

THE OCONTO WATERFRONT: ISSUES AND OPTIONS A SURVEY OF OCONTO RESIDENTS

September 21, 1992

by

Michael Carman, Greg Lamb, Al Miller, Sue Sadowske, and Ron Shaffer*

This survey is part of
Rural Coastal Community Choices and Conflicting Options,
a project funded by:
National Coastal Resources Research and Development Institute

Additional support from
the Wisconsin DNR in distributing the survey instrument
is appreciated.

This project was funded by the National Coastal Resources Research and Development Institute, Portland, Oregon under contract No. BC07.90S-5618-49.

* The authors are listed alphabetically. Michael Carman left the project July 3, 1992 and this document and most of the analysis were done after July 3, 1992.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. SUMMARY	1
II. THE SURVEY	3
III. USE OF THE OCONTO WATERFRONT	5
IV. ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS	11
V. DEVELOPMENTAL CONCERNS	17
VI. ENVIRONMENTAL OPTIONS	21
VII. DEVELOPMENTAL OPTIONS	23
VIII. WILLINGNESS TO FINANCE ENVIRONMENTAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL OPTIONS .	29
IX. AWARENESS AND INTEREST IN THE WATERFRONT	41
X. ENVIRONMENTALISTS & DEVELOPMENTALISTS	45
XI. CITY AND TOWN RESIDENTS	57
XII. DEMOGRAPHICS	63
APPENDIX A -	69
APPENDIX B - SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	78

I: SUMMARY

The 433 Oconto area households responding to a fall 1991 survey requesting information about the waterfront recognized the importance of the waterfront to the future of the area. This support did not vary much regardless of the level of use or types of recreational activities engaged in on the waterfront, or various household characteristics. Likewise, there was minimal difference in the opinions among residents of the City of Oconto and the Towns of Oconto and Little River.

A substantial proportion of the respondents felt the waterfront was more important to the future of Oconto than they thought their friends and neighbors believed. Yet, the survey which went to almost one third of the households in the area, indicated that their friends and neighbors also shared this high regard for the waterfront.

The respondents recognition of the importance of the waterfront confirms the need for communitywide efforts regarding the waterfront's continued contribution to Oconto.

Most residents are very concerned about the Oconto economy with 80 percent agreeing "Oconto has serious economic problems." Many (60 percent) believe that tourism development can help solve Oconto's economic problems, but a similar number (61 percent) say Oconto has more important problems than tourism development, suggesting respondents do not expect tourism to solve all of the city's economic problems. Just over one third thought "increasing tourism would benefit me." There is some support for using local money to encourage tourists (59 percent), but only one-third of the respondents think development costs should be supported by tax dollars.

Business owners consistently displayed less willingness to pay for preservation or development options than the general public.

The strong support for future waterfront development was conditional. While only 12 percent felt further development of the waterfront should cease, 52 percent were agreeable with further development in general. But 58 percent said undeveloped lands needed protection from further development.

Support exceeded opposition for 13 of 16 development options proposed. Opposition was less than 25 percent for 12 of the 16 development options. Support for many of the recreational activities exceeded apparent participation. Over half were concerned about 10 of 14 specific environmental issues and the number concerned exceeded unconcerned by two to one for 12 of the 14 issues.

Respondents preferred minimal change in the Breakwater, but did wish to see increased maintenance on the existing structure.

Respondents want wetlands and shorelines to be protected and made more accessible to residents. While two thirds agreed that wetlands needed to be protected, agreement on specific wetland protection options was less clear. Hiking trails, handicap access, and dredging the harbor received relatively widespread support across different classifications of respondents into environmentalist or developmentalist categories.

Respondents actively use all parts of the waterfront from Suzie's Rapids to the Bay, the wetlands, the breakwater and the Bayshore north and south of the breakwater. Breakwater Park and the Bayshore were the most popular areas visited. Respondents participated in numerous recreation activities and are willing to share their resources with tourists as long as it does not prevent residents from using the waterfront.

Willingness to finance preservation and development options tempers the apparent enthusiasm for both preservation and development options considered. Residents are more willing to have the city spend money for development than to pay themselves. Only seven to twelve percent of those unwilling to spend money opposed the idea of government investments. Frequency of use affected how much people were willing to spend, but perception of the seriousness of Oconto's economic problems did not.

When asked to specify how much they would commit annually over the next ten years to support changes in the waterfront, respondents averaged \$10.37/year for tourist promotion, \$11.52/year for purchasing wetlands, and \$12.60/year for waterfront investments designed for Oconto residents. Multiplying these averages by the population of the City and Towns, and compounding at six percent per year yields a potential investment sum of \$130,000 to \$1,359,000 depending on the option and the inclusion of the Towns.

About half of the respondents were very familiar with the preservation and development options presented in the survey. Most residents were interested in learning more about both environmental preservation options and economic development options. The respondents more familiar with the preservation/development options were also more likely to be willing to spend money on the waterfront.

Twelve percent of the households were simultaneously characterized as pro-development and pro-environmental, fifteen percent did not fall into either category, fifteen percent expressed strong environmental support, and twelve percent gave strong developmental support.

The data reported is from 433 respondents to an October 1991 mail survey to every third household in the City of Oconto and the Towns of Little River and Oconto. Fifty-six percent of the households contacted responded. A copy of the survey is found in Appendix B.

II: THE SURVEY

Early in the fall of 1991 a mail survey was conducted of every third household in the City of Oconto and every second household in the Towns of Oconto and Little River. Its purpose was to solicit the opinions, from a diverse group of Oconto area residents, about the waterfront and their positions regarding either further development or preservation of that resource.

A small sample of people identified as being particularly knowledgeable or concerned about the city and the waterfront were personally interviewed in June 1991. From these open ended interviews the major issues facing the area were discovered and synthesized into the questionnaire.

An Advisory Committee of 15 people was selected in September 1991 and they provided input into the nature and wording of the questionnaire.

Every third household in the City was identified through "Polk's City Directory." This list was edited by personal knowledge of Extension office staff. The households selected were sent a first class letter under Greg Lamb's signature, County Extension Community Development Agent, informing them of the project and the survey. This was followed by a bulk mailed survey that arrived 5 days after the first letter. Ten days latter, individuals who had not responded were sent another letter. Two weeks latter people who had still not responded were sent another letter and copy of the survey. Most of these were timed to arrive at the house on Thursday or Friday. Eventually, 433 people provided usable responses for a 56 percent response rate, corrected for nondeliverable surveys. The information on the following pages summarizes much of the information compiled from that survey. Section XII reports a simple tabulation of demographic characteristics of the survey respondents with 1990 Census information to give some sense of how representative the survey was.

III: USE OF THE OCONTO WATERFRONT

TABLE 1

OCONTO WATERFRONT AREAS VISITED IN 1991*
(n = 433)

Waterfront Area	Percent Respondents Who Visit
The river between Suzie's Rapids and Holtwood campground	37%
Holtwood campground to Park St. Bridge	57
Park St. Bridge downstream to the breakwater	42
Breakwater park	69
The Bayshore north and south of the breakwater	60
Any of the wetland areas along the Bay	34
I have not visited the Oconto waterfront	10

*Percentages do not sum to 100 because of multiple responses.

Oconto residents are using the waterfront areas, only 10 percent of the respondents did not visit the waterfront in the 12 months prior to the survey. Even the least used area was visited by 34 percent of the respondents. This level of use of the wetlands is somewhat surprising since there are few facilities (viewing areas, hiking trails) that would make easy use. The number of respondents who visited either the Breakwater Park or the Bayshore north or south of the breakwater confirms local perceptions that these are popular points.

People use all parts of the waterfront. Most respondents (87 percent) visit more than one waterfront area and a fifth of all respondents visited all six waterfront areas identified. (See Appendix TABLE A1)

TABLE 2

WATERFRONT AREA VISITED MOST OFTEN*
(n = 433)

Waterfront Area Visited Most Often	Percent of Respondents
The river between Suzie's Rapids and Holtwood campground	7%
Holtwood campground to Park St. Bridge	14
Park St. Bridge downstream to the breakwater	7
Breakwater park	42
The Bay shore north and south of the breakwater	24
Any of the wetland areas along the Bay	7

*Percentages may not sum to 100 because of nonresponses.

People visit either the breakwater (42 percent), or the Bayshore north and south of the breakwater (24 percent) more than any other part of the waterfront. The frequency of use of Breakwater Park exceeds the combined frequency for the second and third most frequently visited areas. Yet, given the high proportion of people who visit more than one area (87 percent) most have some awareness of other parts of the waterfront.

The breakwater could become a key element to using the waterfront to assist economic development in Oconto. The breakwater, however, is physically separated from Main St. businesses by almost two miles. Most boaters are unable or unwilling to navigate the river to reach downtown businesses. Even if they were, there are few places for temporary mooring near downtown. At the same time, the drive through tourist, following Highway 41, is also separated from Main St. businesses and the breakwater and marsh. These all have implications for potential development strategies.

TABLE 3

PARTICIPATION IN WATERFRONT RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES*
(n = 433)

Activity	Percent Respondents Who Participate
Park the car to look at the view	61%
Fishing	60
Watching a water ski show	42
Walking	36
Watching birds	32
Boating (but not fishing)	30
Swimming	25
Picnicking	25
Canoeing	17
Hunting	16
Photography	14
Sailing	3
I don't do any of these activities at waterfront areas	6

*Percentages do not sum to 100 because of multiple responses.

TABLE 3 indicates that Oconto area residents are already engaged in numerous recreational activities associated with the waterfront. Many of these are passive (watching view or water ski show, picnicking) while others are more active forms (fishing, swimming, canoeing). Many of these activities require little investment in facilities, but do require some planning and preparation for people to enjoy (walking, bird watching, picnicking, photography). Others like canoeing and boating may require investment in public facilities.

TABLE 4

IMPORTANCE OF THE WATERFRONT TO OCONTO'S FUTURE

	Respondent's Own View (n=397)	Respondent's Rating of Neighbor's View (n=376)
Very important	66%	36%
Somewhat important	25	42
Neither important or unimportant	3	14
Somewhat unimportant	3	4
Very unimportant	3	5

When Oconto area residents were asked "how important is the waterfront to the future of Oconto?" Sixty-six percent said the waterfront was very important. Nine out of ten of the households think the waterfront is very or somewhat important to the future of Oconto, clearly indicating the value people place on this fragile resource.

Only six percent did not think the waterfront was important to the future of Oconto. Even those not using the waterfront, generally felt it was important. Thirteen of the twenty people who had not visited the waterfront (TABLE 1) still thought the waterfront was important to the future of Oconto. Ten of twenty-two respondents (TABLE 3) who did not participate in waterfront activities still thought it was important to the future of Oconto.

The area of the waterfront most frequently visited did not affect people's opinion about the importance of the waterfront.

The respondents recognition of the importance of the waterfront confirms the need for communitywide efforts regarding the waterfront's continued contribution to Oconto.

When asked how they perceived their neighbors opinions about the waterfront, many thought their neighbors believed the waterfront was less important than their own belief. This means there is substantial latent support for addressing issues related to the waterfront. This can be characterized as "If I think something needs to be done about the waterfront, more friends and neighbors than I thought are likely to agree also."

IV: ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

TABLE 5

CONCERNS REGARDING OCONTO WATERFRONT ENVIRONMENT*
(n = 433)

Environmental Issue	Very Concerned	Somewhat Concerned	Unsure	Not At All Concerned	Not Too Concerned
Spring floods	43%	31%	1%	5%	15%
Water levels of Green Bay	40	30	4	6	12
Changing duck populations	16	23	6	15	27
Changing game fish populations	38	24	3	8	15
Non-native species	15	21	11	13	25
Shoreline development on the river	33	33	3	7	14
Shoreline development on the bay	31	32	4	8	14
Crowding on Oconto waters	23	25	3	9	26
Heavy traffic at waterfront access points	24	29	3	9	23
Inadequate access points on the river	22	26	3	10	25
Silting of waterways	26	27	7	8	16
Water pollution	65	21	1	3	4
Septic problems	49	24	1	6	10
Airborne pollution	36	29	2	6	15

*Percentages do not sum to 100 because of nonresponses.

To determine environmental concerns, a series of questions regarding 14 environmental issues on the Oconto waterfront were posed. In ten of fourteen environmental topics, more than half of the respondents were (very or

somewhat) concerned. In twelve of fourteen issues more are concerned than unconcerned.

Respondents were seldom neutral or unsure about their position on waterfront environmental issues. Across a wide range of issues the proportion concerned exceeded those not concerned by two or more to one.

The unsure column indicates not many people are unsure how they feel about the environment. Even though 10 percent indicated they did not visit the waterfront, substantially fewer than said they were unsure about environmental concerns related to the waterfront.

Eighty-six percent are concerned about water pollution.¹ Septic problems are a concern to over 70 percent. The periodic flooding originating from high water levels on Green Bay haven't been forgotten and the spring flooding of the Oconto River remains a concern for many. Over 60 percent are concerned about shoreline development on the river and along the Bayshore. And about 50 percent are concerned about crowding on the water and heavy traffic at the waterfront access points.

Crowding on Oconto waters and inadequate access points also captured just under half the respondents' concern.

Changing duck populations and non-native species were the only issues with less than 40 percent concerned.²

¹ On September 29, 1991 a boil water notice was sent to all City of Oconto water users explaining that respondents should either purchase bottled water or boil tap water before using it. The notice stated that the source of the bacterial contamination had not been found and that the amount of chlorine had been increased to remedy the problem.

² Perhaps zebra mussels (non-native species) haven't become a problem in Oconto and people think they won't be. The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources says that duck populations are at record highs. This may reflect recent growth in the duck population. "Wisconsin's annual breeding waterfowl survey shows the state's total waterfowl population is near last year's record-high level of 415,500 birds, which puts it 35 percent above the previous 18-year average, reports John Bergquist, Department of Natural Resources waterfowl and wetland wildlife ecologist. Wisconsin's breeding waterfowl population has been steadily increasing since 1982, with the exception of 1988 when drought caused a 26 percent drop," (Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources newsletter 1991).

TABLE 6

OPINIONS ABOUT WETLANDS PROTECTION*
(n = 433)

	Definitely Agree	Probably Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Probably Disagree	Definitely Disagree
Wetlands need to be protected from filling & construction	40%	22%	20%	6%	6%
Current wetlands regulations are too restrictive of filling & construction	18	22	27	12	14
The government should purchase wetlands from private owners to compensate them for lands they are unable to use & to protect wetlands permanently	27	22	23	10	14
The government should purchase remaining undeveloped riverfront & bay front lands to protect their natural character	24	16	23	17	13

*Percentages may not sum to 100 because of nonresponses.

The wetlands associated with the Oconto waterfront are an important element of that resource, not only for tourism but environmental considerations as well. The respondents recognize the importance of the wetlands. Almost half of the respondents, who believe the wetlands need protecting, did not visit the wetlands in 1991. Thirty-four percent of the respondents (TABLE 1) visited the wetlands in 1991, but 62 percent believe wetlands need to be protected from filling and construction.

When specific options for preserving the wetlands are presented the clarity disappears. While a plurality of the respondents believe that current wetlands regulations are too restrictive of filling and construction, neither agree nor disagree was the most frequent single response.

A second option reduces the burden on private owners of wetlands. Forty-nine percent support government purchase of wetlands from private owners, compensating them for lands they are unable to use, and permanently protecting wetlands. About a quarter of the respondents oppose this option and another quarter are neutral.

There is less support (40 percent) for purchasing the remaining undeveloped riverfront and bayfront lands to protect their natural character. This is corroborated by a separate question where 42 percent of the respondents (TABLE 8) want undeveloped river banks and bayshoreline purchased and protected from development.

The waterfront area most frequently visited had no effect on respondents level of agreement about: the need to protect wetlands from filling and construction; or existing regulations were too restrictive; or government purchasing of wetlands; or easing wetland regulation.

Respondents position (agree/disagree) on the need to protect undeveloped lands did influence their position (oppose/don't oppose) further development of the waterfront. (See Appendix TABLE A2)

What factors influence peoples belief that wetlands regulations are too restrictive of filling and construction? People who have lived in Oconto longer (more than 10 years) are more likely to agree with this statement, while people who have lived in Oconto less than 10 years are much less likely to agree. (See Appendix TABLE A3)

Older respondents are more likely to believe that wetlands regulations are too restrictive and younger respondents feel the regulations are not too restrictive. (See Appendix TABLE A4)

TABLE 7

SUPPORT FOR GOVERNMENT PURCHASING WETLANDS

	"Wetlands need to be protected from filling & construction":				
	Def. Agree	Prob. Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Prob. Disagree	Def. Disagree
"The govt should purchase remaining undeveloped riverfront & bay front lands to protect their natural character":					
Definitely Agree	44.4%	8.3%	10.5%	4.3%	24.0%
Probably Agree	17.2	24.0	15.1	8.7	0.0
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	18.9	29.2	40.7	13.0	12.0
Prob. Disagree	12.4	27.1	17.4	43.5	8.0
Def. Disagree	7.1	11.5	16.3	30.4	56.0
"The govt should purchase wetlands from priv. owners to compensate them for lands they're unable to use & to protect wetlands permanently":					
Definitely Agree	41.2	14.7	15.3	20.8	26.9
Probably Agree	26.5	27.4	23.5	12.5	3.8
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	20.0	23.2	41.2	8.3	11.5
Prob. Disagree	5.3	15.8	8.2	29.2	7.7
Def. Disagree	7.1	18.9	11.8	29.2	50.0

$$*P\{\chi^2\} = .000/P\{\chi^2\} = .000$$

Respondents level of agreement on whether or not wetlands need to be protected from construction and filling affects their opinions regarding how to accomplish that protection. Comparing respondents answers for the two specific wetlands options clearly indicates some unexpected associations. Those believing wetlands did not need protection were much more supportive of compensating landowners than those who thought wetlands needed protection. In contrast, those believing wetlands need protection tended to support government purchase of wetlands.

V: DEVELOPMENTAL CONCERNS

TABLE 8
DEVELOPMENT CONCERNS*
(n = 433)

	Definitely Agree	Probably Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Probably Disagree	Definitely Disagree
Oconto has serious economic problems	58%	22%	11%	1%	3%
Tourism development can help solve Oconto's economic problems	23	37	20	9	7
Oconto has more important problems than tourism development	32	29	23	7	3
Increasing tourism would benefit me	16	22	27	13	15
Development costs should be supported by tax dollars	9	24	31	16	15
Encouraging tourists to visit would be a waste of local money	5	9	28	30	24
Public access to the breakwater must be maintained	45	35	13	1	1
Remaining undeveloped lands need protection	24	34	24	7	4
I oppose further development of the waterfront	6	6	30	22	30

*Percentages may not sum to 100 because of nonresponses.

The responding households clearly felt that the Oconto area had serious economic problems. While a substantial share (60 percent) thought tourism could help solve those economic problems, a similar share (61 percent) believed Oconto had more important problems than tourism. Respondents think tourism is part of the solution, but it is not the sole solution.

Less than two out of five respondents thought tourism would benefit them directly, even though they apparently thought it might help the community. It's probably true that tourism can't save the economy by itself. It might also be true that some respondents aren't aware of ways that tourism affects them.

While, only 38 percent indicated tourism would benefit them, when asked if "encouraging tourists to visit would be a waste of local money," 54 percent disagreed, meaning they think that encouraging tourists to visit would be a reasonable use of local money. Yet, they were equally divided in their belief about using tax dollars to support development. Like many others, the respondents want public improvements, but not increased public expenditures.

When asked whether they oppose further development of the waterfront, only 12 percent of the respondents agree, but 52 percent disagreed. The majority of these same respondents want the environment protected. Fifty-eight percent say remaining undeveloped lands need protection.

The respondents feel current access to the river is adequate, additional access is unnecessary, but fewer access points would be opposed. While, only 48 percent (TABLE 5) were concerned about inadequate access to the river, many more (80 percent) felt public access to the breakwater must be maintained.

Respondents are concerned about the area economy and support the idea of tourism development (tourism can help solve economic problems) but they are not giving up their own use of the waterfront (maintain access to the breakwater) and are in general agreement about protecting undeveloped lands.

TABLE 9

TOURISM DEVELOPMENT AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

	"Oconto has serious economic problems":				
	Def. Agree	Probably Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Probably Disagree	Def. Disagree
"Tourism development can help solve Oconto's economic problems":					
Definitely agree	31.9%	16.0%	13.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Probably agree	33.9	54.3	32.6	16.7	27.3
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	17.1	19.2	47.8	33.3	9.1
Probably Disagree	9.2	10.6	2.2	33.3	27.3
Definitely Disagree	8.0	0.0	4.4	16.7	36.4
"Oconto has more important problems than tourism development":					
Definitely agree	43.2	21.7	8.5	0.0	50.0
Probably agree	27.8	39.1	34.0	60.0	8.3
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	19.4	26.1	48.9	0.0	16.7
Probably Disagree	7.3	9.8	8.5	20.0	0.0
Definitely Disagree	2.4	3.3	0.0	20.0	25.0

$$P\{\text{chi sq}\} = .000/P\{\text{chi sq}\} = .000$$

Respondents' opinions regarding whether or not Oconto had serious economic problems affected their opinion toward tourism. Those who thought Oconto had economic problems also thought tourism could help solve those problems. These same respondents also tended to believe that Oconto had more serious problems than tourism development.

VI: ENVIRONMENTAL OPTIONS

TABLE 10

SUPPORT FOR WATERFRONT RECREATION & PRESERVATION OPTIONS*
(n = 433)

	Strongly Support	Support	Neither Support/ Oppose	Oppose	Strongly Oppose
Build a boardwalk through the marsh adjacent to Breakwater Park	17%	24%	28%	16%	11%
Build nesting structures for eagles	30	35	23	4	4
Purchase & protect undeveloped river banks & bay shoreline from development	19	23	32	17	5
Pass zoning requirements that protect scenic undeveloped waterfront property	26	27	29	11	4
Build a bicycle trail from Park Avenue bridge to the breakwater	18	27	29	13	9
Purchase wetlands for waterfowl habitat	21	28	30	11	7

*Percentages may not sum to 100 because of nonresponses.

Respondents generally supported rather than opposed the waterfront preservation options, although neither oppose/support often was the most frequent position taken. Sixty-five percent support building nesting structures for eagles. There is relatively more support for zoning protection (53 percent) than purchasing undeveloped waterfront property (42 percent), which generally represents a lower cost option. Yet, almost half (49 percent) supported purchase of wetlands for waterfowl habitat.

While, smaller pluralities want a boardwalk through the marsh adjacent to Breakwater Park, and a bicycle trail from Park Street bridge to the breakwater, there is more support than opposition to both suggestions.

Some nature areas that are most unique to Oconto may not be particularly accessible to residents or tourists. A need exists to explore ways to improve access to those resources. There are ramps for launching boats, and several nice natural areas and water. But the facilities for hiking, bird watching, and picnicking in these areas are limited.

The waterfront area visited most often did not influence respondents level of support for various options to preserve the natural features of the waterfront.

The relative rankings remains unchanged when asked to make first, second, or third preference. (See Appendix TABLE A14) The first choice emphasized building the boardwalk and nesting structures for eagles. The second choice emphasized building nesting structures and zoning ordinances. The third choice emphasized waterfowl wetlands and nesting structures.

VII: DEVELOPMENTAL OPTIONS

TABLE 11
SUPPORT FOR OCONTO WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS*
(n = 433)

	Strongly Support	Support	Neither Support/ Oppose	Oppose	Strongly Oppose
Expand parking at the breakwater	24%	41%	22%	6%	3%
Construct rest rooms at the breakwater	28	44	18	6	3
Put in docks for short term visitors at the breakwater	15	35	34	8	5
Water taxi to go from day slips at break-water to Park St. Bridge (downtown)	4	11	45	25	11
Private developers build condominiums at the breakwater	6	9	23	27	31
Raise Park St. Bridge to allow big boats to go upstream & moor above Park St. Bridge	9	17	29	27	15
Dredge river to allow big boats to go upstream & moor near Park St. Bridge	15	23	29	19	11
Mark river channel between the bay & the Park St. Bridge	15	34	36	6	5
Construct a low cost marina for smaller boats (under 20 ft.)	8	29	41	12	7
Build boat landing near the Park St. Bridge	8	31	37	15	7
Dredge harbor	18	32	33	7	5
Establish "no wake" zones near private piers on the river	15	32	37	7	4
Build a canoe landing at Suzie's Rapids	13	32	35	9	6
Provide hiking trails along the river	17	39	28	7	5
Put in picnic tables near the river in several places	16	40	27	8	6
Construct trails & fishing piers so they are accessible to handicapped people	26	42	24	3	3

*Percentages may not sum to 100 because of nonresponses.

These questions present the elements of an overall strategy to increase recreationally-based development both for residents and visitors. Possibly the most critical insight to notice is that respondents had an opportunity here, as elsewhere, to say they do not support specific development options. They gave support to almost all of the development ideas presented. For most options (12 out of 16) opposition was less than 25 percent. Only one development option (building condos) had more than half of the respondents expressing opposition. More support than opposition was expressed for thirteen of the sixteen development options presented. Seven development options enjoyed support by half or more of the respondents.

Among the options enjoying the strongest support were those linked to use of the breakwater including parking, rest rooms, and short-term docks. Remember, parking and looking at the view was the most popular recreational activity (TABLE 1). The City completed some of this work shortly after the survey was conducted.

A substantial number of people supported constructing docks for short-term visitors. This supports a strategy to bring tourists off Green Bay to stop at the Oconto harbor for a while or even overnight. The target is the boaters on the Bay who could put in somewhere else and are looking for things to do and places to go. Their access to the downtown may be critical.

There are other pieces to the strategy to get people downtown and the respondents support them. They support dredging the river to allow big boats to go upstream and moor near the bridge. And they support marking the channel between the bay and the bridge and building a boat landing at the bridge. These options represent some ways boaters could get closer to the downtown in their boats. While costs may prevent Oconto getting the river dredged, this doesn't prevent establishing a transportation link with the downtown.

Opposition was more than 2 to 1 against a water taxi to go from the day slips at the breakwater to Park St. Bridge. This lack of support may be because Oconto residents wouldn't use it themselves and the users would be visitors drawn off the Bay. Residents visiting to the river vs. wetlands and bayshore were more likely to oppose the taxi idea.

Even though just viewing the scenery was the most popular waterfront activity, people were also supportive of investments for more active forms of recreation. People like the idea of building a canoe landing and they like the idea of hiking trails. Forty-five percent support the canoe landing, even though only 17 percent go canoeing (TABLE 12). Hiking trails are even more popular. Fifty-six percent support this option. Putting picnic tables near the river compliments the trail idea. Sixty-eight percent support constructing trails and fishing piers so they are accessible to handicapped people.

There generally was minimal variation in level of support for the waterfront development options among the waterfront places visited most often.

Opponents outnumbered supporters (by 3 to 1) for allowing private developers building condominiums at the breakwater. This suggests Oconto residents desire developing the waterfront and natural areas in ways that do not destroy the current uses, while expanding the accessibility and diversity of uses for themselves and visitors. Opposition to this development option occurred regardless of length of residence, age, number of visits to waterfront areas, and number of recreational activities, and places visited most frequently. Frequent users of the river between Holtwood and the breakwater were less likely to oppose condos.

When asked to specify first, second, and third options, some interesting differences appear. (See Appendix TABLE A15) Two rather unconnected first choice options were "improve access for handicap" and "dredge harbor." The second choice were related (i.e., hiking trails and picnic tables). "Handicap access" and "hiking trails" were the preferred third choices.

TABLE 12

PARTICIPATION IN RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES AND SUPPORT FOR
EXPANSION/PRESERVATION OF RECREATION RESOURCES

Participation		Support	
Canoeing	17%	Build a canoe landing at Suzie's Rapids	45%
Boating (not fishing)	30	Build a boat landing at Park St. Bridge	39
Watch Birds	32	Purchase wetlands for waterfront habitat	49
Park the car to look at the view	61	Public access to the breakwater must be maintained	80
Walking	36	Provide hiking trails along the river	56

Source: TABLES 3 and 11.

Indication of respondents willingness to support recreational activities, even though they may not personally benefit directly, is found in TABLE 12 which indicates that public support for development of recreational resources exceeds participation in recreational activities.

TABLE 13

PREFERENCE FOR BREAKWATER MAINTENANCE/EXPANSION OPTIONS*
(n = 433)

	Percent Supporting
Spend money to maintain the current breakwater in better condition	45%
Widen breakwater to provide two lanes of traffic	38
Widen breakwater to provide a picnic area with grass & trees at the far end	26
Widen breakwater to provide space for shops, food stands, & boats	18
Continue maintaining the breakwater as it always has been	36

*Percentages do not sum to 100 because of multiple responses.

The breakwater is a critical and visible element of the Oconto waterfront (69 percent visited and 42 percent used the breakwater more often than any other waterfront area). Eighty percent say public access to the breakwater must be maintained (TABLE 8).

TABLE 13 reports responses to a series of options ranging from maintaining the breakwater just as it has always been, to widening the breakwater and putting various facilities in the extra space.

The most popular option was to spend money to maintain the current breakwater in better condition than it is now. Somewhat fewer people want to keep the breakwater as it always has been. The difference in the choices involves concerns that the brush has not been cut as often as some would like, and the breakwater's vulnerability to damage by northeasterly winds. Only five percent responded yes to both options, indicating people were distinguishing among nuances in these questions.

Of the three options for widening the breakwater, people prefer adding a lane of traffic over providing a picnic area or putting in shops, food stands, and boats. So commercializing the waterfront is not very popular with Oconto residents. This impression is also supported by most respondents (58 percent) saying they oppose having condominiums built at the breakwater (TABLE 11).

The support for various breakwater options was disbursed among the respondents. The greatest overlap was that 46 percent of those supporting the picnic area also supported shops and food stands, etc. Forty-two percent of those supporting two lanes of traffic also liked picnic areas. Except for these two options the support for more than one option was generally ten percent or less.

**VIII: WILLINGNESS TO FINANCE ENVIRONMENTAL
AND DEVELOPMENTAL OPTIONS**

TABLE 14

MEAN AMOUNTS RESPONDENTS ARE WILLING TO PAY*

Option	Mean	Percent Indicating Zero	Number Responding
To purchase & preserve waterfront lands & wetlands	\$11.52	58.9%	358
To develop waterfront for residents use	\$12.60	53.8%	346
To develop waterfront to encourage tourists to visit	\$10.37	61.7%	339

*This excludes outlying values over 300 dollars and nonresponses (those who did not even enter a zero).

A significant measure of people's willingness to support an idea is how much time or money they devote to the idea. The survey asked respondents to give a dollar amount that they would be willing to pay annually over the next ten years to support general choices related to the waterfront.

The responses to these questions should temper the enthusiasm for the previously reported generally supportive nature of the respondents answers. The majority do not want to pay for any of the options presented. When faced with giving a dollar amount they are willing to pay, their enthusiasm for the waterfront drops off. Over half of all respondents refuse to pay for preservation or development of the waterfront even though two thirds say the waterfront is very important (TABLE 4).

The lack of familiarity with preservation and development options may have influenced respondent's willingness to pay. Fifty-one percent report they are familiar with environmental preservation options while 54 percent are familiar with development options (TABLE 22). Yet 62 percent of those indicating they were familiar with the environmental options also specified an amount they would pay. The proportion of those indicating the amount they would pay for the two development options and familiarity with these options was 67 percent (residents) and 53 percent (tourists). Obviously awareness of the protection/development options did increase willingness to invest.

The respondents are most willing to pay to develop the waterfront for residents and next to preserve waterfront lands and wetlands. Fewer people are willing to pay to develop the waterfront for tourists than the other two categories. This suggests respondents belief that tourism as part of the solution to economic concerns requires a private not public response.

The data in Appendix TABLE A4 indicate that the most common amount people were willing to pay was \$10.00. There is obviously a wide spread in what people were willing to pay. To reduce the potential bias from a few people stating artificially high amounts, the amounts over \$300 were excluded from the average amounts people were willing to pay reported in TABLE 14. While, the differences in the averages do not appear large, they are statistically different (at 1 percent) and indicate that the respondents were differentiating what they were willing to pay for.

Appendix TABLE A16 displays estimates of total funds potentially available for various options. There are several sets of assumptions that need to be considered. First, the annual average amount specified in TABLE 14 was compounded at six percent per annum for ten years. If a different interest rate is used a different total will emerge. Second, while it is presumed that people responding to the how much are you willing to pay were responding for every member in the household (i.e., per capita amount), an alternative is that they answered for the household (i.e., per household amount). For both the City and City and Towns combined the number of people per household was the same. Third, since the City of Oconto is likely to be the governing unit levying the assessment, a false impression might be given if the total population for City and Towns is used. Thus, a combined and City only estimate is provided.

For the City only, the amounts possibly available for buying land ranged from \$150,751 to \$1,037,014. The amounts available for recreational development for residents ranged from \$162,772 to \$1,119,707. The potential investments for recreational development for tourists ranged from \$130,391 to \$896,958. Similar variation exists if the combined population of the City and Towns was used and whether per capita or per household averages were used.

The key aspect is that there could be substantial amounts of money that people may be willing to invest in the waterfront, depending on the projects.

TABLE 15

REASONS FOR BEING UNWILLING TO PAY

	To Purchase & Preserve Waterfront Lands & Wetlands (n = 211)	To Develop Waterfront for Respondents (n = 186)	To Develop Waterfront to Encourage Tourists to Visit (n = 209)
There are better uses for my tax dollars	30%	28%	32%
Let the people who really want it pay for it / Let tourists pay for the facilities	23	22	25
I don't need greater access to the waterfront lands / Tourist spending is not important to me	22	23	16
It just wouldn't be worth my money	14	14	17
I am opposed to the program	12	7	8

The reasons people were unwilling to pay for the preservation/development options were roughly the same for all three options. A third say there are better uses for their taxes. Approximately a quarter felt that the users (residents and tourists) should pay for the options. Approximately one in five don't need more access to the waterfront, or tourist spending had little importance or effect on them. Perhaps most notable in this table is that only 8 to 12 percent are opposed to these strategies. For these respondents the cost or who pays for the option is not the issue.

Respondents agreement/disagreement with the belief that Oconto has serious economic problems did not affect their willingness/unwillingness to pay for any of the options. (See Appendix TABLES A6a-A6c)

TABLE 16

SUPPORT FOR OCONTO CITY GOVERNMENT SPENDING MONEY TO DEVELOP THE WATERFRONT*
(n = 433)

	For Use by Local Respondents	To Promote Tourist Spending
Strongly favor	23%	22%
Favor	35	37
Neither favor nor oppose	25	24
Oppose	8	8
Strongly oppose	6	6

*Percentages may not sum to 100 because of nonresponses.

Although only 38 to 46 percent (TABLE 14) of the Oconto residents indicated an amount they were willing to spend for development projects to encourage resident or tourist use of the waterfront, more (58-59 percent) support city government spending to develop the waterfront. While, that difference seems inconsistent, it may be explained by the frequent perception that government dollars are someone else's taxes.

This section examines various demographic aspects of peoples' willingness to pay for waterfront investments. The guiding question is: What are the characteristics of people willing to pay compared to those not willing to pay? How are they similar or different? The following variables are used: home ownership, number of years living in Oconto, age, education, employment, property ownership, and family income. While all the data are presented, only those with significant differences are discussed.

Willingness to pay for various waterfront options, whether to preserve environmental features or for economic development, is an important piece of information for decision makers. The issue is more complex than simply "Do the majority of respondents want to pay for a particular option or not?" Knowledge about how various constituencies feel about a municipal project is important if decision makers are to address the objections of opponents and identify the supporters of a particular project.

Respondents who rent are more likely to be willing to pay to purchase additional waterfront lands and wetlands to protect them and make them available for public recreation than are homeowners. (TABLE 17) People under 45 are more willing to pay than people over 45. People with more years of formal education are more likely to be willing to pay than those with fewer years. Both these employed and those seeking employment are more willing to pay than business owners, waterfront property owners, investment property owners and those who are retired. People who work outside of the Oconto area are among the most willing to pay. More of the people with higher incomes are willing to pay than those with lower incomes.

Who is willing to pay to improve waterfront facilities for Oconto residents? Those under 45 years old; those with some college education; both employed, and unemployed; those working outside of Oconto; and those with incomes of more than \$20,000. (TABLE 18)

Who is willing to pay to improve facilities to encourage tourists to visit? Renters; those with some college education; both employed and unemployed, and people who work outside of the Oconto area; and those between age 21-45. Those owning investment property are more likely to support the tourism option than the previous two options, nevertheless, the majority are still unwilling to pay. Higher income people continue to be more likely to pay than those with lower incomes. A surprise in the willingness to pay for visitors is that business owners were 2 to 1 against spending money. (TABLE 19)

Perhaps somewhat surprisingly, respondents opinions regarding the seriousness of Oconto's economic problems did not affect their willingness to pay for either the preservation or development options. (See TABLE 20 and Appendix TABLES A6a-A6c)

Those looking for work consistently were more willing to pay something for the three choices. The margin, however, was smallest for the tourism option. Business owners consistently were less willing to pay for any of the options than the general population.

TABLE 17

WILLINGNESS TO PURCHASE ADDITIONAL WATERFRONT AND WETLANDS BY TYPE
OF RESPONDENT

Characteristics	Not Willing To Pay	Willing to Pay
Overall Share (TABLE 12)	59%	41%
1. Ownership of residence		
Own	61%	39%
Rent	38	62
2. Years lived in Oconto		
Less than one year	-	100
1 to 9 years	56	44
10 to 19 years	45	55
20 or more years	58	42
3. Age		
Under 21 to 24	25	75
25 to 45	46	54
45 to 65	78	22
Over 65	81	19
4. Education		
Less than a high school degree	71	29
High school graduate	62	38
Some college	51	49
College degree	40	60
5. Employment/property ownership		
I am an employed person	49	51
I am looking for employment	38	63
I am a business owner	76	24
I am retired	80	20
I own property on the waterfront	67	33
I own investment property (rental housing, commercial property) in the Oconto area	65	35
I work outside of the Oconto area	43	57
6. Total amount family income (self and spouse)		
< \$10,000	82	18
10,000 to 19,999	56	44
20,000 to 34,999	60	40
More than 35,000	38	62

TABLE 18

WILLINGNESS TO INVEST IN WATERFRONT FOR OCONTO RESIDENTS USE
BY TYPE OF RESPONDENT

Characteristic	Not Willing To Pay	Willing to Pay
Overall Share (TABLE 12)	54%	46%
1. Ownership of residence		
Own	55%	45%
Rent	41	59
2. Years lived in Oconto		
Less than one year	-	100
1 to 9 years	52	49
10 to 19 years	36	64
20 or more years	53	48
3. Age		
Under 21 to 24	29	71
25 to 45	43	57
45 to 65	63	37
Over 65	78	22
4. Education		
Less than a high school degree	74	26
High school graduate	57	43
Some college	44	56
College degree	33	67
5. Employment/property ownership		
I am an employed person	45	55
I am looking for employment	29	71
I am a business owner	61	39
I am retired	75	25
I own property on the waterfront	60	40
I own investment property (rental housing, commercial property) in the Oconto area	54	46
I work outside of the Oconto area	41	59
6. Total amount family income (self and spouse)		
< \$10,000	77	24
10,000 to 19,999	55	17
20,000 to 34,999	50	50
More than 35,000	32	68

TABLE 19

WILLINGNESS TO INVEST IN WATERFRONT FOR VISITORS USE
BY TYPE OF RESPONDENT

Characteristic	Not Willing To Pay	Willing to Pay
Overall Share (TABLE 12)	62%	38%
1. Ownership of residence		
Own	63%	37%
Rent	46	54
2. Years lived in Oconto		
Less than one year	--	100
1 to 9 years	63	37
10 to 19 years	52	48
20 or more years	51	39
3. Age		
Under 21 to 24	57	43
25 to 45	53	47
45 to 65	65	35
Over 65	80	20
4. Education		
Less than a high school degree	78	46
High school graduate	64	45
Some college	55	33
College degree	47	21
5. Employment/property ownership		
I am an employed person	54	46
I am looking for employment	55	45
I am a business owner	67	33
I am retired	79	21
I own property on the waterfront	74	26
I own investment property (rental housing, commercial property) in the Oconto area	52	48
I work outside of the Oconto area	53	47
6. Total amount family income (self and spouse)		
< \$10,000	75	25
10,000 to 19,999	63	37
20,000 to 34,999	61	39
More than 35,000	45	55

TABLE 20

SERIOUS ECONOMIC PROBLEMS BY WILLINGNESS TO PAY

Oconto has Serious Economic Problem	Willingness to Pay Option					
	Buy Waterfront & Wetland		Invest for Residents Use		Promote Tourism	
	Average Amount	n	Average Amount	n	Average Amount	n
Definitely Agree	\$12.62	210	\$13.95	200	\$10.90	191
Probably Agree	11.23	73	12.70	69	9.15	68
Neither	12.49	39	13.43	37	12.41	34
Probably Disagree	13.33	6	8.33	6	12.50	4
Definitely Disagree	1.91	11	1.45	11	1.45	11

The average amount respondents were willing to pay for the three options do not match expected values. Respondents who neither agreed or disagreed that Oconto has serious economic problems generally were willing to pay as much or more as those who agree.³ This may reflect people's belief that waterfront investments may not be crucial to improving economic conditions.

The important aspect of TABLE 20 is those who definitely disagree with the statement that "Oconto has serious economic problems" were willing to spend a statistically significant smaller amount to buy wetlands, and recreational investments for both residents and tourists than were the people who definitely or probably agreed with that statement. None of the other differences were statistically significant.

³ There are so few "probably disagree" the average has little meaning.

TABLE 21

ACTIVITY LEVELS BY WILLINGNESS TO PAY

Number of Waterfront Activities	Willingness to Pay Option					
	Buy Waterfront & Wetland		Invest for Residents Use		Promote Tourism	
	Average Amount	n	Average Amount	n	Average Amount	n
No Activities	\$ 1.72	44	\$ 4.21	43	\$ 3.09	44
1-3 Activities	8.59	129	8.62	126	8.89	121
4-6 Activities	14.16	131	14.47	126	10.73	126
7+ Activities	20.57	51	25.39	49	20.19	46

About a quarter of the respondents who did not wish to spend money on the waterfront said "let the users pay" (TABLE 15). TABLE 21 clearly indicates the willingness of waterfront users to pay was directly linked to their level of use.

The number of waterfront activities had some influence on the amount of money people were willing to pay for the buy land option, as well as the recreational investments for residents and tourists options. Those with no waterfront activities were willing to pay significantly less than those who had some waterfront activities.

IX: AWARENESS AND INTEREST IN THE WATERFRONT

TABLE 22

FAMILIARITY WITH PRESERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS*
(n = 433)

	Preservation Options	Development Options
Very familiar	8%	9%
Familiar	43	45
Unfamiliar	39	37
Very Unfamiliar	8	6

*Percentages may not sum to 100 because of nonresponses.

Slightly more of the respondents indicated they were familiar than unfamiliar with either the development or preservation options shared with them. With this level of familiarity/unfamiliarity conducting educational programs on some of the choices citizens might make regarding the Oconto waterfront has potential for some impact. Level of familiarity appeared to influence willingness to spend on preservation or development options (TABLE 14).

TABLE 23

INTEREST IN LEARNING MORE ABOUT WATERFRONT OPTIONS FOR OCONTO*
(n = 433)

	Environmental Preservation Options	Development Options
Very interested	23%	25%
Somewhat interested	47	47
Not too interested	21	21
Not at all interested	6	6

*Percentages may not sum to 100 because of nonresponses.

Many more people are interested in learning more about waterfront options, than expressed familiarity with the options. Seventy to seventy-two percent of the respondents indicated some interest in learning more about the waterfront options in Oconto (TABLE 23). Only six percent indicated absolutely no interest in learning more about the waterfront options.

TABLE 24

PREFERRED WAYS OF LEARNING ABOUT WATERFRONT OPTIONS*
(n = 433)

	Very Likely	Somewhat Likely	Not at all Likely
Watch T.V. news reports	54%	33%	6%
Read stories in the newspaper	61	28	5
Visit proposed development sites to learn about available options	17	37	32
Watch free videos on development/preservation options available at local libraries	14	24	48
Read educational materials such as pamphlets and brochures you would receive in the mail	48	31	11
Read an Oconto "Waterfront Development Options" newsletter sent to your home	58	26	8
Attend local meetings or workshops	9	29	44

*Percentages may not sum to 100 because of nonresponses.

Respondents were asked about how they wished to learn more about the Oconto waterfront. Four options were preferred -- stories in the newspaper (61 percent); read an Oconto "Waterfront Development Options" newsletter" (58 percent): T.V. news (54 percent), and pamphlets and brochures (48 percent). Given that there is no local newspaper or TV station that reaches all households in of the Oconto area, the newsletter may be the most effective. Forty-four percent indicated that local meetings or workshops were not a preferred way of acquiring information.

X: ENVIRONMENTALISTS & DEVELOPMENTALISTS

One of the fundamental questions for this analysis was "Is there a developmentalist/environmentalist difference and conflict regarding the Oconto waterfront." Several of the preceding tables and discussion indicates very little difference. This section explores the environmental/developmental dimension in greater detail. A series of survey questions were selected that would be indicative of environmental and developmental concerns (TABLES 25 and 26). This was narrowed to only those respondents who answered in the strongest of the five possible responses (i.e., very concerned, strongly support, or definitely agree).

Three quarters of all respondents responded "strongly agree" category to at least one environmental question. (See Appendix TABLE A7) Sixty-three percent of respondents responded strongly agree to at least one developmental question. Since so many respondents qualify for either designation and so many questions qualify the respondent, a threshold number of responses was selected to insure people were relatively consistent in their answers.

A minimum of strong support for at least 4 of the 9 environmental questions indicated 15 percent of respondents qualified as Environmentalists. Restricting the respondents qualifying as developmentalist to answering strongly agree category to at least 3 out of 10 developmental questions put roughly 12 percent in the Developmentalist category. Respondents not meeting these criteria were classified as Neither, if they answered none of the questions at the strongest level; Noncommittal, if they answered some at the strongest level; and Combined, if they meet both the Developmentalist and Environmentalist criteria. (See Figure 1)

FIGURE 1
ORIENTATION OF OCONTO AREA RESIDENTS



Environmentalist (gave the strongest answer in at least four of the environmental questions in TABLE 25)

Developmentalist (gave the strongest answer in at least three of the developmental questions in TABLE 26)

Combined (gave the strongest answer in at least four of the environmental questions in TABLE 25 and at least three of the developmental questions in TABLE 26)

Neither (did not answer any of the questions in TABLES 25 and 26 in the highest category)

Noncommittal (gave the strongest answer in one to three environmental questions in TABLE 25, and one to two developmental questions in TABLE 26)

TABLE 25

DEFINING ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

1)	Section II, Question 1: Shoreline development on the river - "Very Concerned"
2)	Section II, Question 1: Shoreline development on the bay - "Very Concerned"
3)	Section II, Question 2: Wetlands need to be protected from filling and construction - "Definitely Agree"
4)	Section II, Question 2: The government should purchase remaining undeveloped riverfront and bay front lands to protect their natural character - "Definitely Agree"
5)	Section II, Question 4: Pass zoning requirements that protect scenic undeveloped waterfront property - "Strongly Support"
6)	Section III, Question 7: Remaining undeveloped lands need protection - "Definitely Agree"
7)	Section III, Question 7: I oppose further development of the waterfront - "Definitely Agree"
8)	Section II, Question 3: Do you favor or oppose changing wetlands protection legislation to open these lands for development? - "Strongly Oppose"
9)	Section II, Question 7: Willingness to pay for environmental conservation program "yes" (any amount greater than zero).

TABLE 26

DEFINING DEVELOPMENTAL CONCERNS

1)	Section III, Question 2: Do you favor or oppose Oconto city government spending money
2)	Section III, Question 7d: Tourism development can help solve Oconto's economic problems - "Definitely Agree"
3)	Section III, Question 7: Development costs should be supported by tax dollars - "Definitely Agree"
4)	Section III, Question 4g: Dredge river to allow big boats to go upstream and moor near Park St. Bridge - "Strongly Support"
5)	Section III, Question 4i: Construct a low cost marina for smaller boats (under 20 ft.) - "Strongly Support"
6)	Section III, Question 4e: Private developers build condominiums at the breakwater - "Strongly Support"
7)	Section III, Question 4j: Build boat landing near the Park St. Bridge - "Strongly Support"
8)	Section III, Question 10: Willingness to pay to improve access and facilities to encourage more tourists to visit Oconto "yes" (any amount greater than 0 - yes)
9)	Section III, Question 7i: I oppose further development of the waterfront - "Definitely Disagree"
10)	Section III, Question 7a: Remaining undeveloped lands need protection - "Definitely Disagree"

The classification of respondents into five subgroup results in a characterization of how they think about this particular issue, the Oconto waterfront. Each subgroup has a dominant perspective on the waterfront which

has been used in this report to offer some insight into how the community might respond to questions relating to the development of the waterfront.

How important is waterfront to the community? Whether the development of the waterfront is viewed from an environmental or developmental perspective it ranks as a "very important" issue for the majority, about 60 percent, of the community (TABLE 28). Even the majority of those who share a wait-and-see viewpoint placed the waterfront in the "very important" category, the highest ranking provided. The strongest support is likely to come from those who see the advantages of development and those who look for a balanced approach. Respondents who prefer the waterfront as it is, also consider the waterfront "very important" or "somewhat important", the first and second of five categories of importance. Overall, there is little controversy on the waterfront's importance to Oconto.

What part of the total waterfront should receive priority attention to serve area residents? The community agrees that Breakwater Park is the most important place to area residents. No matter how respondents view waterfront development, the majority, over 40 percent, report that Breakwater Park is the area most frequently visited (TABLE 27). The Bay shore ranks second, with about 20 percent. The Bay shore is more likely to be frequented most by those who share an environment or balanced view of development, or those who currently remain uncommitted. Holtwood Campground to the bridge comes in third, about seven percent, visited more by residents with a developmental viewpoint or residents who favor neither development nor environmental protection goals.

Should wetland regulations be eased? Its not likely that an easing of wetland regulations would gain community support (TABLE 30). Those who share an environmental perspective on this issue, as well as those who support a balance between environmental and developmental objectives, about 21 percent, favor maintaining current wetland regulations. The majority, those who favor neither environmental or developmental goals, or who refrain uncommitted, over 23 percent, remain neutral on the issue. When viewed from a developmental vantage point however, it is seen as advantageous to about six percent of area residents.

What options should be used in preserving the waterfront? One would assume that distinct differences of opinion would exist in any community when discussing options to preserve the waterfront (TABLES 31 and 35). Oconto area residents however, tend to agree on what options they prefer. Walking and biking trails are most preferred when look at from a developmental vantage point, but those who are uncommitted to waterfront development at this time, or prefer neither development nor protection, also prefer an increase in trails. Approximately 18 percent of the community favors this option. Over eight percent selected zoning as a preferred means of controlling development, primarily from an environmental or balanced growth perspective. Nesting platforms for eagles ranked high from the development viewpoint, whereas the purchase and protection of undeveloped river and Bay shoreline ranked high from an environmental or balanced growth perspective. Differences among varying viewpoints represented by the subgroups are relatively minor and inconclusive.

What options should be used in developing the waterfront? Oconto area residents would like to see trails and fishing piers made accessible to the handicapped, regardless of what option they may hold on the waterfront (TABLE 35). Handicapped accessibility was the first or second highest priority of all subgroups, providing wide-ranging community support (17 percent). Dredging of the Oconto harbor ranked second, 14.8 percent, again gaining widespread community support including support from both those who favor development goals, and those who favor environmental goals. Only those tending to prefer maintenance of the status quo failed to rank this as a high priority. The third case receiving broad support is the development of trails. It is a favorable option when viewed from an environmental or a balance perspective. Trail development was also a preferred option among those who favor neither developmental or environmental goals. Establishment and improvement of hiking and biking trails is an option preferred under both "preservation" and "development" scenarios.

The *willingness to pay* for various development/protection options also varied across groups of respondents (TABLE 32). Somewhat surprisingly, those respondents categorized as combined were willing to spend more than the other groups regardless of the option.

What the subgroup analysis has demonstrated is that despite apparent differences in perspectives the community generally is in agreement on what areas are important to area residents and what options should be used to improve the waterfront. The easing of wetland regulations is more controversial, but still the majority favor retention of exiting regulations. Should the community move forward with plans to improve the waterfront, differing viewpoint appear reconcilable.

TABLE 27

AREA MOST FREQUENTLY VISITED BY ORIENTATION

	Suzie's to Holt	Holtwood to Bridge	Bridge to Brkwatr	Brkwatr Park	Bay Shore	Wetlands
Combined	4.7%	7.0%	7.0%	48.8%	25.6%	7.0%
Develop	2.4	21.4	7.1	40.5	19.1	7.1
Environ	9.3	7.0	2.3	41.9	27.9	11.6
Neither	5.1	33.3	0.0	46.2	12.8	2.6
Noncommit	7.9	9.9	10.5	38.8	26.3	6.6

P{chi sq} = .02

TABLE 28

IMPORTANCE OF WATERFRONT BY ORIENTATION

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Neither	Not Too Important	Very Unimportant
Combined	98.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Developer	94.1	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Environment	77.2	22.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Neither	30.9	43.6	7.3	12.7	5.5
Noncommit	55.7	32.8	4.4	2.7	4.4

P{chi sq} = .000

TABLE 29

NEIGHBORS OPINION OF THE WATERFRONT'S IMPORTANCE BY ORIENTATION

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Neither	Not Too Important	Very Unimportant
Combined	54.2%	33.3%	6.3%	2.1%	4.2%
Developer	49.0	38.8	12.2	0.0	0.0
Environment	50.00	33.33	14.81	0.00	1.85
Neither	8.70	52.17	21.74	6.52	8.70
Noncommit	29.61	45.81	13.41	5.03	6.15

P{chi sq} = .000

TABLE 30

EASE WETLANDS REGULATIONS BY ORIENTATION

	Strong Favor	Favor	Neither	Oppose	Strong Oppose
Combined	13.7%	7.8%	9.8%	15.7%	52.9%
Developer	25.5	29.4	29.4	15.7	0.0
Environment	3.2	4.8	8.1	12.9	71.0
Neither	6.6	14.8	65.6	13.1	0.0
Noncommit	9.1	25.3	28.8	27.3	9.6

P{chi sq} = .000

TABLE 31

MOST PREFERRED PRESERVATION OPTION BY ORIENTATION

	Board Walk	Nests Eagles	Purc & Protct	Pass Zoning	Bike Trail	For Birds
Combined	14.6%	6.3%	18.8%	27.1%	10.4%	22.9%
Developer	22.5	22.5	6.1	10.2	26.5	12.2
Environment	7.55	20.75	22.64	33.96	3.77	11.32
Neither	25.00	22.50	7.50	12.50	25.00	7.50
Noncommit	23.27	22.01	10.06	14.47	15.09	15.09

P{chi sq} = .000

TABLE 32

WILLING TO PAY FOR PRESERVATION BY ORIENTATION

Orientation:	Average	n
Combined	\$32.32	47
Development	10.83	47
Environment	22.16	49
Neither	0	49
Noncommittal	5.98	163

WILLING TO PAY FOR WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT FOR RESIDENTS BY ORIENTATION

Orientation:	Average	n
Combined	\$32.13	48
Development	15.77	46
Environment	13.10	47
Neither	0	44
Noncommittal	7.43	159

WILLING TO PAY FOR WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT FOR TOURISTS BY ORIENTATION

Orientation:	Average	n
Combined	\$21.91	44
Development	14.06	43
Environment	9.51	45
Neither	.22	47
Noncommittal	4.45	158

TABLE 33

WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT FOR LOCALS BY ORIENTATION

	Strong Favor	Favor	Neither	Oppose	Strong Oppose
Combined	61.5%	26.9%	5.8%	3.9%	1.9%
Developer	65.4	25.0	7.7	1.9	0.0
Environment	18.0	41.0	19.7	13.1	8.2
Neither	4.7	20.6	57.1	12.7	4.8
Noncommit	9.8	45.4	27.3	8.8	8.8

P{chi sq} = .000

TABLE 34

WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT FOR TOURISTS BY ORIENTATION

	Strong Favor	Favor	Neither	Oppose	Strong Oppose
Combined	73.1%	21.2%	1.9%	0.0%	3.9%
Developer	67.3	26.9	3.9	1.9	0.0
Environment	8.3	40.0	30.0	13.3	8.3
Neither	0.0	33.9	51.6	11.3	3.2
Noncommit	8.7	47.2	25.1	10.3	8.7

P{chi sq} = .000

TABLE 35

MOST PREFERRED DEVELOPMENT OPTION BY ORIENTATION

	Breakwater Parking	Construct Restroom	Short-term Docks	Water Taxi	Build Condos	Raise Park St. Bridge
Combined	8.0%	6.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%
Developer	5.9	7.8	9.8	0.0	7.8	3.9
Environment	7.0	7.0	1.8	0.0	5.3	0.0
Neither	9.1	6.8	0.0	2.3	4.6	4.6
Noncommit	13.0	10.7	0.6	0.6	1.8	1.2

	Dredge River G	Mark River Channel	Marina for Smaller Boats	Boat Land at Bridge	Dredge Harbor	No Wake Zone
Combined	8.0	6.0	0.0	6.0	14.0	6.0
Developer	7.8	2.0	2.0	3.9	25.5	2.0
Environment	1.8	0.0	1.8	3.5	14.0	7.0
Neither	0.0	0.0	2.3	4.6	6.8	2.3
Noncommit	3.0	2.4	2.4	3.6	17.2	6.5

	Canoe Landing	Hiking Trails	Picnic Tables	Handicap Accessible
Combined	4.0	12.0	10.0	14.0
Developer	2.0	5.9	2.0	11.8
Environment	8.8	22.8	1.8	17.5
Neither	2.3	18.2	9.1	27.3
Noncommit	5.9	9.5	5.3	16.6

P{chi sq} = .035

XI: CITY AND TOWN RESIDENTS

The advisory committee recommended that the survey sample include the neighboring Towns of Oconto and Little River. A sample was selected from registered properties on the property tax roll, since no town directory existed.

There are some differences among the two sets of respondents classified by City or Town residence. Obviously home ownership varies because of the sample source for the towns. Eighty-five percent of city residents own their home while 98 percent of town residents own their home (Appendix TABLE A8). There was no difference in length of residence in the Oconto area (Appendix TABLE A9), or age (Appendix TABLE A10), or years of schooling (Appendix TABLE A11), or income (Appendix TABLE A12) between city and town respondents.

The waterfront places most frequently visited differed among the city and town residents (TABLE 36). Town residents were more likely to frequent Breakwater Park or the Bayshore north or south, or wetlands than city residents.

There was no real difference in opinions held by the city and town residents regarding the importance of the waterfront (TABLE 37). Yet, town residents are even more likely to believe their friends and neighbors hold a different, generally lower, opinion regarding the importance of the waterfront than city residents.

There is no statistical difference in their agreement about government purchase of wetlands to protect their natural state, even though town residents seemed more likely to not support the idea (TABLE 38). Town and city residents held different opinions regarding spending on the waterfront for use by residents. Town residents were more likely to be either neutral or oppose the idea. Likewise, town residents were less supportive of spending on the waterfront for tourist use, but were more inclined to be neutral about the idea rather than opposed.

On the issue of spending on the waterfront for use by local residents, there are some noticeable differences (TABLE 39). For example, 62 percent of City residents and 55 percent of Towns residents favor spending on the waterfront for use by local residents. The difference is seven percent. A similar difference is evident in those favoring spending to develop the waterfront to promote tourist spending.

A higher proportion of city residents were consistently willing to pay for the three options (TABLE 39). Likewise the average amounts city residents were willing to pay were slightly larger. The average amount city respondents were willing to pay for the various protection and development options ranged from \$3.81 more for improving to \$5.55 and \$5.60 more for purchasing wetlands or waterfront facilities for residents than were town respondents.

Respondents from both city and town locations give essentially the same pattern of responses about opening wetlands for development (Appendix TABLE A13).

TABLE 36

PLACE MOST FREQUENTLY VISITED BY RESIDENCE*

Place Most Frequently Visited	City	Towns
River between Suzie's & Holtwood	8.4%	2.9%
Holtwood to Park St. Bridge	14.9	10.6
Park St. Bridge to Breakwater	9.8	1.9
Breakwater Park	40.5	44.2
Bayshore North & South	21.4	28.8
Any wetlands	4.7	11.5
Not visited	.5	0.0
Column Total	215	104

$P\{\text{chi sq}\} = .008$

TABLE 37

IMPORTANCE OF WATERFRONT BY RESIDENCE*

Oconto Waterfront Is:	City	Towns
Very Important	68.4%	60.4%
Somewhat Important	25.1	26.1
Neither	2.3	4.5
Not Too Important	2.3	4.5
Very Unimportant	1.9	4.5
Column Total	263	134

P{chi sq} = .209

NEIGHBORS OPINION ABOUT WATERFRONT'S IMPORTANCE BY RESIDENCE*

Oconto Waterfront Is:	City	Towns
Very Important	39.0%	28.8%
Somewhat Important	42.6	41.6
Neither	12.0	16.8
Not Too Important	3.2	4.0
Very Unimportant	2.8	8.8
Column Total	251	125

P{chi sq} = .053

TABLE 38

SUPPORT FOR GOVERNMENT PURCHASING WETLANDS BY RESIDENCE

	City	Towns
Strongly Favor	26.1%	24.0%
Favor	18.8	15.1
Neither	25.7	23.3
Oppose	18.0	18.5
Strongly Oppose	11.5	19.2
Column Total	261	146

P{chi sq} = .287

SUPPORT FOR SPENDING ON WATERFRONT FOR RESIDENTS USE BY RESIDENCE

	City	Towns
Strongly Favor	25.0%	20.5%
Favor	37.3	34.2
Neither	23.6	29.4
Oppose	10.9	4.1
Strongly Oppose	3.3	11.6
Column Total	276	146

P{chi sq} = .001

SUPPORT FOR WATERFRONT SPENDING TO PROMOTE TOURIST USE BY RESIDENCE

	City	Towns
Strongly Favor	23.6%	20.7%
Favor	39.9	35.9
Neither	21.4	29.7
Oppose	11.2	3.4
Strongly Oppose	4.0	10.3
Column Total	276	145

P{chi sq} = .002

TABLE 39

WILLINGNESS TO PAY BY CITY/TOWN RESIDENCE

	City			Town		
	% Willing	Average Amount	n	% Willing	Average Amount	n
Purchase wetlands	45.8%	\$13.92	201	33.8%	\$8.37	154
Improve for residents	51.3	15.03	195	38.9	9.42	149
Improve tourism	44.9	12.04	189	29.1	8.23	148

NOTE: % willing is percent of people willing to pay more than \$ 0 over the sample total (n). Average amount is sum of all amounts (zero to \$300) over the sample total (n).

XII: DEMOGRAPHICS

The respondents do not exactly match the general population in the Oconto area, but the differences are minor.

The relatively low response from renters represents the use of tax listings to identify the sample in the Towns of Oconto and Little River. The age distributions are more similar when just the over 21 years distribution is used. Remember the survey went to households or family head.

The respondents generally had more years of formal education than the total population. This should not be too surprising given the increased likelihood that that group would respond to a survey.

While differences exist there is not obvious distortion on the income distribution between the survey respondents and general population.

As TABLE 45 indicates, the average respondent (Oconto resident) is not a member of any of the organizations identified as likely to have an interest in the waterfront. The national environmental organizations, since no local environmental organization per se exist, were used to determine Oconto residents membership in an environmental organization.

TABLE 40

OWNERSHIP OF HOME RESIDENCE
(n = 433)

Ownership of Home Residence	Survey Percent	Census Percent
Own	89.8%	75.2
Rent	10.2	24.8

TABLE 41

YEARS LIVED IN THIS RESIDENCE
(n = 433)

Years Lived in This Residence	Survey Percent	Census Percent
Less than one year	2.0%	n.a.
1 to 9 years	32.7	n.a.
10 to 19 years	25.7	n.a.
20 or more years	39.5	n.a.

TABLE 42

YEARS LIVED IN OCONTO
(n = 433)

Years Lived in Oconto	Survey Percent	Census Percent
Less than one year	.3%	n.a.
1 to 9 years	11.5	n.a.
10 to 19 years	12.1	n.a.
20 or more years	76.1	n.a.

TABLE 43

AGE OF RESPONDENTS
(n = 433)

Age	Survey Percent	Census Percent	Adjusted Census Percent*
Under 21	.5%	31.4	--
21 to 24	1.9	5.1	7.4
25 to 44	39.9	29.2	42.6
45 to 54	17.5	7.9	11.5
55 to 59	8.4	4.1	6.0
60 to 64	9.9	4.2	6.1
65 and above	21.9	18.1	26.4

*Adjusted percent is share of 21 and older.

TABLE 44

HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION COMPLETED
(n = 433)

Highest Level of Education Completed	Survey Percent	Census Percent*
Less than a high school degree	11.6%	33.2
High school graduate	53.1	42.0
Some college	21.7	11.3
College degree	13.5	13.5

*Includes only people 25 years and older.

TABLE 45

MEMBERSHIP IN ORGANIZATIONS
(n = 433)

Membership in Organizations	Number of Oconto Respondents	Percent
Oconto Yacht Club	6	1.4%
Skiing Patriots	7	1.6
Audubon Society	0	0.0
Oconto Chamber of Commerce	18	4.2
Sierra Club	0	0.0
Oconto Sportsman's Club	11	2.5
Power Squadron	1	0.2
Izaak Walton League	2	0.5
Lake Michigan Federation	4	0.9
Friends of the Earth	0	0.0
World Wildlife Federation	6	1.4
Great Lakes Cruise Club	0	0.0
Coast Guard Auxiliary Service	0	0.0

TABLE 46

EMPLOYMENT/PROPERTY OWNERSHIP*
(n = 433)

Employment/Property Ownership	Percent Responding
I am an employed person	57.7%
I am looking for employment	5.8
I am a business owner	12.0
I am retired	27.9
I own property on the waterfront	9.5
I own investment property	6.9
I work outside of the Oconto area	19.4

*Percentages does not sum to 100 because of multiple responses.

TABLE 47

TOTAL ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME*
(n = 433)

Total Annual Family Income	Survey Percent	Census Percent
Less than \$5,000	3.1%	4.7%
5,000 to 7,499	4.7	15.3
7,500 to 9,999	3.4	
10,000 to 14,999	10.6	11.3
15,000 to 19,999	11.5	11.3
20,000 to 24,999	14.2	8.4
25,000 to 34,999	27.1	41.0
35,000 to 49,999	16.8	
50,000 or more	8.7	7.7

*Percentages may not sum to 100 because of nonresponses.

APPENDIX A

TABLE A1

FREQUENCY OF USE OF WATERFRONT AREAS

Number of Waterfront Areas Visited	Percent of Oconto Respondents
1	13.0%
2	23.6
3	15.5
4	13.9
5	14.9
6	19.0

TABLE A2

OPPOSITION TO FURTHER WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT
BY NEED TO PROTECT UNDEVELOPED LANDS

Remaining undeveloped lands need protection.	I oppose further development of the waterfront.				
	Def. Agree	Probably Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Probably Disagree	Def. Disagree
Definitely Agree	44.0%	30.4%	19.5%	16.1%	34.4%
Probably Agree	20.0	34.8	35.2	38.7	39.2
Neither Agree nor Disagree	12.0	21.7	37.5	32.3	12.8
Probably Disagree	8.0	8.7	3.9	9.7	8.8
Definitely Disagree	16.0	4.3	3.9	3.2	4.8

P {Chi-Square} = .000

TABLE A3

CURRENT WETLAND REGULATIONS ARE TOO RESTRICTIVE BY LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

Length of Residence:	Agreement with Option				
	Def. Agree	Probably Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Probably Disagree	Def. Disagree
Less than 1 year	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
1 to 9 years	7.9	13.2	28.9	15.8	34.2
10 to 19 years	24.4	22.0	34.1	12.2	7.3
20 or more years	19.4	25.8	29.4	12.9	12.5
All Respondents	18.6	23.8	29.9	13.4	14.3

P{Chi-Square} = .015

TABLE A4

CURRENT WETLANDS REGULATIONS ARE TOO RESTRICTIVE BY AGE

Age Distribution:	Agreement with Option				
	Def. Agree	Probably Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Probably Disagree	Def. Disagree
under 21	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%
21 - 24			57.1	14.3	28.6
25 - 44	14.0	18.9	32.9	15.2	18.9
45 - 54	27.1	18.6	24.3	14.3	15.7
55 - 59	28.6	25.7	11.4	20.0	14.3
60 - 64	25.0	27.5	32.5	7.5	7.5
65 and over	19.4	38.8	28.4	7.5	6.0
All Respondents	19.5	23.4	29.1	13.5	14.5

Chi-Square = .013

TABLE A5

WILLINGNESS TO PAY

Number of Dollars	To Purchase & Preserve Waterfront Lands & Wetlands (n=358)	To Develop Waterfront for Residents (n=346)	To Develop Waterfront to Encourage Tourists to Visit (n=339)
0.00*	58.9%	53.8%	61.7%
0.50	0.0	.3	.3
1.00	2.8	2.3	2.1
2.00	.6	.6	.6
3.00	.8	1.2	1.2
5.00	3.6	4.9	5.6
10.00	10.9	15.0	10.9
15.00	.6	0.0	.3
20.00	4.5	2.9	2.4
25.00	5.9	6.1	5.0
30.00	.8	.6	.6
50.00	6.4	7.8	6.2
75.00	.3	.6	.3
100.00	2.2	2.9	1.2
120.00	.3	.3	.3
200.00	.3	0.0	.6
300.00	.3	.3	.3
500.00	.3	0.0	0.0
1000.00	.3	.3	.3
5000.00	0.0	0.0	.3
10000.00	.3	.3	0.0

* Only respondents who actually entered a zero (0) were counted as a zero amount willing to pay. Blanks were treated as nonresponses and not included in further analysis of average amount willing to pay.

TABLE A6a

SERIOUSNESS OF ECONOMIC PROBLEMS AND WILLINGNESS TO PURCHASE WETLANDS

Oconto Has Serious Economic Problems	Not Willing to Pay n = 185	Willing to Pay n = 138
Definitely agree	61.6%	62.3%
Agree	18.9	24.6
Neither Agree/Disagree	13.0	9.4
Disagree	2.2	1.4
Definitely Agree	4.3	2.2

P {chi sq} = .799

TABLE A6b

SERIOUSNESS OF ECONOMIC PROBLEMS AND WILLINGNESS TO INVEST IN WATERFRONT FOR OCONTO RESIDENTS

Oconto Has Serious Economic Problems	Not Willing to Pay n = 179	Willing to Pay n = 156
Definitely agree	62.6%	62.2%
Agree	19.6	23.7
Neither Agree/Disagree	10.6	11.5
Disagree	2.8	.6
Definitely Agree	2.8	.6

P {chi sq} = .947

TABLE A6c

SERIOUSNESS OF ECONOMIC PROBLEMS AND WILLINGNESS TO INVEST IN WATERFRONT TO ENCOURAGE TOURISM

Oconto Has Serious Economic Problems	Not Willing to Pay n = 194	Willing to Pay n = 122
Definitely agree	62.4%	62.3%
Agree	19.6	25.4
Neither Agree/Disagree	11.9	9.0
Disagree	1.5	.8
Definitely Agree	4.6	2.5
Column Total	194	122

P {chi sq} = .981

TABLE A7

FREQUENCY OF ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT

Environmental Issues	Frequency	Percent
None	111	25.6
One issue	87	20.1
Two issues	69	15.9
Three issues	51	11.8
Four issues	25	5.8
Five issues	31	7.2
Six issues	24	5.5
Seven issues	22	5.1
Eight issues	12	2.8
Nine issues	1	.2
Total	433	100.0

FREQUENCY OF DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT

Development Issues	Frequency	Percent
None	161	37.2
One issue	103	23.8
Two issues	68	15.7
Three issues	39	9.0
Four issues	27	6.2
Five issues	20	4.6
Six issues	6	1.4
Seven issues	3	.7
Eight issues	5	1.2
Nine issues	1	.2
TOTAL	433	100.0

TABLE A8

OWNERSHIP OF HOME RESIDENCE BY CITY AND TOWNS*

	City	Towns
Own	85.4%	98.0%
Rent	14.6%	2.0%
Total	274	148

P {chi sq} = .000

TABLE A9

YEARS LIVED IN OCONTO BY CITY AND TOWNS*

Years	City	Towns
Less than one		1.0%
1 - 9	10.3%	14.6%
10-19	12.7%	10.7%
20 or more	77.0%	73.8%
Total	252	103

P {chi sq} = .268

TABLE A10

AGE BY CITY AND TOWNS*

Age	City	Towns
Under 21	.7%	
21 to 24	2.2%	1.4%
25 to 44	40.0%	39.7%
45 to 54	16.7%	19.2%
55 to 59	8.5%	8.2%
60 to 64	8.1%	13.0%
65 and above	23.7%	18.5%
Total	270	146

P {chi sq} = .512

TABLE A11

HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION COMPLETED BY CITY AND TOWNS*

	City	Towns
Less than High School	10.4%	13.7%
High School Grad	54.1%	51.4%
Some College	21.3%	22.6%
College Grad	14.2%	12.3%
Total	268	146

P {chi sq} = .726

TABLE A12

TOTAL ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME BY HOME BY CITY AND TOWNS*

Income	City	Towns
No response	17.7%	16.6%
< \$10,000	11.3%	5.3%
\$10,000 to \$19,999	17.4%	19.9%
\$20,000 to \$34,999	33.0%	36.4
More than \$35,000	20.6%	21.9%
Total	282	151

P {chi sq} = .316

TABLE A13

OPENING WETLANDS FOR DEVELOPMENT BY CITY AND TOWN*

	Strong Favor	Favor	Neither	Oppose	Strong Oppose
City	9.24%	18.49%	28.99%	21.01%	22.27%
Town	11.89%	20%	28.65%	19.46%	20%

P {chi sq} = .877

TABLE A14

TOP THREE PREFERENCES FOR PRESERVING NATURAL FEATURES OF OCONTO WATERFRONT

	<----- Choice ----->		
	First	Second	Third
n =	349	320	298
Build Boardwalk in Marsh	19.8%	14.4%	11.3%
Build Nesting Structures	19.8	21.6	19.0
Purchase and Protect Underdeveloped Waterfront	12.3	15.0	13.0
Pass Zoning	18.3	19.7	17.3
Build Bike Trail	15.5	15.3	13.7
Purchase Wetlands for Waterfowl	14.3	13.8	25.0

TABLE A15

TOP THREE DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS FOR OCONTO WATERFRONT

	<----- Choice ----->		
	First	Second	Third
n =	371	349	332
Expand Parking at Breakwater	10.0%	5.3%	2.7%
Construct Restrooms at Breakwater	8.6	10.3	7.5
Short Term Docks at Breakwater	2.2	2.6	3.0
Water Taxi	.5	.6	1.5
Private Condos at Breakwater	3.2	2.6	1.2
Raise Park Street Bridge	2.2	.9	1.5
Dredge River	3.8	5.7	4.2
Mark River Channel	2.2	2.0	3.6
Construct Low Cost Marina for Small Boats	1.9	3.4	3.9
Boat Landing Near Park Street Bridge	4.0	5.2	6.0
Dredge Harbor	16.2	5.2	4.8
No Wake Zones	5.4	8.9	3.3
Canoe Landing at Suzie's	5.1	8.0	6.3
Hiking Trails Along River	12.4	12.6	15.4
Picnic Trails Near River	5.4	16.3	16.0
Improve Access for Handicap	17.0	10.6	18.7

TABLE A16

TOTAL POTENTIAL INVESTMENT*

Combined City and Town:				
PER CAPITA				
	pop	Ave \$/C	PV/cap	Total Invstmt
buy land	6476	\$11.52	\$191.82	\$1,242,249
residents	6476	12.60	209.81	1,358,710
tourists	6476	10.37	172.67	1,118,240
PER HOUSEHOLD				
	hshld	Ave\$/H	PV/Cap	Total Invstmt
buy land	2037	4.43	73.78	150,286
residents	2037	4.85	80.70	164,376
tourists	2037	3.99	66.41	135,284
City Only				
PER CAPITA				
	pop	Ave \$/C	PV/Hshld	Total Invstmt
buy land	4474	13.92	231.77	1,037,014
residents	4474	15.03	250.27	1,119,707
tourists	4474	12.04	200.48	896,958
PER HOUSEHOLD				
	Hshld	Ave\$/H	PV/hshld	Total Invstmt
buy land	1691	5.35	89.15	150,751
residents	1691	5.78	96.26	162,772
tourists	1691	4.63	77.11	130,391

*Assumes 6 percent and 10 year life.