

APPENDIX C

**MEMORANDUM #1**

---

**Trends / Survey**

**MAY 2008**

## Population Projections

As indicated by Table 1, a 14% county growth rate is projected through 2025. Of the 2005 total population of 38,194, the towns totaled 17,282 (45%).

TABLE 1: **Population Projections • 2000–2025**

	Census 2000	Projection 2005	Projection 2010	Projection 2015	Projection 2020	Projection 2025	High Rate of Growth Projection 2025**
<b>Towns</b>							
Clifton	1,657	1,819	1,990	2,147	2,306	2,477	3,757
Diamond Bluff	479	492	508	521	535	552	759
Ellsworth	1,064	1,076	1,095	1,108	1,123	1,146	1,804
El Paso	690	717	748	775	803	836	1,190
Gilman	772	786	804	818	835	856	1,792
Hartland	814	831	854	872	891	916	1,494
Isabelle	289	304	320	334	349	366	509
Maiden Rock	589	578	571	561	553	548	989
Martell	1,070	1,153	1,243	1,323	1,406	1,496	1,990
Oak Grove	1,522	1,672	1,830	1,975	2,122	2,281	3,862
River Falls	2,304	2,398	2,516	2,617	2,724	2,846	
Rock Elm	504	497	495	489	485	485	744
Salem	505	496	492	484	479	476	765
Spring Lake	550	558	569	577	587	600	1,050
Trenton	1,737	1,785	1,845	1,893	1,946	2,010	2,817
Trimbelle	1,511	1,514	1,527	1,532	1,541	1,560	2,851
Union	618	606	598	588	579	575	938
<b>Pierce County*</b>	36,804	38,194	39,818	41,190	42,655	44,368	

\*Includes city and village data.

Source: Demographic Services Center, Wisconsin Department of Administration, January 2004

\*\* Based on average number of residential building permits issued between 1999 and 2004, divided by 5 (years), multiplied by 20 (years) X the average household size of an owner-occupied dwelling unit.

Table 2 illustrates that during the decade of the 1960s, Pierce County experienced its greatest growth spurt (18.4%) followed closely by the 1970s (16.9%). Both of these decades outpaced growth in the 1990s and the first 5 years of the 2000 decade, which are often perceived as high growth eras.

TABLE 2: **Population Trends**

	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	% Change 1960–70	% Change 1970–80	% Change 1980–90	% Change 1990–00
<b>Towns</b>									
Clifton	578	612	975	1,119	1,657	5.0%	59.3%	14.8%	48.1%
Diamond Bluff	432	355	458	492	479	-17.8%	29.0%	7.4%	-2.6%
Ellsworth	1,118	1,260	1,408	1,030	1,064	12.7%	11.7%	-26.8%	3.3%
El Paso	777	686	689	641	690	-11.7%	0.4%	-7.0%	7.5%
Gilman	819	842	914	762	772	2.8%	8.6%	-16.6%	1.3%
Hartland	800	771	821	766	814	-3.6%	6.5%	-6.7%	6.3%
Isabelle	123	168	190	196	289	36.6%	13.1%	3.2%	74.4%
Maiden Rock	639	563	641	649	589	-11.9%	13.9%	1.2%	-9.2%
Martell	726	733	864	866	1,070	1.0%	17.9%	0.2%	23.6%
Oak Grove	664	783	936	1,120	1,522	17.9%	19.5%	19.7%	35.0%
River Falls	920	1,642	2,168	1,944	2,304	78.5%	32.0%	-10.3%	18.5%
Rock Elm	706	638	654	519	504	-9.6%	2.5%	-20.6%	-2.9%
Salem	588	498	616	514	505	-15.3%	23.7%	-16.6%	-1.8%
Spring Lake	640	611	613	565	550	-4.5%	0.3%	-7.8%	-2.7%
Trenton	994	1,286	1,624	1,583	1,737	29.4%	26.3%	-2.5%	9.7%
Trimbelle	1,077	1,225	1,420	1,482	1,511	13.7%	15.9%	4.4%	2.0%
Union	780	746	753	643	618	-4.4%	0.9%	-14.6%	-3.9%
<b>Pierce County*</b>	22,503	26,652	31,149	32,765	36,804	18.4%	16.9%	5.2%	12.3%

\*Includes city and village data.

Source: U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census

How do population projections translate into households? Based on average household sizes determined in the 2000 Census, Pierce County can expect to see over 4,300 household added between 2000 and 2025 (Table 3). Of that number, the towns will absorb 1,837 — a town increase in households of approximately 24%.

TABLE3: **Household Projections • 2000–2025**

	Census 2000	Projection 2005	Projection 2010	Projection 2015	Projection 2020	Projection 2025
<b>Towns</b>						
Clifton	543	610	685	754	823	891
Diamond Bluff	184	193	205	214	223	233
Ellsworth	380	393	410	423	436	450
El Paso	233	248	265	280	295	310
Gilman	283	295	309	321	333	344
Hartland	295	308	324	338	351	364
Isabelle	104	112	120	128	136	144
Maiden Rock	220	221	224	224	225	225
Martell	382	421	465	505	547	587
Oak Grove	498	560	628	692	756	820
River Falls	802	854	919	976	1,032	1,088
Rock Elm	178	180	183	185	186	188
Salem	173	174	177	177	178	179
Spring Lake	191	198	207	214	222	229
Trenton	647	680	721	755	789	822
Trimbelle	532	545	564	577	591	604
Union	212	213	215	216	216	216
<b>Pierce County*</b>	13,015	13,829	14,782	15,656	16,539	17,339

\*Includes city and village data.

Source: Demographic Services Center, Wisconsin Department of Administration, January 2004

With respect to the county-wide survey conducted in January 2007, the following topics are particularly relevant to the development of the goals and objectives of the comprehensive plan.

### **Place of Work**

On a countywide basis, Pierce County was the primary place of work (27.5%) for those workers represented by returned surveys. The Minneapolis/St. Paul metro area followed at 19.0%. As might be expected, those Towns geographically located in closer proximity to Minneapolis/St. Paul indicated a higher percentage of workers in that metro area (Clifton, 27.4%; Oak Grove, 36.4%). Trenton (another “border” township) cited Goodhue County, Minnesota as a place of work for 36% of its worker/wage earners. Three northern Towns (River Falls, Martell, and Gilman) indicated a range of 17% to 19% of their worker/wage earners commuted to the Twin Cities metro area. This relatively high percentage may be attributable to these Towns’ proximity to Interstate 94 and its direct route into the metro area.

### **Income**

While 26% of wage earners income is cited as over \$55,000 on a countywide basis, three Towns significantly exceed that percentage. As should be expected, those Towns with the highest number of workers identifying the Minneapolis/St. Paul metro area as a “place of work,” had a greater percentage of higher income wage earners. Clifton (43.8%), Oak Grove (38.9%), and River Falls (33.3) all were substantially above the county percentage for those earning \$55,000+ per year.

## Housing

An overwhelming percentage of survey respondents indicated a “single-family home” as their place of residence. On a Town basis, this percentage ranged from 99.3% (Oak Grove) to 91.4% (Diamond Bluff). Countywide and in most Towns, the second highest response was “mobile home” (3% to 4%).

When asked their opinion regarding the adequacy of housing options, the vast majority of respondents (93.2%) believed the range of options to be adequate. Those that felt housing options were inadequate most frequently cited the need for additional senior housing, assisted-living housing, handicapped-accessible housing, and more affordable housing. This latter concern was expressed on surveys representing every Town.

## Development

Countywide, respondents held strong opinions regarding the pace of development. The top responses were “too fast” and “about right,” both at 39%. Less than 10% expressed a position that the pace was “too slow.” A cluster of adjacent Towns on the northern tier of the county expressed a stronger opinion that the pace of development was “too fast.” River Falls, Martel, Gilman, Spring Lake, Trimble, Ellsworth and El Paso to varying degrees felt the pace was “too fast.” When comparing responses in these Towns between “too fast” and “about right,” the percentage difference between these two opinions ranged from 2% (Ellsworth) to 29% (Martell).

Similar to the pace of development in Pierce County, the pace of development in the respondent’s Town elicited strong opinions, primarily in the categories of “too fast” or “about right.” In this instance, Clifton (44.3%) joins Gilman (39.3%), Martell (47.9%), and River Falls (46.6%) in expressing an opinion that the pace of development in their respective Towns is “too fast.”

A composite of respondent’s opinions regarding their Town’s pace of development, differs from their composite opinion regarding Pierce County’s pace of development. Regarding county pace of development, they were evenly split between “too fast” (39%) and “about right” (39%). Regarding individual Town development, they expressed an overall opinion of “too fast” (35%) and “about right” (44%).

Responses pertaining to the location of housing primarily fell into two categories: 1) “Market forces and property owner’s desires should decide how much housing development occurs” (36.6%), and 2) “The County/Town should limit the amount of housing development that occurs” (46.7%).

On a town-by-town basis, most Towns leaned toward the latter category (“the County/Town should limit...”) with the exception of Maiden Rock. In Maiden Rock, 46.9% of respondents selected “Market forces...” and 37.5% selected “County/Town should limit...”. Some Towns were nearly evenly split between these two opinions (Gilman, Oak Grove, and Trenton).

On a countywide basis, opinions regarding County efforts to regulate development were balanced (22.7% to 24.5%), with the greatest percentage of respondents indicating that they “did not know” or “had no opinion” (28.8%). For the most part, individual Town responses were similar to the overall County composite. Regarding the first option (“Too much planning...”), responses from six Towns (Maiden Rock, Rock Elm, Salem, Spring Lake, Trimbelle, and Union) ranged from 28% to 34%, compared to the countywide composite of 22.7%. The second option (“About the right amount...”) received balanced support throughout the Towns, with Isabelle spiking to 41.9% compared to the countywide composite of 24.0%. Regarding the far end of the spectrum (“Not enough planning...”), the countywide opinion garnered a 24.5% response while the Towns of Isabelle (16.1%) and Rock Elm (13.6%) were somewhat below the overall county response (24.5%).

Regarding individual Town efforts to regulate and guide development received a wide-range of responses from town-to-town. River Falls (30.6%) and Spring Lake (37.0%), expressed there was “too much planning...” as compared to the Town composite opinion of 19.1%. Most Towns (12) expressed there was “about the right amount of planning...” while four Towns felt there was “not enough planning...” and one Town was evenly split.

## Regulations

Respondents were asked to check any of the eight additional land use regulations they would support. “Groundwater protection” was selected on 62.1% of the returned surveys. This selection received the highest percentage in almost every Town. “Limiting lot creation on agricultural land” (48.9%), “habitat protection” (48.5%), and “bluff protection” (42.7%) followed as regulations respondents would support.

## Land Use

When asked about preferred residential lot sizes, 32.8% desired “single-family on 1-5 acre lots.” “Single family scattered on 5+ acre lots” was selected by 26.6% of respondents, while 18.5% selected “cluster development.” The fourth highest response (13.1%) was “single family on 35+ acre lots.” “Small lots served by sewer and water” received the fewest number of responses (9.1%).

## Commercial / Industrial Development

On this topic, respondents were asked if they felt there was a need for various businesses or services. “Family restaurants” received the highest percentage of “yes” responses—67.9% countywide. In contrast, 59.3% of respondents said they did *not* feel there was a need for “franchise restaurants.” “Industrial development” (64.6%) received the second highest percentage of “yes” responses. “Arts and culture centers” (38.3%) and “major discount retailer” (38.4%) received the lowest percentages of “yes” responses.

When asked where to direct new commercial/industrial/retail development, 54.5% of respondents selected “focus development to existing business districts.” “Developing commercial/retail in cities and villages” was selected by 40% of the respondents. The location receiving the third highest preference (32.0%) was “along highway corridors.”



## **Ag Support**

An overwhelming majority (80.8%) believed Pierce County should encourage agricultural expansion and agri-development.

## **Recreation**

When asked to rate satisfaction with an array of services and recreational opportunities offered in the county, respondents primarily answered “adequate.” Activities related to trails (bike, walking, hiking, and ATV) received more “inadequate” ratings than other categories. In addition, the need for cross-country ski trails and equestrian trails was written in on numerous surveys.

## **Tourism**

When asked about tourism in Pierce County, 51.6% felt it should remain the same, while 43.9% recommended it increase. These combined responses (95.5%) indicate strong support for Pierce County tourism.