

2006 SURVEY RESULTS - ANALYSIS OF "DON'T KNOW" RESPONSES TO ISSUES
For Planning Commission Special Meeting October 30, 2006

The 2006 Random Survey provides the Planning Commission with Fourteen Issues on which the Public has indicated a number of "don't know" responses.

The issues with elevated numbers may warrant further investigation and/or public information efforts such as newsletter articles.

RANK ORDER BY NUMBER OF "DON'T KNOW" ANSWERS

Column Titles

- Rank Order by Number of "Don't Know Answers".
- Survey Page Number
- Number of "Don't Know" Responses
- Township Efforts With Regard to the Issue.
- Percent Responses indicating "Very Important" or "Somewhat Important".
- Percent Responses Indicating "Excellent" or "Above Average" Township Effort
- Percent Responses Indicating "Below Average" or "Poor" Township Effort"

Rank Order	Pg. #	# of DK	Issue	% Important Very or Some	% Twp Effort E or AA	BA or P.
1	9	85	Effort - Preservation of Views from Water	61	38	20
2	14	82	Effort - Water Quality of the Bays	95	37	18
3	15	81	Effort - Noise Pollution	85	26	27
4	13	78	Effort - Light Pollution (Dark Night Sky)	78	35	25
5	14	60	Effort - Increased Traffic	88	23	42
6	10	55	Effort - Preservation of Shoreline	81	43	19
7	12	51	Effort - Sense of Community	67	30	25
8	8	49	Effort - Preservation of Scenic Views of farm/fields with no bay views	75	51	8
9	10	42	Effort - Preservation of Open Space	85	50	14
10	12	40	Effort - Preservation of Township Character	79	50	16
11	7	36	Effort - Preservation of Historic Buildings/Areas	66	59	7
12	8	35	Effort - Preservation of Scenic Bay Views	93	61	10
13	11	31	Effort - Preservation of Agricultural Land	85	61	11
14	6	28	Effort - Development	85	49	17

Gordon L. Hayward
Township Planner

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.