

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
August 4, 2009

Public Input-Survey

On September 11, 2008 the Sheboygan County Planning & Resources Department, in conjunction with, the Sheboygan County UW-Extension sent out a comprehensive planning survey to 5,500 randomly selected households. Those receiving a survey were given until September 29, 2008 to return their completed survey to UW-Extension. The County paid for return postage. Surveys that were received by October 20th were accepted; those received after were not. Sheboygan County sent out a similar survey in 2004. Many of the questions on this survey remained the same, so the County is able to gather trend data on these issues.

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. Data collected through this process will be analyzed and shared with each community in the County.

Method

Five thousand (5,500) surveys were sent to randomly selected households, whose addresses were chosen by a consulting firm named, "The Complete Package." The UW-Extension staff stuffed and labeled all envelopes. Addresses were randomly selected from each zip code within the County. At least one survey was sent to every zip code in the County. With the survey recipients being randomly selected, this means that every person in the County is just as likely as another to have received the survey.

University of Wisconsin-Extension staff entered the survey responses into a Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet that was developed by County Planning & Resources staff. The spreadsheet allowed the users to select an answer from a drop down list of answers 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 tabulated. Two UW-Extension employees completed the initial data entry. To allow the data to be tabulated and analyzed in a meaningful way, the two spreadsheets were merged.

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*. Advertisements were also purchased in the *Sun* and the *Review Xtra Section*.

Analysis

Respondents

Of the 5,500 surveys that were sent, 256 were undeliverable. This means the number we started with was 5,244. Out of these surveys, 1062 surveys were returned resulting in a 20.3% response rate. The confidence level of the sample is 99%, with a confidence interval of +/-2%. 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 70% of the responses (Table 1).

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Table 1: Length Of Residency (Question 64)		
	%	Number
Less than 1 Year	0.6	6
1-5 Years	4.7	50
6-10 Years	7.9	84
11-20 Years	13.7	145
Over 20 Years	70.1	744
No Answer	3.1	33
Total	100	1062

The response rate from individual communities in the survey varied from the municipalities percent of County population from the 2000 Census (Table 2). The two largest variations are the City of Sheboygan and the Village of Kohler. The City of Sheboygan’s population made up 45.1% of the County’s total population. However, the response rate for City of Sheboygan residents was only 12.5% 2. There are a number of factors that could have contributed to the response rate, some of which may include owner-occupancy, less sent to the City of begin with, 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” (2.1%) 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 a great deal lower that its relative population.

The other community where the percent of responses differed greatly is the Village of Kohler. Kohler made up less than 2% of the County’s population in 2000, but over 6% of the respondents were from the Village. The reason for this high response rate may be the Village received more surveys than its proportion of the population and socio-economic factors may play a role. The Village of Kohler has the highest median household income in the County, and those type of factors increase response rates. Surveys were sent to residents on a random basis, this means one person in the County would be just as likely as another to receive the survey.

Table 2: Place of Residence (Question 65a)			
Community	Responses	Percent Of Responses	Percent Of County Population (2000 Us Census)
City of Plymouth	41	3.9%	6.9%
City of Sheboygan	133	12.5%	45.1%
City of Sheboygan Falls	59	5.6%	6%

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Table 2: Place of Residence (Question 65a)			
Community	Responses	Percent Of Responses	Percent Of County Population (2000 Us Census)
Adell	14	1.3%	0.5%
Cascade	14	1.3%	0.6%
Cedar Grove	36	3.4%	1.7%
Elkhart Lake	27	2.5%	0.9%
Glenbeulah	22	2.1%	0.3%
Howards Grove	8	0.8%	2.5%
Kohler	64	6.0%	1.7%
Oostburg	36	3.4%	2.4%
Random Lake	45	4.2%	1.4%
Waldo	25	2.4%	0.4%
Greenbush	54	5.1%	2.5%
Herman	16	1.5%	1.8%
Holland	46	4.3%	2.1%
Lima	55	5.2%	2.6%
Lyndon	47	4.4%	1.3%
Mitchell	29	2.7%	1%
Mosel	1	0.1%	0.7%
Plymouth	21	2.0%	2.8%
Rhine	40	3.8%	2%
Russell	6	0.6%	0.4%
Scott	40	3.8%	1.6%
Sheboygan (Town)	29	2.7%	5.2%
Sheboygan Falls (Town)	9	0.8%	1.5%
Sherman	29	2.7%	1.3%
Wilson	18	1.7%	2.9%
No Answer	45	4.2%	
City	22	2.1%	NA
Village	4	0.4%	NA
Town	17	1.6%	NA
Other	10	0.9%	NA
Total	1062	100	100.1

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Though all residents' responses are important, a picture of whether or not the respondents owned their homes or rented their homes was desired (Table 3). Respondents most frequently stated that they owned their residence (88.8 %) versus rented their residence (7.1%). Home-ownership rates of survey respondents was quite different from that of the general population of the County. According to the 2000 US Census, 67.7% of the County's population owned their home versus 27.1% renting. The number of renters was underrepresented, which is not unusual because of the transient nature of renting.

Table 3: Do you currently rent or own your residence? (Question 66)		
Residence	Number Of Responses	Percent Of Responses
Own	943	88.8%
Rent	75	7.1%
No Answer	44	4.1%

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 4). 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 Holland, but used a Cedar Grove address they might have written "Town of Holland" as a response to this question. From our responses it can be noted that there were people who responded to the survey that are not county residents, but are county property owners.

Table 4: Own Land In The County, Live Outside Of The County (Question 65b)	
Community	Responses
City of Sheboygan	1
City of Sheboygan Falls	1
Greenbush	1
Holland	5
Lima	2
Plymouth	1
Sherman	1
Cedar Grove	2
Howards Grove	1
Oostburg	1
City	2
Total	18

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Most of the respondents were men (Table 5) and were between the ages of 45-64 (Table 6). In the 2000 Census, 47% of the population was male and 53% was female; this means that the survey respondent's gender was not proportional to that of their actual population in the County. According to the 2000 US Census, 33.4% of the population is between the ages of 35 and 65 in Sheboygan County. Greater than 33 percent of the respondents to the survey were in this age range. The reason for the higher response rate of this age range may be socio-economic factors, as well as many people in this age range are homeowners and homeowners are less transient than renters. Many time people under 35 may be renting their residence, and many times renters are harder to reach with a survey.

Table 5: Gender (Question 67)		
	%	Number
Male	61.1	649
Female	35.1	373
No Answer	3.8	40
	100	1062

Table 6: Age (Question 68)			
	Survey		US Census
	Number	%	%
Under 18	0	0	29.2
18-24	5	0.5	6.3
25-34	65	6.1	16.6
35-44	129	12.1	14.9
45-54	250	23.5	9.9
55-64	253	23.8	8.6
65-74	209	19.7	7.9
75 and Older	117	11.0	6.7
No Answer	34	3.2	-
Total	1062	100	100.1

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

The majority of respondents were employed or retired (Table 7). Those that were working were most likely to be employed in the “manufacturing” or “services” fields (Table 8). Many of the survey respondents choose not to answer this question.

Table 7: Employment Status (Question 70)		
	%	Number
Employed	49.0	520
Unemployed	1.9	20
Self-Employed	7.9	84
Student	0.7	7
Retired	34.7	369
Do Not Work	2.6	28
No Answer	3.2	34
	100	1026

Table 8: Field of employment (Question 71)		
	%	Number
Agriculture	4.5	48
Wholesale Trade	1.0	11
Government	4.9	52
Retail Trade	4.9	52
Services	18.3	194
Manufacturing	23.0	244
Construction/Mining	4.8	51
Other	16.4	174
No Answer	22.2	236
Total	100	1062

Education attainment of survey respondents was somewhat consistent with data from the 2000 US population census for the county (Table 9). 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.

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Table 9: Education Attainment (Question 72)			
	Survey		US Census (2000)
	Number	%	%
Some High School	32	3.0	9.8
High School	416	39.2	39.9
Junior College	24	2.3	19.7
College	204	19.2	12.8
Post Graduate	146	13.7	5.1
Technical College	189	17.8	6.9
No Answer	51	4.8	-
Total	1062	100	100

The overall salary of survey respondents was slightly higher than the county population had reported in the 2000 US Census. For example there was only 7.7% of the population making over \$100,000 in 2000, but over 12% of survey respondents stated they made over \$100,000 (Table 10). The response rate for individuals earning under \$15,000 per year was significantly lower for survey respondents (4.4%) than the actual population earning this income in the County according to the 2000 US Census (10.1%). Over 10% of all survey respondents declined to answer this question.

Table 10: Annual Gross Income (Question 73)			
	Survey		US census (2000)
	Number	%	%
Under \$15,000	47	4.4	10.1
\$15,000-\$29,999	135	12.7	44.8%
\$30,000-\$49,999	257	24.2	
\$50,000-\$99,999	378	35.6	37.4
\$100,000 or More	130	12.2	7.7
No Answer	115	10.8	-
Total	1062	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, 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 that had attended junior college or only had some high school 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.

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

County Trends and Land Use

Growth in Sheboygan County over the ten years has been at a rate of approximately 6%, growing from a population of 110,462 in 1997 to 117,045 in 2007. County growth projections for the next 10 years (2010-2020) is projected to be about 6%. Survey respondents said they would prefer growth to be at the same rate or slower than projected, with 50.8% of respondents choosing this response, while an additional 27.2% of respondents would like growth to be slower than projected.

Table 11: What rate would you like to see growth occur? (Question 1)	
Growth Rate	Percent Of Responses
Faster than projected	7.3
Present projected rate of growth	50.8
Slower than projected	27.2
No Growth	6.6
Don't Know	5.1
No Answer	3.0

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, respondents were asked what their vision for the County's economy is for the next 20 years. They were asked to rank six different sectors (Table 12). Respondents ranked manufacturing and industry as what they would most like to see, followed by technology-based companies. Respondents would *least* like to see retail development in the next 20 years in Sheboygan County.

Table 12: What identity would you like Sheboygan county to have in 20 years? (1 being most like to see and 6 least likely to see) (Question 2)		
Economic Base	Average Score	Rank
Tourism	3.9	5
Manufacturing/Industrial	2.6	1
Retail	4.7	6
Business/Service	3.2	3
Technology-Based Companies	3.0	2
Agriculture	3.5	4

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

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

the skills they need for higher-paying jobs that do not specifically require a four-year or two-year degree. Respondents' vision for the future of the County showed that they would like more technology-based companies to move to the Sheboygan County area. This means efforts should also be made to recruit technology-based companies to the area

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 over 75% of the most favorable ratings (Table 13). Selections receiving the least support (lowest percentage with a strongly agree answer) were multi-family residential, large corporate farms, and large retail.

Table 13: The following types of growth should be encouraged within Sheboygan county: (Question 3)			
Type	Strongly Agree/Agree	Neutral	Disagree/Strongly Disagree
Single family residential	78.3%	13.9%	4.0%
Multi-family residential	30.6%	34.1%	30.0%
Rural residential	43.7%	28.2%	22.9%
Hobby farms	45.2%	34.3%	15.4%
Family farms	76.8%	16.1%	3.0%
Large corporate farms	22.8%	26.9%	43.2%
Small businesses	83.5%	10.7%	1.6%
Large retail	33.3%	31.8%	30.1%
Professional/Office	58.2%	29.2%	8.1%
Light industry	83.6%	11.0%	2.5%
Heavy industry	61.0%	22.0%	13.8%

The majority of respondents think the two main roles Sheboygan County Government should play in managing land use are coordinating city, town, village, and county units of government, with 56.1% of respondents agreeing with the statement, and regulating through existing codes and regulations (51.7% agreement), only 11.6% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement (Table 14). Respondents question if the County should be purchasing land development rights with nearly 40% of the respondents disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with the statement. Respondents see the County having a role in land use, but do not see its role as undertaking county-wide zoning, as 36.9% of respondents disagreed with the statement.

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Table 14: Sheboygan County Government should play a role in managing land use by: (Question 4)			
Growth Area	Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
Coordinating city, town, village, and county units of government	56.1%	17.3%	17.7%
Purchasing land development rights	19.6%	29.2%	39.7%
Undertake county-wide zoning	26.3%	27.9%	36.9%
Regulating through existing codes and regulations	51.7%	26.0%	11.6%
Tightening county zoning codes and regulations	27.4%	29.6%	36.1%
Loosening county zoning codes and regulations	20.2%	30.6%	38.1%
No role-let the market decide	24.2%	24.7%	38.9%

Housing

Housing plays a critical role in land-use planning for the future. Knowing the types of housing residents see as needed, is important so developers can create plans. Housing needs are different between the urban and rural areas of the County, so respondents were asked about both areas. 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.

There is a 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 15). Respondents agreed or 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.

Table 15: Ideal urban neighborhoods would include homes as well as: (Question 5)			
Development Type	Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
Apartments	51.2%	22.4%	20.8%
Shopping (groceries/services/etc.)	77.7%	13.3%	5.8%

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Table 15: Ideal urban neighborhoods would include homes as well as: (Question 5)			
Development Type	Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
Employment	76.2%	13.4%	7.1%
Schools	80.4%	11.8%	3.9%
Parks	82.9%	10.3%	2.7%
Alleys	19.8%	30.6%	40.9%
Sidewalks	62.3%	20.2%	12.8%

In rural areas, respondents seemed to favor residential development, of any lot size, or conservation subdivisions (Table 16). Other development such as duplexes, multi-family apartments, and mobile home parks did not receive many responses in the strongly agree category. Disagree or strongly disagree made up nearly 65% of all responses in regards to the appropriateness of multi-family apartments and mobile home parks in rural areas.

Table 16: Other than farm residences, what types of housing would be appropriate in rural areas? (Question 6)			
Development Type	Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
Single-Family (2+ Acres)	60.8%	14.3%	16.9%
Single-Family (Less than 2 Acres)	45.9%	16.8%	29.6%
Conservation Subdivisions	46.4%	21.3%	22.7%
Duplexes	20.1%	24.5%	46.3%
Multi-Family Apartments	8.9%	17.7%	64.9%
Mobile Home Parks	5.2%	14.4%	70.8%
No New Non-Farm Housing	19.0%	23.6%	46.0%

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 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.

Survey respondents were asked to identify housing needs in their community. Respondents most frequently agreed or strongly agreed that moderately priced homes and housing for seniors is needed in

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

their community (Table 17). 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. As the population continues to age, it is going to become even more vital to provide housing for seniors, or we will lose this population to other communities that provide the housing they may need or desire.

Table 17: My city/village/township has a need for more: (Question 7)			
Housing Type	Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
Moderately Priced Homes	59.0%	22.4%	10.6%
Low Income/Subsidized Housing	14.3%	18.8%	56.4%
Higher Priced Homes	14.0%	30.6%	45.5%
Multi-Unit Rental Housing	10.0%	22.7%	57.0%
Manufactured Homes	4.7%	16.4%	68.1%
Housing for Seniors	49.0%	28.5%	14.0%

Overall, survey respondents were satisfied with the quality of the housing in their communities as shown in the table below (Table 18).

Table 18: The overall quality of housing in my city/village/township is good. (Question 8)		
Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
77.9%	12.3%	5.4%

In light of the fact that Sheboygan County will continue to have a need for lower-income, subsidized housing, 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. There was no level of government that received a much larger proportion of responses than another. Respondents tended to choose federal and state governments as the most appropriate level of government to provide financial assistance for housing (Table 19), but in most cases all answers ranged from 20% to 30% in agreement and disagreement, with the final third being neutral.

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Table 19: Government provides financial assistance for lower income residents to maintain and improve their homes. Please rate your opinion for each of the following levels of government providing this service: (Question 9)			
Unit Of Government	Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
Federal	27.8%	23.5%	28.0%
State	29.9%	24.9%	24.6%
County	21.7%	26.7%	30.0%
Local	20.5%	25.5%	33.0%

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 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 20), or next to communities where sewer and water could be extended, than allowing growth to occur anywhere. Nearly 50% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with allowing growth anywhere in the County even without sewer and water services.

Table 20: New homes and businesses should be encouraged: (Question 10)			
Growth Area	Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
Primarily Where Sewer and Water are Available	73.3%	13.7%	6.7%
Next to Communities where Sewer and Water Could be Extended	58.2%	22.8%	12.5%
Anywhere, With or Without Sewer or Water	22.3%	21.1%	49.2%

Nearly 60% of respondents stated that they strongly agree or agree that boundaries should be established for future municipal water and sewer services (Table 21). Almost 68% of respondents stated that these boundaries should be somewhat flexible, allowing for some development outside of the boundary (Table 22). Sixteen percent stated that the boundaries should be very inflexible, essentially stopping development outside of the boundary.

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Table 21: Future boundaries should be established for municipal water and sanitary sewer systems. (Question 11)		
Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
58.4%	22.0%	11.2%

Table 22: The boundaries described above should be: (Question 12)	
Boundaries	Response Rate
Very Inflexible	16.1%
Somewhat Flexible	67.8%
Very Flexible	8.2%
No Answer	7.9%

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.

Nearly 25% of respondents stated that they agree or strongly agree that stormwater is a problem in their community, whereas 45% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement (Table 23). About 20% of respondents remained neutral on the issue. Although some respondents stated runoff is a problem, they may not understand how the problem can be resolved, mitigated, or avoided.

Table 23: Stormwater runoff is a problem in my community. (Question 13)			
	Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
Runoff Is a Problem	24.7%	18.9%	44.4%

Overwhelmingly respondents agreed that Sheboygan County should explore sustainable energy sources. Over four-fifths of all respondents want the County to explore these energy sources. Less than 5% of respondents do not think the County should explore sustainable energy sources. This will be important in the comprehensive planning process to encourage the use of renewable energies for homes as well as businesses.

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Table 24: Sheboygan County should explore sustainable energy sources. (Question 14)		
Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
82.0%%	8.1%	4.7%

Residents think Sheboygan County and local governments should encourage sustainable energy sources. Over 75% of respondents think solar and wind energy should be encouraged, while less than 5% of respondents say these sources of energy should be discouraged. The source of energy that respondents would least encourage is tidal/wave energy. As nonrenewable sources of energy become more expensive and scarce, there will be a greater need for sustainable energy sources. Even though biomass and hydroelectric energy received a smaller proportion of encourage as a response, they still have over 50% of respondents wanting to encourage them.

Table 25: Sheboygan County Government and local governments encourage, discourage, or remain neutral regarding each of the following sustainable energy sources: (Question 15)			
Sustainable Energy Source	Encourage	Neutral	Discourage
Solar Energy	77.5%	15.5%	2.1%
Wind Energy	75.4%	15.4%	4.7%
Tidal/Wave Energy	29.7%	31.5%	13.6%
Biomass Energy	50.8%	27.9%	10.2%
Hydroelectric Energy	51.6%	26.6%	7.3%

Nearly two-thirds of respondents think the County should maintain and improve the conditions and structures at the Sheboygan County Marsh Park. This is shown in Table 26. Under 7% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. The Sheboygan County Marsh Park is strongly supported by Sheboygan County residents.

Table 26: The County should maintain and improve existing conditions and structures at the Sheboygan County Marsh Park. (Question 16)		
Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
61.9%	22.0%	6.7%

Over 40% of respondents, agreed or strongly agreed that there needs to be further development of the cultural, educational, and recreational facilities the Sheboygan Marsh has to offer. Nearly a third of respondents remained neutral on the issue, and less than 15% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagree (Table 27).

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Table 27: Further development of the cultural, educational, and recreational facilities at the Sheboygan County Marsh Park is needed (Question 17)		
Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
40.4%	32.5%	14.3%

Nearly half of all respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the concept of an observation tower at the Sheboygan Marsh. About 28% of the respondents were neutral to the idea of the Sheboygan County Marsh Park and about 17% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the concept of the observation town at the Marsh Park (Table 28).

Table 28: The concept of an observation tower at the Sheboygan County Marsh Park would be an added benefit to the County (Question 18)		
Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
45.6%	27.6%	17.2%

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 in the random sample survey results discussed at the January SGIC meeting. However, a breakdown of the response into categories from the 2004 survey and the 2008 survey show the general types of facilities and programs people would like in their community (Table 29). The categories this question was grouped into is slightly different between the 2004 and 2008 surveys; this is why some categories are listed as Not Applicable (NA) because they were not used in one of the years. The responses from 2008 show that people would like to see more nonmotorized transportation facilities available in the County. In 2008, nearly 26% of respondents saw a need for this program and its facilities; this is compared to 15% of respondents in 2004. Other programs or facilities people would like to see are trails for all-terrain vehicles (ATVs), snowmobiles, and mopeds. This percentage increased to 8.8% in 2008 compared with only 5.7% in 2004.

The greatest change since 2004 is that nearly 15% of respondents wanted to see pools, swimming, and water park facilities in the County, this has now dropped to under 5%. The drop in percentage may be partially due to the Blue Harbor Resort with a conference center and waterpark, opening for business in June of 2004, after the surveys had been completed in early 2004.

In 2008, 3.8% of respondents stated there was a need for a park with dog access. Hopefully this need will be partially met as the Town of Wilson and City of Sheboygan work together to create a dog park in the Town of Wilson on the southern border of the City.

In 2004, the Marsh Park was only listed twice in all the responses, but in 2008, activities and programs relating to the Marsh Park were listed specifically in seven responses. Respondents mentioned fishing, boat tours, public hunting, the observation tower, and walkways into the Marsh in their survey responses. In addition to the recreational opportunities the Marsh provides, it also provides educational

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

opportunities. The Marsh Park currently offers an educational program, but according to the respondents of the 2008 survey, even more conservation education needs to be available. A few respondents (1.8%) feel there needs to be a nature conservation center, that offers classes on possible things like hunting, fishing, ATVing, and other conservation issues.

The percent of residents that would like to see more camping facilities, nearly doubled between 2004 and 2008. In 2004, only 1.7% of the population wanted more camping facilities, this increased to 3.3% in the 2008 survey.

In 2008, over 10% of respondents did not know what was needed or did not have an opinion, while another 4 % of respondents stated no additional programs or facilities are needed. This is a decrease from the 2004 survey, when over 6% of respondent stated there was not need for additional programs or facilities.

Table 29: One recreational program or facility that my family or I would like to see provided somewhere in Sheboygan County is: (Question 19)		
Program or Facility	2008 Responses*	2004 Responses*
Indoor Recreation Activities/Facilities (sports complex)	2.9%	9.6%
Golf Course	2.2%	4.6%
Mini Golf	0.4%	NA
Parks with Dog Access	3.8%	4.3%
Parks	3.1%	4.1%
Winter Activities (Downhill skiing, Ice skating)	2.4%	3.0%
Other Outdoor Activities/Facilities	1.8%	NA
Roller Skating	0.4%	NA
Field/Court	NA	2.0%
Shooting Range	1.5%	1.8%
Skateboard Facilities	0.2%	0.9%
Older (Senior) Softball League	0.9%	0.9%
Minor League Baseball	0.4%	NA
Other Activities	NA	0.9%
Natural Areas	NA	2.8%
Zoo	1.5%	2.2%
Horseback Riding Trails/Camping	0.9%	NA
Camping	3.3%	1.7%
Hunting	0.4%	0.4%
Fishing	0.9%	0.9%
Boating	0.2%	0.4%
Pool/Water Park/Swimming	4.6%	14.4%

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Table 29: One recreational program or facility that my family or I would like to see provided somewhere in Sheboygan County is: (Question 19)		
Program or Facility	2008 Responses*	2004 Responses*
Beaches	1.8%	0.9%
Other Water Based Activities	NA	0.9%
Nature Classes, Programs, Education (including hunter safety, etc.)	1.8%	NA
Other classes, education experiences	0.4%	NA
Marsh Park Improvements/Changes	1.5%	NA
Other (Passive Areas/Facilities Museum/Planetarium/Fairgrounds)	1.3%	0.7%
Non-Motorized Trails/Paths/Lanes (Hiking, Biking, Walking)	25.8%	15%
Motorized Trails (ATVs, snowmobile, moped)	8.8%	5.7%
Casino	1.8%	2.8%
Outdoor Theatre	0.4%	2.6%
Racetrack (NASCAR and Motorcycles)	0.4%	NA
Alternative Energy	0.4%	NA
Community Center (senior centers, etc.)	0.4%	1.3%
Access/Improvements	0.7%	0.9%
Restaurants/Retail	0.2%	0.7%
Youth Activities/Facilities	2.2%	0.7%
All Other Responses	4.2%	2.8%
Already have Adequate Facilities	2.0%	5.2%
No Additional Programs or Facilities	3.8%	6.1%
No Opinion or Not Sure What is Needed	10.6%	NA

*Percent of total responses on this question (n=453, does not include no 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 (Table 30). Over 19.8% of respondents stated that they disagreed that farmland should be preserved at all costs. Nearly 73% 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 relates to how one identifies “productive farmland”; that is equitable to all farmers. Nearly two-thirds of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that there should be no protection to preserve production agricultural regions. Ways to preserve agricultural lands will be discussed in the County’s planning process.

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Table 30: Local government should address the issue of development in productive agricultural regions by: (rate each) (Question 20)			
Preserve farmland	Agree or strongly agree	Neutral	Disagree or strongly disagree
At All Costs	45.0%	21.8%	19.8%
Protect Productive, Allow Development in Non-Ag. Areas	73.5%	11.4%	11.2%
Purchase of Development Rights	28.8%	29.8%	33.2%
No Protection	13.4%	16.4%	65.0%

The idea of purchase of development rights or PDR as a method of preserving farmland was split among respondents. Nearly one-third of respondents agreed with the idea, one-third remained neutral and another third disagreed with the idea. 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. PDR is something that will be explored in the County’s planning efforts.

Sixty-three percent of respondents supported protecting the agricultural economy of the County by directing growth into areas near existing developed areas (Table 31). Agriculture accounts for 20% of the County’s economy, so it is vital to Sheboygan County. Less than 7% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement.

Table 31: The agricultural economy of Sheboygan county should be protected by having growth directed into and around existing developed areas. (Question 21)			
	Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
Growth in existing areas	63.0%	20.1%	6.7%

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; not a single area received less than 60% agreement from the respondents. Very few people disagreed with protecting lakes, rivers, and streams (2.6%), historical and cultural sites (3.7%), and future and existing parkland (4.4%).

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Table 32: My city/village/township should make an effort to identify and protect the following: (Question 22)			
Identify and Protect Areas	Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
Woodlands	79.1%	11.6%	5.5%
Wetlands and Floodplains	69.5%	17.3%	8.7%
Open Spaces	62.5%	25.0%	8.2%
Lakes, Rivers, Streams	87.7%	6.5%	2.6%
Endangered Species Habitat	60.0%	22.7%	12.4%
Parkland, Existing and Future	76.0%	15.2%	4.4%
Historic and Cultural Sites	75.9%	16.3%	3.7%

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. Respondents felt that the largest threat to groundwater contamination are agricultural pesticides and fertilizers (69.4%), industrial waste land spreading (64.3%), and manure and liquid waste application (64.2%). These areas of concern need to be addressed in the plan, as well as other ways to protect these resources, including ways to help protect the groundwater supply of Sheboygan County.

Table 33: The following represent a threat to the quality of Sheboygan county's groundwater: (rate each one) (Question 23)			
Pollution Source	Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
Residential Runoff	55.3%	22.0%	14.3%
Construction Runoff	48.8%	26.4%	14.7%
Agriculture Pesticides & Fertilizers	69.4%	16.8%	6.3%
Manure and Liquid Waste Land Application	64.2%	17.4%	8.7%
Commercial/Industrial Stormwater	63.7%	19.7%	6.1%
Failing Septic Systems	61.8%	17.1%	9.1%
Sewage Holding Tanks Land Spreading	17.7%	25.7%	11.9%
Improperly Abandoned Wells	47.2%	24.0%	11.3%

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Table 33: The following represent a threat to the quality of Sheboygan county's groundwater: (rate each one) (Question 23)			
Pollution Source	Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
Industrial Waste Land Spreading	64.3%	16.0%	6.8%
Municipal Waste and Sludge Land Spreading	56.3%	19.7%	11.0%

Respondents seem to feel strongly that government should be proactive in protecting groundwater and drinking water quality and quantity (Table 34). Over 75% of respondents think the government should protect groundwater and drinking water quality and quantity by land use regulation. This may include the continuation of running the waste pharmaceuticals and hazardous waste drop off sites.

Table 34: Local government should be involved with the protection of groundwater quality and drinking water supplies in the following ways: (Question 24)			
Government Involvement With Groundwater Protection	Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
Land Use Regulation	76.9%	11.4%	6.5%
Provide Information Only	25.3%	23.3%	41.9%
No Involvement	7.3%	17.2%	65.2%

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 of the sources of pollution to Lake Michigan (Table 35). Overall, respondents had a good understanding of the threats to the quality of Lake Michigan and its coastal resources. Storm sewer discharge and invasive and exotic species are seen as the largest treats to the quality of the Lake. Over 50% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that development in the Sheboygan River Basin and residential runoff are threats to Lake Michigan. Residential runoff is an issue because of the chemicals that are used on residences lawns. These responses show there is a vital importance for shoreland and wetland zoning in the County because the greater the decrease in threats, the better quality Lake Michigan will remain.

Table 35: The following represent a threat to the quality of Lake Michigan and the coastal features adjacent to the lake: (Question 25)			
Threat To Lake Michigan	Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
Storm Sewer Discharge	72.4%	12.2%	8.6%

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Table 35: The following represent a threat to the quality of Lake Michigan and the coastal features adjacent to the lake: (Question 25)			
Threat To Lake Michigan	Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
Residential Runoff	57.9%	22.7%	11.9%
Coastal Bluff Erosion	49.2%	27.1%	11.9%
Coastal Dune Alteration	48.1%	26.7%	10.3%
Development in the "Coastal Corridor"	41.9%	26.5%	14.9%
Development in the Sheboygan River Basin	53.7%	21.9%	11.3%
Invasive/Exotic Species	75.7%	11.7%	3.4%

Respondents also had a good understanding of threats to the quality of surface waters in the County (Table 36). The respondents agree or strongly agreed that the largest threat to the surface water quality in the County and Lake Michigan are dumping down storm sewers, failing septic systems, over application of fertilizer and manure, and draining and filling wetlands. The Planning Department handles ordinances that deal with septic system compliance and wetlands within the shoreland zones, so some of these pollutant sources are monitored. Other programs or policies may need to be examined to protect surface water quality from some of the pollutant sources that are not monitored.

Table 36: I have concerns about the following as they affect surface water quality in the County and Lake Michigan: (Question 26)			
Pollutant Source	Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
Draining/Filling Wetlands	64.0%	15.8%	11.5%
Construction Erosion	47.1%	27.1%	18%
Failing Septic Systems	69.4%	13.3%	8.2%
Increased Runoff/Flash Flooding	58.4%	25.0%	8.6%
Road Salts	56.5%	24.1%	12.4%
Automobile Runoff	53.2%	25.7%	12.9%
Pet Wastes	27.8%	34.1%	28.0%
Dumping Down Storm Sewers	75.4%	12.2%	5.1%
Farming too Close to Streams	55.0%	23.6%	12.8%
Land Application of Septic/Sewage Sludge	49.7%	26.1%	12.4%
Manure Runoff	52.7%	23.0%	15.7%
Over Application of Fertilizer/Manure	62.4%	18.9%	10.5%

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Respondents were most likely to state that land along river and stream corridors should remain in its natural state; over 75% of respondents agreed with the statement (Table 37). Respondents also agreed that another acceptable use of land along the corridors is recreation (66.7%). These responses help to determine how the municipalities should plan for development in these sensitive areas. Residential and agricultural uses were not entirely opposed in these areas, but more respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement than did agree or strongly agree. Over 70% of respondents do not think commercial use along river and stream corridors is the best use of the corridors. When communities are developing commercial areas, they need to keep in mind what environmental disruptions can occur in these corridors.

Table 37: The best use of land along the river and stream corridors within rural areas of the county should be: (Question 27)			
Best Use Of Land Along River Corridors	Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
Residential	21.6%	23.3%	47.9%
Agriculture	25.2%	28.8%	37.9%
Recreation	66.7%	15.5%	10.5%
Commercial	5.3%	14.1%	72.4%
Leave it in its Natural State	75.6%	13.8%	5.7%

Commerce and Employment

Respondents agreed or strongly agreed that technology-based development (74.7%) and industrial development (71.5%) would be good to attract to Sheboygan County. Tourism and retail development, also saw a large amount of agreement, over 50% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with attracting these types of businesses to the County (Table 38).

Table 38: What types of new development do you believe would be good for Sheboygan county to attract? (rate each one) (Question 28)			
Types Of Development	Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
Retail	53.6%	26.6%	15.6%
Service	40.4%	37.4%	17.5%
Office	37.3%	34.0%	22.6%
Industrial	71.5%	15.3%	8.2%
Technology	74.7%	14.9%	5.1%
Tourism	68.7%	18.1%	8.6%

Seventy percent of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that Sheboygan County should be actively involved with economic development (Table 39). It is not clear whether or not respondents

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

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.

Table 39: Sheboygan county should be actively involved in economic development. (Question 29)		
Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
69.6%	18.0%	6.5%

Respondents do not strongly believe that there are enough jobs in Sheboygan County (Table 40). Nearly 50% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that there are enough jobs in Sheboygan County to make a living.

Table 40: There are enough job opportunities in Sheboygan county to make a living. (Question 30)		
Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
21.9%	22.7%	48.2%

Over 50% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that tax dollars should be used to attract or develop new jobs in the County, while nearly twenty percent (19.7%) of respondents disagreed that tax dollars should be used for job growth (Table 41). Respondents recognize the importance of jobs to an area, and from their responses their appears to be a need for jobs in the County.

Table 41: Tax dollars should be used to attract or develop new jobs in the County. (Question 31)		
Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
51.4%	23.7%	19.7%

Transportation

In regards to transportation, respondents seem to have mixed feelings about the overall quality of transportation in their community (Table 42). Respondents had the tendency to be slightly less satisfied with the condition of local roads than with the county or state roads. However, overall satisfaction with road conditions appears to be good considering that over 58% of all respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that their local, county, and state roads were in good condition. In regard to the condition of roads, respondents provided the following input:

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Table 42: Local roads in my city/village/township are in good condition. (Question 33-34)			
Type	Strongly Agree/Agree	Neutral	Disagree/Strongly Disagree
Local Roads	58.2%	14.6%	25.2%
County Roads	62.3%	18.7%	16.9%
State Roads	60.2%	21.2%	16.1%

In regards to nonmotorized transportation, about 50% of respondents agree or strongly agree that government needs to have a role in providing more bicycle and pedestrian routes (Table 43), while 25% to 30% of respondents are neutral on this issue.

Table 43: Government needs to provide: (Questions 35)			
Type	Strongly Agree/Agree	Neutral	Disagree/Strongly Disagree
More Bicycle Routes	48.9%	24.4%	22.1%
More Pedestrian Routes	45.0%	28.7%	21.2%

Due to the nonmotorized funding the County has received from the Federal Government, respondents were asked if they were more likely to walk or bicycle. Nearly 43% of respondents stated they were more likely to walk, while 30% said they were not. Approximately one-third of respondents stated they were more likely to bicycle, while nearly 38% stated they were not (Table 44). It appears from the respondents that the current facilities and programs are increasing the number of people walking, but the number of people biking is not increasing at the same rate. It is a positive sign that respondents are saying the programs and facilities are making it more likely for them to walk and bike.

Table 44: Due to the Non-motorized Transportation Pilot Program (NMTTP) Planned Facilities and Programs are you more likely to: (Questions 36)			
Type	Yes	No	Don't Know
Bicycle	33.4%	37.6%	22.8%
Walk	42.6%	30.3%	23.4%

About 45% of respondents do not bike, but for those that bike, they bike for a combination of reasons (22.7%). The NMTTP's goal is to increase the number of people who are using biking for transportation and utilitarian purposes by creating facilities that are safe and convenient for people to use. Once these facilities are in place, it will be interesting to see the mode shift of the County (Table 45).

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Table 45: Do you bike primarily for: (Questions 37)	
Transportation Type	Percent of Responses
Transportation	1.0%
Recreation	13.7%
Exercise	14.4%
Combination of Reasons	22.7%
Do not Bike	44.8%

About 38% of respondents walk for exercise, but an additional 36% walk for a combination of reasons. Only 1.0% of the respondents stated they walked for transportation. As sidewalk gaps are filled, it will become safe and more convenient to walk, so hopefully the number of people walking will increase as well. Nearly 15 % of all respondents say they do not walk, with today’s health issues, this number may decline over time as more people use walking as a way to exercise (Table 46).

Table 46: Do you walk primarily for: (Questions 38)	
Transportation Type	Percent of Responses
Transportation	1.0%
Recreation	7.7%
Exercise	38.1%
Combination of Reasons	36.0%
Do not Walk	14.8%

Nearly 50% of respondents see the NMTTP providing important long-term benefits to the County, while only 18.3% of respondents do not see it providing long-term benefits (Table 47). In support of the project, respondents see the program providing benefits to the County for the long-term.

Table 47: Do you think the NMTTP will provide important long-term benefits to County residents?: (Questions 39)			
Type	Yes	No	Don’t Know
Long-term benefits	49.2%	18.3%	29.1%

Almost 55% of respondents think the government should provide connections to regional trail systems. About 23% of respondents remained neutral on this issue, with only 17.3% of respondents disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with the statement. This means respondents are in favor of projects such as expanding the Interurban Trail to connect to the Old Plank Trail (Table 48).

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Table 48: Government should provide connections to regional trail systems (i.e. Ice Age Trail, Old Plank Road Trail): (Questions 40)			
Type	Strongly Agree/Agree	Neutral	Disagree/Strongly Disagree
Provide Connections	54.6%	22.5%	17.3%

Nearly 60% of respondents, do not use the Old Plank Road Trail at all, while nearly 65% of respondents say they do not use the Interurban Trail. The primary use of these trails tends to be for a combination of reasons such as recreation, exercise, and commuting. About 10% of respondents use the Old Plank Road Trail for recreation and another 10% use it for exercise (Table 49).

Table 49: I use the Interurban Trail for, I use the Old Plank Road Trail for: (Questions 41 & 42)					
Type	Commuting	Recreation	Exercise	Combination of Reasons	Not at All
Interurban Trail	0.2%	8.7%	8.4%	15.8%	64.7%
Old Plank Road Trail	0.3%	10.9%	9.8%	16.9%	59.2%

The majority of respondents who use the Interurban and Old Plank Road Trail appear to use them less than two times a month. Respondents appear to use the Old Plank Road Trail more than the Interurban Trail, but respondents that use the Interurban Trail appear to use the Trail more frequently than the Old Plank Road Trail. About 10% of respondents use the Old Plank Road Trail 2 to 4 times a month (Table 50).

Table 50: If you use the Interurban Trail or Old Plank Road Trail, how often do you use it?: (Questions 41a & 42a)				
Type	3 or more times per week	1-2 times per weeks	2-4 times per month	Less than 2 times a month
Interurban Trail	2.8%	4.2%	7.2%	22.1%
Old Plank Road Trail	2.0%	4.0%	10.1%	24.5%

Respondents were asked how the County's nonmotorized facilities should be maintained and improved. The choice that ranked the highest for how to maintain these facilities was through volunteer programs and organizations, along with community partnerships (Table 51). Respondents also see grants, County funds, and donations as ways to maintain these facilities. Payment by individual municipalities and user fees were seen as the least suitable ways to improve and maintain these County facilities.

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Table 51: Existing County nonmotorized facilities should be maintained and improved by: (1 being most suitable and 7 least suitable) (Question 43)		
Economic Base	Average Score	Rank
Volunteer Programs/Organizations (advocacy groups, community service workers)	2.8	1
Community Partnerships (adopt-a-trail, public agencies work with private companies)	2.9	2
The County	3.5	3
Grants	4.6	5
Donations	3.5	3
User Fees	5.1	7
Individual Municipalities	4.8	6

Respondents were asked how all other nonmotorized facilities should be maintained and improved and the number one response on how to maintain these facilities was again volunteer programs and organizations, along with community partnerships (Table 52). The County and municipalities will have to work together to find ways to maintain and improve the existing facilities. Respondents would be in favor of a 501(c)3 or a grant to help maintain the facilities in the County.

Table 52: <u>All other</u> existing nonmotorized facilities should be maintained and improved by: (1 being most suitable and 7 least suitable) (Question 44)		
Economic Base	Average Score	Rank
Volunteer Programs/Organizations (advocacy groups, community service workers)	2.6	1
Community Partnerships (adopt-a-trail, public agencies work with private companies)	2.9	2
The County	4.7	5
Grants	3.4	3
Donations	3.5	4
User Fees	5.0	6
Individual Municipalities	5.1	7

Over 40% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that once the non-motorized transportation facilities are in place, they will be more likely to bicycle or walk. About 23% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that they will be more likely to bicycle or walk once the facilities are in place (Table 53). This means that nearly double the respondents think they will walk or bicycle more because of the program.

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Table 53: Once the non-motorized transportation facilities are in place, I am more likely to bicycle or walk: (Questions 45)			
Type	Strongly Agree/Agree	Neutral	Disagree/Strongly Disagree
Facilities in Place	40.6%	20.2%	23.2%

Overall, respondents were satisfied with transportation related services. Respondents rate the transportation services as excellent, good, average, poor, or very poor (Table 54). Over 50% of respondents rated road maintenance as being excellent or good, and over 65% respondents rated snow plowing as being excellent and good. Our bicycle and pedestrian facilities also had a favorable rating. The transportation-related service that had the most respondents rate it as poor or very poor is the bus and taxi service in the County, with almost 20% of respondents rating it that way.

Table 54: How would you rate the following transportation-related services in Sheboygan County (Question 46)			
Type	Excellent/Good	Average	Poor/Very Poor
Road Maintenance	54.8%	31.9%	10.4%
Snow Plowing	65.9%	21.8%	9.5%
Bus/Taxi/Etc.	15.4%	25.7%	19.2%
Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities	35.7%	35.5%	8.5%
Transportation for Seniors	24.4%	26.6%	13.3%
Transportation for Disabled	24.5%	25.2%	11.8%
Airport Facilities	34.9%	22.7%	8.7%

Issues and Opportunities

Respondents were asked if they feel the quality of life in Sheboygan County has improved, declined, or remained the same over the last ten years. The responses to this question were split. With 36% of respondents stating the quality of life has improved, 33% saying the quality of life has remained the same, and 23% of respondents stating the quality of life has declined. Further input may be needed to reach a consensus on this question.

Table 55: Do you feel the quality of life in Sheboygan County over the past 10 years has: (Question 47)			
Type	Improved	Declined	Remained the Same
Quality of Life	35.8%	22.8%	32.8%

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

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

score as high in the excellent and good categories, but if you take all the respondents who rated these services average or higher it is over 70% of respondents (Table 56). Nearly 25% of respondents see employment as being poor or very poor in their community.

Table 56: How would you rate the following “quality of life” issues in your community? (Question 48)			
Issue	Excellent Or Good	Average	Poor Or Very Poor
Air Quality	64.4%	24.0%	8.3%
Drinking Water	70.9%	20.7%	4.9%
Surface Water Quality	46.8%	35.2%	8.6%
Public Safety	57.6%	30.5%	7.7%
Employment	30.0%	39.9%	24.9%
Housing	45.7%	43.7%	5.5%
Recreation	61.2%	26.9%	6.9%
Transportation	34.3%	42.1%	13.1%
Cultural Resources	39.6%	36.5%	13.5%

Survey respondents seemed generally satisfied with government services (Table 57). museums/historical sites, agricultural/UW-Extension services, parks and recreation, law enforcement, fire protection, garbage collection, ambulance, recycling, libraries, and schools received an excellent or good rating at least 50% of the time. Natural resources protection, youth activities, senior services and activities, social services, nursing home services, sanitary sewer, municipal sewer, stormwater sewer, and nonmotorized transportation/trail development received an excellent or good rating at least 30% of the time. Planning and zoning services scored the lowest with excellent or good ratings only 28% of the time.

Table 57: How would you rate each of the following services? (Question 49)			
Issue	Excellent Or Good	Average	Poor Or Very Poor
Museum/Historical Sites	58.0%	27.3%	3.3%
Agricultural/UW-Extension Services	56.7%	19.2%	1.3%
Planning & Zoning	28.2%	42.6%	11.0%
Natural Resources Protection	37.7%	39.9%	8.3%
Parks/Recreation	63.4%	28.1%	2.8%
Fire Protection	77.7%	15.6%	1.2%
Law Enforcement	68.0%	22.3%	5.1%
Youth Activities	33.5%	32.8%	15.9%
Senior Services/Activities	31.5%	31.6%	8.4%
Social Services	31.9%	34.0%	7.6%
Nursing Home Services	34.4%	30.6%	11.2%
Sanitary Sewer	42.8%	33.8%	2.9%

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Table 57: How would you rate each of the following services? (Question 49)

Issue	Excellent Or Good	Average	Poor Or Very Poor
Municipal Sewer	47.3%	28.0%	3.3%
Stormwater Sewer	35.2%	34.5%	6.1%
Garbage Collection	60.8%	20.6%	4.8%
Ambulance	61.2%	22.8%	3.2%
Recycling	54.9%	28.5%	9.6%
Library	71.4%	17.8%	2.0%
Schools	69.7%	20.5%	2.3%
Nonmotorized Trans/Trail Develop.	47.3%	29.6%	7.3%

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 58). In general, respondents were most likely to be unwilling to sacrifice general safety types of services such as fire, ambulance, and police protection. More than 50% of respondents stated that they strongly disagreed or disagreed that fire protection, law enforcement, snow plowing, road maintenance, municipal sewer, ambulance, and schools should be sacrificed to keep spending down. Services that respondents were the most likely to sacrifice to keep spending down were the nonmotorized transportation/trail development, museum/historical sites, and agricultural/UW-Extension services.

Table 58: What services would you be willing to sacrifice to keep government spending down? (Question 50)

Service	Willing Or Strongly Willing	Neutral	Unwilling or Strongly Unwilling
Museum/Historical Sites	48.4%	30.0%	14.2%
Agricultural/UW-Extension Services	37.3%	29.8%	24.3%
Planning & Zoning	36.2%	33.8%	19.5%
Natural Resources Protection	28.3%	26.3%	37.9%
Parks/Recreation	27.2%	28.6%	36.5%
Fire Protection	8.3%	11.6%	73.9%
Law Enforcement	10.0%	11.9%	72.5%
Snow Plowing	10.8%	17.7%	65.3%
Road Maintenance	10.4%	21.8%	61.4%
Youth Activities	28.4%	34.0%	28.6%
Senior Services/Activities	27.3%	36.6%	25.4%
Social Services	28.6%	31.9%	28.5%
Nursing Home Services	17.4%	31.2%	41.7%

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Table 58: What services would you be willing to sacrifice to keep government spending down? (Question 50)			
Service	Willing Or Strongly Willing	Neutral	Unwilling or Strongly Unwilling
Sanitary Sewer	9.1%	30.5%	48.7%
Municipal Sewer	9.7%	27.4%	50.8%
Stormwater Sewer	16.3%	31.9%	38.7%
Garbage Collection	17.6%	25.7%	47.0%
Ambulance	11.5%	18.6%	62.9%
Recycling	22.6%	29.1%	40.4%
Library	31.7%	30.7%	29.6%
Schools	17.9%	19.9%	54.2%
Nonmotorized Transportation/ Trail Development	57.7%	20.8%	14.9%

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 59). Not all of the services communities provide were listed because some of the services are unable 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. This is an interesting finding because in many cases the municipalities are already sharing fire protection, law enforcement services, ambulance services, and sewer or water services. However, the responses for sharing these services still was at least 40% or greater. Overall, it appears that survey respondents are willing to share at least some services. Natural resource protection, agricultural/UW-Extension services, parks and recreation, and nonmotorized transportation/trail development were the areas where at least 70% of respondents were willing or strongly willing to share services. Comparing this question to the same question asked in 2004, it is interesting to note that in almost all cases people are more willing to share services than they were in 2004.

Table 59: 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 51)			
Service	Willing Or Strongly Willing	Neutral	Unwilling or Strongly Unwilling
Agricultural/UW-Extension Services	77.0%	10.1%	3.6%
Planning & Zoning	65.0%	16.6%	8.9%
Natural Resources Protection	77.3%	11.3%	3.4%
Parks/Recreation	70.6%	14.5%	7.2%
Fire Protection	42.7%	12.4%	27.7%

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Table 59: 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 51)

Service	Willing Or Strongly Willing	Neutral	Unwilling or Strongly Unwilling
Law Enforcement	55.3%	11.7%	25.8%
Dispatch Services	62.9%	14.3%	13.9%
Snow Plowing	55.5%	15.7%	21.0%
Road Maintenance	60.2%	16.9%	14.9%
Youth Activities	62.8%	21.7%	6.6%
Senior Services/Activities	63.3%	20.1%	6.4%
Social Services	63.2%	19.9%	6.5%
Nursing Home Services	60.3%	18.7%	10.1%
Sanitary Sewer	47.9%	23.7%	16.3%
Municipal Sewer	46.8%	23.2%	17.8%
Stormwater Sewer	48.0%	25.4%	12.3%
Garbage Collection	57.0%	17.9%	14.7%
Ambulance	54.7%	14.8%	22.6%
Recycling	66.7%	15.8%	7.7%
Nonmotorized Transportation/ Trail Development	70.5%	14.9%	4.4%

Sheboygan County started the stewardship fund in 2000 to help provide funding to conserve lakes, streams, wetlands, agricultural land, wildlife habitat, trails, parks, and other natural features. Nearly 60% of respondents support the Sheboygan County Stewardship Fund. Only 16% of respondents did not support this program (Table 60). Over 40% of the respondents who support they program, think that over \$100,000 should be given to the program annually, with 6% saying that over \$500,000 should be provided for the program. Only 20% of these respondents think that less that \$100,000 is appropriate funding for the Stewardship Fund annually (Table 61).

Table 60: Do you support the Sheboygan County Stewardship Fund to conserve Sheboygan County’s lakes, streams, wetlands, and wildlife habitat, and to develop additional trails and parks? (question 52)

Yes	Don’t Know	No
58.9%	21.2%	16.3%

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Table 61: If yes, what level of annual County funding would you support for the County Stewardship Fund? (question 52a)			
<\$100,000	\$100,000-\$250,000	\$250,000-\$500,000	>\$500,000
18.2%	23.8%	11.4%	5.9%

Sheboygan County’s population is going to continue to age in the next 20 years. Respondents were asked to rate the adequacy of services and facilities that will be used by the aging population (Table 62). One of the most notable things about the responses is the percent of respondents that answered don’t know. Don’t know was the most common answer or second most common answer for many of the services or facilities. The two services/facilities that over 50% of respondents stated were adequate were the hospitals (54%) and funeral services (61.3%). Education along with information needs to be provided on the services and facilities that are available. There may be a need for expanded services and facilities as the population continues to age.

Table 62: Sheboygan County faces an aging population. By 2020, it is estimated that 30% of the County’s population will be older than 55 years of age. Are the services and facilities provided for the aging population, adequate, or is there a need in some area? Pleas rate the adequacy of the following services and facilities: (Question 53)				
Service/Facility	Adequate	Somewhat Adequate	Inadequate	Don’t Know
Nutrition/Home Meals	33.8%	25.0%	5.2%	32.3%
Home Health Care	26.3%	27.4%	9.9%	31.8%
Adult Day Care Facilities	17.3%	23.4%	15.4%	39.0%
Hospitals	54.0%	21.2%	4.6%	15.7%
Nursing Homes	32.6%	27.9%	12.5%	22.0%
Residential/Assisted Living Facilities	29.5%	30.2%	11.1%	24.6%
Other Housing Options	17.7%	25.3%	11.7%	40.0%
Hospice	35.3%	24.7%	6.3%	28.7%
Funeral Services	61.3%	14.2%	1.3%	19.1%
Senior Centers	35.8%	27.1%	7.4%	25.1%
Support Groups	27.3%	26.3%	6.5%	35.4%
Transportation	24.8%	29.8%	13.9%	27.1%
Mental Health Services	22.9%	26.6%	8.6%	37.7%
Legal Services	25.0%	25.5%	9.6%	35.8%
Financial Assistance	17.3%	24.4%	13.9%	39.9%
Respite (Caregiver “time off”)	13.6%	22.1%	15.2%	44.6%

Rather than share services, survey respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with government providing services that the private sector could provide (Table 63). Over 46% of

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. Respondents thought that government should not be providing services that the private sector can provide. However, the frame of reference for the response 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.

Table 63: Government should provide services that the private sector can provide. (Question 54)		
Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
17.2%	24.7%	46.2%

To get a feel for respondent’s overall satisfaction with government services, the survey asked 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 64). It appears that respondents were more satisfied with their local units of government and the County in terms of taxes and services provided than the higher levels of government like the Federal and State Governments. The respondents also appeared to be split on the reasonableness of schools and their related taxes. Thirty-four percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the school’s services and its related taxes while 35% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the school’s services and its related taxes.

Table 64: 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 55)			
Issue	Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
Town/Village/City Government	50.1%	20.2%	22.5%
County Government	47.4%	23.8%	20.6%
State of Wisconsin Government	25.2%	22.0%	45.0%
Federal Government	19.5%	23.9%	48.6%
Schools	34.2%	22.8%	35.2%

Given the costs for government to carry on providing 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 65). About two-thirds of respondents were in favor of a sales tax and nearly half of the respondents were not in favor of a sales tax. Respondents lean towards not being in favor of an increase in the sales tax.

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Table 65: Sheboygan county should implement a 0.5% county sales tax to provide general property tax relief. (Question 56)		
Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
32.7%	12.7%	47.6%

If respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with a county sales tax, they were asked to rate their level of agreement with using a portion of the sales tax (\$4.4 million) generated by purchases by Sheboygan County residents specifically for property tax relief and the remaining portion (\$1.8 million) generated by out-of-county tourists specifically for tourism-related items such as road maintenance and other infrastructure related items (Table 66). Of those that responded, over one-thirds still stated that they did not support a County sales tax.

Table 66: If you disagree with the previous statement, would you support enacting 0.5% sales tax that uses the \$4.4 million generated by county residents for direct property tax relief, with the remaining \$1.8 million to be used specifically for tourism related programs and activities such as road maintenance and other infrastructure items? (Question 57)		
Agree Or Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree Or Strongly Disagree
16.7%	9.7%	35.7%

Respondents were asked their preference for growth in the rural portions of Sheboygan County over the next 20 years (Table 67). 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. Over 42% of respondents stated limited growth in the rural parts of the County and nearly 36% of respondents stated they preferred only moderate growth.

Table 67: My preference for development in rural Sheboygan county by the year 2020 is: (check one) (Question 58)	
Answer	Percent
Limited Growth	42.8%
Moderate Growth	35.9%
Unrestricted Growth	4.0%
Maintain Current Growth Level	14.1%
No Answer	3.1%

Respondents were asked their preference for growth in the urban portions of Sheboygan County over the next 20 years (Table 68). 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 (56.9%). It does not appear that respondents would like to see only redevelopment in terms of growth

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

in the County (17.3%). Highway corridors were identified as another appropriate area for development and growth, with nearly 16.6% of respondents choosing this type of growth.

Table 68: My preference for development in urban Sheboygan county by the year 2020 is: (check one) (Question 59)	
Answer	Percent
Redevelopment, No Outward Expansion	17.3%
Some Outward Expansion, Focus on Redevelopment	56.9%
Unrestricted Growth	5.0%
Managed Growth in Highway Corridors	16.6%
No Answer	4.2%

The top three things respondents felt that Sheboygan County and local governments should encourage are environmental preservation (70.3%), farmland preservation (65.5%) and recreational opportunities (60.9%). This means respondents want government to play a role in providing the recreational opportunities, such as the Marsh Park and the multi-use trails (Table 69). The County may continue to support environmental preservation and farmland preservation by running its programs such as helping to create buffers along rivers and streams from farms, having the hazardous waste and waste pharmaceutical drop off programs, and helping to keep all towns in compliance with the farmland preservation plan. The County and local governments may need to develop or expand programs that help to preserve the environment, as well as preserving the farmland.

Table 69: As Sheboygan County and local governments plan for future development, should they discourage, encourage, or remain neutral regarding each of the following: (Question 60)			
	Encourage	Remain Neutral	Discourage
Environmental Preservation	70.3%	21.5%	1.9%
Hunting/Fishing Opportunities	54.4%	37.0%	2.9%
Recreation Opportunities	60.9%	31.3%	1.7%
Farmland Preservation	65.5%	26.7%	2.9%
Industrial Development	56.1%	30.6%	7.3%
Residential Development	31.4%	51.4%	11.3%
Retail Development	36.5%	46.1%	11.1%
Tourism Facilities	46.0%	40.6%	7.3%
Vacation Homes	17.3%	46.9%	28.0%

Respondents seem to be most willing to increase their property tax dollars to help preserve and protect air quality and natural resources, such as the lakes, streams, wetlands, coastal areas, woodlands, etc (Table 70). Over 57% of respondents stated they would increase their property taxes by at least \$0.50

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

per \$1,000 to improve air quality in Sheboygan County. Nearly 56% of respondents said they would be willing to increase their property taxes at least \$0.50 for every \$1,000 to protect and preserve natural resources. Respondents also seem to be willing to increase taxes for nursing home services and parks and recreation. About 51% of respondents said they would increase their taxes at least \$0.50 per \$1,000 for nursing home care, and about 50% of respondents would increase their property taxes have parks and recreation including the Sheboygan Marsh and recreation trails.

Table 70: How much are you willing to increase your property tax dollars to: (Question 61)					
	\$5 Per \$1,000	\$2 Per \$1,000	\$1 Per \$1,000	\$0.50 Per \$1,000	Not at all
Preserve/Protect Farmland/Agriculture	4.7%	8.0%	11.8%	22.3%	47.5%
Preserve/Protect Natural Resources	6.3%	9.1%	14.6%	25.7%	38.6%
Provide Shared Services	1.4%	4.5%	9.7%	19.6%	58.7%
Provide Nursing Home Services	3.5%	7.2%	14.7%	25.6%	42.7%
Improve Air Quality	3.5%	6.3%	14.0%	23.6%	46.3%
Parks/Recreation	3.3%	6.5%	13.1%	26.9%	43.4%
Maintain and Development Nonmotorized Trans. Facilities	2.0%	4.7%	8.9%	20.4%	57.7%

Respondents were asked, “What single improvement would be beneficial to the future of Sheboygan County?” Table 71 is a summary of these responses. Economic development related comments were the most often listed by the respondents as improvements that could be beneficial to the County, followed by comments on utilities and community facilities. A full list of responses can be found in the random sample survey results discussed at the January SGIC meeting.

Table 71: What single improvement would be beneficial to the future of Sheboygan County? (Question 62)	
Improvement	Responses*
Housing	0.9%
Transportation	11.8%
Improvements	3.8%
Maintenance	2.8%
Mode	5.2%
Nonmotorized Transportation	2.8%
Public Transportation	0.7%

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Table 71: What single improvement would be beneficial to the future of Sheboygan County? (Question 62)	
Improvement	Responses*
Senior/Disabled Transportation	0.4%
Airport	0.3%
Railroads	1.0%
Utilities/Community Facilities	18.9%
Recreation	3.9%
Schools	1.7%
Law Enforcement	2.3%
Reduce Crime/Gangs/Drugs	4.9%
EMS	0.1%
Health and Human Services	1.9%
Utilities and Services	0.6%
Alternative Energy	1.9%
Other Services (Utilities and Community Facilities)	1.5%
Agricultural Resources	3.0%
Cultural Resources	0.1%
Natural Resources	6.1%
Economic Development	24.7%
Jobs	8.3%
Industry/Manufacturing	5.8%
Technology/Sustainable Business	0.9%
Tourism	2.3%
Retail/Restaurants	3.6%
General Comments Regarding Econ Dev.	2.9%
Casino	0.6%
Economy Related Comments	0.3%
Intergovernmental Cooperation	4.8%
Cooperation	1.9%
Government Services	2.6%
Law Enforcement/Regulation	0.3%
Budget/Spending	2.3%
Organization of Government	3.9%
Land Use	9.9%
Taxes	8.1%
Don't Know/Nothing	3.6%
Other Comments	1.9%

*Percent of total responses on this question (n=689).

Sheboygan County Comprehensive Planning Survey
 Summary Analysis- Random Sample, Countywide Results
 August 4, 2009

Respondents were asked to share the best part of living in their community. Table 72 is a summary of these responses. Rural/low density development was listed as the best part of living in their municipality by over 15 % of the respondents. The other top two best parts of living in a community are the safety and peace and quiet of the municipality. Housing, jobs, and taxes received the smallest percent of responses. A full list of responses can be found in the random sample survey results discussed at the January SGIC meeting.

Table 72: Please share with us the best part of living in your city/village/township. (Question 63)	
Improvement	Responses*
Rural/Low Density	15.1%
Small Town	9.8%
Safety	10.8%
Quiet	12.9%
Community Character/People	8.3%
Neighborhood/Community	5.4%
Family	1.3%
Cleanliness	3.5%
Location	4.9%
Jobs and Economy	0.9%
Housing	0.5%
Recreational/Cultural Opportunities	3.0%
Scenic/Aesthetics	8.3%
Services/Local Government	9.8%
Taxes	0.9%
Quality of Life	2.3%
Other	2.3%

*Percent of total responses on this question (n=775).