another.

The Scheffé test is a conservative test for running multiple Contrast tests of Means which controls the overall Type I error rate for all possible contrasts based on the selected Confidence Level.

**Tukey-Kramer tests**
MarketSight will run Tukey-Kramer test for Pairwise tests of means. MarketSight only runs Tukey-Kramer test if the ANOVA F-test first rejects the null hypothesis that all column means are equal to one another.

Tukey-Kramer test is a conservative test for running multiple Pairwise comparisons of Means. It controls the overall Type I error rate across a number of related Pairwise tests based on the selected Confidence Level.
TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR PROPORTIONS

Chi-squared
When a Row Variable displays the Column % or Count option for individual Values, MarketSight runs a Chi-squared test. This test examines whether there is a relationship between the Column Variable(s) and the Row Variable.

Chi-squared tests involve a comparison of “actual” cell counts to “expected” cell counts in a crosstab.

The expected count for each cell is derived from a Row Variable’s actual counts as follows: multiply the cell’s row total by its column total, then divide by the sum total of all observations.

If the actual cell counts for one or more cells differ materially from their expected counts, the Chi-squared test may produce a statistically significant result which implies there is a relationship between the Column Variable(s) and the Row Variable.

A modified version of a Chi-Squared test is run for Multiple Response Variables.
Fisher's Exact
For 2x2 crosstabs with small sample sizes, the Chi-squared test may be unreliable. Therefore, MarketSight runs an alternate test, Fisher’s Exact Test, if more than 20% of the cells in a 2x2 crosstab have an expected cell count less than 5, or if any cells in a 2x2 cross-tab have an expected cell count less than 1.

Fisher’s Exact Test calculates the true probability of observing a particular set of actual cell counts in a 2 x 2 crosstab, assuming that row and column totals are held constant.

Fisher’s Exact Test is not run for Multiple Response Variables.

z-test
MarketSight runs Z-tests for both Contrast and Pairwise tests of Column Proportions. A Z-test is used to test for a difference between two column proportions. The column proportions involved in the test are the cell counts divided by their respective column totals.

A Z-test is only run when the cells being compared have actual counts greater or equal to 5 and the column sample size minus the actual cell counts is greater than or equal to 5. If these data sufficiency conditions are not met, MarketSight runs Fisher’s Exact Test instead.

A modified version of a Z-test is run for Multiple Response Variables.
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