



# Countywide Farmland Preservation and Park and Open Space Planning Public Opinion Survey of Ozaukee County Residents, December 2010

**David Trechter  
James Janke  
Shelly Hadley**

**Survey Research Center Report 2010/22  
December 2010**

**This survey and the preparation of this document was funded in part through a Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection (DATCP) Farmland Preservation Planning Grant to the Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department.**

Staff and students working for the Survey Research Center at UW-River Falls were instrumental in the completion of this study. We would like to thank Denise Parks, Aaron Peterson, Ted Cannady, Ashley Julka, Hannah Stuttgen, Danielle Hammer, Caleb Riedeman, and Jacki Roden. We gratefully acknowledge their hard work and dedication. The SRC would also like to thank the Southeastern Regional Planning Commission, County Land Preservation Board, County Comprehensive Planning Board, County Planning & Parks Director Andrew Struck and UW-Extension CNRED Educator Nicole Sidoff for their input and advice. Finally, we would like to thank the Ozaukee County residents who took the time to complete their questionnaires.

This survey and the preparation of this document was funded in part through a Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection (DATCP) Farmland Preservation Planning Grant to the Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department.

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	2
Survey Purpose .....	4
Survey Methods .....	4
Profile of Respondents .....	5
Quality of Life Factors .....	8
Preservation of Farmland and Natural Areas .....	9
Provision of Parks and Recreation Facilities .....	18
Future Funding Priorities .....	25
Environmental Improvement Priorities.....	27
Overall Priority Actions for Ozaukee County.....	28
Additional Comments .....	29
Conclusions .....	30
Appendix A – Non-Response Bias Test .....	31
Appendix B – Ozaukee County Natural Resources Survey Comments .....	32
Appendix C - Quantitative Summary of Responses by Question .....	37

## **Executive Summary**

The purpose of this study was to gather opinions from Ozaukee County residents concerning issues related to: farmland preservation, parks, recreation, natural areas, and open space preservation issues in the County.

In September 2010, under contract with the Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department, the Survey Research Center (SRC) at the University of Wisconsin – River Falls mailed surveys with postage-paid return envelopes to 1,146 randomly selected Ozaukee County households. The initial mailing was followed by reminder postcards and a second mailing to non-respondents. The overall response rate was 37 percent (422 completed questionnaires). The results provided in this report are expected to be accurate to within plus or minus 4.75 percent with 95 percent confidence. Statistical tests did not indicate that “non-response bias” is a problem in this sample.

Respondents said the most important positive influence on the quality of life in Ozaukee County is the low crime rate and safe communities. The second most important quality of life factor was quality schools. Rounding out the top four choices were small town/village charm and tranquil residential areas.

Majorities said development in Ozaukee County should be concentrated around existing cities and villages (67%) and that the County should purchase conservation easements to preserve farmland, maintain open space, or protect important environmental/natural areas (65%). The level of support decreased to 48 percent when asked specifically about purchasing conservation easements for farmland preservation. A majority (54%) opposed a local tax increase to fund a dedicated County farmland preservation program. Preferred funding sources were private/conservancy trust funds and state/federal funding. Half the respondents favored the creation of an Agricultural Enterprise Area (AEA) in the County, which would allow farmers access to State tax credits and preserve farmland, while a third were neutral or wanted more information on this policy option.

Respondents favored “cluster” (conservation subdivision) design of housing developments (66%) compared to the traditional layout.

The largest portion (40%) of respondents favored or strongly favored creating a County program to purchase conservation easements for natural areas, and 22 percent were opposed or strongly opposed. A significant percentage had a neutral opinion (23%), and 15 percent wanted more information. A majority opposed a County property tax increase to fund the program. Private donations, conservancy trust funds, and state/federal funds were the preferred funding sources.

Respondents had fairly equally split opinions about expanding the County Parks System and County Recreation Facilities. The largest portion (38%) favored or strongly favored expansion; while 30 percent were opposed or strongly opposed, and a significant portion (23%) had a neutral opinion. Eleven percent said they need more information. Less than 30 percent supported a tax increase to create a fund for parks and recreational facilities. Favored funding methods were private donations and state/federal funds.

Respondents had split opinions about the development of a Countywide network of bike and pedestrian trails and prefer private donations and state/federal funding sources to local taxes.

Over 70 percent of respondents said the following are high priorities for future funding: maintenance and upkeep of existing park facilities, preserving open space, and river restoration projects. Although respondents placed a high funding priority on preserving open space, majorities of respondents were opposed to raising property taxes to create programs that would preserve open space through conservation

easements on farmland and natural areas. Instead, they prefer that the County look to external funding sources. If County property taxes are used for open space preservation, respondents want funds to come from current resources.

Between half and two-thirds of respondents said the following are high priorities: protecting natural areas near County parks, preserving historic structures and archaeological sites, preservation of farmland for food, and preservation of farmland for rural character. Additional recreational facilities and expansion of parks were lower priorities.

When asked their opinions about natural resource priorities in Ozaukee County, majorities ranging from 58 percent to 63 percent said preservation of wildlife habitat, monitoring Lake Michigan water quality, preventing Lake Michigan beach and bluff erosion, and stricter water quality regulations were high priorities. About half of respondents said stricter flood control and stormwater regulations and promoting efforts to improve air quality were high priorities.

From a list of 11 overall priority actions, respondents said protection of water quality and preservation of rural and small town character were their most important priorities. Increasing the supply of affordable housing and promotion of tourism were the lowest priorities.

## Survey Purpose

The purpose of this study was to gather opinions from Ozaukee County residents concerning issues related to: farmland preservation, parks, recreation, natural areas, and open space preservation issues in the County.

The Survey Research Center (SRC) at the University of Wisconsin – River Falls conducted and analyzed survey results under contract by the Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department. The survey questionnaire was developed collaboratively by UW-River Falls-SRC, Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department, UW-Extension-Ozaukee County, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC), the Land Preservation Board, and the Comprehensive Planning Board.

## Survey Methods

In September 2010, the SRC mailed surveys with prepaid postage envelopes to 1,146 randomly selected households in Ozaukee County. The surveys were followed with reminder postcards and a second mailing to non-respondents.

The response rate was 37 percent (422 returned questionnaires). Based on the estimated number of adults (voting age) in the population of Ozaukee County (66,121<sup>1</sup>) the results provided in this report are expected to be accurate to within plus or minus 4.75 percent with 95 percent confidence. This means that if this survey was replicated 20 times, only once would the results be expected to fall more than 4.75 percent above or below the values reported in this document.

Any survey has to be concerned with “non-response bias.” Non-response bias refers to a situation in which people who do not return a questionnaire have opinions that are systematically different from the opinions of those who return their surveys. **Based upon a standard statistical analysis described in Appendix A, the SRC concludes that there is little evidence that non-response bias is a concern for this sample.**

In addition to the numeric responses, respondents provided additional written comments that were compiled by the SRC from the surveys. **Appendix B to this report contains the complete compilation of comments.**

**Appendix C contains a copy of the survey questionnaire with a quantitative summary of responses by question.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Wisconsin Demographic Services Bureau, Official Population Estimate, 2010.

## Profile of Respondents

Table 1 summarizes the demographic profile of the survey respondents. Where comparable data were available from the 2006-2008 Census Bureau American Community Survey (ACS) estimate or the State of Wisconsin Demographic Services Center, they were included to indicate the degree to which the sample represents the underlying adult population of Ozaukee County.

There were fewer people under 35 years of age in the sample than the ACS indicates should have been included and fewer renters than reported in the ACS estimate. Our experience is that younger residents and renters are less likely to participate in surveys.

The sample contained a higher proportion of respondents with graduate or professional degrees and fewer respondents with no formal education beyond high school.

Although the overall pattern of household income distribution among the respondents generally matches the ACS, there were more households with over \$100,000 annual income and fewer households with very low annual income (<\$15,000).

The most significant discrepancy between the sample and Census Bureau data was with respect to gender; there were substantially more males in the sample than would be expected. Analysis of the mean response values indicated men and women had statistically significant differences in only 17 of the 109 quantitative variables on the survey. Further examination showed the percentage differences were relatively small for 13 of the 17 variables. These questions will be noted in the text of the report. In short, while the gender imbalance is not a good thing from a statistical standpoint, the similarity of views between men and women means that the practical impact of this skewed distribution is small.

With respect to presence of children in the household and place of residence, the sample aligned particularly well with the ACS estimate.

There are no comparable Census data about length of residence. Respondent data indicated that over half of the respondents have lived in Ozaukee County for more than 20 years. Similarly, there are no comparable Census data about type of employment. The largest proportion of employed respondents worked in professional/administrative positions (28%). Another 28 percent said they are retired, which closely corresponds to the 28 percent of County households with Social Security income reported in the American Community Survey.

One percent of respondents said they work in agriculture; again, the response closely corresponds to the American Community Survey, which indicates 1.2 percent of the County workforce (age 16+) is engaged in agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting, and mining.

As we analyze the data, we will identify when various demographic groups have significantly different views.

Table 1. Demographic Profile of Respondents							
Gender	Count	Male	Female				
Sample	386	67%	33%				
Wisconsin Official Est.	66,121	49%	51%				
Age 18+	Count	18 – 24	25 – 34	35 – 44	45 – 54	55 – 64	65+
Sample	389	1%	6%	15%	25%	25%	28%
Wisconsin Official Est.	66,121	12%	11%	17%	23%	18%	18%
Households with Children	Count	0	1+	2	3	4	5+
Sample	393	68%	11%	14%	7%	<1%	<1%
Census ACS 2006-08	23,345	71%	29%				
Residential Status	Count	Own	Rent				
Sample	395	90%	10%				
Census ACS 2006-08	33,071	67%	33%				
Length of Residency	Count	0 to 10 years	11 to 20 years	Over 20 years	Seasonal/ Part time		
Sample <sup>2</sup>	397	22%	21%	56%	1%		
Employment	Count	Sales/ Service	Educ./ Gov't	Factory	General Labor	Agric.	Professional Admin.
Sample <sup>3</sup>	374	13%	8%	3%	1%	1%	28%
		Clerical/ Office	Skilled Trade/ Craft	Retired	Not Employed	Other	
		2%	6%	28%	4%	6%	
Highest Level of Education (Age 25+)	Count	Less than High Sch.	High Sch. Dipl.	Some College/ Tech	Tech/ College Grad.	Bachelor's Degree	Graduate/ Professional Degree
Sample	396	1%	13%	21%	10%	28%	28%
Census ACS 2006-08	57,831	6%	23%	22%	7%	28%	15%
Annual Household Income Range	Count	<\$15,000	\$15-\$24,999	\$25-\$49,999	\$50-\$74,999	\$75-\$99,999	\$100,000+
Sample	354	1%	6%	16%	21%	18%	39%
Census ACS 2006-08	33,071	4%	8%	20%	19%	16%	33%

<sup>2</sup> Census does not collect length of residence data

<sup>3</sup> Census does not contain comparable categories



<b>Place of Residence</b>		<b>Cedarburg C</b>	<b>Cedarburg T</b>	<b>Saukville T</b>	<b>Grafton V</b>
Sample Count = 396  Population <sup>4</sup> = 86,395	Sample	13%	9%	1%	13%
	Estimate <sup>4</sup>	13%	7%	2%	13%
		<b>Mequon</b>	<b>Fredonia T</b>	<b>Bayside</b>	<b>Newburg</b>
	Sample	26%	2%	0%	0%
	Estimate <sup>4</sup>	27%	2%	<1%	<1%
		<b>Port Wash. C</b>	<b>Grafton T</b>	<b>Belgium V</b>	<b>Saukville V</b>
	Sample	13%	7%	<1%	4%
	Estimate <sup>4</sup>	13%	5%	2%	5%
		<b>Belgium T</b>	<b>Port Wash. T</b>	<b>Fredonia V</b>	<b>Thiensville</b>
	Sample	2%	3%	2%	6%
	Estimate <sup>4</sup>	2%	2%	2%	4%

The place of residence of the sample closely aligns with the geographic distribution of the County's population.


To aid in the analysis of the place of residence data, the SRC combined jurisdictions into two groups. Group 1 contained the cities and villages. Group 2 contained the towns. Responses from Mequon were split between the two groups according to the ZIP code of the respondents. Mequon respondents in the 53092 ZIP code were added to the cities/villages; Mequon respondents in the 53097 ZIP code were added to the town group. Eighty-one percent of the Mequon respondents were from the 54092 ZIP code, and 19 percent were from 54097. These percentages closely match the geographic distribution of the population in the two Mequon ZIP code areas as reported in the 2000 Census. In general, there was little difference between the responses from the two areas. Only two questions contained noteworthy differences, which will be noted in the text.

---

<sup>4</sup>2010 US Census

## Quality of Life Factors

The initial section of the survey asked respondents to identify the four most positive influences on the quality of life they experience in Ozaukee County. As shown in Chart 1, two of the 15 choices stood out at the top of the list of influences. Topping the list was low crime/safe community, which was included among their top four choices by 71 percent of respondents. Coming in second place, the quality of local schools was a top influence among 57 percent of respondents and was the only other item included among their top four choices by a majority of the respondents. The third most popular quality of life factor was town/village charm, which was chosen by 38 percent of respondents. Tranquil residential areas and low taxes were in a tie for fourth place at 30 percent. Between 20 percent and 25 percent of respondents included parks and open spaces, well-maintained properties, retail shopping opportunities, and condition of roads among their top four quality of life influences. About one in six respondents said rural agricultural character and natural beauty are among their top quality of life factors. At the bottom of the list of factors were outdoor recreation opportunities, proximity to job opportunities, good pace of development, and historical features.




**Demographic Comparisons:** Perhaps not surprisingly, three-fourths of respondents with children in the household included quality schools among their top four choices compared to half of respondents without children at home. A majority of homeowners (60%) included quality schools among their top four choices compared to 44 percent of renters. A majority of renters picked small town charm (56%) compared to 38 percent of homeowners. Rural agricultural character was chosen more frequently by town respondents (35%) than by respondents from cities and villages (9%).

## Preservation of Farmland and Natural Areas

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with four statements using the following scale: strongly agree, agree, neutral/no opinion, disagree, strongly disagree, or need more information. Chart 2 summarizes the results. The top bar shows the sum of the percentage of the “strongly agree” plus the “agree” responses. The second bar is the percentage of the “neutral/no opinion” responses. The combined percentages of the “disagree” plus “strongly disagree” responses are shown in the third bar. The fourth bar is the “need more info” responses

Two-thirds of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that development should be concentrated around existing cities and villages in order to minimize conflicts between urban and rural activities. Nearly as many (65%) said they agree or strongly agree that Ozaukee County should purchase conservation easements to preserve farmland, maintain open space, or protect important environmental/natural areas. We will explore opinions about the purchase of specific types of conservation easements later in the report.

When asked if the cost of farmland is making agriculture unsustainable and if there is enough farmland in Ozaukee County to support the long-term viability of agriculture, neither a majority agreed or disagreed with these statements. A plurality, approximately 40 percent, agreed or strongly agreed with both statements, but between 23 percent and 29 percent of respondents said they had no opinion or were neutral. Additionally, between 13 percent and 20 percent said they needed more information to form an opinion. The relatively high proportion of respondents with no opinion and the relatively high percentage of people who couldn’t form an opinion because of a lack of information suggest the need for additional educational programming on these topics.



Demographic Comparisons: Women were more likely to want more information than men before offering an opinion about the sufficiency of farmland to support long-term agricultural viability in Ozaukee County and whether the County should purchase conservation easements.


As noted above, respondents indicated support for the concept of purchasing conservation easements (65%). However, when asked specifically about the creation of a County program to purchase easements for farmland preservation, Table 2 shows less enthusiasm than seen in the responses to the earlier question. Half of respondents, or 48 percent, said they favor or strongly favor a County program to purchase farmland easements. Only 23 percent were opposed to a County farmland easement program, while 19 percent chose “neutral/no opinion,” and 11 percent wanted more information.

<b>Table 2. Would you favor or oppose the creation of a County program to purchase conservation easements from farmers in an effort to preserve agricultural land?</b>					
<b>Strongly Favor</b>	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Neutral/ No Opinion</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Strongly Oppose</b>	<b>Need More Info</b>
14%	34%	19%	15%	8%	11%


Demographic Comparison: Renters were more likely to favor or strongly favor purchasing conservation easements for farmland preservation (64%) than homeowners (46%).

In a follow-up question, respondents who said they favored or strongly favored creation of a County program to purchase easements for farmland preservation were asked to indicate their preferences for funding. Six options were listed and respondents could pick as many of the funding mechanisms as applied. As shown in Chart 3, a majority of those who favor County purchase of farmland easements said their top funding choices were to seek monies from conservancy trust funds (such as the Ozaukee/Washington Land Trust) and grants or funds from the state or federal government. More than half of the supporters included private donations among their choices.

Use of County property tax revenue (11%) and sales tax revenue (10%) were decidedly unpopular, even among those who favor creating the program to purchase easements for farmland preservation.




All respondents were then asked their opinion about a specific property tax increase (10 cents per \$1,000 assessed value) to create a dedicated County fund for an agricultural land preservation program. The results are shown in Chart 4. Although there was less opposition to the use of property taxes when provided specific details, over half (54%) were opposed to the proposal. The combined results of Chart 3 and Chart 4 indicate that the majority of County residents were opposed to increasing County property taxes to fund a farmland preservation fund.



The farmland preservation programs and actions included in this section of the survey would have their largest impact on the farming community of Ozaukee County. As discussed previously, the proportion of farmers among the survey respondents was about one percent (4 respondents). Although this figure is proportional to the number of farmers in the County population, the small number of farmers in the survey precludes adequate statistical analysis of the opinions of Ozaukee County farmers. It is important for Ozaukee County officials to seek additional input from the farm community as they deliberate farmland preservation policy.

Respondents who opposed the use of government funds for the preservation of farmland were asked to indicate the reasons for their opposition. Respondents were able to choose multiple answers. Chart 5 indicates that the primary reasons behind the opposition were concerns that government funding costs too much (44%) and that farmland preservation programs interfere with private markets (41%). Nearly as many respondents said they oppose government spending on farmland preservation programs because they prefer the use of zoning regulations to manage farmland preservation (37%). Relatively few respondents (20%) said their opposition was based on a belief that the current amount of farmland is adequate.



Half of the respondents said they favor or strongly favor establishment of Agricultural Enterprise Areas (AEAs) in Ozaukee County, which allow farmland owners to claim tax credits for preserving their farmland. As shown in Table 3, relatively few respondents oppose AEAs (15%), while a third or respondents answered “neutral/no opinion” (23%) or said they needed more information (11%).

**Table 3. Would you favor or oppose the establishment of a State-designated Agricultural Enterprise Area, which would allow farmers to claim state farmland preservation tax credits, to help preserve farmland in Ozaukee County?**

Strongly Favor	Favor	Neutral/ No Opinion	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Need More Info
11%	40%	23%	10%	5%	11%

When asked if they would favor the creation of a County program to purchase conservation easements on natural areas, the results shown in Table 4 indicate that 40 percent would favor this proposal. The overall pattern was roughly similar to the earlier question about purchasing easements on farmland (see Table 2). Nearly equal percentages had no opinion or needed more information.


**Table 4. Would you favor or oppose the creation of a County program to purchase conservation easements on natural areas?**

<b>Strongly Favor</b>	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Neutral/ No Opinion</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Strongly Oppose</b>	<b>Need More Info</b>
8%	32%	23%	13%	9%	15%

Demographic Comparison: Women were more likely to have said they wanted more information.


In a follow-up question respondents who said they favored or strongly favored creation of a County program to purchase easements on natural areas were asked to indicate their preferences for funding. Six options were listed and respondents could pick as many of the funding mechanisms as applied. As shown in Chart 6, a majority of those who favor County purchase of easements on natural areas said their top funding choices were to seek private donations, monies from conservancy trust funds (such as the Ozaukee/Washington Land Trust), and seek funds from the state or federal government. Compared to a similar question about funding the purchase of easements for farmland preservation, respondents were more likely to favor seeking private donations for easements on natural areas (See Chart 3).

Again, use of County property tax revenue and sales tax revenue were decidedly unpopular, even among those who favor creating the program to purchase easements for farmland preservation.






All respondents were then asked their opinion about a specific property tax increase (10 cents per \$1,000 assessed value) to create a dedicated County fund for a natural areas preservation program. The results are shown in Chart 7. Although there was less opposition to the use of property taxes when provided specific details, a majority (63%) opposed the proposal. The combined results of Chart 6 and Chart 7 indicate that the majority of County residents were opposed to increasing County property taxes to create a fund to purchase easements for preservation of natural areas.




Respondents who opposed the use of government funds for the preservation of natural areas were asked to indicate the reasons for their opposition. Respondents were able to choose multiple answers. Chart 8 indicates that the primary reason behind the opposition is a belief that such a program would cost too much (53%). Respondents were less likely to oppose government funding of easements on natural areas because they believe it interferes with private markets (31%), because they believe zoning should be used to manage natural areas (30%), or because they believe the current amount of open space is adequate (27%).

Compared to a similar question regarding opposition to government funding of easements for farmland preservation (see Chart 5), respondents were more likely to oppose a program for easements on natural areas due to the cost.



One method to preserve open space in housing subdivisions is the use of “cluster” (conservation subdivision) design, which has smaller individual lots and shared open space in comparison to a traditional subdivision design with large lots and no shared open space. When asked if they prefer the traditional design or the cluster design, Ozaukee County respondents prefer the cluster design by a two-to-one ratio (Figure 1). The SRC has asked this question in many other surveys with similar results.

**Figure 1.**




## Provision of Parks and Recreation Facilities

When asked about expanding the County Parks System and County Recreation Facilities, respondents were fairly equally split between those who agree, those who disagree, and those still on the fence. As shown in Table 5, a plurality (38%) favored expansion, while 30 percent opposed. The remaining 34 percent had a neutral/no opinion response or said they need more information.


<b>Table 5. Would you favor or oppose the expansion of the Ozaukee County Parks System and County Recreational Facilities?</b>					
<b>Strongly Favor</b>	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Neutral/ No Opinion</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Strongly Oppose</b>	<b>Need More Info</b>
7%	31%	23%	24%	6%	11%

Demographic Comparison: Younger respondents (age 25-44 years) were more likely to favor or strongly favor expansion of the parks and recreation facilities (54%) compared to respondents age 45 and above (33%).

In a follow-up question, respondents who said they favored or strongly favored creation of a dedicated fund for the County's parks and recreational facilities were asked to indicate their preferences for funding. Six options were listed and respondents could pick as many of the funding mechanisms as applied. As shown in Chart 9, a majority of those who favor a dedicated County parks and recreation fund said their top funding choices were to seek private donations and to seek state or federal government funds. Compared to similar questions about funding the purchase of easements for farmland preservation and funding easements on natural areas, respondents were less likely to favor conservancy trust funds. Again, use of County property tax revenue and sales tax revenue were decidedly unpopular, although greater than the percentage for farmland easements or natural area easements, even among those who favor creating a dedicated parks and recreation fund. (See Chart 3 and Chart 6).



All respondents were then asked their opinion about a specific property tax increase (10 cents per \$1,000 assessed value) to create a dedicated County fund for County parks expansion. The results are shown in Chart 10, and indicate 71 percent were opposed to the proposed tax increase. The combined results of Chart 9 and Chart 10 indicate that the majority of County residents were opposed to increasing County property taxes to create a fund to expand parks and recreation facilities.




As shown in Table 6, respondents had split opinions about the development of a Countywide bike and pedestrian trail network. Roughly equal proportions of respondents supported, opposed, and had not decided about the expanded trail concept. While 37 percent were in favor, an equal number were in opposition. The remaining 27 percent had a neutral/no opinion response or said they need more information.


<b>Table 6. Would you favor or oppose the development of a Countywide network of bike and pedestrian trails, in addition to the Ozaukee Interurban Trail?</b>					
<b>Strongly Favor</b>	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Neutral/No Opinion</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Strongly Oppose</b>	<b>Need More Info</b>
11%	26%	21%	28%	9%	6%

Demographic Comparisons: Respondents with children in their households were more likely to support bike and pedestrian trails. Half of households with children favored or strongly favored a Countywide network of trails compared to a third of respondents from households without children.


Chart 11 summarizes the favorability ratings presented in Table 2 through Table 6.



In a follow-up question, respondents who said they favored or strongly favored development of a Countywide trail system, were asked to indicate their preferences for funding. Six options were listed and respondents could pick as many of the funding mechanisms as applied. As shown in Chart 12, a majority of those who favor the trail system said their top funding choices were to seek private donations and to apply for grants from the state or federal government. As we have seen in earlier questions, respondents did not favor use of County property tax revenue and sales tax revenue. (See Chart 3, Chart 6, and Chart 9).



All respondents were then asked their opinion about a specific property tax increase (10 cents per \$1,000 assessed value) to create a dedicated County fund for a Countywide network of bike and pedestrian trails. The results are shown in Chart 13, and indicate 78 percent were opposed to the proposed tax increase. Compared to the earlier questions about a tax increases for farmland preservation (see Chart 4), the purchase of conservation easements on natural areas (see Chart 7), and a dedicated parks and recreation fund (see Chart 10), there is more opposition to a County tax increase for additional trails. Chart 14 (next page) summarizes the comparison.





**Chart 14. Tax Increase For:**

■ Yes ■ No






Chart 15 summarizes the funding preferences by program area shown in Chart 3, Chart 6, Chart 9, and Chart 12.



## Future Funding Priorities

Respondents were presented with a list of 27 projects and activities related to parks/recreation facilities and land preservation issues and were asked to rate each as a “high priority” or a “low priority.” Respondents were also given a third option — “need more info.” The results of the “high priority” ratings are shown in Chart 16a and 16b. Chart 16a lists projects and activities that were rated a high priority by a majority of respondents. Chart 16b lists those projects and activities that a minority of respondents rated as a high priority. The maintenance and upkeep of the County’s existing park facilities and preserving open space in Ozaukee County were rated high priorities by three-fourths of respondents. Although three-fourths of respondents said that preserving open space is a high priority for funding, the results from earlier questions indicate that they did not support a property tax increase to achieve this priority, preferring external funding sources instead.


Between 65 percent and 71 percent of respondents gave high priority ratings to river restoration projects and preserving historic structures and archaeological sites. More than half of respondents said preservation of farmland for food and rural character and protecting natural areas near County parks were high priorities.



As shown in Chart 16b, projects and activities that included expansions to existing facilities/activities or new facilities/activities were more likely to be rated as low priorities by more than half of respondents. Creating a golf driving range, skateboard park, horseback trails, and developing another disc golf course were the lowest priority items.

**Chart 16b. Future Funding Priorities**

■ Less than 50 Percent High Priority



## Environmental Improvement Priorities

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of 10 actions to preserve or improve the natural environment of Ozaukee County. The results are shown in Table 7. Majorities placed a high priority on preserving wildlife habitat, monitoring the water quality of Lake Michigan beaches, preventing beach and bluff erosion along Lake Michigan, and creating stricter water quality regulations.


Half the respondents said stricter flood control/stormwater regulations and air quality improvements were high priority items. Respondents had evenly split opinions about wetland regulations, with 43 percent rating it a high priority, and 43 percent rating it a low priority. Opinions were also evenly split regarding stricter regulations on areas that support groundwater recharge. Pluralities of respondents said stricter regulations on environmental corridors and non-metallic mining were low priorities.

One in four respondents said they needed more information regarding stricter regulations on development in groundwater recharge areas, environmental corridors, and non-metallic mining.

<b>Table 7. Priorities to Preserve or Improve the Natural Environment in County</b>			
	<b>High Priority</b>	<b>Low Priority</b>	<b>Need More Info</b>
Preservation of wildlife habitat	63%	31%	6%
Monitoring Lake Michigan beach water quality	62%	29%	9%
Preventing Lake Michigan beach and bluff erosion	59%	32%	9%
Stricter water quality regulations	58%	30%	12%
Stricter flood control and stormwater regulations	52%	34%	15%
Promoting efforts to improve air quality	49%	39%	11%
Stricter wetland preservation regulations	43%	43%	14%
Stricter regulations on development on lands with high groundwater recharge potential	38%	35%	27%
Stricter environmental corridor area regulations	31%	44%	25%
Stricter non-metallic mining regulations	23%	49%	27%

## Overall Priority Actions for Ozaukee County

Respondents were asked to identify their top four priorities for Ozaukee County government from a list of 11 options. The results are shown in Chart 17. A majority of respondents selected protection of water quality (58%) and preservation of rural and small town character (57%) among their four priority choices. Preservation of green space, road improvements, and preservation of productive agricultural land were in a statistical dead heat with slightly less than 40 percent. At the bottom of the priority list were industrial/commercial development, affordable housing, and tourism promotion.



**Demographic Comparisons:** Half of respondents under age 45 included promoting sustainable community development among their top four priorities compared to a third of respondents age 45 and older. Respondents from towns were more likely to include preservation of productive farmland among their four priorities (48%) compared to respondents from cities/villages (33%).

## Additional Comments

Near the end of the survey, respondents were asked to provide any additional comments they would like to make regarding issues in the survey. The 77 comments were grouped into specific topics by the SRC and are summarized in Table 8. The complete list of responses is included in Appendix B.

Comments related to parks and recreation were in first place (27%). The SRC notes that some comments referred to municipal parks rather than Ozaukee County parks and recreation, which were the focus of this survey. Comments about taxes and government spending were close behind with 25 percent of the total.

Table 8. Additional Comments by Topic		
Topic	Count	%
Parks/Recreation/Open space	21	27%
Taxes and government spending	19	25%
Farmland preservation	10	13%
Preserve what we have (general)	6	8%
Economic Development	3	4%
Need more information	2	3%
Miscellaneous	16	21%
Total	77	

There was a substantial group of comments about parks and recreation that emphasized the need to focus on maintenance of existing park and recreation facilities rather than expansion and acquisition.

*“Assets to be maintained but do not feel further expansion is needed. There is no over crowding of these areas.”*

*“Parks & facilities (esp. buildings) are adequate--but Oz. Co. needs to keep and maintain current parks/facilities--cannot have less.”*

Regarding taxes/spending, a substantial group of respondents expressed a concern about the cost of the programs and projects mentioned in the questionnaire and resulting impact on local taxes. The following quotes illustrate this concern.

*“I would be in favor of gov't funding of various projects as listed above but with the present economic problems would not favor any tax increases for the general populous.”*

*“All good things but at what cost to the taxpayers?”*

Comments specifically about farmland preservation comprised 13 percent of the total, and six percent of the comments were more about preservation in general.

A small number of comments dealt with economic development issues or a concern about insufficient background information to answer some of the questions.

## **Conclusions**

Although two-thirds of Ozaukee County survey respondents agreed with a generic statement that the County should purchase conservation easements, support declined when asked about creating and funding County programs to purchase specific types of conservation easements. At the same time, there was an increase in the percentage of respondents with no opinion or who wanted more information.

Regarding parks and recreation facilities, respondents were more likely to favor expenditures for maintenance and upkeep of existing facilities than funding expansions and new activities. When asked specifically about expanding parks and trails, a significant portion of respondents were not necessarily opposed; rather they indicated they wanted more information or had a neutral opinion.

The relatively high proportion of respondents who do not have clearly formed opinions about many of the issues covered in this survey means that education/outreach efforts could be pivotal in terms of public reaction to policy options chosen by the County Board. The percentage of respondents with neutral opinions or who want more information also suggests that there is not a high level of polarization with respect to many of these policy issues facing the County.

In addition, given the relatively weak economy prevailing when the survey was conducted, it is not surprising that many respondents expressed a reluctance to see the County enact policies/programs that are likely to increase their personal tax burden.



## Appendix A – Non-Response Bias Test

Any survey has to be concerned with “non-response bias.” Non-response bias refers to a situation in which people who do not return a questionnaire have opinions that are systematically different from the opinions of those who return their surveys. For example, suppose most non-respondents felt that preserving historic structures and archaeological sites is a low priority (Question 13m), whereas most of those who returned their questionnaire felt that historic preservation is a high priority. In this case, non-response bias would exist, and the raw results would overstate the opinion of the population of the residents of Ozaukee County.

The standard way to test for non-response bias is to compare the responses of those who return the first mailing of a questionnaire to those who return the second mailing. Those who return the second questionnaire are, in effect, a sample of non-respondents (to the first mailing), and we assume that they are representative of that group. In this survey, 282 people responded to the first mailing, and 140 responded to the second mailing.

We found 21 variables with statistically significant differences between the mean responses of these two groups of respondents out of 109 tested. Table A1 indicates that even when statistical differences exist, the magnitude of this difference is very small. **The Survey Research Center (SRC) concludes that there is little evidence that non-response bias is a concern for this sample.**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Statistical Significance</b>	<b>Mean First Mailing</b>	<b>Mean Second Mailing</b>
1. Pace of development	.015	.05	.11
2. Development should be concentrated in existing cities and villages	.030	2.35	2.67
6. Housing design preference	.006	1.71	1.57
8. Conservancy trust	.014	.37	.25
8. Private donations	.038	.33	.23
12i. New facilities in existing parks	.019	1.84	1.69
13c. Upgrading Ozaukee Interurban Trail	.007	1.57	1.75
13d. Expanding links with Ozaukee Interurban Trail	.003	1.61	1.80
13m. Preserving historic structures & archaeological sites	.013	1.38	1.55
13p. Developing more campsites and campgrounds	.009	1.89	1.75
15. Conservancy trust funds	.042	.31	.21
15. Private donations	.029	.32	.21
17. Use zoning regulations	.045	.19	.11
22. State/Federal grants/funds	.008	.24	.13
22. Conservancy trust funds	.009	.19	.09
22. Private donations	.015	.29	.18
24c. Stricter regulations for environmental corridors	.012	1.87	2.07
24d. Stricter regulations for non-metallic mining	.001	1.95	2.21
24e. Stricter regulations for wetland protection	.009	1.64	1.84
24f. Stricter regulations for groundwater recharge areas	.007	1.81	2.05
25. Improve roads	.041	.35	.45

## **Appendix B – Ozaukee County Natural Resources Survey Comments**

***Q8. If you favor or strongly favor, how do you think the program should be funded? ‘Other’ (8 Responses)***

- All three
- Are we talking reserving or creating?
- Encourage private conservation easements.
- N/A
- No more bureaucracy.
- No program...no taxes
- Tax on new development on agricultural land.
- We are far enough in debt—let’s pay that.

***Q 15. If you favor or strongly favor, how do you think the program should be funded? ‘Other’ (5 Responses)***

- All three
- None
- Private investment--no taxes
- Tax on new development on agricultural land.
- We have too much to pay for as of now.

***Q 19. If you favor or strongly favor, how to you think the program should be funded? ‘Other’ (9 Responses)***

- User fees (i.e., county park sticker, county driving range) (3x)
- No taxes (2x)
- None
- Parks are actually adequate, facilities more than adequate.
- Tax on new construction
- Unsure

***Q 22. If you favor or strongly favor, how do you think the program should be funded? ‘Other’ (5 Responses)***

- N/A(3x)
- Lottery
- Private investment user fees

***Q 26. Do you have any additional comments regarding farmland preservation and/or park and open space issues in Ozaukee County? ‘Other’ (77 Responses)***

### **Parks & Recreation/Open Spaces (21 Responses)**

- Assets to be maintained, but do not feel further expansion is needed. There is no over crowding of these areas.
- Beautiful parks and natural areas.
- I believe we are already sufficiently green-space/wetland/conservation/parkland conscious enough. Between state and city-town restrictions, we have enough political footballs without creating more.
- I live near the Ozaukee Interurban Trail and I rarely see any bicyclists stop for the road, many rolling stops, and more going at a pretty good speed than those who stop. Visibility at the road crossing is not the best. Was the interurban bridge built because bicyclists don't like to obey traffic laws?
- I think the more rural and green with trails, the better. But you need a waste plan so it fits and flows. This is good for property values and fast resale.

- Invest in Cedar Creek Park. The band shell, landscaping, some flowers would be nice. So many people use that park, it should look much better.
- Issue Ozaukee county park use stickers at \$2.00/year charge now resident for park use.
- It is critical to maintain open space through zoning and maintaining large lots (3 acres). This requires much less government funding.
- Let private people--to handle park & rec. developments in county.
- Maintaining what is already in place needs to be a priority over any expansion. Roads, maintaining existing trails, and balanced budgets to support all.
- Old paved areas, run down, non-usual warehouse parking lots should be piped/torn out to make natural areas and/or large lots of residential areas.
- Open more areas to public hunting!
- Our parks are a nice area to visit. Fees to enter parks could help fund these parks.
- Our son was in the baseball program. Played at tournaments in neighboring communities, Mequon's facilities are by far the worst we saw.
- Ozaukee has a good amount of park and natural space. The Interurban Trail accommodates biking. These are all to be maintained, but do not feel further expansion is needed. There is no over crowding of these areas.
- Parks & facilities (esp. buildings) are adequate--but Oz. Co. needs to keep and maintain current parks/facilities--cannot have less.
- Preserve and take care of what we have. Open spaces are important. Later, when times get better, we can improve on those spaces and add trails etc.-unless you get grants.
- Preserve spaces; don't enlarge government by expanding county park system. Oz/Wash Land Trust should be your partner!
- The Interurban Trail is a wonderful asset to Ozaukee County as is Lion's Den Gorge and the Mequon Nature Preserve. It has been fantastic to see the development of these areas. An enclosed off-leash dog park with running areas for large and small dogs as well as trails to walk would be another asset to our county. While we have at least 2 dog parks in the Mequon area, one patterned after Minooka in Waukesha would be very helpful in exercising dogs, especially ones that do need a lot of running space.
- There is always a lot of talk about bike paths and recreational areas but no one talks about the cost to maintain them. What is the break-even point considering volume of usage vs. maintenance costs?
- You don't want to lose too much open spaces. You also don't want to grow too fast if you would lose farmland.

#### **Taxes and Government Spending (19 Responses)**

- No taxes (2x).
- All good things but at what cost to the taxpayers? There must be other ways besides private donation. (No increases taxes and fees).
- Conservation groups need to pay taxes on the land they purchase.
- Do not put any more people on payrolls--ask for volunteers to monitor rec. lands/areas.
- Farmers using pesticides, inorganic fertilizers that pollute water table and rivers and lakes should be taxed for their externalities, same with growing genetically modified (GM) crops. County should be careful raising general taxes during this fragile economy. County should have provided more information related to its current financial condition along with this survey.
- I am opposed to any project that would increase taxes; we pay far too much in taxes now. I would like to see more commercial and industrial development to increase our taxes.
- I strongly oppose any type of property tax increase to support the purchase of easements.

- I would be in favor of gov't funding of various projects as listed above, but with the present economic problems would not favor any tax increases for the general populous.
- Keep farmland taxes low.
- Please do not keep increasing our taxes.
- Right now with the poor economic situation, we can't have everything added to the tax base. It adds up bit by bit.
- Stop federal, state and county government from spending money on more land. Improve our roads, increase involvement in police and fire protection and maintain our existing parks etc. Stop finding ways to spend more and increase our taxes!
- Tax dollars should not be used for this.
- Taxes are too high already!
- The economy couldn't get much worse and you want me to consider a skateboard park? Or an outdoor ice rink? Or a water trail for a gosh darn kayak? By the time things get better, your survey will be outdated and you'll waste more time and money working up a new one. Don't bother me. Find someone else.
- We have enough--there is no need to use tax dollars for this purpose.
- We need to use the funding we have.
- You don't get it--Stop spending money.

#### **Farmland Preservation (10 Responses)**

- Current agricultural land is sufficient. No less.
- Don't know how you would choose farmland preservation there are good farmers out there that would want to keep farming and then not so good farmers that would jump on this to waste our tax dollars for their benefit.
- Farmer using organic farming methods should be incented through the farmland preservation initiative.
- I am opposed to farmland preservation by the government. This is a free market issue.
- I don't feel strongly about farmland preservation because I am not informed on the issue and because I am more concerned about preserving open spaces and the environment in general. These are not the same thing.
- I think it's very important that Mequon starts preservation of farmland. I have lived here for 29 of my 30 years and constantly see new condos and subdivisions being built on the old farmland. This is making the animals that used to call these places home have to search for new places to live. Now because of the recent building behind our homes where deer and coyotes used to live, the deer population decreased and the coyotes are now moving into our backyard and golf course and killing family pets.
- Preserving farmland is very important as farms that sell their produce, such as Barthel Fruit Farm and Witte's Farm attract people to our area and hopefully would lead them to also spend their dollars in our towns like Cedarburg and Port Washington. We need to promote the many benefits of visiting Ozaukee County as we have much to offer--tourism promotion--more of it would be great!
- Purchasing conservation easements on farmland is fine, as long as it is done by private organizations that are motivated to do so. It should not be the County's business.
- Too many people treat farm fields like privately owned public land. Why is the only farmland that gets development rights purchase to have some form of water or woods? Why can't good farmland be purchased because it is good farmland? Or would stop some urban sprawl and its purchase would protect a lot more farm land?
- We consider the current level of farmland preservation and the number/size/condition of parks as sufficient.

**Preservation (general comments) (6 Responses)**

- Be careful to protect the rural nature because development and expansion (even in a bad economy) is easy. Preservation is difficult.
- Better zoning to protect land and water. Encourage rebuild or update rather than new build. Please do something about invasive Buckthorn—I see it killing a lot of old trees.
- If we spend all our time and money preserving everything that exists, and encroach on more, how do we continue to attract younger families to live here so there is a sustainable tax base to support it? Take care of the youth needs, they will come. Make it impossible to get in, they will not. Putting all development in existing urban areas then puts control of their expansion in their hands and the politics will continue to be ridiculous.
- Keep up what we have.
- Preservation of farmland/park/open spaces is very important. However, we already pay way too much in taxes and if the county bought this land, who determines access? Will the public have access? Would hunting and fishing be allowed? I would much rather see the county encourage private property owners and farmers to preserve land and wetlands without government ownership of these lands. Existing programs like CRP, WRP, and others work and should be supported, not the transfer of land to the county gov't. This is not how our tax dollars should be spent.
- Yes- rural development should be cut to one acre lots in rural areas like the state of Illinois--nothing bigger.

**Business/Economic Development (3 Responses)**

- No more big box stores!
- Please no more gas stations or car washes north side of Port.
- Promote private enterprise, promote private jobs, promote manufacturing

**Need more information (2 Responses)**

- Much of this needs further information especially the above.
- This survey did not provide enough specifics regarding the study of money and other questions.

**Miscellaneous (16 Responses)**

- None (4x)
- Do not remove any existing dams on the Milwaukee River/Cedar Creek system. Limit snow dumping into areas near waterways--use lake Michigan.
- I am opposed to county telling a private property owner what they can or cannot do with their property.
- Inform everyone what you offer and fund all with donations. Don't over kill this idea.
- My family and I enjoy living in this county, and did this survey as a family discussion. Please provide a result of this survey when available. We are glad when government business is done like this rather than with ad campaigns. We consider this survey as "money well spent"!
- Questions 2-5 are screwed up.
- Some funding from county residents is going to have to be assessed, that I realize, but it has to be used frugally with little demographic B.S...try and try for federal if its there, simply because they are going to spend it anyway. I personally would have to educate myself on some of the issues listed. Put it out there people have to know and this is a good start. Thanks
- Stay out of it!
- Stop creating & duplicating jobs. Let the State do it.

- The greater number of generations the less amounts the results will be.
- This whole survey is total liberal garbage if I ever saw one!
- Use some common sense. Don't listen to all the high interest groups.
- What the heck are you doing with the roads? Every year. Do you not consider that people have to travel in and out of Mequon/Thiensville? And you tear them up and redo the same projects over and over again. What is this costing us? Green Bay Avenue--2 summers in a row--tore up the same work this summer that was done last summer. Road looks awful and terrible design with the weird bump outs. Huge waste of money that could have been spent on something more worthwhile. Don't waste any more of our money.

***Q 29. Which of the following best describes the type of work you do? 'Other' (19 Responses)***

- Business owner(2x)
- Executive(2x)
- Homemaker( 2x)
- IT(2x)
- Mom(2x)
- Artist
- Construction
- Engineering
- Healthcare
- Law enforcement
- Nurse/social worker
- Own machine shop
- Retired
- Supervisor

## Appendix C - Quantitative Summary of Responses by Question

### Ozaukee County Natural Resources Survey – 2010

**\*\*Please return by October 6, 2010\*\***

Using blue or black ink, please fill the circle that most closely matches your response on the following:

Like this: ● Not like this: ✓ ✗ 1/2

Please fill the circle:

1. From the following list, which **FOUR** have the most positive influence on the quality of life in Ozaukee County?  
(Please mark ● only FOUR)



30% Tranquil residential areas	57% Quality schools	22% Adequate availability of shopping/retail services
25% Parks and open spaces	71% Low crime rate/safe community	23% Well-maintained properties
11% Outdoor recreation opportunities	30% Low taxes	17% Rural agricultural character
22% Condition of roads	16% Natural beauty	38% Small town/village charm
11% Proximity to job opportunities	7% Good pace of development	6% Historical features

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral/ No Opinion	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Need More Info
2. Development should be concentrated in existing cities & villages to minimize conflicts between urban and rural uses	25%	42%	15%	3%	11%	5%
3. There is enough farmland in Ozaukee County to support the long-term economic viability of agriculture in the County	6%	34%	23%	8%	16%	13%
4. The cost of farmland is making agriculture unsustainable in Ozaukee County	12%	29%	29%	2%	7%	20%
5. Ozaukee County should purchase conservation easements to preserve farmland, maintain open space, or protect important environmental areas	27%	39%	12%	6%	10%	7%
6. Would you prefer housing built in a <u>traditional design (Option A)</u> with larger individual lots and no shared open space or a <u>cluster design (Option B)</u> with smaller individual lots and shared open space? Please fill the circle for either Option A or Option B below to indicate your preference.						

34% OPTION A

66% OPTION B



7. Would you favor or oppose the creation of a County program to purchase conservation easements from farmers in an effort to preserve agricultural land?						
Strongly Favor	Favor	Neutral/ No Opinion	Oppose	Strongly oppose	Need More Information	
14%	34%	19%	15%	8%	11%	
8. If you favor or strongly favor, how do you think the program should be funded? (Please mark • all that apply)						
11% County property tax revenue	61% Conservancy trust funds (e.g. Ozaukee/Washington Land Trust)			54%	Private donations	
58% State/Federal grants/funds	42% Dedicated farmland preservation fund			10%	Sales taxes	
2% Other (specify) See Appendix B						
9. Would you be willing to support a property tax increase of \$0.10 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$25.00 annually for a \$250,000 home) to create and sustain a dedicated fund for an agricultural land preservation program?						
Yes No						
46% 54%						
10. If you do not support using government funds for the preservation of farmland, why not? (Please mark • all that apply)						
37% It should be managed through zoning regulations		44%		Too costly		
20% Current farmland is adequate		41%		Interferes with private markets		
11. Would you favor or oppose the establishment of a State-designated Agricultural Enterprise Area, which would allow farmers to claim state farmland preservation tax credits, to help preserve farmland in Ozaukee County?						
Strongly Favor	Favor	Neutral/ No Opinion	Oppose	Strongly oppose	Need More Information	
11%	40%	23%	10%	5%	11%	
12. What would be your relative priorities for future funding and projects?				High Priority	Low Priority	Need More Info
a. Acquiring parkland for passive uses (trails, nature study, picnicking, etc.)				38%	52%	11%
b. Acquiring parkland for active uses (playgrounds, ball fields, sand volleyball courts, etc.)				21%	72%	8%
c. Preserving open space, protecting natural resources and wildlife habitat				74%	21%	5%
d. River restoration projects to improve flood control, water quality, and wildlife habitat				71%	20%	9%
e. Maintenance and upkeep of existing park facilities				76%	19%	5%
f. Security/ranger patrols/rules enforcement				26%	63%	12%
g. Outdoor education programs in parks/natural areas				23%	67%	9%
h. Establishing greenways/parkways along rivers				41%	50%	10%
i. New facilities in existing parks (playground equipment, flush toilets, etc.)				31%	59%	10%
j. Preservation of farmland to maintain the feeling of rural character				52%	40%	8%
k. Preservation of farmland for food				57%	30%	13%



13. What would be your relative priorities for future funding and projects?

	High Priority	Low Priority	Need More Info
a. Creating mountain bike trails	13%	82%	5%
b. Developing horseback riding trails	6%	88%	6%
c. Upgrading the Ozaukee Interurban Trail (additional paved, off-road sections, trailheads, signage)	44%	49%	7%
d. Expanding links with the Ozaukee Interurban Trail (to County parks, communities west of Trail)	41%	50%	9%
e. Grooming cross country skiing trails in County parks	18%	76%	7%
f. Creating an off-leash dog park	19%	76%	7%
g. Establishing water trails for canoes and kayaks (on rivers and Lake Michigan)	28%	63%	9%
h. Developing additional public access to Lake Michigan	48%	46%	6%
i. Protecting natural areas adjacent to existing County parks	55%	40%	5%
j. Developing a golf driving range	9%	86%	5%
k. Establishing community gardens	27%	64%	9%
l. Creating another disc golf course	5%	90%	5%
m. Preserving historic structures and archaeological sites	65%	27%	9%
n. Building a skateboard park	9%	86%	6%
o. Creating an outdoor ice-skating/hockey rink	23%	69%	7%
p. Developing more campsites and campgrounds	22%	72%	7%

14. Would you favor or oppose the creation of a County program to purchase conservation easements on natural areas?

Strongly Favor	Favor	Neutral/ No Opinion	Oppose	Strongly oppose	Need More Information
8%	32%	23%	13%	9%	15%

15. If you favor or strongly favor, how do you think the program should be funded? (Please mark • all that apply)

17% County property tax revenue	63% Conservancy trust funds (e.g. Ozaukee/Washington Land Trust)	64% Private donations
53% State/Federal grants/funds	36% Dedicated natural area fund	11% Sales taxes
1% Other (specify) See Appendix B		

16. Would you be willing to support a property tax increase of \$0.10 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$25.00 annually for a \$250,000 home) to create and sustain a dedicated fund for a program to purchase conservation easements on natural areas?

Yes	No
37%	63%

17. If you do not support using government funds for the preservation of natural areas, why not?

(Please mark • all that apply)

30% It should be managed through zoning regulations	53% Too costly
27% Current natural areas and open spaces are adequate	31% Interferes with private markets

18. Would you favor or oppose the expansion of the Ozaukee County Parks System and County Recreational Facilities?

Strongly Favor	Favor	Neutral/ No Opinion	Oppose	Strongly oppose	Need More Information
7%	31%	23%	24%	6%	11%

19. If you favor or strongly favor, how do you think the program should be funded? (Please mark • all that apply)

23%	County property tax revenue	45%	Conservancy trust funds (e.g. Ozaukee/Washington Land Trust)	58%	Private donations
53%	State/Federal grants/funds	50%	Dedicated park and recreation fund	14%	Sales taxes
4%	Other (specify) See Appendix B				

20. Would you be willing to support a property tax increase of \$0.10 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$25.00 annually for a \$250,000 home) to create and sustain a dedicated fund for Ozaukee County’s parks and recreational facilities?

Yes	No
29%	71%

21. Would you favor or oppose the development of a Countywide network of bike and pedestrian trails, in addition to the Ozaukee Interurban Trail?

Strongly Favor	Favor	Neutral/ No Opinion	Oppose	Strongly oppose	Need More Information
11%	26%	21%	28%	9%	6%

22. If you favor or strongly favor, how do you think the program should be funded? (Please mark • all that apply)

20%	County property tax revenue	41%	Conservancy trust funds (e.g. Ozaukee/Washington Land Trust)	64%	Private donations
52%	State/Federal grants/funds	51%	Dedicated bike and pedestrian trail fund	10%	Sales taxes
2%	Other (specify) See Appendix B				

23. Would you be willing to support a property tax increase of \$0.10 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$25.00 annually for a \$250,000 home) to create and sustain a dedicated fund for a Countywide network of bike and pedestrian trails?

Yes	No
22%	78%

24. Please indicate how high a priority you would place on the following actions to preserve or improve the natural environment in Ozaukee County.

	High Priority	Low Priority	Need More Information
a. Creating stricter regulations to improve water quality (streams, rivers, lakes)	58%	30%	12%
b. Creating stricter regulations for flood control and stormwater	52%	34%	15%
c. Creating stricter regulations for environmental corridor areas	31%	44%	25%
d. Creating stricter regulations of non-metallic mining	23%	49%	27%
e. Creating stricter regulations for wetland protection	43%	43%	14%
f. Creating stricter regulations for development on lands with high groundwater recharge potential	38%	35%	27%
g. Preventing Lake Michigan beach and bluff erosion	59%	32%	9%
h. Preservation of wildlife habitat	63%	31%	6%
i. Monitoring Lake Michigan beach water quality	62%	29%	9%
j. Promoting efforts to improve air quality	49%	39%	11%

**25. From the following list, please mark the FOUR most important actions you think the County should pursue.**

*( Please mark ● only FOUR)*

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| 39% Preserve green space                        | 18% Increase industrial park/commercial development | 28% Promote sustainable community development |
| 27% Promote development in existing urban areas | 13% Increase affordable housing supply              | 30% Promote renewable energy production       |
| 58% Protect water quality                       | 38% Improve roads                                   | 57% Preserve rural and small town character   |
| 37% Preserve productive agricultural land       | 10% Promote tourism                                 |   |

**26. Do you have any additional comments regarding farmland preservation and/or park and open space issues in Ozaukee County? See Appendix B**

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

27. Gender	Male	Female				
	67%	33%				
28. Age	Under 25	25 - 34	35 - 44	45 - 54	55 - 64	65+
	1%	6%	15%	25%	25%	28%
29. Which of the following best describes the type of work you do?	Sales/ Services	Education/ Government	Factory	General Labor	Agriculture/ Farming	Professional/ Administrative
	13%	8%	3%	1%	1%	28%
	Clerical/ Office	Skilled Trade/ Craft	Retired	Not Employed	Other See Appendix B	
	2%	6%	28%	4%	6%	

30. Number of children (under 18) in household								
	0	1	2	3	4	5+		
	68%	11%	14%	7%	1%	1%		
31. Highest level of Education								
	Less than high school	High school diploma	Some college/tech	Tech college graduate	Bachelor’s degree	Graduate or professional degree		
	1%	13%	21%	10%	28%	28%		
32. Residential Status								
	Own	Rent						
	90%	10%						
33. If a year-round resident, how many years have you lived in Ozaukee County?								
	0 to 10 years	11 to 20 years	Over 20 years	Not applicable (seasonal/part-time resident)				
	22%	21%	56%	1%				
34. Annual Household Income Range								
	Less than \$15,000	\$15,000 - \$24,999	\$25,000 - \$49,999	\$50,000 - \$74,999	\$75,000 - \$99,999	\$100,000 or more		
	1%	6%	16%	21%	18%	39%		
35. Please indicate the jurisdiction in which you live	13%	City of Cedarburg	9%	Town of Cedarburg	1%	Town of Saukville	13%	Village of Grafton
	26%	City of Mequon	2%	Town of Fredonia	0%	Village of Bayside	0%	Village of Newburg
	13%	City of Port Washington	7%	Town of Grafton	1%	Village of Belgium	4%	Village of Saukville
	2%	Town of Belgium	3%	Town of Port Washington	2%	Village of Fredonia	6%	Village of Thiensville