

## CITIZEN QUESTIONNAIRE

As part of the Comprehensive Plan update, a citizen survey was conducted by the Village Planning Commission in late 2004. The purpose of the survey was to seek public opinion on land use issues related to this comprehensive plan. A total of 447 surveys were received from the residents of the Village. A survey was also conducted as part of the previous plan update in 2000. When appropriate, the response from the two surveys are compared.

The survey contained 11 questions. The first question asked respondents to rate various Village services. Respondents were asked provide a rating of very good, good, average, poor and very poor. The number of responses by category are provided below including weighted average scores from the 2004 and 2000 surveys.

*How would you rate the following village services?*

	VERY GOOD	GOOD	AVERAGE	POOR	VERY POOR	NO RESPONSE	WEIGHTED AVERAGE SCORE	
							2004	2000
Street maintenance	121	219	83	9	1	15	3.04	2.82
Street lighting	85	198	115	31	1	16	2.77	2.80
Water	74	153	126	51	21	22	2.49	2.15
Sewer	80	195	113	27	4	28	2.76	2.67
Sidewalk maintenance	70	206	121	21	9	20	2.72	2.49
Police: Traffic control	115	187	94	28	5	18	2.88	2.72
Police: Crime enforcement	112	202	83	15	4	31	2.96	2.93
Parks	163	193	69	7	0	15	3.19	2.92
Library	128	212	60	8	0	39	3.13	3.13
Leaf/brush collection	154	182	75	9	2	25	2.47	3.18
Recycling	56	154	118	46	18	55	2.50	2.42
Village government	47	187	131	42	14	26	2.51	N/A
Code enforcement	46	158	150	29	10	54	3.44	N/A
Fire (township)	221	179	29	0	1	17	3.46	3.41
Rescue (township)	227	169	27	1	1	22	3.46	3.30

N/A – Not applicable, question was not asked in previous survey.

Fire and rescue services received the highest weighted average scores while recycling and water services ranked lowest. Several comments were received regarding the lack of knowledge of or incomplete recycling services, high water rates, and poor water quality. A high “no response” rate can suggest a lack of familiarity with the intent of the question or a lack of knowledge that such a facility exists. Other than leaf/brush collection, the weighted average scores for services increased or were stable.

Question 2 asked respondents to rate various conditions within the Village. The results are presented in the following table:

***How would you rate these conditions within Blissfield?***

	VERY GOOD	GOOD	AVERAGE	POOR	VERY POOR	NO RESPONSE	WEIGHTED AVERAGE SCORE	
							2004	2000
Property maintenance: Residential	62	253	105	9	3	15	2.84	2.77
Property maintenance: Commercial	36	185	153	35	4	34	2.52	2.48
Visual appearance: Adrian St. (US-223)	49	171	147	45	14	21	2.46	2.35
Visual appearance: Lane St.	83	215	102	15	4	28	2.85	2.66
Visual appearance: Commercial district flower plantings	147	194	78	9	2	17	3.10	N/A
Downtown parking	95	203	96	32	5	16	2.81	2.63
Visual appearance of commercial signs	49	209	142	27	5	15	2.63	2.54

N/A – Not applicable, question was not asked in previous survey.

The flower plantings in the commercial district scored the highest among the seven conditions within the village. From the weighted average scores, it appears that the visual appearance of Lane Street is perceived to be better than Adrian Street. Residential property is perceived to be better maintained than commercial property. In general, downtown parking received favorable ratings. Good and average ratings were predominant for the appearance of commercial signs. Weighted average scores

increased in all applicable cases from 2000-2004 suggesting that these specific conditions are improving.

The purpose of question 3 was to understand where residents travel to obtain various goods and services. Respondents were asked to provide primary and secondary preferences for purchase of these services. The results are presented in the following table:

***Where do you usually purchase these goods/services? (Indicate your primary choice with "1" and your secondary choice with "2").***

	Blissfield			Adrian			Toledo area			Internet			Other		
	1	2	X	1	2	X	1	2	X	1	2	X	1	2	X
Groceries	106	182	19	221	79	21	87	61	12	0	1	0	2	4	0
Clothing	2	19	3	183	140	24	204	107	21	2	14	3	14	17	5
Appliances	67	41	5	163	108	10	154	100	13	0	2	1	18	10	1
Medical/dental	184	60	26	77	86	21	100	73	19	3	0	0	34	30	4
Entertainment	30	22	4	99	143	14	227	77	13	1	3	0	27	28	4
Gifts	42	67	16	157	121	28	179	94	21	5	6	5	9	19	6
Professional services	149	57	8	118	109	10	103	61	7	0	0	1	23	19	4
Building/maintenance supplies	186	100	21	161	132	24	47	60	10	0	0	1	4	6	4

The table shows that the availability and purchase of goods and services in Blissfield varies according to the type of good or service. Groceries tend to be purchased in Blissfield or Adrian. Little clothing and few appliances are purchased in Blissfield but rather in Adrian and Toledo. A relatively large number of medical and dental appointments are made in Blissfield but a significant number of trips are also made to Adrian and Toledo (and other places such as Ann Arbor). It appears that very few residents stay within Blissfield for entertainment with Toledo and Adrian serving as entertainment hubs. Residents tend to travel to Adrian and Toledo for gift shopping. It appears that professional services and building/maintenance supplies are available within Blissfield. The distribution of responses showed a similar pattern in the 2000 survey.

Question 4 asked respondents the frequency of use of various village facilities for members of their household. The results are presented in the following table:

***How often do you and/or your family use the following village facilities?***

	<b>DAILY</b>	<b>WEEKLY</b>	<b>MONTHLY</b>	<b>RARELY</b>	<b>NEVER</b>	<b>NO RESPONSE</b>
Parks	7	80	99	223	20	18
Recycling center	1	45	124	106	157	14
Swimming pool	13	35	26	104	251	18
Library	3	63	133	161	74	13
Sidewalks	173	105	41	90	26	12

According to the table, sidewalks get the most use of listed facilities. The recycling center and swimming pools were used the least. Some respondents indicated that they were unaware of the recycling facility or were not satisfied after having used the recycling facility

In question 5, the survey requested public opinion regarding various policy issues facing the Village. The responses are below:

***Please indicate your opinions on the following issues?***

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No response</b>
Should the Village attract more industry?	287	125	35
Should the Village annex Township lands to accommodate growth?	258	133	56
Should the Village promote development of more stores and shopping areas?	314	99	34
Should the Village encourage development of:			
Single-family housing?	311	75	61
Multi-family housing?	159	212	76
Senior citizen housing?	369	52	26
Extended care facilities?	297	104	46
Urgent care facilities?	263	118	66
Day care facilities?	247	133	67
Should the Village promote tourism?	357	68	22
Should the Village consider village-wide wireless internet service?	243	139	65
Should the Village add small neighborhood parks?	131	286	30

Seventy percent of respondents were of the opinion that the village should attempt to attract more industry. In addition, 76% believed that further commercial development should be promoted. This may be combined with Question #3 to determine commercial needs that are not being met locally (i.e. clothing, appliances, entertainment, and gifts). By varying degrees, respondents saw the need for certain types of residential development – single-family housing (81% in favor), senior citizen housing (88%), extended care facilities (74%), urgent care facilities (69%), and day care facilities

(65%). However, a minority of respondents (43%) believed that the village should encourage new multi-family housing development. Two-thirds of respondents replied that township lands should be added to accommodate growth. A large majority of survey respondents (84%) believed that the village should promote tourism. Sixty-four percent said they would like the village to consider village-wide wireless internet service. The addition of small neighborhood parks was not viewed favorably by most (69%) of respondents. This pattern of response does not differ greatly from the 2000 survey.

The remaining questions on the survey regarded the demographic makeup of the respondents. The demographic information served several purposes but primarily was used to measure the validity of the survey response against known demographic characteristics of the Village from 2000 census data. The demographic questions also allow a breakout of survey response by demographic group.

Question 6 asked the length of time respondents have been residents of the Village. The response is summarized in the following table:

***How many years have you been a village resident?***

<b>Years in Blissfield</b>	<b># of responses</b>	<b>% of total response</b>
<b>1-5</b>	72	17.1
<b>6-10</b>	59	14.0
<b>11-15</b>	44	10.5
<b>16-20</b>	38	9.0
<b>21-30</b>	60	14.3
<b>31-40</b>	55	13.1
<b>41-50</b>	37	8.8
<b>51-60</b>	26	6.2
<b>61-70</b>	15	3.6
<b>71-80</b>	10	2.4
<b>81-90</b>	4	1.0
<b>Total</b>	420	100.0

The response appears to be representative. It is evenly divided between residents who have lived in the village under 20 years (50.6%) and those who have lived in the village for over 20 years (49.4%).

Question 7 asked the age or responses. The responses are presented in the following table along with a comparison to the actual age numbers from the 2000 census.

***What is your age group?***

<i>Age Group</i>	<i># of responses</i>	<i>% of total response</i>	<i>Percentage age group from 2000 Census</i>	<i>Representation (over/under)</i>
18-24	3	0.7	10.3	-9.6

25-34	41	10.0	18.9	-8.9
35-44	70	16.5	19.1	-2.6
45-54	92	21.7	18.3	+3.4
55-64	80	18.9	11.6	+7.3
65-74	59	13.9	11.1	+2.8
75-84	64	15.1	7.1	+8.0
85 +	14	3.3	3.5	-0.2
Total	423	100.0	100.0	

As is usually the case, older residents tend to respond at a higher rate than younger ones. Most of the age brackets above the age of 44 responded at a higher proportion than their percentage of the population. Though the 2000 Census data are somewhat out of date, the information is current enough to provide an indication of response rates by age bracket.

Another demographic measure that can be used to measure response against the known background of the residents of the Village is income. A breakdown of income of respondents against 2000 census data is shown in the following table:

***What is your household income?***

Household Income (\$)	# of responses	% of total response	Percentage from 2000 census	Over/under Response
Less than 10,000	11	3.0	8.4	-5.4
10,000-14,999	26	7.0	7.7	-0.7
15,000-19,999	17	4.6	8.2	-3.6
20,000-24,999	23	6.2	7.5	-1.3
25,000-29,999	22	5.9	7.3	-1.4
30,000-34,999	23	6.2	7.4	-1.2
35,000-39,999	19	5.1	4.0	+1.1
40,000-44,999	22	5.9	7.1	-1.2
45,000-49,999	22	5.9	5.5	+0.4
50,000-59,999	42	11.3	7.2	+4.1
60,000-74,999	46	12.4	11.5	+0.9
75,000-99,999	56	15.1	11.5	+1.7
100,000-124,999	26	7.0	5.3	+1.7
125,000-149,999	8	2.2	0.5	+1.7
150,000-199,999	6	1.6	0.3	+1.3
200,000 or more	2	0.5	0.7	-0.2
Total	371	100.0	100.1	

Higher income brackets tended to respond at a higher rate than lower ones. However, this was somewhat tempered by the fact that senior citizen households tend to have lower income than working households.

Question 9 was in two parts. Respondents were asked to indicate the number of adults and children that are members of their family. The results are presented below.

***Indicate your family size.***

<i>Number of persons</i>	<i>Adults</i>	<i>Children</i>
<b>1</b>	107	45
<b>2</b>	254	57
<b>3</b>	32	21
<b>4</b>	13	3
<b>5</b>	3	2
<b>6</b>	1	2
<b>7</b>	0	0
<b>8</b>	0	0
<b>9</b>	0	0
<b>10</b>	0	0

The table indicates that most of the families contained either one or two adults. Many of the respondents had small families. When children were present, there were only one or two in the family.

Question 10 pertained to the quadrant of the Village in which respondents reside. The following table presents the results.

***Which area of the village do you reside in?***

<i>Quadrant</i>	<i># of responses</i>	<i>Percent of total</i>
<b><i>Southeast</i></b>	138	32.5
<b><i>Southwest</i></b>	82	19.3
<b><i>Northeast</i></b>	83	19.5
<b><i>Northwest</i></b>	122	28.7
<b><i>Total</i></b>	425	100.0

The southeast and northwest quadrants made up over 61 percent of the respondents while the southwest and northeast quadrants contributed about 19% apiece.

The survey's twelfth and final question asked about residence status. Almost all of the respondents replied that they own the home in which they abide.

***Indicate the status of your residential dwelling.***

<i>Residence status</i>	<i># of response</i>	<i>Percent of total</i>
<b><i>Own home</i></b>	413	94.1
<b><i>Rent single-family home</i></b>	12	2.7
<b><i>Rent duplex</i></b>	5	1.1
<b><i>Rent multi-family</i></b>	2	0.5
<b><i>Rent apartment</i></b>	7	1.6
<b><i>Total</i></b>	439	100.0

## BUSINESS SURVEY

The Village Planning Commission surveyed business owners to understand their perspective on various aspects of business conditions. Forty-three responses were received.

The business survey contained eleven questions intended to describe the respondent's business and their perceptions of life and the business climate in the community. The first question in the business survey asked respondents to provide the type of business they have. The following table shows the results of this question:

Type of Business	Number of Responses
Retail	12
Industrial	5
Service	14
Professional	9
Food Service	0
Transportation	0
Not-for-profit	5
N/A	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>46</b>

In some cases the number of responses is greater than the total of number of survey forms received due to the fact that some respondents placed their business in more than one category.

Question 2 on the business survey asked the number of workers each business employs. The results are shown in the following table:

Number of Employees	Number of Responses
Less than 9	34
10 to 20	6
21 to 40	1
41 to 60	1
61 to 80	0
81 +	1
N/A	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>43</b>

Nearly 80% of the respondents had nine or fewer employees. This question was answered by all of the business survey respondents.

The third question of the survey asked business owners how long their company had been in business in Blissfield. The following table breaks out the response:



<b>Number of Years in Blissfield</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>
Less than 9	11
10 to 20	10
21 to 40	13
41 to 60	2
61 to 80	0
81 +	6
N/A	1
TOTAL	43

According to the survey response, nearly half of the businesses have been active less than 20 years. Over 80% were in business less than 40 years.

Question 4 asked whether the respondent owned or leased the building in which their business is located. Thirty-four own the building their business is located in and nine rent or lease the building.

Question 5 asked respondents where their business is located in relation to Adrian Street and the River Raisin. The results are listed below:

<b>Business Location</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>
East Side	17
West Side	17
Downtown	13
Other	0
N/A	0
TOTAL	47

Respondents were distributed throughout the town. Once again, due to multiple responses, more responses were received than the number of surveys returned.

Question 6 asked business owners in what town their residence is located. The results are included in the following table:

<b>Location of Residence</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>
Blissfield	29
Adrian	4
Toledo Area	2
Other	7
N/A	1
TOTAL	43

Most business owners also live in Blissfield. Question 7 was a follow-up question for business owners who do not reside in the Village. The select group was asked why they chose to located their business in Blissfield. The responses to this open-ended question are varied.

Question 8 asked business owners to rate Village services. Ratings ranged from poor to very good with "no opinion" as another possible response. The following table presents the results along with weighted average scores for the services:

	<b>VERY GOOD</b>	<b>GOOD</b>	<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>POOR</b>	<b>VERY POOR</b>	<b>NO RESPONSE</b>	<b>WEIGHTED AVERAGE SCORE</b>
Street maintenance	20	15	6	1	0	1	3.29
Street lighting	17	12	9	4	0	1	3.00
Water	10	15	12	1	4	1	2.62
Sewer	13	15	9	2	2	2	2.85
Sidewalk maintenance	14	15	8	2	2	2	2.90
Police: Traffic control	16	13	7	4	2	1	2.88
Police: Crime enforcement	14	14	8	3	2	2	2.85
Code enforcement	14	15	5	2	5	2	2.76
Fire (township)	21	18	2	0	0	2	3.46
Rescue (township)	23	16	2	0	0	2	3.51

Question 9 asked respondents to rate various conditions within the Village. The following are the results of this evaluation:

	<b>VERY GOOD</b>	<b>GOOD</b>	<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>POOR</b>	<b>VERY POOR</b>	<b>NO RESPONSE</b>	<b>WEIGHTED AVERAGE SCORE</b>
Property maintenance: Residential	7	27	8	0	0	1	2.98
Property maintenance: Commercial	5	19	17	1	0	1	2.67
Visual appearance: Adrian St. (US-223)	8	13	13	7	1	1	2.29
Visual appearance: Lane St.	9	15	17	1	0	1	2.76
Downtown parking	12	20	7	2	0	2	3.02
Visual appearance of commercial signs	7	16	17	2	0	1	2.67

The purpose of Question 10 was to learn where business owners travel to obtain various goods and services. Respondents were asked what their primary and secondary destinations were to purchase the various goods and services. The responses to this question are presented below:

	<b>Blissfield</b>		<b>Adrian</b>		<b>Toledo area</b>		<b>Internet</b>		<b>Other</b>	
	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
Professional Services	23	2	5	13	2	5	0	0	4	4
Building/Maintenance Supplies	27	6	9	17	7	4	1	0	4	2
Office Supplies	0	11	22	7	10	12	3	0	8	3
Appliances	14	3	17	4	8	13	0	0	3	2
Capital Equipment	5	3	5	5	7	4	0	0	18	4

Finally, in Question 11, respondents were asked a number of questions regarding various policy issues facing the Village. The questions and responses follow:

	Yes	No	No response
Should the Village attract more industry?	31	9	3
Should the Village annex Township lands to accommodate growth?	29	9	5
Should the Village promote development of more stores and shopping areas?	27	14	2
Should the Village encourage development of:			
Single-family housing?	34	3	6
Multi-family housing?	17	19	7
Senior citizen housing?	33	7	3
Extended care facilities?	30	9	4
Urgent care facilities?	19	17	7
Day care facilities?	21	14	8
Should the Village promote tourism?	33	9	1
Should the Village consider village-wide wireless internet service?	28	10	5