Policy Overview

Does Two Rivers need more retail businesses to meet customer needs that now must be met by traveling out of town?

Policy added 2017-06-15
7 opinions
151 votes

Opinions

Dorothy Tinkham Delo's opinion In favor of Yes 0 votes
How about a decent grocery store. The same item is 48 cents cheaper in Manatowoc. The local produce is horrid. Every darn store including drug stores sells beer, but there is no real ice cream shop!

Carlos Fuentes's opinion In favor of Unsure 0 votes
it would be good unless it's big box stores that put local businesses in danger.

Betty L Kuhn's opinion In favor of Yes 0 votes
What we need and what is feasible are very different things.

Bart Lewis's opinion In favor of Yes 0 votes
Yes its ok to be small town but we could use a larger business in two rivers

Sue Matczynski 's opinion In favor of Unsure 0 votes
I'm unsure of the future of retail anywhere give the increase in online shopping.

Heather Ross's opinion In favor of No 0 votes
Having recently moved into the area, this is something that has been of interest to me. For the most part, we have been able to complete all shopping needs within the city limits. Choices in family clothing, organic/"natural" foods, and building supplies are the only things that have taken us out of town to shop.
Stanley Howard Palmer's opinion *in favor of Yes* 0 votes

This is a tough one. Betty Kuhn puts it well when she says "what we need and what is feasible are very different things." Ideally, of course we'd like more stores in town. But for a town of 11,700 this is hard to pull off: the demand base is just not there, especially when there are so many choices in the adjacent city 3x larger six miles south of us. That said, it would be desirable to have small or family businesses start up and thrive in town. I'm glad, for example, that Casa Mexico took the risk to come to town; a year later, it appears to be thriving. But, really, I have no idea WHAT KIND of businesses stand a good chance of 'making it.'
### All respondents (151)

- 85%
- 10%
- 5%

### Registered Voters (116)

- 85%
- 9%
- 6%

### Abstained ()

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

## Breakdown

### Registered voters (116)

#### M (71)

- 83.1%
- 4.2%
- 12.7%

#### F (45)

- 88.9%
- 8.9%
- 2.2%

---

### Breakdown

#### Registered voters (116)

- **TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 5 (21)**
  - 85.7%
  - 4.8%
  - 9.5%
- **TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (19)**
  - 78.9%

---

Data provided by Polco
Interim Report: 2017-06-15 to 2017-07-29

Data provided by Polco
### Policy Overview

**How should the City prioritize development of affordable apartment housing for younger singles, couples, and families based on income?**

Policy added 2017-06-27  
1 opinion  
128 votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Level</th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Registered Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Opinions

**Dorothy Tinkham Delo’s opinion** *In favor of Low Priority* 0 votes

There are gazillions of low rent places but you don’t keep them up to code. NO one should be expected to pay money to rent a dirty apartment with 60 amps of electricity and lousy plumbing. Bring codes up to date and stop favoring the wealthy landlords!
### All respondents (128)

- 5% High Priority
- 30% Medium Priority
- 65% Low Priority

### Registered Voters (93)

- 5% High Priority
- 29% Medium Priority
- 66% Low Priority

### Abstained ()

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Breakdown

93 Registered voters

**M (53)**

- 5.7% High Priority
- 26.4% Medium Priority
- 67.9% Low Priority

**F (40)**

- 5% High Priority
- 32.5% Medium Priority
- 62.5% Low Priority

#### Breakdown

93 Registered voters

**TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 5 (21)**

- 9.5% High Priority
- 33.3% Medium Priority
- 57.1% Low Priority

**TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (17)**

- 0% High Priority

Data provided by Polco
### Breakdown

#### 50-59 (28)
- High Priority: 3.6%
- Medium Priority: 32.1%
- Low Priority: 64.3%

#### 60-69 (24)
- High Priority: 8.3%
- Medium Priority: 37.5%
- Low Priority: 54.2%

#### 40-49 (16)
- Medium Priority: 25%
- Low Priority: 75%

#### 30-39 (11)
- Medium Priority: 18.2%
- Low Priority: 81.8%

#### 70-79 (7)
- High Priority: 14.3%
- Medium Priority: 14.3%
- Low Priority: 71.4%

#### Unknown (4)
- Low Priority: 50%

---

Interim Report: 2017-06-27 to 2017-07-29

Data provided by Polco
### Policy Overview

**How should the City prioritize the development of new, affordable apartment housing for seniors based upon income?**

Policy added **2017-06-27**  
0 opinions  
126 votes

#### Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Level</th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Registered Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Opinions

There are no opinions.

---

**Data provided by Polco**
### Breakdown

**Two Rivers City Ward 5 (20)**
- High Priority: 5%
- Medium Priority: 70%
- Low Priority: 25%

**Two Rivers City Ward 4 (17)**
- High Priority: 5.9%
- Medium Priority: 52.9%
- Low Priority: 41.2%

**Two Rivers City Ward 1 (12)**
- High Priority: 8.3%
- Medium Priority: 75%
- Low Priority: 16.7%

**Two Rivers City Ward 3 (11)**
- High Priority: 0%
- Medium Priority: 45.5%
- Low Priority: 54.5%

**Two Rivers City Ward 6 (7)**
- High Priority: 0%
- Medium Priority: 42.9%
- Low Priority: 57.1%

**Two Rivers City Ward 2 (6)**
- High Priority: 16.7%
- Medium Priority: 50%
- Low Priority: 33.3%

**Two Rivers City Ward 8 (4)**
- High Priority: 0%
- Medium Priority: 25%
- Low Priority: 75%

**Two Rivers Town Ward 2 (3)**
- High Priority: 0%
- Medium Priority: 25%
- Low Priority: 75%
Data provided by Polco
Policy Overview

How should the City prioritize the development of new, market-rate apartment housing available for all ages?

Policy added 2017-06-27
1 opinion
135 votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Registered voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opinions

Jerry Walters's opinion In favor of Low Priority 0 votes

The more of this the more trash,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>96 Registered voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Breakdown:

- **50-59 (26)**: 11.5% High Priority, 23.1% Medium Priority, 65.4% Low Priority
- **60-69 (25)**: 20% High Priority, 32% Medium Priority, 48% Low Priority
- **40-49 (18)**: 11.1% High Priority, 22.2% Medium Priority, 66.7% Low Priority
- **30-39 (12)**: 8.3% High Priority, 8.3% Medium Priority, 83.3% Low Priority
- **70-79 (7)**: 0% High Priority, 42.9% Medium Priority, 57.1% Low Priority
- **unknown (5)**: 0% High Priority, 40% Medium Priority, 60% Low Priority

Data provided by Polco
Interim Report: 2017-06-27 to 2017-07-29

- High Priority: 0%
- Medium Priority: 33.3%
- Low Priority: 66.7%

Data provided by Polco
Policy Overview

How should we prioritize using City funds to redevelop blighted properties to make them available for private sector redevelopment?

Policy added 2017-06-27
7 opinions
159 votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Registered voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opinions

Jay Orvis's opinion *In favor of Low Priority* 2 votes
At one time businesses weren't expected to be subsidized by taxpayers.

Pat Prock Pelz's opinion *In favor of Low Priority* 0 votes
The city should not be in the loan business.

Bart Lewis's opinion *In favor of High Priority* 0 votes
We need to get our Main Street looking better with have stores clean up parking lots and clean up the facades so we have a cleaner looking Main Street.

Dorothy Tinkham Delo's opinion *In favor of High Priority* 0 votes
Run your own codes. NO cars, trucks, junk on lawns. No stupid trailers lining the roads. Demand shoveling of sidewalks. No weeds or junk on terraces including cars,etc. No junk all over yards!

James Van Lanen Sr.'s opinion *In favor of High Priority* 0 votes
The City should lead the way in investing into the property. We cannot expect a stranger to come to town without first having the trail set by the City. We should expect the City to lead the way.

Jason Krings's opinion *In favor of High Priority* 0 votes
I would include in these 'blighted' areas the former gas stations that have been vacant for decades.
brad bosar's opinion  in favor of Medium Priority 0 votes

I understand the concept but more often than not, large outside companies use these funds to set up shop, and compete against long time tax payers.
All respondents (159)

- High Priority: 45%
- Medium Priority: 43%
- Low Priority: 13%

Registered Voters (115)

- High Priority: 43%
- Medium Priority: 46%
- Low Priority: 11%

Abstained ()

Breakdown
115 Registered voters

M (63)

- High Priority: 44.4%
- Medium Priority: 42.9%
- Low Priority: 12.7%

F (52)

- High Priority: 40.4%
- Medium Priority: 50%
- Low Priority: 9.6%

Breakdown
115 Registered voters

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 5 (25)

- High Priority: 36%
- Medium Priority: 52%
- Low Priority: 12%

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (20)

- High Priority: 55%

Data provided by Polco
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 1 (16)</td>
<td>35%, 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 3 (15)</td>
<td>56.3%, 43.8%, 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 2 (7)</td>
<td>33.3%, 60%, 6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 6 (7)</td>
<td>28.6%, 42.9%, 28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 8 (6)</td>
<td>33.3%, 50%, 16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 2 (4)</td>
<td>25%, 25%, 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 1 (2)</td>
<td>0%, 100%, 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURLINGTON TOWN WARD 07 (1)</td>
<td>100%, 0%, 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALEDONIA VLG WARD 14 (1)</td>
<td>0%, 100%, 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATO TOWN WARD 2 (1)</td>
<td>100%, 0%, 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCIS CREEK VLG (1)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data provided by Polco
Breakdown
115 Registered voters

60-69 (33)
- High Priority: 51.5%
- Medium Priority: 30.3%
- Low Priority: 18.2%

50-59 (30)
- High Priority: 43.3%
- Medium Priority: 53.3%
- Low Priority: 3.3%

40-49 (21)
- High Priority: 33.3%
- Medium Priority: 57.1%
- Low Priority: 9.5%

30-39 (13)
- High Priority: 38.5%
- Medium Priority: 61.5%
- Low Priority: 0%
Interim Report: 2017-06-27 to 2017-07-29

70-79 (8)
- 37.5% High Priority
- 62.5% Medium Priority
- 0% Low Priority

18-29 (5)
- 20% High Priority
- 0% Medium Priority
- 80% Low Priority

unknown (5)
- 60% High Priority
- 40% Medium Priority
- 0% Low Priority

Data provided by Polco
Policy Overview

On a scale of high to low, how much priority should Two Rivers place on actively supporting expansion by existing businesses and industry?

Policy added 2017-06-05
6 opinions
127 votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Registered voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72% High Priority</td>
<td>73% High Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24% Medium Priority</td>
<td>23% Medium Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4% Low Priority</td>
<td>4% Low Priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opinions

Charlotte Haskins's opinion *in favor of High Priority* 0 votes
More businesses, more tax dollars, more opportunities for the youth to get jobs, better for the community.

Kim Skrzycke's opinion *in favor of Low Priority* 0 votes
It should be up to the company itself to know weather or not to expand. Not the city.

Troy J. Wilson's opinion *in favor of Medium Priority* 0 votes
The existing business is not enough to brighten the area. New businesses and variety is key to success. The sister town can not pull it up. It needs its own businesses.

Gerry Schmidt's opinion *in favor of High Priority* 0 votes
I think the businesses themselves should decide whether to expand or not, not the City of Two Rivers.

David England's opinion *in favor of High Priority* 0 votes
Expansion and development of locally-owned small-to-medium sized businesses should be our focus. Ideally, we would have an interlocking network of mutually-supporting small businesses across many sectors of the economy.

Curt Vanderstelt's opinion *in favor of High Priority* 0 votes
Do whatever possible to encourage their growth and development so they’ll stay and TR will prosper with them.
All respondents (127)

- 72% High Priority
- 24% Medium Priority
- 4% Low Priority

Registered Voters (97)

- 73% High Priority
- 23% Medium Priority
- 4% Low Priority

Abstained ()

Breakdown
97 Registered voters

M (58)

- 77.6% High Priority
- 20.7% Medium Priority
- 1.7% Low Priority

F (39)

- 66.7% High Priority
- 25.6% Medium Priority
- 7.7% Low Priority

Breakdown
97 Registered voters

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 3 (21)

- 66.7% High Priority
- 23.8% Medium Priority
- 9.5% Low Priority

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (17)

- 76.5% High Priority

Data provided by Polco
| Ward Description                  | Percentage | | | |
|----------------------------------|------------|--|--|
| TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 5 (15)     | 73.3%      | 26.7% | 0% |
| TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 1 (13)     | 69.2%      | 30.8% | 0% |
| TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 2 (8)      | 62.5%      | 37.5% | 0% |
| TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 6 (6)      | 100%       | 0%    | 0% |
| TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 8 (6)      | 66.7%      | 33.3% | 0% |
| TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 7 (3)      | 66.7%      | 33.3% | 0% |
| TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 2 (3)      | 100%       | 0%    | 0% |
| CATO TOWN WARD 2 (1)             | 100%       | 0%    | 0% |
| GREEN BAY TOWN WARD 3 (1)       | 100%       | 0%    | 0% |
| LAKE GENEVA CITY WARD 06 (1)    | 100%       | 0%    | 0% |
| MADISON CITY WARD 055 (1)       | 100%       | 0%    | 0% |
| TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 1 (1)      | 0%         |       |    |

Data provided by Polco
Interim Report: 2017-06-05 to 2017-07-29

Breakdown
97 Registered voters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>High Priority</th>
<th>Medium Priority</th>
<th>Low Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-59 (34)</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69 (21)</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 (18)</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 (10)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79 (8)</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown (4)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29 (1)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89 (1)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data provided by Polco
Policy Overview

Should City assistance for retail and commercial projects require certain standards for the exterior appearance of businesses?

Policy added 2017-06-15
3 opinions
145 votes

All Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registered voters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opinions

Heather Ross's opinion *in favor of No* 0 votes

The city should not be providing assistance at tax payer expense. Who would decide these "standards"?

Benjamin Dow's opinion *in favor of Yes* 0 votes

Businesses building or remodeling in downtown should keep the vintage look of the historical downtown. Who ever approved the Family Video building really detracted from the atmosphere of downtown.

Stanley Howard Palmer's opinion *in favor of Yes* 0 votes

This is a conditional YES. On the downtown's primary streets, Washington and Jefferson come to mind, there should be standards for physical attractiveness. Edward Hamilton's 1931 gift to the city of the "Community Center" is a beautiful Collegiate Gothic building. ("Given" during the Great Depression; just remarkable. What a collective spirit there must have been back then.) But the city is not "a homeowner's association," and I think on the secondary and tertiary streets no restrictions should be set. Personally, I believe that the new Kwik Trip building is a great addition to downtown: attractive, well kept, site of necessary food items and gas. By contrast, it is a pity that abandoned gas stations on Washington St cannot be demolished. Eyesores.
All respondents (145)

- 81%
- 14%
- 5%

Registered Voters (112)

- 80%
- 16%
- 4%

Abstained ()

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Breakdown
112 Registered voters

M (67)

- 77.6%
- 17.9%
- 4.5%

F (45)

- 84.4%
- 13.3%
- 2.2%

Breakdown
112 Registered voters

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 5 (21)

- 90.5%
- 9.5%
- 0%

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (20)

- 90%

Data provided by Polco
Policy Overview

Should the City continue to actively encourage property owner Thermo Fisher Scientific to pursue private redevelopment of former Hamilton site?

Policy added 2017-05-31
Voting ends 2017-06-18
1 opinions
54 votes

ALL RESPONDENTS: 75.9 % (41) YES 24.1 % (13) NO
Registered voters: 76.6 % (36) YES 23.4 % (11) NO
Opinions

David England's opinion FOR (0 votes):
Absolutely.
All respondents (54)

- 76% (41)
- 24% (13)

Registered Voters (47)

- 77% (36)
- 23% (11)

Abstained ()

Breakdown
47 Registered voters

M (28)
- 82.1%
- 17.9%

F (19)
- 68.4%
- 31.6%

Breakdown
47 Registered voters

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 3 (13)
- 69.2%
- 30.8%

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 5 (8)
- 75%
- 25%

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (6)
- 83.3%
- 16.7%

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 2 (5)
- 100%

Data provided by Polco
80-89 (1)

100%

0%

Yes

No
Policy Overview

Should the City invest in planned public improvements at the Hamilton site along the water's edge?

Policy added 2017-06-06
12 opinions
128 votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Registered voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% Yes</td>
<td>78% Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16% No</td>
<td>17% No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4% Not Sure</td>
<td>5% Not Sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opinions

Charlotte Haskins's opinion  In favor of No 1 vote
Sell it to a business that can promote restaurant water views or hotel water views, etc. no more public crap! We need BUSINESSES!!!

Patrick Ernst's opinion  In favor of No 1 vote
No. The city shouldn't invest any money into development until the owners of the land have a plan in place. In the short term, there are other areas of the city where that money could be spent or attention could be given. Let's not let the city government's urge to collect more tax revenue from the Hamilton site force us into a rash plan of action at the expense of other areas in the city.

Julie Freeman's opinion  In favor of Yes 0 votes
I would be more interested in the city buying the property for sale at 3000 Forest Ave. and turning it into a city run campground. The only decent campground in the immediate area is Point Beach, but it fills fast, requires a vehicle sticker, and is not on any river. We have enough "glamground". It would be nice to have another spot for those of us who prefer tent camping. Imagine the possibilities!

brian miller's opinion  In favor of Yes 0 votes
It would entirely depend on how it would be developed. If it creates income for the city, then yes. I would just be concerned it would be another park that would cost the city money to maintain. We need to be thinking of money coming in and less going out.

Betty Franz's opinion  In favor of No 0 votes
Leave it alone no more condos Manitowoc cannot fill there's
Bart Lewis's opinion  *In favor of Yes* 0 votes

Yes casinos boating. Hotel or just a boat park.

randy richards's opinion  *In favor of No* 0 votes

TR does not need another park or recreational facility usage for the Hamilton site. The waters edge can be developed in conjunction with new manufacturing or commercial or business investment at the site.

Steve Bacalzo's opinion  *In favor of No* 0 votes

Developing a river-walk & park as the planned portion of the riverfront development is acceptable. The city should not assert eminent domain or condemnation at current time to reestablish vacated streets on private property nor should a city marina compete with privately-owned marina facilities.

Anonymous user's opinion  *In favor of No* 0 votes

That property was privately owned prior to this and should continue as privately owned. What that location needs is commercial development that compliments the downtown/small town atmosphere of what is already in that area. The property should be collecting considerable taxes since it is waterfront (cities and counties that take ownership of quality TAXABLE land are simply cutting off their stream of income!). Promote the sale of the land with careful zoning to assure that it meets strict requirement to compliment and help the entire downtown area. No condo's but a nice hotel with shops convenient to downtown would be one suggestion. NO PARKS! Require that the property maintain 'Green Space' but the area has enough public tax parks to maintain.

Dorothy Tinkham Delo's opinion  *In favor of Yes* 0 votes

What a great place for a central high School! The problem is the pollution. How many cubic feet of that earth needs to go? We do not need the area to go to more wealthy high rises!

Stanley Howard Palmer's opinion  *In favor of Yes* 0 votes

Yes, the City should make "public improvements along the water's edge." For me, these would be walk/bike trails along the East Twin and the harbor front, landscaped greenways, plantings, and a small city-run marina on the East Twin north of the 17th street bridge. Absolutely develop the waterfront areas for public usage--by residents and tourists and other visitors. Behind this water frontage might be privately-developed buildings with superb water views: a beer garden, a boutique small motel/hotel (our city's population is less than 12,000) to give the Lighthouse some competition, small businesses that are 'clean' and not manufacturing in nature (these should rather be in ANOTHER part of town). In short, we need to develop and highlight what Nature has given to Two Rivers.

Curt Vanderstelt's opinion  *In favor of No* 0 votes

Please continue what has been started near the Coast Guard Station. WOW! What a great spot along the river. If that was continued along the Hamilton prop., it would be great.
All respondents (128)

- 80% (Yes)
- 16% (No)
- 4% (Not Sure)

Registered Voters (96)

- 78% (Yes)
- 17% (No)
- 5% (Not Sure)

Abstained ()

- 80%
- 16%
- 4%

Breakdown

96 Registered voters

M (54)

- 72.2% (Yes)
- 20.4% (No)
- 7.4% (Not Sure)

F (42)

- 85.7% (Yes)
- 11.9% (No)
- 2.4% (Not Sure)

Breakdown

96 Registered voters

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 3 (18)

- 66.7% (Yes)
- 27.8% (No)
- 5.6% (Not Sure)

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (16)

- 81.3% (Yes)

Data provided by Polco
Policy Overview

Should the City provide incentives for the private redevelopment of the Hamilton site and other nearby downtown waterfront properties?

Policy added 2017-05-31
5 opinions
95 votes

Opinions

Steve Bacalzo's opinion  In favor of No 1 vote
The current property owner has not expressed an interest in development at this time. Do not spend additional city resources without property owner consent.

David England's opinion  In favor of Not sure 0 votes
My support would depend to a great extent on the nature of the incentives and the nature of the development being incentivized.

Clarence Novachek's opinion  In favor of No 0 votes
I find it abhorrent that the city is using condemnation to take the strip of land along the water front present owners. This may be their best asset for future development. Also do we really need square block pattern in the entire area, if this is so important why did we not do the same in the old high school area?

Stanley Howard Palmer's opinion  In favor of Yes 0 votes
The City should provide incentives to businesses of the sort appropriate to this area. In my opinion, that would be: a boutique motel, low-rise condominiums, restaurants, classy and attractive drinking establishments, a beer garden. In short, suitable to the city's riverfront and harbor front. Views out toward Lake Michigan must be preserved. This area could be a wonderful New Downtown to complement/supplement the Old Downtown. In my opinion, one structure that already does this is the new, trim, attractive, popular Kwik Trip. :-)

All Respondents | Registered voters
---|---
66% | 64% |
Yes | Yes |
19% | 18% |
No | No |
15% | 17% |
Not sure | Not sure
brian miller's opinion  In favor of No 0 votes

Any effort towards the Hamilton property is a waste until they are ready to sell. If the city leaders believe it is such a great asset why are they not purchasing or trying to develop the areas around that property. Areas such as properties around old Eggers, Blue Goose area, Suttingers hardware, and all blocks around that area.
All respondents (95)

- Yes: 66%
- No: 19%
- Not sure: 15%

Registered Voters (76)

- Yes: 64%
- No: 18%
- Not sure: 17%

Abstained ()

Breakdown
76 Registered voters

M (42)
- Yes: 66.7%
- No: 21.4%
- Not sure: 11.9%

F (34)
- Yes: 61.8%
- No: 14.7%
- Not sure: 23.5%

Breakdown
76 Registered voters

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 3 (14)
- Yes: 64.3%
- No: 21.4%
- Not sure: 14.3%

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (14)
- Yes: 64.3%

Data provided by Polco
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Rivers City Ward 1</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Rivers City Ward 2</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Rivers City Ward 5</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Rivers City Ward 2</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Rivers City Ward 6</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Rivers City Ward 7</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Rivers City Ward 8</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Rivers Town Ward 2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cato Town Ward 2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Geneva City Ward 06</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Rivers Town Ward 1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Breakdown
76 Registered voters

50-59 (26)
- 61.5% Yes
- 11.5% No
- 26.9% Not sure

60-69 (22)
- 72.7% Yes
- 13.6% No
- 13.6% Not sure

40-49 (10)
- 50% Yes
- 30% No
- 20% Not sure

30-39 (8)
- 50% Yes
- 37.5% No
- 12.5% Not sure

70-79 (7)
- 85.7% Yes
- 14.3% No
- 0% Not sure

unknown (2)
- 100% Yes
- 0% No
- 0% Not sure

80-89 (1)
- 100% Yes
- 0% No
- 0% Not sure

Data provided by Polco
Policy Overview

Should the City recruit/encourage investment by new retail businesses, even those in direct competition with existing businesses?

Policy added 2017-06-15
8 opinions
162 votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Registered voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opinions

Dale Schnicke's opinion  In favor of No 0 votes
only if the city gives equal assistance to existing businesses, it would only be fair.

Betty L Kuhn's opinion  In favor of Yes 0 votes
fair is fair

brian miller's opinion  In favor of Yes 0 votes
Competition is part of business

Anonymous user's opinion  In favor of Yes 0 votes
Competition is what drives growth, encourages innovation and weeds out the marginal businesses that can't keep up. Strive for small businesses that are not 'chains' or Big Box stores but can compete with those types of stores with price, customer service and selection.

Heather Ross's opinion  In favor of Yes 0 votes
"Encouragement" and "recruitment" can take many forms. It is important that new entrants into the Two Rivers market NOT be given financial or structural incentives. By creating a welcoming environment through reasonable tax and regulatory environments which apply to ALL businesses, an atmosphere is created where entrepreneurship and a free market can thrive.

Stanley Howard Palmer's opinion  In favor of Yes 0 votes
I'm in favor of trying it. Competition stimulates quality and also price control. If too many such business crater and crash, then reduce the attraction to competitive businesses. Worth a try.
Pamela Wargin's opinion  in favor of Yes 0 votes

Competition breeds activity; it does not inhibit it. A Hometown Shopko would be my idea!

Bonnie Shimulunas's opinion  in favor of Unsure 0 votes

Maybe not recruit, but they should not discourage it.
All respondents (162)

- 75% [Yes]
- 15% [No]
- 10% [Unsure]

Registered Voters (120)

- 73% [Yes]
- 16% [No]
- 11% [Unsure]

Abstained ()

Breakdown
120 Registered voters

M (70)

- 71.4% [Yes]
- 17.1% [No]
- 11.4% [Unsure]

F (50)

- 76% [Yes]
- 14% [No]
- 10% [Unsure]

Breakdown
120 Registered voters

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 5 (24)

- 87.5% [Yes]
- 12.5% [No]
- 0% [Unsure]

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (21)

- 61.9% [Yes]

Data provided by Polco
Policy Overview

Should these exterior condition standards be a condition of City assistance for retail and commercial projects along the lakefront on Memorial Drive?

Policy added 2017-06-15
3 opinions
143 votes

All Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Registered voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opinions

Bart Lewis's opinion  *in favor of Yes* 0 votes

You have to be blind not to notice the dollar store and empty gas stations and how unkempt they are and in maintained.. get them to clean up or close them down..

Curt Vanderstelt's opinion  *in favor of Yes* 0 votes

That's a gateway into our community. If City funds are used they should have to maintain a standard for appearance.

Stanley Howard Palmer's opinion  *in favor of Yes* 0 votes

Absolutely, yes. As the scenic entrance to town, consider the following: spring, summer, fall there is an array of gorgeous flowers greeting those who drive south to north along Memorial Drive as they enter Two Rivers. (By contrast, Manitowoc has no such aesthetic entry. Sad.) Consider the recent buildings on Memorial: Lester Public Library, Bank 1st National, HFM Clinic (in process)--these are all very modern, very attractive buildings. The older buildings--the (old) Honeypot gift store, the Lakeview motel--are shabby by comparison. IN SUM, THERE SHOULD (HIGH) EXTERIOR STANDARDS for all new buildings to be built on Memorial Drive. Please.
All respondents (143)
- 82% Yes
- 12% No
- 6% Unsure

Registered Voters (110)
- 81% Yes
- 13% No
- 6% Unsure

Abstained
- 6%

Breakdown
110 Registered voters

M (65)
- 84.6% Yes
- 10.8% No
- 4.6% Unsure

F (45)
- 75.6% Yes
- 15.6% No
- 8.9% Unsure

Breakdown
110 Registered voters

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 5 (21)
- 85.7% Yes
- 14.3% No
- 0%

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (19)
- 89.5% Yes

Data provided by Polco
LAKE GENEVA CITY WARD 06 (1)

MISHICOT TOWN WARD 1 (1)

SHEBOYGAN CITY WARD 23 (1)

Breakdown

50-59 (33)

60-69 (29)

40-49 (19)

30-39 (12)

70-79 (9)

18-29 (4)

unknown (3)

Interim Report: 2017-06-15 to 2017-07-29
Policy Overview

Should we encourage the development of more campgrounds/RV courts?

Policy added 2017-06-15
3 opinions
89 votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Registered voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35% High Priority</td>
<td>36% High Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39% Medium Priority</td>
<td>43% Medium Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26% Low Priority</td>
<td>21% Low Priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opinions

Scott Gleichner's opinion  in favor of High Priority 0 votes
Neshota Park ball field should be redeveloped into a campground. WE have plenty of other ball fields and that location would make a perfect campground.

Kris Klein's opinion  in favor of High Priority 0 votes
Absolutely!!!! Finally a Two Rivers Campground.

Dorothy Tinkham Delo's opinion  in favor of Low Priority 0 votes
There are many many many camping places in WI. We don't need any more.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>High Priority</th>
<th>Medium Priority</th>
<th>Low Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-59 (22)</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69 (17)</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 (13)</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 (7)</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79 (5)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown (2)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89 (1)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy Overview

Should we encourage use of existing properties as vacation rentals?

Policy added 2017-06-15
2 opinions
136 votes

All Respondents | Registered voters
---|---
31% | 29%
High Priority | High Priority
46% | 46%
Medium Priority | Medium Priority
24% | 26%
Low Priority | Low Priority

Opinions

brad bosar's opinion *in favor of High Priority* 0 votes

Let's use what we have, tr beaches are top notch. Expand marina and functions and you create a demand

Chris Dee Eggert-Rosenthal's opinion *in favor of High Priority* 0 votes

I have discovered many wonderful vacation locations by using air B&B and I have also found many locations using other private rentals that were economical and also included a local host you could give me pointers on where to go. Celso that's rather new to the local area by bringing in people who spend money as long as we don't go way overboard and start taxing those who rent to death
### All respondents (136)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Registered Voters (105)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Abstained ()

- High Priority
- Medium Priority
- Low Priority

### Breakdown

#### 105 Registered voters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M (63)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (42)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Breakdown

#### 105 Registered voters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (19)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 5 (19)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interim Report: 2017-06-15 to 2017-07-29

Breakdown
105 Registered voters

50-59 (32)
- High Priority: 37.5%
- Medium Priority: 46.9%
- Low Priority: 15.6%

60-69 (28)
- High Priority: 10.7%
- Medium Priority: 53.6%
- Low Priority: 35.7%

40-49 (18)
- High Priority: 33.3%
- Medium Priority: 27.8%
- Low Priority: 38.9%

30-39 (11)
- High Priority: 27.3%
- Medium Priority: 45.5%
- Low Priority: 27.3%

70-79 (8)
- High Priority: 25%
- Medium Priority: 50%
- Low Priority: 25%

18-29 (4)
- High Priority: 50%
- Medium Priority: 50%
- Low Priority: 0%

unknown (3)
- High Priority: 0%
- Medium Priority: 0%
- Low Priority: 0%
Interim Report: 2017-06-15 to 2017-07-29

Unknown (3)
- High Priority: 33.3%
- Medium Priority: 66.7%
- Low Priority: 0%

80-89 (1)
- High Priority: 100%
- Medium Priority: 0%
- Low Priority: 0%

Data provided by Polco
Policy Overview

Should we promote sports tournaments for outside to encourage tourism?

Policy added 2017-06-15
3 opinions
136 votes

All Respondents

registered voters

61% High Priority 64% High Priority
32% Medium Priority 28% Medium Priority
7% Low Priority 8% Low Priority

Opinions

brad bosar's opinion in favor of High Priority 0 votes
This a very good way to bring in dollars to community.

Chris Dee Eggert-Rosenthal's opinion in favor of High Priority 0 votes
The Beachhouse is one example of excellent use of our beaches.

Curt Vanderstelt's opinion in favor of High Priority 0 votes
This is an excellent way to bring young families into our community. Lots of American dollars are spent on sports and travel. Building an area where multiple teams, families, etc. attend would be a great boost for businesses of all types. This would require quality hotels, too.
### All respondents (136)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Registered Voters (104)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Abstained ()

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Interim Report: 2017-06-15 to 2017-07-29**

**Breakdown**

104 Registered voters

**M (62)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F (42)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Breakdown**

104 Registered voters

**TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 5 (20)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (19)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data provided by Polco
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward Code</th>
<th>Ward Name</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 3 (17)</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.6% 5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64.7% 29.4% 5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 1 (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>69.2% 15.4% 15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62.5% 37.5% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 2 (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.5% 25% 12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25% 50% 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 6 (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.7% 0% 33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.7% 33.3% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 8 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.7% 33.3% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.7% 33.3% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 1 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.7% 33.3% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.7% 33.3% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 2 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.7% 33.3% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.7% 33.3% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATO TOWN WARD 2 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILLETT TOWN WARD 1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN BAY TOWN WARD 3 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE GENEVA CITY WARD 06 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data provided by Polco
### Breakdown

104 Registered voters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Registered Voters</th>
<th>High Priority</th>
<th>Medium Priority</th>
<th>Low Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data provided by Polco
High Priority
Medium Priority
Low Priority
Policy Overview

What priority should be placed on encouraging development of new condominium housing for younger singles, couples and families?

Policy added 2017-06-27
6 opinions
146 votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Registered voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16% High Priority</td>
<td>14% High Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35% Medium Priority</td>
<td>36% Medium Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49% Low Priority</td>
<td>50% Low Priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opinions

Nathan Schultz’s opinion  *In favor of Low Priority* 0 votes
Property values are so low in the Two Rivers area home ownership is obtainable by most. It would be of great beneficent to publicize programs for younger lower income families and get them into existing homes in the neighborhood. Local rental properties seem to be the properties that are falling into disrepair and young homeowners with pride and a vested interest could go a long way in revitalizing our community.

Rick Kenneth Juedes’s opinion  *In favor of Low Priority* 0 votes
The need for jobs in the area should be a little higher priority. Why are there no bigger businesses trying to come to our area. Just because there is housing and a ton of parks doesn't mean people want to live here. We need jobs and good paying ones not 12 an hour.

Bart Lewis’s opinion  *In favor of Low Priority* 0 votes
We needs to bring in more businesses

James Van Lanen Sr.’s opinion  *In favor of Medium Priority* 0 votes
condos for young adults will not work because we do not have the demand for this. Change the issue of providing housing for retires and there will be a demand. Go after the Chicago market where people want security, low crime, good health care and they will bring the money here to stabilize the tax base.

Curt Vanderstelt’s opinion  *In favor of High Priority* 0 votes
I was recently in the market for a home. My desire was to find a condo-ish setting. I did not find one. If I wouldn’t have found a home with a small yard I would probably have bought or rented a condo in Manitowoc. I’m really glad I found a home in TR but would have preferred a condo.
alessandra schwartz's opinion In favor of Low Priority 0 votes

there is a glut of excess housing already
All respondents (146)

- 16% High Priority
- 35% Medium Priority
- 49% Low Priority

Registered Voters (106)

- 14% High Priority
- 36% Medium Priority
- 50% Low Priority

Abstained ()

Breakdown
106 Registered voters

M (56)

- 17.9% High Priority
- 44.6% Medium Priority
- 37.5% Low Priority

F (50)

- 10% High Priority
- 56% Medium Priority
- 34% Low Priority

Breakdown
106 Registered voters

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 5 (24)

- 20.8% High Priority
- 37.5% Medium Priority
- 41.7% Low Priority

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (18)

- 11.1% High Priority

Data provided by Polco
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>High Priority</th>
<th>Low Priority</th>
<th>Medium Priority</th>
<th>Medium Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interim Report: 2017-06-27 to 2017-07-29

Breakdown
106 Registered voters

Data provided by Polco
Policy Overview

What priority should be placed on encouraging initiatives concerning the development of new condominium housing for retirees?

Policy added 2017-06-27
4 opinions
133 votes

Opinions

Stanley Howard Palmer's opinion In favor of High Priority 0 votes
A new home for retirees, a place for (summer) tourists to visit, and a site for small and medium size businesses is ‘the future’ for Two Rivers. Develop commercially on Lincoln Ave (Hwy 42) north of the High School.

Sue Matczynski’s opinion In favor of High Priority 0 votes
While I would love to see Two Rivers attract employers who will bring young families to the community, I don’t see that happening given the preference of many young families to live in more urban areas. The city may do best to promote itself as a beautiful, affordable place for retirees to live or vacation (especially during the summer and fall).

Brenda DeBruyn's opinion In favor of Medium Priority 0 votes
I have several neighbors who have retired from Chicago and other areas, buying homes for prices much more reasonably than elsewhere. They love the area, the lake, and the many opportunities for recreation and volunteerism. I think condos for retirees might be good, but a lesser priority than some other initiatives.

Curt Vanderstelt's opinion In favor of High Priority 0 votes
It seems that people want to come to TR to vacation, as well as live here. Maybe this type of development would inspire more of that?
**All respondents (133)**

- High Priority: 17%
- Medium Priority: 31%
- Low Priority: 52%

**Registered Voters (96)**

- High Priority: 16%
- Medium Priority: 30%
- Low Priority: 54%

**Abstained ()**

**Breakdown**

**96 Registered voters**

**M (54)**

- High Priority: 18.5%
- Medium Priority: 29.6%
- Low Priority: 51.9%

**F (42)**

- High Priority: 11.9%
- Medium Priority: 31%
- Low Priority: 57.1%

**Breakdown**

**96 Registered voters**

**TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 5 (22)**

- High Priority: 9.1%
- Medium Priority: 50%
- Low Priority: 40.9%

**TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (17)**

- High Priority: 17.6%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward Description</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Bar Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 1 (15)</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 3 (12)</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 6 (7)</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 2 (6)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 8 (4)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 2 (3)</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 1 (2)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURLINGTON TOWN WARD 07 (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATO TOWN WARD 2 (1)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILLET TOWN WARD 1 (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN BAY TOWN WARD 3 (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE GENEVA CITY WARD 06 (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy Overview

What priority should be placed on extending and improving the bike trail system throughout the city to connect to outside trails?

Policy added 2017-06-15
3 opinions
130 votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Registered voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opinions

brian miller's opinion  In favor of High Priority 0 votes
When Mariners Trail was constructed I thought it was a waste of money, but it is always being used. Definitely changed my mind.

Anonymous user's opinion  In favor of High Priority 0 votes
A paved bike trail to Point Beach State Park should be considered. All bikers riding road bikes have to ride on the road surface which is crap and crowded with cars passing dangerously close. The gravel trail could be paved or a secondary road path could be added along the road.

Kris Klein's opinion  In favor of Medium Priority 0 votes
Construction of a city owned Campground should be asked in this survey. This would cost very little and would be a constant revenue source not only for the city but the businesses in town.
Interim Report: 2017-06-15 to 2017-07-29

All respondents (130)
- 56%
- 31%
- 13%

Registered Voters (101)
- 53%
- 33%
- 14%

Abstained ()

Breakdown
101 Registered voters

M (58)
- 53.4%
- 31%
- 15.5%

F (43)
- 53.5%
- 34.9%
- 11.6%

Breakdown
101 Registered voters

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (19)
- 63.2%
- 31.6%
- 5.3%

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 5 (18)
- 50%

Data provided by Polco
Policy Overview

What priority should be placed on more aggressive code enforcement to address code violations and Neighborhood appearance issues?

Policy added 2017-06-27
5 opinions
152 votes

Opinions

Brian Miller's opinion  In favor of High Priority 1 vote
Majority of the people in this city work hard to keep their yards looking nice. It is a shame to see one house well kept and the neighbors full of junk.

Bruce Grossheim's opinion  In favor of Medium Priority 0 votes
I'm more interested in the development of the Lake front. In the Harbor area. I've been to Sheboygan, Port Washington, Racine, and Kenosha Harbor districts. I think Two Rivers Has a chance to jump ahead of them all, using what God gave Two Rivers The Lake Front, Lake Michigan and River Frontage. Restaurants, Lodging, Docking Slips, Bait store. Like along South Pier St in Sheboygan. Shore fishing areas. That area just up river from the Coast Guard Station is a great start. The area from the old Hamitlons Plant past the Old Eggers area. A restaurant over looking the Harbor and Lake on the corner above the old Harbor Park and lookout tower. A stairway down to river with walkway for boats to tie up for patrons. Maybe the city planners should take a road trip to check out these afore mentioned places. I bet they would love to show you around. I've been fishing out of the Two Rivers area since 1977. I moved to Mishicot when I got out of the Army in 1973. I worked in Two Rivers with the Old General Telephone Co. From the Plymouth area originally. I m semi retired I work part time for Seehafer Broadcasting at WCUB Radio, and live in Two Rivers. One of the few cities in Wis I care to live in. If it wasn't for the fishing I'd have moved on. This weekend Port Washington has Fish Days, The worlds Largest Fish Fry. With a new lakeFront Two Rivers could tie in the the Two Rivers Fish Derby and Combine an Event. Maybe Bring back the Sno fest? Thank you for your consideration.

Bart Lewis's opinion  In favor of High Priority 0 votes
We have so many trashy looking yards and homes it's a shame.
Chris Dee Eggert-Rosenthal's opinion  In favor of High Priority 0 votes

Neighborhoods with unattended property attracts not only human intruders but animals as well. This is a wonderful community and affordable we can attract more commuters from GB potentially by publicizing this fact. with todays craze for DIY and remodeling Two Rivers has a tremendous potential with great properties that are perfect for this process.

james Van Lanen's opinion  In favor of High Priority 0 votes

check 39th and Mishicot road as am example of no enforcement.
All respondents (152)

- 43% High Priority
- 39% Medium Priority
- 18% Low Priority

Registered Voters (111)

- 39% High Priority
- 43% Medium Priority
- 18% Low Priority

Abstained ()

Breakdown
111 Registered voters

M (59)

- 44.1% High Priority
- 45.8% Medium Priority
- 10.2% Low Priority

F (52)

- 32.7% High Priority
- 40.4% Medium Priority
- 26.9% Low Priority

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 5 (24)

- 37.5% High Priority
- 45.8% Medium Priority
- 16.7% Low Priority

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (18)

- 33.3% High Priority

Data provided by Polco
**Policy Overview**

**What priority should be placed on promoting and investing in the use of East and West Twin Rivers for canoeing and kayaking?**

Policy added 2017-06-15
4 opinions
135 votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Registered voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>55%</strong></td>
<td><strong>52%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>32%</strong></td>
<td><strong>34%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13%</strong></td>
<td><strong>14%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Opinions**

**Stanley Howard Palmer's opinion** *In favor of High Priority* 0 votes

Absolutely. Other towns in the state are doing this since Wisconsin is blessed with an abundance of rivers and lakes. Our town's Rotary club is supporting this project, and I hope it comes to fruition. Our town's location 'between' two rivers and on the edge of a great inland sea argue that we should 'turn back to the water,' as City Manager Buckley phrases it. Yes, support kayaking and canoeing.

**Joanne Crowley's opinion** *In favor of High Priority* 2 votes

The rivers are a hidden treasure that should be capitalized on. Other towns and cities take advantage of the valuable water resources they have.

**Christine McFadzen's opinion** *In favor of High Priority* 2 votes

Perhaps a dusk and sunrise pontoon cruises along with dinner cruises. The ideas are endless. It is a no brainer.

**Kris Klein's opinion** *In favor of High Priority* 2 votes

A city owned campground should be asked about in this survey. This would cost very little and be a consistent revenue source not only for the city, but the business owners as well.
Interim Report: 2017-06-15 to 2017-07-29

Data provided by Polco
Policy Overview

What priority should be placed on promoting "day trip" tourism - visits from those who live within an hour’s drive of Two Rivers?

Policy added 2017-06-15
1 opinion
89 votes

All Respondents  Registered voters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opinions

Stanley Howard Palmer's opinion  In favor of High Priority 0 votes

I used to have a flower bed on Mariner’s Trail, and day-trippers from Appleton and Green Bay and other nearby towns often told me how they "loved" to come to Two Rivers—just to experience Lake Michigan, its blue waters, waves and whitecaps. It makes our town a special "gem" when, once discovered, people do return.
All respondents (89)

- 65% High Priority
- 28% Medium Priority
- 7% Low Priority

Registered Voters (69)

- 65% High Priority
- 28% Medium Priority
- 7% Low Priority

Abstained ()

Breakdown
69 Registered voters

M (40)

- 65% High Priority
- 27.5% Medium Priority
- 7.5% Low Priority

F (29)

- 65.5% High Priority
- 27.6% Medium Priority
- 6.9% Low Priority

Breakdown
69 Registered voters

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (15)

- 46.7% High Priority
- 40% Medium Priority
- 13.3% Low Priority

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 3 (11)

- 72.7% High Priority

Data provided by Polco
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward/Location</th>
<th>18.2%</th>
<th>9.1%</th>
<th>45.5%</th>
<th>54.5%</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 5 (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 1 (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 6 (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 2 (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 7 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 8 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATO TOWN WARD 2 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN BAY TOWN WARD 3 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE GENEVA CITY WARD 06 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 2 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data provided by Polco
Policy Overview

What priority should be placed on promoting Two Rivers as a destination for overnight visitors?

Policy added 2017-06-15
4 opinions
97 votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Registered voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opinions

Bart Lewis's opinion  in favor of High Priority 1 vote

Let get people to see our beaches and enjoy our trails and parks and fishing.

Dorothy Tinkham Delo's opinion  in favor of Medium Priority 0 votes

We are day tripper place. What if it rains. You need a small movie place or take a factory and have a paint ball place for the kids. Get a couple more decent restaurants with real food!!! Real food! Put up HUGE signs at the center concerts: Please have the common courtesy to SHUT UP when the musicians are playing so normal people can come and hear the concerts. It’s like gossip central and why go if you can’t even hear the musicians? Have a quality control on the "crafts" that come to the Farmer's Market.

Stanley Howard Palmer's opinion  in favor of High Priority 0 votes

Promote Two Rivers, and "they" will come. Woodland Dunes, the Twin Rivers, the 1/2 mile of groomed sandy beach, the summer events, Point Beach State Forest. We already publish (with Manitowoc) a great, helpful Summer Tourist Guide. The maps alone are gorgeous. "Let's get people to see our beaches," says Bart Lewis, and I agree 100%. Seeing is believing, and "they" will return. The Mariner's Trail is a huge success: people come from Appleton and Green Bay just to walk and bike on this 6-mile "trail" along the edge of the vast inland sea. Out-of-staters find our town by curiosity and accident–perched as we are on Lake Michigan--and they oh and ah over what they've discovered.

Kris Klein's opinion  in favor of High Priority 0 votes

Build a city campground.
Interim Report: 2017-06-15 to 2017-07-29

All respondents (97)

- 63% High Priority
- 30% Medium Priority
- 7% Low Priority

Registered Voters (72)

- 61% High Priority
- 29% Medium Priority
- 10% Low Priority

Abstained ()

Breakdown

72 Registered voters

M (40)

- 57.5% High Priority
- 32.5% Medium Priority
- 10% Low Priority

F (32)

- 65.6% High Priority
- 25% Medium Priority
- 9.4% Low Priority

Breakdown

72 Registered voters

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (14)

- 71.4% High Priority
- 21.4% Medium Priority
- 7.1% Low Priority

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 1 (13)

- 76.9% High Priority

Data provided by Polco
Breakdown
72 Registered voters

50-59 (23)
- High Priority: 56.5%
- Medium Priority: 30.4%
- Low Priority: 13%

60-69 (18)
- High Priority: 66.7%
- Medium Priority: 22.2%
- Low Priority: 11.1%

40-49 (12)
- High Priority: 58.3%
- Medium Priority: 25%
- Low Priority: 16.7%

30-39 (8)
- High Priority: 37.5%
- Medium Priority: 62.5%
- Low Priority: 0%

70-79 (7)
- High Priority: 71.4%
- Medium Priority: 28.6%
- Low Priority: 0%

unknown (3)
- High Priority: 100%
- Medium Priority: 0%
- Low Priority: 0%

80-89 (1)
- High Priority: 100%
- Medium Priority: 0%
- Low Priority: 0%
Policy Overview

What priority should be placed on retail and commercial development or redevelopment of the area along Lincoln Avenue//STH 42?

Policy added 2017-06-15
2 opinions
137 votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Registered voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opinions

Dorothy Tinkham Delo's opinion *In favor of Low Priority* 0 votes
There should be a concerted effort to tighten and clean up zoning. Sticking commercial stuff in residential areas should be forbidden. Old junk like bars right in residential areas should go with the death of the current owner.

Stanley Howard Palmer's opinion *In favor of High Priority* 0 votes
I think Lincoln Ave/Hwy 42, north of the High School, should be the new commercial corridor for Two Rivers. After all, Mishicot Road (147) has no available land, I think; and Memorial Drive should be left 'natural' east of Memorial, and west of Memorial Drive authorize only buildings meeting quality exterior standards. What TYPES of businesses should go onto Hwy 42, I really don't know.
Interim Report: 2017-06-15 to 2017-07-29

Data provided by Polco

![Chart showing survey results]

**All respondents (137)**
- 27% High Priority
- 55% Medium Priority
- 18% Low Priority

**Registered Voters (107)**
- 23% High Priority
- 61% Medium Priority
- 16% Low Priority

**Abstained ()**

**Breakdown**
107 Registered voters

- **M (63)**
  - 23.8% High Priority
  - 17.5% Medium Priority
  - 58.7% Low Priority

- **F (44)**
  - 22.7% High Priority
  - 13.6% Medium Priority
  - 63.6% Low Priority

**Breakdown**
107 Registered voters

- **TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 5 (21)**
  - 28.6% High Priority
  - 14.3% Medium Priority
  - 57.1% Low Priority

- **TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (19)**
  - 21.1% High Priority
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage 1</th>
<th>Percentage 2</th>
<th>Percentage 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 3 (17)</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 1 (13)</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 2 (8)</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 6 (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 7 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 1 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 2 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURLINGTON TOWN WARD 07 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATO TOWN WARD 2 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILLET TOWN WARD 1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN BAY TOWN WARD 3 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data provided by Polco
Interim Report: 2017-06-15 to 2017-07-29

### Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>High Priority</th>
<th>Low Priority</th>
<th>Medium Priority</th>
<th>Total Registered Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data provided by Polco
Policy Overview

What priority should be placed on retail and commercial development or redevelopment of the area along Memorial Drive/STH 42?

Policy added 2017-06-15
1 opinion
140 votes

Opinions

Stanley Howard Palmer's opinion in favor of Low Priority 0 votes

Memorial Drive should be kept as a tourist treasure. Mariner's Trail, the flowerbeds, and the Lake complement each other, so keep this area as 'natural' as possible.
Interim Report: 2017-06-15 to 2017-07-29

Data provided by Polco
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 3 (18)</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 1 (13)</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 2 (8)</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 6 (8)</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 8 (5)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 7 (4)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 1 (3)</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 2 (3)</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURLINGTON TOWN WARD 07 (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATO TOWN WARD 2 (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILLET TOWN WARD 1 (1)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN BAY TOWN WARD 3 (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interim Report: 2017-06-15 to 2017-07-29

Data provided by Polco
Policy Overview

What priority should be placed on the development of new, single-family housing subdivisions?

Policy added 2017-06-27
3 opinions
139 votes

Opinions

brian miller's opinion In favor of Low Priority 1 vote
I would think there would have to be some very high paying jobs come to the area to support building new houses.

brad bosar's opinion In favor of High Priority 0 votes
Housing development needs jobs, jobs are created from within. We need to start with local government buying local from the business paying taxes. As long as the same quality and value are available.

Robert Webber's opinion In favor of Low Priority 0 votes
We have plenty of single family homes in TR. With the right new and younger owner, and great work opportunities, these older run down homes could be made beautiful again.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 1 (16)</td>
<td>23.5%  52.9%  52.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 3 (11)</td>
<td>18.2%  36.4%  45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 6 (7)</td>
<td>0%  0%  100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 2 (6)</td>
<td>16.7%  50%  33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 8 (4)</td>
<td>0%  0%  100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 2 (3)</td>
<td>33.3%  0%  66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 7 (2)</td>
<td>50%  0%  50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 1 (2)</td>
<td>0%  50%  50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURLINGTON TOWN WARD 07 (1)</td>
<td>0%  0%  100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATO TOWN WARD 2 (1)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCIS CREEK VLG (1)</td>
<td>0%  100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILLETT TOWN WARD 1 (1)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data provided by Polco
Policy Overview

What priority should the City place on investing tax funds in updating blighted properties for commercial & retail redevelopment?

Policy added 2017-06-15
2 opinions
151 votes

All Respondents | Registered voters
---|---
39% | 36%
| High Priority | High Priority
44% | 46%
| Medium Priority | Medium Priority
17% | 18%
| Low Priority | Low Priority

Opinions

brad bosar's opinion in favor of Medium Priority 0 votes
Make sure funds are offered local first

Bart Lewis's opinion in favor of Low Priority 0 votes
Theses are owned by someone have them fix them up or tear them down for something worth while.
All respondents (151)

- 39% High Priority
- 44% Medium Priority
- 17% Low Priority

Registered Voters (115)

- 36% High Priority
- 46% Medium Priority
- 18% Low Priority

Abstained ()

Breakdown
115 Registered voters

M (69)

- 37.7% High Priority
- 15.9% Medium Priority
- 46.4% Low Priority

F (46)

- 32.6% High Priority
- 21.7% Medium Priority
- 45.7% Low Priority

Breakdown
115 Registered voters

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 5 (21)

- 33.3% High Priority
- 19% Medium Priority
- 47.6% Low Priority

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (20)

- 50% High Priority

Data provided by Polco
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Percentage Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 3 (18)</td>
<td>25% 25% 44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 1 (13)</td>
<td>30.8% 15.4% 53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 2 (9)</td>
<td>22.2% 0% 77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 6 (9)</td>
<td>22.2% 22.2% 55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 8 (7)</td>
<td>57.1% 28.6% 14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 7 (4)</td>
<td>0% 50% 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 1 (3)</td>
<td>66.7% 0% 33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 2 (3)</td>
<td>33.3% 0% 66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILLET TOWN WARD 1 (2)</td>
<td>50% 0% 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURLINGTON TOWN WARD 07 (1)</td>
<td>0% 0% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATO TOWN WARD 2 (1)</td>
<td>0% 100% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN BAY TOWN WARD 3 (1)</td>
<td>0% 100% 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy Overview

Would a City Facebook page be an effective means of communicating with your household about local economic development issues?

Policy added 2017-06-27
1 opinion
130 votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Registered voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72% Yes</td>
<td>74% Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16% No</td>
<td>17% No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12% Not Sure</td>
<td>9% Not Sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opinions

Dorothy Tinkham Delo’s opinion *In favor of Not Sure* 0 votes

Only having commuters for information is both age discrimination and discriminatory to poorer families. Everything on computer should be available in print or on a phone line.
All respondents (130)

- Yes: 72%
- No: 16%
- Not Sure: 12%

Registered Voters (95)

- Yes: 74%
- No: 17%
- Not Sure: 9%

Abstained ()

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure

Breakdown
95 Registered voters

M (54)

- Yes: 79.6%
- No: 13%
- Not Sure: 7.4%

F (41)

- Yes: 65.9%
- No: 22%
- Not Sure: 12.2%

Breakdown
95 Registered voters

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 5 (21)

- Yes: 85.7%
- No: 14.3%
- Not Sure: 0%

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (18)

- Yes: 66.7%

Data provided by Polco
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward Description</th>
<th>Percentage分布</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 3 (13)</td>
<td>27.8% 5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 1 (11)</td>
<td>72.7% 18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 6 (7)</td>
<td>71.4% 14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 2 (5)</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 8 (5)</td>
<td>40% 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 2 (3)</td>
<td>66.7% 33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 7 (2)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 1 (2)</td>
<td>50% 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURLINGTON TOWN WARD 07 (1)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALEDONIA VLG WARD 14 (1)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATO TOWN WARD 2 (1)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILLET TOWN WARD 1 (1)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data provided by Polco
Policy Overview

Would a City Newspaper be an effective means of communicating with your household about local economic development issues?

Policy added 2017-06-27
3 opinions
129 votes

All Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Registered voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34% Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>57% No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>9% Not Sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opinions

Stanley Howard Palmer's opinion  in favor of No 0 votes
Manitowoc's Herald Times Reporter prints Two Rivers' news now. The days are long gone that our city can afford to sell/maintain a city newspaper.

Bart Lewis's opinion  in favor of Yes 0 votes
Home town news share community sales events. Be a good idea to have a newspaper

Curt Vanderstelt's opinion  in favor of Yes 0 votes
I would love that! Maybe TR could learn some tricks from what they're doing in Denmark with their local paper?
All respondents (129)

35%  
54%  
11%

Registered Voters (95)

34%  
57%  
9%

Abstained ()

Yes  
No  
Not Sure

Breakdown
95 Registered voters

M (55)
23.6%  
7.3%  
69.1%

F (40)
47.5%  
12.5%  
40%

Breakdown
95 Registered voters

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 5 (21)
28.6%  
4.8%  
66.7%

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (18)
27.8%

Data provided by Polco
Interim Report: 2017-06-27 to 2017-07-29

Breakdown
95 Registered voters

50-59 (27)
- Yes: 25.9%
- Not Sure: 7.4%
- No: 66.7%

60-69 (26)
- Yes: 53.8%
- Not Sure: 7.7%
- No: 38.5%

40-49 (17)
- Yes: 23.5%
- Not Sure: 17.6%
- No: 58.8%

30-39 (11)
- Yes: 18.2%
- Not Sure: 9.1%
- No: 72.7%

70-79 (8)
- Yes: 50%
- Not Sure: 0%
- No: 50%

18-29 (3)
- Yes: 33.3%
- Not Sure: 0%
- No: 66.7%

unknown (3)
- Yes: 50%
- Not Sure: 0%
- No: 50%
Policy Overview

Would a City Website be an effective means of communicating with your household about local economic development issues?

Policy added 2017-06-27
3 opinions
131 votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Registered voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66% Yes</td>
<td>64% Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18% No</td>
<td>17% No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17% Not Sure</td>
<td>19% Not Sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opinions

Brenda DeBruyn's opinion *In favor of Not Sure* 0 votes
I get most of my news about the city via the newspaper and on the street. It takes time to “fire up” the computer and search out info on the website.

E.samuel Samuel Ramirez's opinion *In favor of Yes* 0 votes
A website is effective but it is only one tool.

Curt Vanderstelt's opinion *In favor of Yes* 0 votes
Please DON’T count on the HTR to be a source of information. I'd prefer something on paper but I'm afraid that day has come and gone. I think the City will need to promote itself and be it's own information source. A website generated by social media may be the best form of communication (sadly).
All respondents (131)

- 66%
- 18%
- 17%

Registered Voters (94)

- 64%
- 17%
- 19%

Abstained ()

Breakdown
94 Registered voters

M (54)

- 66.7%
- 16.7%
- 16.7%

F (40)

- 60%
- 22.5%
- 17.5%

Data provided by Polco
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward Description</th>
<th>Percentage Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 3 (13)</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 1 (11)</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 6 (7)</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 2 (5)</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 8 (5)</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 2 (3)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 7 (2)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 1 (2)</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURLINGTON TOWN WARD 07 (1)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATO TOWN WARD 2 (1)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILLET TOWN WARD 1 (1)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN BAY TOWN WARD 3 (1)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy Overview

Would you be willing to pay a nominal extra amount in property taxes if the funds were used for economic development purposes?

Policy added 2017-06-27
3 opinions
135 votes

ALL RESPONDENTS:

64.4 % (87) YES 35.6 % (48) NO

Registered voters:

59.6 % (59) YES 40.4 % (40) NO
Opinions

**Stanley Howard Palmer's opinion FOR** (0 votes):
Depends on one's definition of nominal. But nothing's free. And citizens should be expected/willing to pitch in. Great oaks grow from acorns.

**Bonnie Shimulunas's opinion FOR** (0 votes):
Only if the money goes for true development, such as loans for businesses, start-up or existing,...improving infrastructure etc. NOT for building apartment complexes. So far, this survey is all about grouping people together according to classification....poor, single, old. Why can't people have freedom to live where they want throughout the community? I believe it is for this reason: if you build complexes, the federal government will give grants to the people building. and of course, it does not matter if there is a need for it or not, it will get built. How can the builder lose if he gets grants as opposed to loans?

**Nathan Schultz's opinion AGAINST** (1 vote):
We have an alarmingly high tax rate for the area already. Any developments that bring jobs wouldn't necessarily bring residents when they can live north, south or west of the city and pay lower taxes in communities with better schools. I would let cities closer to the interstate focus on sustainable development and use those funds to make Two Rivers a top tier residential community.
All respondents (135)

- 64% (87) Yes
- 36% (48) No

Registered Voters (99)

- 60% (59) Yes
- 40% (40) No

Abstained ()

Breakdown
99 Registered voters

M (57)

- 57.9% Yes
- 42.1% No

F (42)

- 61.9% Yes
- 38.1% No

Breakdown
99 Registered voters

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 5 (21)

- 61.9% Yes
- 38.1% No

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (19)

- 47.4% Yes
- 52.6% No

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 3 (14)

- 50% Yes
- 50% No

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 1 (12)

- 91.7% Yes
- 8.3% No

Data provided by Polco
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-59 (28)</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69 (27)</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 (18)</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 (11)</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79 (8)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29 (4)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown (3)</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy Overview

Would you be willing to serve on a citizen committee to assist with economic development of our City?

Policy added 2017-06-27
3 opinions
133 votes

ALL RESPONDENTS: 57.9 % (77) YES 42.1 % (56) NO
Registered voters: 54.6 % (53) YES 45.4 % (44) NO
Opinions

**Chris Dee Eggert-Rosenthal's** opinion **FOR** (0 votes):
This is important work and we need a good representation of people who look for benefit to Two Rivers and not themselves or other special interests.

**Judy Goodchild's** opinion **AGAINST** (0 votes):
Not at this time.

**Sarah Gallagher's** opinion **AGAINST** (0 votes):
Not at this time.
**All respondents (133)**

- 58% (77)
- 42% (56)

**Registered Voters (97)**

- 55% (53)
- 45% (44)

**Abstained ()**

- Yes
- No

### Breakdown

**Registered voters**

- **M (53)**
  - 67.9%
  - 32.1%

- **F (44)**
  - 38.6%
  - 61.4%

**TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 5 (21)**

- 47.6%
- 52.4%

**TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (18)**

- 50%
- 50%

**TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 3 (15)**

- 40%
- 60%

**TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 1 (11)**

- 90.9%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward/Location</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 6 (7)</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 2 (6)</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 8 (4)</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 2 (3)</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 7 (3)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 1 (2)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATO TOWN WARD 2 (1)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN BAY TOWN WARD 3 (1)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE GENEVA CITY WARD 06 (1)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHEBOYGAN CITY WARD 23 (1)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURLINGTON TOWN WARD 07 (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILLET TOWN WARD 1 (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISHICOT TOWN WARD 1 (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Breakdown

97 Registered voters

Data provided by Polco
Policy Overview

Does Two Rivers need more retail businesses to meet customer needs that now must be met by traveling out of town?

Policy added 2017-06-15
7 opinions
151 votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Registered voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85% Yes</td>
<td>85% Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9% No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>6% Unsure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opinions

Dorothy Tinkham Delo’s opinion in favor of Yes 0 votes
How about a decent grocery store. The same item is 48 cents cheaper in Manatowoc. The local produce is horrid. Every darn store including drug stores sells beer, but there is no real ice cream shop!

Carlos Fuentes’s opinion in favor of Unsure 0 votes
it would be good unless it’s big box stores that put local businesses in danger.

Betty L Kuhn’s opinion in favor of Yes 0 votes
What we need and what is feasible are very different things.

Bart Lewis’s opinion in favor of Yes 0 votes
Yes its ok to be small town but we could use a larger business in two rivers

Sue Matczynski ’s opinion in favor of Unsure 0 votes
I’m unsure of the future of retail anywhere give the increase in online shopping.

Heather Ross’s opinion in favor of No 0 votes
Having recently moved into the area, this is something that has been of interest to me. For the most part, we have been able to complete all shopping needs within the city limits. Choices in family clothing, organic/"natural" foods, and building supplies are the only things that have taken us out of town to shop.
Stanley Howard Palmer's opinion *in favor of Yes* 0 votes

This is a tough one. Betty Kuhn puts it well when she says “what we need and what is feasible are very different things.” Ideally, of course we’d like more stores in town. But for a town of 11,700 this is hard to pull off: the demand base is just not there, especially when there are so many choices in the adjacent city 3x larger six miles south of us. That said, it would be desirable to have small or family businesses start up and thrive in town. I’m glad, for example, that Casa Mexico took the risk to come to town; a year later, it appears to be thriving. But, really, I have no idea WHAT KIND of businesses stand a good chance of ‘making it.’
All respondents (151)

- 85% Yes
- 10% No
- 5% Unsure

Registered Voters (116)

- 85% Yes
- 9% No
- 6% Unsure

Abstained ()

Breakdown
116 Registered voters

M (71)

- 83.1% Yes
- 4.2% No
- 12.7% Unsure

F (45)

- 88.9% Yes
- 8.9% No
- 2.2% Unsure

Breakdown
116 Registered voters

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 5 (21)

- 85.7% Yes
- 4.8% No
- 9.5% Unsure

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (19)

- 78.9% Yes

Data provided by Polco
Policy Overview

How should the City prioritize development of affordable apartment housing for younger singles, couples, and families based on income?

Policy added 2017-06-27
1 opinion
128 votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Registered voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opinions

Dorothy Tinkham Delo's opinion *In favor of Low Priority* 0 votes

There are gazilions of low rent places but you don't keep them up to code. NO one should be expected to pay money to rent a dirty apartment with 60 amps of electricity and lousy plumbing. Bring codes up to date and stop favoring the wealthy landlords!
All respondents (128)

- 5% High Priority
- 30% Medium Priority
- 65% Low Priority

Registered Voters (93)

- 5% High Priority
- 29% Medium Priority
- 66% Low Priority

Abstained ()

Breakdown

93 Registered voters

M (53)

- 5.7% High Priority
- 26.4% Medium Priority
- 67.9% Low Priority

F (40)

- 5% High Priority
- 32.5% Medium Priority
- 62.5% Low Priority

Breakdown

93 Registered voters

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 5 (21)

- 9.5% High Priority
- 33.3% Medium Priority
- 57.1% Low Priority

TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (17)

- 0% High Priority

Data provided by Polco
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward Description</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 1 (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 2 (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 3 (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 6 (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 8 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 2 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 1 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURLINGTON TOWN WARD 07 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATO TOWN WARD 2 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILLET TOWN WARD 1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN BAY TOWN WARD 3 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE GENEVA CITY WARD 06 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data provided by Polco
High Priority
Medium Priority
Low Priority

Interim Report: 2017-06-27 to 2017-07-29

33.3% High Priority
0% Medium Priority
66.7% Low Priority

Data provided by Polco
Policy Overview

How should the City prioritize the development of new, affordable apartment housing for seniors based upon income?

Policy added 2017-06-27
0 opinions
126 votes

Opinions

There are no opinions.

All respondents (126)

8% High Priority
52% Medium Priority
40% Low Priority

Registered Voters (90)

6% High Priority
54% Medium Priority
40% Low Priority

Abstained ()
### Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Number of Voters</th>
<th>High Priority</th>
<th>Medium Priority</th>
<th>Low Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 5 (20)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 4 (17)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 1 (12)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 3 (11)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 6 (7)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 2 (6)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 8 (4)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 2 (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data provided by Polco
Interim Report: 2017-06-27 to 2017-07-29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township/Ward</th>
<th>Breakdown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS TOWN WARD 1 (2)</td>
<td>0% 33.3% 66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURLINGTON TOWN WARD 07 (1)</td>
<td>0% 100% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATO TOWN WARD 2 (1)</td>
<td>0% 100% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILLET TOWN WARD 1 (1)</td>
<td>0% 100% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN BAY TOWN WARD 3 (1)</td>
<td>0% 0% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE GENEVA CITY WARD 06 (1)</td>
<td>0% 0% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISHICOT TOWN WARD 1 (1)</td>
<td>0% 100% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHEBOYGAN CITY WARD 23 (1)</td>
<td>0% 0% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO RIVERS CITY WARD 7 (1)</td>
<td>100% 0% 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Breakdown
90 Registered voters

Data provided by Polco
### Question 1

**Overall, how do you feel about the use of Polco for our municipal feedback and economic development survey questions?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Tinkham Delo's comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel better if I thought you listened to real people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Van Lanen's comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's fast and efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Bittner's comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Franzen's comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like that we are able to give input into city planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous user's comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no different then other survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Cleveland's comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it's great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous user's comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoyed using it and found it a breeze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony R Karbowski's comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great! The more that the public has a chance for input the better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Samuel Samuel Ramirez's comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great. I hope they reaching a large percentage of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Crowley's comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the fact that I have a forum to voice my opinion regarding potential ideas for municipal and economic development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Data provided by Polco
David Alan Glesner's comment
I feel it is good that the city is getting the feedback from everyone to make informed decisions.

Sue Kaminsky's comment
i liked it alot.

Anonymous user's comment
Good

Anonymous user's comment
I like it

Chris Dee Eggert-Rosenthal's comment
I think it is a great idea and allows feedback from a wide variety of citizens.

Rick Kenneth Juedes's comment
I think it is a good idea. I honestly thought out was a scam though the first time I saw it. Now having done it i hope you post more questions on it about a lot bigger and more important issues.

Anonymous user's comment
It is an excellent resource if the responses are seen as valuable and a pulse of the community. Often times polls are skewed to produce the desired result.

Eric Jon Scola's comment
I think it was a very good idea, just have to get more people involved with the system now.

Anonymous user's comment
It's ok if you have a computer. I'm glad I do because I want my voice to be heard.

Karen Aasen's comment
Easy to navigate; few questions on multiple occasions worked well for me.

Dan Pawlitcke's comment
ok. There should be an explanation process on "how-to-use" the survey.

Anonymous user's comment
I like the idea of an online feedback system but polco seems clunky and has some issues with repeat questions and recording responses. Perhaps the polco app is better.

LuAnn Myers's comment
It has the potential of being a very helpful tool.

Trudy LeClair's comment
they are fine, glad to hear you are seeking community input. Would like to believe some input is discussed at your monthly meetings.

Clarence James Novachek's comment
Question 2

Did you find it easy to navigate and complete our questions on Polco?

All respondents (30)

80% (24)
20% (6)

Registered Voters (24)

83% (20)
17% (4)

Abstained (0)

C Hamburg's comment
It was easy to use and seemed pretty efficient.

Sarah Gallagher's comment
Good idea!

Anonymous user's comment
Great idea!

Steve Bacalzo's comment
I think it is a great mechanism for obtaining input in a timely manner and for ensuring one voice per constituent.

Vic Murauskas's comment
Positive.
Did you feel that the questions were fair and not misleading?

All respondents (30)
- 93% (28)
- 7% (2)

Registered Voters (24)
- 92% (22)
- 8% (2)

Abstained (0)

Question 4
Do you think the questions were asked in a proper format: High - Medium - Low Priority?

All respondents (30)
- 90% (27)
- 10% (3)

Registered Voters (24)
- 92% (22)
- 8% (2)

Abstained (0)
### Do you think the questions were asked at a proper frequency (every 10 to 14 days)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>All respondents (30)</th>
<th>Registered Voters (24)</th>
<th>Abstained (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>No, not asked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Yes, the questions were asked at an appropriate frequency
- No, the questions were asked too frequently
- No, the questions were not asked frequently enough

### Question 6

**Do you think there were an appropriate number of questions asked each batch (8 to 12 questions)?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>All respondents (30)</th>
<th>Registered Voters (24)</th>
<th>Abstained (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>No, not asked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Yes, the questions were asked at an appropriate frequency
- No, the questions were asked too frequently
- No, the questions were not asked frequently enough

Data provided by Polco
Question 7

Reflecting on your experience, what do you feel needs to be improved about the process?

Dorothy Tinkham Delo's comment
I can't get in to answer your questions, Yes and No sit there.

James Van Lanen's comment
Maybe more time to think each question in more detail.

Mark Bittner's comment
Ask questions which can actually be achieved by reference subject

Jim Franzen's comment
~

Anonymous user's comment
seemed like some of the questions asked the same thing just in a different matter.

Karen Cleveland's comment
I can't think of anything.

Anonymous user's comment
more questions of different topics

Anthony R Karbowski's comment
Keep 'em coming -- I know that the purpose of this survey was development -- would like to see a survey about parks & rec. ie: Neshotah park - optimizing utilization potential - shelters - cleaning deadwood from the park woods -- shelters & concessions -- cleanup of "rock city" area w/shelter added and signage indicating its origin.

E. Samuel Samuel Ramirez's comment
Less questions more often so dialogue and thought can be placed on each answer. I know i glossed over some of the answers and comments ad i did not choose or have the immediate time available to be diligent and thorough in the response

Joanne Crowley's comment
It would be helpful to add a little more background to some of the questions so there is more context to the what's and why's of the questions.
why's of the questions.

David Alan Glesner's comment
Sometimes it was hard to find where the survey left off from the previous questions.

Sue Kaminsky's comment
nothing

Anonymous user's comment
Nothing

Anonymous user's comment
The login process

Chris Dee Eggert-Rosenthal's comment
perhaps more publicity for everyone to learn about the process

Rick Kenneth Juedes's comment
It seemed like I was answering the same question a couple times but worded differently. Also if you made people know you are doing this out may get better results. The first time I saw it I thought out was spam.

Anonymous user's comment
N/A

Eric Jon Scola's comment
get the questions out to a larger part of the community

Anonymous user's comment
It's too soon for me to tell. If I have a problem with the next set of questions, I will be sure to write it down so I can relate it to you when the time comes.

Karen Aasen's comment
No suggestions.

Dan Pawlitzke's comment
see above

Anonymous user's comment
Polco interface, response recording and submission is glitchy and duplicate questions.

LuAnn Myers's comment
n/a

Trudy LeClair's comment
Maybe survey events or activities right after they happen as a form of reflection and improvement process for the following year.
Question 8

Would you be willing to help Two Rivers again?

All respondents (30)

- 83%
- 0%
- 13%
- 3%
- 0%

Registered Voters (24)

- 88%
- 0%
- 13%
- 0%
- 0%

Abstained (0)

Clarence James Novachek's comment
The process and format were in my opinion good.

C Hamburg's comment
Not sure a computer survey is representative of TR's population; older folks are less likely to fill out a computer survey.

Sarah Gallagher's comment
All was fine

Anonymous user's comment
can not think of anything

Steve Bacalzo's comment
It was difficult to see that my input (both "votes" and comments) actually registered. If there was a form of confirmation, then I missed it.

Vic Murauskas's comment
This is the 3rd time I have answered these same questions!?
Question 9

How likely are you to recommend Two Rivers’ questions to a friend?

**All respondents (30)**

- Very unlikely: 3%
- Unlikely: 10%
- Likely: 27%
- Very likely: 27%
- I have already recommended Two Rivers’ questions to a friend: 33%

**Registered Voters (24)**

- Very unlikely: 0%
- Unlikely: 8%
- Likely: 25%
- Very likely: 33%
- I have already recommended Two Rivers’ questions to a friend: 33%

**Abstained (0)**
Executive Summary

1717 E Park St, Two Rivers, Wisconsin, 54241
Drive Time: 5, 10, 15 minute radii

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>5 minutes</th>
<th>10 minutes</th>
<th>15 minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000 Population</td>
<td>8,695</td>
<td>15,896</td>
<td>35,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Population</td>
<td>8,031</td>
<td>14,978</td>
<td>34,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Population</td>
<td>8,015</td>
<td>14,937</td>
<td>33,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 Population</td>
<td>7,988</td>
<td>14,867</td>
<td>33,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2010 Annual Rate</td>
<td>-0.79%</td>
<td>-0.59%</td>
<td>-0.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2016 Annual Rate</td>
<td>-0.03%</td>
<td>-0.04%</td>
<td>-0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2021 Annual Rate</td>
<td>-0.07%</td>
<td>-0.09%</td>
<td>-0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Male Population</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Female Population</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Median Age</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the identified area, the current year population is 33,925. In 2010, the Census count in the area was 34,099. The rate of change since 2010 was -0.08% annually. The five-year projection for the population in the area is 33,703 representing a change of -0.13% annually from 2016 to 2021. Currently, the population is 49.6% male and 50.4% female.

Median Age

The median age in this area is 42.2, compared to U.S. median age of 38.0.

Race and Ethnicity

Persons of Hispanic origin represent 4.2% of the population in the identified area compared to 17.9% of the U.S. population. Persons of Hispanic Origin may be of any race. The Diversity Index, which measures the probability that two people from the same area will be from different race/ethnic groups, is 22.1 in the identified area, compared to 63.5 for the U.S. as a whole.

Households

The household count in this area has changed from 14,980 in 2010 to 15,076 in the current year, a change of 0.10% annually. The five-year projection of households is 15,067, a change of -0.01% annually from the current year total. Average household size is currently 2.23, compared to 2.26 in the year 2010. The number of families in the current year is 9,133 in the specified area.

---

Data Note: Income is expressed in current dollars
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Executive Summary

1717 E Park St, Two Rivers, Wisconsin, 54241
Drive Time: 5, 10, 15 minute radii

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
<th>5 minutes</th>
<th>10 minutes</th>
<th>15 minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 Median Household Income</td>
<td>$43,818</td>
<td>$44,971</td>
<td>$45,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 Median Household Income</td>
<td>$48,246</td>
<td>$50,238</td>
<td>$51,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2021 Annual Rate</td>
<td>1.94%</td>
<td>2.24%</td>
<td>2.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Household Income</th>
<th>5 minutes</th>
<th>10 minutes</th>
<th>15 minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 Average Household Income</td>
<td>$53,273</td>
<td>$56,637</td>
<td>$59,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 Average Household Income</td>
<td>$57,063</td>
<td>$61,131</td>
<td>$64,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2021 Annual Rate</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Capita Income</th>
<th>5 minutes</th>
<th>10 minutes</th>
<th>15 minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 Per Capita Income</td>
<td>$23,615</td>
<td>$25,535</td>
<td>$26,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 Per Capita Income</td>
<td>$25,445</td>
<td>$27,747</td>
<td>$28,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2021 Annual Rate</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>1.66%</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households by Income</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current median household income</td>
<td>$45,714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compared to $54,149 for all U.S.</td>
<td>$51,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current average household income</td>
<td>$59,588</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compared to $77,008 for all U.S.</td>
<td>$64,802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current per capita income</td>
<td>$26,371</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compared to the U.S. per capita</td>
<td>$28,839</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income of $29,472. The per capita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income is projected to be $28,839</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in five years, compared to $32,025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for all U.S. households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000 Total Housing Units</td>
<td>3,854</td>
<td>7,046</td>
<td>15,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Owner Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>2,577</td>
<td>4,791</td>
<td>10,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Renter Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>4,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Vacant Housing Units</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Total Housing Units</td>
<td>3,946</td>
<td>7,333</td>
<td>16,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Owner Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>2,461</td>
<td>4,693</td>
<td>10,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Renter Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>1,927</td>
<td>4,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Vacant Housing Units</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>1,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Total Housing Units</td>
<td>4,051</td>
<td>7,502</td>
<td>16,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Owner Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>2,405</td>
<td>4,589</td>
<td>10,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Renter Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>2,104</td>
<td>4,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Vacant Housing Units</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>1,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 Total Housing Units</td>
<td>4,112</td>
<td>7,599</td>
<td>16,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 Owner Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>2,405</td>
<td>4,590</td>
<td>10,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 Renter Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>2,117</td>
<td>4,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 Vacant Housing Units</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>1,782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Currently, 61.4% of the 16,721 housing units in the area are owner occupied; 28.8%, renter occupied; and 9.8% are vacant. Currently, in the U.S., 55.4% of the housing units in the area are owner occupied; 32.9% are renter occupied; and 11.7% are vacant. In 2010, there were 16,486 housing units in the area - 63.8% owner occupied, 27.1% renter occupied, and 9.1% vacant. The annual rate of change in housing units since 2010 is 0.63%. Median home value in the area is $115,617, compared to a median home value of $198,891 for the U.S. In five years, median value is projected to change by 4.13% annually to $141,539.

Data Note: Income is expressed in current dollars
LifeMode Group: Cozy Country Living
Heartland Communities

Households: 2,864,000
Average Household Size: 2.38
Median Age: 41.5
Median Household Income: $39,000

WHO ARE WE?
Well settled and close-knit, Heartland Communities are semirural and semiretired. These older householders are primarily homeowners, and many have paid off their mortgages. Their children have moved away, but they have no plans to leave their homes. Their hearts are with the country; they embrace the slower pace of life here but actively participate in outdoor activities and community events. Traditional and patriotic, these residents support their local businesses, always buy American, and favor domestic driving vacations over foreign plane trips.

OUR NEIGHBORHOOD
• Rural communities or small towns are concentrated in the Midwest, from older Rustbelt cities to the Great Plains.
• Distribution of household types is comparable to the US, primarily (but not the majority) married couples, more with no children, and a slightly higher proportion of singles (Index 112) that reflects the aging of the population.
• Residents own modest, single-family homes built before 1970.
• They own one or two vehicles; commutes are short (Index 95).

SOCIOECONOMIC TRAITS
• Retirees in this market depress the average labor force participation rate to less than 60% (Index 95), but the unemployment rate is comparable to the US.
• More workers are white collar than blue collar; more skilled than unskilled.
• The rural economy of this market provides employment in the manufacturing, construction, and agriculture industries.
• These are budget savvy consumers; they stick to brands they grew up with and know the price of goods they purchase. Buying American is important.
• Daily life is busy, but routine. Working on the weekends is not uncommon.
• Residents trust TV and newspapers more than any other media.
• Skeptical about their financial future, they stick to community banks and low-risk investments.

Note: The Index represents the ratio of the segment rate to the US rate multiplied by 100. Consumer preferences are estimated from data by GfK MRI.
**AGE BY SEX** (Esri data)

**Median Age:** 41.5 US: 37.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5–9</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–14</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–19</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–24</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–29</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–34</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–39</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–44</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–49</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–54</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–59</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–64</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65–69</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70–74</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75–79</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80–84</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RACE AND ETHNICITY** (Esri data)

The Diversity Index summarizes racial and ethnic diversity. The index shows the likelihood that two persons, chosen at random from the same area, belong to different race or ethnic groups. The index ranges from 0 (no diversity) to 100 (complete diversity).

**Diversity Index:** 29.6 US: 62.1

- Hispanic*: 6.1%
- Multiple: 2.0%
- Other: 2.4%
- Asian and Pac. Island: 0.8%
- American Indian: 1.2%
- Black: 4.7%
- White: 89.0%

* Hispanic can be of any race.

**INCOME AND NET WORTH**

Net worth measures total household assets (homes, vehicles, investments, etc.) less any debts, secured (e.g., mortgages) or unsecured (credit cards). Household income and net worth are estimated by Esri.

**AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET INDEX**

The index compares the average amount spent in this market’s household budgets for housing, food, apparel, etc., to the average amount spent by all US households. An index of 100 is average. An index of 120 shows that average spending by consumers in this market is 20 percent above the national average. Consumer expenditures are estimated by Esri.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparel &amp; Services</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensions &amp; Social Security</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OCCUPATION BY EARNINGS**

The five occupations with the highest number of workers in the market are displayed by median earnings. Data from the Census Bureau’s American Community Survey.

- Management
- Transportation and Material Moving
- Production
- Sales and Related
- Office and Administrative Support
MARKET PROFILE  (Consumer preferences are estimated from data by GfK MRI)

- Traditional in their ways, residents of Heartland Communities choose to bank and pay their bills in person and purchase insurance from an agent.
- Most have high-speed Internet access at home or on their cell phone but aren't ready to go paperless.
- Many residents have paid off their home mortgages but still hold auto loans and student loans. Noninterest checking accounts are common.
- To support their local community, residents participate in public activities.
- Home remodeling is not a priority, but homeowners do tackle necessary maintenance work on their cherished homes. They have invested in riding lawn mowers to maintain their larger yards.
- They enjoy country music and watch CMT.
- Motorcycling, hunting, and fishing are popular; walking is the main form of exercise.
- To get around these semirural communities, residents prefer domestic trucks or SUVs.
- They prefer to travel in the US and favor the convenience of packaged deals.

ESRI INDEXES

Esri developed three indexes to display average household wealth, socioeconomic status, and housing affordability for the market relative to US standards.

- **Wealth Index**: 63  
  - US Percentage: 63.6% Own 36.4% Rent

- **Socioeconomic Status Index**: 84

- **Housing Affordability Index**: 216
SEGMENT DENSITY
This map illustrates the density and distribution of the Heartland Communities Tapestry Segment by households.
WHO ARE WE?
Residents in this segment live primarily in low-density, settled neighborhoods in the Midwest. The households are a mix of married-couple families and singles. Many families encompass two generations who have lived and worked in the community; their children are likely to follow suit. The manufacturing, retail trade, and health care sectors are the primary sources of employment for these residents. This is a younger market—beginning householders who are juggling the responsibilities of living on their own or a new marriage, while retaining their youthful interests in style and fun.

OUR NEIGHBORHOOD
- Married couples are the dominant household type, but fewer than expected from the younger age profile and fewer with children (Index 79); however, there are higher proportions of single-parent (Index 146) and single-person households (Index 112).
- Average household size is slightly lower at 2.50.
- Homes are primarily single family or duplexes in older neighborhoods, built before 1940 (Index 183).
- Most neighborhoods are located in lower-density urban clusters of metro areas throughout the Midwest and South.
- Average commuting time to work is slightly shorter (Index 88).
- Households have one or two vehicles.

SOCIOECONOMIC TRAITS
- Over 70% have completed high school or some college.
- Unemployment is higher at 10.9% (Index 127); labor force participation is also a bit higher at 64.6%.
- Over three quarters of households derive income from wages and salaries, augmented by Supplemental Security Income (Index 122) and public assistance (Index 149).
- Cost-conscious consumers that are comfortable with brand loyalty, unless the price is too high.
- Connected and comfortable with the Internet, they are more likely to participate in online gaming or to access dating websites.
- TV is seen as the most trusted media.
AGE BY SEX (Esri data)
Median Age: 34.8 US: 37.6
Indicates US

RACE AND ETHNICITY (Esri data)
The Diversity Index summarizes racial and ethnic diversity. The index shows the likelihood that two persons, chosen at random from the same area, belong to different race or ethnic groups. The index ranges from 0 (no diversity) to 100 (complete diversity).

Diversity Index: 53.1 US: 62.1

INCOME AND NET WORTH
Net worth measures total household assets (homes, vehicles, investments, etc.) less any debts, secured (e.g., mortgages) or unsecured (credit cards). Household income and net worth are estimated by Esri.

AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET INDEX
The index compares the average amount spent in this market’s household budgets for housing, food, apparel, etc., to the average amount spent by all US households. An index of 100 is average. An index of 120 shows that average spending by consumers in this market is 20 percent above the national average. Consumer expenditures are estimated by Esri.

OCCUPATION BY EARNINGS
The five occupations with the highest number of workers in the market are displayed by median earnings. Data from the Census Bureau’s American Community Survey.
MARKET PROFILE  (Consumer preferences are estimated from data by GfK MRI)

- They shop for groceries at discount stores such as Walmart supercenters; Kmart is also a favorite for apparel and sundry household and personal care products.
- Convenience stores are commonly used for fuel or picking up incidentals like lottery tickets.
- They tend to carry credit card balances, have student loans, and pay bills in person.
- Half of households have abandoned landlines for cell phones only.
- They watch their favorite channels including QVC, CMT, and Game Show Network.
- They’re fast food devotees.
- They enjoy outdoor activities such as camping and taking trips to the zoo.

ESRI INDEXES

Esri developed three indexes to display average household wealth, socioeconomic status, and housing affordability for the market relative to US standards.

- **Wealth Index**: 51
- **Socioeconomic Status Index**: 76
- **Housing Affordability Index**: 231

POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

Total population, average annual population change since Census 2010, and average density (population per square mile) are displayed for the market relative to the size and change among all Tapestry markets. Data estimated by Esri.

- **Population**: 900,000 - 11,000,000
- **Population Growth**: -0.5% - 3.0%
- **Population Density**: 0 - 25,000

HOUSING

Median home value is displayed for markets that are primarily owner occupied; average rent is shown for renter-occupied markets. Tenure and home value are estimated by Esri. Housing type and average rent are from the Census Bureau’s American Community Survey.

- **Typical Housing**: Single Family
- **Median Value**: $79,000
- **US Median**: $177,000

TYPICAL HOUSING

- **Home Ownership**: 60.1%
- **Rent**: 39.9%

Housing type and average rent are from the Census Bureau’s American Community Survey.
SEGMENT DENSITY

This map illustrates the density and distribution of the Traditional Living Tapestry Segment by households.
WHO ARE WE?

Small Town Simplicity includes young families and senior householders that are bound by community ties. The lifestyle is down-to-earth and semirural, with television for entertainment and news, and emphasis on convenience for both young parents and senior citizens. Residents embark on pursuits including online computer games, scrapbooking, and rural activities like hunting and fishing. Since almost 1 in 4 households is below poverty level, residents also keep their finances simple—paying bills in person and avoiding debt.

OUR NEIGHBORHOOD

- They reside in small towns or semirural neighborhoods, mostly outside metropolitan areas.
- Homes are a mix of older single-family houses (61%), apartments, and mobile homes.
- A majority, 51%, of homes are owner occupied. (Index 80).
- Median home value of $88,000 is about half the US median.
- Average rent is $600 (Index 62).
- This is an older market, with almost half of the householders aged 55 years or older, and predominantly single-person households (Index 139).

SOCIOECONOMIC TRAITS

- Education: 65% with high school diploma or some college.
- Unemployment higher at 11.9% (Index 138).
- Labor force participation lower at 51% (Index 81), which could result from lack of jobs or retirement.
- Income from wages and salaries (Index 82), Social Security (Index 142) or retirement (Index 112), increased by Supplemental Security Income (Index 203).
- Price-conscious consumers that shop accordingly, with coupons at discount centers.
- Connected, but not to the latest or greatest gadgets; keep their landlines.
- Community-orientated residents; more conservative than middle-of-the-road.
- Rely on television or newspapers to stay informed.

Note: The Index represents the ratio of the segment rate to the US rate multiplied by 100. Consumer preferences are estimated from data by GfK MRI.
**AGE BY SEX**  
* (Esri data)  
**Median Age:** 40.0 US: 37.6  
* Indicates US

**RACE AND ETHNICITY**  
* (Esri data)  
The Diversity Index summarizes racial and ethnic diversity. The index shows the likelihood that two persons, chosen at random from the same area, belong to different race or ethnic groups. The index ranges from 0 (no diversity) to 100 (complete diversity).

**Diversity Index:** 49.1 US: 62.1

- Hispanic*: 9.5%  
- Multiple: 2.9%  
- Other: 3.8%  
- Asian and Pac. Island American Indian: 1.2%  
- Black: 13.1%  
- White: 77.3%

* Hispanic can be of any race.  
US Average

**INCOME AND NET WORTH**

Net worth measures total household assets (homes, vehicles, investments, etc.) less any debts, secured (e.g., mortgages) or unsecured (credit cards). Household income and net worth are estimated by Esri.

**Median Household Income**

- $27,000  
- US Median $51,000

**Median Net Worth**

- $14,000  
- US Median $71,000

**AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET INDEX**

The index compares the average amount spent in this market’s household budgets for housing, food, apparel, etc., to the average amount spent by all US households. An index of 100 is average. An index of 120 shows that average spending by consumers in this market is 20 percent above the national average. Consumer expenditures are estimated by Esri.

- Housing: 53  
- Food: 57  
- Apparel & Services: 35  
- Transportation: 58  
- Health Care: 59  
- Entertainment & Recreation: 57  
- Education: 50  
- Pensions & Social Security: 50  
- Other: 54

**OCCUPATION BY EARNINGS**

The five occupations with the highest number of workers in the market are displayed by median earnings. Data from the Census Bureau’s American Community Survey.

- Transportation and Material Moving  
- Food Preparation and Serving Related  
- Sales and Related  
- Office and Administrative Support  
- Production
MARKET PROFILE  (Consumer preferences are estimated from data by GfK MRI)

- **Small Town Simplicity** features a semirural lifestyle, complete with trucks (domestic, of course), ATVs, and vegetable gardens.
- Hunting, fishing, and target shooting are favorite pastimes.
- A large senior population visit doctors and health practitioners regularly.
- However, a largely single population favors convenience over cooking—frozen meals and fast food.
- Home improvement is not a priority, but vehicle maintenance is.

POPSULATION CHARACTERISTICS
Total population, average annual population change since Census 2010, and average density (population per square mile) are displayed for the market relative to the size and change among all Tapestry markets. Data estimated by Esri.

- **Population**: 900,000 - 1,000,000
- **Population Growth**: -0.5% - 3.0%
- **Population Density**: 0 - 25,000

HOUSING
Median home value is displayed for markets that are primarily owner occupied; average rent is shown for renter-occupied markets. Tenure and home value are estimated by Esri. Housing type and average rent are from the Census Bureau's American Community Survey.

- **Typical Housing**: Single Family
  - **Median Value**: $88,000
  - **US Median**: $177,000

ESRI INDEXES
Esri developed three indexes to display average household wealth, socioeconomic status, and housing affordability for the market relative to US standards.

- **Wealth Index**: 41
- **Socioeconomic Status Index**: 68
- **Housing Affordability Index**: 160
SEGMENT DENSITY
This map illustrates the density and distribution of the Small Town Simplicity Tapestry Segment by households.