



Town of
MOSEL
Sheboygan County

Responses to 2018 Citizen Opinion Survey

Final Report: September 4, 2018

Submitted by Kevin Struck
Growth Management Educator
UW-Extension Sheboygan County

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	1
Methodology and Response Rate	3
Technical Notes	4
Results Color Coding	5
Respondent Characteristics	6
Survey Results	8

Executive Summary

Introduction

To obtain public feedback on the preferences of Town residents and property owners regarding growth and planning issues, transportation, community services, agriculture, economic development in the Town of Mosel, Town officials partnered with the Sheboygan County UW-Extension Office to create an opinion survey. Some of the questions are repeats from a similar survey conducted in 2004, while others were created by the Town Plan Commission and the Town Board during an open meeting in the spring of 2018.

Surveys were delivered by mail in mid-June 2018 to a list of addresses supplied by the Town of Mosel that included landowners, homeowners, businesses, and residential rental properties within the Town. The deadline for the survey's return was July 6, 2018; however, because numerous surveys continued to be returned after the deadline, surveys were accepted until August 20, by which time the daily returns had slowed to one or less per day.

Respondents

A proprietary step was taken during survey printing in the UW-Extension Office to protect the integrity of the survey results and to ensure a "one vote for each property" tally. In total, **118** of 410 surveys were returned — a response rate of **28.8%** — and entered by UW-Extension staff into a Google data entry form.

Five questions at the end of the survey asked for information about individuals filling out the survey. Respondents' ages were generally in their 50s and 60s; only one individual was under the age of 25, which, unfortunately, is typical of community surveys. Forty of the respondents had lived in the Town for 20 years or longer, and an additional 21 respondents identified themselves as lifetime residents. Nearly 94% of respondents owned property in the Town.

Results

Questions 1-3 focused on **recreational needs** in the Town. There appears to be some support for improvements to the Rowe Road lake access, especially a better pathway. Funding for improvements will probably have to come from a variety of sources.

Questions 4, 8, 22, 23, 24 and 25 asked about different **types of future development** — in particular, what types are preferred and where. Hobby farms, single-family residential, and family farms were by far the most preferred, with heavy industry the least. If service, office, retail, or tourism-related business do arise, very few respondents would want to see them dispersed throughout the Town; the State Highway 42 corridor was the most preferred location. Respondents were split on the question about new development around Whistling Straits, but if it does occur, single-family residential would have the most support.



Questions 5, 6 and 20 touched on some aspect of **agriculture**. Large livestock operations are more often than not seen as a threat to groundwater. About 70% of respondents indicated support for the Town's recently adopted zoning that allows and regulates agricultural activities such as event barns, bed and breakfasts, farmer's markets, and u-pick operations. And the "right to farm" concept continues to draw a large majority of support, even among non-farmers.



Roads were either directly or indirectly the subject of Questions 11, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. The **condition and maintenance of the Town's road system** was identified as the most serious issue facing the Town in the next 3 years, and likely beyond that. Nevertheless, only 4% of respondents rated Mosel's roads as "Poor," and more people thought conditions were improving than declining. This held true even for individuals who commute outside Mosel for work and are therefore using several miles of the road system every weekday. Despite these findings, "Road maintenance" was the one category of services that saw a significant decline in its level of satisfaction from 2004 to 2018.



Questions 17, 18 and 19 sought input regarding **services available in the Town**. Waste disposal, recycling, fire protection, police protection, and ambulance services all had satisfaction levels of at least 62%, with fire protection leading the way at 81%. While respondents indicated they wanted expanded transfer station opportunities, there was not a lot of support for user fees or budget increases.

Finally, Questions 9 and 10 sought to capture **how respondents view the Town of Mosel as a community now and into the future**. In the 2004 survey most respondents described Mosel as quiet and well located, and they hoped it would be primarily a "Mixed agricultural/residential community" and secondarily a "Rural, agricultural community." In 2018, quietness and location were still the two most liked attributes, but the vision for the future had changed slightly, with "Rural, agricultural community" taking the top spot and "Mixed agricultural/residential community" coming in second.

Methodology and Response Rate

In May of 2018, Kevin Struck met with the Town Plan Commission and Town Board to review potential questions for this opinion survey, as well as the details of printing, distribution, and tabulation. To promote a fair tally, the Town decided to limit survey distribution to one survey per household or business.

Surveys were delivered by mail in mid-June 2018. The mailing list included property owner addresses supplied by the Town of Mosel. Duplicate names for individuals owning more than one parcel had already been removed. Residential rental properties were also included, each receiving a survey addressed to "Mosel Resident or Current Resident."

Ultimately, a total of 423 surveys were mailed or personally handed out; 13 of these were returned as undeliverable or with a note from the recipient stating they no longer owned property in the Town, leaving a final total of **410**. Of these, **118** surveys were returned — a response rate of **28.8%** — and entered by UW-Extension staff into a custom Google form designed for input of data from this survey. For comparison's sake, 138 responses were received for the Town's 2004 survey and there were 162 responses to the 1996 survey. (The response rates for the most recent surveys in Lyndon, Scott, and Holland were 30%, 28%, and 26%, respectively.)

Technical Notes

I. Fractional results on Questions 3, 5, 7, 9, 13, 14, 15, 22, 26, 27 and 28

The “number of responses” to these Questions that contain fractions of whole numbers are due to a small number of respondents checking more answers than instructed or appropriate.

Since no assumption could be made as to which response was the primary response, a decision was made to allocate the respondent’s answers in proportion to the number of answers he/she gave. This was deemed to be more fair than eliminating the response altogether or giving the respondent multiple “votes.”

II. Fractional results on Questions 29, 32 and 33

The “number of responses” to these Questions that contain fractions of whole numbers are due to a small number of respondents checking two answers in an effort to represent more than one adult in their household.

III. Calculating percentages for “check one” questions

Percentages for these questions were calculated by dividing the number of responses to each choice by the number of respondents to the particular question. An exception to this is the percentage of “No response,” which was calculated by dividing the number of no responses by 118, the total number of surveys returned.

IV. Calculating percentages for the “check no more than two” and “check all that apply” questions

Percentages for Questions 1, 5, 8, 10 and 25 — where respondents were invited to check more than one possible response — were calculated by dividing the number of responses for each choice listed by the total number of responses to the question. Because respondents were not limited to one choice, this naturally yields a total percentage that exceeds 100% and is not an error.

V. Quality control

No “unauthorized” copies of the survey were detected.

Results Color Coding

To help readers of this report quickly identify key findings, the following color coding, if applicable, has been used to highlight key data:

GREEN = *Result(s) with Clearly the Highest (or Best) Percentage or Number*

RED = *Result(s) with Clearly the Lowest (or Worst) Percentage or Number*

Respondent Characteristics

What was the most common age range of those filling out the survey? (Q29)

Under 18 yrs: 0.0% (0)	
18-24 yrs: 0.9% (1)	<u>2010 Census</u>
25-34 yrs: 5.4% (6)	6.0%
35-44 yrs: 8.0% (9)	13.4%
45-54 yrs: 18.3% (20.5)	21.0%
55-64 yrs: 28.6% (32)	14.8%
65-74 yrs: 25.4% (28.5)	12.5%
75+ yrs: 13.4% (15)	5.1%
(No response): 5.1% (6)	

37% of people who filled out the 2004 survey were between the ages of 35-54, as opposed to only 26% in 2018. This most likely reflects the overall aging of the population over the last 14 years.

It should be noted that the age range of respondents is not as representative of the Town as a random sample. This may have had an impact on the results. Performing queries to select younger age ranges before calculating results for certain questions can help mitigate this.

How long have respondents lived in the Town? (Q30)

Less than 5 yrs: 7.3% (8)
5-10 yrs: 13.6% (15)
11-19 yrs: 16.4% (18)
20 yrs or longer: 36.4% (40)
Lifetime resident: 19.1% (21)
Not a resident: 7.3% (8)
(No response): 6.8% (8)

62% of respondents to the 2004 survey had lived in the Town at least 20 years or were lifetime residents. That percentage has now declined to 55%, probably due in part to older residents moving to retirement destinations or facilities not offered in the Town.

What percentage of respondents own their property? Rent? (Q31)

◆ Owned: 93.8%
◆ Rented: 6.2%
(No response): 4.2% (5)

This proportion has changed very little since 2004.

Respondent Characteristics (cont.)

What percentage of respondents work in Mosel? Commute? (Q32)

Place of employment located in Mosel: 21.4% (23.5)
Place of employment located elsewhere: 45.0% (49.5)
Retired: 32.7% (36)
Not currently employed: 0.9% (1)
(No response): 7.3% (8)

The percentage of respondents employed within Mosel is similar to 2004, perhaps indicating stability in the Town's agricultural and small business sectors.

What type of occupations are respondents employed in? (Q33)

Agriculture/farming: 18.1% (13.5)	Finance, insurance, or real estate: 4.0% (3)
Construction: 7.6% (5.66)	Government: 5.4% (4)
Manufacturing: 20.3% (15.16)	Education: 3.4% (2.5)
Utilities: 1.3% (1)	Homemaker: 0.7% (0.5)
Wholesale trade: 0.0% (0)	Other professional: 11.9% (8.83)
Retail trade: 3.1% (2.33)	Other service occupation: 4.7% (3.5)
(No response): 36.9% (43.5)	Other (specify): 19.5% (14.5)

Since 2004, there has been a shift away from Manufacturing (31%), Retail trade (7%), and Other service occupations (11%) toward Agriculture, Finance/insurance/real estate, and Other miscellaneous jobs in 2018 like working at Whistling Straits.

Survey Results

===== GROWTH AND PLANNING ISSUES =====

QUESTION 1: Would you like to see additional recreational space in the Town of Mosel? *(check all that apply)*

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes; a small park with picnic tables	9.4%	11
Yes; improved Lake Michigan access on Rowe Road or elsewhere	41.0%	48
Yes; here's what I'd like to see	7.7%	9
No	52.1%	61
(No response)	0.8%	1

The percentage of respondents who chose a "Yes" option for this question is actually 48.7%. The percentage looks higher because respondents could check multiple options.

There was no consensus among the written responses for "Yes; here's what I'd like to see."

The percentage for improved lake access on Rowe Road is an increase of about 8% from the 2004 survey result.

QUESTION 2: If you would like to see greater public access to Lake Michigan beyond what is currently offered at the end of Rowe Road, what improvements would you prefer?

This was an open-ended question where 54 respondents wrote in answers. The following predominate themes were identified (approximate number of times in parenthesis):

- Improved pathway (12)
- Picnic area (8)
- Beach (6)
- Parking area (6)
- Boat launch (5)

A substantial number of respondents to the 2004 survey indicated they did not know about the Rowe Road access; there was only one such comment this time. Of those who did respond with suggestions in 2004, a pathway (11) was the top comment.

QUESTION 3: How should future park and recreation needs be funded?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Funded through the use of tax dollars	13.4%	14.5
User fees	20.8%	22.5
There are enough parks and recreational programs already	29.8%	32.2
Private or corporate partnership w/ the Town	21.9%	23.65
Private organizations/service clubs	14.0%	15.15
(No response)	8.5%	10

QUESTION 4: If you feel the Mosel area should continue to grow to increase the tax base to fund the Town's financial needs, what are your preferences for the various types of development? (check all the boxes indicating those items you feel are appropriate for the Town of Mosel) Note: zoning ordinances would dictate appropriate areas within the Town for various uses)

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Single-family residential	53.6%	60
Two-family residential	13.4%	15
Condominiums	11.6%	13
Hobby farms (minimum 5 acres)	57.1%	64
Family farms	55.4%	62
Large-scale farm operations	9.8%	11
Commercial, tourist related shops	19.6%	22
Commercial, office-type related shops	12.5%	14
Commercial, convenience business/service for residents	17.0%	19
Home based businesses	36.6%	41
Light industry	28.6%	32
Heavy industry	8.0%	9
No growth should be encouraged	18.8%	21
Other	1.8%	2
(No response)	5.1%	6

In 2004, this was a "Common Question," meaning respondents from Herman and Howards Grove also answered it, making a comparison to 2018 results difficult.

QUESTION 5: What, if anything, concerns you about the impact of large livestock operations? (check no more than two)

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Threats to groundwater and wells	55.9%	64.8
Odors	30.3%	35.2
Truck traffic	11.4%	13.2
Noise	3.6%	4.2
24-hour operation	9.5%	11
Premature road deterioration	27.5%	31.9
Other	5.8%	6.7
No concerns	12.1%	14
(No response)	1.7%	2

“Threats to groundwater and wells” was the top concern in 2004 and it remains so today despite a voluntary UWEX well water testing program in 2015 for Mosel/Herman that showed 0 of 107 samples above the health standard for nitrate; in fact, only 2 samples even came remotely close to exceeding the standard.

QUESTION 6: Recently the Town added Agricultural Enterprise zoning to Chapter 7 of the Town code. This zoning encourages re-use of our agricultural properties no longer used for traditional farming to be used in agricultural related activities and businesses, such as event barns, bed and breakfasts, farmer’s markets, and u-pick operations. Should the Town encourage use of this zoning? Do you have any thoughts as to how this should be used?)

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	70.2%	73
No	29.8%	31
(No response)	11.9%	14

This question also included a second part that asked for additional thoughts. 21 respondents wrote in comments. Slightly more of the comments were positive regarding agritourism than negative.

According to a Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel article (8/13/18), 15% of couples held barn weddings in 2017, up sharply from 2% in 2009.

QUESTION 7: If home-based businesses outgrow the limitations set forth in Town ordinances, how should this be handled? *(check one)*

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Direct them toward an appropriately zoned parcel when exceeding the definition of a home-based business in the Town ordinances	33.2%	36.5
Treat them on an individual basis through the conditional use permit process	55.9%	61.5
Allow them to stay where they are and expand with little or no additional regulations even if they exceed the definition of a home-based business in the Town ordinances	10.9%	12
(No response)	7.3%	8

QUESTION 8: Regarding future development in the area, what would be your preference? *(check all that apply)*

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Businesses that attract out-of-town visitors	4.5%	5
Businesses that primarily serve local residents	26.8%	30
Both	40.2%	45
No additional businesses needed	33.0%	37
(No response)	5.4%	6

In 2004, this was a "Common Question," meaning respondents from Herman and Howards Grove also answered it, making a comparison to 2018 results difficult.

As a follow-up to the apparent support for agritourism in Question #6, agritourism conceivably falls into all of the first three categories of Question 8 above, which received a total of 80 checks, well ahead of "No additional businesses needed."

QUESTION 9: Throughout its history, Mosel has been described as a rural, agricultural community. If you could control the future, which one term would you select to describe Mosel in 10 to 20 years?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Rural, agricultural community	53.9%	62
Residential community	1.7%	2
Mixed agricultural/residential community	33.7%	38.8
Business community	1.3%	1.5
Mixed residential/business community	6.8%	7.8
Industrial community	0.4%	0.5
Other	2.0%	2.3
(No response)	2.6%	3

In 2004, the percentages for “Rural, agricultural” and “Mixed agricultural/residential” switched places from the 2018 results. Support for a more rural Town would appear to be growing. Somewhat surprisingly, the support seems to be strongest in those respondents under 54 years of age.

(Cross-tabulation: Q29, Select “Age = less than or equal to 54”. Then re-tabulate results for Q9 using only this subset.)

RESPONSE (54 yrs. of age or less)	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Rural, agricultural community	63.0%	23
Residential community	0.0%	0
Mixed agricultural/residential community	23.3%	8.5
Business community	1.4%	0.5
Mixed residential/business community	6.8%	2.5
Industrial community	1.4%	0.5
Other	5.5%	2

QUESTION 10: What do you like about the Town of Mosel?
(check all that apply)

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Friendly people	61.8%	70
Quietness	74.5%	84
Location	70.0%	80
Good services	14.5%	16
Proximity to Lake Michigan	34.5%	39
Safety/feeling of security	48.1%	54
Good government	35.5%	39
Rural, country atmosphere	45.5%	53
Other	4.5%	5
(No response)	4.3%	5

In 2004, "Quietness" and "Location" were also the top 2 results. The percentage for "Rural, country atmosphere" was about 63% in 2004. Since previous questions seem to show support for a more rural Town, the lower percentage of respondents *liking* "Rural, country atmosphere" in 2018 may be an indication that there is a perception that this quality is being lost, at least among older residents.

(Cross-tabulation: Q29, Select "Age = less than or equal to 54". Then re-tabulate results for Q10 using only this subset.)

(Cross-tabulation: Q30, Select "Lived in Mosel = 20 years or more" and "Lived in Mosel = Lifetime resident". Then re-tabulate results for Q10 using only this subset.)

See page 14 for the results of these two cross-tabulations.

QUESTION 10 continued ...

RESPONSE (54 yrs. of age or less)	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Friendly people	65.8%	24
Quietness	87.7%	32
Location	74.0%	27
Good services	5.5%	2
Proximity to Lake Michigan	30.1%	11
Safety/feeling of security	52.1%	19
Good government	19.2%	7
Rural, country atmosphere	63.0%	23
Other	2.7%	1

It's likely that younger respondents so overwhelmingly chose "Quietness" as their top response because many have more recently come from more urban areas and Mosel seems very quiet in comparison. They may also be more used to extensive urban services, which might help explain the low number for that category—compare to table below for long-term residents.

Those who have lived in Mosel a long time, on the other hand, may recall an even quieter Town, and therefore their perspective is different.

RESPONSE (Lived in Mosel 20 years or more); or (Lifetime resident)	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Friendly people	57.4%	35
Quietness	68.9%	42
Location	73.8%	45
Good services	18.0%	11
Proximity to Lake Michigan	36.1%	22
Safety/feeling of security	49.2%	30
Good government	32.8%	20
Rural, country atmosphere	39.3%	24
Other	4.9%	3

QUESTION 11a: What is the one most serious issue that the Town of Mosel faces in the immediate future (next 1-3 years)?

This was an open-ended question where 80 respondents wrote in answers. The following predominate themes were identified (approximate number of times in parenthesis):

Road conditions/maintenance (28)
Growth management (10)

The same question was asked on the 2004 survey and growth management was the major theme (30). Consideration of a local sewer system/treatment was second (9). Road conditions were only mentioned 5 times.

QUESTION 11b: (4+ years into the future)

This was likewise an open-ended question. 48 respondents wrote in answers. The following predominate themes were identified (approximate number of times in parenthesis):

Growth management (12)
Road conditions/maintenance (11)

QUESTION 12: Are there issues in the Town that need new or stricter ordinances or stricter enforcement?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	35.1%	34
No	22.7%	22
No opinion	42.3%	41
(No response)	17.8%	21

This question also included a second part that asked for additional details. 40 respondents wrote in comments. The following predominate themes were identified:

Junk in yards (9) Speeding (8) Dumping trash in ditches, elsewhere (6)

In 2004, the major themes were also junk (16) and speeding (6).

===== TRANSPORTATION =====

QUESTION 13: How would you rate Mosel's overall road grid?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Excellent	0.9%	1
Good	55.7%	63.5
Fair	39.5%	45
Poor	3.9%	4.5
(No response)	3.4%	4

A cross-tabulation was performed to see how people who work outside Mosel—and therefore drive several miles on the roads every weekday—answered this question. The percentages remained very similar.

(Cross-tabulation: Q32, Select "Is place of employment in Mosel = No". Then re-tabulate results for Q13 using only this subset.)

RESPONSE (people who work outside Mosel)	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Excellent	2.0%	1
Good	57.1%	28
Fair	39.8%	19.5
Poor	1.0%	0.5



QUESTION 14: How do you feel Mosel's overall road grid is trending in the past 5 years?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Better	28.8%	32.5
Same	53.1%	60
Poorer	18.1%	20.5
(No response)	4.2%	5

Again, a cross-tabulation was performed to see how people who work outside Mosel answered this question. The perception that the roads were trending "better" was somewhat more likely for the commuters.

(Cross-tabulation: Q32, Select "Is place of employment in Mosel = No". Then re-tabulate results for Q14 using only this subset.)

RESPONSE (people who work outside Mosel)	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Better	33.7%	16.5
Same	50.0%	24.5
Poorer	16.3%	8

QUESTION 15: In addition to grants, matching funds, and Mosel’s annual budget outlays, the Town will need more funds to rebuild and maintain what we have in Mosel. What is your preferred strategy for funding these needs? (check one)

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Spend the minimum on annual maintenance by under-spending Town budgeted amounts to save for major projects	17.3%	18.5
Spend the Town’s entire annual budget allocated for road maintenance each year and not accumulate funds for major rebuilds that are needed	7.5%	8
Road maintenance should be a priority and done regardless of what is necessary to keep all of them in good condition, including additional cost to Town residents	12.6%	13.5
Conservatively borrow to rebuild roads only when needed to spread outlays over multiple years and spend the Town’s annual budget on maintaining the remainder of our roads to attain maximum life from them, resulting in less major rebuilds	54.2%	58
Other	8.4%	9
(No response)	9.3%	11

QUESTION 16: Do you have concerns about the condition or maintenance on any other roads in Mosel?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	28.9%	26
No	71.1%	64
(No response)	23.7%	28

This question also included a second part that asked for additional details. 35 respondents wrote in comments. The following roads were mentioned the most often:

Playbird (6)
 Garton (5)
 Orchard (5)
 Rowe (4)

===== UTILITIES & COMMUNITY FACILITIES =====

QUESTION 17: Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following services available in the Town.

TYPE OF SERVICE	VERY SATISFIED	SATISFIED	NEUTRAL	UNSATISFIED	VERY UNSATISFIED	DON'T KNOW	(NO RESPONSE)
Waste disposal	22.0%	43.1%	19.3%	6.4%	2.8%	6.4%	7.6%
Recycling program	23.6%	47.3%	18.2%	2.7%	2.7%	5.5%	6.8%
Road maintenance	8.0%	42.9%	27.7%	14.3%	4.5%	2.7%	5.1%
Fire protection	37.2%	44.2%	12.4%	0.0%	0.9%	5.3%	4.2%
Police Protection	21.1%	45.0%	21.1%	2.8%	0.9%	9.2%	7.6%
Ambulance services	22.0%	40.4%	22.9%	0.0%	0.9%	13.8%	7.6%
Other	0.0%	41.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	89.8%

The only significant difference in the percentages from the 2004 survey for the same question was for "Road maintenance," where a total of 69% were "Very satisfied" or "Satisfied" in 2004 in comparison to a total of 51% in 2018.

QUESTION 18: Use of the Town's transfer station has grown over the last number of years. On many occasions the volume collected is near, at, or sometimes over capacity. Would you like to see the transfer station open more days and/or different days? How would you like to fund the additional cost? Small user fee, restrict the amount of refuse received, increase the budgeted expense at the peril of other categories or services?

RESPONSE	YES	No
More days?	38	32
Same day, but more capacity?	62	14
Annual user fee?	25	35
Restrict amount allowed?	17	37
Handle in budget at the expense of other services?	20	27
(No response)	12 (10.2%)	

This question also included an option to specify "Different days." 13 respondents wrote in the days they preferred, with "Saturday" being the most popular response.

QUESTION 19: Are there any programs or services that the Town of Mosel should improve or establish?

This was an open-ended question where 29 respondents wrote in answers. The most common responses were the following (approximate number of times in parenthesis):

No or None (10)
Garbage collection (6)

Respondents to the same question on the 2004 survey predominately listed Garbage collection (8).

===== **AGRICULTURE** =====

QUESTION 20: A neighboring farmer’s “right to farm” is important to me even if I am bothered by noise, dust, and odors from the operation.

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Strongly agree	30.7%	35
Generally agree with some exceptions	57.9%	66
Generally disagree with some exceptions	5.3%	6
Strongly disagree	1.8%	2
No opinion	4.4%	5
(No response)	3.5%	4

The percentage of respondents who chose “Strongly agree” in 2004 was 42% and those who chose “Generally agree” was 51%, for a total of 93%—versus a total of 89% in 2018. It would appear that the support of “right to farm” is still solid but not quite as strong as 14 years ago.

A cross-tabulation was performed to see how non-farmers answered this question. Surprisingly, support for “right to farm” was actually a bit stronger, with 34% “Strongly agree” and 57% “Generally agree,” for a total of 91%.

(Cross-tabulation: Q33, Select “Category of occupation ≠ Agriculture/farming”. Then re-tabulate results for Q20 using only this subset.)

QUESTION 21: Are there specific areas within the Town that should be protected from development?

This was an open-ended question where 53 respondents wrote in answers. The following predominate themes were identified (approximate number of times in parenthesis):

Farmland (10)
Lakeshore (9)
No or None (8)

Respondents to the same question on the 2004 survey predominately listed Wetlands (12) and Woodlands (10).

===== **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT** =====

Note: This section alluded to a map showing areas designated for development as a result of the Farmland Preservation Zoning revision completed in 2017. Due to an oversight, the map was not included. Fortunately, the questions were structured in such a way that it was still possible to provide responses.

**QUESTION 22: Should future business, commercial, and light industry development(s) be concentrated in a few areas or dispersed throughout the Town?
(check one column, if any, for each location)**

TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT	LOCATION				
	Concentrated along Playbird Road	Concentrated along Hwy 42	Dispersed throughout town	Not sure	Other location (please specify)
Service / office	28.3%	46.7%	10.7%	10.7%	3.3%
Retail / commercial	22.9%	57.0%	8.1%	8.8%	3.3%
Light industry	34.3%	44.6%	8.4%	9.2%	3.4%
(No response)	16.1% (19)				

QUESTION 23: Should commercial growth be allowed beyond those areas designated on Mosel’s future land use plan if they are adjacent or connected to a previously commercially developed property within those designated areas?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	43.6%	41
No	56.4%	53
(No response)	20.3%	24

QUESTION 24: In the future, in order to meet housing demand and increase the property tax base to fund Town expenses, should the Town allow the land surrounding the Whistling Straits Golf Course to be used/developed?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	48.0%	49
No	52.0%	53
(No response)	13.6%	16

QUESTION 25: If your answer to the previous question was yes, what type of development should be encouraged?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Commercial, office-type businesses	22.4%	11
Residential, single-family	59.2%	29
Residential, condominiums	38.8%	19
Commercial, tourist-related businesses and specialty shops	44.9%	22
Commercial, convenience and service businesses	30.6%	15
Residential, multi-family apartments	10.2%	5

QUESTION 26: Again, if your answer was yes to development around Whistling Straights, would you prefer the development be built and located in such a way to remain largely out of view from the public roads in the Town?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	23.5%	11.5
No	19.4%	9.5
Don't care	57.1%	28

QUESTION 27: How would you rate the broadband/high speed Internet access options and performance at your home or business?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Excellent	5.2%	5
Good	16.0%	15.5
Okay	48.5%	47
Insufficient	30.4%	29.5
(No response)	17.8%	21

This question also included a second part that asked for the name of the respondent's Internet provider. 79 respondents replied, with TDS (49) and Spectrum/Charter (9) topping the list.

QUESTION 28: Would you like the Town to attempt to improve the options and performance of Internet service made available to residents even if there would be a financial cost to the Town?

RESPONSE	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER
Yes	41.2%	44.5
No	31.0%	33.5
No opinion	27.8%	30
(No response)	8.5%	10