A REPORT OF A CONCORD TOWNSHIP AND VILLAGE SURVEY

DECEMBER 10, 2018

BO KLAUTH

Contents

A Report of a Concord Township Survey 3
Survey Respondents 3
Relationship to Township and/or Village 3
Property Location 4
How long have you been a resident in Concord Area? 6
Do you own or rent in the Concord Area? 7
How many acres do you own? 8
Where do you learn about local Concord Area? 9
Access to Email/Internet and Computer Devices at Home and Work 11
Please rank the statements on a scale of 1 to 5 regarding the importance of the subject to you. 12
What is the best way to accommodate future growth? 16
Convenience Stores 16
Services (e.g., healthcare, restaurant, mechanical repair) 17
Other Retail (e.g., bakery, coffee shops, produce, sportswear, gardening) 19
Office Parks 19
Other Office-Type Businesses 20
Agriculture-Related Businesses 21
Recreational Facilities 21
Family Farms 22
Hobby Farms 23
Large Corporate Livestock Farms 23
Light Industry and Manufacturing 24
Commercial, Business to Business 25
Mineral Extraction 26
Condominiums 27
Duplexes 27
Mobile-Home Parks 28
Multi-Family Residences 29
Single-Family Residential in Clustered Subdivisions 29
Single-Family Residential on Large Scattered Lots 30
Traditional Village Development with Small Commercial uses 31
Rank the Five Most Important Issues and/or Concerns That You Feel Currently Face Concord Township/Village 32

Schools 32
Township/Village taxes 33
Adequate services in the Township/Village 34
Loss of Farmland 35
What Should Be Allowed and Where? 36
Where Should New Housing Development be Located in the Concord Area? 36
Should Business Development be Concentrated in a Few Areas of Dispersed Throughout the Concord Area? 37
Should the Township/Village Encourage Commercial Development? 39
Should the Township/Village Encourage Light Industrial Development? 39
Please Provide Any Comments about This Survey or Planning in the Concord Area in the Space Below 40
Comments from Undecided Residents 40
Comments from Township Residents 40
Comments from Village Residents 41
Appendix A 43
Crosstabulation of Relied upon Source by the Four Groups of Residence: Undecided, Township, Village, and Total 43
Appendix B 56
Crosstabs of Access to Email/Internet and Uses of Computer Devices by Resident Groups 56
Appendix C 60
A Crosstabulation of Issues by Resident Group 60
Appendix D 94
Ranking of Issues or Concerns 94


A Report of a Concord Township Survey

Survey Respondents

Relationship to Township and/or Village

Most respondents reported their relationships to the Township and/or Village. Out of 133 respondents, 65.4% reported that they were residents, and 74.4% indicated that they were property owners. Business owners made up only 9.8%. Student made up 0.8%. See Figure 1.

Figure 1: Respondent's Relationship to Township/Village (Multi-Response Coding)



When grouping 133 respondents (Missing = 12) by the relationships into single-response categories, respondents who are in the category Resident and Property Owner accounted for the highest percentage, 42.1%. The second highest, 22.6%, was Property Owners Only. Residents Only made up 15.8%. The category of Resident, Property Owner, and Business Owner made up 6%, while the category of Property Owner and Business Owner made up just 3%. The category of Resident, Property Owner, and Student made up 0.8%, which is equal to the category of Resident and Business Owner. See Figure 2 and Table 1 for details.

Figure 2:Respondents' Multiple Relationship to Township/Village (Single Response Coding)





Table 1: Respondents' Multiple Relationship to Township/Village (Single Response Coding)

Description	Frequency	Percent
Property owner only	30.0	22.6%
property owner and business owner	4.0	3.0%
Resident only	21.0	15.8%
Resident and business owner	1.0	0.8%
Resident and property owner	56	42.1%
Resident, property owner, and student	1.0	0.8%
Resident, property owner, and business owner	8.0	6.0%
Total without Missing	121.0	91.0%
Missing	12.0	9.0%
Total	133	100%

Property Location


The total number of survey respondents was 133. They were grouped into three categories based on their responses to the question asking about where their property was located. Of all the respondents, the residents whose property was located in the Township comprised of 60.9% (81 respondents), and the residents whose property was located in the Village made up 27.8% (37 respondents). The respondents who did not mention their property location were grouped in "Undecided," and there were 15 respondents or 11.3%. See Figure 3.

Figure 3: Residency Types of Survey Respondents



The respondents, whose properties were located in the Township, were grouped into four different geographical locations. The respondents with properties located in the Northwest ¼ of

Figure 4: Respondents with Property Locations Broken Down into Four Geographic Locations



the Township (NW) made up 17.3% of 133 respondents. The respondents with properties located in the Northeast ¼ of the Township (NE) made up 10.5%. The respondents with properties located in Sourthwest and Southeast ¼ of the Township accounted for 12.8% and 20.3%, respectively.

How long have you been a resident in Concord Area?

Table 2 displays counts and percentages of the ranges of years the respondents had been residents in Concord Area. The figures were calculated out of 116 respondents (Missing = 17) and divided into four groups: Undecided, Township, Village, and Total. For Total, 14.7% or 17 respondents had been a resident in Concord area from 16 to 20 years. This percentage was the highest. The second highest was 12.9% for the length in Concord area from 6-10 years. The other lengths were 0-5 years (12.1%), 36-40 years (11.2%), 11-15 years (10.3%), and 21-25 years (9.5%). For other figures and residence types, see Table 2.

Table 2: Length of Residence in Concord Area Broken by Residence Type: Undecided, Township, Village, and Total


Range of Years	Count and Percentage	Residence type			Total
		Undecided	Township	Village	
0-5 years	Count	1	7	6	14
	Percent	7.1%	50.0%	42.9%	100.0%
	Percent of Total	.9%	6.0%	5.2%	12.1%
6-10 years	Count	1	10	4	15
	Percent	6.7%	66.7%	26.7%	100.0%
	Percent of Total	.9%	8.6%	3.4%	12.9%
11-15 years	Count	0	10	2	12
	Percent	0.0%	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
	Percent of Total	0.0%	8.6%	1.7%	10.3%
16-20 years	Count	2	11	4	17
	Percent	11.8%	64.7%	23.5%	100.0%
	Percent of Total	1.7%	9.5%	3.4%	14.7%
21-25 years	Count	2	6	3	11
	Percent	18.2%	54.5%	27.3%	100.0%
	Percent of Total	1.7%	5.2%	2.6%	9.5%
26-30 years	Count	0	4	2	6
	Percent	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Percent of Total	0.0%	3.4%	1.7%	5.2%
31-35 years	Count	1	2	1	4
	Percent	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	Percent of Total	.9%	1.7%	.9%	3.4%
36-40 years	Count	0	9	4	13
	Percent	0.0%	69.2%	30.8%	100.0%
	Percent of Total	0.0%	7.8%	3.4%	11.2%

40-45 years	Count	0	3	1	4
	Percent	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	Percent of Total	0.0%	2.6%	.9%	3.4%
46-50 years	Count	1	7	1	9
	Percent	11.1%	77.8%	11.1%	100.0%
	Percent of Total	.9%	6.0%	.9%	7.8%
51-55 years	Count	0	0	1	1
	Percent	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Percent of Total	0.0%	0.0%	.9%	.9%
56-60 years	Count	0	4	1	5
	Percent	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	Percent of Total	0.0%	3.4%	.9%	4.3%
Over 60 years	Count	1	2	2	5
	Percent	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	Percent of Total	.9%	1.7%	1.7%	4.3%
Total	Count	9	75	32	116
	Percent	7.8%	64.7%	27.6%	100.0%
	Percent of Total	7.8%	64.7%	27.6%	100.0%

Do you own or rent in the Concord Area?

Out of 123 respondents (Missing = 10), 99.2% of the respondents (122 respondents) owned a property in Concord Area. This percentage was comprised of 7.3% of 123 respondents who were Undecided, 62.6% of the respondents who lived in Township, and 29.3% who lived in the Village. The total percentage of the residents who rented a property was .8%, which was from the residents who lived in Concord Township only.


Figure 5: Crosstabulation of Residential Type with Four Groups of Township/Village



How many acres do you own?

Figure 6 shows a cross-tabulation of land size by the four groups of residents in the Township/Village. The respondents with a plot of land from 0 to 10 acres made up 70.3% of the 101 respondents (Missing = 32). This percentage was contributed by 21.8% of the respondents, whose properties were located in the Village, 44.6% of the respondents with properties in the Township, and 4% from undecided respondents. For the land size from 11-20 acres the percentage, 7.9%, was from the respondents with properties in the Township. About 6% of the respondents had properties from 21-30 acres: 1% from the Village respondents and 5% from the Township respondents. Two per cent of the residents in the Township and 1% of undecided respondents had properties from 31-40 acres. None of the respondents living in the Village had properties over 50 acres, but the undecided and Township residents did, 2% and 10.9%, respectively.

Figure 6: *Crosstabulation of Land Size by the Four Resident Groups*



Note: The total number of respondents for this item was 101; thus, 0.99% is equivalent to 1 respondent.

See Table 3 for further details.

Table 3: A Crosstabulation of Land Size by Resident Groups


Land size owned in Concord Area	Count and Percent	Residence type			
		Undecided	Township	Village	Total
Less than 10 acres	Count	4	45	22	71
	% within Land size owned in Concord Area	5.6%	63.4%	31.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	4.0%	44.6%	21.8%	70.3%
11-20 acres	Count	0	8	0	8
	% within Land size owned in Concord Area	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	0.0%	7.9%	0.0%	7.9%
21-30 acres	Count	0	5	1	6
	% within Land size owned in Concord Area	0.0%	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
	% of Total	0.0%	5.0%	1.0%	5.9%
31-40 acres	Count	1	2	0	3
	% within Land size owned in Concord Area	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	1.0%	2.0%	0.0%	3.0%
Over 50 acres	Count	2	11	0	13
	% within Land size owned in the area	15.4%	84.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	2.0%	10.9%	0.0%	12.9%
Total	Count	7	71	23	101
	% within Land size owned in Concord Area	6.9%	70.3%	22.8%	100.0%
	% of Total	6.9%	70.3%	22.8%	100.0%

Where do you learn about local Concord Area?

Figure 7 indicates that the respondents in Concord Township/Village and undecided ones received news from a variety of sources. Top five sources from which respondents received the news were word of mouth (67.7% of 133 respondents), local newspapers (58.6%), TV regional television (48.1%), regional newspapers (42.1%), and social media (37.6%).

Other made up 6.8%. The residents referred to Albion-news, Lions Club, mail, meeting minutes publications from village meetings, MLive, monthly Village Voice Paper, Village mailer, and Village News sheet.

Figure 7: News Sources of Concord Residents



The respondents were asked to rank news sources with 1 as the most relied-upon news source. As shown in Table 2, the highest rank for local newspapers as the most relied-upon news source was at 36.8%, the second highest rank was at 10.5%, and third highest was at 6.8%. Regarding "word of mouth," the percentages of the highest, second highest, and third highest ranks were 33.1%, 11.3%, and 11.3%, respectively. Regarding social media, such as Facebook, Twitter, Snapchat, etc., the highest rank made up 23.3%, which is a little higher than the highest rank for regional televisions, 22.6%. For these two sources the second and third highest rank for as the most relied-upon news sources were equal; for social media the ranks were 5.3%, which is lower than the ranks for regional televisions, 9%. Regional newspapers were ranked 20.3% as the most relied upon news source, a little lower than regional television. The second and third highest ranks were at 12.8% and 3.8%, respectively. Please see Appendix A for cross-tabulations of all new sources with all rankings provided by the respondents.

Table 4: Most Relied-Upon News Sources Ranked by Concord Residents


	Most Relied Upon Source						
	Ranking of 1		Ranking of 2		Ranking of 3		Total
News Source	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Percent
Social Media: Facebook, Twitter, Snapchat, etc.	31	23.3%	7	5.3%	7	5.3%	33.8%
Local Newspaper: The Salesman; Albion Reader	49	36.8%	14	10.5%	9	6.8%	54.1%
Regional Newspapers: Jackson Citizen Patriot	27	20.3%	17	12.8%	5	3.8%	36.8%

TV Regional television: WILX NBC 10; WLNS CBS 6; WSYM FOX 47; WLAJ ABC 53	30	22.6%	12	9.0%	12	9.0%	40.6%
Radio: Q106.1; K105.3; etc.	5	3.8%	2	1.5%	1	0.8%	6.0%
Word of mouth	44	33.1%	15	11.3%	15	11.3%	55.6%
Township/village meetings	9	6.8%	4	3.0%	2	1.5%	11.3%
Township/village websites	10	7.5%	3	2.3%	5	3.8%	13.5%
Other online sources (email, websites, etc).	12	9.0%	3	2.3%	4	3.0%	14.3%
Other	6	4.5%	2	1.5%	1	0.8%	6.8%

Note: For a set of responses that endorsed the news sources but did not indicate any ranking were treated as a ranking of 1.

Access to Email/Internet and Computer Devices at Home and Work

Figure 8: Access to Email/Internet and the Use of Computer Devices at Home and Work




The residents who used laptop, tablet, computer, and/or smartphone in the homes accounted for 80.5% (107 respondents), which is higher than the percentage of the residents who used these computer devices at their workplaces, 39.1% (52). However, more the residents had access to email/internet in their workplaces, 76.7% (102) than the residents who had access to the internet at home, 39.8% (53). See Figure 8.

Figure 9 shows access to email/internet and the uses of computer devices broken by three groups residents. In this case, the total shows 100% for each item. The residents in Concord Township had the highest percentages for having access to email/internet in the home (52.8%), in the workplace (62.7%); using laptop, tablet, computer, and/or smartphone in the home (61.7%), and in the workplace (50.0%). The residents in Concord Village had the second highest percentages for having access to email/internet in the home (41.5%), in the workplace (30.4%);

using laptop, tablet, computer, and/or smartphone in the home (42.3%), and in the workplace (30.8). See Appendix B for more details.

Figure 9: Crosstabulation of Access to Email/Internet and Uses of Computer Devices at Home and Work by Resident Groups: Undecided, Township, and Village



Please rank the statements on a scale of 1 to 5 regarding the importance of the subject to you.

The respondents were asked to rank the presented statements on a five-point scales of importance (1 = Excellent; 2 = Good; 3 = Average; 4 = Poor; 5 = No Opinion). To minimize measurement error, the statements were treated as a four-point scale from 1 to 4 because "No Opinion" does not belong to the continuum of the scale. This then four-point scale was used to calculate the mean (*M*) and standard deviation (*SD*) for each statement. When the respondents did not rate a statement, that statement was given a 5 for No Opinion (NP). Doing this was to give an idea where each statement was on the continuum of the four-point scale.

Table 5 shows the mean ratings for the statements in numbers and gradient red colors. A light red color represents a rating closer to 1 (Excellent), whereas a dark red color represents a rating closer to 4 (Poor). Undecided residents had a minimum mean rating of 1.7 and maximum mean rating of 3.3. Township residents had a minimum and maximum mean ratings of 1.7 and 2.8, respectively. The Village residents had the minimum and maximum mean ratings of 1.0 and 2.7, respectively. The minimum and maximum mean ratings for all residents were 1.6 and 2.7 respectively.

Based on the mean ratings from 1.6 to 1.9, the Township and Village residents thought that the following issues were important than other issues:

- Public Safety: Concord Fire Department
- Public Safety: Jackson County Sheriff contracted policy services
- Quality of life: Concord Area as a place to live
- Quality of life: A healthy and safe community

- Environment: Preservation of distinct topography, soils, lakes, streams, rivers, and wetlands
- Environment: Clean air

On slightly less important issues, the Village residents placed the importance on some issues more than other resident groups did. With a mean rating of 2.0 by the Village residents, which is lower than the mean ratings by Undecided and Township residents, the following issues were viewed as more important compared to the other groups of residents.

- Mobility and transportation: Roads safe for walking and biking
- Economy: Continued improvements to Village's Downtown Business District
- Quality of life: Quality housing and services for residents of varying ages and income levels
- Government: The Village Administration making changes necessary for community improvement within the Village

For Township residents (with a rating of 2.0), one issue that seemed to be more important to them than to other resident groups was:

- Recreation: Park & Recreation Opportunities: i.e., Gottschalk Park, Spring Street Park Canoe/Kayak Launch, Mill Pond Park, Trailhead, Concord Trail Extension, etc.

For mean ratings for all residents that fell at or below 2.0, which suggested higher levels of importance were:

- Quality of life: Concord Area as a place to live (1.7)
- Quality of life: A healthy and safe community (1.7)
- Public Safety: Concord Fire Department (1.7)
- Public Safety: Jackson County Sheriff contracted policy services (1.8)
- Environment: Preservation of distinct topography, soils, lakes, streams, rivers, and wetlands (1.9)
- Environment: Clean air (1.9)
- Recreation: Park & Recreation Opportunities: i.e., Gottschalk Park, Spring Street Park Canoe/Kayak Launch, Mill Pond Park, Trailhead, Concord Trail Extension, etc. (2.0)

For other issues and mean ratings, please see Table 5. For detail crosstabulations for all ratings for each statement, please see Appendix C.

Table 5:Mean, Standard Deviation, and No Opinions for Statements by Resident Group

Statements	Undecided			Township			Village			Total		
	M	SD	NP	M	SD	NP	M	SD	NP	M	SD	NP
Community: Strong sense of individuality and community pride	2.1	1.2	5	2.2	1.0	19	2.1	1.0	6	2.1	1.0	30
Community: Public participation/community cohesiveness	2.5	1.1	4	2.6	1.0	22	2.3	0.9	5	2.5	1.0	31

Statements	Undecided			Township			Village			Total		
	M	SD	NP	M	SD	NP	M	SD	NP	M	SD	NP
Community: Diversity among residents and neighborhoods	2.7	0.7	6	2.7	0.8	24	2.5	1.1	9	2.6	0.9	39
Mobility and transportation: Roads safe for walking and biking	2.5	1.2	2	2.4	1.1	8	2.0	1.1	3	2.3	1.1	13
Mobility and transportation: Condition of Township roads (excluding Village streets and M-60 State Highway)	2.8	1.0	3	2.4	1.2	5	2.4	1.1	1	2.4	1.1	9
Mobility and transportation: Condition of Village streets (excluding Township roads and M-60 State Highway)	2.4	0.8	2	2.4	1.0	10	2.3	1.1	1	2.4	1.0	13
Mobility and transportation: Villages sidewalk system	2.5	0.8	5	2.5	1.0	16	2.3	1.0	1	2.4	1.0	22
Economy: Diversity of commercial business	2.7	1.0	6	2.8	1.1	17	2.6	1.1	5	2.7	1.1	28
Economy: Incentives for business development	3.3	0.8	8	2.5	1.0	26	2.7	1.1	8	2.6	1.1	42
Economy: Incorporating commercial development into appropriate community design	3.1	0.7	8	2.7	1.1	22	2.4	1.1	11	2.6	1.0	41
Economy: Encourage expansion of access to high speed internet and improved cellular services	3.0	1.1	6	2.2	1.2	16	2.2	1.2	9	2.3	1.2	31
Economy: Continued improvements to Village's Downtown Business District?	2.3	1.0	4	2.3	1.0	14	2.0	0.7	2	2.2	0.9	20
Economy: Make improvements to Village's Downtown Business District?	2.9	0.6	6	2.3	0.9	12	2.2	0.9	4	2.3	0.9	22
Economy: Downtown business district parking	2.6	1.3	7	2.6	0.9	14	2.3	1.0	5	2.5	1.0	26
Recreation: Village's Paddock Park area i.e. boat Launch, nature trail, etc.	2.4	1.1	6	2.4	0.9	21	2.6	0.9	5	2.4	0.9	32

Statements	Undecided			Township			Village			Total		
	M	SD	NP	M	SD	NP	M	SD	NP	M	SD	NP
Is there something we missed you would like to rank?	.	.	15	1.8	1.2	71	1.0	0.0	34	1.6	1.1	120
Quality of life: Concord Area as a place to live	1.7	0.8	3	1.7	0.7	4	1.7	0.7	5	1.7	0.7	12
Quality of life: A healthy and safe community	2.1	1.2	3	1.7	0.7	5	1.6	0.8	3	1.7	0.8	11
Quality of life: Quality housing and services for residents of varying ages and income levels	2.7	0.9	6	2.3	0.8	12	2.0	1.0	4	2.2	0.9	22
Government: Administration of the Village	2.0	1.1	7	2.3	0.9	16	2.2	1.0	2	2.2	0.9	25
Government: The Village Administration making changes necessary for community improvement within the Village	2.1	1.0	7	2.3	0.8	20	2.0	1.0	4	2.2	0.9	31
Government: The Township Administration making changes necessary for community improvement within the Township	3.0	1.1	6	2.2	0.8	15	2.1	0.9	5	2.2	0.9	26
Government: Administration of the Township	2.7	1.0	6	2.2	0.8	17	2.3	1.0	5	2.3	0.9	28
Public Safety: Concord Fire Department	2.0	1.0	4	1.7	0.8	4	1.6	0.7	2	1.7	0.8	10
Public Safety: Jackson County Sheriff contracted policy services	2.2	1.1	2	1.8	0.8	5	1.7	0.8	1	1.8	0.9	8
Environment: Preservation of farmland	3.0	1.1	5	2.0	1.0	10	2.1	1.0	5	2.1	1.0	20
Environment: Preservation of distinct topography, soils, lakes, streams, rivers, and wetlands	2.7	1.0	6	1.9	0.9	6	1.9	0.9	5	1.9	0.9	17
Environment: Exploring alternative forms of energy production and reduction of waste	2.7	1.4	8	2.3	1.0	15	2.2	1.1	9	2.3	1.1	32
Environment: Energy conservation	2.3	1.2	9	2.3	1.0	16	2.2	1.1	8	2.3	1.0	33
Environment: Clean air	2.0	1.1	5	1.9	0.9	10	1.8	0.9	7	1.9	0.9	22

Statements	Undecided			Township			Village			Total		
	M	SD	NP	M	SD	NP	M	SD	NP	M	SD	NP
Recreation: The paved shoulder along Main/Street/ Pulaski Road to Swains Lake Park	2.1	0.8	7	2.3	1.0	15	2.2	1.0	4	2.3	1.0	26
Recreation: Park & Recreation Opportunities: i.e., Gottschalk Park, Spring Street Park Canoe/Kayak Launch, Mill Pond Park, Trailhead, Concord Trail Extension, etc.	1.9	0.7	5	2.0	0.9	10	2.1	0.9	1	2.0	0.9	16
Min	1.7			1.7			1.0			1.6		
Max	3.3			2.8			2.7			2.7		

Note: M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation; NP = No Opinion

Other issues that were not listed, the respondents wrote and ranked the issues. The issues are presented with their ratings in parentheses.

- Needing more grocery store (1)
- Consolidating/merging village/Township Boards (1)
- Exerting social pressure to get the qualified for grants (1)
- Conducting a survey is very important. (1)
- Farm vehicles, cars, trucks speed on Hanover street. (1)
- Road repair: King Road is a disaster. Patching is not helping and in fact is making it worse. (1)
- Mail boxes are too close to the road for wipe farm equipment. (1)
- Need a Menards so we don't need to run to Jackson East side. (1)
- Recycling to expand to more items in Village. (1)
- Village Concord needs a Facebook page in addition to the website. (1)
- High speed internet (1)
- Township-Village Cohesiveness (1)
- Chinese food restaurant (2);
- Flower shop (2);
- Natural gas lines would be nice--Propane is expensive. (4)
- Homicide and suicide reported to public (4)

What is the best way to accommodate future growth?

The respondents were asked to select "Encourage," "Allow but not encourage," or "Discourage" for twenty types of development presented to them. This section will present the development types with figures and comments.

Convenience Stores

For Table 6, for convenient stores, 28% of 125 respondents encouraged this kind of development, whereas 51.2% would allow it, but would not encourage it. However, 20.8% of the respondents would discourage it.

One respondent who encouraged convenience stores mentioned building a "grocery store". Some respondents who allowed it but would not encourage cited the following reasons:

- "These undercut abilities of grocery store to survive."
- "We need so may more out in the Township please."

Some respondents discourage convenience stores, citing the following reasons:

- "Concord has enough" with "Dollar General and two gas stations"
- "Not big enough for more"
- "Till we get more business.

Table 6: Crosstabulation of Convenience Stores by Resident Group

Accommodate Future Growth: Convenience stores * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Accommodate Future Growth: Convenience stores	Encourage	Count	4	23	8	35
		% within Accommodate Future Growth: Convenience stores	11.4%	65.7%	22.9%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.2%	18.4%	6.4%	28.0%
	Allow	Count	5	42	17	64
		% within Accommodate Future Growth: Convenience stores	7.8%	65.6%	26.6%	100.0%
		% of Total	4.0%	33.6%	13.6%	51.2%
	Discourage	Count	3	12	11	26
		% within Accommodate Future Growth: Convenience stores	11.5%	46.2%	42.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	2.4%	9.6%	8.8%	20.8%
Total		Count	12	77	36	125
		% within Accommodate Future Growth: Convenience stores	9.6%	61.6%	28.8%	100.0%
		% of Total	9.6%	61.6%	28.8%	100.0%

Services (e.g., healthcare, restaurant, mechanical repair)

Table 7 shows that most of the respondents (63.6% of 129 respondents) encouraged having service types of development, such as health care, restaurant, mechanical repair, etc. 34.9% of the respondents (24.8% were Township residents) would allow this development. Only 1.6% would discourage this development.

Some of the respondents who encouraged this type of development commented “A buffet you can afford to take 3 or 4 kids” and “Need comparative prices to high”. Some that allowed this development but did not encourage said, “If the area supports it, go for it.”

Table 7: A Crosstabulation of Service by Resident Group

Accommodate Future Growth: Services (eg, healthcare, restaurant, mechanical repair) * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Accommodate Future Growth: Services (eg, healthcare, restaurant, mechanical repair)	Encourage	Count	9	46	27	82
		% within Accommodate Future Growth: Services (eg, healthcare, restaurant, mechanical repair)	11.0%	56.1%	32.9%	100.0%
		% of Total	7.0%	35.7%	20.9%	63.6%
	Allow	Count	3	32	10	45
		% within Accommodate Future Growth: Services (eg, healthcare, restaurant, mechanical repair)	6.7%	71.1%	22.2%	100.0%
		% of Total	2.3%	24.8%	7.8%	34.9%
	Discourage	Count	1	1	0	2
		% within Accommodate Future Growth: Services (eg, healthcare, restaurant, mechanical repair)	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	.8%	.8%	0.0%	1.6%
Total		Count	13	79	37	129
		% within Accommodate Future Growth: Services (eg, healthcare, restaurant, mechanical repair)	10.1%	61.2%	28.7%	100.0%
		% of Total	10.1%	61.2%	28.7%	100.0%

Other Retail (e.g., bakery, coffee shops, produce, sportswear, gardening)

Most of the respondents (66.4% of 128 respondents) also encouraged retail stores, whereas 31.3% allowed them. Only 2.3% of the respondents discouraged this kind of development. See Table 8.

Some of respondents who encouraged this development mentioned the following:

- "Flower shop would be nice again."
- "No good coffee in Concord! No garden supplies."
- One respondent did not want to have "marijuana stores."

One of the respondents who allowed this type of development stated that "We need things downtown."

Table 8: A Crosstabulation of Other Retail Stores by Resident Group

Other retail [Stores]* Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Other retail	Encourage	Count	9	50	26	85
		% within Other retail	10.6%	58.8%	30.6%	100.0%
		% of Total	7.0%	39.1%	20.3%	66.4%
	Allow	Count	3	26	11	40
		% within Other retail	7.5%	65.0%	27.5%	100.0%
		% of Total	2.3%	20.3%	8.6%	31.3%
	Discourage	Count	1	2	0	3
		% within Other retail	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	.8%	1.6%	0.0%	2.3%
Total		Count	13	78	37	128
		% within Other retail	10.2%	60.9%	28.9%	100.0%
		% of Total	10.2%	60.9%	28.9%	100.0%

Office Parks

Most respondents (62.8% of 113 respondents) only allowed this type of development, but they wondered "where" these office parks should be. Only 26.5% encouraged it. 10.6% of the respondents discouraged this type of development, citing a concern, "What happens if they go out of business. Who takes care of the buildings?"

Table 9: A Crosstabulation of Office Parks by Resident Group

Office parks * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Office parks	Encourage	Count	2	21	7	30
		% within Office parks	6.7%	70.0%	23.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.8%	18.6%	6.2%	26.5%
	Allow	Count	7	41	23	71
		% within Office parks	9.9%	57.7%	32.4%	100.0%

		% of Total	6.2%	36.3%	20.4%	62.8%
	Discourage	Count	1	9	2	12
		% within Office parks	8.3%	75.0%	16.7%	100.0%
		% of Total	.9%	8.0%	1.8%	10.6%
Total		Count	10	71	32	113
		% within Office parks	8.8%	62.8%	28.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	8.8%	62.8%	28.3%	100.0%

Other Office-Type Businesses

Table 10 shows that 30.8% of 117 respondents encouraged Other Office-Type businesses. 64.1% of them allowed it but would not encourage, citing "We have plenty of open buildings." Only 5.1% of the respondents discouraged this type of development, but they said "minimal."

Table 10: A Crosstabulation of Other Office-Type Businesses by Resident Group

Other office-type businesses * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Other office-type businesses	Encourage	Count	3	23	10	36
		% within Other office-type businesses	8.3%	63.9%	27.8%	100.0%
		% of Total	2.6%	19.7%	8.5%	30.8%
	Allow	Count	8	42	25	75
		% within Other office-type businesses	10.7%	56.0%	33.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	6.8%	35.9%	21.4%	64.1%
	Discourage	Count	1	5	0	6
		% within Other office-type businesses	16.7%	83.3%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	.9%	4.3%	0.0%	5.1%
Total		Count	12	70	35	117
		% within Other office-type businesses	10.3%	59.8%	29.9%	100.0%
		% of Total	10.3%	59.8%	29.9%	100.0%

Agriculture-Related Businesses

According to Table 11, 46.8% of 124 respondents encouraged agriculture-related businesses. However, 3.2% discouraged this kind of business. 50% of respondents allowed this kind of businesses, and they had some following concerns:

- "Do not allow marijuana."
- "Look at Albion all the business [ran] out [of] business, then what about the buildings?"
- "No corporate livestock"

Table 11: A Crosstabulation of Agriculture-Related Business by Resident Group

Agriculture-related businesses * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Agriculture-related businesses	Encourage	Count	8	39	11	58
		% within Agriculture-related businesses	13.8%	67.2%	19.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	6.5%	31.5%	8.9%	46.8%
	Allow	Count	3	34	25	62
		% within Agriculture-related businesses	4.8%	54.8%	40.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	2.4%	27.4%	20.2%	50.0%
	Discourage	Count	0	3	1	4
		% within Agriculture-related businesses	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	2.4%	.8%	3.2%
Total		Count	11	76	37	124
		% within Agriculture-related businesses	8.9%	61.3%	29.8%	100.0%
		% of Total	8.9%	61.3%	29.8%	100.0%

Recreational Facilities

Table 12 shows that 44.6% of 121 respondents encouraged recreational facilities, and 52.9% of them allowed this kind of development. Only 2.5% of the respondents discouraged this kind of development.

Some of the respondents who allowed it commented the following:

- "Keep going strong, just don't get too fancy, [because] upkeep is expensive"
- "We have a good sports park and appreciates the improvements."

Table 12: A Crosstabulation of Recreational Facilities by Resident Group

Recreational Facilities * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Recreational Facilities	Encourage	Count	5	35	14	54
		% within Recreational Facilities	9.3%	64.8%	25.9%	100.0%
		% of Total	4.1%	28.9%	11.6%	44.6%
	Allow	Count	6	37	21	64
		% within Recreational Facilities	9.4%	57.8%	32.8%	100.0%
		% of Total	5.0%	30.6%	17.4%	52.9%
	Discourage	Count	1	1	1	3
		% within Recreational Facilities	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	.8%	.8%	.8%	2.5%
Total		Count	12	73	36	121
		% within Recreational Facilities	9.9%	60.3%	29.8%	100.0%
		% of Total	9.9%	60.3%	29.8%	100.0%

Family Farms

Table 13 indicates that 54.6% of 119 residents encouraged family farms, 42.9% of them allowed them, and 2.5% of the residents discouraged them. Some of the respondents who encouraged family farms mentioned that "[they would] encourage selling what they produce" and "Need more small farms instead of big ones." Some of the respondents who allowed family farms also made some comments: "grain," and "This is concerned."

Table 13: A Crosstabulation of Family Farms by Resident Group

Family Farms * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Family Farms	Encourage	Count	8	41	16	65
		% within Family Farms	12.3%	63.1%	24.6%	100.0%
		% of Total	6.7%	34.5%	13.4%	54.6%
	Allow	Count	3	31	17	51
		% within Family Farms	5.9%	60.8%	33.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	2.5%	26.1%	14.3%	42.9%
	Discourage	Count	0	3	0	3
		% within Family Farms	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	2.5%
Total		Count	11	75	33	119

	% within Family Farms	9.2%	63.0%	27.7%	100.0%
	% of Total	9.2%	63.0%	27.7%	100.0%

Hobby Farms

From Table 14, 43% of 121 respondents encouraged hobby farms, whereas 51.2% of them allowed them but would not encourage. 5.8% of the respondents discouraged this kind of development. Some respondents who endorsed "Allow" said:

- "Inside the Village? Didn't we just have a BBC problem?"
- Tax the living hell out of them; Put some of that money towards village expenses schools, roads …"

Some respondents who discouraged hobby farms mentioned "No pig farms."

Table 14: A Crosstabulation of Hobby Farms by Resident Group

Hobby Farms * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Hobby Farms	Encourage	Count	8	30	14	52
		% within Hobby Farms	15.4%	57.7%	26.9%	100.0%
		% of Total	6.6%	24.8%	11.6%	43.0%
	Allow	Count	3	41	18	62
		% within Hobby Farms	4.8%	66.1%	29.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	2.5%	33.9%	14.9%	51.2%
	Discourage	Count	0	6	1	7
		% within Hobby Farms	0.0%	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	5.0%	.8%	5.8%
Total		Count	11	77	33	121
		% within Hobby Farms	9.1%	63.6%	27.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	9.1%	63.6%	27.3%	100.0%

Large Corporate Livestock Farms

For a development related to large corporate livestock farms, 52.8% of 123 respondents discouraged it, whereas 35.8% allowed this type of development. Only 11.4% of the respondents encouraged it.

Some respondents who discouraged large corporate livestock farms made the following comments:

- "Absolutely discourage"
- "Little revenue for Township, large damage to quality of life"
- "No CAFO's"
- "No pig farm"
- "Not environmentally friendly"
- "Not good for environment"

- "Pollution"
  Some respondents who allowed it said, "Follow the laws, who cares." See Table 15.

Table 15: A Crosstabulation of Large Corporate Livestock Farms by Resident Group

Large corporate livestock farms * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Large corporate livestock farms	Encourage	Count	5	7	2	14
		% within Large corporate livestock farms	35.7%	50.0%	14.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	4.1%	5.7%	1.6%	11.4%
	Allow	Count	3	25	16	44
		% within Large corporate livestock farms	6.8%	56.8%	36.4%	100.0%
		% of Total	2.4%	20.3%	13.0%	35.8%
	Discourage	Count	5	43	17	65
		% within Large corporate livestock farms	7.7%	66.2%	26.2%	100.0%
		% of Total	4.1%	35.0%	13.8%	52.8%
Total		Count	13	75	35	123
		% within Large corporate livestock farms	10.6%	61.0%	28.5%	100.0%
		% of Total	10.6%	61.0%	28.5%	100.0%

Light Industry and Manufacturing

For light industry and manufacturing, 38.2% of 123 respondents encouraged it, and 52% would not encourage it but allowed it. 9.8% discouraged this type of development. See Table 16.

Some of the respondents who allowed it commented:

- "Don't subsidize them but try to help them."
- In existing vacant facilities, repurpose not rezone."
- "Only if it doesn't pollute."

Some of the respondents who discouraged it said:

- "Keep Concord pure."
- "Skilled tradesmen instead?"

Table 16: A Crosstabulation of Light Industry and Manufacturing by Resident Group

Light industry and manufacturing * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Light industry and manufacturing	Encourage	Count	5	29	13	47
		% within Light industry and manufacturing	10.6%	61.7%	27.7%	100.0%
		% of Total	4.1%	23.6%	10.6%	38.2%
	Allow	Count	4	40	20	64
		% within Light industry and manufacturing	6.3%	62.5%	31.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.3%	32.5%	16.3%	52.0%
	Discourage	Count	4	5	3	12
		% within Light industry and manufacturing	33.3%	41.7%	25.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.3%	4.1%	2.4%	9.8%
Total		Count	13	74	36	123
		% within Light industry and manufacturing	10.6%	60.2%	29.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	10.6%	60.2%	29.3%	100.0%

Commercial, Business to Business

According to Table 17, 34.2% of 117 respondents encouraged commercial, business to business. 59% of them allowed this kind of development, whereas 6.8% discouraged it. Some of the respondents who allowed it mentioned, “Don’t subsidize them, but try to help them” and “some [are] ok.”

Table 17: A Crosstabulation of Commercial, Business to Business by Resident Group

Commercial, business to business * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Commercial, business to business	Encourage	Count	4	25	11	40
		% within Commercial, business to business	10.0%	62.5%	27.5%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.4%	21.4%	9.4%	34.2%
	Allow	Count	6	42	21	69

		% within Commercial, business to business	8.7%	60.9%	30.4%	100.0%
		% of Total	5.1%	35.9%	17.9%	59.0%
	Discourage	Count	2	5	1	8
		% within Commercial, business to business	25.0%	62.5%	12.5%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.7%	4.3%	.9%	6.8%
Total		Count	12	72	33	117
		% within Commercial, business to business	10.3%	61.5%	28.2%	100.0%
		% of Total	10.3%	61.5%	28.2%	100.0%

Mineral Extraction

A majority of the respondents (45% of 114 people) discouraged mineral extraction. Some of them mentioned that "Nobody wants that in their community," "Preserve our natural beauty," and "Should not be allowed." However, 42.1% of them allowed mineral extraction, and some of them said, "Follow the laws." Only 12.3% of the respondents encouraged mineral extraction.

Table 18: A Crosstabulation of Mineral Extraction by Resident Group

Mineral extraction * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Mineral extraction	Encourage	Count	3	10	1	14
		% within Mineral extraction	21.4%	71.4%	7.1%	100.0%
		% of Total	2.6%	8.8%	.9%	12.3%
	Allow	Count	5	25	18	48
		% within Mineral extraction	10.4%	52.1%	37.5%	100.0%
		% of Total	4.4%	21.9%	15.8%	42.1%
	Discourage	Count	3	34	15	52
		% within Mineral extraction	5.8%	65.4%	28.8%	100.0%
		% of Total	2.6%	29.8%	13.2%	45.6%
Total		Count	11	69	34	114
		% within Mineral extraction	9.6%	60.5%	29.8%	100.0%
		% of Total	9.6%	60.5%	29.8%	100.0%

Condominiums

According to Table 19, 19.4% of 124 respondents encourage condominiums, and 50.8% of them allowed this type of development. 29.8% of them discouraged condominiums. Some respondents who encouraged it said:
"There are many homes w/one person, elderly. Creating an opportunity for these people to move into smaller manageable condos would open home sales to young families, which would also increase school enrollment. Win/win!"

Table 19: A Crosstabulation of Condominiums by Resident Group

Condominiums * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Condominiums	Encourage	Count	4	13	7	24
		% within Condominiums	16.7%	54.2%	29.2%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.2%	10.5%	5.6%	19.4%
	Allow	Count	5	39	19	63
		% within Condominiums	7.9%	61.9%	30.2%	100.0%
		% of Total	4.0%	31.5%	15.3%	50.8%
	Discourage	Count	3	23	11	37
		% within Condominiums	8.1%	62.2%	29.7%	100.0%
		% of Total	2.4%	18.5%	8.9%	29.8%
Total		Count	12	75	37	124
		% within Condominiums	9.7%	60.5%	29.8%	100.0%
		% of Total	9.7%	60.5%	29.8%	100.0%

Duplexes

From Table 20, 16.1% of 124 respondents encouraged Duplexes, whereas 31.5% discouraged them. 52.4% of them allowed this kind of development. Some respondent who allowed it commented: "Keep them up to code and don't rent to fools." Some respondents who discouraged it mentioned that they "usually became renter nightmare."

Table 20: A Crosstabulation of Duplexes by Resident Group

Duplexes * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Duplexes	Encourage	Count	2	14	4	20
		% within Duplexes	10.0%	70.0%	20.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.6%	11.3%	3.2%	16.1%
	Allow	Count	7	39	19	65
		% within Duplexes	10.8%	60.0%	29.2%	100.0%

		% of Total	5.6%	31.5%	15.3%	52.4%
	Discourage	Count	3	24	12	39
		% within Duplexes	7.7%	61.5%	30.8%	100.0%
		% of Total	2.4%	19.4%	9.7%	31.5%
Total		Count	12	77	35	124
		% within Duplexes	9.7%	62.1%	28.2%	100.0%
		% of Total	9.7%	62.1%	28.2%	100.0%

Mobile-Home Parks

For this type of development, 70.2% of 124 respondents discouraged it. However, 27.4% of them allowed. Only 2.4% of the respondents encouraged this kind of development. Some respondents who mobile-home parks commented the following:

- "Don't encourage our farm community destruction."
- "More burden than benefit."
- "Usually became renter nightmare"

Some of the respondents who allowed mobile-home parks gave the following comments:

- "If needed for lower income families"
- "Not my preference, but not my business"
- "Tiny home, encourage"

Table 21: A Crosstabulation of Mobile-Home Parks by Resident Group

Mobile-home parks * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Mobile-home parks	Encourage	Count	2	0	1	3
		% within Mobile-home parks	66.7%	0.0%	33.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.6%	0.0%	.8%	2.4%
	Allow	Count	2	26	6	34
		% within Mobile-home parks	5.9%	76.5%	17.6%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.6%	21.0%	4.8%	27.4%
	Discourage	Count	7	52	28	87
		% within Mobile-home parks	8.0%	59.8%	32.2%	100.0%
		% of Total	5.6%	41.9%	22.6%	70.2%
Total		Count	11	78	35	124
		% within Mobile-home parks	8.9%	62.9%	28.2%	100.0%
		% of Total	8.9%	62.9%	28.2%	100.0%

Multi-Family Residences

According to Table 22, 9.8% of 122 residents encouraged multi-family residence. A majority of the respondents allowed this kind of development, 55.7%. 34.4% of the respondents discouraged multi-family residences. Some of the respondents who allowed this kind of development commented, "skyscrapers for everyone!". Some of those who discouraged said, they "usually become renter nightmare."

Table 22: A Crosstabulation of Multi-Family Residence by Resident Group

Multi-family residences * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Multi-family residences	Encourage	Count	2	7	3	12
		% within Multi-family residences	16.7%	58.3%	25.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.6%	5.7%	2.5%	9.8%
	Allow	Count	4	47	17	68
		% within Multi-family residences	5.9%	69.1%	25.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.3%	38.5%	13.9%	55.7%
	Discourage	Count	5	22	15	42
		% within Multi-family residences	11.9%	52.4%	35.7%	100.0%
		% of Total	4.1%	18.0%	12.3%	34.4%
Total		Count	11	76	35	122
		% within Multi-family residences	9.0%	62.3%	28.7%	100.0%
		% of Total	9.0%	62.3%	28.7%	100.0%

Single-Family Residential in Clustered Subdivisions

According to Table 23, 22.4% of 125 respondents encouraged single-family residential in clustered subdivisions. 62.4% allowed them, but 15.2% of the respondents discouraged this type of development.

Some of the respondents who allowed sing-family residential in clustered subdivisions mentioned that "developer funds roads and utilities/water sewer" and "whatever floats your boat."

Table 23: A Crosstabulation of Single-Family Residential in Clustered Subdivisions by Resident Group

Single-family residential in clustered subdivisions * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
	Encourage	Count	2	17	9	28

Single-family residential in clustered subdivisions		% within Single-family residential in clustered subdivisions	7.1%	60.7%	32.1%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.6%	13.6%	7.2%	22.4%
	Allow	Count	8	46	24	78
		% within Single-family residential in clustered subdivisions	10.3%	59.0%	30.8%	100.0%
		% of Total	6.4%	36.8%	19.2%	62.4%
	Discourage	Count	2	14	3	19
		% within Single-family residential in clustered subdivisions	10.5%	73.7%	15.8%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.6%	11.2%	2.4%	15.2%
Total		Count	12	77	36	125
		% within Single-family residential in clustered subdivisions	9.6%	61.6%	28.8%	100.0%
		% of Total	9.6%	61.6%	28.8%	100.0%

Single-Family Residential on Large Scattered Lots

As seen from Table 4, 35.8% encouraged single-family residential on large scattered lots. 52.8% allowed this kind of development, and some of them commented that "whatever floats your boat." However, 11.4% discouraged it, saying "Takes farm land mediocre/selfish appearance."

Table 24: A Crosstabulation of Single-Family Residential on Large Scattered Lots by Resident Group

Single-family residential on large scattered lots * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Single-family residential on large scattered lots	Encourage	Count	5	25	14	44
		% within Single-family residential on large scattered lots	11.4%	56.8%	31.8%	100.0%
		% of Total	4.1%	20.3%	11.4%	35.8%
	Allow	Count	5	40	20	65
		% within Single-family residential on large scattered lots	7.7%	61.5%	30.8%	100.0%
		% of Total	4.1%	32.5%	16.3%	52.8%
	Discourage	Count	1	11	2	14

	% within Single-family residential on large scattered lots	7.1%	78.6%	14.3%	100.0%
	% of Total	.8%	8.9%	1.6%	11.4%
Total	Count	11	76	36	123
	% within Single-family residential on large scattered lots	8.9%	61.8%	29.3%	100.0%
	% of Total	8.9%	61.8%	29.3%	100.0%

Traditional Village Development with Small Commercial uses

According to Table 25, 36.7% of 120 respondents encouraged traditional Village development with small commercial uses. 57.5% of them allowed this type of development, and some of them commented, "Isn't this what we're doing now?" 5.8% of the respondents discouraged it.

Table 25: A Crosstabulation of Traditional Village Development with Small Commercial Uses by Resident Group

Traditional village development with small commercial uses * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Traditional village development with small commercial uses	Encourage	Count	4	21	19	44
		% within Traditional village development with small commercial uses	9.1%	47.7%	43.2%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.3%	17.5%	15.8%	36.7%
	Allow	Count	7	49	13	69
		% within Traditional village development with small commercial uses	10.1%	71.0%	18.8%	100.0%
		% of Total	5.8%	40.8%	10.8%	57.5%
	Discourage	Count	0	4	3	7
		% within Traditional village development with small commerical uses	0.0%	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	3.3%	2.5%	5.8%
Total		Count	11	74	35	120
		% within Traditional village development with small commerical uses	9.2%	61.7%	29.2%	100.0%
		% of Total	9.2%	61.7%	29.2%	100.0%

Rank the Five Most Important Issues and/or Concerns That You Feel Currently Face Concord Township/Village.

Eight issues or concerns were presented to the survey respondents. The respondents were asked to rank the issues or concerns from 1 to 5, where 1 was the most important and 5 was the least important. If the respondents give a number that was out of range (i.e., 6, 7, or 8), the numbers were discarded and treated as no ranking. For other issues that were not presented, the respondents were asked to rank it and specify the issue in the space provided.

From Table 26, the most popular issues that were selected to be ranked by the respondents were schools (82.0%), adequate services in the Township/Village (80.5%), amount of development in the Township/Village as a whole (75.2%), township/Village taxes (72.9%), crime (50.4%). However, the top important issues that were based on mean ratings less than 3.0 were:

- Schools (2.3)
- Township/Village taxes (2.6)
- Adequate services in the Township/Village (2.6)
- Loss of farmland (2.7)

For other issues or concerns, see Table 26.

Table 26: Counts and Percentages of the Respondents Who Ranked the Presented Issues or Concerns

Issues or Concerns	N	Percent	Mean	SD
Schools	109	82.00%	2.3	1.3
Township/Village taxes	97	72.90%	2.6	1.3
Other	10	7.50%	2.6	1.8
Adequate services in the Township/Village	107	80.50%	2.6	1.3
Loss of farmland	56	42.10%	2.7	1.6
Crime	67	50.40%	3.2	1.4
Amount of development in the Township/Village as a whole	100	75.20%	3.2	1.4
Environmental degradation in the Township/Village	50	37.60%	3.3	1.2
Recreational opportunities	49	36.80%	3.7	1.4

Note: N = Count; SD = Standard Deviation; a scale from 1 to 5 for ranking means that the average is 3. Thus, top important issues were selected when mean ranking was less than 3.0; Other was not selected because the mean had some bias.

Schools

The percentages of the rankings started with 34.9% of 109 respondents (or 38 respondents) for a ranking of 1, 26.6% for a ranking of 2, and 16.5% for a ranking of 3. The lower the ranking (that is more important the issue is), the higher the percentage of the respondents. See Table 27.

Table 27: A Crosstabulation of Schools by Resident Group

Schools * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			
			Undecided	Township	Village	Total
Schools	1.00	Count	6	21	11	38
		% within Schools	15.8%	55.3%	28.9%	100.0%
		% of Total	5.5%	19.3%	10.1%	34.9%
	2.00	Count	2	17	10	29
		% within Schools	6.9%	58.6%	34.5%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.8%	15.6%	9.2%	26.6%
	3.00	Count	2	11	5	18
		% within Schools	11.1%	61.1%	27.8%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.8%	10.1%	4.6%	16.5%
	4.00	Count	1	11	4	16
		% within Schools	6.3%	68.8%	25.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	.9%	10.1%	3.7%	14.7%
	5.00	Count	0	7	1	8
		% within Schools	0.0%	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	6.4%	.9%	7.3%
Total		Count	11	67	31	109
		% within Schools	10.1%	61.5%	28.4%	100.0%
		% of Total	10.1%	61.5%	28.4%	100.0%

Township/Village taxes

Ninety-seven respondents ranked the issue Township/Village taxes with a ranking of 1 (24.7%), 2 (27.8%), and 3 (21.6%). A ranking of 4 and 5 made up 15.5% and 10.3%, respectively. See Table 28.

Table 28: A Crosstabulation of Township/Village Taxes by Resident Group

Township/Village taxes * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			
			Undecided	Township	Village	Total
Township/Village taxes	1.00	Count	2	12	10	24
		% within Township/Village taxes	8.3%	50.0%	41.7%	100.0%
		% of Total	2.1%	12.4%	10.3%	24.7%
	2.00	Count	3	13	11	27

		% within Township/Village taxes	11.1%	48.1%	40.7%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.1%	13.4%	11.3%	27.8%
	3.00	Count	2	15	4	21
		% within Township/Village taxes	9.5%	71.4%	19.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	2.1%	15.5%	4.1%	21.6%
	4.00	Count	2	7	6	15
		% within Township/Village taxes	13.3%	46.7%	40.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	2.1%	7.2%	6.2%	15.5%
	5.00	Count	1	7	2	10
		% within Township/Village taxes	10.0%	70.0%	20.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.0%	7.2%	2.1%	10.3%
Total		Count	10	54	33	97
		% within Township/Village taxes	10.3%	55.7%	34.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	10.3%	55.7%	34.0%	100.0%

Adequate services in the Township/Village

A hundred and seven respondents ranked the issue Adequate Services in the Township/Village with a ranking of 1 (27.1%), 2 (21.5%), and 3 (29%). A ranking of 4 and 5 made up 12.1% and 10.3%, respectively. See Table 29.

Table 29: A Crosstabulation of Adequate Services in the Township/Village by Resident Group

Adequate services in the Township/Village * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			
			Undecided	Township	Village	Total
Adequate services in the Township/Village	1.00	Count	1	19	9	29
		% within Adequate services in the Township/Village	3.4%	65.5%	31.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	.9%	17.8%	8.4%	27.1%
	2.00	Count	5	12	6	23

		% within Adequate services in the Township/Village	21.7%	52.2%	26.1%	100.0%
		% of Total	4.7%	11.2%	5.6%	21.5%
	3.00	Count	2	22	7	31
		% within Adequate services in the Township/Village	6.5%	71.0%	22.6%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.9%	20.6%	6.5%	29.0%
	4.00	Count	2	8	3	13
		% within Adequate services in the Township/Village	15.4%	61.5%	23.1%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.9%	7.5%	2.8%	12.1%
	5.00	Count	1	5	5	11
		% within Adequate services in the Township/Village	9.1%	45.5%	45.5%	100.0%
		% of Total	.9%	4.7%	4.7%	10.3%
Total		Count	11	66	30	107
		% within Adequate services in the Township/Village	10.3%	61.7%	28.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	10.3%	61.7%	28.0%	100.0%

Loss of Farmland

According to Table 30, 33.9% of 56 respondents ranked the issue loss of farmland with a ranking of 1; 16.1%, a ranking of 2; 16.1%, a raking of 3. A ranking of 4 and 5 made up 10.7% and 23.2%, respectively.

Table 30: A Crosstabulation of Loss of Farmland by Resident Group

Loss of farmland * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			
			Undecided	Township	Village	Total
Loss of farmland	1.00	Count	2	15	2	19
		% within Loss of farmland	10.5%	78.9%	10.5%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.6%	26.8%	3.6%	33.9%
	2.00	Count	1	5	3	9
		% within Loss of farmland	11.1%	55.6%	33.3%	100.0%

		% of Total	1.8%	8.9%	5.4%	16.1%
	3.00	Count	1	7	1	9
		% within Loss of farmland	11.1%	77.8%	11.1%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.8%	12.5%	1.8%	16.1%
	4.00	Count	2	2	2	6
		% within Loss of farmland	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.6%	3.6%	3.6%	10.7%
	5.00	Count	2	8	3	13
		% within Loss of farmland	15.4%	61.5%	23.1%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.6%	14.3%	5.4%	23.2%
Total		Count	8	37	11	56
		% within Loss of farmland	14.3%	66.1%	19.6%	100.0%
		% of Total	14.3%	66.1%	19.6%	100.0%

For all crosstabulations of the issues by resident group, please see Appendix D.

What Should Be Allowed and Where?

Where Should New Housing Development be Located in the Concord Area?

From Table 31, out of 127 respondents, the percentage of the respondents who wanted housing development to be located in both within the Village and Township's rural areas was 44.9%. The second higher percentage (18.1%) of the respondents wanted the housing development to be located within the Village proper. 9.4% of respondents chose Other.

Table 31: Crosstabulation of Housing Development Location by Resident Group

			Resident Group			
			Undecided	Township	Village	Total
Where should new housing development be located in the Concord Area?	Within the Village proper (1)	Count	3	17	3	23
		% within	13.0%	73.9%	13.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	2.4%	13.4%	2.4%	18.1%
	Both within the Village and Township's rural areas (2)	Count	5	33	19	57
		% within	8.8%	57.9%	33.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.9%	26.0%	15.0%	44.9%
		Count	2	8	7	17

	New housing styled in a traditional Village / neighborhood design (3)	Count	2	9	7	18
		% within	11.8%	47.1%	41.2%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.6%	6.3%	5.5%	13.4%
	New mixed-use town center design (commercial, office, residential) (4)	Count	1	12	5	18
		% within	5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	100.0%
		% of Total	.8%	9.4%	3.9%	14.2%
	Other (please specify)	Count	3	7	2	12
		% within	25.0%	58.3%	16.7%	100.0%
		% of Total	2.4%	5.5%	1.6%	9.4%
Total		Count	14	77	36	127
		% within	11.0%	60.6%	28.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	11.0%	60.6%	28.3%	100.0%

Note: (1), (2), (3), and (4) are response options referred to for option "Other (please specify)".

For option "Other (please specify)", the respondents mentioned the following:

- "Any of the above"
- "Anywhere the market allows"
- "None-keep what we have"
- "Not on farm land"
- "Option 3 and lofts in existing building, upper level"
- "Options 2, and 3"
- "Options 2 and 4"
- "Should be minimized"
- "Somewhere away from Agricultural areas"
- "Who cares as long as it's not run down and disgusting and up to code."

Should Business Development be Concentrated in a Few Areas of Dispersed Throughout the Concord Area?

According to Table 32, a majority of the respondents (37.9% of 124 people) thought that business development should be located on the Village/Township's business corridor (M-60). 25.8% thought that business development should be located on the Village Downtown Business District, while the other 24.2% of the respondents thought it should be dispersed throughout the Township. 12.1% of them provided other responses.

Table 32: A Crosstabulation of Business Development Location by Resident Group

			Resident Group			
			Undecided	Township	Village	Total
Should business development be concentrated in a few areas or dispersed throughout the Concord Area?	Located on the Village/Township's business corridor (M-60) (1)	Count	2	31	14	47
		% within	4.3%	66.0%	29.8%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.6%	25.0%	11.3%	37.9%
	Located on the Village Downtown Business District (2)	Count	6	16	10	32
		% within	18.8%	50.0%	31.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	4.8%	12.9%	8.1%	25.8%
	Dispersed throughout the Township (3)	Count	2	21	7	30
		% within	6.7%	70.0%	23.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.6%	16.9%	5.6%	24.2%
	Other (please specify)	Count	4	7	4	15
		% within	26.7%	46.7%	26.7%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.2%	5.6%	3.2%	12.1%
Total		Count	14	75	35	124
		% within	11.3%	60.5%	28.2%	100.0%
		% of Total	11.3%	60.5%	28.2%	100.0%

Note: (1), (2), and (3) are response options.

The respondents who chose the option "Other (please specify)," mentioned the following:

- All of the above
- Anywhere the market allows
- Doesn't matter.
- Option 3 and free market, capitalism and opportunity for growth.
- Options 1 and 2
- Options 1, 2, and 3
- Options 2 and 3

Should the Township/Village Encourage Commercial Development?

According to Table 33, 85.4% of 123 respondents thought that the Township/Village should encourage commercial development. Only 13% thought the opposite. 1.6% of the respondents chose other option. The responses for Other included, "depends on what it is, and "some, not much".

Table 33: A Crosstabulation of Commercial Development Responses by Resident Group

Should the Township/Village encourage commercial development? * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Should the Township/Village encourage commercial development?	No	Count	2	12	2	16
		% within	12.5%	75.0%	12.5%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.6%	9.8%	1.6%	13.0%
	Yes	Count	11	62	32	105
		% within	10.5%	59.0%	30.5%	100.0%
		% of Total	8.9%	50.4%	26.0%	85.4%
	Other	Count	0	1	1	2
		% within	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	.8%	.8%	1.6%
Total		Count	13	75	35	123
		% within	10.6%	61.0%	28.5%	100.0%
		% of Total	10.6%	61.0%	28.5%	100.0%

Should the Township/Village Encourage Light Industrial Development?

According to Table 34, similar to the above question, 83.2% of 125 respondents thought that the Township/Village should encourage light industrial development. Only 14.4% thought the opposite. Finally, 2.4% of the respondents chose other responses rather than "No" or "Yes". The responses included "Depends [on] what it is," "Should be allowed, but not encouraged," and "Within reasons."

Table 34: A Crosstabulation of Light Industrial Development Responses by Resident Group

Should the Township/Village encourage light industrial development? * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Should the Township/Village encourage light industrial development?	No	Count	3	12	3	18
		% within	16.7%	66.7%	16.7%	100.0%
		% of Total	2.4%	9.6%	2.4%	14.4%
	Yes	Count	10	61	33	104
		% within	9.6%	58.7%	31.7%	100.0%
		% of Total	8.0%	48.8%	26.4%	83.2%
	Other	Count	0	2	1	3
		% within	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	1.6%	.8%	2.4%
Total		Count	13	75	37	125
		% within	10.4%	60.0%	29.6%	100.0%
		% of Total	10.4%	60.0%	29.6%	100.0%

Please Provide Any Comments about This Survey or Planning in the Concord Area in the Space Below.

The following unique comments were from respondents in three groups: Undecided, Township, and Village.

Comments from Undecided Residents

- "Keep Concord Township, small agricultural community."
- "The Village needs to separate itself from the township."
- "Minutes of planning commission should be posted on township website."
- "Any new ordinances should be sent to property owners."

Comments from Township Residents

- "All of these [sources of news] are useless. You put out news??? When? Who? I never hear anything."

- "All things should be discussed separately. It is a shame that a huge hog farm can be voted in and disrupt quality of life for home owners."
- "Better/more options for phone/internet. It has not improved where we live."
- "High speed internet [is an issue that should be focused]. Service outside village is horrible/nonexistent)"
- "Consolidate village/township governments (save money)"
- "Do something about the Coyotes--I can't even go outside at night. Also, the constant fireworks and shooting fun, after dark. many laws being broke. Also using Action city streets and destroys personal property. Constant littering on dirt roads and throwing couches, refrigerators on public property."
- "Do something to lower tax"
- "Encourage current bldg [building] owners to develop and allow others to develop their bldgs [buildings] and revive the town."
- "From my real experience on Village, Twp, and County operations, I would like to be informed as to the income (taxes, etc) and expenses (labor, roads, fine dept., Emergency Services, etc). To me, it seems as though the amt. of R/E taxes paid to Concord Twp, we residents see virtually No Road work accomplished. Thank you."
- "I love our little town would hate to see the quaint style completely i would favor a historic district to present that"
- "It would be nice if we could get high speed internet /cable out where we live."
- "Light industrial development "should be allowed, but not encouraged.""
- "Need a "Welcome to Concord" sign along M-60 (2-sided) big and pretty; I really like the flowers planted along the Mill Pond. More along the M-60 corridor in some sort of way"
- "Need something to draw old resident back "home" and keep Young Families here. A great school district with Plenty of housing, jobs and recreational/entertainment opportunities."
- "Notify all residence of any potential change to property zoning prior to any meetings to discuss."
- "Support to medical marijuana facilities and related research facilities as a source of tax and job growth for local economy."
- "We have most of what you are asking about. What you don't have is a Seniors friendly area; no discount water rates for instance. Housing is almost non-existent., almost everything has steps (sometimes many) to get into homes."
- "Would like to see a splash pad at the Park for kids updated playground equipment added to park; restrooms and another concession stand, dugouts and bleachers needed new businesses encouraged in downtown area more community events during year; water bills increase Seniors cannot afford it."

Comments from Village Residents

- "All growth and development is good! It brings in more tax dollars ant it takes the burden of the rest of us."

- "Clean the drinking water in the Village. We buy bottled water. In the kitchen bathrooms, it leaves a residue."
- "The Township should not double tax."
- "Too long of a survey; way too many questions were beyond the scope of the purpose of the survey. It's nice the Boards are encouraging public participation. You guys are doing a good job, it's nice to see the Township & Village working together more and that the boards are forward thinking about problems and opportunities…The quality/ workmanship as well as the artwork were not on par w/ previous years. Same as the silent auction. Unpleasant surprises.
- "Township and village should work together"
- "Residential and commercial growth within the Village of Concord will never happen until the Village Property Taxes are reduced. Concord is too small to have 2 Governments. If we combine both Governments into one, we could reduce the village property taxes, which would encourage growth."
- "…[I] would like to see Concord become more 'farm' friendly with their ordinances. Perhaps not just that, but also concerned with the impact commercial or industrial farming has on or beautiful planet! Not many years ago, even the towns people had a horse, cow or chickens in their yard. This allowed families to provide food for their tables from selling what the animals produced and eating it themselves. Today, our green lawns are only useful to sit on an mow. What a waste of such good land! Understandably, there are limits to this in the present day, Animals make noise and smells (if not managed properly) that most people in town may want to avoid. Just know there are residents who would have to have more freedom on tehri property to raise animals that they know what they ate and how they lived. These would be animals that didn't live on inhumane factory farms and contributed to the degradation of the soil, run off into water ways and pollution of our air. Instead, they would improve the solid and the lives of the owners."
- "No mowing or weed whipping on Sundays (Village). No residential fire works after 10.00 PM (Village). Landlords in the village "MUST BE REQUIRED" to keep there rental houses and or rental buildings in decent shape. Mainly painted and roofs kept up. Residents in the village must be encouraged to keep there [their] houses in decent repair (mainly scraped and painted). Residents and landlord's in the village must be required to keep there [their] limbs high enough and ack off the sidewalks far enough as to allow people to walk freely. There are just a few things that both the township and village should stand together on. Yes, that's right, if the village and the township stand together on some of these issues then no one can take sides.

Appendix A

Crosstabulation of Relied upon Source by the Four Groups of Residence: Undecided, Township, Village, and Total.

News: Social Media: Facebook, Twitter, Snapchat, etc. * Residence type Crosstabulation

			Residence type			
			Undecided	Township	Village	Total
News: Social Media: Facebook, Twitter, Snapchat, etc.	1	Count	5	13	13	31
		% within News: Social Media: Facebook, Twitter, Snapchat, etc.	16.1%	41.9%	41.9%	100.0%
		% of Total	10.0%	26.0%	26.0%	62.0%
	2	Count	1	6	0	7
		% within News: Social Media: Facebook, Twitter, Snapchat, etc.	14.3%	85.7%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	2.0%	12.0%	0.0%	14.0%
	3	Count	0	4	3	7
		% within News: Social Media: Facebook, Twitter, Snapchat, etc.	0.0%	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	8.0%	6.0%	14.0%
	4	Count	0	1	0	1
		% within News: Social Media: Facebook, Twitter, Snapchat, etc.	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	2.0%
	5	Count	0	2	0	2
		% within News: Social Media: Facebook, Twitter, Snapchat, etc.	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	4.0%
	7	Count	0	0	1	1
		% within News: Social Media: Facebook, Twitter, Snapchat, etc.	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	2.0%
	9	Count	0	1	0	1
		% within News: Social Media: Facebook, Twitter, Snapchat, etc.	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	2.0%
Total		Count	6	27	17	50
		% within News: Social Media: Facebook, Twitter, Snapchat, etc.	12.0%	54.0%	34.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	12.0%	54.0%	34.0%	100.0%

News: Local Newspaper: The Salesman; Albion Reader * Residence type Crosstabulation

			Residence type		
			Undecided	Township	Village
News: Local Newspaper: The Salesman; Albion Reader	1	Count	6	33	10
		% within News: Local Newspaper: The Salesman; Albion Reader	12.2%	67.3%	20.4%
		% of Total	7.7%	42.3%	12.8%
	2	Count	1	9	4
		% within News: Local Newspaper: The Salesman; Albion Reader	7.1%	64.3%	28.6%
		% of Total	1.3%	11.5%	5.1%
	3	Count	0	6	3
		% within News: Local Newspaper: The Salesman; Albion Reader	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%
		% of Total	0.0%	7.7%	3.8%
	4	Count	0	2	3
		% within News: Local Newspaper: The Salesman; Albion Reader	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	2.6%	3.8%
	5	Count	0	1	0
		% within News: Local Newspaper: The Salesman; Albion Reader	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%
Total		Count	7	51	20
		% within News: Local Newspaper: The Salesman; Albion Reader	9.0%	65.4%	25.6%
		% of Total	9.0%	65.4%	25.6%

News: Local Newspaper: The Salesman; Albion Reader * Residence type Crosstabulation

			Total
News: Local Newspaper: The Salesman; Albion Reader	1	Count	49
		% within News: Local Newspaper: The Salesman; Albion Reader	100.0%
		% of Total	62.8%
	2	Count	14
		% within News: Local Newspaper: The Salesman; Albion Reader	100.0%
		% of Total	17.9%
	3	Count	9

		% within News: Local Newspaper: The Salesman; Albion Reader	100.0%
		% of Total	11.5%
	4	Count	5
		% within News: Local Newspaper: The Salesman; Albion Reader	100.0%
		% of Total	6.4%
	5	Count	1
		% within News: Local Newspaper: The Salesman; Albion Reader	100.0%
		% of Total	1.3%
Total		Count	78
		% within News: Local Newspaper: The Salesman; Albion Reader	100.0%
		% of Total	100.0%

News: Regional Newspapers: Jackson Citizen Patriot * Residence type Crosstabulation

			Residence type			
			Undecided	Township	Village	Total
News: Regional Newspapers: Jackson Citizen Patriot	1	Count	2	19	5	26
		% within News: Regional Newspapers: Jackson Citizen Patriot	7.7%	73.1%	19.2%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.6%	33.9%	8.9%	46.4%
	2	Count	0	13	4	17
		% within News: Regional Newspapers: Jackson Citizen Patriot	0.0%	76.5%	23.5%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	23.2%	7.1%	30.4%
	3	Count	1	4	0	5
		% within News: Regional Newspapers: Jackson Citizen Patriot	20.0%	80.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.8%	7.1%	0.0%	8.9%
	4	Count	0	2	2	4
		% within News: Regional Newspapers: Jackson Citizen Patriot	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	3.6%	3.6%	7.1%
	5	Count	0	2	0	2
		% within News: Regional Newspapers: Jackson Citizen Patriot	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	3.6%
	6	Count	0	0	1	1
		% within News: Regional Newspapers: Jackson Citizen Patriot	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%

		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	1.8%
	10	Count	0	0	1	1
		% within News: Regional Newspapers: Jackson Citizen Patriot	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	1.8%
Total		Count	3	40	13	56
		% within News: Regional Newspapers: Jackson Citizen Patriot	5.4%	71.4%	23.2%	100.0%
		% of Total	5.4%	71.4%	23.2%	100.0%

News: TV Regional television: WILX NBC 10; WLNS CBS 6; WSYM FOX 47; WLAJ ABC 53 * Residence type Crosstabulation

			Residence type			
			Undecided	Township	Village	Total
News: TV Regional television: WILX NBC 10; WLNS CBS 6; WSYM FOX 47; WLAJ ABC 53	1	Count	2	25	3	30
		% within News: TV Regional television: WILX NBC 10; WLNS CBS 6; WSYM FOX 47; WLAJ ABC 53	6.7%	83.3%	10.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.1%	39.1%	4.7%	46.9%
	2	Count	0	9	3	12
		% within News: TV Regional television: WILX NBC 10; WLNS CBS 6; WSYM FOX 47; WLAJ ABC 53	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	14.1%	4.7%	18.8%
	3	Count	0	9	3	12
		% within News: TV Regional television: WILX NBC 10; WLNS CBS 6; WSYM FOX 47; WLAJ ABC 53	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	14.1%	4.7%	18.8%
	4	Count	0	4	2	6
		% within News: TV Regional television: WILX NBC 10; WLNS CBS 6; WSYM FOX 47; WLAJ ABC 53	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	6.3%	3.1%	9.4%
	5	Count	0	1	0	1
		% within News: TV Regional television: WILX NBC 10; WLNS CBS 6; WSYM FOX 47; WLAJ ABC 53	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	1.6%
	6	Count	0	1	0	1

		% within News: TV Regional television: WILX NBC 10; WLNS CBS 6; WSYM FOX 47; WLAJ ABC 53	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	1.6%
	10	Count	0	1	1	2
		% within News: TV Regional television: WILX NBC 10; WLNS CBS 6; WSYM FOX 47; WLAJ ABC 53	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	1.6%	1.6%	3.1%
Total		Count	2	50	12	64
		% within News: TV Regional television: WILX NBC 10; WLNS CBS 6; WSYM FOX 47; WLAJ ABC 53	3.1%	78.1%	18.8%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.1%	78.1%	18.8%	100.0%

News: Radio: Q106.1; K105.3; etc. * Residence type Crosstabulation

			Residence type		
			Township	Village	Total
News: Radio: Q106.1; K105.3; etc.	1	Count	3	2	5
		% within News: Radio: Q106.1; K105.3; etc.	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	14.3%	9.5%	23.8%
	2	Count	2	0	2
		% within News: Radio: Q106.1; K105.3; etc.	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	9.5%	0.0%	9.5%
	3	Count	1	0	1
		% within News: Radio: Q106.1; K105.3; etc.	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	4.8%	0.0%	4.8%
	4	Count	4	0	4
		% within News: Radio: Q106.1; K105.3; etc.	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	19.0%	0.0%	19.0%
	5	Count	4	0	4
		% within News: Radio: Q106.1; K105.3; etc.	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	19.0%	0.0%	19.0%
	6	Count	2	1	3
		% within News: Radio: Q106.1; K105.3; etc.	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	9.5%	4.8%	14.3%
	7	Count	0	1	1
		% within News: Radio: Q106.1; K105.3; etc.	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%

		% of Total	0.0%	4.8%	4.8%
	9	Count	1	0	1
		% within News: Radio: Q106.1; K105.3; etc.	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	4.8%	0.0%	4.8%
Total		Count	17	4	21
		% within News: Radio: Q106.1; K105.3; etc.	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%

News: Word of mouth * Residence type Crosstabulation

			Residence type		
			Undecided	Township	Village
News: Word of mouth	1	Count	6	22	16
		% within News: Word of mouth	13.6%	50.0%	36.4%
		% of Total	6.7%	24.4%	17.8%
	2	Count	1	10	4
		% within News: Word of mouth	6.7%	66.7%	26.7%
		% of Total	1.1%	11.1%	4.4%
	3	Count	0	10	5
		% within News: Word of mouth	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%
		% of Total	0.0%	11.1%	5.6%
	4	Count	1	6	2
		% within News: Word of mouth	11.1%	66.7%	22.2%
		% of Total	1.1%	6.7%	2.2%
	5	Count	0	6	0
		% within News: Word of mouth	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%
	6	Count	0	1	0
		% within News: Word of mouth	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%
Total		Count	8	55	27
		% within News: Word of mouth	8.9%	61.1%	30.0%
		% of Total	8.9%	61.1%	30.0%

News: Word of mouth * Residence type Crosstabulation

			Total
News: Word of mouth	1	Count	44
		% within News: Word of mouth	100.0%
		% of Total	48.9%
	2	Count	15
		% within News: Word of mouth	100.0%
		% of Total	16.7%

	3	Count	15
		% within News: Word of mouth	100.0%
		% of Total	16.7%
	4	Count	9
		% within News: Word of mouth	100.0%
		% of Total	10.0%
	5	Count	6
		% within News: Word of mouth	100.0%
		% of Total	6.7%
	6	Count	1
		% within News: Word of mouth	100.0%
		% of Total	1.1%
Total		Count	90
		% within News: Word of mouth	100.0%
		% of Total	100.0%

News: Township/village meetings * Residence type Crosstabulation

			Residence type			
			Undecided	Township	Village	Total
News: Township/village meetings	1	Count	1	3	5	9
		% within News: Township/village meetings	11.1%	33.3%	55.6%	100.0%
		% of Total	4.3%	13.0%	21.7%	39.1%
	2	Count	0	3	1	4
		% within News: Township/village meetings	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	13.0%	4.3%	17.4%
	3	Count	0	1	1	2
		% within News: Township/village meetings	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	4.3%	4.3%	8.7%
	4	Count	0	2	1	3
		% within News: Township/village meetings	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	8.7%	4.3%	13.0%
	5	Count	0	1	0	1
		% within News: Township/village meetings	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	4.3%	0.0%	4.3%
	6	Count	0	0	1	1
		% within News: Township/village meetings	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	4.3%
	7	Count	0	1	0	1
		% within News: Township/village meetings	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%

		% of Total	0.0%	4.3%	0.0%	4.3%
	8	Count	0	1	1	2
		% within News: Township/village meetings	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	4.3%	4.3%	8.7%
Total		Count	1	12	10	23
		% within News: Township/village meetings	4.3%	52.2%	43.5%	100.0%
		% of Total	4.3%	52.2%	43.5%	100.0%

News: Township/village websites * Residence type Crosstabulation

			Residence type			
			Undecided	Township	Village	Total
News: Township/village websites	1	Count	1	3	6	10
		% within News: Township/village websites	10.0%	30.0%	60.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.4%	10.3%	20.7%	34.5%
	2	Count	0	2	1	3
		% within News: Township/village websites	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	6.9%	3.4%	10.3%
	3	Count	0	0	5	5
		% within News: Township/village websites	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	17.2%	17.2%
	4	Count	0	2	0	2
		% within News: Township/village websites	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	6.9%	0.0%	6.9%
	5	Count	1	1	4	6
		% within News: Township/village websites	16.7%	16.7%	66.7%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.4%	3.4%	13.8%	20.7%
	6	Count	0	1	0	1
		% within News: Township/village websites	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	3.4%
	7	Count	0	1	0	1
		% within News: Township/village websites	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	3.4%
	8	Count	0	1	0	1
		% within News: Township/village websites	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	3.4%
Total		Count	2	11	16	29

	% within News: Township/village websites	6.9%	37.9%	55.2%	100.0%
	% of Total	6.9%	37.9%	55.2%	100.0%

News: Other online sources (email, webisites, etc). * Residence type Crosstabulation

			Residence type			
			Undecided	Township	Village	Total
News: Other online sources (email, webisites, etc).	1	Count	1	7	4	12
		% within News: Other online sources (email, webisites, etc).	8.3%	58.3%	33.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.4%	24.1%	13.8%	41.4%
	2	Count	0	2	1	3
		% within News: Other online sources (email, webisites, etc).	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	6.9%	3.4%	10.3%
	3	Count	0	4	0	4
		% within News: Other online sources (email, webisites, etc).	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	13.8%	0.0%	13.8%
	4	Count	0	2	3	5
		% within News: Other online sources (email, webisites, etc).	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	6.9%	10.3%	17.2%
	5	Count	0	1	0	1
		% within News: Other online sources (email, webisites, etc).	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	3.4%
	6	Count	0	3	0	3
		% within News: Other online sources (email, webisites, etc).	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	10.3%	0.0%	10.3%
	7	Count	0	0	1	1
		% within News: Other online sources (email, webisites, etc).	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	3.4%
Total		Count	1	19	9	29
		% within News: Other online sources (email, webisites, etc).	3.4%	65.5%	31.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.4%	65.5%	31.0%	100.0%

News: Other, please specify: * Residence type Crosstabulation

			Residence type		
			Undecided	Township	Village
News: Other, please specify:	1	Count	1	1	4
		% within News: Other, please specify:	16.7%	16.7%	66.7%
		% of Total	11.1%	11.1%	44.4%
	2	Count	1	0	1
		% within News: Other, please specify:	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%
		% of Total	11.1%	0.0%	11.1%
	5	Count	0	1	0
		% within News: Other, please specify:	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%
Total		Count	2	2	5
		% within News: Other, please specify:	22.2%	22.2%	55.6%
		% of Total	22.2%	22.2%	55.6%

News: Other, please specify: * Residence type Crosstabulation

			Total
News: Other, please specify:	1	Count	6
		% within News: Other, please specify:	100.0%
		% of Total	66.7%
	2	Count	2
		% within News: Other, please specify:	100.0%
		% of Total	22.2%
	5	Count	1
		% within News: Other, please specify:	100.0%
		% of Total	11.1%
Total		Count	9
		% within News: Other, please specify:	100.0%
		% of Total	100.0%

Other, please specify * Residence type Crosstabulation

		Residence type			
		Undecided	Township	Village	Total
Other, please specify	Count	13	79	32	124
	% within Other, please specify	10.5%	63.7%	25.8%	100.0%

		% of Total	9.8%	59.4%	24.1%	93.2%
	Albion-news	Count	0	1	0	1
		% within Other, please specify	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%
	Lions Club	Count	0	0	1	1
		% within Other, please specify	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%
	Mail	Count	0	1	0	1
		% within Other, please specify	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%
	Meeting minutes pubications from village meetings	Count	0	0	1	1
		% within Other, please specify	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%
	Minutes of the meetings come to the salesman.	Count	0	0	1	1
		% within Other, please specify	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%
	MLive	Count	1	0	0	1
		% within Other, please specify	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
	Monthly Village Voice Paper	Count	0	0	1	1
		% within Other, please specify	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%
	Village mailer	Count	0	0	1	1
		% within Other, please specify	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%
	Village News sheet	Count	1	0	0	1
		% within Other, please specify	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
Total		Count	15	81	37	133
		% within Other, please specify	11.3%	60.9%	27.8%	100.0%
		% of Total	11.3%	60.9%	27.8%	100.0%

Other, please specify * Residence type Crosstabulation

	Residence type			
	Undecided	Township	Village	Total

Other, please specify		Count	13	79	32	124
		% within Other, please specify	10.5%	63.7%	25.8%	100.0%
		% of Total	9.8%	59.4%	24.1%	93.2%
	Albion-news	Count	0	1	0	1
		% within Other, please specify	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%
	Lions Club	Count	0	0	1	1
		% within Other, please specify	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%
	Mail	Count	0	1	0	1
		% within Other, please specify	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%
	Meeting minutes pubications from village meetings	Count	0	0	1	1
		% within Other, please specify	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%
	Minutes of the meetings come to the salesman.	Count	0	0	1	1
		% within Other, please specify	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%
	MLive	Count	1	0	0	1
		% within Other, please specify	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
	Monthly Village Voice Paper	Count	0	0	1	1
		% within Other, please specify	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%
	Village mailer	Count	0	0	1	1
		% within Other, please specify	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%

Village News sheet	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within Other, please specify	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
Total	Count	15	81	37	133
	% within Other, please specify	11.3%	60.9%	27.8%	100.0%
	% of Total	11.3%	60.9%	27.8%	100.0%

Appendix B

Crosstabs of Access to Email/Internet and Uses of Computer Devices by Resident Groups

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
I use laptop, tablet, computer, and/or smartphone in my home * Residence type	107	80.5%	26	19.5%	133	100.0%
I use laptop, tablet, computer, and/or smartphone in my work * Residence type	52	39.1%	81	60.9%	133	100.0%
I have access to email/internet in my work * Residence type	102	76.7%	31	23.3%	133	100.0%
I have access to email/internet in my home * Residence type	53	39.8%	80	60.2%	133	100.0%

I use laptop, tablet, computer, and/or smartphone in my home * Residence type Crosstabulation

			Residence type		
			Undecided	Township	Village
I use laptop, tablet, computer, and/or smartphone in my home	Yes	Count	8	66	33
		% within I use laptop, tablet, computer, and/or smartphone in my home	7.5%	61.7%	30.8%
		% of Total	7.5%	61.7%	30.8%
Total		Count	8	66	33
		% within I use laptop, tablet, computer, and/or smartphone in my home	7.5%	61.7%	30.8%
		% of Total	7.5%	61.7%	30.8%

I use laptop, tablet, computer, and/or smartphone in my home * Residence type Crosstabulation

			Total
I use laptop, tablet, computer, and/or smartphone in my home	Yes	Count	107
		% within I use laptop, tablet, computer, and/or smartphone in my home	100.0%
		% of Total	100.0%
Total		Count	107
		% within I use laptop, tablet, computer, and/or smartphone in my home	100.0%
		% of Total	100.0%

I use laptop, tablet, computer, and/or smartphone in my work * Residence type Crosstabulation

			Residence type		
			Undecided	Township	Village
I use laptop, tablet, computer, and/or smartphone in my work	Yes	Count	4	26	22
		% within I use laptop, tablet, computer, and/or smartphone in my work	7.7%	50.0%	42.3%
		% of Total	7.7%	50.0%	42.3%
Total		Count	4	26	22
		% within I use laptop, tablet, computer, and/or smartphone in my work	7.7%	50.0%	42.3%
		% of Total	7.7%	50.0%	42.3%

I use laptop, tablet, computer, and/or smartphone in my work * Residence type Crosstabulation

			Total
I use laptop, tablet, computer, and/or smartphone in my work	Yes	Count	52
		% within I use laptop, tablet, computer, and/or smartphone in my work	100.0%
		% of Total	100.0%
Total		Count	52
		% within I use laptop, tablet, computer, and/or smartphone in my work	100.0%
		% of Total	100.0%

I have access to email/internet in my work * Residence type Crosstabulation

			Residence type		
			Undecided	Township	Village
I have access to email/internet in my work	Yes	Count	7	64	31
		% within I have access to email/internet in my work	6.9%	62.7%	30.4%
		% of Total	6.9%	62.7%	30.4%
Total		Count	7	64	31
		% within I have access to email/internet in my work	6.9%	62.7%	30.4%
		% of Total	6.9%	62.7%	30.4%

I have access to email/internet in my work * Residence type Crosstabulation

			Total
I have access to email/internet in my work	Yes	Count	102
		% within I have access to email/internet in my work	100.0%
		% of Total	100.0%
Total		Count	102
		% within I have access to email/internet in my work	100.0%
		% of Total	100.0%

I have access to email/internet in my home * Residence type Crosstabulation

			Residence type		
			Undecided	Township	Village
I have access to email/internet in my home	Yes	Count	3	28	22
		% within I have access to email/internet in my home	5.7%	52.8%	41.5%
		% of Total	5.7%	52.8%	41.5%
Total		Count	3	28	22
		% within I have access to email/internet in my home	5.7%	52.8%	41.5%
		% of Total	5.7%	52.8%	41.5%

I have access to email/internet in my home * Residence type Crosstabulation

			Total
I have access to email/internet in my home	Yes	Count	53
		% within I have access to email/internet in my home	100.0%
		% of Total	100.0%
Total		Count	53
		% within I have access to email/internet in my home	100.0%
		% of Total	100.0%

Appendix C

A Crosstabulation of Issues by Resident Group

Community: Strong sense of individuality and community pride * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Community: Strong sense of individuality and community pride	1	Count	4	19	9	32
		% within Community: Strong sense of individuality and community pride	12.50%	59.40%	28.10%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.00%	14.30%	6.80%	24.10%
	2	Count	3	19	14	36
		% within Community: Strong sense of individuality and community pride	8.30%	52.80%	38.90%	100.00%
		% of Total	2.30%	14.30%	10.50%	27.10%
	3	Count	1	19	4	24
		% within Community: Strong sense of individuality and community pride	4.20%	79.20%	16.70%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	14.30%	3.00%	18.00%
	4	Count	2	5	4	11
		% within Community: Strong sense of individuality and community pride	18.20%	45.50%	36.40%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	3.80%	3.00%	8.30%
	NP	Count	5	19	6	30
		% within Community: Strong sense of individuality and community pride	16.70%	63.30%	20.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.80%	14.30%	4.50%	22.60%
Total		Count	15	81	37	133

	% within Community: Strong sense of individuality and community pride	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
	% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Community: Public participation/community cohesiveness * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Community: Public participation/community cohesiveness	1	Count	2	10	4	16
		% within Community: Public participation/community cohesiveness	12.50%	62.50%	25.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	7.50%	3.00%	12.00%
	2	Count	4	16	17	37
		% within Community: Public participation/community cohesiveness	10.80%	43.20%	45.90%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.00%	12.00%	12.80%	27.80%
	3	Count	2	23	7	32
		% within Community: Public participation/community cohesiveness	6.30%	71.90%	21.90%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	17.30%	5.30%	24.10%
	4	Count	3	10	4	17
		% within Community: Public participation/community cohesiveness	17.60%	58.80%	23.50%	100.00%
		% of Total	2.30%	7.50%	3.00%	12.80%
	NP	Count	4	22	5	31
		% within Community: Public participation/community cohesiveness	12.90%	71.00%	16.10%	100.00%

	% of Total	3.00%	16.50%	3.80%	23.30%
Total	Count	15	81	37	133
	% within Community: Public participation/community cohesiveness	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
	% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Community: Diversity among residents and neighborhoods * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Community: Diversity among residents and neighborhoods	1	Count	0	5	6	11
		% within Community: Diversity among residents and neighborhoods	0.00%	45.50%	54.50%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.00%	3.80%	4.50%	8.30%
	2	Count	4	15	7	26
		% within Community: Diversity among residents and neighborhoods	15.40%	57.70%	26.90%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.00%	11.30%	5.30%	19.50%
	3	Count	4	29	9	42
		% within Community: Diversity among residents and neighborhoods	9.50%	69.00%	21.40%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.00%	21.80%	6.80%	31.60%
	4	Count	1	8	6	15
		% within Community: Diversity among residents and neighborhoods	6.70%	53.30%	40.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	6.00%	4.50%	11.30%
	NP	Count	6	24	9	39
		% within Community: Diversity among residents and neighborhoods	15.40%	61.50%	23.10%	100.00%
		% of Total	4.50%	18.00%	6.80%	29.30%
Total		Count	15	81	37	133

	% within Community: Diversity among residents and neighborhoods	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
	% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Mobility and transportation: Roads safe for walking and biking * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Mobility and transportation: Roads safe for walking and biking	1	Count	3	19	14	36
		% within Mobility and transportation: Roads safe for walking and biking	8.30%	52.80%	38.90%	100.00%
		% of Total	2.30%	14.30%	10.50%	27.10%
	2	Count	5	23	11	39
		% within Mobility and transportation: Roads safe for walking and biking	12.80%	59.00%	28.20%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.80%	17.30%	8.30%	29.30%
	3	Count	1	13	4	18
		% within Mobility and transportation: Roads safe for walking and biking	5.60%	72.20%	22.20%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	9.80%	3.00%	13.50%
	4	Count	4	18	5	27
		% within Mobility and transportation: Roads safe for walking and biking	14.80%	66.70%	18.50%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.00%	13.50%	3.80%	20.30%
	NP	Count	2	8	3	13
		% within Mobility and transportation: Roads safe for walking and biking	15.40%	61.50%	23.10%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	6.00%	2.30%	9.80%
Total		Count	15	81	37	133
		% within Mobility and transportation: Roads safe for walking and biking	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

	% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Mobility and transportation: Condition of Township roads (excluding Village streets and M-60 State Highway) * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Mobility and transportation: Condition of Township roads (excluding Village streets and M-60 State Highway)	1	Count	1	24	11	36
		% within Mobility and transportation: Condition of Township roads (excluding Village streets and M-60 State Highway)	2.80%	66.70%	30.60%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	18.00%	8.30%	27.10%
	2	Count	4	18	5	27
		% within Mobility and transportation: Condition of Township roads (excluding Village streets and M-60 State Highway)	14.80%	66.70%	18.50%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.00%	13.50%	3.80%	20.30%
	3	Count	4	15	14	33
		% within Mobility and transportation: Condition of Township roads (excluding Village streets and M-60 State Highway)	12.10%	45.50%	42.40%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.00%	11.30%	10.50%	24.80%
	4	Count	3	19	6	28
		% within Mobility and transportation: Condition of Township roads (excluding Village streets and M-60 State Highway)	10.70%	67.90%	21.40%	100.00%
		% of Total	2.30%	14.30%	4.50%	21.10%
	NP	Count	3	5	1	9

	% within Mobility and transportation: Condition of Township roads (excluding Village streets and M-60 State Highway)	33.30%	55.60%	11.10%	100.00%
	% of Total	2.30%	3.80%	0.80%	6.80%
Total	Count	15	81	37	133
	% within Mobility and transportation: Condition of Township roads (excluding Village streets and M-60 State Highway)	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
	% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Mobility and transportation: Condition of Village streets (excluding Township roads and M-60 State Highway) * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Mobility and transportation: Condition of Village streets (excluding Township roads and M-60 State Highway)	1	Count	1	15	11	27
		% within Mobility and transportation: Condition of Village streets (excluding Township roads and M-60 State Highway)	3.70%	55.60%	40.70%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	11.30%	8.30%	20.30%
	2	Count	7	23	10	40
		% within Mobility and transportation: Condition of Village streets (excluding Township roads and M-60 State Highway)	17.50%	57.50%	25.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	5.30%	17.30%	7.50%	30.10%
	3	Count	4	23	9	36
		% within Mobility and transportation: Condition of Village streets (excluding Township roads and M-60 State Highway)	11.10%	63.90%	25.00%	100.00%

		% of Total	3.00%	17.30%	6.80%	27.10%
	4	Count	1	10	6	17
		% within Mobility and transportation: Condition of Village streets (excluding Township roads and M-60 State Highway)	5.90%	58.80%	35.30%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	7.50%	4.50%	12.80%
	NP	Count	2	10	1	13
		% within Mobility and transportation: Condition of Village streets (excluding Township roads and M-60 State Highway)	15.40%	76.90%	7.70%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	7.50%	0.80%	9.80%
Total		Count	15	81	37	133
		% within Mobility and transportation: Condition of Village streets (excluding Township roads and M-60 State Highway)	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Mobility and transportation: Villages sidewalk system * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Mobility and transportation: Villages sidewalk system	1	Count	1	12	10	23
		% within Mobility and transportation: Villages sidewalk system	4.30%	52.20%	43.50%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	9.00%	7.50%	17.30%
	2	Count	4	20	9	33
		% within Mobility and transportation: Villages sidewalk system	12.10%	60.60%	27.30%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.00%	15.00%	6.80%	24.80%
	3	Count	4	22	12	38

		% within Mobility and transportation: Villages sidewalk system	10.50%	57.90%	31.60%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.00%	16.50%	9.00%	28.60%
	4	Count	1	11	5	17
		% within Mobility and transportation: Villages sidewalk system	5.90%	64.70%	29.40%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	8.30%	3.80%	12.80%
	NP	Count	5	16	1	22
		% within Mobility and transportation: Villages sidewalk system	22.70%	72.70%	4.50%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.80%	12.00%	0.80%	16.50%
Total		Count	15	81	37	133
		% within Mobility and transportation: Villages sidewalk system	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Economy: Diversity of commercial business * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Economy: Diversity of commercial business	1	Count	1	11	8	20
		% within Economy: Diversity of commercial business	5.00%	55.00%	40.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	8.30%	6.00%	15.00%
	2	Count	3	13	5	21
		% within Economy: Diversity of commercial business	14.30%	61.90%	23.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	2.30%	9.80%	3.80%	15.80%
	3	Count	3	19	11	33
		% within Economy: Diversity of commercial business	9.10%	57.60%	33.30%	100.00%

		% of Total	2.30%	14.30%	8.30%	24.80%
	4	Count	2	21	8	31
		% within Economy: Diversity of commercial business	6.50%	67.70%	25.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	15.80%	6.00%	23.30%
	NP	Count	6	17	5	28
		% within Economy: Diversity of commercial business	21.40%	60.70%	17.90%	100.00%
		% of Total	4.50%	12.80%	3.80%	21.10%
Total		Count	15	81	37	133
		% within Economy: Diversity of commercial business	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Economy: Incentives for business development * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Economy: Incentives for business development	1	Count	0	12	6	18
		% within Economy: Incentives for business development	0.00%	66.70%	33.30%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.00%	9.00%	4.50%	13.50%
	2	Count	1	14	6	21
		% within Economy: Incentives for business development	4.80%	66.70%	28.60%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	10.50%	4.50%	15.80%
	3	Count	3	19	8	30
		% within Economy: Incentives for business development	10.00%	63.30%	26.70%	100.00%
		% of Total	2.30%	14.30%	6.00%	22.60%
	4	Count	3	10	9	22

		% within Economy: Incentives for business development	13.60%	45.50%	40.90%	100.00%
		% of Total	2.30%	7.50%	6.80%	16.50%
	NP	Count	8	26	8	42
		% within Economy: Incentives for business development	19.00%	61.90%	19.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	6.00%	19.50%	6.00%	31.60%
Total		Count	15	81	37	133
		% within Economy: Incentives for business development	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Economy: Incorporating commercial development into appropriate community design * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Economy: Incorporating commercial development into appropriate community design	1	Count	0	11	6	17
		% within Economy: Incorporating commercial development into appropriate community design	0.00%	64.70%	35.30%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.00%	8.30%	4.50%	12.80%
	2	Count	1	13	8	22
		% within Economy: Incorporating commercial development into appropriate community design	4.50%	59.10%	36.40%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	9.80%	6.00%	16.50%
	3	Count	4	20	7	31

		% within Economy: Incorporating commercial development into appropriate community design	12.90%	64.50%	22.60%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.00%	15.00%	5.30%	23.30%
	4	Count	2	15	5	22
		% within Economy: Incorporating commercial development into appropriate community design	9.10%	68.20%	22.70%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	11.30%	3.80%	16.50%
	NP	Count	8	22	11	41
		% within Economy: Incorporating commercial development into appropriate community design	19.50%	53.70%	26.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	6.00%	16.50%	8.30%	30.80%
Total		Count	15	81	37	133
		% within Economy: Incorporating commercial development into appropriate community design	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Economy: Encourage expansion of access to high speed internet and improved cellular services * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Economy: Encourage expansion of access to high speed internet and improved cellular services	1	Count	1	25	12	38
		% within Economy: Encourage expansion of access to high speed internet and improved cellular services	2.60%	65.80%	31.60%	100.00%

		% of Total	0.80%	18.80%	9.00%	28.60%
	2	Count	2	12	3	17
		% within Economy: Encourage expansion of access to high speed internet and improved cellular services	11.80%	70.60%	17.60%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	9.00%	2.30%	12.80%
	3	Count	2	16	8	26
		% within Economy: Encourage expansion of access to high speed internet and improved cellular services	7.70%	61.50%	30.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	12.00%	6.00%	19.50%
	4	Count	4	12	5	21
		% within Economy: Encourage expansion of access to high speed internet and improved cellular services	19.00%	57.10%	23.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.00%	9.00%	3.80%	15.80%
	NP	Count	6	16	9	31
		% within Economy: Encourage expansion of access to high speed internet and improved cellular services	19.40%	51.60%	29.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	4.50%	12.00%	6.80%	23.30%
Total		Count	15	81	37	133
		% within Economy: Encourage expansion of access to high speed internet and improved cellular services	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Economy: Continued improvements to Village's Downtown Business District? * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Economy: Continued improvements to Village's Downtown Business District?	1	Count	2	18	9	29
		% within Economy: Continued improvements to Village's Downtown Business District?	6.90%	62.10%	31.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	13.50%	6.80%	21.80%
	2	Count	6	21	16	43
		% within Economy: Continued improvements to Village's Downtown Business District?	14.00%	48.80%	37.20%	100.00%
		% of Total	4.50%	15.80%	12.00%	32.30%
	3	Count	1	19	10	30
		% within Economy: Continued improvements to Village's Downtown Business District?	3.30%	63.30%	33.30%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	14.30%	7.50%	22.60%
	4	Count	2	9	0	11
		% within Economy: Continued improvements to Village's Downtown Business District?	18.20%	81.80%	0.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	6.80%	0.00%	8.30%
	NP	Count	4	14	2	20

Economy: Continued improvements to Village's Downtown Business District? * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Economy: Continued improvements to Village's Downtown Business District?	NP	% within Economy: Continued improvements to Village's Downtown Business District?	20.00%	70.00%	10.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.00%	10.50%	1.50%	15.00%

Total	Count	15	81	37	133
	% within Economy: Continued improvements to Village's Downtown Business District?	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
	% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Economy: Make improvements to Village's Downtown Business District? * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Economy: Make improvements to Village's Downtown Business District?	1	Count	0	17	8	25
		% within Economy: Make improvements to Village's Downtown Business District?	0.00%	68.00%	32.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.00%	12.80%	6.00%	18.80%
	2	Count	2	19	11	32
		% within Economy: Make improvements to Village's Downtown Business District?	6.30%	59.40%	34.40%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	14.30%	8.30%	24.10%
	3	Count	6	28	12	46
		% within Economy: Make improvements to Village's Downtown Business District?	13.00%	60.90%	26.10%	100.00%
		% of Total	4.50%	21.10%	9.00%	34.60%
	4	Count	1	5	2	8
		% within Economy: Make improvements to Village's Downtown Business District?	12.50%	62.50%	25.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	3.80%	1.50%	6.00%
	NP	Count	6	12	4	22

	% within Economy: Make improvements to Village's Downtown Business District?	27.30%	54.50%	18.20%	100.00%
	% of Total	4.50%	9.00%	3.00%	16.50%
Total	Count	15	81	37	133
	% within Economy: Make improvements to Village's Downtown Business District?	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
	% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Economy: Downtown business district parking * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Economy: Downtown business district parking	1	Count	2	9	7	18
		% within Economy: Downtown business district parking	11.10%	50.00%	38.90%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	6.80%	5.30%	13.50%
	2	Count	2	17	14	33
		% within Economy: Downtown business district parking	6.10%	51.50%	42.40%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	12.80%	10.50%	24.80%
	3	Count	1	31	7	39
		% within Economy: Downtown business district parking	2.60%	79.50%	17.90%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	23.30%	5.30%	29.30%
	4	Count	3	10	4	17
		% within Economy: Downtown business district parking	17.60%	58.80%	23.50%	100.00%
		% of Total	2.30%	7.50%	3.00%	12.80%
	NP	Count	7	14	5	26

	% within Economy: Downtown business district parking	26.90%	53.80%	19.20%	100.00%
	% of Total	5.30%	10.50%	3.80%	19.50%
Total	Count	15	81	37	133
	% within Economy: Downtown business district parking	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
	% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Recreation: Village's Paddock Park area i.e. boat Launch, nature trail, etc. * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Recreation: Village's Paddock Park area i.e. boat Launch, nature trail, etc.	1	Count	2	11	4	17
		% within Recreation: Village's Paddock Park area i.e. boat Launch, nature trail, etc.	11.80%	64.70%	23.50%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	8.30%	3.00%	12.80%
	2	Count	3	22	11	36
		% within Recreation: Village's Paddock Park area i.e. boat Launch, nature trail, etc.	8.30%	61.10%	30.60%	100.00%
		% of Total	2.30%	16.50%	8.30%	27.10%
	3	Count	2	20	12	34
		% within Recreation: Village's Paddock Park area i.e. boat Launch, nature trail, etc.	5.90%	58.80%	35.30%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	15.00%	9.00%	25.60%
	4	Count	2	7	5	14
		% within Recreation: Village's Paddock Park area i.e. boat Launch, nature trail, etc.	14.30%	50.00%	35.70%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	5.30%	3.80%	10.50%

	NP	Count	6	21	5	32
		% within Recreation: Village's Paddock Park area i.e. boat Launch, nature trail, etc.	18.80%	65.60%	15.60%	100.00%
		% of Total	4.50%	15.80%	3.80%	24.10%
Total		Count	15	81	37	133
		% within Recreation: Village's Paddock Park area i.e. boat Launch, nature trail, etc.	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Is there something we missed you would like to rank? * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Is there something we missed you would like to rank?	1	Count	0	6	3	9
		% within Is there something we missed you would like to rank?	0.00%	66.70%	33.30%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.00%	4.50%	2.30%	6.80%
	2	Count	0	2	0	2
		% within Is there something we missed you would like to rank?	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.00%	1.50%	0.00%	1.50%
	4	Count	0	2	0	2
		% within Is there something we missed you would like to rank?	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.00%	1.50%	0.00%	1.50%
	NP	Count	15	71	34	120
		% within Is there something we missed you would like to rank?	12.50%	59.20%	28.30%	100.00%
		% of Total	11.30%	53.40%	25.60%	90.20%
Total		Count	15	81	37	133

	% within Is there something we missed you would like to rank?	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
	% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Quality of life: Concord Area as a place to live * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Quality of life: Concord Area as a place to live	1	Count	6	32	15	53
		% within Quality of life: Concord Area as a place to live	11.30%	60.40%	28.30%	100.00%
		% of Total	4.50%	24.10%	11.30%	39.80%
	2	Count	4	33	12	49
		% within Quality of life: Concord Area as a place to live	8.20%	67.30%	24.50%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.00%	24.80%	9.00%	36.80%
	3	Count	2	12	5	19
		% within Quality of life: Concord Area as a place to live	10.50%	63.20%	26.30%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	9.00%	3.80%	14.30%
	NP	Count	3	4	5	12
		% within Quality of life: Concord Area as a place to live	25.00%	33.30%	41.70%	100.00%
		% of Total	2.30%	3.00%	3.80%	9.00%
Total		Count	15	81	37	133
		% within Quality of life: Concord Area as a place to live	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Quality of life: A healthy and safe community * Resident Group Crosstabulation

	Resident Group	Total

			Undecided	Township	Village	
Quality of life: A healthy and safe community	1	Count	5	34	20	59
		% within Quality of life: A healthy and safe community	8.50%	57.60%	33.90%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.80%	25.60%	15.00%	44.40%
	2	Count	3	30	10	43
		% within Quality of life: A healthy and safe community	7.00%	69.80%	23.30%	100.00%
		% of Total	2.30%	22.60%	7.50%	32.30%
	3	Count	2	12	3	17
		% within Quality of life: A healthy and safe community	11.80%	70.60%	17.60%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	9.00%	2.30%	12.80%
	4	Count	2	0	1	3
		% within Quality of life: A healthy and safe community	66.70%	0.00%	33.30%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	0.00%	0.80%	2.30%
	NP	Count	3	5	3	11
		% within Quality of life: A healthy and safe community	27.30%	45.50%	27.30%	100.00%
		% of Total	2.30%	3.80%	2.30%	8.30%
Total		Count	15	81	37	133
		% within Quality of life: A healthy and safe community	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Quality of life: Quality housing and services for residents of varying ages and income levels * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Quality of life: Quality housing and services for residents of varying ages and income levels	1	Count	1	13	14	28

		% within Quality of life: Quality housing and services for residents of varying ages and income levels	3.60%	46.40%	50.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	9.80%	10.50%	21.10%
Quality of life: Quality housing and services for residents of varying ages and income levels	2	Count	2	25	9	36
		% within Quality of life: Quality housing and services for residents of varying ages and income levels	5.60%	69.40%	25.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	18.80%	6.80%	27.10%
	3	Count	5	27	7	39
		% within Quality of life: Quality housing and services for residents of varying ages and income levels	12.80%	69.20%	17.90%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.80%	20.30%	5.30%	29.30%
	4	Count	1	4	3	8
		% within Quality of life: Quality housing and services for residents of varying ages and income levels	12.50%	50.00%	37.50%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	3.00%	2.30%	6.00%
	NP	Count	6	12	4	22
		% within Quality of life: Quality housing and services for residents of varying ages and income levels	27.30%	54.50%	18.20%	100.00%
		% of Total	4.50%	9.00%	3.00%	16.50%
Total		Count	15	81	37	133
		% within Quality of life: Quality housing and services for residents of varying ages and income levels	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

	% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Government: Administration of the Village * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Government: Administration of the Village	1	Count	3	13	11	27
		% within Government: Administration of the Village	11.10%	48.10%	40.70%	100.00%
		% of Total	2.30%	9.80%	8.30%	20.30%
	2	Count	3	25	10	38
		% within Government: Administration of the Village	7.90%	65.80%	26.30%	100.00%
		% of Total	2.30%	18.80%	7.50%	28.60%
	3	Count	1	23	10	34
		% within Government: Administration of the Village	2.90%	67.60%	29.40%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	17.30%	7.50%	25.60%
	4	Count	1	4	4	9
		% within Government: Administration of the Village	11.10%	44.40%	44.40%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	3.00%	3.00%	6.80%
	NP	Count	7	16	2	25
		% within Government: Administration of the Village	28.00%	64.00%	8.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	5.30%	12.00%	1.50%	18.80%
Total		Count	15	81	37	133
		% within Government: Administration of the Village	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Government: The Village Administration making changes necessary for community improvement within the Village * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Government: The Village Administration making changes necessary for community improvement within the Village	1	Count	2	12	12	26
		% within Government: The Village Administration making changes necessary for community improvement within the Village	7.70%	46.20%	46.20%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	9.00%	9.00%	19.50%
	2	Count	4	22	12	38
		% within Government: The Village Administration making changes necessary for community improvement within the Village	10.50%	57.90%	31.60%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.00%	16.50%	9.00%	28.60%
	3	Count	1	25	6	32
		% within Government: The Village Administration making changes necessary for community improvement within the Village	3.10%	78.10%	18.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	18.80%	4.50%	24.10%
	4	Count	1	2	3	6
		% within Government: The Village Administration making changes necessary for community improvement within the Village	16.70%	33.30%	50.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	1.50%	2.30%	4.50%
	NP	Count	7	20	4	31

	% within Government: The Village Administration making changes necessary for community improvement within the Village	22.60%	64.50%	12.90%	100.00%
	% of Total	5.30%	15.00%	3.00%	23.30%
Total	Count	15	81	37	133
	% within Government: The Village Administration making changes necessary for community improvement within the Village	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
	% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Government: The Township Administration making changes necessary for community improvement within the Township * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Government: The Township Administration making changes necessary for community improvement within the Township	1	Count	1	16	10	27
		% within Government: The Township Administration making changes necessary for community improvement within the Township	3.70%	59.30%	37.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	12.00%	7.50%	20.30%
	2	Count	2	23	10	35
		% within Government: The Township Administration making changes necessary for community improvement within the Township	5.70%	65.70%	28.60%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	17.30%	7.50%	26.30%
	3	Count	2	25	10	37

		% within Government: The Township Administration making changes necessary for community improvement within the Township	5.40%	67.60%	27.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	18.80%	7.50%	27.80%
	4	Count	4	2	2	8
		% within Government: The Township Administration making changes necessary for community improvement within the Township	50.00%	25.00%	25.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.00%	1.50%	1.50%	6.00%
	NP	Count	6	15	5	26
		% within Government: The Township Administration making changes necessary for community improvement within the Township	23.10%	57.70%	19.20%	100.00%
		% of Total	4.50%	11.30%	3.80%	19.50%
Total		Count	15	81	37	133
		% within Government: The Township Administration making changes necessary for community improvement within the Township	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Government: Administration of the Township * Resident Group Crosstabulation

		Resident Group			Total
		Undecided	Township	Village	
1	Count	1	15	9	25

Government: Administration of the Township		% within Government: Administration of the Township	4.00%	60.00%	36.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	11.30%	6.80%	18.80%
	2	Count	3	22	7	32
		% within Government: Administration of the Township	9.40%	68.80%	21.90%	100.00%
		% of Total	2.30%	16.50%	5.30%	24.10%
	3	Count	3	25	13	41
		% within Government: Administration of the Township	7.30%	61.00%	31.70%	100.00%
		% of Total	2.30%	18.80%	9.80%	30.80%
	4	Count	2	2	3	7
		% within Government: Administration of the Township	28.60%	28.60%	42.90%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	1.50%	2.30%	5.30%
	NP	Count	6	17	5	28
		% within Government: Administration of the Township	21.40%	60.70%	17.90%	100.00%
		% of Total	4.50%	12.80%	3.80%	21.10%
Total		Count	15	81	37	133
		% within Government: Administration of the Township	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Public Safety: Concord Fire Department * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Public Safety: Concord Fire Department	1	Count	4	39	20	63
		% within Public Safety: Concord Fire Department	6.30%	61.90%	31.70%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.00%	29.30%	15.00%	47.40%

	2	Count	4	22	10	36
		% within Public Safety: Concord Fire Department	11.10%	61.10%	27.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.00%	16.50%	7.50%	27.10%
	3	Count	2	15	5	22
		% within Public Safety: Concord Fire Department	9.10%	68.20%	22.70%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	11.30%	3.80%	16.50%
	4	Count	1	1	0	2
		% within Public Safety: Concord Fire Department	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	0.80%	0.00%	1.50%
	NP	Count	4	4	2	10
		% within Public Safety: Concord Fire Department	40.00%	40.00%	20.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.00%	3.00%	1.50%	7.50%
Total		Count	15	81	37	133
		% within Public Safety: Concord Fire Department	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Public Safety: Jackson County Sheriff contracted policy services * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Public Safety: Jackson County Sheriff contracted policy services	1	Count	4	35	18	57
		% within Public Safety: Jackson County Sheriff contracted policy services	7.00%	61.40%	31.60%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.00%	26.30%	13.50%	42.90%
	2	Count	4	25	12	41
		% within Public Safety: Jackson County Sheriff contracted policy services	9.80%	61.00%	29.30%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.00%	18.80%	9.00%	30.80%
	3	Count	3	14	6	23

		% within Public Safety: Jackson County Sheriff contracted policy services	13.00%	60.90%	26.10%	100.00%
		% of Total	2.30%	10.50%	4.50%	17.30%
	4	Count	2	2	0	4
		% within Public Safety: Jackson County Sheriff contracted policy services	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	1.50%	0.00%	3.00%
	NP	Count	2	5	1	8
		% within Public Safety: Jackson County Sheriff contracted policy services	25.00%	62.50%	12.50%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	3.80%	0.80%	6.00%
Total		Count	15	81	37	133
		% within Public Safety: Jackson County Sheriff contracted policy services	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Environment: Preservation of farmland * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Environment: Preservation of farmland	1	Count	1	30	12	43
		% within Environment: Preservation of farmland	2.30%	69.80%	27.90%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	22.60%	9.00%	32.30%
	2	Count	2	20	8	30
		% within Environment: Preservation of farmland	6.70%	66.70%	26.70%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	15.00%	6.00%	22.60%
	3	Count	3	15	9	27
		% within Environment: Preservation of farmland	11.10%	55.60%	33.30%	100.00%
		% of Total	2.30%	11.30%	6.80%	20.30%
	4	Count	4	6	3	13

		% within Environment: Preservation of farmland	30.80%	46.20%	23.10%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.00%	4.50%	2.30%	9.80%
	NP	Count	5	10	5	20
		% within Environment: Preservation of farmland	25.00%	50.00%	25.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.80%	7.50%	3.80%	15.00%
Total		Count	15	81	37	133
		% within Environment: Preservation of farmland	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Environment: Preservation of distinct topography, soils, lakes, streams, rivers, and wetlands * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Environment: Preservation of distinct topography, soils, lakes, streams, rivers, and wetlands	1	Count	1	34	14	49
		% within Environment: Preservation of distinct topography, soils, lakes, streams, rivers, and wetlands	2.00%	69.40%	28.60%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	25.60%	10.50%	36.80%
	2	Count	3	20	8	31
		% within Environment: Preservation of distinct topography, soils, lakes, streams, rivers, and wetlands	9.70%	64.50%	25.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	2.30%	15.00%	6.00%	23.30%
	3	Count	3	18	9	30
		% within Environment: Preservation of distinct topography, soils, lakes, streams, rivers, and wetlands	10.00%	60.00%	30.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	2.30%	13.50%	6.80%	22.60%
	4	Count	2	3	1	6

		% within Environment: Preservation of distinct topography, soils, lakes, streams, rivers, and wetlands	33.30%	50.00%	16.70%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	2.30%	0.80%	4.50%
	NP	Count	6	6	5	17
		% within Environment: Preservation of distinct topography, soils, lakes, streams, rivers, and wetlands	35.30%	35.30%	29.40%	100.00%
		% of Total	4.50%	4.50%	3.80%	12.80%
Total		Count	15	81	37	133
		% within Environment: Preservation of distinct topography, soils, lakes, streams, rivers, and wetlands	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Environment: Exploring alternative forms of energy production and reduction of waste * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Environment: Exploring alternative forms of energy production and reduction of waste	1	Count	2	19	10	31
		% within Environment: Exploring alternative forms of energy production and reduction of waste	6.50%	61.30%	32.30%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	14.30%	7.50%	23.30%
	2	Count	1	21	7	29
		% within Environment: Exploring alternative forms of energy production and reduction of waste	3.40%	72.40%	24.10%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	15.80%	5.30%	21.80%
	3	Count	1	16	7	24

		% within Environment: Exploring alternative forms of energy production and reduction of waste	4.20%	66.70%	29.20%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	12.00%	5.30%	18.00%
	4	Count	3	10	4	17
		% within Environment: Exploring alternative forms of energy production and reduction of waste	17.60%	58.80%	23.50%	100.00%
		% of Total	2.30%	7.50%	3.00%	12.80%
	NP	Count	8	15	9	32
		% within Environment: Exploring alternative forms of energy production and reduction of waste	25.00%	46.90%	28.10%	100.00%
		% of Total	6.00%	11.30%	6.80%	24.10%
Total		Count	15	81	37	133
		% within Environment: Exploring alternative forms of energy production and reduction of waste	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Environment: Energy conservation * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Environment: Energy conservation	1	Count	2	15	11	28
		% within Environment: Energy conservation	7.10%	53.60%	39.30%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	11.30%	8.30%	21.10%
	2	Count	1	21	5	27
		% within Environment: Energy conservation	3.70%	77.80%	18.50%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	15.80%	3.80%	20.30%
	3	Count	2	22	9	33

		% within Environment: Energy conservation	6.10%	66.70%	27.30%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	16.50%	6.80%	24.80%
	4	Count	1	7	4	12
		% within Environment: Energy conservation	8.30%	58.30%	33.30%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	5.30%	3.00%	9.00%
	NP	Count	9	16	8	33
		% within Environment: Energy conservation	27.30%	48.50%	24.20%	100.00%
		% of Total	6.80%	12.00%	6.00%	24.80%
Total		Count	15	81	37	133
		% within Environment: Energy conservation	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Environment: Clean air * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Environment: Clean air	1	Count	4	27	16	47
		% within Environment: Clean air	8.50%	57.40%	34.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.00%	20.30%	12.00%	35.30%
	2	Count	3	25	6	34
		% within Environment: Clean air	8.80%	73.50%	17.60%	100.00%
		% of Total	2.30%	18.80%	4.50%	25.60%
	3	Count	2	17	7	26
		% within Environment: Clean air	7.70%	65.40%	26.90%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	12.80%	5.30%	19.50%
	4	Count	1	2	1	4
		% within Environment: Clean air	25.00%	50.00%	25.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.80%	1.50%	0.80%	3.00%
	NP	Count	5	10	7	22

	% within Environment: Clean air	22.70%	45.50%	31.80%	100.00%
	% of Total	3.80%	7.50%	5.30%	16.50%
Total	Count	15	81	37	133
	% within Environment: Clean air	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
	% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Recreation: The paved shoulder along Main/Street/ Pulaski Road to Swains Lake Park * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Recreation: The paved shoulder along Main/Street/ Pulaski Road to Swains Lake Park	1	Count	2	17	10	29
		% within Recreation: The paved shoulder along Main/Street/ Pulaski Road to Swains Lake Park	6.90%	58.60%	34.50%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	12.80%	7.50%	21.80%
	2	Count	3	22	10	35
		% within Recreation: The paved shoulder along Main/Street/ Pulaski Road to Swains Lake Park	8.60%	62.90%	28.60%	100.00%
		% of Total	2.30%	16.50%	7.50%	26.30%
	3	Count	3	18	9	30
		% within Recreation: The paved shoulder along Main/Street/ Pulaski Road to Swains Lake Park	10.00%	60.00%	30.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	2.30%	13.50%	6.80%	22.60%
	4	Count	0	9	4	13
		% within Recreation: The paved shoulder along Main/Street/ Pulaski Road to Swains Lake Park	0.00%	69.20%	30.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.00%	6.80%	3.00%	9.80%
	NP	Count	7	15	4	26

	% within Recreation: The paved shoulder along Main/Street/ Pulaski Road to Swains Lake Park	26.90%	57.70%	15.40%	100.00%
	% of Total	5.30%	11.30%	3.00%	19.50%
Total	Count	15	81	37	133
	% within Recreation: The paved shoulder along Main/Street/ Pulaski Road to Swains Lake Park	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
	% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Recreation: Park & Recreation Opportunities: i.e., Gottschalk Park, Spring Street Park Canoe/Kayak Launch, Mill Pond Park, Trailhead, Concord Trail Extension, etc. * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Recreation: Park & Recreation Opportunities: i.e., Gottschalk Park, Spring Street Park Canoe/Kayak Launch, Mill Pond Park, Trailhead, Concord Trail Extension, etc.	1	Count	3	21	10	34
		% within Recreation: Park & Recreation Opportunities: i.e., Gottschalk Park, Spring Street Park Canoe/Kayak Launch, Mill Pond Park, Trailhead, Concord Trail Extension, etc.	8.80%	61.80%	29.40%	100.00%
		% of Total	2.30%	15.80%	7.50%	25.60%
	2	Count	5	31	16	52
		% within Recreation: Park & Recreation Opportunities: i.e., Gottschalk Park, Spring Street Park Canoe/Kayak Launch, Mill Pond Park, Trailhead, Concord Trail Extension, etc.	9.60%	59.60%	30.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.80%	23.30%	12.00%	39.10%
	3	Count	2	14	8	24

		% within Recreation: Park & Recreation Opportunities: i.e., Gottschalk Park, Spring Street Park Canoe/Kayak Launch, Mill Pond Park, Trailhead, Concord Trail Extension, etc.	8.30%	58.30%	33.30%	100.00%
		% of Total	1.50%	10.50%	6.00%	18.00%
	4	Count	0	5	2	7
		% within Recreation: Park & Recreation Opportunities: i.e., Gottschalk Park, Spring Street Park Canoe/Kayak Launch, Mill Pond Park, Trailhead, Concord Trail Extension, etc.	0.00%	71.40%	28.60%	100.00%
		% of Total	0.00%	3.80%	1.50%	5.30%
	NP	Count	5	10	1	16
		% within Recreation: Park & Recreation Opportunities: i.e., Gottschalk Park, Spring Street Park Canoe/Kayak Launch, Mill Pond Park, Trailhead, Concord Trail Extension, etc.	31.30%	62.50%	6.30%	100.00%
		% of Total	3.80%	7.50%	0.80%	12.00%
Total		Count	15	81	37	133
		% within Recreation: Park & Recreation Opportunities: i.e., Gottschalk Park, Spring Street Park Canoe/Kayak Launch, Mill Pond Park, Trailhead, Concord Trail Extension, etc.	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%
		% of Total	11.30%	60.90%	27.80%	100.00%

Appendix D

Ranking of Issues or Concerns

Amount of development in the Township/Village as a whole * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			
			Undecided	Township	Village	Total
Amount of development in the Township/Village as a whole	1.00	Count	2	12	4	18
		% within Amount of development in the Township/Village as a whole	11.1%	66.7%	22.2%	100.0%
		% of Total	2.0%	12.0%	4.0%	18.0%
	2.00	Count	0	11	4	15
		% within Amount of development in the Township/Village as a whole	0.0%	73.3%	26.7%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	11.0%	4.0%	15.0%
	3.00	Count	3	13	6	22
		% within Amount of development in the Township/Village as a whole	13.6%	59.1%	27.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.0%	13.0%	6.0%	22.0%
	4.00	Count	3	13	8	24
		% within Amount of development in the Township/Village as a whole	12.5%	54.2%	33.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.0%	13.0%	8.0%	24.0%
	5.00	Count	1	11	9	21
		% within Amount of development in the Township/Village as a whole	4.8%	52.4%	42.9%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.0%	11.0%	9.0%	21.0%
Total		Count	9	60	31	100
		% within Amount of development in the Township/Village as a whole	9.0%	60.0%	31.0%	100.0%

		% of Total	9.0%	60.0%	31.0%	100.0%

Loss of farmland * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			
			Undecided	Township	Village	Total
Loss of farmland	1.00	Count	2	15	2	19
		% within Loss of farmland	10.5%	78.9%	10.5%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.6%	26.8%	3.6%	33.9%
	2.00	Count	1	5	3	9
		% within Loss of farmland	11.1%	55.6%	33.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.8%	8.9%	5.4%	16.1%
	3.00	Count	1	7	1	9
		% within Loss of farmland	11.1%	77.8%	11.1%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.8%	12.5%	1.8%	16.1%
	4.00	Count	2	2	2	6
		% within Loss of farmland	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.6%	3.6%	3.6%	10.7%
	5.00	Count	2	8	3	13
		% within Loss of farmland	15.4%	61.5%	23.1%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.6%	14.3%	5.4%	23.2%
Total		Count	8	37	11	56
		% within Loss of farmland	14.3%	66.1%	19.6%	100.0%
		% of Total	14.3%	66.1%	19.6%	100.0%

Environmental degradation in the Township/Villlage * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			
			Undecided	Township	Village	Total
Environmental degradation in the Township/Villlage	1.00	Count	0	3	2	5
		% within Environmental degradation in the Township/Villlage	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	6.0%	4.0%	10.0%

	2.00	Count	2	4	1	7
		% within Environmental degradation in the Township/Villlage	28.6%	57.1%	14.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	4.0%	8.0%	2.0%	14.0%
	3.00	Count	4	7	4	15
		% within Environmental degradation in the Township/Villlage	26.7%	46.7%	26.7%	100.0%
		% of Total	8.0%	14.0%	8.0%	30.0%
	4.00	Count	2	7	4	13
		% within Environmental degradation in the Township/Villlage	15.4%	53.8%	30.8%	100.0%
		% of Total	4.0%	14.0%	8.0%	26.0%
	5.00	Count	0	8	2	10
		% within Environmental degradation in the Township/Villlage	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	16.0%	4.0%	20.0%
Total		Count	8	29	13	50
		% within Environmental degradation in the Township/Villlage	16.0%	58.0%	26.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	16.0%	58.0%	26.0%	100.0%

Adequate services in the Township/Village * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			
			Undecided	Township	Village	Total
Adequate services in the Township/Village	1.00	Count	1	19	9	29
		% within Adequate services in the Township/Village	3.4%	65.5%	31.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	.9%	17.8%	8.4%	27.1%
	2.00	Count	5	12	6	23

		% within Adequate services in the Township/Village	21.7%	52.2%	26.1%	100.0%
		% of Total	4.7%	11.2%	5.6%	21.5%
	3.00	Count	2	22	7	31
		% within Adequate services in the Township/Village	6.5%	71.0%	22.6%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.9%	20.6%	6.5%	29.0%
	4.00	Count	2	8	3	13
		% within Adequate services in the Township/Village	15.4%	61.5%	23.1%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.9%	7.5%	2.8%	12.1%
	5.00	Count	1	5	5	11
		% within Adequate services in the Township/Village	9.1%	45.5%	45.5%	100.0%
		% of Total	.9%	4.7%	4.7%	10.3%
Total		Count	11	66	30	107
		% within Adequate services in the Township/Village	10.3%	61.7%	28.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	10.3%	61.7%	28.0%	100.0%

Township/Village taxes * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			
			Undecided	Township	Village	Total
Township/Village taxes	1.00	Count	2	12	10	24
		% within Township/Village taxes	8.3%	50.0%	41.7%	100.0%
		% of Total	2.1%	12.4%	10.3%	24.7%
	2.00	Count	3	13	11	27
		% within Township/Village taxes	11.1%	48.1%	40.7%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.1%	13.4%	11.3%	27.8%
	3.00	Count	2	15	4	21
		% within Township/Village taxes	9.5%	71.4%	19.0%	100.0%

		% of Total	2.1%	15.5%	4.1%	21.6%
	4.00	Count	2	7	6	15
		% within Township/Village taxes	13.3%	46.7%	40.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	2.1%	7.2%	6.2%	15.5%
	5.00	Count	1	7	2	10
		% within Township/Village taxes	10.0%	70.0%	20.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.0%	7.2%	2.1%	10.3%
Total		Count	10	54	33	97
		% within Township/Village taxes	10.3%	55.7%	34.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	10.3%	55.7%	34.0%	100.0%

Recreational opportunities * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			
			Undecided	Township	Village	Total
Recreational opportunities	1.00	Count	0	3	2	5
		% within Recreational opportunities	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	6.1%	4.1%	10.2%
	2.00	Count	0	4	1	5
		% within Recreational opportunities	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	8.2%	2.0%	10.2%
	3.00	Count	1	7	3	11
		% within Recreational opportunities	9.1%	63.6%	27.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	2.0%	14.3%	6.1%	22.4%
	4.00	Count	0	5	2	7
		% within Recreational opportunities	0.0%	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	10.2%	4.1%	14.3%
	5.00	Count	2	13	6	21

	% within Recreational opportunities	9.5%	61.9%	28.6%	100.0%
	% of Total	4.1%	26.5%	12.2%	42.9%
Total	Count	3	32	14	49
	% within Recreational opportunities	6.1%	65.3%	28.6%	100.0%
	% of Total	6.1%	65.3%	28.6%	100.0%

Schools * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			
			Undecided	Township	Village	Total
Schools	1.00	Count	6	21	11	38
		% within Schools	15.8%	55.3%	28.9%	100.0%
		% of Total	5.5%	19.3%	10.1%	34.9%
	2.00	Count	2	17	10	29
		% within Schools	6.9%	58.6%	34.5%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.8%	15.6%	9.2%	26.6%
	3.00	Count	2	11	5	18
		% within Schools	11.1%	61.1%	27.8%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.8%	10.1%	4.6%	16.5%
	4.00	Count	1	11	4	16
		% within Schools	6.3%	68.8%	25.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	.9%	10.1%	3.7%	14.7%
	5.00	Count	0	7	1	8
		% within Schools	0.0%	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	6.4%	.9%	7.3%
Total		Count	11	67	31	109
		% within Schools	10.1%	61.5%	28.4%	100.0%
		% of Total	10.1%	61.5%	28.4%	100.0%

Crime * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			
			Undecided	Township	Village	Total
Crime	1.00	Count	1	9	0	10
		% within Crime	10.0%	90.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.5%	13.4%	0.0%	14.9%

	2.00	Count	2	10	2	14
		% within Crime	14.3%	71.4%	14.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.0%	14.9%	3.0%	20.9%
	3.00	Count	0	3	6	9
		% within Crime	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	4.5%	9.0%	13.4%
	4.00	Count	1	12	5	18
		% within Crime	5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.5%	17.9%	7.5%	26.9%
	5.00	Count	4	7	5	16
		% within Crime	25.0%	43.8%	31.3%	100.0%
		% of Total	6.0%	10.4%	7.5%	23.9%
Total		Count	8	41	18	67
		% within Crime	11.9%	61.2%	26.9%	100.0%
		% of Total	11.9%	61.2%	26.9%	100.0%

Other * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			
			Undecided	Township	Village	Total
Other	1.00	Count	0	4	0	4
		% within Other	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	40.0%	0.0%	40.0%
	2.00	Count	1	0	1	2
		% within Other	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	10.0%	0.0%	10.0%	20.0%
	3.00	Count	0	0	1	1
		% within Other	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	10.0%
	5.00	Count	0	1	2	3
		% within Other	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	10.0%	20.0%	30.0%
Total		Count	1	5	4	10
		% within Other	10.0%	50.0%	40.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	10.0%	50.0%	40.0%	100.0%

Other-text * Resident Group Crosstabulation

			Resident Group			Total
			Undecided	Township	Village	
Other-text		Count	14	77	34	125
		% within Other-text	11.2%	61.6%	27.2%	100.0%
		% of Total	10.5%	57.9%	25.6%	94.0%
	Enforcement of Village/Township Ordinances	Count	0	0	1	1
		% within Other-text	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	.8%	.8%
	excessive ordinances and restrictions. We need less government.	Count	1	0	0	1
		% within Other-text	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	.8%	0.0%	0.0%	.8%
	Give older people a break on school taxes.	Count	0	1	0	1
		% within Other-text	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	.8%	0.0%	.8%
	Mill Pond clearance/dredged. H smells at times.	Count	0	1	0	1
		% within Other-text	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	.8%	0.0%	.8%
	Tax is to high	Count	0	1	0	1
		% within Other-text	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	.8%	0.0%	.8%
	Township/Village Cohesiveness	Count	0	1	0	1
		% within Other-text	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%

		% of Total	0.0%	.8%	0.0%	.8%
	Water bills, 60L FCART/SNOW Mobile 1554ES	Count	0	0	1	1
		% within Other-text	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	.8%	.8%
	Water Quality	Count	0	0	1	1
		% within Other-text	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	.8%	.8%
Total		Count	15	81	37	133
		% within Other-text	11.3%	60.9%	27.8%	100.0%
		% of Total	11.3%	60.9%	27.8%	100.0%