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Executive Summary

From late-October to mid-November 2008, the Survey Research Center (SRC) at the University of Wisconsin – River Falls mailed surveys to 981 Town of Lafayette residences. The SRC received 651 completed surveys, which is a strong 66 percent response rate. With 651 responses, the estimates contained in this report are expected to be accurate to within plus or minus 2.2 percent. Statistical tests do not indicate that “non-response bias” is a problem with this sample.

Nine of ten respondents rate the overall quality of life in the Town of Lafayette as good or excellent. Respondents are closely divided on the issue of growth in the Town; nearly four in ten respondents believe that Town growth is the right amount; one-third believes it is too much.

A majority of respondents are supportive of incorporating the Town as a Village to protect the Town’s tax base and boundaries from annexations and land use conflicts. Forty-two percent are supportive of a boundary agreement with the City of Chippewa Falls.

Most Town services and facilities are deemed adequate by majorities of respondents. Fast food/drive thru restaurants have the highest ‘inadequate’ ratings followed closely by full service – casual restaurants and hotels/motels. In addition, over three-fourths of respondents rate the general condition of roads in the Town of Lafayette as excellent or good.

Almost three-fourths of respondents believe the Town communicates adequately with residents. When respondents were asked to identify what is the best way for the Town to communicate with residents, newsletters are, overwhelmingly, the preferred method.

In terms of law enforcement, a majority of residents are satisfied with the way things are. Only one-third support contracting with the Chippewa County Sheriff’s department for dedicated patrols. Slightly over one-half of respondents oppose an expansion of fire protection services; a substantial portion of the respondents (29%) are not sure about this. When asked if they would support a tax increase to fund additional law enforcement and fire protection services, a majority of respondents are not supportive; nearly one-quarter are not sure.

More than three-fourths of respondents believe that housing is affordable for them in the Town. When asked to define affordable housing and affordable rent, approximately six in ten respondents chose homes valued between $100,000 and $200,000 and rentals between $500 and $1,000 per month. Of the housing types discussed in the survey, the highest percentage of respondents believe there is a need for more elderly/assisted living. Almost one-half of respondents believe that there are too many mobile homes.

Nearly half of residents believe that the quality of the natural environment in the Town has stayed the same over the past 5 years, while one-third see a decline. A majority of respondents believe that groundwater quality is good in the Town.
A substantial number of respondents (86%) support the preservation of agricultural land in the Town. Ninety-one percent of respondents support the preservation of green space and natural areas in the Town. A relatively high percentage (33%), however, would not support the use of tax dollars to preserve green space and natural areas in the Town.

One half or more respondents are supportive of increased development of multi-use, bike, and pedestrian trails. More than one-third do not see a need for more cross country ski, ATV/snowmobile, or equestrian trails.

More than 8 in 10 respondents agree that the Town needs to manage development in order to preserve the natural environment. Nearly 7 in 10 respondents do not see the need for the Town to develop a “downtown” or core business and civic area and a similar percentage (69%), do not see a need for more private recreational development in the Town.

A majority of respondents are not supportive of the Town promoting an industrial park for light industry. Nearly one-half of respondents are not enthusiastic about the Town pursuing new retail and commercial businesses. With respect to the development of an expanded marina and associated services, respondents are split almost equally between those who support (43%) and those who do not (40%).

When asked how often they used various Town facilities in 2008, over one-half of the respondents did not use Ray’s Beach or the Lafayette Sports Park at all. The Recycling Center had the highest usage; nearly seven in ten respondents used the Center at least once during the year and more than one-third used it six or more times.

Respondents are quite interested in the Town employing sustainable practices in purchasing and operations for energy efficiency and cost savings. Residents are less eager to see the Town complete a water or sanitary sewer district for the Lake area.
Survey Purpose

The purpose of this survey was to understand public opinions about a range of important land use issues facing the Town of Lafayette. Survey results will provide input into the comprehensive land use plan that the Town of Lafayette is developing.

Survey Methods

From late-October to mid-November 2008, the Survey Research Center (SRC) at the University of Wisconsin – River Falls mailed surveys to 981 Town of Lafayette residences. The SRC received 651 completed surveys, which is a very strong 66 percent response rate. With 651 responses, the estimates contained in this report are expected to be accurate to within plus or minus 2.2 percent.

Surveys have 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, Question 18 of the survey asked respondents to rate the general condition of roads in the Town on a scale from “excellent” (= 1) to “poor” (= 4). If only people who were very satisfied with road conditions responded to the survey, the rating in the report would overstate the level of satisfaction of the overall population and the survey would have non-response bias.

The SRC tested 90 variables included in the questionnaire and found 27 instances in which responses from the first mailing and those from the second were statistically different. In most instances, the differences do not change the interpretation of results. Based upon a standard statistical analysis that is described in Appendix A, the Survey Research Center (SRC) concludes that non-response bias is not a concern for the Town of Lafayette survey.

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 the survey questionnaire with a quantitative summary of responses by question.
Profile of Respondents

Table 1 summarizes the demographic profile of respondents to the Town of Lafayette Comprehensive Planning Public Opinion survey. Where comparable data were available from the 2000 Census, they were included to indicate the degree to which the sample represents the underlying adult population in the Town.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Demographic Profile of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census (18+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census (18+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census (16+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number in Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults (sample)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (sample)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census (households with children &lt;18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census (households)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerns about Sample Bias. The sample differs from the Census figures in a few places. There are substantially more males in the sample than would be expected. The SRC did statistical tests that show that men and women have statistically significant differences of opinion in about 11 percent of the questions included in the survey. As we summarize the various elements of the survey, we will note differences between the opinions of males and females.

¹ Census employment data does not differentiate between full-time and part-time workers.
² Households with retirement income.
Another difference from the expected demographic profile is with respect to age. There are substantially fewer people under 45 years of age in this sample than the Census. This shortage is likely due to a few factors. First, our experience is that younger residents in most jurisdictions are less likely to participate in surveys than are older residents. Second, the property tax list was used to identify people to be included in the sample. Younger residents are less likely to be property owners than are older Town residents. One-fifth of the variables tested showed a significant difference between the opinions of those younger than 45 and those older than that. Differences include recreational development issues and usage of community facilities. Significant age-related differences will be noted throughout the report.

In addition, the sample has a significantly lower percentage of respondents who rent their place of residence (1%) than the 2000 census (15%). Again, because of the property tax list used to identify people to be included in the sample, underrepresentation of renters is to be expected.

**Background**

A few residency questions opened the survey. Table 1-A summarizes the responses. Comparisons of key survey questions were made by the SRC based on residency demographics and will be described throughout the report.

Demographic differences In terms of residency:

- Respondents without children in their household are more likely to be longer-term residents of the Town of Lafayette (> 10 years) and are more likely to own waterfront property.
- Employed respondents are more likely to be shorter-term property owners in the Town (10 years or less) and are less likely to own waterfront property.
- Higher income respondents ($75,000 and over household income) are more likely to have owned Town property for 10 years or less.
- Residents 45 or older are more likely to own waterfront property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1-A: Residency Profile of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Residence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample (could mark all that apply)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census (occup. units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of Residency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Residency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waterfront Property</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the fall of 2008, a survey was sent to residents in Chippewa County Towns asking questions regarding comprehensive planning. For comparison purposes, we will note applicable similarities and differences between the results of the two surveys (Town of Lafayette and Chippewa County Towns) throughout the report.
Planning

Quality of Life. Chart 1 shows that nine of ten respondents feel that the overall quality of life in the Town is good (58%) or excellent (32%). No statistically significant differences were shown by demographic groups for this question.

A very similar result occurred in the Chippewa County survey with eighty-seven percent of respondents rating the overall quality of life as good or excellent.

Population Growth. Residents were asked how they feel about the amount of growth in the Town of Lafayette. Background information was provided explaining that the population has grown by about 736 people or 14% since 2000 and is expected to grow to 7,167 people by the year 2025. Nearly four in ten respondents believe that Town growth is the right amount; one-third believe it is too much. Only 1% think there is too little growth and over one-quarter are not sure (Chart 2). Longer-term residents (> 10 years) are more likely to feel that projected growth in the Town is too much.
Funding for growth and development. When asked how public infrastructure and services (needed to support growth and development) should be funded, nearly one-half of respondents believe that user fees (49%) are the way to fund such growth (Chart 3). Development impact fees are supported by nearly one-third of respondents. Less enthusiasm is shown for taxes (19%) and nearly one-quarter of respondents do not support the funding options listed.

Chart 3: Funding for Public Infrastructure and Services Needed to Support Growth and Development

- Respondents owning waterfront property are more likely to believe that public infrastructure and services needed to support growth and development should be funded through development impact fees.
- Higher income respondents (household incomes of $75,000 and over) are more likely to believe that public infrastructure and services needed to support growth and development should be funded by development impact fees and user fees.

Protect the Town’s tax base and boundaries. A slight majority of respondents (52%) are supportive of the incorporation of the Town to a Village to protect the Town’s tax base and boundaries from annexations and conflicting land uses. Forty-two percent are supportive of a boundary agreement with the City of Chippewa Falls. A boundary agreement with the Village of Lake Hallie is supported by a small number (6%) of respondents (Chart 4). Respondents without children in their household are more likely to say that the Town should incorporate to a Village and are less likely to support pursuing a boundary agreement with the City of Chippewa Falls.

Chart 4: To Protect the Town’s Base and Boundaries, the Town of Lafayette should pursue...

- Incorporation of the Town to a Village: 52%
- Boundary Agreement with the City of Chippewa Falls: 42%
- Boundary Agreement with the Village of Lake Hallie: 6%
Community Facilities and Services

Adequacy of Town Services and Facilities. In Chart 5 the ratings respondents give to Town services and facilities are grouped into “adequate” (top bar), “inadequate” (middle bar), and “no opinion” (bottom bar). Most of the services and facilities listed are deemed adequate by majorities of respondents. Fast food/drive thru restaurants have the highest “inadequate” rating at 40% followed closely by full service – casual restaurants and hotels/motels (both at 36%). Respondents could write in “other” services/facilities. In general, it appears that public services (recycling, fire dept./EMS, town hall, etc.) are deemed adequate by respondents and private services (dental services, fast food, etc.) less so. Appendix B contains the compilation of “other” responses.

Chart 5: Adequacy of Town Services and Facilities
Opinions about Town facilities and services vary by demographic group:

- Older residents are more likely to report that dental services in the Town are inadequate.
- Younger respondents are significantly more likely to say that organized recreation programs are inadequate in the Town.
- Higher income respondents and waterfront property owners are more likely to believe that full service – fine dining restaurants and fuel dispensing for boats/marina are inadequate.
- Higher income respondents are more likely to report that current law enforcement is inadequate.
- Employed respondents are more likely to state that fast food/drive thru restaurants are inadequate.
- Employed respondents and those with children in their households are more likely to believe that current organized recreation programs are inadequate.
- Females are more likely to report that medical facilities, law enforcement, and the fire department/emergency medical services are inadequate.

**Law Enforcement and Fire Protection Services.** Respondents were asked, in terms of law enforcement, if the Town, with a population nearing 6,000, should explore various types of law enforcement services. As Chart 6 highlights, a majority of residents are satisfied with the way things are. This means, however, that nearly half are not satisfied with the status quo at some level. Slightly over one-third would support contracting with the Chippewa County Sheriff’s Department for dedicated patrol.

- Higher income respondents are more likely to support the exploration of contracting with the Chippewa County Sheriff’s Department for dedicated patrol.
- Respondents without children in their households are more supportive of the status quo, wanting no change in the current structure of Town law enforcement.

**Chart 6: In terms of Law Enforcement, the Town should explore the possibility of:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change, stay with the status quo</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract w/Chippewa Cty. Sheriff’s Dept. for Diluted Patrol</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish its own law enforcement department</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint police services with the Village of Lake Hallie</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residents were asked if the Town should expand fire protection services to include 24-7, on-duty fire protection services. A slim majority of respondents are opposed to this option (51%); a substantial portion (29%) are not sure.

- Employed respondents are less likely to support 24-7, on-duty fire protection services.
A follow-up question asked residents if they would support a tax increase to fund the additional law enforcement and fire protection services listed in the survey. As Table 2 highlights, a majority of respondents are not supportive and more than one-fifth are not sure.

- Higher income respondents and respondents without children in their household are less likely to support a tax increase to fund additional law and fire protection services.
- Females are more likely to report they are not sure if they support such a tax increase.

**Frequency of Usage.** Respondents were asked how often they used various Town facilities in 2008. Table 3 indicates that over three-fourths of survey respondents did not use Lafayette Sports Park at all in 2008 and over one-half did not visit Ray’s Beach. The Recycling Center had the highest usage; nearly seven in ten respondents used the Recycling Center at least once during the year and more than one-third used it six or more times.

- Longer-term residents are less likely to have used boat landings, Ray’s Beach, or the Lafayette Sports Park, but they are more likely to be frequent users (more than 10 times in 2008) of the Recycling Center.
- Waterfront property owners are more likely to frequent boat landings in 2008 and less likely to have gone to Lafayette Sports Park.
- Respondents who are not employed are less likely to have visited boat landings, Ray’s Beach, or Lafayette Sports Park in 2008.
- Respondents without children in their household are less likely to have visited Ray’s Beach or Lafayette Sports Park in 2008.
- Older respondents are more likely to be frequent users of the Recycling Center and less likely to have visited Ray’s Beach or Lafayette Sports Park.
- Higher income respondents are more likely to have used boat landings in 2008.
Future Town Facilities and Services. Respondents were asked, *within the next 10 years*, if the Town will need to build, expand, or develop various community facilities and services (Table 4). A majority of respondents anticipate the need for building, expanding, or developing, law enforcement and fire department/EMS, services.

Interestingly, as noted earlier, when given Town growth projections, a majority of respondents were satisfied with the status quo in terms of current law enforcement services (see Chart 6, page 10) and were not very enthusiastic about expanding fire protection services (see Table 2, page 11).

A few items of note when comparing the responses to the two set of questions regarding current and future Town services:

- 32% of respondents who want no change to current law enforcement see a need for expanded law enforcement services within the next 10 years.
- 40% of respondents who are not interested in an expansion of current fire protection services see a need for expanded services within the next 10 years.

A relatively high percentage of respondents do not see the need, over the next ten years, for future building, expansion, or development of the Community Center (55%), Lafayette Sports Park (52%), or Town Hall facility (51%). “Other” facilities and services ranging from walking trails to an airport were specified by respondents. Appendix B contains the complete compilation of “other” facilities and services mentioned.

- Shorter terms residents are more likely to see the need for the expansion or development of parks in the Town within the next 10 years.
- Respondents with children in their households and younger respondents (<45) are more likely to see the need for the expansion or development, over the next 10 years, of parks (in general), and the Lafayette Sports Park.
- Higher income respondents are more likely to see the need for Town Hall facility building, expansion, or development within the next 10 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Future Town Facilities and Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within the next 10 years, the Town will need to build, expand, or develop:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Department/Emer. Med. Serv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette Sports Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall Facility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Sustainable Practices.** Chart 7 indicates that respondents are quite interested in the Town employing sustainable practices in purchasing and operations for energy efficiency and cost savings. Residents are less eager about the Town exploring the completion of a water or sanitary district for the Lake area (Chart 8).

- Higher income respondents are more likely to support the completion of a water or sanitary district for the Lake area.

**Housing**

**Affordable Housing.** Respondents were asked if they feel housing is affordable for them in the Town of Lafayette. Chart 9 shows that 78% believe that housing is affordable for them in the Town.

- Shorter-term residents and higher-income respondents are more likely to believe that housing is affordable to them in the Town.

**Chart 9: Is Housing Affordable for You in the Town of Lafayette?**
Residents were asked to define what the terms affordable housing and affordable rent mean to them (Charts 10 and 11). In both cases, respondents generally chose moderate levels of affordability. Homes between $100,000 and $200,000 and rentals between $500 and $1,000 were chosen by approximately six in ten respondents.

- Waterfront property owners are more likely to define affordable housing at higher dollar values (more than $200,000) than non-waterfront property owners.
- Not surprisingly, respondents with higher incomes put affordable housing at higher levels than lower income households. Thirty-one percent of higher income respondents define affordable housing as over $200,000 versus 12% of households with less than $75,000 income.

**Housing Supply.** Of the housing types discussed in the survey, the highest percentage of respondents agree that there is a need for more elderly/assisted living (42%). Almost one-half of respondents believe that there are too many mobile homes. Considerable numbers of respondents have no opinion about the current supply of housing in the Town (Table 5). Two-thirds of respondents to the Chippewa County survey sent to Town residents in the fall of 2008 opposed more mobile homes in the County.
Table 5: Current Supply of Housing in the Town of Lafayette

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Too Much</th>
<th>About Right</th>
<th>Too Little</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Homes</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Housing</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxury Homes</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominiums</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second/Vacation Homes</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Homes</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly/Assisted Living</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By demographic group:

- Longer-term residents are more likely to say there are too many luxury homes and condominiums and too few elderly/assisted living housing facilities.
- Older residents and residents without children in their households are more likely to say that there are too few elderly/assisted living housing facilities.
- Respondents with household incomes of less than $75,000 are more likely to think there is not enough affordable housing in the Town.

Subdivision Ordinance. A question asked respondents if they believe the Town should strengthen its regulations for future subdivision development. Background information was provided explaining that the Town first adopted its subdivision ordinance in 1996 and has made minor revisions since that time. Survey responses are summarized in Chart 12 and a considerable number (58%) of respondents indicate they either strongly agree or agree with the need for stronger subdivision regulation. One-quarter of respondents are not sure and 17% disagree or strongly disagree to stronger regulations.
Transportation

The data in Chart 13 indicate that over three-fourths of respondents rate the general condition of roads in the Town of Lafayette as excellent or good. No statistically significant differences were shown by demographic groups for this question.

**Chart 13: Rate the General Condition of Roads in the Town of Lafayette**

Only 10% of respondents believe the Town of Lafayette should consider assessing properties which front a road to help defray local street repair and reconstruction costs; over three-fourths disagree with assessing properties in this manner (Chart 14).

In terms of demographic differences:

- Older respondents are more likely to disagree that properties fronting roads should be assessed to help defray local street repair and reconstruction costs.
- Females are more likely to have no opinion about assessing properties for this purpose.

**Chart 14: Assessing Properties which Front Roads to Help Defray Local Street Repair and Reconstruction Costs**
Agricultural and Natural Resources

Quality of the Natural Environment. Chart 15 shows that nearly a majority of residents believe that the quality of the natural environment has stayed about the same over the past 5 years. One-third believe that the quality has declined; 7% believe that the quality has improved.

- Respondents who have owned or rented Town property for 10 years or less are more likely to report they are “not sure” how the quality of the natural environment has changed in the past five years.
- Waterfront property owners are more likely to say that the quality of the natural environment has stayed about the same over the past five years.

Groundwater Quality. A majority of Lafayette respondents believe that groundwater quality is good in the Town. One-fifth of respondents believe there are problems with the groundwater and almost one-quarter are not sure (Chart 16). No statistically significant differences were shown by demographic groups for this question.

- Groundwater Quality is Good 57%
- Problems with Groundwater 20%
- Not Sure 23%
Preservation of agricultural land. A question asked respondents to consider how important it is to preserve productive agricultural land in the Town of Lafayette. Survey responses are summarized in Table 6 and shows that a substantial number of respondents (86%) support the preservation of productive agricultural land in the Town. Only seven percent disagree with the importance of agricultural land preservation. In comparison, eighty-four percent of Chippewa County survey respondents supported the preservation of agricultural land when asked in the fall 2008.

Ninety-one percent of respondents support the preservation of green space and natural areas in the Town. When respondents who agreed with the need to preserve green space and natural areas were asked if they would support the use of tax dollars to do so, one-third of respondents indicated they would not support such a plan; 44% are supportive and almost one-quarter are not sure. The relatively high proportion who are not sure about using tax dollars to preserve green space and natural areas suggests that additional discussions about this topic in the Town would be beneficial.

| Table 6: Preservation of Agricultural Land, Green Space, and Natural Areas |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| It is important to support the preservation of productive agricultural land in the Town of Lafayette. | Count | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | No Opinion |
| 612 | 30% | 56% | 6% | 1% | 7% |
| It is important to support the preservation of green space and natural areas in the Town of Lafayette. | 611 | 43% | 48% | 4% | 1% | 5% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you support preserving these areas (green space and natural areas) if it resulted in increased Town taxes?</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>587</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Respondents from households with incomes of less than $75,000 are more likely to support the preservation of productive agricultural land in the Town.
- Respondents from households with incomes of $75,000 and over are more likely to support increased taxes to support preserving green space and natural areas in the Town.

Recreational Development. Chart 17 indicates that one half or more respondents are supportive of increased bike, pedestrian, and multi-use trail development (strongly agree/agree = left column).
More than one-third of respondents disagree or strongly disagree that more cross country ski trails, ATV and snowmobile trails, and equestrian trails are needed (disagree/strongly disagree = middle column). Considerable numbers of respondents, ranging from 12% to 29% per trail option, have no opinion about increased recreational trail development (right column).

- With one exception (ATV and snowmobile trails), females are more likely to support increased development of various forms of recreational trails than males.
- Higher income respondents are more likely to support bike and pedestrian trail development.
- Longer-term residents are less likely to see the need for increased bike trail development.
- Waterfront property owners are less likely to support more ATV and snowmobile trails.
- Employed respondents are more likely to support multi-use and ATV and snowmobile trail development.
- Respondents with children in their household are more likely to support increased development of bike, pedestrian, and multi-use trails.
- Younger respondents (<45) are more likely to support bike, multi-use, and ATV and snowmobile trail development.

Land Use

Respondents were given a set of statements that dealt with land use issues and asked if they agree or disagree with each statement. Table 7 highlights the responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7: Land Use Issues</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town needs to manage development in order to preserve our natural environment.</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakes and rivers within the Town are being over-developed.</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town has an adequate amount of public parks.</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town needs more public recreational development (campgrounds, boat landings, etc.)</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town should support the construction of additional communication towers.</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning ordinances are enforced in the Town.</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinances governing outside lights and light pollution are enforced in the Town.</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town should develop a “downtown” or core business and civic area.</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town should purchase additional land to ensure space for future growth.</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town needs more private recreational development (golf courses, sports facilities, etc.)</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A majority of respondents agree with four land use statements:

- The Town needs to manage development in order to preserve the natural environment.
- Lakes and rivers within the Town of Lafayette are being over-developed.
- The Town has an adequate amount of public parks.
- Zoning ordinances are enforced in the Town of Lafayette.

A majority of respondents disagree with four land use statements:

- The Town needs more private recreational development.
- The Town needs more public recreational development.
- The Town should develop a “downtown” or core business and civic area.
- The Town should purchase additional land to ensure space for future growth.

It should be noted that in some cases, a relatively large percentage of respondents have no opinion about the land use issues described in Table 7.

In terms of demographic differences:

- Respondents who are older, have a longer association with the Town, and don’t have children in their homes, are more likely to agree that lakes and rivers within the Town are being over-developed.
- Waterfront property owners are less likely to believe that lakes and rivers in the Town are being over-developed, and are less likely to see the need for more public recreational development. Waterfront property owners are also less likely to agree that zoning ordinances are enforced in the Town.
- Higher income respondents are less likely to support developing a “downtown” or core business and civic area and are less likely to feel that lakes and rivers within the Town are being over-developed.
- Older respondents and longer-term residents are less likely to see the need for more private recreational development (golf courses, sports facilities, etc.)
- Respondents with children in their homes are more likely to say the Town needs more private recreational development.
- Longer-term residents are more likely to believe the Town has an adequate amount of public parks.
- Females are more likely to have no opinion as to whether zoning ordinances are enforced in the Town and they are more likely to disagree that there is an adequate amount of public parks in the Town.
- Younger respondents are more likely to support the construction of additional communication towers.
Economic Development

Respondents were asked if they agree or disagree with the Town pursuing, promoting, or encouraging three specific types of economic development. Less than one-half of respondents agree/strongly agree with any of the three economic development pursuits mentioned in the survey (agree/strongly agree = top bar). Chart 18 indicates that a majority of respondents are not supportive of the Town promoting an industrial park for light industry (disagree/strongly disagree = middle bar), however, over one-third agree that an industrial park should be promoted.

Chart 18: Types of Economic Development in the Town of Lafayette

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Development</th>
<th>Strongly Agree/Agree</th>
<th>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage Devel. of Expanded Marina &amp; Services</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursue New Retail and Commercial Businesses</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote an Industrial Park for Light Industry</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly one-half of respondents are not enthusiastic about the Town actively pursuing new retail and commercial businesses. A substantial number, however, (40%) agree that the Town should pursue new retail and commercial businesses. This result is consistent with the relatively high ‘inadequate’ ratings given to casual restaurants, fast food/drive thrus, and hotels/motels (see Chart 5, page 9). With respect to the development of an expanded marina and associated services, respondents are split almost equally between those who agree and those who disagree.

- Higher income respondents are less likely to support the Town actively pursuing new retail and commercial businesses or the Town promoting an industrial park for light industry, they are, however, more likely to support the development of an expanded marina and associated services.
- Younger respondents and employed respondents are more likely to support the development of an expanded marina and longer-term residents are less likely to see the need for an expanded marina.
Communication

Table 8 indicates that residents generally agree that the Town communicates adequately with them (74% strongly agree/agree).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When respondents were asked to identify what is the best way for the Town to communicate with residents (Chart 19), newsletters are overwhelmingly the preferred method. Younger respondents are more likely to prefer website communication and respondents with children in their household are more likely to prefer email communication with the Town.

![Chart 19: Best Way for Town to Communicate with Residents]

Additional Comments

When respondents were asked if there was anything else they would like to say about the Town of Lafayette’s Comprehensive Plan, nearly one quarter of survey respondents provided input and their comments were grouped into topics. Development was the topic with the most additional comments offered (24% of additional comments), followed by taxes and transportation. Appendix B contains the complete compilation of comments. Comments include:

“The focus should be that the Town of Lafayette is now primarily a residential community. We are surrounded by other communities that have many of the commercial, industrial and recreational services we need and use, thus the need for these in Lafayette is limited and what we have is adequate for our growth projections.”

“I am a retired senior, with a small moderate home, and with the taxes as they are and increasing like they have over the years, my wife and I will not be able to live in our home.”

“We like the small town feel of Lafayette. Increased growth of low cost housing/rentals/developments create excess demand on infrastructure and should be limited.”
Conclusions

The results of this survey indicate that residents in the Town of Lafayette are generally happy with the overall quality of life they have and are somewhat split regarding the amount of growth in the Town.

One-third or more respondents report that fast food/drive thru restaurants, full service – casual restaurants, hotels/motels, and medical facilities are not adequate in the Town.

Slightly over one-third of respondents support contracting with the Chippewa County Sheriff’s Department for dedicated patrol; a majority are supportive of the status quo, wanting no change in the current structure of Town law enforcement. Less than one-fifth of respondents are supportive of expanded (24-7, on-duty) fire protection services.

Most residents believe that housing in the Town is affordable for them and most residents define affordable housing as homes between $100,000 - $200,000 and affordable rent as rentals between $500 - $1,000/month. Nearly a majority of respondents believe there are too many mobile homes and more than 4 in 10 respondents believe there are not enough elderly/assisted living facilities. A majority of respondents would like to see the Town strengthen its regulations for future subdivision development.

When asked about transportation issues, a large majority of respondents said they believe the roads in the Town are in excellent or good condition. Additionally, over three-fourths of respondents do not support the Town assessing properties which front a road to help defray local street repair and reconstruction costs.

Nearly a majority of respondents indicate that they believe the quality of the natural environment in the Town of Lafayette has stayed about the same over the past five years. A majority believe that groundwater quality in the Town is good. Residents are generally in agreement that productive agricultural land, as well as, green space and natural areas should be preserved.

With respect to recreational development, a majority of Lafayette residents would like to see more bike and pedestrian trails. One-half are supportive of increased multi-use trail development.

Less than half of residents (40%) believe the Town should actively pursue new retail and commercial businesses. Only about one-third of respondents (34%) support the Town promoting an industrial park for light industry. Forty-three percent support an expanded marina and associated services.

Nearly three-fourths of respondents feel that the Town adequately communicates with its residents. Most residents favor newsletters as the best way for the Town to communicate with them.
Appendix A – Non-Response Bias Test

Surveys have 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, Question 18 of the survey asked respondents to rate the general condition of roads in the Town on a scale from “excellent” (= 1) to “poor” (= 4). If only people who were very satisfied with road conditions responded to the survey, the overall rating in the report would overstate the level of satisfaction of the overall population and the survey would have non-response bias.

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, 500 people responded to the first mailing and 151 responded to the second mailing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean First Mailing</th>
<th>Mean Second Mailing</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 Own or Rent Place of Residence</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 Own Waterfront Property</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 Quality of Life</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 Public Infrastructure funded by: User Fees</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 Public Infrastructure funded by: Taxes</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9b Adequacy of: fast food/drive thru</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9h Adequacy of: banking services</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9i Adequacy of: recycling</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16a Current Supply: single-family homes</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16b Current Supply: second/vacation</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16c Current Supply: mobile homes</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16d Current Supply: luxury homes</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16f Current Supply: condominiums</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16g Current Supply: elderly/assisted living</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16h Current Supply: affordable housing</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17 Strengthen subdivision regulations</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24 Preserve green space if tax increase</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25c Increased Recreational Dev: Ped. Trails</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26g Construction of comm. towers</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26h Zoning ordinances are enforced</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26i Manage devel. to preserve nat’l environ.</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27 Pursue new retail and comm. businesses</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28 Promote an industrial park for lt. industry</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30d Used recycling center</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31a Next 10 years: expand law enforcement</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31c Next 10 years: expand parks</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33 Water District for Lake area</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We found twenty-seven variables with statistically significant differences between the mean responses of these two groups of respondents (Table A1) out of 90 tested. Instances in which the difference would modify the interpretation of results are highlighted in bold text in the Table. For example, we noted that the respondents to the second mailing were more likely to say there are ‘too little’ second/vacation homes (mean = 2.79) than Mail 1 respondents (mean = 2.48) on a scale of “1 = Too Much” to “3 = Too Little”. While these items are statistically different, with few exceptions, the differences are quite small and generally would not affect the overall interpretation of the results. The Survey Research Center (SRC) concludes that non-response bias is not a concern for this sample.
Appendix B — Town of Lafayette Comprehensive Planning Public Opinion Survey – Written Comments

Q9 Rate the current adequacy of the following services and facilities in the Town of Lafayette. ‘Other’ responses (31 Comments)

The scale used for Question 9 was adequate or inadequate with a ‘no opinion’ option. The rating given for the items listed below was ‘inadequate’.

- Cable TV (2x)
- Dog control (2x)
- Lake Access (2x)
- Parks (2x)
- Public transportation (2x)
- Shopping (2x)
- Amtrak
- Auto parts store
- Bike trails, sidewalks, or walkways
- Boat Landing
- Control of burning and noise pollution
- Drunk driving enforcement
- High Speed Internet
- Is so close to Chippewa Falls, we use their services
- Keep drunk drivers off road
- Landing for boats
- Lines on County Hwy X almost nonexistent at night
- No need for curbs on country roads - waste of road funds
- Park for kids
- Small business rental property. I have looked for a place to rent, and there is nothing.
- Snow plowing
- Staff response at town hall
- Town planning
- Walking trail
- Waste water treatment facility

Q31 Within the next 10 years, the Town of Lafayette will need to build, expand, or develop: ‘Other’ responses (36 Comments)

- Walking trails/walkways/pedestrian trails (4x)
- Sewage facility/waste water treatment facility/sewer system (3x)
- Street lights/some street lights (2x)
- Bike trails (2x)
- Airport
- ATV-snow trails
- Benches, landings
- Boat landing
- Brush facility
- Business growth
- Cross country skiing
- Eco friendly power, possible energy, land use, wind power
- High Speed Internet Cable/DSL
- Improved land use plan
- Lake access
- Larger recycling center/dump
- Leave as is
- Light industry
- Local businesses
- Metro/Amtrak
- Private enterprise
- Public works
- Recycling centers
- Roadside bike lanes
- School
- Small business rental property
- Smaller government
- Too many unneeded services, too high of taxes
- Walk on public access for ice fishermen

Q35 What is the best way for the Town to communicate with residents? ‘Other’ response (1 Comment)

- Surveys and questionnaires
Q36  Is there anything else you would like to tell us regarding the Town of Lafayette Comprehensive Plan?  
Responses (209 Comments)

Development (51 responses)  
GROWTH (15 RESPONSES)
- I would like to see Lafayette stay small and quiet!!  
- I would like to see growth with young families and in moderate income levels.  
- Forward planning is always to be encouraged.  
- Growth rate is okay-but expanding at a higher rate will reduce quality of life.  
- I like living in the "country". Too many houses close together does not appeal to me.  
- I support any developments that would encourage citizens to be outdoors and physically active.  
- Keep South 29 rural. Restrict development in agricultural and woodland areas.  
- Keep township growth at a minimum.  
- Lafayette is going to continue to grow and the township needs to nurture that. However, in a time of economic downturn, the town must be very cautious and deliberate when picking ideas and projects to fund and support.  
- Lafayette is not a city. People moved here for the rural lifestyle that we enjoy. Why is it that there always has to be some people that want to change this? Why make Lafayette bigger? Leave it alone!  
- Less is best.  
- "Quality" of life is preferred over population growth, clean/well cared for properties/neighborhoods.  
- There has been too much building close to Lake Wissota as well as too many subdivisions. The lake and green space has declined in recent years. There has been more pollution and litter in the lake. Also, more light pollution and traffic. I hope that the population does not increase anymore!  
- Way too much growth, we are losing our small town atmosphere.  
- We like the small town feel of Lafayette. Increased growth of low cost housing/rentals/developments create excess demand on infrastructure and should be limited.

ZONING (14 RESPONSES)
- Alarming number of apartments/duplexes being built.  
- Building codes and zoning doesn't seem to be enforced in regards to lakes, light pollution etc.  
- Building housing on 5 acres of land or more.  
- Decrease multi-family zoning, do not allow key holing by developers into Lake Wissota.  
- I would like this township to remain as rural as possible. If we had wanted to live in town, we would have purchased a house in town. No more farm fields into housing developments. Thank You!  
- If I wanted to live in a town, I would move to one we are close enough to a town that we shouldn't have to become one. I'm in the country, I don't want to be in a city. Zoning is a little lax and so are the burning restrictions.  
- No more duplex or multi-family housing.  
- Please enforce the zoning laws and laws we already know.  
- Stop allowing multi-family (duplexes), housing developments.  
- Stop development of farm and forest lands. Stop people from building multiple homes in Lafayette, once you build one home in Lafayette that's it, you don't get to sell it and build another one. It would stop people from building for profit. Larger minimum land site to build on - 40 acres minimum.  
- There are too many duplexes being built that encourage transient living and no sense of ownership and responsibility in our township. We need to support tougher zoning regulations to encourage people to stay here permanently, not just temporarily.  
- Too much residential development in rural areas, especially those zoned as agricultural. It is destroying the environment and for example look at the Apple Orchards now. Please change so that homes must be on more than one acre--suggest 20 acres.
We enjoy fabulous natural beauty, but with continued growth and inadequate planning, our community is at grave risk of becoming a jumble of ugly sprawl. New regulations on signage, zoning, burning by residents and residential land usage such as limiting junk cars will be more and more essential.

Yes, be able to construct without going to zoning board.

**SEWER/WATER DISTRICT (10 RESPONSES)**

- Developers should bear the costs of any infrastructure improvements (roads, lighting, sewer/water, etc.) Resulting in township expense. Pass through hot/building prices to their customers, not burden other township residents.
- I believe having water and sewer services to the properties around and near the lake should be a high priority.
- I would like to know if there are any plans to put in city water/sewage-as we just spent a considerable amount of money on a new septic system.
- If the Township is allowed to continue its current growth, we must get going with a water and sanitary district now, let us not do as Lake Hallie has done - put both systems in together. Yes, cost, let taxes and state and federal funding help.
- In my opinion, the residential areas growing around the lake should be slowed down until the increased tax revenue can accommodate a treatment facility.
- Sanitary sewer is not feasible due to sparsely located improvements.
- Sewers should be brought up to date on the lake. All sewers should have to be pumped every three years.
- Sounds like someone has plans for public water & sewer. Strongly against it.
- The lake area needs to seriously consider a wastewater treatment facility. The amount/size of the commercial development is limited by the septic systems.
- Water/sewer district will become more and more necessary as development (subdivisions) increase. Some sub-park areas could benefit greatly from water/sewer utilities.

**BUSINESS AND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (8 RESPONSES)**

- A small industrial park away from the lake would be great for revenue.
- I'd like to see a little more diversity in the way of services, businesses, etc. but keeping a spacious, open air feel to the community. I feel I'm close enough to metropolis areas to shop and for entertainment. I like it here!
- It really would be nice for someone to start up an auto parts store.
- No porn shops/strip joints.
- Road improvements in 2008 with fantastic business development is steady with needs.
- The current owner of the View needs to be shut down. He is running the business in a way that is a disgrace to the Lafayette community and an embarrassment.
- The focus should be that the Town of Lafayette is now primarily a residential community. We are surrounded by other communities that have many of the commercial, industrial and recreational services we need and use, thus the need for these in Lafayette is limited and what we have is adequate for our growth projections.
- We have only lived here for one year. I believe the town should focus on bringing in light industry to help the job situation.

**ANNEXATION (4 RESPONSES)**

- Annex into city. Town government is anachronism. A level of government which is expensive and useless - worse than that - it's only purpose is to stop progress.
- Annex into the city of Chippewa Falls and eliminate town government.
- Forget about protecting boundaries. Let people annex if it is what they want.
- We think the town should annex to Chippewa Falls in return for water and sewer services. It is a duplication of local government to maintain and support town government. This survey should've asked whether there is support for annexation.

**Taxes (26 responses)**

- All improvements cost a lot of money, it will mean higher taxes, can we afford it now, we cannot be taxed out of our homes!
- Be more honest with residents. We have heard and agree with the fact that if you have more money you can do more with the lakeshore. If people have less money, they are told no to lakeshore developing.
Don't increase taxes!
Don't raise taxes.
Get the taxes down so people can live in comfort and not fear of being taxed off their property. It costs me over $300 a month to support the government. How property taxes have to come down listen to both presidential candidates - too much taxes and government interference.
I am a retired senior, with a small moderate home, and with the taxes as they are and increasing like they have over the years, my wife and I will not be able to live in our home. I think that retired seniors should get some type of property tax relief. We sure do not get much for the taxes we pay.
I can't understand all of the $250,000 homes being built in Lafayette and my taxes keep going up!
I have lived in Lafayette area since 1962, watched it grow. The most difficult experience has been the high taxes. I have been especially hard since I have retired and they are raising taxes every year.
In these fragile economic times, we should be looking for ways to save money, not increase taxes for more spending.
Keep taxes low.
Let's just keep in mind here that we are dealing with a very fragile economy. We are also nearly the highest taxed state in the Union. Be careful!
Lower taxes.
Many people I've talked to complain of the taxes being too high (more now with the economy like it is). Also too many "city folk" moving to the country side think they can just go wherever they want on private land without permission maybe help property owner protect what they have worked hard to get and lower taxes to help them keep it (economy again).
No new taxes!
Pursuing a police department is a completely bad idea. You already have adequate county support. The last thing that is needed is increased taxes to pay for this. As we all have seen with an over funded fire department.
Quality of life is good in Lafayette and with the current economy and projected economy, I believe keeping taxes low for current residents and not raising them because of people that have not even moved here yet should be number one priority.
Road use taxes should be paid by all, not discriminated by taxes for people who happen to live along the edges of the road.
Stop trying to find new ways to spend. Look for things to eliminate, to cut taxes!
Taxes are high enough; do not get any stupid ideas.
Taxes are too high now.
Taxes in Lafayette are very high already. I don't want them raised to accommodate all these proposals implied on this survey. I'd like to keep Lafayette a small Township. That's why we don't live in a town or city.
Taxes should not increase because town growth has increased tax base and therefore revenue. Taxes should decrease.
Tell me taxes on apple orchards pays as much as homes.
The taxes are way out of line for lake property. I pay more for our little place on the lake than I do at my other home.
The town should be cutting back on expenditures and services, not considering expanding them. That includes government pay rolls. Instead of looking for more ways to spend money, you should be looking at ways to conserve money. With all the new construction within the past 10 years, the taxes should have dropped dramatically, due to increased taxes from that construction, instead, they have risen. Some thing is very wrong with that scenario. Stop spending-start cutting programs and services.
We are retired. We would like better use of our tax base. With no sewer and city water, where is all of the tax money used? How can we ask for anything when property taxes will drive everyone out of their homes? More goodies, more tax right.

Transportation (25 responses)
Almost impossible to drive Co X at night and see road lines-dangerous.
Ask for railroad bridge to be raised for boat traffic on big lake (my boat clears, but many do not).
Closer regulation of parking in CTH X wayside.
CTH X and CTH J convert to a roundabout.
• CTH X Bridge when replaced between the lakes increase the height over the water for navigation on the waterway and accommodate pedestrian walking on both sides of the bridge.
• Evaluate drainage on road system - civil engineering. Convert CTX to a four-lane roadway.
• Future subdivisions built by private developers should follow a strict set of specifications and pass inspections prior to the road being turned over to the township.
• I would like to see sidewalks near the Stillson School area for the children who walk.
• It would really exceed time and planning to develop a station in town for existing Metro and Amtrak station where you can have tourism and local based residents can enjoy for leisure and business. It wouldn't be that difficult or expensive to build and manage. The track is already there.
• On and off ramps to Highway 29 at County K or Town Line Rd.
• Please explain to citizens why curbs and gutters are being added where they are not only unnecessary, but where they are also "counter productive"--ruin road drainage to ditch, get in the way of plows, ruin the rural look--why isn't this money spent on other road related costs. Who wants these costs and who decides to do this (or not)? Perhaps an article in the next newsletter?
• Speed bumps on 53rd Ave. are not needed and are a nuisance.
• Spend more on snowplowing.
• Stop wasting money on curb and gutter when doing road projects.
• Streetlights for safety reasons and so many new development areas of homes or at least some major corners.
• The airport should be expanded to support tourism.
• There is much wasteful spending going on in the Town of Lafayette. Many places where two roads cross, now have curb and gutter for approximately 20 feet in both directions at each corner. This is truly wasteful spending. Just look at all the new curb and gutter work on the road in front of the town hall. What a waste of taxpayer's money.
• The town should try to get the railroad to re-design the bridge so people can use the whole lake.
• The use of speed bumps should and ought to be a consensus decision by all those affected by daily use of them and not one or two people.
• The way housing developments are being built, there are few to no inter connecting roads. Children must go out on busy main roads to get from one development to another. This is poor pre-planning by developers.
• Too many drunk drivers!
• Very adequate snow plowing and prompt after a snowfall-excellent.
• Walking, sidewalks, and or bike trails need to be built. There is no way to walk to the town hall, ball diamond, beach, restaurants, gas stations, or anything else without walking on the road.
• What about the walking and biking space in the wide roads that was supposed to have been put in 16 years ago or more?
• Would like to see a bike trail designated from Gordy's to the Town Hall. The road is too busy to ride on and the bridge is too narrow.

**Natural Resources (19 responses)**
• Continue to control invasive water-borne species in lakes and rivers.
• Find a way to resolve algae problem. Water causing scum and large infections.
• Green water in small lake looks awful.
• Have to look for sustainability. The future belongs to the efficient long-term not short term.
• I am concerned about the quality of our groundwater with all the new housing developments.
• I am very concerned about groundwater contamination from pesticide and herbicide usage on neighboring yards.
• I would hope that in the future we could have more green space and less pavement when doing road improvement projects. We were let down about brush that was replaced with asphalt around Paint Creek Bridge.
• I would like Lafayette to take more interest in water quality of area rivers, lakes, and creeks.
If the town needs a project, then why not fight the water quality problem we have in Lake Wissota. The DNR isn't doing anything about it. Perhaps one thing that might help would be putting some laws into affect that would outlaw fertilizer run off. If something isn't done soon, we will be able to walk across Wissota.

If you can keep development down or at least intelligent the water, air clean, light pollution less then have enough of the beautiful Wisconsin land and trees that's why we moved here and why we'll stay. If it changes too much we'll go elsewhere. Thanks for your efforts.

It's important to preserve the quality of our water (lakes and rivers) the land (farming and development) at the level we have now or improve it. Not over-develop and create urban sprawl.

Lake Wissota is too green!

Make sure we keep nature in mind when we develop for the future.

One of the town amenities that we appreciate the most is the brush disposal facility. We are concerned about shoreline erosion and lake water quality.

Research and correct ever-increasing run off problems associated with Lake Wissota's feeder streams. The agriculture issue must be addressed. The blue-green growth is a problem now. Where is the enforcement?

The density of residential homes will soon start to pollute the shallow ground water with nitrates.

The lake shore area (wayside area) at top of bank starting across from the view past Ray's beach is a very nice visual asset and should be maintained by keeping brush cut down along the fence line for the best view. Change the orientation of the light turn it off at Ray's beach it is one of the worst nighttime light polluters on that bay area of Lake Wissota.

Water quality of lake. Fertilizer limitation on Lake/River shore property.

Yes - the lake needs replenishment of walleye mainly and other fish. Restock lake so our kids can fish too.

**Ordinances, Rules, etc. (17 responses)**

- Address the problem of light pollution from glaring yard lights.
- Animal control enforcement is not adequate.
- Boat landing across from the view should be close with the gate at 10:00 every weeknight. Too much noise and traffic after 10:00 Monday nights to Thursday nights.
- Dirt bikes on open land causing noise levels where you cannot enjoy your own outdoors. Outlaw small parcels under 5 acres to have a course used by many (or) Set ordinances of at least 25-50 acres to keep the dirt bike courses out of residential areas.
- Enforce garbage-burning ordinances please!!
- I would like to see burning of garbage enforced. The air around the lake is really bad some days-especially early in the mornings.
- If the town is going to ban fireworks as stated in their newsletter, then they should enforce it. Just because some big wigs want to have these doesn't mean the rest of the community wants to listen to this all night.
- Noise ordinance for ATV, snowmobiles.
- Outlaw Brown Excavating trucks from driving on residential streets, specifically 166th street.
- Remove old worn out signage or require upkeep for pleasant clean appearances. Similar to the new school first signage.
- Some residential zoning rules for such concerns as set back for houses, 18-wheelers parked in residential, wood burners for heating, old cars and other junk.
- Stronger enforcement of fireworks ordinance during Fourth of July. Stronger enforcement of boating laws in unmarked boats.
- Stronger ordinances on "junk" i.e., cars, etc. around residences.
- There are junk cars and old school buses used for storage - the law needs to be enforced. It's a very poor image to have neighbors next door with their junked vehicles, when you want to take pride in your home.
- There should be a noise ordinance. The planes that fly over on weekends (Town of Lafayette) are mind-boggling and should be shot down. Talk about disturbing the peace. Yuck!
To maintain property values, it would be most helpful for the town to develop ordinances which address the issue of people using their yards as storage areas for their unused junk...to apply the same to gulleys and vacant land, where people dump their tires, car parts, etc. Any complaints I have voiced about this in the past have been referred to the county zoning commission, which has virtually no ordinances to this effect.

Township needs to have definite regulations pertaining to fireworks, where they can be set off, where not, taking into considerations proximity to buildings, density of buildings, etc. Permit currently needed but what are guidelines to get one and how does current procedure protect residents.

Lake Access (16 responses)

- Consider season pass for boat launch.
- Current public access points to Lake Wissota should be preserved, upheld, and developed. In order for the township to encourage family growth, it should look to how it is serving its youth. People who live next to and claim these access points are not paying taxes on this property and are in effect stealing. This must stop. The current town board must either take a stand and enforce the access points or resign en masse.
- Do not open the public access to the Lake. It will attract a lot of problems.
- I feel there should be more/better access to Lake Wissota for those who don't have lake property.
- I would like clear descriptions of public easements into the little part of Lake Wissota. There seems to be a lot of controversy over the easement on 55th avenue.
- Keep access open to the land and waterways. Post public access to the lake.
- More boat landings need to be added/fixed up. Local businesses have declined on the lake, help them out. With only two beaches there is a need for it.
- Need to clean up all public access and mark as such for the public to use.
- Please create/allow for trails for those not living on the lake to use ATV's to get to the boat landing, etc.
- Please keep the public land in Lake Wissota, other public and post it is it is known by all.
- Should be user fee for Ray's Beach if not a Town of Lafayette resident.
- There is no Marina or place to gas our boats on the big Lake Wissota. Some of us have pontoons or boats that won't fit under X railroad bridge.
- We need more boat landings.
- We should be charging $2 per person to use Ray's Beach. I've talked to a lot of people who feel this way. One suggestion was $2 a carload. I checked strongly disagree on question 19 because lets all share the cost of the roads. It's a lot to pay out at one time if it's in front of your house.
- What fees are being freely received from the public using Ray's Beach?
- What was happened to the long awaited, supposed 50-foot public access every half mile on Lake Wissota?

Recreation (13 responses)

- A gym similar to south view Elementary should be added at Stillson Elementary.
- Allow ATV's to use road system. Surrounding townships do.
- Focusing on recreation and tourism is key to the future. Especially regarding fundraising. However, it is important to incorporate to keep CF at bay.
- I prefer to discourage ATV and snowmobiles because of the loud noise and the damage the snowmobiles cause to my property.
- In general, I think things are moving in the right direction. The addition of Ray's Beach and the update to Goizay's is good.
- Let's strive to maintain a country life style with parks, trails and great green spaces.
- Stop spending money on recreation.
- Thank you to all who have helped with Ray's Beach, good call!
- There needs to be a larger playground area to include equipment for younger kids and older kids.
We need to look at ATV's as a plus for the town so we are not looking only to walkers and bike trails. Tax the people that ride the bike trails as we do cars and make them be more respectful of others who don't utilize the trail.

What activities are available for senior citizens or teenagers? Do we need to have a skateboard park or bike park in the old gravel pit at the town hall?

What attracts most people to this area is "green-ness". We need to preserve and expand park and water use areas.

Where is the preservation of hunting?

Communication (7 responses)

- At this time, a newsletter would be the best way to reach the most residents. After this is established, a website or email notification could be worked in to go paperless.
- I think the best way to communicate with residents is a website but that should be combined with a newsletter for those who do not have internet especially the elderly.
- Please communicate well when public meetings are coming up.
- Please put survey results in the newsletter.
- Since I do not live in the Town of Lafayette (only own property) I cannot answer many of these questions. No knowledge of what is happening in the township. I do appreciate any newsletters that keep us informed of what is going on since we have family members living on the property we own.
- Would be good to provide information educating regarding advantages and disadvantages of incorporating as a village with an honest discussion of services vs. taxes.
- Would like to see a more "news" type letter. More personal and about what's going on in the town. The newsletter does not come out enough. Call it "Wissota Whispers".

Government (7 responses)

- Ask the government of the township to work for the people and disallow the people to be made to work for the government. Fiscal responsibility along with small government will work!
- Don't pursue large government programs.
- Get rid of liberals on the town board.
- I do not believe in the expansion of government. Having said that, I would have to know the demographics of the population to determine the size of government services needed.
- Keep a better eye on town workers.
- Leave it alone, make government smaller, equalize market values, fire town assessor, term limits on town board members.
- Let the private sector do more and government do less. More government = more taxes, more regulation, less freedom. Lafayette is great just the way it is.

Restaurants (4 responses)

- It would be nice to have more restaurant choices near by and a nice community center.
- More restaurants serving healthy foods, such as Native Bay.
- New restaurant, good pizza joint.
- We need more casual restaurants, not everyone can afford High Shores and Connells--more "Asian Oriental" restaurants.

Miscellaneous (24 responses)

- A couple of things: Why would the town of Lafayette need a downtown or core area? A failing Chippewa Falls downtown area is just down the street. Who would support it? We have a sports park? With all the questions about land use, borders, zoning, etc. you might have included a map to show where the "town of Lafayette" actually is. I've been here 6 years and don't know what land makes up our township.
- Amending #35. Reaching community via only one source does not reach all. Combine w/radio and website would raise awareness.
- Beautiful community, but homes are too expensive on the lake.
Dead trees next door should be cut down.
Encourage tourism.
Explore the possibility of putting in some type of sound barrier in Blue Spruce Estates-Highway 29 is rather noisy.
I do not have enough information, or description of proposals made in questions 8 and 10, to make an informed decision!
I feel we need some control of gun use!
I had difficulty with many of the questions in this survey. Specially related to the information and the wording of some of the questions.
I think that there could be more than one first responder on duty overnight but not a full-fledged 24/7 on duty fire protection services. Although I am unaware as to how busy the fire department is overnight. As we grown, a 24/7 service may be necessary.
It is difficult to give an opinion on these questions without knowing the facts. I feel these surveys are very poor indicators based upon peoples opinions, no facts are given to allow people to give an informed response.
Less personal use of town equipment.
Monday - Thursday hours make it impossible for me to ever get to the town hall when it's open.
Need pro/com background for 7, 8, 10, 12, 17.
Nice work at the cemetery, running water and a new sign were needed/future project should be continuation of the road and fence.
Quality of life I associate with the state of Wisconsin (which is good) not specifically to the town of Lafayette.
Should have included a boundary map and explained questions.
Thanks you for asking for input.
The recycling center hours are very inconvenient. As a result, less recycling is being done by residents. This is for big items like scrap metal and yard waste or brush.
The recycling center is great. Lots of participation.
We don't live in Lafayette, My mother signed the farm over to her children and she still pays the taxes to live there. I feel we can't answer this survey, as we will never live there.
We have a big enough fire department and enough police driving up and down X all day and night long! And a very nice and big enough town hall.
Who is paying for this survey??
Your efforts are appreciated!

Q39 Employment Status
‘Other’ responses (3 Comments)

- Disabled (2x)
- House wife

Q40 If you are a resident and currently employed, which community do you work in?
‘Other’ responses (56 Comments)

- Menomonie (7x)
- Hallie (6x)
- All (5x)
- Altoona (3x)
- Anson (2x)
- Augusta (2x)
- Barron (2x)
- Cornell (2x)
- Area
- Bruce
- California
- Chippewa County
- Dunn Cty
- Durand
- Fall Creek
- Illinois
- Jacksonville, FL
- LaCrosse
- Ladysmith
- Lafayette and surrounding area
- Madison
- Minneapolis, MN
- Minnesota
- Mosinee
- Northern WI/MN
- On the road
- Out of town
- Owen
- Owen-Withee
- Retired
- Several
- Twin Cities
- Varies
- Wausau
- Western Wisconsin
Appendix C: Quantitative Summary of Responses by Question

TOWN OF LAFAYETTE COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY

PLEASE RETURN BY xxxxxxxxxxx, 2008

Fill the circle that most closely describes your perspective toward the following statements:

Like this: ☑️ Not like this: ☐️ ☐️ ☐️

BACKGROUND

1. Do you own or rent your place of residence in the Town of Lafayette? Mark (●) all that apply.
   Own: 96%
   Rent: 1%
   Own land, but do not have a dwelling on it: 5%

2. How long have you owned or rented property in the Town of Lafayette?
   Less than 5 years: 19%
   5 to 10 years: 23%
   11 to 20 years: 21%
   More than 20 years: 37%

3. You are a Town of Lafayette...
   Seasonal Resident: 5%
   Year-Round Resident: 89%
   Non-Resident Property Owner: 6%

4. Do you own waterfront property in the Town of Lafayette?
   Yes: 33%
   No: 67%

PLANNING

5. The population of the Town of Lafayette has grown by about 736 people or 14% since 2000, and is expected to be 7,167 people by the year 2025. How do you feel about this amount of growth? Mark (●) one only.
   Too much growth: 33%
   Right amount of growth: 39%
   Too little growth: 1%
   Not Sure: 27%

6. How would you rate the overall quality of life in the Town of Lafayette? Mark (●) one only.
   Excellent: 32%
   Good: 58%
   Fair: 6%
   Poor: 1%
   No Opinion: 3%

7. How should public infrastructure and services needed to support growth and development be funded? Mark (●) all that apply.
   Development Impact Fees: 31%
   User Fees: 49%
   Taxes: 19%
   Do not support such funding: 23%

8. To protect the Town’s tax base and boundaries from annexations and conflicting land uses, should the Town of Lafayette pursue...?
   Incorporation of the Town to a Village: 52%
   Boundary Agreement with the City of Chippewa Falls: 42%
   Boundary Agreement with the Village of Lake Hallie: 6%
9. Rate the current adequacy of the following services and facilities in the Town of Lafayette:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Hotels/Motels</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Fast Food/Drive Thru</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Full Service - Casual Restaurants</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Full Service - Fine Dining Restaurants</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Fuel Dispensing for Boats/Marina</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Medical Facilities - Clinics, Pharmacy, Optical, etc.</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Dental Services</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Banking Services</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Law Enforcement</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Fire Department/Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Town Hall Facility</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Recycling</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Organized Recreation Programs</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Other (specify: See Appendix B)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. In terms of law enforcement, with a population nearing 6,000, should the Town of Lafayette explore the possibility of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A contract with the Chippewa County Sheriff's Department for dedicated patrol</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint police services with the Village of Lake Hallie</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing its own Law Enforcement Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change, stay with the status quo</td>
<td></td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Lafayette Fire Station is currently manned 6:30 am to 5:00 pm, Monday through Friday with one person as a first responder for medical and backup for fire protection. Should the Town of Lafayette expand these services to include 24-7 on-duty fire protection services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Would you support increased Town taxes to fund the additional services suggested in Questions 10 and 11?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOUSING**

13. Do you feel housing is affordable for you in the Town of Lafayette?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. What does the term “affordable housing” mean to you? Mark (●) one only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homes under $100,000</th>
<th>Homes between $100,000 - $200,000</th>
<th>Homes between $200,000 - $300,000</th>
<th>Homes between $300,001 - $400,000</th>
<th>Homes $400,001 and Above</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. What does the term “affordable rent” per month mean to you? Mark (●) one only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rentals under $500</th>
<th>Rentals between $500 - $1,000</th>
<th>Rentals between $1,001 - $1,500</th>
<th>Rentals $1,501 and above</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Please rate the current supply of housing by category in the Town of Lafayette: Mark (●) one only.

   a. Single family homes
   b. Second/Vacation homes
   c. Mobile homes
   d. Luxury homes
   e. Rental housing
   f. Condominiums
   g. Elderly/Assisted Living
   h. Affordable housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Too Much</th>
<th>About Right</th>
<th>Too Little</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. The Town of Lafayette first adopted its subdivision ordinance in 1996 and has made minor revisions since. The Town of Lafayette should strengthen its regulations for future subdivision development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRANSPORTATION

18. How would you rate the general condition of roads in the Town of Lafayette?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. The Town of Lafayette should consider assessing properties which front a road to help defray local street repair and reconstruction costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGRICULTURAL AND NATURAL RESOURCES

20. In your opinion, how has the quality of the natural environment in the Town of Lafayette changed in the past 5 years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>Stayed about the same</th>
<th>Declined</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Which of these statements concerning groundwater quality would you agree with? Mark (●) one only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groundwater quality is good</th>
<th>There are problems with the groundwater</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. It is important to support the preservation of productive agricultural land in the Town of Lafayette.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. It is important to support the preservation of green space and natural areas in the Town of Lafayette.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. If you agree with Question 23, do you support preserving these areas if it resulted in increased Town taxes? Keep in mind that there are matching funds available from State and Federal sources to offset Town costs.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. The Town of Lafayette should support increased development of these forms of recreation:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cross country ski trails</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Bike trails</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Pedestrian trails</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Equestrian trails</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Multi-use trails</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. ATV and snowmobile trails</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LAND USE**

26. Which statement best describes your opinion concerning these land use issues?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The Town should develop a “downtown” or core business and civic area.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The Town of Lafayette should purchase additional land to ensure space for future growth.</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Lakes and rivers within the Town of Lafayette are being over-developed.</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The Town needs more private recreational development (golf courses, sports facilities, etc.)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The Town needs more public recreational development (campgrounds, boat landings, etc.)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Ordinances governing outside lights and light pollution are enforced in the Town of Lafayette.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. The Town of Lafayette should support the construction of additional communication towers.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Zoning ordinances are enforced in the Town of Lafayette.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. The Town of Lafayette needs to manage development in order to preserve our natural environment.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. The Town of Lafayette has an adequate amount of public parks.</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

27. The Town of Lafayette should actively pursue new retail and commercial businesses.  
   Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | No Opinion  
   5% | 35% | 37% | 11% | 12%

28. The Town of Lafayette should promote an industrial park for light industry.  
   Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | No Opinion  
   4% | 30% | 37% | 18% | 11%

29. The Town of Lafayette should encourage development of an expanded Marina and associated services (fuel, slips, food service, etc.)  
   Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | No Opinion  
   9% | 34% | 28% | 12% | 17%

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

30. How many times did you use these facilities in the Town of Lafayette in 2008?  
   Have not used facility in 2008 | 1-5 times | 6-10 times | 11 or more times  
   a. Boat Landings | 45% | 41% | 8% | 7%  
   b. Ray’s Beach | 53% | 37% | 7% | 3%  
   c. Lafayette Sports Park | 77% | 12% | 5% | 6%  
   d. Recycling Center | 32% | 32% | 15% | 21%

31. Within the next 10 years, the Town of Lafayette will need to build, expand, or develop:  
   Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | No Opinion  
   a. Law Enforcement | 8% | 47% | 25% | 7% | 13%  
   b. Fire Department/Emergency Medical Services | 6% | 50% | 26% | 5% | 13%  
   c. Parks | 4% | 33% | 39% | 7% | 17%  
   d. Community Center | 2% | 23% | 44% | 11% | 20%  
   e. Lafayette Sports Park | 4% | 22% | 42% | 10% | 21%  
   e. Town Hall Facility | 2% | 29% | 43% | 8% | 18%  
   f. Other (please specify): See Appendix B | 17% | 12% | 12% | 1% | 59%  

32. The Town of Lafayette should employ sustainable practices in purchasing and operations for energy efficiency and cost-savings.  
   24% | 60% | 3% | 1% | 12%

33. At the current development rate, the Town of Lafayette needs to explore the completion of a water or sanitary district for the Lake area.  
   11% | 31% | 24% | 12% | 22%

COMMUNICATION

34. The Town of Lafayette communicates adequately with residents.  
   Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | No Opinion  
   6% | 68% | 14% | 2% | 10%

35. What is the best way for the Town to communicate with residents?  
   Mark (●) one only.  
   Website | Email | Newsletters | Newspaper Articles | Public Meeting | Other: See Appendix B  
   9% | 5% | 80% | 2% | 3% | 0%
36. Is there anything else you would like to tell us regarding the Town of Lafayette Comprehensive Plan?

   See Appendix B

**DEMOGRAPHICS:** Please tell us some things about you:

37. Gender:  
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. Age:  
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65 and older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. Employment Status:  
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employed Full Time</th>
<th>Employed Part Time</th>
<th>Self Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Retired</th>
<th>Other: See Appendix B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. If you are a resident and currently employed, which community do you work in?  
   Mark (*) one only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town of Lafayette</th>
<th>Eau Claire</th>
<th>Chippewa Falls</th>
<th>Stanley</th>
<th>Cadott</th>
<th>Bloomer</th>
<th>Other: specify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. Number of Adults (18 or older) in Household:  

   | 3%  | 12% | 76% | 6%  | 2%  | 0%  |

42. Number of Children (under 18) in Household:  

   | 68% | 10% | 16% | 4%  | 1%  | 0%  |

43. Household Income Range:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than $25,000</th>
<th>$25,000 – $49,999</th>
<th>$50,000 – $74,999</th>
<th>$75,000 – $99,999</th>
<th>$100,000 – $199,999</th>
<th>$200,000 – $299,999</th>
<th>$300,000 or More</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thank You for Completing the Survey!**

Please return your survey in the enclosed postage-paid envelope by xxxxxxx, 2008 to:

**Survey Research Center**

University of Wisconsin - River Falls  
124 Regional Development Institute, 410 S. Third St.  
River Falls, WI 54022-5001