

Appendix I: Pepin County Summary

Pepin County Summary

The Survey Research Center received 182 surveys from Pepin County. Based on the estimated number of households in the County as reported by the American Community Survey (2,923), the results are expected to be accurate within plus or minus 7.0 percent.

Demographic Profile. Pepin County respondents were more likely to be male, more than 55 years of age, and long-term residents of the County. About half were employed or self-employed, and approximately four in ten were retired. Their household was likely to consist of two adults with no minor children. Roughly half of respondents had annual household income greater than \$50,000. About seven in ten respondents had some post-secondary education, with between a quarter and a third having completed a bachelor's or graduate/professional degree program.

Demographics

Gender	Count	Male	Female				
	181	73%	27%				
Age	Count	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
	182	1%	7%	18%	15%	26%	34%
Employment	Count	Full-Time	Part-Time	Self	Unemp	Retired	Other
	176	36%	6%	13%	4%	36%	4%
	Count	0	1	2	3	4	5+
Adults	175		21%	71%	8%	0%	1%
Children	167	72%	8%	11%	7%	1%	2%
Income	Count	Under 15,000	15,000-24,999	25,000-49,999	50,000-74,999	75,000-99,999	100,000+
	171	11%	13%	30%	27%	13%	6%
Education	Count	Under High School	High School	Some College/ Tech	Tech Grad	Bachelors	Grad Degree
	180	6%	26%	24%	15%	20%	9%
Years Resident	Count	Under 1	1 - 4	5 - 9	10 - 24	25+	
	182	2%	5%	15%	20%	58%	
Residence	Count	City	Village	Town			
	177	19%	21%	60%			

Key Points – Taxes and Economic Development

- Large majorities of Pepin County respondents said that counties should be allowed to share law enforcement costs with other counties and that programs should be developed to increase the amount of locally produced food in schools and other local institutions.
- Solid majorities of respondents agreed that the economics and ecologic implications of sand mining need additional study, that they would be willing to see an increase in the sales tax as a means of reducing property taxes, and that manufacturing will remain a key driver of the regional economy.
- Half of Pepin County respondents disagreed that businesses that expand or start-up in Wisconsin should pay no state corporate income tax for the first 5 years of operations.
- Very few Pepin County respondents said that more overnight lodging is needed in their communities.

Taxes and Economic Development

Topic	Count	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree
Cost Share Law Enforcement	182	81%	8%	11%
Local Foods in Schools	182	79%	9%	13%
Study Ecology of Sand Mining	180	68%	14%	17%
Study Economics of Sand Mining	180	64%	19%	17%
Raise Sales Tax/Reduce Property Tax	182	61%	13%	26%
Manufacturing Economic Driver	180	59%	21%	20%
Local Internet Access Good	181	57%	19%	24%
Good Local Business Climate	181	57%	17%	26%
Rec/Tourism Development	181	54%	23%	23%
Business Development in Villages/Cities	181	48%	24%	28%
More State Funding for Schools	181	46%	15%	38%
Fund Schools with Sales Tax	182	46%	19%	35%
Minimize Industry Development in Rural Areas	180	43%	24%	32%
No State Corp Income Tax	180	27%	18%	55%
Need More Lodging	181	9%	27%	65%

Key Points – Recreation and Tourism

- The most acceptable tourism activities among Pepin County respondents were hunting, fishing, and bicycling. These activities were also seen as most likely to be successful in attracting tourists to Pepin County.
- Majorities of Pepin County respondents, ranging from six in ten to nine in ten, said all other listed recreational and tourism activities listed would be acceptable in their communities
- About half of respondents did not believe cross-country skiing or tennis would be successful in attracting tourists. Majorities of respondents said that winter hill sports and ice skating/hockey would not be successful tourism activities.

Recreation and Tourism

	Accepted			Successful		
	Count	Yes	No	Count	Yes	No
Hunting	172	94%	6%	165	92%	8%
Fishing	173	94%	6%	163	91%	9%
Bicycling	172	94%	6%	164	88%	12%
Ag/Industry Tours	171	92%	8%	160	78%	22%
Camping	173	90%	10%	160	80%	20%
Nature Recreation	173	87%	13%	161	73%	27%
Baseball/Softball	172	87%	13%	159	69%	31%
Basketball/Volleyball	172	86%	14%	159	64%	36%
Non-Motorized Water Activities	172	85%	15%	162	73%	27%
Golfing	171	84%	16%	162	70%	30%
Get-Away Destination	172	84%	16%	165	66%	34%
Motorized Outdoor Activities	170	82%	18%	164	79%	21%
Football/Soccer	170	82%	18%	158	63%	37%
Motorized Water Activities	172	81%	19%	162	72%	28%
Culture/Fine Arts	173	81%	19%	162	63%	37%
Horse Events	172	81%	19%	164	60%	40%
Cross Country Skiing	172	77%	23%	164	51%	49%
Tennis	172	77%	23%	156	48%	52%
Winter Hill Sports	172	67%	33%	159	39%	61%
Ice Skating/Hockey	171	61%	39%	159	30%	70%

Key Points – Land Use, Housing, and Quality of Life

- Approximately seven in ten Pepin County respondents agreed that government regulations and funding are needed to protect natural areas and that redeveloping existing residential, commercial and industrial areas is a higher priority than expanding into new areas.
- Solid majorities also felt that government regulations are needed to protect farm and forest lands and that the supply of housing for the elderly is adequate in their community.
- About six in ten Pepin County respondents said that they had a high quality of life in their community, but they are not so sure about the future. Only about a third agreed that the quality of life in their communities will improve in coming years, and about four in ten had no opinion.
- Respondents from Pepin County had split opinions about the need for more land use planning in their communities. About a third of respondents agreed, another third disagreed, and the remaining third had no opinion.

Land Use, Housing, and Quality of Life

	Count	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree
Gov't Regs Needed to Protect Natural Areas	175	70%	9%	22%
Redevelop Rather than Expand To New Areas	177	67%	15%	19%
Gov't Regs Needed to Protect Farm/Forest	174	63%	11%	26%
Local Housing for Elderly Adequate	177	62%	20%	18%
Local Quality of Life is High	179	58%	21%	22%
Local Gov'ts Should Ensure Affordable Housing	175	55%	16%	29%
New Housing Adjacent to Villages/Cities	177	54%	23%	24%
Local Community Accept Diverse Populations	179	49%	25%	26%
Sustainability Should Guide Development	175	49%	34%	17%
Gov't Regs Needed to Protect History	175	49%	21%	30%
Local Housing for Special Needs Adequate	175	43%	38%	19%
Local Gov't & Business Work Together	179	39%	32%	29%
More Local Land Use Planning Needed	178	30%	36%	34%
Local Quality of Life Will Improve	176	30%	38%	32%

Key Points – Energy Alternatives

- Solar energy and burning biomass had the highest level of acceptability among Pepin County respondents. These were also the alternative energy sources that respondents thought most likely to be successful in their communities.
- With the exception of nuclear energy, smaller majorities of respondents, ranging from two-thirds to three-fourths, believed other forms energy production would be accepted in their communities.
- About half of Pepin County respondents said they do not believe that biodiesel (whether from plants or animal fats) and ethanol from waste/grasses would be successful. Over half of respondents said nuclear energy production would not be successful.

Energy Alternatives

	Accepted				Successful		
	Count	Yes	No		Count	Yes	No
Solar	177	85%	15%		161	67%	33%
Burning Biomass	171	80%	20%		158	77%	23%
Ethanol from Crops	175	75%	25%		161	58%	42%
Wind	176	74%	26%		159	65%	35%
Hydroelectric	171	74%	26%		160	62%	38%
Methane	171	70%	30%		159	65%	35%
Ethanol from Waste/Grasses	174	67%	33%		160	51%	49%
Biodiesel from Plants	170	66%	34%		154	51%	49%
Biodiesel from Animal Fats	171	64%	36%		154	47%	53%
Nuclear	172	26%	74%		160	41%	59%