

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

**Public Input-Survey**

On March 19, 2004, the Sheboygan County Planning & Resources Department in conjunction with UW-Extension sent out a comprehensive planning survey to 5,000 randomly selected households. Those receiving a survey were given until April 5, 2004 to return their completed survey to UW-Extension. The County paid for return postage. Surveys that were received during that week were accepted; those received after were not.

**Purpose**

The purpose of the *Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey* was to gather public input on issues related to the nine elements of the State Comprehensive Planning Law (Ch. 66.1001, Wis. States). All of the information gathered and developed will be used for the completion the County's Comprehensive Plan in accordance with State Statutes, the *Sheboygan County Natural Areas and Critical Resources Plan*, *Sheboygan County Outdoor Recreation and Open Space Plan*, and the *Farmland Preservation Plan*. Data collected through this process will be analyzed and shared with each community in the County.

**Method**

Five thousand (5,000) surveys were sent to randomly selected households by a consulting firm named, "The Complete Package." Addresses were selected from each zip code within the County, proportionate to the population of the County. We are not sure why the Waldo zip code received no surveys. Results from this selection are below:

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Zip Code</b>	<b>Actual Number Of Surveys Sent</b>	<b>Actual Population In Zip Code (2000 Us Census)</b>	<b>Actual Percent Of The County Population</b>	<b>Percent Receiving Surveys</b>
Adell	53001	121	1947	1.90	2.42
Cascade	53011	133	1894	1.85	2.66
Cedar Grove	53013	181	3056	2.98	3.62
Elkhart Lake	53020	229	3730	3.64	4.58
Glenbeulah	53023	107	1968	1.92	2.14
Kohler	53044	107	1968	1.92	2.14
Oostburg	53070	227	4637	4.52	4.54
Plymouth	53073	662	14,903	14.54	13.24
Random Lake	53075	182	4180	4.08	3.64
Sheboygan-Town of Wilson	53081	2107	43,928	42.85	42.14
Sheboygan-Howards Grove-Town of Mosel	53083	419	10,370	10.11	8.38
Sheboygan Falls	53085	568	10,370	10.11	11.36
<b>Total</b>		<b>5000</b>	<b>102525</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Zip Code</b>	<b>Actual Number Of Surveys Sent</b>	<b>Actual Population In Zip Code (2000 Us Census)</b>	<b>Actual Percent Of The County Population</b>	<b>Percent Receiving Surveys</b>
Missing:					
Waldo	53093	0	2650	0	2.9

University of Wisconsin-Extension staff entered the survey responses into a Microsoft Access Database that was developed by County Planning & Resources staff. The database allowed the users to select an answer from a menu for each question; this option minimized data entry errors and ensured that the format for each question was uniform. Following data entry, the information was exported from the Access database into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet for tabulation. Two UW-Extension employees completed the initial data entry. To allow the data to be tabulated and analyzed in a meaningful way, the two databases were merged and a new ID# was assigned to each record; this eliminated the likelihood that data duplicates would occur.

Several opportunities were used to generate participation in the survey process. A press release was sent to the local media outlets. This press release resulted in articles in local newspapers including the *Sheboygan Press*, the *Sounder*, the *Plymouth Review*, and *The Beacon*. The item in the *Sheboygan Press* also included an editorial on the importance of completing the survey. Short radio spots were aired on local radio stations.

## Analysis

### *Respondents*

Of the 5,000 surveys that were sent out, 981 surveys were returned resulting in just under a 20% response rate. The standard error of the sample is +/-3%. The majority of the respondents are long-time residents of the County, with those living in the County for more than 20 years making up 65% of the responses (Table 1).

<b>Table 1: Length Of Residency (Question 50)</b>		
	<b>%</b>	<b>Number</b>
Less than 1 Year	0.4	4
1-5 Years	7.7	76
6-10 Years	7.9	77
11-20 Years	14.6	143
Over 20 Years	65.2	640
No Answer	4.2	41
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>981</b>

The response rate from communities for the survey was nearly parallel with the corresponding population rate for a community (Table 2). There are two exceptions, the City of Sheboygan and the

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
 Results Summary- Random Sample  
 November 15, 2004

Village of Waldo. The City of Sheboygan’s population makes up 45.1% of the County’s total population. However, the response rate for City of Sheboygan residents was 22.12%. There are a number of factors that could have contributed to the response rate, some of which may include language barriers, owner-occupancy, and/or other socio-economic factors that may have played a role in an individual’s likelihood to participate.

Another possibility is that some respondents did not indicate which city, village, or town they lived in, they simply marked one of the three “city”, “village”, or “town”. Some of the people that indicated that they lived in the “city” may be City of Sheboygan residents. However, if all of the respondents choosing “city” (13.05%) were residents of the City of Sheboygan only (not City of Plymouth or City of Sheboygan Falls), the City of Sheboygan response rate would still be lower than its relative population.

The other community that did not have a response was the Village of Waldo. Due to an error by the company that was used to generate the mailing list, no surveys were sent to people living in the Waldo zip code. Surveys were sent to residents based on their community’s population. For example, City of Sheboygan Residents received 45.1% of the surveys that were sent out.

<b>Table 2: Place of Residence (Question 51)</b>			
<b>Community</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent Of Responses</b>	<b>Percent Of County Population (2000 Us Census)</b>
City of Plymouth	61	6.22%	6.9
City of Sheboygan	217	22.12%	45.1
City of Sheboygan Falls	55	5.61%	6
Adell	9	0.92%	0.5
Cascade	8	0.82%	0.6
Cedar Grove	12	1.22%	1.7
Glenbeulah	4	0.41%	0.3
Elkhart Lake	13	1.33%	0.9
Howards Grove	17	1.73%	2.5
Kohler	14	1.43%	1.7
Oostburg	16	1.63%	2.4
Random Lake	19	1.94%	1.4
Waldo	0	0.00%	0.4
Greenbush	22	2.24%	2.5
Herman	18	1.83%	1.8
Holland	36	3.67%	2.1
Lyndon	12	1.22%	1.3
Lima	26	2.65%	2.6

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

<b>Table 2: Place of Residence (Question 51)</b>			
<b>Community</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent Of Responses</b>	<b>Percent Of County Population (2000 Us Census)</b>
Mitchell	15	1.53%	1
Mosel	7	0.71%	0.7
Plymouth	39	3.98%	2.8
Rhine	27	2.75%	2
Russell	3	0.31%	0.4
Scott	22	2.24%	1.6
Sheboygan (Town)	41	4.18%	5.2
Sheboygan Falls (Town)	33	3.36%	1.5
Sherman	19	1.94%	1.3
Wilson	39	3.98%	2.9
No Answer	41	4.18%	
City	128	13.05%	
Village	7	0.71%	
Town	2	0.20%	
<b>Total</b>	<b>982</b>	<b>100.10%</b>	<b>100.1</b>

To get an idea if any of the respondents were seasonal residents or part-time residents, survey respondents were given the option to write in the name of the Community in which they owned land if they lived outside of the County (Table 3). It appears that some of the respondents completed this section if they lived outside of a village or city (in a town) but lived in a postal area that had the name of an incorporated village or city. For example, if an individual lived in the Town of Rhine, but used an Elkhart Lake address they might have written "Town of Rhine" as a response to this question.

<b>Table 3: Own Land In The County, Live Outside Of The County (Question 52)</b>	
<b>Community</b>	<b>Responses</b>
Cedar Grove	1
"City"	1
Cleveland	1
Greenbush	1
Herman	1

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

<b>Table 3: Own Land In The County, Live Outside Of The County (Question 52)</b>	
<b>Community</b>	<b>Responses</b>
Holland	3
Mosel	1
Rhine	2
“Village”	1

Though all residents’ responses are important, a picture of whether or not the respondents owned their homes or rented their homes was desired (Table 4). Respondents most frequently stated that they owned their homes (88.0%) versus rented their homes (8.2%). Home ownership rates of survey respondents was quite different from that of the general population of the County. According to the last US Census, 67.7% of the County’s population owned their home versus 27.1% renting.

<b>Table 4: Own/Rent (Question 53)</b>			
<b>Survey</b>			<b>Us Census (2000)</b>
	%	Number	%
Own	88.0	863	67.7
Rent	8.2	80	27.1
No Answer	3.8	38	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>981</b>	<b>94.8*</b>

\*This number does not account for vacant housing and seasonal housing

Most of the respondents were men (Table 5), aged 35-65 (Table 6). In general, 47% of the population is male and 53% are female. According to the 2000 US Census, 33.4% of the population is between the ages of 35 and 65 in Sheboygan County.

<b>Table 5: Gender (Question 54)</b>		
	%	Number
Male	59.3	582
Female	35.9	352
No Answer	4.8	47

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

<b>Table 5: Gender (Question 54)</b>		
	100	981

<b>Table 6: Age (Question 55)</b>			
	<b>Survey</b>		<b>US Census</b>
	Number	%	%
Under 18	0	0	29.2
18-24	12	1.2	6.3
25-34	86	8.8	16.6
35-44	154	15.7	14.9
45-54	246	25.1	9.9
55-64	195	19.8	8.6
65-74	143	14.6	7.9
75 and Older	107	10.9	6.7
No Answer	38	3.9	-
Total	981	100	100.1

Household sizes are shrinking as more people are choosing to have fewer children and “baby boomers” grow older. As families get older, the children leave the house and develop their own families and households. The survey respondents’ household size was most likely 2 people (Table 7). The highest percentage of people had no children (people in household under 18 years old- Table 8), representing 77% of respondents.

<b>Table 7: People In Household (Question 55a)</b>		
	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>
9	1	0.1
7	4	0.4
6	14	1.4
5	55	5.6
4	110	11.2
3	116	11.8
2	425	43.3

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
 Results Summary- Random Sample  
 November 15, 2004

<b>Table 7: People In Household (Question 55a)</b>		
1	181	18.5
0	7	0.7
No Answer	68	6.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>981</b>	<b>100</b>

<b>Table 8: People In Household Under 18 Years Old (Question 55b)</b>		
	<b>%</b>	<b>Number</b>
7	0.1	1
5	0.3	3
4	0.9	9
3	4.1	40
2	9.3	91
1	8.3	81
0	35.1	345
NA	41.9	411
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>981</b>

The majority of respondents were employed or retired (Table 9). Those that were working were most likely to be employed in the “services” field (Table 10). Many of the survey respondents choose not to answer this question.

<b>Table 9: Employment Status (Question 56)</b>		
	<b>%</b>	<b>Number</b>
Employed	54.3	533
Unemployed	2.3	23
Self-Employed	8.0	78
Student	0.1	1
Retired	27.8	273

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
 Results Summary- Random Sample  
 November 15, 2004

<b>Table 9: Employment Status (Question 56)</b>		
Do Not Work	2.7	26
No Answer	4.8	47
	100	981

<b>Table 10: Field of employment (Question 57)</b>		
	%	Number
Agriculture	4.1	40
Wholesale Trade	6.8	67
Government	5.5	54
Retail Trade	6.1	60
Services	36.6	359
Construction/Mining	5.6	55
No Answer	35.3	346
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>981</b>

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
 Results Summary- Random Sample  
 November 15, 2004

Education attainment of survey respondents was not very consistent with data from the 2000 US population census for the county (Table 11). High School education attainment by survey respondents was about equal to that reported on the 2000 US Census for Sheboygan County residents. However, the rate of college, graduate, and technical college education attainment among the survey respondents was significantly higher than education attainment for Sheboygan County residents reported on the last US Census.

<b>Table 11: Education Attainment (Question 58)</b>			
	Survey		US Census (2000)
	Number	%	%
8 <sup>th</sup> Grade	1	0.1	5.8
Some High School	35	3.6	9.8
High School	352	35.8	39.9
Junior College	23	2.3	19.7
College	247	25.2	12.8
Post Graduate	130	13.3	5.1
Technical College	133	13.6	6.9
No Answer	60	6.1	-
Total	981	100	100

The salary of survey respondents was slightly lower than the county population as reported in the 2000 US Census in the \$15,000 to \$49,999 category (38.7% for survey respondents and 44.8% for county residents) (Table 12). The response rate for individuals earning under \$15,000 per year was significantly lower for survey respondents (4.3%) than the actual population earning this income in the County according to the 2000 US Census (10.1%).

<b>Table 12: Annual Gross Income (Question 59)</b>			
	Survey		US census (2000)
	Number	%	%
Under \$15,000	42	4.3	10.1

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

\$15,000- \$49,999	379	38.7	44.8
\$50,000- \$99,999	343	34.9	37.4
\$100,000 or More	92	9.4	7.7
No Answer	125	12.7	-
Total	981	100	100

Overall, survey respondents were more likely to be older men with a higher level of education earning a little bit more than the average person in Sheboygan County. The average survey respondent has lived in the County for more than twenty years, owns his/her own home, with four or less people, most likely with him or herself and one other person and is currently employed or retired.

The survey did not capture the opinion of newer residents, residents that are more likely to be living in poverty, renters, and those with a lower level of education. Additional efforts should be made in the planning process to involve individuals most likely to fit into this demographic group in the input process.

***County Trends and Land Use***

Growth in Sheboygan County over the ten years between the last US Census has been at a rate of approximately 10%, growing from a population of 103,877 in 1990 to 112,646 in 2000. County growth projections for the next 10 years (2000-2010) is projected to be about 11%. Survey respondents said they would prefer growth to be at the same rate or slower than projected, with 738 or 75.2% of respondents choosing this response.

In the past, Sheboygan County has relied heavily on manufacturing and industry to sustain its economy, with nearly 40% of residents employed in the manufacturing sector of the economy. With recent declines in manufacturing jobs (nearly 10% in the past 3 years in the community), respondents were asked what their vision for the County's economy is for the next 20 years. Thirty five percent of respondents said that they would like to see the community continue as a manufacturing center, twenty three percent said they would like to see the community become stronger in the business/service sector, and eighteen percent said they would like to see the community become a tourism destination (Table 13).

<b>Table 13: What rate would you like to see growth occur? (Question 1)</b>	
<b>Growth Rate</b>	<b>Percent Of Responses</b>
Faster than projected	8.3
Present projected rate of growth	43.5

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

Slower than projected	31.7
No Growth	5.7
Don't Know	6.0
No Answer	4.8

Based on these results, economic development efforts should be focused on promoting and protecting the manufacturing base of the community and education efforts should focus on providing workers with the skills they need for higher-paying jobs that do not specifically require a four-year or two-year degree.

Agriculture was also identified as an important sector of the economy, with 12.7% of respondents indicating that they would prefer the community to rely on agriculture to support its economy (Table 14). The response rate is similar to the rate of employment in agriculture in Sheboygan County, which is 20%. Agriculture accounts for 20% of the County's economy.

<b>Table 14: What identity would you like Sheboygan county to have in 20 years ? (Question 2)</b>	
<b>Economic Base</b>	<b>Percent Of Responses</b>
Tourism	18.4
Manufacturing	34.5
Retail	7.2
Business/Service	23.1
Agriculture	12.7

Respondents were asked about their opinions regarding types of growth in the County for a twenty-year planning period. Single-family residential development, family farms, small businesses, and light industry accounted for the responses getting the most favorable ratings (Table 15). Selections receiving the least support (lowest percentage with a "strongly agree" answer) were multi-family residential and large corporate farms.

<b>Table 15: The following types of growth should be encouraged within Sheboygan county: (Question 3)</b>			
<b>Type</b>	<b>Strongly Agree/Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</b>
Single family residential	43.7%	13.5%	4.3%
Multi-family residential	27.5%	33.0%	27.3%
Rural residential	41.7%	25.2%	20.3%

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

<b>Table 15: The following types of growth should be encouraged within Sheboygan county: (Question 3)</b>			
<b>Type</b>	<b>Strongly Agree/Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</b>
Hobby farms	37.0%	35.2%	14.0%
Family farms	67.6%	18.1%	4.4%
Large corporate farms	14.7%	21.4%	50.2%
Small businesses	79.1%	9.0%	2.5%
Large retail	33.2%	26.4%	28.8%
Light industry	76.6%	11.8%	3.9%
Heavy industry	54.3%	21.5%	15.3%

***Housing***

To get a better picture of what residents would like to see in their urban neighborhoods, respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement on a variety of types of features that would likely be found in an urban area.

One movement in communities across the country is toward “traditional neighborhood development”. This planning strategy attempts to recapture the characteristics of neighborhoods built in the first half of the last century when people worked, shopped, and lived generally in the same neighborhood and did not rely heavily on the automobile to get the things that they need to sustain their everyday lives. Responses to this survey tend to support this planning strategy (Table 16). Respondents “strongly agreed” that shopping, employment, schools, parks, and sidewalks should be found in urban neighborhoods. Currently, new developments in the area do not frequently connect these amenities. Frequently, newer subdivisions are built without parks and sidewalks and are not located near employment, shopping, or schools. Efforts should be made to encourage developments that support a wide range of uses in an urban area.

Another movement in the planning arena is “new urbanism”. This movement is complimentary to “traditional neighborhood development”, however the overall design of development is meant to reflect architecture of the past. One component of this movement is the promotion of alleys in residential areas. Based on the responses of the survey, it does not appear residents would be in favor of developing new alleys in residential areas.

<b>Table 16: Ideal urban neighborhoods would include homes as well as: (Question 4)</b>			
<b>Development Type</b>	<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
Apartments	46.7%	21.9%	20.3%
Shopping	74.8%	11.5%	16.0%

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

<b>Table 16: Ideal urban neighborhoods would include homes as well as: (Question 4)</b>			
<b>Development Type</b>	<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
(groceries/services/etc.)			
Employment	73.5%	12.7%	6.1%
Schools	76.9%	1.7%	3.3%
Parks	78.6%	9.7%	3.4%
Alleys	20.0%	28.3%	37.8%
Sidewalks	59.1%	17.6%	13.5%

In rural areas, respondents seemed to favor residential development, regardless of lot size (Table 17). Other development such as duplexes, multi-family apartments, and mobile home parks did not receive many responses in the “strongly agree” category.

<b>Table 17: Other than farm residences, what types of housing would be appropriate in rural areas? (Question 5)</b>			
<b>Development Type</b>	<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
Single-Family (2+ Acres)	60.2%	13.0%	26.3%
Single-Family (Less than 2 Acres)	50.4%	15.9%	24.1%
Duplexes	21.7%	28.1%	39.0%
Multi-Family Apartments	11.7%	21.0%	55.0%
Mobile Home Parks	11.0%	14.9%	37.1%
No New Non-Farm Housing	17.1%	27.9%	39.6%

It is important to mention that later responses in the survey, which will be discussed in greater detail, supported efforts to preserve farmland. There is some disagreement throughout the planning and agricultural communities as to whether or not residential development that is not related to farm operations conflicts with agricultural uses. Frequently residents not accustomed to the working landscape (manure on the roads, slow moving traffic, strong odors from animal operations, and operating late at night in the fields) find much of the farmer’s activities offensive, resulting in complaints about their farming neighbors. This is a long-standing issue that will continue in the future as non-farm residential growth continues in the rural area and is worth mentioning in the context of the survey results.

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

Survey respondents were asked to identify housing needs in their community. Respondents most frequently chose “moderately priced homes” as a need (Table 18). Other housing options including low income or subsidized housing, higher priced homes, multi-unit rental homes, and manufactured homes did not receive much support. However, the County will continue to need housing of these types, especially multi-family and low-income housing, as more immigrants continue to move into the community to take lower paying manufacturing jobs. Also, the County will be receiving nearly 250 Hmong refugees over the course of the next year. Housing for seniors was also recognized as need in the community, with 17.3% (170) respondents stating that they “strongly agree” that this was a need.

<b>Table 18: My city/village/township has a need for more : (Question 6)</b>			
<b>Housing Type</b>	<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
Moderately Priced Homes	61.5%	19.7%	11.0%
Low Income/Subsidized Housing	18.3%	23.2%	46.1%
Higher Priced Homes	15.2%	32.2%	40.0%
Multi-Unit Rental Housing	12.8%	24.5%	49.1%
Manufactured Homes	6.9%	17.4%	62.0%
Housing for Seniors	51.0%	25.4%	9.2%

Overall, survey respondents were satisfied with the quality of the housing in their communities as shown in the table below (Table 19).

<b>Table 19: The overall quality of housing in my city/village/township is good. (Question 7)</b>		
<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
76.5%	13.0%	5.5%

In light of the fact that Sheboygan County will continue to have a need for lower-income, subsidized housing in the near future, survey respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with government providing financial assistance for housing. More specifically, respondents were asked to indicate which level of government should provide financial assistance for housing. Respondents chose Federal and State government as the most appropriate for providing financial assistance for housing. Respondents did not strongly support County or Local government assuming the role of providing financial assistance for housing.

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

<b>Table 20: Government should provide financial assistance for lower income residents to maintain and improve their homes. Please rate your opinion for each of the following levels of government: (Question 8)</b>			
<b>Unit Of Government</b>	<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
Federal	39.8%	17.9%	33.8%
State	39.0%	21.0%	31.4%
County	24.9%	25.0%	39.9%
Local	24.6%	21.8%	43.1%

***Utilities and Community Facilities***

The major drive for conducting this survey is the County’s requirement to comply with Section 66.1001 of the Wisconsin State Statutes. These statutes require the County to complete a comprehensive plan, also sometimes called a “Smart Growth” plan. One of the goals of the statute and the comprehensive planning process is to encourage growth in areas that already have adequate infrastructure and services to support the growth. To gauge how County residents’ opinions about where growth should go, respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with a variety of growth scenarios.

Respondents agreed most strongly with placing growth in communities where sewer and water are available (Table 21). Respondents did not strongly support growth in areas where sewer and water were not available.

<b>Table 21: New homes and businesses should be encouraged: (Question 9)</b>			
<b>Growth Area</b>	<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
Primarily Where Sewer and Water are Available	71.1%	10.0%	6.4%
Next to Communities where Sewer and Water Could be Extended	58.7%	17.2%	13.4%
Anywhere, With or Without Sewer or Water	22.2%	25.3%	22.6%

Sixty percent of respondents stated that they “strongly agree” or “agree” that boundaries should be established for future municipal water and sewer services (Table 22). Sixty five percent stated that these boundaries should be somewhat flexible, allowing for some development outside of the boundary (Table 23). Seventeen percent stated that the boundaries should be very inflexible, essentially stopping development outside of the boundary.

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

<b>Table 22: Future boundaries should be established for municipal water and sanitary sewer systems. (Question 10)</b>		
<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
60.1%	19.0%	11.5%

<b>Table 23: The boundaries described above should be: (Question 11)</b>	
Boundaries	Response Rate
Very Inflexible	16.6%
Somewhat Flexible	65.2%
Very Flexible	10.0%
No Answer	8.2%

The City of Sheboygan, City of Sheboygan Falls, Village of Kohler, Town of Wilson and Town of Sheboygan are required to comply with Phase I of the Clean Water Act Amendments of 1987. Sheboygan County, Town of Mosel, Town of Sheboygan Falls, Town of Lima, and Village of Howards Grove are required to comply with Phase II of these amendments. The amendments regulate stormwater discharge to waterways and set specific requirements for reduction of pollutants in these discharges. To gauge resident’s understanding of stormwater issues and the related infrastructure requirements, the survey included specific questions about stormwater issues.

Twenty percent of respondents stated that they “agree” that stormwater is a problem in their community, where twenty-five percent of respondents disagree (Table 24). Nearly an equal number of respondents remained neutral on the issue.

<b>Table 24: Stormwater runoff is a problem in my community. (Question 12)</b>			
	<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
Runoff Is a Problem	30.0%	22.6%	34.5%

To address stormwater quantity issues, respondents were most likely to favor detention/retention basins and conservation design measures (Table 25). Ditching or channelization were also frequently chosen as an option for stormwater quantity mitigation. However, this method of

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

stormwater management is no longer a widely accepted best management practice as it has been found to increase downstream flooding and stream “flashiness”. Impact fees were not highly favored to help pay for stormwater mitigation.

<b>Table 25: Stormwater runoff problems (quantity) should be addressed with: (Question 13)</b>			
<b>Stormwater Management Practice (Quantity)</b>	<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
Impact Fees	15.1%	23.0%	38.8%
Detention/Retention Basins (dry)	40.7%	26.7%	11.7%
Conservation Design	56.8%	17.8%	7.4%
Ditching/Channelization	43.3%	23.4%	12.5%

In regard to stormwater quality issues, twenty seven percent of respondents stated that they “agree” that wet-detention ponds with standing water were a solution (Table 26). New State of Wisconsin stormwater rules will require wet-detention ponds for water quality improvement in many new developments, but are frequently controversial due to the issue of standing water as a health and safety concern. However, wet detention basins are frequently designed to eliminate issues related to mosquito spawning through increased depth and safety issues can be mitigated with design measures such as a safety shelf or fencing.

Conservation design measures that promote infiltration of stormwater where possible was the most highly favored. Polymer, or chemical treatment, which is an emerging technology for improving stormwater quality was not highly favored. Again, ditching and channelization was chosen as an option for stormwater quality improvement.

<b>Table 26: Stormwater runoff problems (quality/nonpoint pollution) should be addressed with: (Question 14)</b>			
<b>Stormwater Management practice (quality)</b>	<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
Impact Fees	18.5%	21.9%	32.2%
Detention/Retention Basins (wet)	33.3%	24.9%	17.0%
Conservation Design	57.0%	16.0%	5.9%
Polymer (chemical) Treatment	11.8%	25.3%	35.4%
Ditching/Channelization	40.2%	25.4%	11.7%

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
 Results Summary- Random Sample  
 November 15, 2004

Though it appears that respondents have a solid, basic understanding of stormwater issues, responses indicate that government will need to be more proactive in providing education on issues related to stormwater quantity and quality; Clean Water Act Amendments require public outreach and education as part of the permitting process.

As the nation and the state's energy needs continue to increase and traditional methods of generating energy continue to change, new methods of electricity generation will continue to be explored. Sheboygan County has been identified as an area that would be highly conducive to wind turbines for electricity generation. Respondents were asked to identify where wind turbines would be most appropriate if they were to be located in Sheboygan County (Table 27). Three areas received the most responses, nearly in an equal manner; off of the shore of Lake Michigan (which has been identified as a possibility), rural Sheboygan County, and in industrial parks.

<b>Table 27: If wind turbines were located in Sheboygan county they should be located (check one that you agree with): (Question 15)</b>	
<b>Wind turbine location</b>	<b>Responses</b>
Lake Michigan	25.7%
Kettle Moraine	8.9%
Rural County	27.3%
No Where	27.6%
No Answer	3.8%

In regard to the distance that people would prefer wind turbines to be located from residences, respondents stated that ¼ to ½ mile, ½ to 1 mile or 1 mile or more would be the most appropriate (Table 28). A distance of more than 5 miles was also chosen as an option 17% of the time. Approximately 6 percent of respondents said that wind turbines should not be located in Sheboygan County. Given the development pattern of Sheboygan County, there are very few places where a residence would be greater than 1 mile from a wind turbine, except off the shore of Lake Michigan.

<b>Table 28: If a wind turbine project would be located in Sheboygan County, how far from a residence should the nearest turbine be?</b>	
<b>Distance of wind turbine from a residence</b>	<b>Responses</b>
¼ to ½ mile	22.7%
½ to 1 mile	23.8%
1 mile or more	25.1%

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

<b>Table 28: If a wind turbine project would be located in Sheboygan County, how far from a residence should the nearest turbine be?</b>	
<b>Distance of wind turbine from a residence</b>	<b>Responses</b>
5 miles or more	17.6%
Anywhere is too close	5.7%
No Answer	5.1%

Survey respondents were asked to identify one recreational program or facility that their family would like to see provided somewhere in Sheboygan County. A full list of responses can be found at the end of this report. However, an overview of the response rates shows the general types of facilities and programs people would like in their community (Table 29).

<b>Table 29: One recreational program or facility that my family or I would like to see provided somewhere in Sheboygan County is: (Question 17)</b>	
<b>Program or Facility</b>	<b>Responses*</b>
Indoor Recreation	9.6%
Golf Course	4.6%
Parks with Pet Access	4.3%
Parks	4.1%
Winter Activities	3.0%
Field/Court	2.0%
Shooting Range	1.8%
Skateboard Facilities	0.9%
Other Activities	0.9%
Natural Areas	2.8%
Zoo	2.2%
Camping	1.7%
Hunting	0.4%
Other (Passive Areas/Facilities)	0.7%
Non-Motorized Trails	15%
Motorized Trails	5.7%
Pool/Water Park	14.4%
Beaches	0.9%
Fishing	0.9%

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

<b>Table 29: One recreational program or facility that my family or I would like to see provided somewhere in Sheboygan County is: (Question 17)</b>	
<b>Program or Facility</b>	<b>Responses*</b>
Boating	0.4%
Other Water Based Activities	0.9%
Casino	2.8%
Theatre	2.6%
Community Center	1.3%
Access/Improvements	0.9%
Restaurants/Retail	0.7%
Youth Activities/Facilities	0.7%
All Other Responses	2.8%
Already have Adequate Facilities	5.2%
No Additional Programs or Facilities	6.1%

\*Percent of total responses on this question (n=460, does not include “do not know” response).

***Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources***

The survey asked respondents specific questions about preserving farmland in Sheboygan County. The respondents overwhelmingly stated that they would like to see productive farmland preserved. Only 16.8% of respondents stated that they “disagree” that farmland should be preserved at all costs. Nearly 72% of respondents stated that they “strongly agreed” or “agreed” with protecting productive farmland, but allowing growth in areas not suitable for agricultural use. The difficult issue related to this question is how to identify areas that are not suitable for agricultural use.

Respondents agreed to some level to the “purchase of development rights” or PDR as a method of preserving farmland. This approach to farmland preservation pays farmers the difference between the agricultural value and the market value of their land in return for the sale of their right to develop their land for purposes other than agriculture. These programs are frequently funded through taxes or private efforts such as land conservancy groups.

<b>Table 30: Local government should address the issue of development in productive agricultural regions by: (rate each) (Question 18)</b>			
<b>Preserve farmland</b>	<b>Agree or strongly agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree or strongly disagree</b>
At All Costs	49.8%	21.5%	21.0%
Protect Productive, Allow Development in	71.6%	11.6%	9.6%

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

Non-Ag. Areas			
Purchase of Development Rights	31.0%	29.5%	26.1%
No Protection	12.2%	14.8%	62.5%

Sixty percent of respondents supported protecting the agricultural economy of the County by directing growth into areas near existing developed areas (Table 31).

<b>Table 31: The agricultural economy of Sheboygan county should be protected by having growth directed into and around existing developed areas. (Question 19)</b>			
	<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
Growth in existing areas	60.3%	19.3%	8.0%

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement to the idea that government should identify and protect natural resources (Table 32). Respondents overwhelmingly supported the idea of government protecting woodlands, wetlands and floodplains, open spaces, lakes, rivers, and streams, endangered species, parkland, and historic and cultural sites.

<b>Table 32: My city/village/township should make an effort to identify and protect the following: (Question 20)</b>			
<b>Resource</b>	<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
Woodlands	77.4%	11.1%	3.7%
Wetlands & Floodplains	72.5%	13.4%	7.1%
Open Space	58.5%	25.1%	8.0%
Lakes, Rivers, Streams	86.3%	5.4%	2.0%
Endangered Species Habitat	62.9%	20.2%	8.9%
Parkland	76.9%	12.4%	3.8%
Historic and Cultural Sites	73.7%	15.9%	3.8%

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement to sources that could represent a threat to groundwater contamination (Table 33). Generally, respondents seem to have a clear understanding of sources of groundwater pollution.

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

<b>Table 33: The following represent a threat to the quality of Sheboygan county's groundwater: (rate each one) (Question 21)</b>			
<b>Pollution Source</b>	<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
Residential Runoff	51.4%	23.3%	13.7%
Construction Runoff	51.4%	23.3%	13.7%
Agriculture Pesticides & Fertilizers	49.5%	26.5%	13.3%
Manure and Liquid Waste Land Application	69.8%	14.9%	4.9%
Commercial/Industrial Stormwater	65.3%	15.2%	7.9%
Failing Septic Systems	61.0%	18.1%	7.3%
Sewage Holding Tanks Land Spreading	48.8%	24.1%	11.0%
Improperly Abandoned Wells	43.5%	28.7%	11.4%
Industrial Waste Land Spreading	66.4%	14.9%	5.8%
Municipal Waste and Sludge Land Spreading	58.7%	20.0%	8.2%

Slightly lower responses to sources such as residential runoff, construction site runoff, agricultural and pesticide runoff, and land spreading indicate a need for further education on this issue. However, the overall responses indicate that people have a good, general understanding of potential sources of groundwater contamination.

Respondents seemed to feel strongly that government should be proactive in protecting groundwater and drinking water quality and quantity (Table 34).

<b>Table 34: Local government should be involved with the protection of groundwater quality and drinking water supplies in the following ways: (Question 22)</b>			
<b>Government Involvement With Groundwater Protection</b>	<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
Land Use Regulation	76.9%	10.1%	5.8%
Provide Information Only	21.8%	22.7%	40.9%

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

<b>Table 34: Local government should be involved with the protection of groundwater quality and drinking water supplies in the following ways: (Question 22)</b>			
<b>Government Involvement With Groundwater Protection</b>	<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
No Involvement	6.5%	15.4%	62.4%

Recent beach closings along Lake Michigan and the dumping of untreated sewage by the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District have brought the quality of Lake Michigan water to the forefront. The survey asked respondents to rate their level of agreement to sources of pollution to Lake Michigan (Table 35). Overall, respondents had a good understanding of threats to the quality of Lake Michigan and its coastal resources Storm Sewer Discharge, 61.3%

<b>Table 35: The following represent a threat to the quality of lake michigan and the coastal features adjacent to the lake: (Question 23)</b>			
<b>Threat To Lake Michigan</b>	<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
Storm Sewer Discharge	61.3%	10.1%	5.8%
Residential Runoff	52.7%	21.9%	12.4%
Coastal Bluff Erosion	50.1%	21.5%	13.5%
Coastal Dune Alteration	48.1%	24.8%	10.4%
Development in the "Coastal Corridor"	40.0%	37.2%	29.1%
Development in the Sheboygan River Basin	23.7%	37.2%	29.1%
Invasive/Exotic Species	59.7%	17.5%	5.4%

Respondents also had a good understanding of threats to the quality of surface waters in the County (Table 36).

<b>Table 36: I have concerns about the following as they affect surface water quality in the County and Lake Michigan: (Question 24)</b>			
<b>Pollutant Source</b>	<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
Draining/Filling Wetlands	62.1%	24.8%	10.4%

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

<b>Table 36: I have concerns about the following as they affect surface water quality in the County and Lake Michigan: (Question 24)</b>			
<b>Pollutant Source</b>	<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
Construction Erosion	45.4%	26.5%	13.7%
Failing Septic Systems	64.8%	14.9%	5.6%
Increased Runoff/Flash Flooding	51.1%	26.2%	7.8%
Road Salts	57.2%	20.6%	8.4%
Automobile Runoff	52.9%	23.1%	9.4%
Pet Wastes	29.6%	32.6%	23.9%
Dumping Down Storm Sewers	70.1%	12.5%	4.2%
Farming too Close to Streams	54.6%	21.1%	9.9%
Land Application of Septic/Sewage Sludge	50.5%	22.9%	9.5%
Manure Runoff	51.7%	21.6%	12.8%
Over Application of Fertilizer/Manure	62.2%	16.5%	7.6%

Respondents were most likely to state that land along river and stream corridors should remain in its natural state; recreational uses received the next highest frequency of response (Table 37). Residential, commercial, and agricultural uses were not entirely opposed to, but did not receive the same level of agreement as leaving it natural and recreational uses did.

<b>Table 37: The best use of land along the river and stream corridors within rural areas of the county should be: (Question 25)</b>			
<b>Best Use Of Land Along River Corridors</b>	<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
Residential	23.0%	21.6%	14.6%
Agriculture	23.2%	27.7%	35.2%
Recreation	63.3%	14.8%	9.5%
Commercial	6.1%	15.2%	64.6%
Leave it in its Natural State	71.3%	14.0%	5.4%

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
 Results Summary- Random Sample  
 November 15, 2004

**Commerce and Employment**

Respondents agreed that retail development, service development such as hotels, beauty salons, and health clubs, office development, and industrial development would be good for Sheboygan County (Table 38).

<b>Table 38: What types of new development do you believe would be good for Sheboygan county to attract? (rate each one) (Question 26)</b>			
<b>Types Of Development</b>	<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
Retail	56.3%	20.7%	14.6%
Service	47.8%	27.1%	15.9%
Office	44.0%	27.0%	20.0%
Industrial	71.1%	13.6%	9.5%

Seventy percent of respondents either “strongly agree” or “agree” that Sheboygan County should be actively involved with economic development (Table 39). It is not clear whether or not respondents agree that Sheboygan County government should be the lead entity, or if respondents mean “Sheboygan County” in general terms as a community should be the lead entity.

<b>Table 39: Sheboygan county should be actively involved in economic development. (Question 27)</b>		
<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
71.1%	13.6%	9.5%

Respondents do not strongly believe that there are enough jobs in Sheboygan County (Table 40). Fifty two percent of respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that tax dollars should be used to attract or develop new jobs in the County. Twenty percent (19.5%) disagreed that tax dollars should be used for job growth (Table 41).

<b>Table 40: There are enough job opportunities in Sheboygan county to make a living. (Question 28)</b>		
<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
20.3%	16.2%	53.4%

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

<b>Table 41: Tax dollars should be used to attract or develop new jobs in the county. (Question 29)</b>		
<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
51.6%	20.6%	19.5%

**Transportation**

In regard to transportation, respondents seemed to have mixed feelings about the overall quality of transportation in their community (Table 42). Respondents tended to be less satisfied with the condition of local roads than with county or state roads. However, overall satisfaction with road conditions appears to be good. In regard to the condition of roads, respondents provided the following input:

<b>Table 42: Local roads in my city/village/township are in good condition. (Question 30-32)</b>		
<b>Type</b>	<b>Strongly Agree/Agree</b>	<b>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</b>
Local Roads	54.1%	27.8%
County Roads	64.9%	14.3%
State Roads	66.1%	10.2%

In general, respondents seemed to favor a government role in providing more bicycle and pedestrian routes. However, opinions on additional routes is somewhat split (Table 43).

<b>Table 43: Government needs to provide: (Questions 33-34)</b>			
<b>Type</b>	<b>Strongly Agree/Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</b>
More Bicycle Routes	45.1%	28.6%	28.4%
More Pedestrian Routes	36.4%	30.7%	26.2%
Connections to Regional Trail Systems	45.1%	25.4%	22.2%

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
 Results Summary- Random Sample  
 November 15, 2004

Overall, respondents were satisfied with transportation related services, responding that they were “excellent”, “good”, “neutral”, “poor”, “very poor” or “don’t know” in regard to the following services (Table 44):

<b>Table 44: State of Wisconsin highways are in good condition (Question 35)</b>		
<b>Type</b>	<b>Excellent/Good</b>	<b>Poor/Very Poor</b>
Road Maintenance	54%	13.6%
Snow Plowing	65.6%	9.8%
Bus/Taxi/Etc.	22.2%	18.4%
Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities	39.6%	8.54%
Transportation for Seniors	27.2%	13.8%
Airport Facilities	32.9%	11.4%

***Issues and Opportunities***

Overall, respondents appear to be satisfied with the quality of life in Sheboygan County. Respondents rated air quality, drinking water, public safety, housing, recreation, “excellent” or “good”, at a rate of 50% or higher. Employment, surface water quality, transportation and cultural resources did not score as high (Table 45).

<b>Table 45: How would you rate the following “quality of life” issues in your community? (Question 36)</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Excellent Or Good</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Poor Or Very Poor</b>
Air Quality	65.2%	24.9%	5.5%
Drinking Water	70.8%	20.6%	2.2%
Surface Water Quality	46.7%	35.2%	5.7%
Public Safety	67.6%	24.4%	2.2%
Employment	30.5%	39.3%	23.3%
Housing	55.3%	34.4%	3.9%
Recreation	56.8%	30.3%	6.5%
Transportation	36.1%	43.4%	10.1%
Cultural Resources	40.3%	36.7%	10.2%

Survey respondents seemed generally satisfied with government services (Table 46). Museums/Historical sites, Agricultural UW-Extension services, Parks & Recreation, Law Enforcement, Fire Protection, Snow Plowing, Road Maintenance, Garbage Collection,

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

Ambulance, Library, and Schools received an “excellent” or “good” rating at least 50% of the time. Planning & Zoning services, Youth Activities, Senior Services and Activities, Social Services, Nursing Home Services, Sanitary Sewer, Municipal Sewer, Recycling received an “excellent” or “good” rating at least 30% of the time. Natural Resources Protection scored the lowest with “excellent” or “good” ratings only 8% of the time.

<b>Table 46: How would you rate each of the following services? (Question 37)</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Excellent Or Good</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Poor Or Very Poor</b>
Museum/Historical Sites	61.3%	23.5%	3.4%
Agricultural UW-Extension Services	55.4%	20.6%	1.6%
Planning & Zoning	29.0%	41.3%	11.1%
Natural Resources Protection	8.2%	38.3%	8.8%
Parks/Recreation	62.8%	26.1%	4.2%
Fire Protection	75.4%	16.4%	1.1%
Law Enforcement	71.1%	19.9%	3.4%
Snow Plowing	64.9%	21.1%	9.6%
Road Maintenance	50.6%	28.8%	15.2%
Youth Activities	31.6%	35.4%	6.1%
Senior Services/Activities	32.2%	31.9%	7.5%
Social Services	32.3%	34.3%	8.7%
Nursing Home Services	38.2%	30.9%	7.8%
Sanitary Sewer	44.1%	33.9%	3.5%
Municipal Sewer	49.4%	29.1%	3.5%
Stormwater Sewer	34.7%	37.1%	6.1%
Garbage Collection	62.6%	21.0%	5.0%
Ambulance	58.4%	23.2%	2.7%
Recycling	46.6%	29.7%	15.7%
Library	70.5%	19.0%	3.4%
Schools	70.1%	18.2%	3.2%

All units of government will continue to struggle with budget issues and look for ways to cut costs. Survey respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with cutting various services currently available (Table 47). In general, respondents were most likely to support general safety types of services such as fire, ambulance, and police protection, where they did not support other types of services as strongly. More than 50% of respondents stated that they “strongly disagreed” or “disagreed” that Fire Protection, Law Enforcement, Ambulance, and Schools should be sacrificed to balance a budget.

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

**Table 47: What services would you be willing to sacrifice to keep government spending down?  
(Question 38)**

Service	Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree*
Museum/Historical Sites	47.8%	26.5%	14.2%
Agricultural UW-Extension Services	35.6%	30.5%	20.1%
Planning & Zoning	33.0%	32.1%	20.4%
Natural Resources Protection	23.9%	25.8%	37.2%
Parks/Recreation	25.6%	27.1%	35.0%
Fire Protection	10.6%	14.5%	62.6%
Law Enforcement	11.1%	15.8%	61.3%
Snow Plowing	16.3%	24.2%	47.8%
Road Maintenance	14.1%	25.9%	47.7%
Youth Activities	24.1%	31.8%	31.0%
Senior Services/Activities	27.1%	32.7%	26.3%
Social Services	25.7%	32.8%	26.9%
Nursing Home Services	18.4%	28.8%	38.4%
Sanitary Sewer	10.7%	29.3%	44.5%
Municipal Sewer	10.5%	27.6%	46.2%
Stormwater Sewer	15.2%	32.3%	35.6%
Garbage Collection	17.3%	25.7%	44.4%
Ambulance	10.8%	23.0%	53.6%
Recycling	25.1%	29.9%	33.4%
Library	25.3%	30.1%	32.8%
Schools	17.5%	19.2%	52.1%

\*For this question, respondents choosing “strongly disagree” or “disagree” are stating that they do not wish to see these services cut. However, after reviewing the response rates and comparing them to the previous question about the quality of these services, it is likely that respondents choosing the affirmative responses (“agree” or “strongly agree”) are saying that they do not wish to see these services cut.

Cutting government services that residents rely on can be very difficult. Before a service is cut, it might be appropriate to determine if there are areas of duplication between jurisdictions that could be consolidated or “shared”. Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with sharing services with another jurisdiction (Table 48). Not all of the services were listed because some of the services would not be able to be shared. Based on the responses, it appears that most respondents would be willing to share most services except for Fire Protection, Law Enforcement, Ambulance, and Sewer Services. However, the responses for sharing these

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

services still was at least 40% or greater. Overall, it appears that survey respondents are willing to share at least some services.

<b>Table 48: Which of the following services would you be willing to share with other units of government such as another town, city, village, or county? (Question 39)</b>			
<b>Service</b>	<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
Agricultural UW-Extension Services	72.6%	10.2%	2.8%
Planning & Zoning	61.1%	16.1%	8.6%
Natural Resources Protection	71.9%	11.2%	4.7%
Parks/Recreation	64.5%	14.0%	9.0%
Fire Protection	44.1%	14.3%	29.7%
Law Enforcement	48.7%	14.3%	25.5%
Snow Plowing	50.1%	18.3%	19.7%
Road Maintenance	57.0%	16.4%	14.6%
Youth Activities	55.3%	21.9%	9.6%
Senior Services/Activities	56.9%	20.7%	8.4%
Social Services	57.4%	19.8%	8.9%
Nursing Home Services	56.3%	18.8%	10.4%
Sanitary Sewer	44.0%	20.9%	18.5%
Municipal Sewer	43.6%	19.6%	20.8%
Stormwater Sewer	43.4%	22.4%	17.3%
Garbage Collection	53.7%	17.0%	15.5%
Ambulance	49.1%	15.5%	21.6%
Recycling	62.9%	15.8%	9.0%

Rather than share services, survey respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with privatizing services that the government is currently providing (Table 49). Over 51.9% of respondents “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with this statement. However, the frame of reference for the responses is unclear. For example, the private sector can collect garbage and recycling. Property taxes may go down, however, the homeowner would bear the entire cost by paying the private garbage hauler. It is not clear what types of services respondents would be willing to privatize.

<p><b>Table 49: Government should not provide services that the private sector can provide. (Question 40)</b></p>
---

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
51.5%	17.0%	19.9%

Currently, Sheboygan County owns and operates two nursing home facilities, Rocky Knoll and Sunny Ridge. State and federal financial assistance associated with operating the County nursing homes has decreased and will likely to continue to do so in the future. The net result of this reduction in state and federal assistance will be an increase in local dollars (property taxes, sales tax) to cover the costs of operation.

Survey respondents were asked whether or not they would be in favor of continuing operations at Sunny Ridge and Rocky Knoll in light of the fact that taxes will likely need to go up to cover operations in the future (Table 50).

<b>Table 50: Sheboygan county should continue to provide nursing home services even if doing so increases property taxes. (Question 41)</b>			
Issue	Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
Sunny Ridge	50.6%	16.0%	25.8%
Rocky Knoll	50.0%	16.7%	25.5%

Responses were nearly equal in regard to each of the facilities, with a difference in response rates less than 1%. One-half of respondents were in favor of continuing services at both facilities, where one-quarter of respondents were not in favor of continuing services. Sixteen percent of respondents were neutral on the issue. The remaining respondents (9%) either did not know or did not answer the question.

To get a feel for respondent’s overall satisfaction with government services, the survey asks respondents to rate their level of agreement with the reasonableness of taxes in regard to the services that are received for these taxes at each level of government (Table 51). It appears that respondents were more satisfied with their local units of government in terms of taxes and services than higher levels of government such as Federal and State government.

<b>Table 51: Please rate the following statement as it applies to the following unit of government: “overall, the services provided and the related taxes are reasonable”. (Question 42)</b>			
Issue	Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
Town/Village/City Government	47.0%	19.3%	25.0%

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

<b>Table 51: Please rate the following statement as it applies to the following unit of government: “overall, the services provided and the related taxes are reasonable”. (Question 42)</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
County Government	41.5%	25.4%	25.0%
State of Wisconsin Government	25.1%	20.5%	46.2%
Federal Government	21.2%	21.2%	49.0%
Schools	38.3%	21.2%	31.5%

Given that costs to government to continue to provide services continues to increase and Sheboygan County government has routinely made cuts, including some cuts to services, respondents were asked their level of agreement to two statements regarding a County sales tax of 0.5% or \$0.05 per \$1.00.

Respondents were asked their level of agreement with a 0.5% County sales tax that could generate an additional \$6.2 million in revenue annually (Table 52). Responses in favor of a sales tax and responses not in favor of a sales tax were nearly equal, with each receiving approximately 40% of the responses.

<b>Table 52: Sheboygan county should implement a 0.5% county sales tax to provide general property tax relief. (Question 43)</b>		
<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
42.5%	12.5%	39.6%

If respondents were not in favor of a sales tax in general, they were asked to rate their level of agreement with using a portion of the sales tax (\$4.9 million) generated by purchases by Sheboygan County residents specifically for property tax relief and the remaining portion (\$1.3 million) generated by out-of-county tourists specifically for tourism-related items such as road maintenance and other infrastructure related items (Table 53). Of those that responded, thirty percent still stated that they did not support a County sales tax.

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

<b>Table 53: If you disagree with the previous statement, would you support enacting 0.5% sales tax that uses the \$4.9 million generated by county residents for direct property tax relief, with the remaining \$1.3 million to be used specifically for tourism related programs and activities such as road maintenance and other infrastructure items? (Question 44)</b>		
<b>Agree Or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Or Strongly Disagree</b>
18.5%	12.2%	30.2%

Respondents were asked their preference for growth in the rural portions of Sheboygan County over the next 15-20 years (Table 54). Consistent with the vision for Sheboygan County described in the “Trends and Land Use” section of the survey, respondents do not wish to see a lot of growth and development in the rural portions of the County over this time period.

<b>Table 54: My preference for development in rural Sheboygan county by the year 2020 is: (check one) (Question 45)</b>	
<b>Answer</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Limited Growth	38.4%
Moderate Growth	37.2%
Unrestricted Growth	5.5%
Maintain Current Growth Level	12.8%
No Answer	6.0%

Respondents were asked their preference for growth in the urban portions of Sheboygan County over the next 15-20 years (Table 55). Respondents seem to understand the necessity of redevelopment, especially in highly urbanized areas, but would also like to see some outward expansion from the existing urban area. It does not appear that respondents would like to see only redevelopment in terms of growth in the County. Highway corridors were identified second for appropriate for development and growth, with nearly 14% of respondents choosing this type of growth.

<b>Table 55: My preference for development in urban Sheboygan county by the year 2020 is: (check one) (Question 46)</b>	
<b>Answer</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Redevelopment	15.9%

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

Some Outward Expansion, Focus on Redevelopment	55.2%
Unrestricted Growth	8.1%
Managed Growth in Highway Corridors	13.6%
No Answer	7.2%

To gain a better understanding of what residents think government’s role should be in regard to a number of issues, the survey asked respondents to choose whether or not certain activities and/or land uses should be encouraged or discouraged (Table 56). Except for the issue of vacation homes (24.9% of respondents stating that government should discourage them), most of the issues were identified to be “encouraged” or “do nothing”. Few of the issues were preferred to be “discouraged”.

<b>Table 56: As Sheboygan county and local government plan for future development, should they discourage, encourage, or remain neutral regarding each of the following: (Question 47)</b>			
Issue	Encourage	Remain Neutral	Discourage
Environmental Preservation	65.2%	23.8%	1.8%
Hunting/Fishing Opportunities	51.1%	37.1%	3.0%
Recreation Opportunities	62.4%	27.1%	1.4%
Industrial Development	58.2%	25.8%	7.1%
Residential Development	35.1%	46.1%	10.1%
Retail Development	39.9%	41.1%	10.1%
Tourism Facilities	49.5%	34.6%	6.4%
Vacation homes	18.8%	45.6%	24.9%

Respondents were asked, “What single improvement would be beneficial to the future of Sheboygan County?” Table 57 is a summary of these responses. A full list of responses can be found at the end of this report. However, an overview of the response rates shows the general types of facilities and programs people would like in their community (Table 29).

<b>Table 57: What single improvement would be beneficial to the future of Sheboygan County? (Question 48)</b>	
Improvement	Responses*
Housing	2.1%
Transportation-Improvements	5.4%
Transportation-Maintenance	2.1%

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
Results Summary- Random Sample  
November 15, 2004

<b>Table 57: What single improvement would be beneficial to the future of Sheboygan County? (Question 48)</b>	
<b>Improvement</b>	<b>Responses*</b>
Transportation- Options	1.1%
Recreation	4.3%
Schools	1.9%
Law Enforcement	1.8%
Health and Human Services	1.3%
Utilities and Services	2.4%
Other Services (Utilities and Community Facilities)	0.3%
Agricultural Resources	1.6%
Cultural Resources	0.3%
Natural Resources	5.7%
Economic Development	32.2%
Industry/Manufacturing	7.8%
Tourism	4.0%
Retail/Restaurants	3.7%
General Comments Regarding Economic Development	2.1%
Casino	1.4%
Economy Related Comments	0.6%
Cooperation/Organization Between Governments	8.1%
Government Services	3.2%
Intergovernmental Cooperation-Law Enforcement/Regulation	1.0%
Budget	0.6%
Land Use	13.1%
Quality of Life	2.4%
Taxes	8.3%
Other Comments Related to Intergovernmental Cooperation	4.0%

\*Percent of total responses on this question (n=627).

Respondents were asked to share the best part of living in their community. Table 58 is a summary of these responses. A full list of responses can be found at the end of this report.

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey  
 Results Summary- Random Sample  
 November 15, 2004

<b>Table 58: Please share with us the best part of living in your city/village/township. (Question 49)</b>	
<b>Improvement</b>	<b>Responses*</b>
Rural/Low Density	13.6%
Small Town	4.6%
Safety	12.3%
Quiet	10.4%
Community Character/People	8.1%
Neighborhood/Community	5.8%
Family	2.3%
Cleanliness	6.1%
Location	6.2%
Jobs and Economy	1.2%
Housing	0.7%
Recreational Opportunities	4.9%
Scenic/Aesthetics	6.5%
Services/Local Government	8.1%
Taxes	1.9%
Quality of Life	3.5%
Other	3.9%

\*Percent of total responses on this question (n=692).