Library Copy

City of Washburn Community Planning Survey: Spring 2005

David Trechter
Denise Parks
UW-River Falls/UW-Extension

Tim Kane
UW-Extension, Bayfield County

Survey Research Center Report 2005/11
July, 2005

Students working for the Survey Research Center were instrumental in the completion of this study. Danielle Rogers, Ashley Frye, Lindsey Thompson, Kristi Sirinek, Nathan Wilber, Corrie Ford, Bethany Barnett, Rachel Ehlert, and Adrienne Adolpson entered and verified the data. Danielle Rogers calculated the initial descriptive statistics for this study. Danielle, Kristi, and Lindsey proofread earlier drafts of the study. Their hard work and dedication are gratefully acknowledged.

Executive Summery

In early May 2005, registered voters in Washburn, Wisconsin were mailed a questionnaire to gather their opinions about planning issues facing the city. A total of 602 completed questionnaires were returned (a 37 percent response rate), producing results that should be accurate to within plus or minus 3.2 percent. Key results of the survey include:

- Respondents have a demographic profile similar to the overall population of Washburn in terms of age, years resident in Washburn, home-ownership and employment status
- People who returned the questionnaire generally rate Washburn as a good (63 percent) or excellent (19 percent) place to live
- Respondents expressed strong support for the city to encourage preservation and public amenities
- Despite this preference for preservation, when identifying the most important issue facing Washburn, increasing businesses and jobs was rated as most important by the largest number of respondents
- Younger and newer residents favor a stronger focus by the city on environmental issues, while older and longer-term residents focus more on the economic challenges facing Washburn
- With respect to housing, respondents feel that Washburn is solidly average and there is strong support for a city ordinance that would require minimum property maintenance standards
- Majorities of Washburn residents feel that at least some additions to the stock of moderately priced homes is needed, but no more mobile homes or high-priced homes are needed
- As was true with housing, respondents feel that the condition of streets and highways in Washburn is average
- Residents are very supportive of bike lanes (74 percent say the city should encourage this option), but less supportive of car pooling (33 percent support this idea)
- Small proportions of the city's population use public transportation options (BART, and the Blue Goose); BART users tend to be younger and employed or self-employed, while retirees and homemakers dominate patrons of the Blue Goose)
- Most basic public services and facilities (the library, ambulance, fire protection, garbage collection, recycling, police, parks, schools, water, sewer and marina service) are rated as satisfactory by respondents. In contrast, the condition of sidewalks in Washburn are rated as needing improvements
- The top two capital improvement projects for survey respondents are street maintenance and renovating the civic center. Men and women have significantly different rankings for capital improvement projects (other than the top two priorities)
- Fewer respondents (33 percent) agree with the proposal to support the Bayfield Recreation Center than oppose this proposal (49 percent)
- Residents assign high values to a number of environmental amenities (water quality along the lakeshore, public access to Lake Superior, scenic views of Lake Superior, access to outdoor recreation)

- Respondents favor all forms of business development but commercial and retail businesses are viewed particularly favorably
- More than 90 percent of survey respondents feel that the city should pursue ways of enhancing the downtown business district, while about half of them support the development of a business park or a business incubator
- Tax incentives seem to be the most powerful inducement for Washburn residents considering opening a business
- Respondents support inclusion of commercial development on city-owned land along Central Avenue and public recreational uses along West Holman Lakeview Drive and Omaha Street. Additional community dialogue seems to be needed before settling on the use of all four properties
- The city's relationship with the governmental entities with which it works most closely, Bayfield County and the local school district, are seen as sufficiently cooperative by a majority of survey respondents
- Other than the city's sign ordinance, less than half of all respondents feel that city regulations are effective in regulating building, regulating land divisions, protecting property values, controlling junk vehicles, maintaining residences, and maintaining yard appearances

On May 2, 2005, Washburn, Wisconsin mailed a questionnaire to registered voters in the city. Additional copies of the survey were available at city hall and in the public library for adults who didn't received them in the mail. The questionnaire is included as Appendix 1 of this report. A total of 602 completed questionnaires were received and the data entered by the Survey Research Center (SRC) at UW-River Falls. The 602 completed questionnaires constitute a 37 percent response rate. As of the 2000 Census of Population and Housing, there were 1,673 people 18 years of age or older living in the city of Washburn. If this is a random sample, the size of this sample would mean that the estimated values discussed in this report are accurate to within plus or minus 3.2 percent.

Profile of Survey Respondents

Table 1 summarizes the demographic features of the respondents to the Washburn Community Planning Survey. Most of the respondents to the survey are middle-aged or older, are year round residents, have lived in Washburn for more than 10 years and own their own home. The relatively high proportion of people out of the work force (retirees and homemakers) is consistent with census data for the city.

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Respondents

	Count	Male	Female			
Gender	596	44%	56%			
	Count	<25	25 – 44	45 - 64	65+	
Age	598	3%	24%	46%	26%	
	Count	Year-Round Resident	Seasonal Resident	Non-Resident Prop Owner		
Residency status	596	98%	2%	0%		
	Count	<5	5 – 10	11 - 20	20+	
Years resident in Washburn	580	21%	20%	21%	39%	
	Count	Own	Rent	Land Only		
Housing	581	84%	16%	0%		
	Count	Employed	Self-Employed	Unemployed	Retired	Homemaker
Employment Status	595	49%	15%	3%	30%	4%

The 2000 Census indicates that males make up 48 percent of the population of Washburn and females 52 percent. Because the sample has a somewhat higher percentage of women than we'd expect given the Census data, the SRC did statistical tests to see if the responses of men and women were systematically different. The tests are described in Appendix 2 of this report, but our conclusion is that, with one exception to be discussed later, men and women do not hold systematically different opinions about the planning issues covered in the questionnaire.

Planning Issues and Opportunities

The first substantive section of the questionnaire started with a question asking respondents to rate Washburn as a place to live. As Table 2 shows, respondents generally feel that Washburn is a good place to live. In the sample as a whole 82 percent rate Washburn as a good (63 percent) or excellent (19 percent) place to live compared to only 13 percent who said it is a fair (12 percent) or poor (1 percent) place to live.

Table 2: Rating Washburn as a Place to Live, by Gender		
	Male	Female
Excellent	17%	20%
Good	61%	63%
No Opinion	0%	1%
Fair	12%	11%
Poor	9%	4%

Respondents were asked their opinion about encouraging or discouraging a range of development and preservation options for the city. Table 3 summarizes these results. In the table, if a respondent said a given action should be strongly encouraged, it was given a weight of 2, encouraged received a weight of 1, take no action a weight of 0, discourage a weight of -1 and strongly discourage a weight of -2. So, the larger the number the more strongly do the respondents feel about the action. The general trend reflected in Table 3 is a preference for preservation and public amenities over private development. Only one private development option (commercial development) is in the top half of the table and only one preservation/public access option (preserving green space) is in the lower half. Finally, even for the lowest ranking option (water front development), nearly twice as many respondents said to encourage or strongly encourage (298) this option as said to discourage or strongly discourage (153) it.

Table 3: Actions to Encourage or Discourage		
Action	Count	Weighted Value
Public Access to Lakeshore	581	1.32
Commercial Development	570	1.31
Lakeshore Preservation	579	1.22
Public Recreation Facilities	556	1.13
Residential Development	561	1.13
Green Space Preservation	566	0.99
Industrial Development	550	0.78
Waterfront Development	553	0.37

Different demographic groups view these actions somewhat differently. People who have lived in Washburn for 20 years or more (about 40 percent of the sample) are statistically more supportive of industrial and waterfront development and less supportive of public recreation facilities and preserving green space and the lakeshore than those who have lived there for shorter periods. The self-employed are more supportive of preserving green space and the lakeshore and ensuring public access to the lake than are those who were employed, retired, unemployed or homemakers. Younger residents (those under 25 years of age) are less

supportive of residential, commercial or industrial development, but more supportive of public recreation facilities than are older residents.

At the end of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to identify the two most important issues facing Washburn. This closing question, which parallels in many respects, the information gathered in Table 3, provides both confirmation and some contradictions of these results. As Table 4 shows, preserving the environmental amenities of the region is, again, seen as a high priority. Issues that have environmental preservation dimensions are well represented in the upper half of Table 4: preserving views/access to Lake Superior, development of the lakefront, and preserving a healthy environment.

However an interesting and important difference is that economic or private development issues are more prominent in Table 4 than was the case in Table 3. In particular, increasing businesses and jobs, increasing the tax base and improving the central business district were all identified by about one-fifth or more of the respondents as being one of the two most important issues facing the city. Increasing businesses and jobs is, as one would expect, particularly important to those currently unemployed and to long-term residents of Washburn, but significantly less important to the self employed. Those who have lived in Washburn for 11 to 20 years are significantly less concerned about lakefront development than are newer or longer-term residents. Newer arrivals are more focused on preserving cultural and environmental amenities in the area. A significantly higher proportion of men identified the need to expand the tax base as a key issue facing Washburn. Those middle-aged or older are disproportionately concerned about upgrading the central business district. Younger residents are significantly more concerned about the future use of public lands.

Table 4: Most important issues facing Washburn

Issue	Number	Percent	Count
Increase businesses/jobs	258	45%	578
Preserve views/access to Superior	157	27%	578
Lakefront development	141	24%	578
Preserve healthy environment	112	19%	578
Increase tax base	110	19%	578
Improve business district	108	19%	578
Preserve natural areas	71	12%	578
Increase population	57	10%	578
Use of public lands	56	10%	578
Infrastructure needs	43	7%	578
Cultural activities	17	3%	578

So, all in all, the results summarized in Tables 3 and 4 present broadly similar stories. Residents who are younger and more newly arrived appear to have a stronger focus on the environmental issues facing the city, while those who are older and have lived in the area for a longer period of time are more focused on the economic challenges facing Washburn.

Housing

The next segment of the questionnaire asked respondents about housing issues in Washburn.

Respondents were asked about the overall appearance of housing in the city and about the need for an ordinance defining a minimum property maintenance standard. A majority (54 percent) of residents say that the overall appearance of housing in the city is average. Twenty-seven percent said the appearance is good or very good and 19 percent said it is poor. There is strong support for a city ordinance that would require a minimum property maintenance standard. Seventy percent of respondents say they strongly agree (26 percent) or agree (45 percent) that such an ordinance is needed; 27 percent disagree or strongly disagree with this proposition.

Table 5 summarizes their opinions with respect to the type and economic class of housing that is needed in the city. Based on these responses, it does not appear that there is a serious shortage of any of the types/classes of housing about which residents were asked. Moderate increases in the supply of single family homes, rental units, and elderly/assisted living housing are favored by nearly half of all respondents. There is a strong majority opposed to additional mobile homes in the city. In terms of the economic class of housing, 83 percent of all respondents say that at least some additions to the stock of moderately priced homes is needed. In contrast, a majority say that no more high priced homes are needed.

Table 5: The Supply of Types and Economic Classes of Housing in the City of Washburn

	Need a Lot More	Need a Little More	Need No More	No Opinion	Count
Single Family	23%	48%	13%	16%	572
Rental Units	21%	48%	15%	16%	576
Elderly/Assisted Living	17%	46%	20%	17%	569
Condos/Townhouses	10%	24%	51%	15%	563
Mobile Homes	2%	8%	74%	16%	570
Moderate Priced	34%	49%	8%	9%	572
Low Income	17%	38%	29%	17%	569
High Priced	5%	24%	55%	16%	564

Again, there are some demographic differences embedded in the responses summarized in Table 5. Those reporting that they are retired are significantly more likely to say that Washburn needs a good deal more elderly/assisted living housing and condominiums than are other groups. Not surprisingly, the unemployed would like to see lots more low-income housing. Those who have lived in Washburn for less than 10 years are less certain what type of housing is needed, particularly with respect to moderately priced homes and condominiums. Men are more likely to see a need for more rental units and high priced homes than are women. Longer term residents (those having spent 11 or more years in Washburn) see a greater need for more elderly and high priced housing units than do those who have lived there for fewer years.

Transportation

Survey respondents were asked to rate the overall condition of Washburn's streets and highways, public transportation, and alternative transportation services in Washburn. Generally, residents feel that the road network in Washburn is decidedly average. Nearly half of all respondents rated

the overall condition of streets and highways in Washburn as average and about one-quarter each rate them good and poor. About half of those surveyed feel that they don't know enough to evaluate the adequacy of public transportation services in the city generally or those available to the elderly and disabled.

In terms of alternative transportation options, the residents do not appear supportive of car pool parking (only 33 percent support for this idea), but are more enthusiastic about bike lanes or paths (74 percent say the city should encourage this option). Respondents were given the opportunity to identify other transportation services the city should encourage. The three most common suggestions are expanded or improved bus service (13 suggestions), taxi services (12 suggestions), and improved sidewalks (6 suggestions).

The final portion of the transportation segment of the questionnaire asked about use of the Bay Area Regional Transit (BART) and the Blue Goose. Eight percent (44 people) of the sample say they use public transportation. Of these, 33 provided information on the frequency with which they rode BART and 9 on their use of the Blue Goose. Four respondents who said they used public transit didn't provide information about their use of either of these options and two provided information on their use of both services. Approximately 37 percent of the adult population of Washburn responded to this survey. Given this response rate and the estimated margin of error (+/- 3.2 percent), the estimated number of people in Washburn using either BART or the Blue Goose is between 122 and 130 people (=44/0.35 +/- 3.2 percent).

Table 6: Use of Public Transit

Times Used/ Year	BART/ Year	Blue Goose/ Year
<5	18	4
5 - 10	5	0
11 - 15	4	0
16 - 20	1	0
21 - 25	1	0
25+	4	5

As Table 6 indicates, the pattern of ridership of the two services is somewhat different. Most people utilize BART less than once a month and a relatively small minority rides at least a couple of times per week. In contrast Blue Goose users fall into two distinct camps of roughly equal size; those who use it a few times per year and those who use it once a week (all of those reporting more than 25 uses per year said they use it 4 times a month or 48 times per year). The users of the two services are also quite different. Eight of the nine people who report using the Blue Goose are 65 or older compared to only three of thirty-three for BART. Nearly three-quarters of BART riders are employed or self-employed, while all of the Blue Goose riders are retired or homemakers.

Utilities and Community Facilities

Residents were asked to rate their satisfaction with a wide variety of community utilities, facilities, and services. Table 7 summarizes their responses. If a citizen rates a service as above average, we assigned it a value of 2, satisfactory a 1, no opinion a zero, some need for improvement a negative 1, and great need for improvement a negative 2. If we round the resulting weighted rating, we see a large set of services that are deemed to be satisfactory by the people of Washburn, though none earned an above average rating. So, the quality of many of the basic city services (library, ambulance, fire protection, garbage collection, recycling services,

police, parks, water, and sewer) are seen as satisfactory by the average citizen of Washburn. In this group, marina services and elderly recreational services have fairly different patterns of responses; 45 percent of respondents said they have no opinion about the marina and 41 percent for elderly recreational services.

Table 7: Satisfaction with Utilities and Facilities

Service	Weighted Rating	Count	Categorical Rating
Library	1.29	586	Satisfactory
Ambulance	1.15	585	Satisfactory
Fire Protection	1.11	586	Satisfactory
Garbage Collection	1.07	587	Satisfactory
Recycling	0.89	588	Satisfactory
Police	0.81	586	Satisfactory
Parks	0.76	586	Satisfactory
Water	0.71	585	Satisfactory
Sewer	0.56	582	Satisfactory
Marina Services	0.55	575	Satisfactory
Snow Removal	0.44	590	Nearly Satisfactory
Street Lighting	0.37	587	Nearly Satisfactory
Animal Control	-0.04	582	Some Concern
Elderly Recreation	-0.06	578	Some Concern
Youth Recreation	-0.10	583	Some Concern
Street Maintenance	-0.11	583	Some Concern
Storm Drainage	-0.24	580	Some Concern
Sidewalks	-0.93	581	Needs Improvement

The next two services (snow removal, street lighting) seem to be assessed by the sample as nearly satisfactory. For both of these services two-thirds of the sample rated them as "above average" or "satisfactory", but sizable minorities (30 percent in both cases) felt they need some or a great deal of improvement.

Animal control, elderly and youth recreation services, street maintenance, and storm water drainage, all fall into the "some concern" category. The fact that the weighted average rating for all of these services is slightly negative indicates that more people feel they need improvement than feel they are satisfactory or better.

Finally, sidewalks stand very much in a class of their own. Three-quarters of the respondents say that sidewalks either need some improvement (34 percent) or are in great need of improvement (41 percent). The depth and breadth of dissatisfaction with sidewalks in Washburn is apparent.

Demographically, residents who have lived in Washburn for more than 20 years hold statistically different opinions about many of the services listed in Table 7 than do more recent arrivals. Longer-term residents are more satisfied with the ambulance, fire service, the parks, storm water drainage, and street lighting than are newer arrivals. Longer term residents are more likely to have opinions about more of the services (animal control, elderly recreational services, the marina, police services) included in Table 7 than are others. Men and women share similar opinions about all of these services other than recreational opportunities for the elderly and youth and sidewalks, where women see more need for improvement.

City residents were also asked for their opinions about the quality of education provided by the local schools. We again weighted responses saying educational quality is excellent with a 2,

good with a 1, average with a 0, below average with a -1, and poor with a -2. Using this weighting scheme allows us to compare the 0.76 average rating for the schools to the ratings of the services summarized in Table 7. Nearly two-thirds of the respondents feel that the local schools provide either an excellent (20 percent) or good (42 percent) education compared to the 9 percent who think they are either below average (5 percent) or poor (4 percent). In addition, another 21 percent rated the schools as average. Long-term residents are statistically more satisfied with the schools and younger adults (those under 44) are less so than other segments of the population. So, all in all, the citizens of the city seem reasonably satisfied with the quality of the schools.

Respondents were asked to prioritize 11 capital improvement projects, many of which relate directly to items in Table 7. Men and women differed significantly in the level and order of priority assigned to most of these projects. Interestingly, the one item (street maintenance) for which there is not a statistically significant difference by gender, is the number one capital improvement priority for the citizens of Washburn (Table 8). Eighty-five percent of the respondents said that street maintenance should be a high (41 percent) or medium priority (44 percent) for the city of Washburn. Beyond the relatively high priority assigned to street maintenance, Table 8 shows a substantially higher priority for Civic Center renovations, sewer system improvements, storm drainage improvements, park improvements and water system improvements than the next set of capital improvement projects.

Table 8: Capital Improvement Priorities, Weighted Average

	Men	Women	Overall	Count
Street Maintenance	1.12	1.15	1.13	578
Civic Center Renovations	0.84	0.90	0.88	577
Sewer Improvements	0.79	0.76	0.77	572
Storm Drainage Improvements	0.64	0.82	0.75	578
Park Improvements	0.59	0.75	0.68	574
Water System Improvements	0.68	0.62	0.66	563
Walking Trail Improvements	0.34	0.53	0.38	577
Tree Care and Planting	0.16	0.53	0.38	576
Athletic Flied Improvements	-0.06	0.06	0.00	565
Ski Trail Development	-0.42	-0.04	-0.21	573
Marina Improvements	-0.31	-0.17	-0.22	575

Specific segments of the population in Washburn have significantly different reactions to the projects listed in Table 8. Those who are employed or self-employed assign a higher priority to improving the ski and walking trails and to tree care and planting than do other groups. The youngest segment (under 25) and the oldest group (over 65) share a number of opinions: both see ski and walking trail improvements as lower priorities than the average person. Younger adults put a lower priority on water system upgrades and park improvements, while the elderly view athletic fields as being a lower priority. Longer term residents are less interested in ski trail development and tree care and planting than more recent arrivals.

The final question in this section asked citizens to indicate if they feel the city of Washburn should support the Bayfield Recreation Center. The results indicate a large share of city residents are not in favor of supporting the Center. The weighted average response to this question is -0.29 and substantially more people disagreed (49 percent) with the proposal to support the Center than agreed with it (33 percent).

Natural, Cultural, and Historical Resources

It seems clear that the residents of Washburn value the environmental amenities of the region, particularly Lake Superior. The rating values in Table 9 represent the percentage difference between those who rate a particular amenity as having "high value" and those who rate it as having "low value." For example, 73 percent of the respondents said that surface water quality along the lakeshore has a high value and only 4 percent said it has a low value (73 percent – 4 percent = 69 percent). The amenities most cherished by residents all relate to Lake Superior and most of the items in the upper portions of the table focus on natural or environmental resources. None of the amenities listed in Table 9 were said to have low value by more than one-fifth of the respondents. So, even for the lowest rated amenity, cultural events, there are more than twice as many respondents saying they have high value (37 percent) as say they have low value (15 percent).

Table 9: Value Placed on Natural, Cultural and Historical Resources (weighted average)

Resource	Rating	Count
Lakeshore Water Quality	69%	581
Public Access to Superior	66%	580
Scenic Views of Superior	61%	578
Outdoor Recreation	45%	573
Historical Structures	41%	580
Forest Conservation	34%	580
Community Festivals	29%	577
Performing Arts	23%	578
Cultural Events	22%	575

As has been true in a number of sections of this report, there are a number of statistical differences between the responses of long-term residents of Washburn and those who've lived there for less than 20 years. Long-term residents value cultural events, forest conservation, surface water quality along the lakeshore, historical preservation, outdoor recreation and education, and preservation of scenic views less highly than do shorter-term residents. One should be careful not to overstate the significance of this difference. In all cases, a larger number of long-term residents rate the amenities in Table 9 as having high value than rate them as having low value. For instance, 59 percent of those who report having lived in Washburn for more than 20 years said that preserving scenic views has high value and 9 percent said it had low value. So the rating for this group of people is 50 percent (59 percent – 9 percent). For more recently arrived residents, 73 percent rate preserving scenic views as having high value and only 4 percent say it has low value for a rating of 69 percent. The bottom line is that longer-term residents value the natural, cultural and historical amenities of the area, but with significantly less ardor than do more recent arrivals.

Economic Development

As noted in Tables 3 and 4, many residents of Washburn feel that economic development is one of the most important issues facing the city. As Table 10 indicates, the need for business development in Washburn is embraced by most residents. As has been true in most tables in this report, a response indicating that it is "very important" to promote a given business type is given a weight of 2, "important" a 1, "no opinion" a 0, "not important" a -1 and "should not promote" a -2. Ninety-three percent of respondents indicate that city promotion of commercial or retail

businesses is important or very important. For even the lowest rated business type, home-based businesses, 70 percent of respondents say that it is important or very important for the city to promote them. The three types of businesses that received the largest number of responses in the "not important" or "should not promote" categories are, eco-tourism businesses (16 percent), light manufacturing (17 percent), and home-based businesses (25 percent).

While it is true that most people recognize the need for economic development in the city, the "flavor" of that development differs somewhat by demographic segment:

Table 10: Business Development Priorities

Business Type	Weighted Average	Count
Commercial/Retail	1.48	584
Service	1.17	580
Recreation	1.16	571
Technology	1.14	580
Tourism	1.04	579
Eco-Tourism	0.96	574
Light Manufacturing	0.86	574
Home-Based	0.65	581

- commercial or retail development is more favored by residents who are older, longer-term and female
- both newer and longer-term residents favor service business development.
- newer residents, the self-employed, young adults, and women are more supportive of recreation businesses
- older respondents favor technology businesses
- tourism is more favored by the self-employed and older residents
- the employed and self-employed, older residents and women back eco-tourism development
- older, longer term residents, and the retired population favor light manufacturing
- the self-employed and older residents are more supportive of home-based businesses

There is near unanimity that the city should pursue ways of enhancing the downtown business district with 60 percent strongly supporting this idea and another 34 percent supportive. This result seems compatible with the strong support for commercial and retail development highlighted in Table 10. There is less support for developing a business park (50 percent favorably disposed) or a business incubator with shared services for start-up businesses (53 percent favorable).

Finally, residents were asked what they would most need to open an office or business in Washburn. Table 11 summarizes their responses. Nearly three-quarters of the respondents have no interest in opening a business or office in Washburn. Tax incentives such as Tax Increment Financing (TIF) are the most commonly identified need for aspiring entrepreneurs (10 percent). The need for office space (7 percent) and land for construction (5 percent) are roughly comparable and within the margin of error associated with our estimates. Interestingly, even in this the "Information Age," high speed internet service

Table 11: Need to Open New Office or Business

Need	Number	Percent
No interest in opening	364	72%
Tax incentives	52	10%
Office space	34	7%
Land for construction	26	5%
Shared office space/equipment	19	4%
High-speed internet	8	2%

is seen as the most important need for opening a new office or business by only 2 percent of the 139 respondents who showed some interest in opening a business in Washburn.

Land Use

The land use section of the questionnaire sought citizen input on how specific city-owned land should be used. The sites about which input was sought included land:

- along West Holman Lakeview Drive from the IGA to West End Park
- along Omaha Street from the IGA to the Coal Dock
- along Central Avenue from the Museum to the Coal Dock
- west of West End Park

Table 12 summarizes respondents' views with respect to land use in these four areas. The use garnering the highest level of support for each of the four parcels of land in Table 12 is in bold type.

Table 12: Preferred Use of Four Publicly-Owned Tracts of Land

	W Holman Lakeview Dr	Omaha St	Central Ave	West of West End Park
Mixed Commercial/Public Recreational	11%	**28%**	**34%**	8%
Commercial	3%	10%	24%	4%
Mixed Residential/ Public Recreational	20%	19%	13%	20%
Public Recreational	**28%**	14%	9%	18%
No Development	21%	12%	8%	**23%**
No Opinion	1%	2%	5%	6%
Residential	10%	9%	5%	17%
Other	5%	6%	3%	4%
Count	572	570	575	581

A majority of respondents (59 percent) think that Central Avenue should include commercial development. If all of those who support some mixture of public recreational and residential development are grouped, they make up more than one-quarter of the survey respondents.

Public recreational uses (alone or in conjunction with other uses) is favored by majorities for West Holman Lakeview Drive (60 percent) and Omaha Street (61 percent). Similar to the Central Avenue discussion, substantial minorities prefer other uses for these properties.

The property for which there is the least degree of commonality is the parcel west of West End Park. Four options (no development (23 percent), mixed residential and public recreational (20 percent), public recreational (18 percent), and residential (17 percent)) are statistically indistinguishable (they are all within the margin of error of each other).

There are statistically significant differences by demographic group for only two of the properties – West Holman Lakeview Drive and Omaha Street. For West Holman Lakeview Drive both length of residence in Washburn and the age of the respondent are significant. With respect to length of residence, those who've lived in Washburn for less than 5 years prefer to see mixed commercial and public recreation use while those with more than 20 years residence are more favorably disposed to residential and commercial development in this area and less supportive of recreational uses. In terms of age of respondent, those under 25 prefer that no development take place along West Holman, while those 65 and over would like to see commercial or residential development.

Employment status and age are demographic elements within which there are significant differences of opinion about the future of public property along Omaha Street. The self-employed are significantly more supportive of mixed commercial and public recreational development along Omaha Street and less supportive of residential development. The unemployed are also less supportive of residential development on this street, but retirees are more supportive of this use. Both retirees and homemakers are less supportive of public recreational uses of the Omaha Street property.

The bottom line is that there is no community-wide consensus on how these four properties should be used. We can generally say that commercial development is more acceptable on Central Avenue and not acceptable on the land west of West End Park. Public recreational uses alone, with mixed commercial, and mixed residential are favored by 60 percent of respondents for West Holman Lakeview Drive and 61 percent for Omaha Street. With respect to all four properties, additional community dialogue followed by the development of specific proposals seems to be in order.

Intergovernmental Collaboration

City residents were asked to offer their opinions about how well the city of Washburn cooperates and works with neighboring town, state, federal and tribal governmental units and agencies. Respondents had the options of:

- agreeing that Washburn works well with a given governmental unit or agency, in which case it was given a weight of 1
- saying they have no opinion, given a weight of 0
- disagreeing, given a weight of -1

So, in Table 13, the closer the weighted value is to 1, the more strongly do city residents feel that Washburn is doing a good job of cooperating with the given governmental unit or agency.

One conclusion from Table 13 is that a relatively high proportion of people don't have an opinion one way or another about the success of Washburn in working with other units of government. For all but two of the governmental units and agencies in Table 13, nearly half or more selected the "no opinion" option for these questions. When it comes to relations between Washburn and tribal governments, the level of uncertainty rises to about three-quarters.

A second conclusion is that the units of government with which Washburn is likely to work with most closely, Bayfield County and the local school district, a majority of people believe cooperation is adequate. For Bayfield County, 319 respondents agreed the city cooperates and works well versus 37 who disagreed. For the school district, the comparable numbers are 308 agreeing and 48 disagreeing.

Table 13: Opinions About Washburn's Relations with other Governmental Units/Agencies

	Weighted Rating	Percent "no opinion"	Count
Bayfield County	0.50	37%	561
Washburn School District	0.46	36%	560
Town of Washburn	0.45	47%	557
U.S. Forest Service	0.43	49%	559
Town of Barksdale	0.42	48%	557
Town of Bayview	0.42	48%	559
Wisconsin DNR	0.35	53%	558
Wisconsin DOT	0.26	60%	553
City of Bayfield	0.23	56%	558
City of Ashland	0.21	54%	556
Red Cliff Tribe	0.06	73%	553
Bad River Tribe	0.01	78%	557

In many cases the unemployed, retirees, those 65 and older and those under 25 years of age feel that the city cooperates with many of its neighbors (city of Ashland, county of Bayfield, the towns of Barksdale, Bayview, and Washburn, and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation). In contrast those who have lived in Washburn for 5 – 10 years feel that Washburn doesn't cooperate well with its neighbors (county of Bayfield, Red Cliff tribe, the towns of Barksdale, Bayview, and Washburn, the U.S. Forest Service and the Wisconsin Departments of Transportation and Natural Resources).

Zoning and Ordinances

The city has ordinances and zoning regulations designed to control junk vehicles and signs, maintain residences and yards, protect property values, and regulate building and land divisions. Residents were asked to indicate if the ordinances have been effective an achieving their desired ends. As has been the pattern, responses indicating "strong agreement" receive a weight of 2, "agreement" a 1, "no

Table 14: Effectiveness of City Ordinances

Ordinance	Weighted Value	Count	Agree Effective	Disagree Effective
Controlling signs	0.39	562	61%	25%
Regulating building	0.26	557	49%	23%
Regulating land divisions	0.21	557	39%	20%
Protecting property values	0.16	557	48%	32%
Controlling junk vehicles	0.02	565	46%	41%
Maintaining residences	(0.07)	563	42%	43%
Maintaining yards	(0.18)	565	39%	48%

opinion" a 0, "disagreement" a -1 and "strong disagreement" a -2. Table 14 summarizes the responses received.

With the exception of the city's sign ordinance, the population is fairly neutral on the impact of the regulations examined in Table 14. There are more than twice as many people (344) who agree or strongly agree that the sign ordinance has been effective as disagree (139). The number of people who don't have an opinion increases sharply for building (28 percent) and land division regulations (41 percent). In the section on housing, we reported that 71 percent of the respondents were in favor of an ordinance requiring standards for property maintenance in Washburn. The results reported in Table 14 suggest that ordinances that currently exist are not seen as effective. There were more respondents who disagreed with the statement that Washburn ordinances relating to maintaining residences have been effective (43 percent) than said they were effective (42 percent). The effectiveness of ordinances about yard maintenance is questioned by an even higher proportion of the sample (48 percent disagreed with the position that this ordinance has been effective versus only 39 percent who agreed).

Finally, there are few demographic group differences in respondent's assessment of the effectiveness of city ordinances.

Conclusions

Based on this survey, the citizens of Washburn generally feel that the city is a good place to live and that most basic city services and facilities are satisfactory. They would like to see improvements in the city's sidewalks and put priorities on street maintenance and renovation of the civic center. They also seem to favor additional regulatory efforts by the city to maintain minimum housing standards, despite their assessment that some existing ordinances have not been as effective as they might like.

They recognize the importance of expanding jobs and businesses in the community but also place a high value on the preservation of local environmental amenities. These twin desires (creation and amenity preservation) play out in respondents' suggested uses of city-owned properties. While there are tendencies toward preferring commercial development on Central Avenue and public recreational uses on West Holman Lakeview Drive and Omaha Street, there is not a consensus on any of these uses.

Appendix 1 – Questionnaire

City of Washburn Community Planning Survey

Here are the initial results of the recent city wide Community Planning Survey. Surveys were mailed to the registered voters of the City and individuals who did not receive a survey were encouraged to pick up a copy from the City Hall or the Public Library. 602 surveys were returned and tallied to obtain these results. The analysis was performed by the University of Wisconsin Survey Research Center in River Falls.

This is only the first step in creating a Comprehensive Plan for the City. *Your input and ideas are still needed* – please forward your suggestions to your City representatives or members of the Steering Committee.

Respondent Information

1. Are you a City of Washburn? (check one)
   97.7% Year-round resident **2.0%** Seasonal resident **0.3%**Non-resident property owner (see below)

   1.a. If a Non-resident property owner, do you plan to move to Washburn in (check one):
   27.3%0 – 5 years **18.2%**6 – 10 years **27.3%**11 – 15 years
   9.1%16 – 20 years **9.1%**>20 years **9.1%**Never

2. Do you own or rent your place of residence in the City of Washburn? (check one)
   84.0%Own **15.7%**Rent **0.3%**Own land but don't have dwelling on it

3. If you own land, do you plan to build a residence or business within the next 5 years? (check one)
   11.0%Yes **89.0%**No

   3.a. If you answered yes, which type of structure do you plan to build?
   82.1%Residence **17.9%**Business

4. How long have you owned or rented property in the City of Washburn? (check one)
   20.5%Less than 5years **21.2%**11 to 20 years
   19.7%5 to 10 years **38.6%**More than 20 years

5. What is your current employment status? (check one)
   49.2%Employed **14.6%**Self-employed **2.9%**Unemployed
   29.7%Retired **3.5%**Homemaker

6. What is your age? (check one)
   3.3%Under 25 **24.2%**25 to 44 **46.0%**45 to 64 **26.4%**65 or older

7. What is your gender? (check one)
   44.1%Male **55.9%**Female

Planning Issues and Opportunities

8. How would you rate the City of Washburn as a place to live? (check one)
18.6%Excellent **62.5%**Good **6.4%**Poor **11.7%**Fair **0.7%**No opinion

9. In planning for the future, should the City of Washburn encourage action in the following areas (check one per category)?

	Stongly Encourage	Encourage	Take No Action	Discourage	Strongly Discourage
Residential Development	**32.8%**	**49.6%**	**16.0%**	**0.9%**	**0.7%**
Commercial Development	**45.3%**	**44.4%**	**6.7%**	**3.0%**	**0.7%**
Industrial Development	**31.6%**	**34.7%**	**18.4%**	**10.2%**	**5.1%**
Waterfront Development	**25.5%**	**28.4%**	**18.4%**	**12.5%**	**15.2%**
Public Recreational Facilities	**32.6%**	**51.3%**	**14.0%**	**1.4%**	**0.7%**
Greenspace Preservation	**39.8%**	**32.7%**	**18.4%**	**4.8%**	**4.4%**
Lakeshore Preservation	**50.8%**	**29.7%**	**14.2%**	**1.9%**	**3.5%**
Public Access to the Lakeshore	**51.5%**	**32.2%**	**14.3%**	**1.4%**	**0.7%**

Housing

10. How would you rate the supply of housing by category in the City of Washburn? (check one per category)

	Need a Lot More	Need a Little More	Do Not Need Any More	No Opinion
Single Family Homes	**23.4%**	**48.4%**	**12.6%**	**15.6%**
Rental Housing / Apartments	**20.8%**	**48.4%**	**14.8%**	**16.0%**
Condominiums / Townhouses	**9.6%**	**23.8%**	**51.3%**	**15.3%**
Elderly / Assisted Living	**17.2%**	**45.9%**	**19.7%**	**17.2%**
Low Income Housing	**16.7%**	**38.0%**	**28.8%**	**16.5%**
Moderately Priced Housing	**34.1%**	**48.8%**	**7.7%**	**9.4%**
High Priced Housing	**5.1%**	**23.9%**	**55.3%**	**15.6%**
Mobile Homes	**2.3%**	**7.5%**	**73.7%**	**16.5%**

11. How would you rate the overall appearance of housing in the City of Washburn? (check one)
2.2%Very good **24.9%**Good **54.2%**Average **18.6%**Poor **0.2%**No opinion

12. The City of Washburn should adopt and enforce a property maintenance ordinance requiring owners to maintain their properties to predetermined city standards. (check one)
25.5%Strongly agree **44.6%**Agree **16.6%**Disagree **10.0%**Strongly disagree
3.4%No opinion

Transportation

13. How would you rate the overall condition of the streets and highways in the City of Washburn? (check one)
2.4%Very good **25.5%**Good **47.9%**Average **23.9%**Poor **0.3%**No opinion

14. In your view are the public transportation services in the City adequate to meet the needs of the general public? (check one)
27.7%Yes **28.4%**No **43.9%**Don't Know

15. In your view are there adequate transportation services available to meet the needs of the elderly and persons with disabilities who live in the City of Washburn? (check one)
24.0%Yes **22.9%**No **53.1%**Don't know

16. Should the City encourage the following alternative transportation options? (check all that apply).
32.7%Car Pool Parking **74.1%**Bicycle lanes / Paths **18.4%**Other _____
(please specify)

17. Do you use public transportation? (check one) **7.4%**Yes **92.6%**No

If yes, please answer the following (please specify for all that apply):

17.a. Bay Area Regional Transit (BART) ____times/month or ____times/year
17.b. Blue Goose ____times/month or ____times/year

...Continued on the next page...

Utilities and Community Facilities

18. Please rate your satisfaction with the following City of Washburn utilities, community facilities and services. (check one per category)

	Above Average	Satisfactory	Some Need for Improvement	Great Need for Improvement	No Opinion
Ambulance	35.4%	47.4%	2.7%	0.3%	14.2%
Animal Control	3.1%	41.4%	24.2%	13.9%	17.4%
Elderly Recreation	1.7%	27.7%	23.2%	6.9%	40.5%
Fire Protection	29.4%	57.0%	3.9%	0.3%	9.4%
Garbage Collection	23.3%	67.8%	6.0%	0.7%	2.2%
Marina Services	10.4%	39.7%	4.2%	0.7%	45.0%
Parks	22.7%	54.1%	18.4%	2.4%	2.4%
Police Services	20.1%	59.9%	11.3%	3.8%	4.9%
Public Library	44.0%	46.9%	4.9%	0.7%	3.4%
Recycling Services	19.7%	65.0%	10.2%	2.7%	2.4%
Sewer Service	8.6%	60.0%	13.9%	3.8%	13.7%
Sidewalk Maintenance	2.1%	17.7%	33.6%	40.8%	5.9%
Snow Removal	14.2%	53.6%	22.4%	7.8%	2.0%
Storm Water Drainage	2.6%	35.5%	30.9%	17.1%	14.0%
Street Lighting	6.1%	60.6%	24.2%	5.6%	3.4%
Street Maintenance	4.1%	45.6%	32.2%	16.3%	1.7%
Water Service	8.2%	69.2%	7.2%	3.9%	11.5%
Youth Recreation	5.7%	33.3%	24.5%	14.9%	21.6%

19. How would you grade the quality of education provided by local schools to children in the City of Washburn? (check one)

19.8% Excellent 42.1% Good 20.8% Average 5.1% Below average
3.7% Poor 8.5% No opinion

20. Each year the City of Washburn makes choices about which capital improvement projects to implement. Please rate the priority of the following projects (check one per category):

	High Priority	Medium Priority	Low Priority	Do Not Implement	No Opinion
Athletic Field Improvements	**5.8%**	**36.5%**	**38.9%**	**4.8%**	**14.0%**
Civic Center Renovation	**34.8%**	**40.7%**	**13.9%**	**4.5%**	**6.1%**
Marina Improvements	**4.9%**	**28.3%**	**39.8%**	**10.1%**	**16.9%**
Park Improvements	**21.4%**	**50.0%**	**21.8%**	**1.4%**	**5.4%**
Sewer System Improvements	**30.6%**	**38.3%**	**14.0%**	**4.0%**	**13.1%**
Ski Trail Development	**11.3%**	**26.2%**	**32.1%**	**19.0%**	**11.3%**
Storm Drainage Improvements	**29.9%**	**40.1%**	**14.4%**	**5.2%**	**10.4%**
Street Maintenance	**40.8%**	**44.3%**	**10.0%**	**1.2%**	**3.6%**
Tree Care & Planting	**24.4%**	**34.0%**	**27.9%**	**8.5%**	**5.2%**
Walking Trail Improvements	**24.8%**	**34.8%**	**26.3%**	**9.9%**	**4.2%**
Water System Improvements	**26.5%**	**39.1%**	**16.9%**	**4.4%**	**13.1%**

21. The City of Washburn should support the Bayfield Recreation Center. (check one)
9.3%Strongly agree **23.4%**Agree **27.2%**Disagree **22.0%**Strongly disagree
18.2%No opinion

…Continued on the next page…

Natural, Cultural, and Historical Resources

22. Please indicate the value that you place on each of the following items in the city (check one per category):

	High Value	Moderate Value	Low Value
Arts / Performing Arts Community	**41.5%**	**39.4%**	**19.0%**
Community Festivals	**40.7%**	**47.7%**	**11.6%**
Cultural Events	**37.2%**	**47.7%**	**15.1%**
Forest Conservation	**49.1%**	**36.0%**	**14.8%**
Surface Water Quality along Lakeshore	**73.3%**	**22.4%**	**4.3%**
Historical Structures and Artifacts	**50.5%**	**39.5%**	**10.0%**
Outdoor Recreation and Education	**51.7%**	**41.7%**	**6.6%**
Public Access to Lake Superior	**70.7%**	**24.1%**	**5.2%**
Scenic Views of Lake Superior	**67.3%**	**26.1%**	**6.6%**

…Continued on the next page…

Economic Development

23. How important is it for the City of Washburn to promote (check one per category)

	Very Important	Important	Not Important	Should not Promote	No Opinion
Commercial/Retail Businesses	**62.7%**	**30.5%**	**4.3%**	**1.7%**	**0.9%**
Eco-Tourism Based Businesses	**39.2%**	**38.7%**	**10.8%**	**5.2%**	**6.1%**
Home Based Businesses	**26.9%**	**42.7%**	**19.4%**	**6.0%**	**5.0%**
Light Manufacturing	**34.0%**	**40.6%**	**12.0%**	**5.4%**	**8.0%**
Recreation Based Businesses	**40.1%**	**46.8%**	**5.6%**	**2.6%**	**4.9%**
Service Businesses	**37.8%**	**50.5%**	**6.4%**	**1.4%**	**4.0%**
Technology Based Businesses	**43.4%**	**39.7%**	**9.3%**	**1.7%**	**5.9%**
Tourist Based Businesses	**42.7%**	**38.9%**	**11.4%**	**4.3%**	**2.8%**

24. The City of Washburn should pursue ways to enhance the downtown business district.(check one)
59.7%Strongly agree **34.0%**Agree **2.7%**Disagree **1.2%**Strongly disagree
2.4%No opinion

25. The City of Washburn should develop a business park. (check one)
21.9%Strongly agree **28.3%**Agree **22.1%**Disagree **10.2%**Strongly disagree
17.6%No opinion

26. The City of Washburn should develop a business building with shared services to house new startup businesses. (check one)
17.6%Strongly agree **34.9%**Agree **22.1%**Disagree **6.9%**Strongly disagree
18.3%No opinion

27. What would you need to open an office or business in Washburn? (check one)
6.8%Office space for single business
3.8%Joint office space that shares copier, printers, fax, computer lines etc
5.2%Available land for new construction
10.3%Tax incentives such as a Tax Increment Finance area, et. al.
1.6%High speed internet service
72.4%Have no interest in opening an office or business in the City of Washburn

Land Use

28. In your view what should the City of Washburn-owned land be used for along West Holman Lakeview Drive? (from IGA to West End Park) (check one)
2.8%Commercial development
11.2%Mixed commercial & public recreational
20.3%Mixed residential & public recreational
28.1%Public recreational development
9.8%Residential development
21.3%No development
5.1%Other (please specify) _____
1.4%No opinion

29. In your view what should the City of Washburn-owned land be used for along Omaha Street?(from IGA to Coal Dock) (check one)
9.8%Commercial development
27.9%Mixed commercial & public recreational
19.3%Mixed residential & public recreational
13.9%Public recreational development
8.6%Residential development
12.5%No development
5.6%Other (please specify) _____
2.5%No opinion

30. In your view what should the City of Washburn–owned land be used for along Central Avenue? (from Museum down to Coal Dock) (check one)
24.3%Commercial development
34.3%Mixed commercial & public recreational
12.5%Mixed residential & public recreational
8.5%Public recreational development
4.9%Residential development
7.7%No development
2.8%Other (please specify) _____
5.0%No opinion

31. In your view what should the City of Washburn–owned land be used for west of the West End Park? (check one)
4.0%Commercial development
8.1%Mixed commercial & public recreational
20.1%Mixed residential & public recreational
18.4%Public recreational development
16.5%Residential development
22.5%No development
4.5%Other (please specify) _____
5.9%No opinion

Intergovernmental Cooperation

32. In your opinion the City of Washburn cooperates and works well with (check one per category)

	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion
Bad River Tribe	**11.1%**	**10.4%**	**78.5%**
Bayfield County	**56.9%**	**6.6%**	**36.5%**
City of Ashland	**33.6%**	**12.4%**	**54.0%**
City of Bayfield	**33.7%**	**10.4%**	**55.9%**
Red Cliff Tribe	**16.5%**	**10.3%**	**73.2%**
Town of Barksdale	**46.7%**	**4.8%**	**48.5%**
Town of Bayview	**46.7%**	**5.0%**	**48.3%**
Town of Washburn	**49.2%**	**3.9%**	**46.9%**
U. S. Forest Service	**46.7%**	**4.1%**	**49.2%**
Washburn School District	**55.0%**	**8.6%**	**36.4%**
WI Dept. of Natural Resources	**41.0%**	**6.5%**	**52.5%**
WI Dept. of Transportation	**33.1%**	**6.7%**	**60.2%**

…Continued on the next page…

Implementation

33. The City of Washburn's zoning and related ordinances have been effective in (check one per category)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
Controlling junk vehicles	**11.3%**	**34.3%**	**27.8%**	**13.6%**	**12.9%**
Controlling signs	**8.9%**	**52.3%**	**18.0%**	**6.8%**	**14.1%**
Maintaining residences	**5.5%**	**36.8%**	**31.4%**	**11.5%**	**14.7%**
Maintaining yards appearances	**6.5%**	**32.2%**	**32.9%**	**15.0%**	**13.3%**
Protecting property values	**8.1%**	**39.5%**	**23.5%**	**8.1%**	**20.8%**
Regulating building	**6.8%**	**42.4%**	**16.0%**	**6.8%**	**28.0%**
Regulating land divisions	**5.8%**	**33.6%**	**15.8%**	**4.1%**	**40.8%**

Other

34. What do you think are the ***two*** most important issues facing the City of Washburn in the coming years? (check two only)

24.7% Development of the lakefront
9.8% Future use of public lands
3.0% Maintaining cultural activities (art shows, concerts, plays)
7.5% Need to address infrastructure needs
45.2% Need to increase businesses & jobs
18.9% Need to improve central business district
10.0% Need to increase population
19.3% Need to increase tax base
12.4% Preserving natural areas
27.5% Preserving views and public access to Lake Superior
19.6% Providing and preserving a healthy environment
7.9% Other (please specify) _____
2.1% Other (please specify) _____

Thank You For Completing This Survey And Helping The City of Washburn Plan For Its Future

Please return your completed survey by **May 15, 2005**

Appendix 2 – Statistical Tests for Gender Differences

The SRC looked for systematic statistical differences in the responses of males and females to survey questions using Pearson's T-Statistic. This procedure compares the means of men and women and, using the variability of each gender's responses, determines the probability that these means are different. If we can say with 95 percent confidence that the means are different, we say that the differences are significant. A 95 percent level of confidence means that there is only a one in twenty chance that the observed differences in average values are actually the result of a set of respondents who don't really reflect how others of their gender feel about a given issue.

While there are statistical differences between men and women in slightly more than one-quarter of the 118 variables tested, there is only one area in which there is a strong pattern of differences. In virtually all variables, the general tendency of men and women are the same, but the degree of intensity varies. For example, respondents were asked to rate the city of Washburn as a place to live (see Table 2) and women rate Washburn significantly higher than do men. Substantively, however, both genders generally feel that Washburn is a good place to live.

The opinions of men and women are systematically different with respect to the priority of eleven capital improvement projects (Question 20). Men and women differ significantly on the priority attached to 10 of the 11 projects (street maintenance was the sole exception and even here there is nearly a statistically significant difference). Table A2.1 summarizes the responses to this question by gender. In Table A2.1, if a person rated a given capital improvement project as a high priority, it is given a weight of 2, if medium a weight of 1, if no opinion a 0, if low a -1, and if they felt the investment shouldn't be made a -2. Thus, the more positive the weighted value, the higher the priority attached to the capital improvement project. As Table 3 indicates, women generally give these capital improvement projects a slightly higher level of priority. In addition the rankings of the two genders are quite different. The Table also shows that the ranking of these capital improvement projects is similar at the top (both men and women identified street maintenance and Civic Center improvements as the top two priorities for both men and women) and bottom of the list (athletic field improvements, marina improvements, and

Table 3: Weighted Average Priorities of Capital Improvement Projects, by Gender

	Men	Women	Women's Ranking
1. Street Maintenance	1.12	1.15	1
2. Civic Center Improvements	0.84	0.90	2
3. Sewer System Improvements	0.79	0.76	4
4. Water System Improvements	0.68	0.62	6
5. Storm Drain System Improvements	0.64	0.82	3
6. Park Improvements	0.59	0.75	5
7. Walk Trail Improvements	0.34	0.53	7
8. Trees Care and Planting	0.16	0.53	7
9. Athletic Fields Improvements	-0.06	0.06	9
10. Marina Improvements	-0.31	-0.17	11
11. Ski Trail Improvements	-0.42	-0.04	10

ski trail improvements are the bottom three priorities for both genders). The rankings in the middle of the list are substantially different for men and women.

We conclude that the higher than expected number of females in the sample does not create any systematic bias and, therefore, no adjustments to the results are needed.