

Report to

PENINSULA TOWNSHIP

for

RESIDENT SURVEY

Prepared by:

*Research Services  
Northwestern Michigan College*

October 2006

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<i>Section</i>	<i>Page</i>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1.0 OVERVIEW .....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1 Objective .....	5
1.2 Methodology .....	5
<b>2.0 SURVEY RESULTS.....</b>	<b>6</b>
Gap Analysis.....	16
Demographics.....	38
<b>3.0 CROSS-TABULATIONS.....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Appendix A .....</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>
<b>Appendix B.....</b>	<b>Survey Instrument</b>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

### Key Findings:

- The majority of respondents are permanent residents of the Township (81%), with the single largest group (30%) reporting they have lived in Peninsula Township for 20 years or more, followed by 19% at 5 – 9 years and 18% at 10 – 14 years.

Approximately 11% of respondents report operating a business out of their home. The single largest group of respondents (47%) report owning less than one acre, while 34% report owning 1 – 2 acres. With regard to where respondents live on the peninsula, 43% report living *between Wilson Road and Mapleton*, 35% report living *south of Wilson Road*, and 22% report living *north of Mapleton*.

- With regard to long-range planning issues, respondents assigned the highest importance ratings to Water Quality of Bays, Preservation of Scenic Bay Views, and Increased Traffic (95%, 93% and 88%, respectively, rating issue Somewhat or Very Important).
- Respondents assigned the highest effectiveness ratings to Peninsula Township on Preservation of Scenic Bay Views, Preservation of Agricultural Land, and Preservation of Historic Buildings/Areas (61%, 61% and 59%, respectively, assigning Excellent or Above Average ratings).
- Concerning potential Peninsula Township initiatives, respondents assigned the highest importance ratings to Ensure Ground Water Quality, Maintain Growth Through Strong Zoning/Planning, and Maintain Scenic Quality of M-37 (92%, 86% and 84%, respectively, rating initiative Somewhat or Very Important).
- Given a series of potential development patterns, respondents assigned the highest desirability ratings to *housing density planned so that public water/sewer are not necessary*; respondents assigned the lowest desirability ratings to *developments with houses farther apart with less open space*.
- The majority of respondents indicated development should be discouraged on wetlands, steep slopes, and shorelines (79%, 65%, and 52%, respectively).
- With respect to the rate and quality of development within the Township, the majority of respondents (63%) supported addressing both equally, as opposed to concentrating on quality (27%) or rate (8%) independently.
- The majority of respondents (56%) believe the Township should plan for a maximum population of less than 14,000, versus a maximum population of more than 14,000 (11%) or a maximum population of 14,000 (33%).

- The slight majority of respondents (55%) believe the Township should pursue more open space at the south end; similarly, 54% believe the Township should pursue public parks at the south end.
- Concerning public developments, the majority of respondents rated *improvements of present Township parks* and *development of additional outdoor recreational opportunities* as medium or high priority developments (69% and 51%, respectively); conversely, the majority of respondents rated *community center* and *provision of more public access to the bays* as low or not a priority (63% and 62%, respectively).
- With regard to preservation of farmland, the single largest group of respondents (49%) rated *continue the PDR program with voted millage* a high priority. Concerning *cluster development/keep open space as farmland* and *remove future residential development from farmland and locate in other areas*, 39% and 30%, respectively, assigned a high priority rating.
- With regard to potential land use, respondents most frequently identified Gas Station (75%), Restaurant (71%), Single Family Housing with less than 5 acre lots (70%), Private/Public Schools (68%), Single Family Housing, 5 acre lots (67%), and Country Inn (67%) as appropriate for development in Peninsula Township.

Respondents most frequently identified Mobile homes (99%), Light Manufacturing/Fabrication (92%), and Low Income Housing (85%) as inappropriate for potential land use on the peninsula.

- The single largest group of respondents (43%) indicated windmills over 100 feet should be allowed with height and location standards, while 37% indicated they should not and 21% are uncertain; similarly, the majority of respondents (54%) indicated windmills less than 100 feet should be allowed with height and location standards, while 25% indicated they should not and 21% are uncertain.
- A total of 45% of respondents indicated the Township should develop additional parkland at the south end, while 38% indicated the Township should not pursue this type of development in the south end.
- The majority, or single largest group, of respondents support development of Improved Trail Systems (66%), Unpaved Trails (60%), and Open Grass Fields (50%) in the southern end of the Township. Conversely, the majority or single largest group of respondents indicated they *do not* support development of Ball Fields (57%) or Water Access (48%) in the south end.

- The majority of respondents (68%) believe the Township should have bicycle paths and trail systems *along primary roads with widened shoulders*. In addition, the majority of respondents believe the Township should have bicycle paths and trail systems *off main roads* (63%), *the full length of peninsula* (62%), and *linking parks or scenic views* (61%). With respect to each option, approximately one-quarter of respondents indicated they do not believe the Township should have this type of bicycle path/trail system.
- The single largest group of respondents (39%) indicated they had seen changes to water quality in the bay over the last several years, with the majority of this group (67%) reporting the change reflected lower quality; 31% of respondents indicated they had not seen a change, and 30% are uncertain.
- The majority of respondents (77%) support the Planning Commission’s working concept for future traffic needs; in addition, the majority of respondents (70%) believe the Township’s policy should be to discourage widening roads paralleling M-37.
- With regard to funding and potential initiatives, the slight majority of respondents (53%) believe the Township should *maintain agriculturally productive land* “only if it does not raise my taxes,” while 39% believe the township should pursue this initiative “even if it raises my taxes.”

In addition, 44% of respondents believe the township should pursue *preservation of open space* “even if it raises my taxes,” while 41% support pursuit “only if it does not raise my taxes;” 44% of respondents support *expansion of Township park facilities* “only if it does not raise my taxes,” while 25% do not support at all and 23% support “even if it raises my taxes.” Concerning *more zoning enforcement*, 38% of respondents support “only if it does not raise my taxes,” while 34% support “even if it raises my taxes.”

- Approximately 42% of respondents reported they are somewhat or very involved in Township issues/matters.
- Respondents most frequently cited the Township Newsletter as their preferred method of communication regarding Township issues, followed by local newspaper.
- The majority of respondents (63%) reported they have not visited the Peninsula Township website. In addition, the majority (90%) reported they have not used the Bay Area Transportation Authority service.
- Respondents were divided regarding a perceived lack of community feeling in the Township, with 52% agreeing there is a lack of community feeling and 48% disagreeing. Of those who agreed, the majority indicated support for *more publicity of community events* (75%), *community information meetings* (68%), and a *Fall Festival* (67%) to address this issue.

# PENINSULA TOWNSHIP 2006 RESIDENT SURVEY

---

## 1.0 OVERVIEW

### 1.1 Objective

The purpose of the research was to determine the views and opinions of Peninsula Township residents on a variety of Township planning issues. Through a mail survey, residents were asked to respond to questions addressing long range planning, potential Township initiatives, development patterns, potential land uses, and other relevant issues. Demographic data (e.g., age, length of residency, location of residence) was gathered for use in determining views by various resident subsections. The results of the research identify residents' views on Township strengths and weaknesses, providing Peninsula Township representatives with information that can be used to prioritize opportunities or areas needing improvement, and for use in the Master Plan update.

### 1.2 Methodology

*Phase 1:* A series of seven focus groups were conducted with Peninsula Township stakeholders. Identified stakeholder groups included: Agriculture (1 group), Business (1 group), Residential (shoreline) (2 groups), Residential (Services) (1 group), and Residential (non-shoreline, south of McKinley) (2 groups). Participants discussed the current condition of the township, identifying what they hope remains the same and what needs to change, as well as the future of the Township, answering questions concerning their vision for the next five and ten years. Results of the focus group were used in development of a survey instrument to be administered in Phase 2 of the research.

*Phase 2:* A mail survey was conducted with a randomly selected sample of Peninsula Township property owners. Sample size was determined by applying the total number of property owners to a sampling table for 95% confidence level. Based upon an approximate population of 3,095, a sample size of 342 was determined to be necessary for a confidence interval of +/- 5%. A total of 750 surveys was mailed on August 11, 2006. Completed surveys were accepted and processed during a five-week period (8/14/06 - 9/15/06). A total of 256 completed surveys was included for analyses, for an approximate 34% response rate, +/-5.8% margin of error.

The survey instrument was developed using Cardiff's Teleform scanning software. Survey data was analyzed using SPSS for Windows. Analyses included frequencies, cross-tabulations, and significance testing, as appropriate. The final report includes: Section 2.0 - SPSS frequency tables\* and Section 3.0 - significant cross-tabulations

\*SPSS Tables include the following column headers:

Frequency – the actual count/number of respondents choosing the response category

Percent – the percent of respondents choosing the response category, based on all cases (i.e., 518)

Valid Percent – the percent of respondents choosing the response category, based only on those answering the question (omits missing data). Recommended for use when interpreting results.

Cumulative Percent – sum of valid percents.

## 2.0 SURVEY RESULTS

Peninsula Township will be faced with many issues in the next decade for which long-range planning is critical. Following is a series of items addressing various issues relevant to the township. First, please indicate the importance of each item when considering the future of Peninsula Township, and then rate Peninsula Township's efforts with regard to the item.

### Development

#### How important is this issue to you?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	168	65.6	68.0	68.0
	Somewhat Important	43	16.8	17.4	85.4
	Neutral	22	8.6	8.9	94.3
	Somewhat Unimportant	5	2.0	2.0	96.4
	Very Unimportant	9	3.5	3.6	100.0
	Total	247	96.5	100.0	
Missing	System	9	3.5		
Total		256	100.0		

#### How would you rate Peninsula Township's efforts with regard to this issue?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Excellent	17	6.6	7.9	7.9
	Above Average	89	34.8	41.2	49.1
	Average	73	28.5	33.8	82.9
	Below Average	27	10.5	12.5	95.4
	Poor	10	3.9	4.6	100.0
	Total	216	84.4	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	28	10.9		
	System	12	4.7		
	Total	40	15.6		
Total		256	100.0		

## Preservation of historic buildings/areas

### How important is this issue to you?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	90	35.2	36.3	36.3
	Somewhat Important	74	28.9	29.8	66.1
	Neutral	58	22.7	23.4	89.5
	Somewhat Unimportant	14	5.5	5.6	95.2
	Very Unimportant	12	4.7	4.8	100.0
	Total	248	96.9	100.0	
Missing	System	8	3.1		
Total		256	100.0		

### How would you rate Peninsula Township's efforts with regard to this issue?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Excellent	26	10.2	12.8	12.8
	Above Average	94	36.7	46.3	59.1
	Average	69	27.0	34.0	93.1
	Below Average	9	3.5	4.4	97.5
	Poor	5	2.0	2.5	100.0
	Total	203	79.3	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	36	14.1		
	System	17	6.6		
	Total	53	20.7		
Total		256	100.0		

## Preservation of scenic bay views

### How important is this issue to you?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	192	75.0	76.2	76.2
	Somewhat Important	42	16.4	16.7	92.9
	Neutral	12	4.7	4.8	97.6
	Somewhat Unimportant	4	1.6	1.6	99.2
	Very Unimportant	2	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	252	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.6		
Total		256	100.0		



**How would you rate Peninsula Township's efforts with regard to this issue?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Excellent	50	19.5	23.8	23.8
	Above Average	79	30.9	37.6	61.4
	Average	60	23.4	28.6	90.0
	Below Average	16	6.3	7.6	97.6
	Poor	5	2.0	2.4	100.0
	Total	210	82.0	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	35	13.7		
	System	11	4.3		
	Total	46	18.0		
Total		256	100.0		

**Preservation of scenic views of farms/fields with no bay views**

**How important is this issue to you?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	103	40.2	41.0	41.0
	Somewhat Important	84	32.8	33.5	74.5
	Neutral	41	16.0	16.3	90.8
	Somewhat Unimportant	14	5.5	5.6	96.4
	Very Unimportant	9	3.5	3.6	100.0
	Total	251	98.0	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.0		
Total		256	100.0		

**How would you rate Peninsula Township's efforts with regard to this issue?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Excellent	26	10.2	13.3	13.3
	Above Average	73	28.5	37.4	50.8
	Average	79	30.9	40.5	91.3
	Below Average	11	4.3	5.6	96.9
	Poor	6	2.3	3.1	100.0
	Total	195	76.2	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	49	19.1		
	System	12	4.7		
	Total	61	23.8		
Total		256	100.0		

## Preservation of views from water

### How important is this issue to you?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	93	36.3	37.8	37.8
	Somewhat Important	56	21.9	22.8	60.6
	Neutral	62	24.2	25.2	85.8
	Somewhat Unimportant	25	9.8	10.2	95.9
	Very Unimportant	10	3.9	4.1	100.0
	Total	246	96.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	3.9		
Total		256	100.0		

### How would you rate Peninsula Township's efforts with regard to this issue?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Excellent	12	4.7	7.7	7.7
	Above Average	47	18.4	30.1	37.8
	Average	66	25.8	42.3	80.1
	Below Average	23	9.0	14.7	94.9
	Poor	8	3.1	5.1	100.0
	Total	156	60.9	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	85	33.2		
	System	15	5.9		
	Total	100	39.1		
Total		256	100.0		

## Preservation of natural shoreline

### How important is this issue to you?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	145	56.6	57.5	57.5
	Somewhat Important	59	23.0	23.4	81.0
	Neutral	31	12.1	12.3	93.3
	Somewhat Unimportant	8	3.1	3.2	96.4
	Very Unimportant	9	3.5	3.6	100.0
	Total	252	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.6		
Total		256	100.0		

**How would you rate Peninsula Township's efforts with regard to this issue?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Excellent	21	8.2	11.1	11.1
	Above Average	61	23.8	32.3	43.4
	Average	71	27.7	37.6	81.0
	Below Average	26	10.2	13.8	94.7
	Poor	10	3.9	5.3	100.0
	Total	189	73.8	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	55	21.5		
	System	12	4.7		
	Total	67	26.2		
Total		256	100.0		

**Preservation of open space**

**How important is this issue to you?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	155	60.5	61.3	61.3
	Somewhat Important	60	23.4	23.7	85.0
	Neutral	25	9.8	9.9	94.9
	Somewhat Unimportant	11	4.3	4.3	99.2
	Very Unimportant	2	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	253	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.2		
Total		256	100.0		

**How would you rate Peninsula Township's efforts with regard to this issue?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Excellent	21	8.2	10.5	10.5
	Above Average	79	30.9	39.5	50.0
	Average	72	28.1	36.0	86.0
	Below Average	20	7.8	10.0	96.0
	Poor	8	3.1	4.0	100.0
	Total	200	78.1	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	42	16.4		
	System	14	5.5		
	Total	56	21.9		
Total		256	100.0		

## Preservation of agricultural land

### How important is this issue to you?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	129	50.4	51.2	51.2
	Somewhat Important	84	32.8	33.3	84.5
	Neutral	23	9.0	9.1	93.7
	Somewhat Unimportant	9	3.5	3.6	97.2
	Very Unimportant	7	2.7	2.8	100.0
	Total	252	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.6		
Total		256	100.0		

### How would you rate Peninsula Township's efforts with regard to this issue?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Excellent	52	20.3	24.8	24.8
	Above Average	76	29.7	36.2	61.0
	Average	59	23.0	28.1	89.0
	Below Average	16	6.3	7.6	96.7
	Poor	7	2.7	3.3	100.0
	Total	210	82.0	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	31	12.1		
	System	15	5.9		
	Total	46	18.0		
Total		256	100.0		

## Preservation of Township character

### How important is this issue to you?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	125	48.8	49.8	49.8
	Somewhat Important	73	28.5	29.1	78.9
	Neutral	40	15.6	15.9	94.8
	Somewhat Unimportant	8	3.1	3.2	98.0
	Very Unimportant	5	2.0	2.0	100.0
	Total	251	98.0	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.0		
Total		256	100.0		

**How would you rate Peninsula Township's efforts with regard to this issue?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Excellent	25	9.8	12.3	12.3
	Above Average	76	29.7	37.4	49.8
	Average	69	27.0	34.0	83.7
	Below Average	24	9.4	11.8	95.6
	Poor	9	3.5	4.4	100.0
	Total	203	79.3	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	40	15.6		
	System	13	5.1		
	Total	53	20.7		
Total		256	100.0		

**Sense of community**

**How important is this issue to you?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	79	30.9	31.5	31.5
	Somewhat Important	90	35.2	35.9	67.3
	Neutral	70	27.3	27.9	95.2
	Somewhat Unimportant	7	2.7	2.8	98.0
	Very Unimportant	5	2.0	2.0	100.0
	Total	251	98.0	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.0		
Total		256	100.0		

**How would you rate Peninsula Township's efforts with regard to this issue?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Excellent	13	5.1	6.8	6.8
	Above Average	44	17.2	22.9	29.7
	Average	87	34.0	45.3	75.0
	Below Average	36	14.1	18.8	93.8
	Poor	12	4.7	6.3	100.0
	Total	192	75.0	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	51	19.9		
	System	13	5.1		
	Total	64	25.0		
Total		256	100.0		

## Light pollution (dark night sky)

### How important is this issue to you?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	118	46.1	47.6	47.6
	Somewhat Important	76	29.7	30.6	78.2
	Neutral	40	15.6	16.1	94.4
	Somewhat Unimportant	8	3.1	3.2	97.6
	Very Unimportant	6	2.3	2.4	100.0
	Total	248	96.9	100.0	
Missing	System	8	3.1		
Total		256	100.0		

### How would you rate Peninsula Township's efforts with regard to this issue?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Excellent	15	5.9	9.1	9.1
	Above Average	42	16.4	25.6	34.8
	Average	66	25.8	40.2	75.0
	Below Average	25	9.8	15.2	90.2
	Poor	16	6.3	9.8	100.0
	Total	164	64.1	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	78	30.5		
	System	14	5.5		
	Total	92	35.9		
Total		256	100.0		

## Increased traffic

### How important is this issue to you?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	175	68.4	69.2	69.2
	Somewhat Important	48	18.8	19.0	88.1
	Neutral	21	8.2	8.3	96.4
	Somewhat Unimportant	2	.8	.8	97.2
	Very Unimportant	7	2.7	2.8	100.0
	Total	253	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.2		
Total		256	100.0		

**How would you rate Peninsula Township's efforts with regard to this issue?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Excellent	9	3.5	4.9	4.9
	Above Average	33	12.9	17.9	22.8
	Average	64	25.0	34.8	57.6
	Below Average	43	16.8	23.4	81.0
	Poor	35	13.7	19.0	100.0
	Total	184	71.9	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	60	23.4		
	System	12	4.7		
	Total	72	28.1		
Total		256	100.0		

**Water quality of the bays**

**How important is this issue to you?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	213	83.2	83.9	83.9
	Somewhat Important	27	10.5	10.6	94.5
	Neutral	13	5.1	5.1	99.6
	Very Unimportant	1	.4	.4	100.0
	Total	254	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.8		
Total		256	100.0		

**How would you rate Peninsula Township's efforts with regard to this issue?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Excellent	20	7.8	12.3	12.3
	Above Average	41	16.0	25.2	37.4
	Average	73	28.5	44.8	82.2
	Below Average	20	7.8	12.3	94.5
	Poor	9	3.5	5.5	100.0
	Total	163	63.7	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	82	32.0		
	System	11	4.3		
	Total	93	36.3		
Total		256	100.0		

## Noise pollution

### How important is this issue to you?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	146	57.0	58.2	58.2
	Somewhat Important	68	26.6	27.1	85.3
	Neutral	33	12.9	13.1	98.4
	Somewhat Unimportant	1	.4	.4	98.8
	Very Unimportant	3	1.2	1.2	100.0
	Total	251	98.0	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.0		
Total		256	100.0		

### How would you rate Peninsula Township's efforts with regard to this issue?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Excellent	9	3.5	5.5	5.5
	Above Average	34	13.3	20.9	26.4
	Average	76	29.7	46.6	73.0
	Below Average	25	9.8	15.3	88.3
	Poor	19	7.4	11.7	100.0
	Total	163	63.7	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	81	31.6		
	System	12	4.7		
	Total	93	36.3		
Total		256	100.0		

*Percent of respondents rating each item "Very Important," in descending order:*

Water quality of the bays (83.9%)  
 Preservation of scenic bay views (76.2%)  
 Increased traffic (69.2%)  
 Development (68.0%)  
 Preservation of open space (61.3%)  
 Preservation of natural shoreline (57.5%)  
 Noise pollution (58.2%)  
 Preservation of agricultural land (51.2%)  
 Preservation of Township character (49.8%)  
 Preservation of scenic views of farms/fields with no bay views (41.0%)  
 Light pollution (dark night sky) (47.6%)  
 Preservation of views from water (37.8%)  
 Preservation of historic buildings/areas (36.3%)  
 Sense of community (31.5%)

*Percent of respondents rating Peninsula Township "Excellent" on each item, in descending order:*

Preservation of agricultural land (24.8%)  
 Preservation of scenic bay views (23.8%)  
 Preservation of scenic views of farms/fields with no bay views (13.3%)  
 Preservation of historic buildings/areas (12.8%)  
 Water quality of the bays (12.3%)  
 Preservation of Township character (12.3%)  
 Preservation of natural shoreline (11.1%)  
 Preservation of open space (10.5%)  
 Light pollution (dark night sky) (9.1%)  
 Development (7.9%)  
 Preservation of views from water (7.7%)  
 Sense of community (6.8%)  
 Noise pollution (5.5%)  
 Increased traffic (4.9%)



It should be noted that some respondents felt unable to assign ratings on certain items. For example, 85 respondents indicated they did not know how to rate Peninsula Township on *preservation of views from water*. In addition, 82 respondents indicated they did not know how to rate the Township with regard to *water quality of the bays* and 81 respondents did not know how to rate the Township on *noise pollution*.

### Gap Analysis

As noted above, Peninsula Township received the highest rating on *preservation of agricultural land*, which was rated eighth in terms of importance. The largest contrast between importance and the Township's effectiveness concerned *increased traffic*. While this item was rated third in terms of importance, the ranking was lowest in terms of effectiveness. A gap analysis was conducted to examine discrepancies between importance and effectiveness on each characteristic. Gap analysis rankings are as follows:

Increased traffic -1.88  
Water quality of the bays -1.50  
Noise pollution -1.46  
Development -1.12  
Light pollution (dark night sky) -1.09  
Preservation of open space -1.02  
Preservation of natural shoreline -0.98  
Preservation of scenic bay views -0.94  
Sense of community -0.93  
Preservation of Township character -0.79  
Preservation of views from water -0.77  
Preservation of agricultural land -0.56  
Preservation of scenic views of farms/fields with no bay views -0.51  
Preservation of historic buildings/areas -0.32

It should be noted that concern over service level is not recommended until a gap approaches -1.5 to -2 points; however, the current data is useful when prioritizing actions.

In your opinion, how important is each of the following potential Peninsula Township initiatives?

**Township acquisition of open space?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	107	41.8	43.1	43.1
	Somewhat Important	77	30.1	31.0	74.2
	Neutral	38	14.8	15.3	89.5
	Somewhat Unimportant	14	5.5	5.6	95.2
	Very Unimportant	12	4.7	4.8	100.0
	Total	248	96.9	100.0	
Missing	System	8	3.1		
Total		256	100.0		

**Township acquisition of scenic views?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	115	44.9	46.6	46.6
	Somewhat Important	75	29.3	30.4	76.9
	Neutral	32	12.5	13.0	89.9
	Somewhat Unimportant	14	5.5	5.7	95.5
	Very Unimportant	11	4.3	4.5	100.0
	Total	247	96.5	100.0	
Missing	System	9	3.5		
Total		256	100.0		

**Wetland preservation?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	115	44.9	46.6	46.6
	Somewhat Important	55	21.5	22.3	68.8
	Neutral	48	18.8	19.4	88.3
	Somewhat Unimportant	19	7.4	7.7	96.0
	Very Unimportant	10	3.9	4.0	100.0
	Total	247	96.5	100.0	
Missing	System	9	3.5		
Total		256	100.0		

**Financial incentives for land owners to keep open space?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	105	41.0	42.7	42.7
	Somewhat Important	70	27.3	28.5	71.1
	Neutral	45	17.6	18.3	89.4
	Somewhat Unimportant	9	3.5	3.7	93.1
	Very Unimportant	17	6.6	6.9	100.0
	Total	246	96.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	3.9		
Total		256	100.0		

**Increased police enforcement of speed limits?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	83	32.4	32.8	32.8
	Somewhat Important	68	26.6	26.9	59.7
	Neutral	65	25.4	25.7	85.4
	Somewhat Unimportant	26	10.2	10.3	95.7
	Very Unimportant	11	4.3	4.3	100.0
	Total	253	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.2		
Total		256	100.0		

**Expansion of public transportation?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	26	10.2	10.4	10.4
	Somewhat Important	53	20.7	21.2	31.6
	Neutral	84	32.8	33.6	65.2
	Somewhat Unimportant	37	14.5	14.8	80.0
	Very Unimportant	50	19.5	20.0	100.0
	Total	250	97.7	100.0	
Missing	System	6	2.3		
Total		256	100.0		

**Designated bicycle paths along main roads?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	116	45.3	46.2	46.2
	Somewhat Important	73	28.5	29.1	75.3
	Neutral	27	10.5	10.8	86.1
	Somewhat Unimportant	22	8.6	8.8	94.8
	Very Unimportant	13	5.1	5.2	100.0
	Total	251	98.0	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.0		
Total		256	100.0		

**Designated bicycle paths off main roads?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	88	34.4	35.2	35.2
	Somewhat Important	75	29.3	30.0	65.2
	Neutral	49	19.1	19.6	84.8
	Somewhat Unimportant	22	8.6	8.8	93.6
	Very Unimportant	16	6.3	6.4	100.0
	Total	250	97.7	100.0	
Missing	System	6	2.3		
Total		256	100.0		

**Maintaining growth through strong zoning and planning?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	169	66.0	67.6	67.6
	Somewhat Important	45	17.6	18.0	85.6
	Neutral	15	5.9	6.0	91.6
	Somewhat Unimportant	9	3.5	3.6	95.2
	Very Unimportant	12	4.7	4.8	100.0
	Total	250	97.7	100.0	
Missing	System	6	2.3		
Total		256	100.0		

**Ensure effectiveness of existing septic systems?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	126	49.2	50.6	50.6
	Somewhat Important	70	27.3	28.1	78.7
	Neutral	37	14.5	14.9	93.6
	Somewhat Unimportant	9	3.5	3.6	97.2
	Very Unimportant	7	2.7	2.8	100.0
	Total	249	97.3	100.0	
Missing	System	7	2.7		
Total		256	100.0		

**Ensure ground water quality (ground, lakes, streams)?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	176	68.8	70.4	70.4
	Somewhat Important	54	21.1	21.6	92.0
	Neutral	12	4.7	4.8	96.8
	Somewhat Unimportant	5	2.0	2.0	98.8
	Very Unimportant	3	1.2	1.2	100.0
	Total	250	97.7	100.0	
Missing	System	6	2.3		
Total		256	100.0		

**Installation of street lights at intersections?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	36	14.1	14.3	14.3
	Somewhat Important	57	22.3	22.7	37.1
	Neutral	75	29.3	29.9	66.9
	Somewhat Unimportant	34	13.3	13.5	80.5
	Very Unimportant	49	19.1	19.5	100.0
	Total	251	98.0	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.0		
Total		256	100.0		

**Regulating removal of shoreline vegetation?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	53	20.7	21.3	21.3
	Somewhat Important	47	18.4	18.9	40.2
	Neutral	68	26.6	27.3	67.5
	Somewhat Unimportant	32	12.5	12.9	80.3
	Very Unimportant	49	19.1	19.7	100.0
	Total	249	97.3	100.0	
Missing	System	7	2.7		
Total		256	100.0		

**Maintenance of scenic quality of M-37?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	130	50.8	51.8	51.8
	Somewhat Important	81	31.6	32.3	84.1
	Neutral	24	9.4	9.6	93.6
	Somewhat Unimportant	10	3.9	4.0	97.6
	Very Unimportant	6	2.3	2.4	100.0
	Total	251	98.0	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.0		
Total		256	100.0		

**Regulating off-season storage for docks/joists?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	48	18.8	19.5	19.5
	Somewhat Important	69	27.0	28.0	47.6
	Neutral	51	19.9	20.7	68.3
	Somewhat Unimportant	30	11.7	12.2	80.5
	Very Unimportant	48	18.8	19.5	100.0
	Total	246	96.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	3.9		
Total		256	100.0		

**Increased public access to water?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	43	16.8	17.3	17.3
	Somewhat Important	52	20.3	21.0	38.3
	Neutral	62	24.2	25.0	63.3
	Somewhat Unimportant	39	15.2	15.7	79.0
	Very Unimportant	52	20.3	21.0	100.0
	Total	248	96.9	100.0	
Missing	System	8	3.1		
Total		256	100.0		

**Encouragement of agriculture?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	117	45.7	47.2	47.2
	Somewhat Important	77	30.1	31.0	78.2
	Neutral	36	14.1	14.5	92.7
	Somewhat Unimportant	10	3.9	4.0	96.8
	Very Unimportant	8	3.1	3.2	100.0
	Total	248	96.9	100.0	
Missing	System	8	3.1		
Total		256	100.0		

**Regulating storage for boats, RVs, etc.?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	66	25.8	26.4	26.4
	Somewhat Important	63	24.6	25.2	51.6
	Neutral	57	22.3	22.8	74.4
	Somewhat Unimportant	23	9.0	9.2	83.6
	Very Unimportant	41	16.0	16.4	100.0
	Total	250	97.7	100.0	
Missing	System	6	2.3		
Total		256	100.0		

## DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS

Based on current zoning and average rate of growth, Peninsula Township could grow from the current population of approximately 6,000 to a maximum of 14,000 in 40 years. With this assumption, there are a number of development patterns the township can pursue. Please rate each of the following potential development patterns on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being least desirable and 10 being most desirable.

### Developments with houses closer together with larger blocks of open space?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Most Desirable	46	18.0	18.5	18.5
	9	20	7.8	8.1	26.6
	8	33	12.9	13.3	39.9
	7	11	4.3	4.4	44.4
	6	12	4.7	4.8	49.2
	5	32	12.5	12.9	62.1
	4	15	5.9	6.0	68.1
	3	27	10.5	10.9	79.0
	2	13	5.1	5.2	84.3
	Least Desirable	39	15.2	15.7	100.0
	Total	248	96.9	100.0	
Missing	System	8	3.1		
Total		256	100.0		

### Developments with houses farther apart with less open space?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Most Desirable	12	4.7	4.8	4.8
	9	6	2.3	2.4	7.3
	8	14	5.5	5.6	12.9
	7	12	4.7	4.8	17.7
	6	14	5.5	5.6	23.4
	5	37	14.5	14.9	38.3
	4	18	7.0	7.3	45.6
	3	39	15.2	15.7	61.3
	2	32	12.5	12.9	74.2
	Least Desirable	64	25.0	25.8	100.0
	Total	248	96.9	100.0	
Missing	System	8	3.1		
Total		256	100.0		

**Houses in a village cluster (small village of up to 350 homes as an alternative to subdivisions)?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Most Desirable	35	13.7	14.1	14.1
	9	15	5.9	6.0	20.1
	8	22	8.6	8.8	28.9
	7	26	10.2	10.4	39.4
	6	10	3.9	4.0	43.4
	5	40	15.6	16.1	59.4
	4	12	4.7	4.8	64.3
	3	17	6.6	6.8	71.1
	2	18	7.0	7.2	78.3
	Least Desirable	54	21.1	21.7	100.0
	Total	249	97.3	100.0	
Missing	System	7	2.7		
Total		256	100.0		

**Extend sewer and water systems beyond Wilson Rd.?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Most Desirable	58	22.7	23.5	23.5
	9	5	2.0	2.0	25.5
	8	22	8.6	8.9	34.4
	7	16	6.3	6.5	40.9
	6	9	3.5	3.6	44.5
	5	34	13.3	13.8	58.3
	4	7	2.7	2.8	61.1
	3	19	7.4	7.7	68.8
	2	18	7.0	7.3	76.1
	Least Desirable	59	23.0	23.9	100.0
	Total	247	96.5	100.0	
Missing	System	9	3.5		
Total		256	100.0		

**Housing density planned so that public water/sewer are not necessary?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Most Desirable	69	27.0	27.6	27.6
	9	22	8.6	8.8	36.4
	8	32	12.5	12.8	49.2
	7	17	6.6	6.8	56.0
	6	10	3.9	4.0	60.0
	5	25	9.8	10.0	70.0
	4	9	3.5	3.6	73.6
	3	19	7.4	7.6	81.2
	2	13	5.1	5.2	86.4
	Least Desirable	34	13.3	13.6	100.0
	Total	250	97.7	100.0	
Missing	System	6	2.3		
Total		256	100.0		



In your opinion, should residential development be discouraged on the following types of land:

**Steep slopes?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	40	15.6	15.9	15.9
	No	49	19.1	19.5	35.5
	Yes	162	63.3	64.5	100.0
	Total	251	98.0	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.0		
Total		256	100.0		

**Shorelines?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	33	12.9	13.2	13.2
	No	87	34.0	34.8	48.0
	Yes	130	50.8	52.0	100.0
	Total	250	97.7	100.0	
Missing	System	6	2.3		
Total		256	100.0		

**Ridgelines?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	64	25.0	26.1	26.1
	No	87	34.0	35.5	61.6
	Yes	94	36.7	38.4	100.0
	Total	245	95.7	100.0	
Missing	System	11	4.3		
Total		256	100.0		

**Wetlands?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	17	6.6	6.9	6.9
	No	34	13.3	13.8	20.6
	Yes	196	76.6	79.4	100.0
	Total	247	96.5	100.0	
Missing	System	9	3.5		
Total		256	100.0		

In your opinion, should the Township concentrate on the *rate* of development or the *quality* of development?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	5	2.0	2.0	2.0
	Both Equally	158	61.7	62.9	64.9
	Quality	67	26.2	26.7	91.6
	Rate	21	8.2	8.4	100.0
	Total	251	98.0	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.0		
Total		256	100.0		

Based on current zoning and average rate of growth, Peninsula Township could grow from current population of approximately 6,000 to a maximum of 14,000 in 40 years.

In your opinion, should the township plan for:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	A maximum population of more than 14,000	28	10.9	11.3	11.3
	A maximum population of 14,000	81	31.6	32.8	44.1
	A maximum population of less than 14,000	138	53.9	55.9	100.0
	Total	247	96.5	100.0	
Missing	System	9	3.5		
Total		256	100.0		

The Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) program has resulted in a lot of open space at the Peninsula's north end with development concentrated in the south end. This development has been accommodated with public utilities. Recognizing this, do you believe the township should pursue:

More open space at the south end?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	53	20.7	21.5	21.5
	No	58	22.7	23.5	44.9
	Yes	136	53.1	55.1	100.0
	Total	247	96.5	100.0	
Missing	System	9	3.5		
Total		256	100.0		

**Public parks at the south end?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	46	18.0	18.5	18.5
	No	67	26.2	27.0	45.6
	Yes	135	52.7	54.4	100.0
	Total	248	96.9	100.0	
Missing	System	8	3.1		
Total		256	100.0		

Please rate the following potential public developments in terms of your preference for development in Peninsula Township:

**Improvements of present township parks:**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	High Priority	45	17.6	18.1	18.1
	Medium	127	49.6	51.2	69.4
	Low	38	14.8	15.3	84.7
	Not a Priority	38	14.8	15.3	100.0
	Total	248	96.9	100.0	
Missing	System	8	3.1		
Total		256	100.0		

**Development of additional outdoor recreational opportunities:**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	High Priority	33	12.9	13.2	13.2
	Medium	94	36.7	37.6	50.8
	Low	75	29.3	30.0	80.8
	Not a Priority	48	18.8	19.2	100.0
	Total	250	97.7	100.0	
Missing	System	6	2.3		
Total		256	100.0		

**Provision of more public access to the bays:**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	High Priority	32	12.5	12.7	12.7
	Medium	63	24.6	25.0	37.7
	Low	86	33.6	34.1	71.8
	Not a Priority	71	27.7	28.2	100.0
	Total	252	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.6		
Total		256	100.0		

**Community Center, to include a recreation area (e.g., volleyball) and meeting rooms for public use:**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	High Priority	25	9.8	10.0	10.0
	Medium	67	26.2	26.7	36.7
	Low	75	29.3	29.9	66.5
	Not a Priority	84	32.8	33.5	100.0
	Total	251	98.0	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.0		
Total		256	100.0		

The Township has been purchasing conservation easements to preserve farmland with voted taxes (PDR). Some people think the farmland should also be preserved by other means, such as clustering or transferring development to other areas provided there is protection to neighboring properties. What do you think should be done in the future? Please rate the following options:

**Continue the PDR program with voted millage:**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	High Priority	120	46.9	49.0	49.0
	Medium	75	29.3	30.6	79.6
	Low	23	9.0	9.4	89.0
	Not a Priority	27	10.5	11.0	100.0
	Total	245	95.7	100.0	
Missing	System	11	4.3		
Total		256	100.0		

**Cluster development and keep open space as farmland:**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	High Priority	94	36.7	38.5	38.5
	Medium	84	32.8	34.4	73.0
	Low	39	15.2	16.0	88.9
	Not a Priority	27	10.5	11.1	100.0
	Total	244	95.3	100.0	
Missing	System	12	4.7		
Total		256	100.0		

**Removing future residential development from farmland and locating it on other areas:**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	High Priority	72	28.1	29.6	29.6
	Medium	86	33.6	35.4	65.0
	Low	45	17.6	18.5	83.5
	Not a Priority	40	15.6	16.5	100.0
	Total	243	94.9	100.0	
Missing	System	13	5.1		
Total		256	100.0		

There are different kinds of commercial, industrial, and housing uses. Some are appropriate in one area; some in another area; some may not be appropriate in any area of Peninsula Township. For each of the following potential land uses, please indicate if you feel the use is appropriate for Peninsula Township. If you feel the use is appropriate, indicate in which area or areas of the Township it is appropriate. You may indicate more than one area for each use.

Appropriate In Township?	No % (count)	Yes % (count)	Village of Old Mission? count	Bowers Harbor count	Mapleton count	South end of Township count	North end of Township count
Campground	66% (161)	34% (84)	32	12	9	8	65
Country Inn	33% (78)	67% (161)	104	95	71	38	71
Golf Course	74% (180)	26% (63)	13	14	22	26	45
Golf Course/ Residential Development	83% (206)	17% (41)	8	9	17	22	28
Neighborhood Retail	38% (91)	62% (148)	69	39	124	31	16
Community Center	53% (127)	47% (112)	12	13	81	24	8
Restaurant	29% (71)	71% (173)	102	111	122	72	65
Professional Offices	67% (162)	33% (79)	22	17	68	19	10
Mixed Use (Residential/ Commercial)	78% (189)	22% (52)	25	14	39	11	5
Boat/ RV Storage	42% (101)	58% (142)	38	62	64	32	62
Gas Station	25% (63)	75% (184)	37	17	163	12	14
Marina	38% (90)	62% (150)	66	123	7	24	30
Light Manufacturing/ Fabricating	92% (227)	8% (20)	7	6	12	10	13
Single Family, 5 ac. Lots	33% (79)	67% (160)	54	52	59	90	114
Single Family, <5 ac. Lots	30% (69)	70% (164)	67	61	68	112	85
Apartments, 1/ac.	81% (192)	19% (46)	18	15	24	34	16
Mobile Home Parks	99% (249)	1% (2)	3	3	2	3	3
Senior Housing	46% (111)	54% (130)	30	27	47	81	37
Low Income Housing	85% (211)	15% (37)	9	7	17	30	15
Short term rental, <1 mo., resid. Zone	81% (201)	19% (48)	32	29	27	32	36
Private/ Public School	32% (78)	68% (166)	25	27	86	80	51

Current Township zoning allows for 100 foot windmills, in any zone, if approved by special use permit.

**Should windmills that are over 100 feet tall be allowed if there are standards for their height and location?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	53	20.7	21.0	21.0
	No	92	35.9	36.5	57.5
	Yes	107	41.8	42.5	100.0
	Total	252	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.6		
Total		256	100.0		

**Should any windmills less than 100 feet be allowed if there are standards for height and location?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	53	20.7	21.0	21.0
	No	62	24.2	24.6	45.6
	Yes	137	53.5	54.4	100.0
	Total	252	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.6		
Total		256	100.0		

Currently all Township parkland is located north of Bowers Harbor, except for Archie Park.

**In your opinion, should the Township develop additional parkland at the south end?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	43	16.8	17.1	17.1
	No	96	37.5	38.2	55.4
	Yes	112	43.8	44.6	100.0
	Total	251	98.0	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.0		
Total		256	100.0		

Please indicate if you support development of the following for public use in the southern end of the Township:

**Water access?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	35	13.7	14.2	14.2
	No	119	46.5	48.4	62.6
	Yes	92	35.9	37.4	100.0
	Total	246	96.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	3.9		
Total		256	100.0		

**Ball fields?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	39	15.2	16.0	16.0
	No	140	54.7	57.4	73.4
	Yes	65	25.4	26.6	100.0
	Total	244	95.3	100.0	
Missing	System	12	4.7		
Total		256	100.0		

**Improved trail systems?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	32	12.5	13.1	13.1
	No	50	19.5	20.4	33.5
	Yes	163	63.7	66.5	100.0
	Total	245	95.7	100.0	
Missing	System	11	4.3		
Total		256	100.0		

**Open grass fields?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	61	23.8	25.5	25.5
	No	59	23.0	24.7	50.2
	Yes	119	46.5	49.8	100.0
	Total	239	93.4	100.0	
Missing	System	17	6.6		
Total		256	100.0		

**Unpaved trails?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	44	17.2	18.6	18.6
	No	50	19.5	21.2	39.8
	Yes	142	55.5	60.2	100.0
	Total	236	92.2	100.0	
Missing	System	20	7.8		
Total		256	100.0		



In your opinion, should Peninsula Township have bicycle paths/trail systems:

**Along primary roads, with widened shoulder?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	26	10.2	10.4	10.4
	No	53	20.7	21.2	31.6
	Yes	171	66.8	68.4	100.0
	Total	250	97.7	100.0	
Missing	System	6	2.3		
Total		256	100.0		

**Off main roads?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	33	12.9	13.4	13.4
	No	58	22.7	23.6	37.0
	Yes	155	60.5	63.0	100.0
	Total	246	96.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	3.9		
Total		256	100.0		

**Linking parks or scenic views?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	35	13.7	14.2	14.2
	No	61	23.8	24.8	39.0
	Yes	150	58.6	61.0	100.0
	Total	246	96.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	3.9		
Total		256	100.0		

**The full length of peninsula?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	35	13.7	14.2	14.2
	No	58	22.7	23.5	37.7
	Yes	154	60.2	62.3	100.0
	Total	247	96.5	100.0	
Missing	System	9	3.5		
Total		256	100.0		

**Have you seen any changes to water quality in the bay over the last several years?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	74	28.9	30.2	30.2
	No	75	29.3	30.6	60.8
	Yes	96	37.5	39.2	100.0
	Total	245	95.7	100.0	
Missing	System	11	4.3		
Total		256	100.0		

**If Yes:**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Lower Water Quality	69	27.0	67.0	67.0
	Higher Water Quality	34	13.3	33.0	100.0
	Total	103	40.2	100.0	
Missing	System	153	59.8		
Total		256	100.0		

The Planning Commission currently has a working concept to provide for future traffic needs: Center Road to carry cars with no stop signs or signals, with north-south roads such as Bluff, East Shore, Peninsula Drive and Smokey Hollow serving local properties.

**Do you support this concept?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	32	12.5	13.3	13.3
	No	23	9.0	9.5	22.8
	Yes	186	72.7	77.2	100.0
	Total	241	94.1	100.0	
Missing	System	15	5.9		
Total		256	100.0		

**Should the Township's policy be to discourage widening roads paralleling M-37, such as Bluff, Peninsula Drive, East Shore and Smokey Hollow?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	26	10.2	10.4	10.4
	No	49	19.1	19.5	29.9
	Yes	176	68.8	70.1	100.0
	Total	251	98.0	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.0		
Total		256	100.0		

With regard to funding, do you believe the following initiatives should be pursued in Peninsula Township?

**Maintain agriculturally productive land?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	4	1.6	1.6	1.6
	No	16	6.3	6.4	8.0
	Yes, only if it does not raise my taxes	132	51.6	52.6	60.6
	Yes, even if it raises my taxes	99	38.7	39.4	100.0
	Total	251	98.0	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.0		
Total		256	100.0		

**Preservation of open space (non-farmland) through purchase?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	11	4.3	4.4	4.4
	No	27	10.5	10.7	15.1
	Yes, only if it does not raise my taxes	102	39.8	40.5	55.6
	Yes, even if it raises my taxes	112	43.8	44.4	100.0
	Total	252	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.6		
Total		256	100.0		

**Expansion of township park facilities?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	20	7.8	8.1	8.1
	No	61	23.8	24.6	32.7
	Yes, only if it does not raise my taxes	110	43.0	44.4	77.0
	Yes, even if it raises my taxes	57	22.3	23.0	100.0
	Total	248	96.9	100.0	
Missing	System	8	3.1		
Total		256	100.0		

**More zoning enforcement?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	28	10.9	11.2	11.2
	No	43	16.8	17.3	28.5
	Yes, only if it does not raise my taxes	94	36.7	37.8	66.3
	Yes, even if it raises my taxes	84	32.8	33.7	100.0
	Total	249	97.3	100.0	
Missing	System	7	2.7		
Total		256	100.0		

**How would you rate your level of involvement in Township issues/matters?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all Involved	45	17.6	19.0	19.0
	Somewhat Uninvolved	93	36.3	39.2	58.2
	Somewhat Involved	90	35.2	38.0	96.2
	Very Involved	9	3.5	3.8	100.0
	Total	237	92.6	100.0	
Missing	System	19	7.4		
Total		256	100.0		

**What is your preferred method(s) of communication regarding Township issues?**

**Local Newspaper?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Local Newspaper	128	50.0	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	128	50.0		
Total		256	100.0		

**Local news?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Local News	86	33.6	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	170	66.4		
Total		256	100.0		

**TCTV2?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	TCTV2	13	5.1	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	243	94.9		
Total		256	100.0		

**Township Newsletter?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Township Newsletter	220	85.9	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	36	14.1		
Total		256	100.0		

**Township Web Page?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Township Web Page	80	31.3	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	176	68.8		
Total		256	100.0		

**Friends/Word of Mouth?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Friends/Word of mouth	68	26.6	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	188	73.4		
Total		256	100.0		

**Township Meetings?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Township Meetings	63	24.6	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	193	75.4		
Total		256	100.0		

**Other, please specify:**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Other, please specify:	10	3.9	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	246	96.1		
Total		256	100.0		

**Have you visited the Peninsula Township web site (peninsulatownship.com)?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	158	61.7	63.2	63.2
	Yes	92	35.9	36.8	100.0
	Total	250	97.7	100.0	
Missing	System	6	2.3		
Total		256	100.0		

**Have you used the Bay Area Transportation Authority service?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	225	87.9	90.4	90.4
	Yes	24	9.4	9.6	100.0
	Total	249	97.3	100.0	
Missing	System	7	2.7		
Total		256	100.0		

Some residents have expressed concern that there is a lack of community feeling in the township.

**Do you agree?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	112	43.8	48.3	48.3
	Yes	120	46.9	51.7	100.0
	Total	232	90.6	100.0	
Missing	System	24	9.4		
Total		256	100.0		

**IF YOU AGREE, should the Township support the following:**

**Fall festival with farm products and local crafts?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	23	9.0	14.5	14.5
	No	30	11.7	18.9	33.3
	Yes	106	41.4	66.7	100.0
	Total	159	62.1	100.0	
Missing	System	97	37.9		
Total		256	100.0		

**Community facility for large group gathering?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	33	12.9	21.7	21.7
	No	74	28.9	48.7	70.4
	Yes	45	17.6	29.6	100.0
	Total	152	59.4	100.0	
Missing	System	104	40.6		
Total		256	100.0		

**Community information meetings?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	29	11.3	18.8	18.8
	No	21	8.2	13.6	32.5
	Yes	104	40.6	67.5	100.0
	Total	154	60.2	100.0	
Missing	System	102	39.8		
Total		256	100.0		

**More publicity of community events?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Uncertain	21	8.2	13.3	13.3
	No	18	7.0	11.4	24.7
	Yes	119	46.5	75.3	100.0
	Total	158	61.7	100.0	
Missing	System	98	38.3		
Total		256	100.0		

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

**Please indicate your age range:**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Over 75 years	44	17.2	17.6	17.6
	66 to 75 years	50	19.5	20.0	37.6
	56 to 65 years	68	26.6	27.2	64.8
	46 to 55 years	52	20.3	20.8	85.6
	36 to 45 years	30	11.7	12.0	97.6
	26 to 35 years	6	2.3	2.4	100.0
	Total	250	97.7	100.0	
Missing	System	6	2.3		
Total		256	100.0		

**Are you currently:**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not a resident of the township	14	5.5	5.6	5.6
	A seasonal resident of the township	34	13.3	13.6	19.2
	A permanent resident of the township	202	78.9	80.8	100.0
	Total	250	97.7	100.0	
Missing	System	6	2.3		
Total		256	100.0		

**How many years have you lived in Peninsula Township?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	20 years or more	73	28.5	30.4	30.4
	15-19 years	34	13.3	14.2	44.6
	10-14 years	44	17.2	18.3	62.9
	5-9 years	46	18.0	19.2	82.1
	1-4 years	30	11.7	12.5	94.6
	Less than 1 year	13	5.1	5.4	100.0
	Total	240	93.8	100.0	
Missing	System	16	6.3		
Total		256	100.0		

**Please indicate the type of employment that best represents you:**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Other, specify:	10	3.9	4.1	4.1
	Unemployed	2	.8	.8	4.9
	Retired	106	41.4	43.1	48.0
	Professional	85	33.2	34.6	82.5
	Office/Clerical	6	2.3	2.4	85.0
	Manufacturing	8	3.1	3.3	88.2
	Health care	20	7.8	8.1	96.3
	Farming/Agriculture	5	2.0	2.0	98.4
	Construction/Trade	4	1.6	1.6	100.0
	Total	246	96.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	3.9		
Total		256	100.0		

**Do you operate a business out of your home?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	218	85.2	88.6	88.6
	Yes	28	10.9	11.4	100.0
	Total	246	96.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	3.9		
Total		256	100.0		

**Which of the following best describes where you live?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	South of Wilson Road	84	32.8	34.7	34.7
	Between Wilson Road and Mapleton	104	40.6	43.0	77.7
	North of Mapleton	54	21.1	22.3	100.0
	Total	242	94.5	100.0	
Missing	System	14	5.5		
Total		256	100.0		



**Which best describes the amount of land you own in Peninsula Township?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	41 and over acres	7	2.7	2.8	2.8
	21 to 40 acres	4	1.6	1.6	4.4
	11 to 20 acres	3	1.2	1.2	5.6
	6 to 10 acres	11	4.3	4.4	10.0
	3 to 5 acres	20	7.8	8.0	18.1
	1 to 2 acres	85	33.2	34.1	52.2
	Less than one acre	116	45.3	46.6	98.8
	I do not own any land in Peninsula Township	3	1.2	1.2	100.0
	Total	249	97.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	7	2.7	
Total		256	100.0		

**Gender:**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Female	97	37.9	44.9	44.9
	Male	119	46.5	55.1	100.0
	Total	216	84.4	100.0	
Missing	System	40	15.6		
Total		256	100.0		