RUSK COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
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## 1 Demographics and Issues \& Opportunities

## Overview

Rusk County's Comprehensive Plan begins with an overview of the county based on information including the past, present, and future projections covering a 20-year planning period. This overview is necessary to understand the changes that are taking place in Rusk County. The information found in this plan is all important and will help assist in achieving the goals and objectives that will guide the future development and policy for the next 20 years in Rusk County.

### 1.2 Population Characteristics

The population in Rusk County increased by 5,243 during the ten year span between 1910 and 1920. Between 1920 and 1950 the population of the county remained steady. The population of the County had increased through 1940. After 1940 a continue decline in population is evident according to Table 1.1:

Table 1.1:Rusk County:Population 1910-2000

| Year | 1910 | 1920 | 1930 | 1940 | 1950 | 1960 | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pop. | 11,160 | 16,403 | 16,081 | 17,737 | 16,790 | 14,794 | 14,238 | 15,589 | 15,079 | 15,347 |
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## Population Projections

Table 1.2 shows population projections for Rusk County from 2005 to 2025. These projections shown are based on current and past population trends that took place in Rusk County and are intended to be a baseline guide for any of the county decision makers. In this table it shows that Rusk County will steadily increase through the next 25 years. Figure 1.1 shows the populations levels of 1950-2000 and the projections of 2005-2025.

| Table 1.2: Rusk County Population Projections 2005-2025 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Year | Rusk County |
| 2005 | 15,564 |
| 2010 | 15,854 |
| 2015 | 15,996 |
| 2020 | 16,124 |
| 2025 | 15,944 |
| Absolute Changes 2005-2025 | +380 |
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Figure 1.1 Rusk County
Population 1950-2000, Population Projections 2005-2025


## Ethnicity and Ancestral Composition

An ethnic group consists of those who conceive themselves as being alike. For a lot of them they share a common history, culture, and ancestry. This could in fact include things such as language, values, religion, music, employment patterns, and geographic origins. Table 1.3 below shows the ethnicity for residents of Rusk County. Backgrounds of Polish ancestries and German ancestries appear to be the strongest of Rusk County.
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|  | Table 1.3: Rusk County Ethnicity |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Czech | $\mathbf{6 7 2}$ | Polish | $\mathbf{2 , 1 5 9}$ |
| Danish | 284 | Portuguese | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| Dutch | $\mathbf{4 8 3}$ | Russian | $\mathbf{7 4}$ |
| English | $\mathbf{1 , 2 2 3}$ | Scotch-Irish | $\mathbf{1 4 5}$ |
| French (except Basque) | $\mathbf{6 4 9}$ | Scottish | $\mathbf{1 9 3}$ |
| French Canadian | $\mathbf{2 1 7}$ | Slovak | $\mathbf{6 2}$ |
| German | $\mathbf{5 , 5 4 5}$ | Swedish | $\mathbf{7 3 5}$ |
| Greek | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | Swiss | $\mathbf{1 2 1}$ |
| Hungarian | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | Ukrainian | $\mathbf{3 6}$ |
| Irish | $\mathbf{1 , 7 3 2}$ | United States or American | $\mathbf{7 8 1}$ |
| Italian | $\mathbf{2 7 5}$ | Welsh | $\mathbf{3 7}$ |
| Lithuanian | $\mathbf{5 1}$ | West Indian | $\mathbf{1 7}$ |
| Norwegian | $\mathbf{1 , 6 2 8}$ | Other ancestries | $\mathbf{1 , 2 6 8}$ |
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Most of the county residents reported that their race was white (97.7\%) in the 2000 U.S. Census for Rusk County. Other racial categories only accounted for almost four percent of of the total population as shown in table 1.4.

| Table 1.4:Race in Rusk County, 2000 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Race | Number | Percent |
| White | 14,992 | $\mathbf{9 7 . 7 \%}$ |
| Black | $\mathbf{7 9}$ | $<\mathbf{1 \%}$ |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | $\mathbf{6 5}$ | $<\mathbf{1 \%}$ |
| Asian | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | $<1 \%$ |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander | 15 | $<1 \%$ |
| Some Other Race | 54 | $<1 \%$ |
| Two or more races | 102 | $<1 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

## Demographic Change and Age Distribution

Table 1.5 below shows Rusk County starting to age within ten years. Shifts in the age structure of the population can affect many needs and services within the county which would include housing, elderly care, and schooling. State trends point to an aging population that will need more services. The biggest changes happened in the age groups of 25-34, 35-44, and 45-54.
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| Table 1.5: Rusk County Population by Age, 1990 and 2000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1990 |  | 2000 |  | \% Change |
| Age | Number | \% of Total | Number | \% of Total | 1990-2000 |
| Under 5 | 1,079 | 7.1\% | 829 | 5.4\% | -1.7\% |
| 5-9 | 1,184 | 7.9\% | 1,057 | 6.9\% | -1\% |
| 10-14 | 1,182 | 7.8\% | 1,151 | 7.5\% | -0.3\% |
| 15-19 | 1,118 | 7.4\% | 1,189 | 7.7\% | 0.3\% |
| 20-24 | 821 | 5.4\% | 787 | 5.1 \% | -0.3\% |
| 25-34 | 2,123 | 14.1\% | 1,572 | 10.2\% | -3.9\% |
| 35-44 | 1,980 | 13.1\% | 2,237 | 14.6\% | 1.5\% |
| 45-54 | 1,420 | 9.4\% | 2,113 | 13.8\% | 4.4\% |
| 55-59 | 680 | 4.5\% | 822 | 5.4\% | 0.9\% |
| 60-64 | 734 | 4.7\% | 758 | 4.9\% | 0.2\% |
| 65-74 | 1,515 | 10\% | 1,400 | 9.1\% | -0.9\% |
| 75-84 | 955 | 6.3\% | 1,021 | 6.7\% | 0.4\% |
| 85 and over | 288 | 1.9\% | 411 | 2.7\% | 0.8\% |
| Total | 15,079 |  | 15,347 |  |  |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
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Table 1.6 and Figure 1.2 show the amount of males and females by each age group.

Table 1.6:Population by Age Groups

|  | Male | Female |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $0-4$ | 434 | 395 |
| $5-9$ | 535 | 522 |
| $10-14$ | 553 | 598 |
| $15-19$ | 644 | 545 |
| $20-24$ | 429 | 358 |
| $25-29$ | 355 | 333 |
| $30-34$ | 442 | 442 |
| $35-39$ | 562 | 538 |
| $40-44$ | 575 | 562 |
| $45-49$ | 576 | 564 |
| $50-54$ | 497 | 476 |
| $55-59$ | 422 | 400 |
| $60-64$ | 367 | 391 |
| $65-69$ | 344 | 386 |
| $70-74$ | 302 | 369 |
| $75+$ | 577 | 855 |
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Figure 1.2: Age Groups
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## Population of Municipal Divisions

## Historical Population

Table 1.7 shows the populations of each civil division and their change in population from 1950 to 2000. Of the county's 33 civil divisions, 26 of them sustained loss in population. Some notable municipalities to gain a larger population was the Town of Dewey, which gained 148 people (39.8\%), Town of Flambeau who gained 124 people (13.1\%) and the Town of Willard who gained 147 people (37.5\%).

Table 1.7: Historical Population, 1950-2000

| MUNICIPALITY | 1950 | 1960 | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | Absolute Change 1950-2000 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & \text { Change } \\ & 1950-2000 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Towns |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Town of Atlanta | 661 | 549 | 489 | 586 | 585 | 627 | -34 | -5.1\% |
| Town of Big Bend | 445 | 365 | 324 | 398 | 386 | 402 | -43 | -9.7\% |
| Town of Big Falls | 175 | 136 | 130 | 122 | 107 | 107 | -68 | -38.9\% |
| Town of Cedar Rapids | 43 | 28 | 9 | 30 | 30 | 37 | -6 | -14\% |
| Town of Dewey | 375 | 369 | 363 | 399 | 487 | 523 | 148 | 39.5\% |
| Town of Flambeau | 943 | 895 | 931 | 1,086 | 1,018 | 1,067 | 124 | 13.1\% |
| Town of Grant | 983 | 1049 | 931 | 998 | 847 | 767 | -216 | -22\% |
| Town of Grow | 644 | 559 | 548 | 560 | 450 | 473 | -171 | -26.6\% |
| Town of Hawkins | 317 | 281 | 230 | 184 | 163 | 170 | -147 | -46.4\% |
| Town of Hubbard | 227 | 124 | 112 | 185 | 216 | 168 | -59 | -26\% |
| Town of Lawrence | 337 | 219 | 167 | 240 | 240 | 240 | -97 | -28.8\% |
| Town of Marshall | 725 | 706 | 679 | 697 | 630 | 683 | -42 | -5.7\% |
| Town of Murry | 416 | 324 | 253 | 301 | 291 | 275 | -141 | -33.9\% |
| Town of Richland | 287 | 211 | 196 | 217 | 185 | 206 | -81 | -28.2\% |
| Town of Rusk | 500 | 387 | 372 | 422 | 443 | 475 | -25 | -5\% |
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| Table 1.7: Historical Population, 1950-2000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Town of South Fork | 197 | 201 | 204 | 146 | 119 | 120 | -77 | -39.1\% |
| Town of Strickland | 465 | 385 | 262 | 281 | 262 | 300 | -165 | -35.5\% |
| Town of Stubbs | 720 | 631 | 633 | 612 | 573 | 587 | -133 | -18.5\% |
| Town of Thornapple | 661 | 450 | 543 | 740 | 757 | 811 | 150 | 22.7\% |
| Town of True | 430 | 361 | 360 | 332 | 310 | 291 | -139 | -32.3\% |
| Town of Washington | 323 | 233 | 206 | 318 | 301 | 312 | -11 | -3.4\% |
| Town of Wilkinson | 85 | 49 | 44 | 63 | 51 | 66 | -19 | -22.4\% |
| Town of Willard | 392 | 362 | 380 | 481 | 448 | 539 | 147 | 37.5\% |
| Town of Wilson | 99 | 83 | 75 | 72 | 67 | 84 | -15 | -15.2\% |
| Village |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Village of Bruce | 867 | 815 | 799 | 905 | 844 | 787 | -80 | -9.2\% |
| Village of Conrath | 114 | 121 | 114 | 86 | 92 | 98 | -16 | -14\% |
| Village of Glen Flora | 91 | 75 | 69 | 83 | 108 | 93 | 2 | 2.2\% |
| Village of Hawkins | 414 | 402 | 385 | 407 | 375 | 317 | -97 | -23.4\% |
| Village of Ingram | 146 | 99 | 109 | 61 | 91 | 76 | -70 | -47.9\% |
| Village of Sheldon | 271 | 240 | 218 | 292 | 268 | 256 | -15 | -5.5\% |
| Village of Tony | 182 | 162 | 144 | 146 | 114 | 105 | -77 | -42.3\% |
| Village of Weyerhaeuser | 331 | 339 | 285 | 313 | 283 | 353 | 22 | 6.6\% |
| City |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Ladysmith | 3,924 | 3,584 | 3,678 | 3,826 | 3,938 | 3,932 | 8 | 0.2\% |
| Rusk County | 16,790 | 14,794 | 14,238 | 15,589 | 15,079 | 15,347 | -1,443 | -8.6\% |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
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## Projected Changes Through 2025

Table 1.8 shows the population projections for the civil divisions through 2025. Rusk County shows that it will slightly rise trough 2025 with a $2.4 \%$ increase in population.

## Table 1.8: Population Projections, 2005-2025

MUNICIPALITY $2005 \quad 2010 \quad 2015 \quad 2020 \quad 2025 \quad$ Absolute $\quad 2020$ Change 2005- Change 2005 $2025 \quad 2025$

| Towns |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Town of Atlanta | 650 | 676 | 696 | 715 | 721 | 71 | 10.9\% |
| Town of Big Bend | 410 | 420 | 426 | 432 | 430 | 20 | 4.9\% |
| Town of Big Falls | 104 | 101 | 98 | 94 | 89 | -15 | -14.4\% |
| Town of Cedar Rapids | 36 | 36 | 35 | 34 | 33 | -3 | -8.3\% |
| Town of Dewey | 550 | 579 | 604 | 627 | 639 | 89 | 16.2\% |
| Town of Flambeau | 1,094 | 1,137 | 1,170 | 1,202 | 1,210 | 116 | 10.6\% |
| Town of Grant | 748 | 732 | 708 | 684 | 648 | -100 | -13.4\% |
| Town of Grow | 467 | 463 | 455 | 447 | 430 | -37 | -7.9\% |
| Town of Hawkins | 175 | 182 | 186 | 191 | 192 | 17 | 9.7\% |
| Town of Hubbard | 160 | 154 | 145 | 137 | 126 | -34 | -21.3\% |
| Town of Lawrence | 252 | 265 | 276 | 286 | 291 | 39 | 15.5\% |
| Town of Marshall | 696 | 713 | 723 | 733 | 728 | 32 | 4.6\% |
| Town of Murry | 267 | 261 | 252 | 243 | 229 | -38 | -14.2\% |
| Town of Richland | 209 | 213 | 216 | 217 | 215 | 6 | 2.9\% |
| Town of Rusk | 492 | 511 | 526 | 540 | 544 | 52 | 10.6\% |
| Town of South Fork | 120 | 120 | 120 | 119 | 116 | -4 | -3.3\% |
| Town of Strickland | 317 | 335 | 350 | 365 | 373 | 56 | 17.7\% |
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| Table 1.8: Population Projections, 2005-2025 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Town of Stubbs | 601 | 617 | 628 | 638 | 636 | 35 | 5.8\% |
| Town of Thornapple | 838 | 868 | 891 | 913 | 918 | 80 | 9.5\% |
| Town of True | 282 | 275 | 265 | 254 | 239 | -43 | -15.2\% |
| Town of Washington | 316 | 321 | 323 | 326 | 321 | 5 | 1.6\% |
| Town of Wilkinson | 72 | 78 | 84 | 89 | 93 | 21 | 29.2\% |
| Town of Willard | 587 | 639 | 684 | 730 | 760 | 173 | 29.5\% |
| Town of Wilson | 88 | 92 | 95 | 99 | 100 | 12 | 13.6\% |
| Village |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Village of Bruce | 773 | 761 | 743 | 724 | 691 | -82 | -10.6\% |
| Village of Conrath | 107 | 117 | 126 | 135 | 141 | 34 | 31.8\% |
| Village of Glen Flora | 93 | 93 | 92 | 91 | 89 | -4 | -4.3\% |
| Village of Hawkins | 347 | 379 | 407 | 436 | 455 | 108 | 31.1\% |
| Village of Ingram | 79 | 82 | 85 | 87 | 88 | 9 | 11.4\% |
| Village of Sheldon | 253 | 251 | 246 | 241 | 232 | -21 | -8.3\% |
| Village of Tony | 100 | 96 | 91 | 85 | 79 | -21 | -21\% |
| Village of Weyerhaeuser | 368 | 385 | 398 | 411 | 415 | 47 | 12.8\% |
| City |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Ladysmith | 3,913 | 3,902 | 3,852 | 3,799 | 3,673 | -240 | -6.1\% |
| Rusk County | 15,564 | 15,854 | 15,996 | 16,124 | 15,944 | 380 | 2.4\% |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
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### 1.3 Household Characteristics

A household includes all of the people who live in a housing unit. By gathering the data of these households of a community it will help establish an understanding of what the community is like along with that it provides insight into a community life.

The 2000 Census identified 6,095 households in Rusk County. Of this total, 4,158 are family households which makes up almost $70 \%$ of all households. What it means by a family household is that there must be two or more people living in that household who are related by marriage, birth, or adoption. There are 1,937 non-family households in Rusk County which means it is a householder living alone or lives with non-relatives only. Table 1.9 gives an understanding of what Rusk County households are like and what the amount for a type of family there is.

## Table 1.9: Household Characteristics

|  | Total | Percent of all Households |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Total Households | $\mathbf{6 , 0 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |
| Family Households (families) |  |  |
| With own children under 18 years | $\mathbf{4 , 1 5 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 8 . 2 \%}$ |
| Married-couple family | $\mathbf{1 , 7 4 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 . 6 \%}$ |
| With own children under 18 years | $\mathbf{1 , 3 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 . 9 \%}$ |
| Female householder, no husband present | $\mathbf{4 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 . 8 \%}$ |
| With own children under 18 years | $\mathbf{2 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 9 \%}$ |
| Non-Family Households | $\mathbf{1 , 9 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 2 \%}$ |
| Householder living alone | $\mathbf{1 , 6 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 . 8 \%}$ |
| Householder 65 years and older | $\mathbf{8 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 4}$ |
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## Table 1.9: Household Characteristics

Households with individuals under 18 years
Households with individuals 65 years and older

Average household size
Average family size
Source: U.S. Census Bureau

1,871
30.7\%

1,968
2.45
2.97
32.3\%
(X)
(X)

## Household Projections

Household projections for Rusk County to the year 2025 are shown on table 1.10. From 2000 to 2025, the county is projected to gain 1,054 households (Approximately 42 households per year). That would be an increase of $17.3 \%$.

| Table 1.10: Household Projections 2000-2025 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rusk County | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 5}$ |
| U.S. Census | $\mathbf{6 , 0 9 5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Projections |  | $\mathbf{6 , 3 3 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 , 6 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 , 8 8 8}$ | $\mathbf{7 , 1 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 , 1 4 9}$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

### 1.4 Employment Characteristics

According to the 2000 U.S. Census Bureau figures, the Rusk County population who are employed is at 6,997 people. Manufacturing employed the most from Rusk County reaching 2,043 with educational, health, and social services coming in second with 1,310 people hired. The figure displays employment of Rusk County by percentage of industry sector.
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## Figure 1.3: Employment by Industry


*Other Services (except public administration) - 3.4\%
Source: U.S. Census Bureau

## Rusk County Labor Force

A community's labor force is that portion of the population that is employed or seeking employment. The table below lists Rusk County labor force statistics for the last ten years on an average annual basis. According to the Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development, the unemployed has gradually gone up and was at it's highest in 2007 in the ten years shown.
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| Table 1.11: Rusk County Labor Force Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| Labor Force | 7,167 | 7,199 | 7,941 | 7,973 | 7,927 | 7,829 | 7,825 | 8,021 | 7,913 | 7,728 |
| Employed | 6,748 | 6,861 | 7,532 | 7,504 | 7,403 | 7,320 | 7,324 | 7,511 | 7,387 | 7,190 |
| Unemployed | 419 | 338 | 409 | 469 | 524 | 509 | 501 | 510 | 526 | 538 |
| Unemp. Rate | $5.8 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ | $6.6 \%$ | $6.5 \%$ | $6.4 \%$ | $6.4 \%$ | $6.6 \%$ | $7.0 \%$ |

Source: Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development, LAUS

### 1.5 Income Levels and Poverty Rates

## Median Household Income

The 2000 U.S. Census reports that the median household income for Rusk County is $\$ 31,344$. Wisconsin's median household income is $\$ 43,791$, making Rusk County falling short of the average income. The table shown here gives the detailed averages of annual incomes for Rusk County.
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| Table 1.12: Rusk County Household Income |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Annual Income | Number of Households | Percent of Households |
| Less than $\$ 10,000$ | 670 | $\mathbf{1 0 . 9 \%}$ |
| $\$ 10,000$ to $\$ 14,999$ | 506 | $\mathbf{8 . 3 \%}$ |
| $\$ 15,000$ to $\$ 24,999$ | 1,186 | $\mathbf{1 9 . 4 \%}$ |
| $\$ 25,000$ to $\$ 34,999$ | 1,006 | $\mathbf{1 6 . 4 \%}$ |
| $\$ 35,000$ to $\$ 49,999$ | 1,159 | $\mathbf{1 8 . 9 \%}$ |
| $\$ 50,000$ to $\$ 74,999$ | 1,065 | $\mathbf{1 7 . 4 \%}$ |
| $\$ 75,000$ to $\$ 99,999$ | 334 | $5.5 \%$ |
| $\$ 100,000$ to $\$ 149,999$ | 143 | $2.3 \%$ |
| $\$ 150,000$ to $\$ 199,999$ | 20 | $0.3 \%$ |
| $\$ 200,000$ or more | 30 | $0.5 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

## Per Capita Income

Per capita money income ( PCl ) is defined as all resident income divided by the population and is reported by census data. It is gathered from traceable income from interest, welfare program payments, dividends, wages, etc. Per capita personal income (PCPI) is the same as PCl except that it includes moneys received from insurance payments, refunds, and gifts. Since that happens, PCPI figures will always be higher than that of PCI.

## Table 1.13: Rusk County and the State of Wisconsin: Income and Poverty Levels

Per Capita Personal Income (2002)
Per Capita Income (1999)
Percent of Population below Poverty Level (1999)

| Rusk County | Wisconsin |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\$ 20,859$ | $\$ 30,050$ |
| $\$ 15,563$ | $\$ 21,271$ |
| $\mathbf{1 5 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 . 2 \%}$ |
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### 1.6 Educational Attainment

Educational attainment is the highest degree or level of schooling a person can complete, and is a variable used when assessing a community's labor force potential. According to the 2000 Census data of Rusk County's population age 25 an older, 79.1 percent attained a high school education or higher, while Wisconsin's percentage was a little higher at 85.1. Table 1.14 details educational attainment for Rusk County and Wisconsin.

| Table 1.14: Educational Attainment 2000 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Rusk County | Wisconsin |
| Less than $9^{\text {th }}$ Grade | 864 | 186,125 |
| $9^{\text {th }}$ to $12^{\text {th }}$ Grade, No Diploma | 1,286 | 332,292 |
| High School Graduate | 4,468 | 1,201,813 |
| Some College, No Degree | 1,901 | 715,664 |
| Associate Degree | 627 | 260,711 |
| Bachelor's Degree | 848 | 530,268 |
| Graduate or Professional Degree | 302 | 249,005 |
| Total | 10,296 | 3,475,878 |

[^3]
## ADOPTED -

### 1.7 Survey Data Summary

The Rusk County Comprehensive Planning Survey included questions relating to importance of various County assets, i.e., farming, forests, rivers, schools, etc.. The results indicated that pertaining to Quality of Life, lakes and rivers are very important to respondents along with a safe environment from crime and keeping the natural environment clean. It seems that of lesser importance was public outdoor motorized recreation.
Overall Quality of Life was graded Good or Excellent by 55.8\% of survey respondents 24.8\% graded it Average, and 19.3\% felt that it was Fair or Poor.
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