

Please respond to the following statements: Local governments that have not yet adopted Comprehensive Plans that meet the requirements of Wis Rev Stats 66.1001 should be provided a deadline extension of January 1, 2012 to complete and adopt their plan.		Local governments should be given the option of adopting comprehensive plans by either an ordinance or resolution.	
Response	Please feel free to add additional comments:	Response	Please feel free to add additional comments:
Neutral		Neutral	
Strongly Agree		Strongly Disagree	
Agree	This would allow the incorporation of 2010 census date into our planning effort.	Neutral	
Neutral		Disagree	
Disagree		Agree	
Neutral		Strongly Agree	
Agree		Disagree	
Agree		Disagree	
Agree		Neutral	
Strongly Agree		Agree	
Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Agree	I only marked 'agree' because I think an extension is needed, but 2012 is not sufficient time. Although funding assistance was made available by the state (taxpayers), significant time and money is needed to meet the statutory requirements. Smaller communities without a full-time planning staff throughout the state may not have the resources to draft a Plan. Also, many communities feel that a high quality Plan that is created specific to the needs/conditions of their individual community will be their greatest asset with the best outcome rather than a cookie-cutter Plan created through large multi-jurisdictional efforts.	Neutral	
Strongly Disagree		Neutral	
Strongly Disagree	This extension will lead everyone to procrastinate on their plans. They should be given no reason to put it off further!	Strongly Agree	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Neutral		Strongly Agree	
Disagree	There should be some mechanism to allow those governments who want to adopt plans, time to adopt them. However, the danger is that by 2012, new rule changes may be forced through, threatening comp planning in general. Also, those communities that did their plan and are playing by the rules (so to speak) should be rewarded for their efforts, instead of making exceptions.	Strongly Disagree	The local plan should be adopted by ordinance. This provides a stronger backing for actions that utilize the comp plan.
Agree	Local opinion from the 25 municipalities and county that with difficult and expense will have a comprehensive plan adopted by January 1, 2010 is that everyone had a chance to get a plan completed and they should not be rewarded with an extension for burying their head in the sand with the hope that requirement for a comprehensive plan would go away. It is not fair to extend the deadline at this late a date. The local municipalities and county would have preferred to delayed creating their comprehensive plan until such time as there was not much of a budget crunch, but they followed the law. Why should other local governments be rewarded for not following the law?	Agree	
Disagree		Neutral	
Neutral		Disagree	
Strongly Agree		Strongly Agree	
Disagree		Disagree	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Agree		Agree	
Agree	Only if they have begun the process by 2010 and just need more time to finish. For those completed, they need to be effective as of Jan 1, 2010.	Strongly Disagree	Must be by ordinance to be effective
Agree		Agree	
Disagree		Disagree	
Agree		Strongly Agree	
Disagree	Sort of depends on where they are in the process. If they have had their head in the sand for 10 years, then they do not warrant an extension. If they are genuinely "in progress", then an extension should be made available.	Disagree	This was not a random choice back in the 90s and it remains today that the elected local government must make a strong statement of support of their plan. In Haas's words, it represents "an impermanent constitution". The ordinance status provides the legal framework for implementation ordinances (zoning, etc.)
Neutral		Agree	
Strongly Disagree		Agree	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree	the ordinance requirement had been a major source of problem with doing this planning and is difficult for lay persons to understand-although plans are also adopted by ordinance in MN.
Agree	With a caveat that they are ineligible for state discretionary grant funds until the plan is adopted. Come on, these people have had years to prepare plans! Most of these Cities just figured it would get repealed and they are paying the price for their miscalculation!	Strongly Agree	Planning represents the values of the community. An ordinance gives that plan teeth for implementation.
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	Ordinance!
Disagree		Neutral	
Strongly Disagree	Folks have had 10 years warning that this was coming, legislative changes mid-stream to make it easier on them, extensive technical assistance resources at their disposal (state guidebooks, UW-Extension, etc.), and a state grant program to help clear financial hurdles. An extension would simply enable bad behavior on the part of a few scoundrels who didn't take it seriously. Absolutely not!	Neutral	I don't know enough about the tradeoffs inherent in either option to be able to say.
Agree	However, an extension, while postponing the inevitable legal questions that may jeopardize the statute, raises other questions: So who might be entitled to receive an extension? Do local units need to certify by resolution they intend to ultimately comply, or is this merely a stalling tactic in hopes the entire requirement disappears in 2012? Maybe this is an opportunity, if a testamentary statement is required, for counties to anticipate where they may need to step in and work collaboratively with those units who decide to do nothing. And they would have two years to accomplish this. That's one form, another might be for a neighboring MCD to partner with the non-adopting unit of government in order to provide effective land use planning and regulation - perhaps through a cooperative agreement (s. 66.0307). How are adjoining MCD's, some with 1001 plans, others without, going to address relevant issues such as annexation, extrajurisdictional powers, that relate to common boundaries, shared or competing visions/services, etc. Does an extension prospectively mean that everyone, compliers and non-compliers, are going to be treated	Neutral	I think perhaps the nuances involved in this question should have been laid out - what's the argument for changing the statute vs. maintaining current language?
Agree		Strongly Disagree	
Neutral	Not without some strings and possibly penalty. Communities had 10 years! But, at the same time, I would hate to see some of the potential chaos and court mess that could occur without an extension for some communities. Nancy	Disagree	
Strongly Agree		Neutral	
Neutral		Strongly Disagree	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Agree	It seems the legislation was implemented with ample timeframe to complete the task. I do however recognize budget constraints but if grant funds were/are available even something minimal is better than no plan.	Disagree	I think resolution but then the ordinances definitely must come with implementation.
Strongly Disagree		Neutral	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree	
Neutral		Strongly Disagree	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Strongly Agree		Strongly Agree	
Strongly Disagree		Agree	
Disagree		Neutral	
Strongly Disagree		Neutral	
Disagree	This is not a new requirement and people had plenty of time to prepare. There need to be deadlines, or there is no reason to get things done. Having real impacts of not complying will help planners get management on board.	Disagree	This is the cornerstone of the planning process. It needs to be an ordinance.
Agree	This would be a reasonable extension	Strongly Disagree	The plan should carry the weight of law
Disagree		Disagree	
Agree		Disagree	
Disagree		Disagree	
Strongly Disagree	Time given to complete the plan has been more than adequate.	Strongly Disagree	Rules should be the same for all communities.
Agree		Strongly Agree	
Agree	I think that this extension should be provided with some clear guidelines and expectations, but that any future extension (beyond 1/2012) should be much more onerous.	Strongly Disagree	
Strongly Agree		Strongly Agree	
Agree		Disagree	
Agree		Neutral	
Disagree		Disagree	
Disagree		Neutral	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	Allowing comprehensive plans to be adopted by ordinance blurs the distinction between planning and zoning. A comprehensive plan, which is a document that should be used to guide a municipality's future decisions, is very different from a zoning regulation that restricts a property owner's present ability to use his or her property in a certain way. Comprehensive plans should be adopted by resolution and zoning regulations should be adopted by ordinance.
Strongly Disagree		Neutral	
Agree	If extensions are granted, the community should have to demonstrate hardship that prevented them from meeting the deadline and also effort and progress towards completing the plan. If the deadline was not met due to negligence or the idea that the comp plan is not necessary then they should not receive an extension. But besides, what are the penalties for not completing the plan? None correct. Other than that a jurisdiction could be sued for not having the comp plan has a basis for a land regulation.	Strongly Agree	I think it would change how the plans are written if they were adopted by ordinance. They would need to be more specific and prescriptive.

Please respond to the following statements: Local governments that have not yet adopted Comprehensive Plans that meet the requirements of Wis Rev Stats 66.1001 should be provided a deadline extension of January 1, 2012 to complete and adopt their plan.		Local governments should be given the option of adopting comprehensive plans by either an ordinance or resolution.	
Response	Please feel free to add additional comments:	Response	Please feel free to add additional comments:
Disagree	What are the Neanderthals waiting for...kick butt and take names!!!!	Disagree	A plan is a more formal document, with public input and proper procedures leading to hopefully a well thought out document that is implementable. A resolution is a piece of paper promising to be good...no thought or "planning" is required to adopt a resolution, and ultimately it is about as enforceable...what does the state do, or concerned citizens of the community do, if a municipality fails to live up to (ignores) its own resolution?
Disagree	They've had plenty of time to fulfill the law requirements. However, I would agree to making an exception if there was some major event that effected the local government such as a natural disaster or major employer closing that would effect economic/employment trends and projections, etc).	Neutral	
Strongly Agree		Strongly Disagree	
Agree	If they have started the process. If they have not started the process they are SOL after 2010.	Agree	
Neutral		Neutral	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Strongly Disagree	nine years is enough.	Strongly Disagree	confusing.
Disagree	There should not be a blanket extension, but perhaps the legislature could allow DOA to grant extensions to specific communities through an application process for those instances where extenuating circumstances apply (not just foot-dragging).	Disagree	
Disagree		Agree	
Strongly Agree		Strongly Agree	
Agree		Disagree	
Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Agree		Disagree	
Agree	Depends. I do think the Town's Association proposal makes sense. There are a number of communities who had a long way to travel to get to planning, and those communities should have an extension.	Disagree	
Disagree	I think ten years advance notice was long enough. There would have to be a pretty darn good reason for a community NOT to have done a plan during this time.	Disagree	The "teeth" are in the consistency requirements. I have concerns that changing the adoption process will give the appearance of diminishing the importance of the plan, even if, from a legal perspective, it doesn't change anything...
Disagree		Agree	
Disagree		Disagree	
Strongly Disagree		Agree	
Strongly Disagree		Disagree	Should be by ordinance, which has legal standing than a resolution.
Neutral		Agree	
Disagree		Disagree	
Agree		Agree	
Neutral		Agree	
Disagree	At some point the law needs to be the law. If the date is continually altered to assist communities that didn't feel the need to prepare a plan, what message are we sending? especially given cuts to several planning divisions/departments over past few years due to budget cuts	Strongly Disagree	Adoption by ordinance give the document and its contents the full weight of the community decision-makers.
Agree		Disagree	public plan, should be a public hearing process
Agree		Agree	
Disagree		Neutral	
Neutral		Disagree	
Neutral	Adequate time was provided for all communities to comply. Those that have not yet prepared or adopted their plans should not be "let off the hook" however it is better to have all communities adopt comprehensive plans than not.	Strongly Disagree	Comprehensive plans must have the authority of law.
Neutral		Neutral	
Neutral		Neutral	
Disagree		Neutral	
Disagree		Agree	
Strongly Agree		Neutral	
Disagree		Agree	
Disagree		Agree	
Neutral		Disagree	
Strongly Agree	But only if the community is actively working on their plan.	Neutral	
Strongly Disagree	Ten years is plenty of time to budget for and complete a comprehensive plan.	Strongly Disagree	If adopted by resolution, it will "stay on the shelf" just like all the other comp plans and land use plans and community development plans prior to 1999.
Disagree		Strongly Agree	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Disagree		Agree	
Strongly Agree		Strongly Disagree	
Agree		Agree	
Strongly Agree		Strongly Agree	
Agree		Neutral	
Strongly Disagree		Agree	
Neutral		Neutral	
Agree		Neutral	
Disagree		Neutral	
Disagree		Disagree	
Disagree	There has been more than ample time to create and adopt a plan.	Strongly Disagree	This needs to be adopted by formal ordinance.
Strongly Agree		Agree	
Strongly Agree		Agree	
Strongly Agree		Agree	
Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Disagree		Disagree	
Neutral		Neutral	
Neutral		Neutral	
Disagree	As there has been plenty of years to accomplish this task, it is a pity to see that the legislature would allow for extending the deadline. So many communities took the deadline seriously and worked very diligently to ensure that they met the requirement.	Neutral	The process to adopt a plan revisions is cumbersome, and could be relieved through resolution process. However, a plan could carry the more legal weight if adopted through ordinance.
Disagree		Disagree	
Agree	With the state of the economy and tight local government revenues, it may be difficult for some communities to allocate resources for this worthy effort.	Agree	
Neutral		Agree	
Agree		Agree	
Disagree		Disagree	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Disagree		Neutral	
Agree		Agree	
Strongly Agree	However, for those local government units with plans already adopted, retain the consistency requirement (decisions to be made consistent with the plan) at Jan 1, 2010. If a plan is adopted after 2010, the consistency requirement should be the date of local adoption, not Jan 1, 2012.	Strongly Agree	The plan is NOT an ordinance-- it is a guideline for future action and compilation of goals, objectives and policies to support that action. Therefore, adoption by resolution is the appropriate method of recognition. Adopting these plan by ordinance has served to confuse the difference between an actual ordinance (i.e., subdivision ordinance) and a planning document for the future.
Agree		Agree	
Neutral		Agree	
Agree	Could limit it to those who are actively working on a comp plan but there should be some sort of extension given how hard it was to get the grants.	Strongly Disagree	We need to stay with the ordinance requirement. We need to strengthen the role of the comprehensive plan in this state!
Strongly Agree		Neutral	
Strongly Agree		Strongly Agree	
Disagree		Disagree	
Agree		Strongly Disagree	
Strongly Agree		Strongly Agree	
Disagree		Agree	
Neutral		Disagree	
Agree	I only agree to this as I understand both sides. Some communities simply have lacked leadership and should have the opportunity to do the right thing. Ultimately it is about getting the communities in a position to be successful and manage their growth, not about compliance to the timeline. On the other hand, the timeline has been out there for 11 years... is difficult to ignore that communities in this position of needing an extension are not the most astute... but then I default back to my original point.	Disagree	If Wisconsin is serious about making plans a central part of decision-making then maintaining the ordinance regulation for adoption is the right decision. It will not be about what the communities do, but how they go about doing it... in essence the procedural due process will matter, and the formality of the ordinance requirements will help communities manage their land use decisions.
Strongly Disagree		Neutral	
Disagree		Disagree	
Neutral		Agree	
Strongly Disagree		Agree	
Agree		Agree	