# Town of Ashippun Inventory and Trends Report

# Contents

1.	Issues and Opportunities1-11.1Introduction1-11.2Planning Process1-11.3Public Participation Efforts1-21.4Population Characteristics1-21.5Housing Characteristics1-101.6Employment Characteristics1-121.7Issues and Opportunities Trends1-13
2.	Housing
	2.1 Introduction
	2.2 Housing Characteristics
	2.3 Housing Unit Projections
	2.4 Housing Trends
3.	Transportation
	3.1 Introduction
	3.2 Transportation Programs
	3.3 State and Regional Transportation Plans
	3.4 Functional Classification of Highways
	3.5 Traffic Volumes
	3.6 Traffic Safety
	3.7 Town Road and County Highway Standards
	3.8 Town Road and County Highway Deficiencies
	3.9 The Transporation System
	3.10 Transporatation Trends
4.	Utilities and Community Facilities
	4.1 Introduction
	4.2 Administrative Facilities and Services
	4.3 Protective Services
	4.4 School Facilities
	4.5 Quasi Public Facilities
	4.6 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
	4.7 Solid Waste Management and Recycling
	4.8 Communication and Power Faclities
	4.9 Sanitary Sewer Service
	4.10 Private Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems (POWTS)

	4.11 Public Water Supply	4-4
	4.12 Stormwater Management	
	4.13 Health Care Facilities	
	4.14 Day Care Faclities	4-5
	4.15 Utilities and Community Facilities Trends	4-5
5.	Agriculture, Natural, and Cultural Resources	
	5.1 Introduction	5-1
	5.2 Soils	
	5.3 Prime Agricultural Soils	5-1
	5.4 Forests	
	5.5 Metallic and Nonmetallic Mineral Resources	5-2
	5.6 Wetlands	5-2
	5.7 Floodplains	5-3
	5.8 Watersheds and Drainage	5-3
	5.9 Surface Water Features	5-3
	5.10 Groundwater Resources	5-4
	5.11 Air Quality	5-5
	5.12 Environmental Corridors/Sensitive Areas	5-5
	5.13 Threatened and Endangered Species	. 5-6
	5.14 Wildlife Habitat and Recreational Areas	. 5-8
	5.15 Historic Places	. 5-8
	5.16 Cultural Resources	5-9
	5.17 Community Design	5-9
	5.18 Agricultural, Natural and Cultural Resources Trends	5-9
6	Economic Development	6-1
0.	6.1 Introduction	
	6.2 Labor Force and Employment Status	
	6.3 Economic Base Analysis	
	6.4 Economic Development Trends	
	0.1 Leonomie Development Trends	0 10
7.	Intergovernmental Cooperation	7-1
	7.1 Introduction	
	7.2 Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Building Process	
	7.3 Wisconsin Intergovernmental Agreement Statutes	
	7.4 Inventory of Plans for Communities in Dodge County	
	7.5 Inventory of Existing Intergovermental Agreements	
	7.6 Analysis of Town of Ashippun's Relationship with School Districts, Local	
	Governmental Units, Other Jurisdictions, Neighboring Counties, Region and State	. 7-7
	7.7 Intergovermental Cooperation Trends	
0	Land Use	Q 1
0.	8.1 Introduction	
	8.2 Existing Land Use	0-1
	8.3 Supply, Demand and Price Trends of Land	8-3

	8.4 Land Use Programs	
	8.5 Land and Resource Management	
	8.6 Existing and Potential Land Use Conflicts	
	8.7 Land Use Trends	
9.	Implementation	
	9.1 Introduction	
	9.2 Implementation Programs and Speciffic Actions	
	9.3 Integration and Consistancy of Plan Elements	
	9.4 Measurement of Plan Success	
	9.5 Upgrading of the Plan	

# Tables

Table 1-1, Population Trends, Dodge County, 1960-20001-3	3
Table 1-2, Population Change, Dodge County, 1970-20001-4	4
Table 1-3, Population by Age Cohort, Town of Ashippun and Dodge County, 20001-5	5
Table 1-4, Educational Attainment, Town of Ashippun and Dodge County, 2000 1-6	6
Table 1-5, Household Income, Town of Ashippun and Dodge County, 2000 1-7	7
Table 1-6, Population Trends, Town of Ashippun and Dodge County, 2000 1-8	8
Table 1-7, WDOA Population Projection, Town of Ashippun, 2000-2025 1-9	9
Table 1-8, Census/Population Estimate Projection, Town of Ashippun, 2000-2030 1-9	9
Table 1-9, Alternate Population Projection, Town of Ashippun, 2000-2030 1-10	0
Table 1-10, Housing Supply, Occupancy and Tenure, Town of Ashippun and Dodge County,	
1990-2000	
Table 1-11, Average Household Size, Town of Ashippun and Dodge County, 1990-2000 1-1	
Table 1-12, Employment by Industrial Sector, Town of Ashippun and Dodge County, 2000. 1-13	3
Table 2-1, Housing Supply, Occupancy and Tenure, Town of Ashippun and Dodge County,	
1990-2000	
Table 2-2, Units in Structure, Town of Ashippun and Dodge County, 2000 2-3	
Table 2-3, Year Structures Built, Town of Ashippun and Dodge County, 20002-4	
Table 2-4, Housing Value for Specified Owner-Occupied Units, Town of Ashippun and Dodge	
County, 2000	
Table 2-5, Linear Housing Unit Projection, Town of Ashippun, 2000-20302-6	
Table 2-6, Alternate Housing Unit Projection, Town of Ashippun, 2000-20302-6	6
Table 3-1, Dodge County Minimum Street Design Standards    3-4	
Table 3-2, State of Wisconsin Minimum Street Design Standards    3-4	
Table 3-3, Town of Ashippun Minimum Street Design Standards    3-4	4
Table 5-1, Rare, Threatened and Endangered Species, Town of Ashippun and Dodge County. 5-7	7
Table 6-1, Civilian Labor Force Annual Averages, Dodge County and Wisconsin, 1999-2002 6-1	
Table 6-2, Household Income, Town of Ashippun and Dodge County, 1999      6-3	
Table 6-3, Travel Time to Work, Town of Ashippun and Dodge County, 2000	4

Table 6-4, Employment by Industrial Sector, Town of Ashippun and Dodge County, 2000	6-5
Table 6-5, Employment by Occupation, Town of Ashippun and Dodge County, 2000	6-7
Table 6-6, Annual Average Wage by Industry Division, Dodge County and Wisconsin, 2002.	6-8
Table 6-7, Contaminated Sites in Town of Ashippun	6-9
Table 8-1, Existing Land Uses, Town of Ashippun, 2004	8-1
Table 8-2, Agricultural Land Sales, Dodge County, 1998-2001	8-3
Table 8-3, Letters of Intent and Certified Survey Maps, Town of Ashippun, 1999-2003	8-6
Table 8-4, Number of Permits Issued for On-Site Sanitary Systems by Year, Town of Ashippu	ın,
1994-2003	8-7

#### **Figures**

Figure 6-1, Monthly Unemployment Rates, Dodge County and Wisconsin, 2002	. 6-2
Figure 6-2, Employment by Industry, Town of Ashippun, 2000	. 6-6
Figure 8-1, Permits for New Homes, Town of Ashippun 1994-2003	. 8-5

#### **Appendix**

Map	1-1:	Regional	Setting
-----	------	----------	---------

- Map 1-2: Multi-jurisdictional Plan Groupings
- Map 3-1: Functional Classification of Highways & Location of Railroads and Airports
- Map 3-2: Average Daily Traffic Counts
- Map 4-1: Fire Emergency Services Areas
- Map 4-2: Emergency Medical Service Areas
- Map 4-3: School District Boundaries
- Map 4-4: County, State, & Federal Recreation Areas
- Map 4-5: Telephone Service Providers
- Map 4-6: Electric Utilities and Cooperatives
- Map 4-7: Natural Gas Service Providers
- Map 4-8: Public Sewer and Water Facilities
- Map 4-9: Utilities and Community Facilities
- Map 5-1: Prime Agricultural Soils
- Map 5-2: Woodlots
- Map 5-3: Wetlands, Watersheds, Streams, and Surface Water
- Map 5-4: Floodplains
- Map 5-5: Environmental Corridors
- Map 5-6: Historical, Cultural, and Archeological Resources
- Map 7-1: Extraterritorial Jurisdiction
- Map 7-2: Status of Planning
- Map 8-1: Existing Land Use
- Map 8-2: Farmland Preservation Participants
- Map 8-3: Year 2030 Future Land Use
- Map 9-1: Existing Zoning

# **1. Issues and Opportunities**

# 1.1 Introduction

In the summer of 2002, the Town of Ashippun signed a Resolution agreeing to participate in the preparation of a Multi-Jurisdiction Comprehensive Plan for the general purpose of guiding and accomplishing coordinated, adjusted, harmonious development within the Town. With assistance from the staff of the Dodge County Planning and Development Department and Foth & Van Dyke & Associates Inc., a comprehensive planning effort was begun. This planning effort is intended to serve as a guide to assist the Town in making decisions concerning the conservation and development of land over the next 20 years and beyond.

The Town of Ashippun is located in the southeast corner of Dodge County. Ashippun is bounded by the Town of Rubicon to the north, Washington County to the east, Waukesha County to the South, and the Town of Lebanon to the west. The Town of Ashippun contains the unincorporated Villages of Ashippun, Old Ashippun, and Alderly. The Town is located approximately 3 miles south of the City of Hartford and about 8 miles east of the City of Watertown. STH 67 provides a direct route from north to south in the Town, and a direct route to the Oconomowoc area. Also, CTH P provides a north-south transportation route through the Town, while CTH O provides an east – west transportation route in the Town. Map 1-1, Appendix, shows the regional setting of the Town of Ashippun.

# **1.2 Planning Process**

In November of 2002, the Dodge County Planning and Development Department and Foth & Van Dyke & Associates Inc. prepared a Comprehensive Planning Grant application on behalf of the Town of Ashippun and 18 other communities in Dodge County (Map 1-2, Appendix, shows the Multi-jurisdictional Plan Groupings). In February of 2003, the County was informed by the state that Dodge County, the Town of Ashippun, and the other participating communities were awarded a \$321,000 comprehensive planning grant. On April 30, 2003, the contract with the Wisconsin Department of Administration to produce a comprehensive plan document within 30 months became effective.

In June of 2003, the Town signed a Memorandum of Agreement with the Dodge County Planning and Development Department to assist with the development of a Town Comprehensive Plan. The planning program called for a Comprehensive Plan document, a current land use map, and a future land use map. Mapping for the planning program involved the recording, classifying, and analyzing of current land uses in the Town. From this information, a base map with property lines was developed along with an existing land use map and a series of future land use maps.

Wisconsin Statutes, Section 62.23 by reference from Section 60.62 provides that it is a function of the Town Plan Commission to make and certify to the Town Board, a plan for the physical development of the Town. The plan's general purpose is in guiding and accomplishing a coordinated, adjusted, and harmonious development...which will, in accordance with existing and future needs, best promote public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity, or the general welfare, as well as efficiency and economy in the process of development. Wisconsin

Statutes, Section 66.1001, further defines a comprehensive plan and a local unit of government's responsibilities. This legislation requires that a community that engages in land use regulations develop and adopt a comprehensive plan. The plan must contain nine elements as specified in the statutes. It also requires that all land use decisions be consistent with the comprehensive plan.

The plan document is divided into two separate reports, the Inventory and Trends Report and the Recommendations Report. The Inventory and Trends Report contains the necessary background information and maps about the Town and points out important trends. The Recommendations Report contains the policies, goals, and objectives of the Town and the recommendations for future action.

Policies, goals, and objectives stated in this document reflect the deliberations of the Town Plan Commission and Town Board, based on the comments and opinions expressed by the people within the Town of Ashippun. References made to specific state, county, and other governmental programs do not imply endorsement of such plans, but are presented for background and reference only.

# **1.3 Public Participation Efforts**

The Town of Ashippun adopted a Public Participation Plan at the beginning of the comprehensive planning process based on input from the Town Plan Commission. The following core efforts were identified to foster public participation above and beyond the statutory requirements of Wisconsin's Smart Growth law:

- All meetings will be open to the public;
- Notices and press releases will be sent to local media outlets identifying the time and location of public informational meetings and public hearings;
- Materials will be kept at the Town Hall for review by local residents and interested persons;
- Information about regional meetings and the Multi-Jurisdiction Comprehensive Plan will be available on the Dodge County Planning and Development Department website.

In addition, an address to forward written comments shall be provided in meeting notices and news releases. The Commission shall respond to written comments at public meetings. A copy of the Public Participation Resolution is included.

# **1.4 Population Characteristics**

### **Population Counts**

Population change is the primary component in tracking a community's past growth as well as predicting future population trends. Population characteristics relate directly to the community's housing, educational, utility, community, and recreational facility needs, as well as its future economic development. Tables 1-1 and 1-2 display population trends and changes from 1960 to 2000 for all municipalities in Dodge County.

	- 1960	1070	1000	1000	2000
		1970	1980	1990	2000
T. Ashippun	1,376	1,500	1,929	1,783	2,308
T. Beaver Dam	1,509	1,933	3,030	3,097	3,440
T. Burnett	899	875	917	915	919
T. Calamus	908	934	1,077	1,009	1,005
T. Chester	933	1,060	981	797	960
T. Clyman	852	889	815	742	849
T. Elba	928	960	1,028	964	1,086
T. Emmet	969	1,050	1,089	1,014	1,221
T. Fox Lake	793	1,501	1,674	1,928	2,402
T. Herman	1,145	1,215	1,131	1,127	1,207
T. Hubbard	1,079	1,301	1,508	1,390	1,643
T. Hustisford	891	1,034	1,262	1,209	1,379
T. Lebanon	1,212	1,278	1,518	1,630	1,664
T. Leroy	1,086	1,146	1,110	1,025	1,116
T. Lomira	1,242	1,247	1,391	1,280	1,228
T. Lowell	1,205	1,254	1,205	1,134	1,169
T. Oak Grove	1,543	1,326	1,333	1,200	1,126
T. Portland	879	915	976	994	1,106
T. Rubicon	1,355	1,564	1,759	1,709	2,005
T. Shields	625	602	584	500	554
T. Theresa	1,092	1,174	1,152	1,083	1,080
T. Trenton	1,221	1,406	1,319	1,299	1,301
T. Westford	890	1,006	1,203	1,248	1,400
T. Williamstown	659	659	657	692	646
V. Brownsville	276	374	433	415	570
V. Clyman	259	328	317	370	388
V. Hustisford	708	789	874	979	1,135
V. Iron Ridge	419	480	766	887	998
V. Kekoskee	247	233	224	218	169
V. Lomira	807	1,084	1,446	1,542	2,233
V. Lowell	341	322	326	312	366
V. Neosho	345	400	575	658	593
V. Randolph*	978	1,089	1,206	1,227	1,346
V. Reeseville	491	566	649	673	703
V. Theresa	570	611	766	771	1,252
C. Beaver Dam	13,118	14,265	14,149	14,196	15,169
C. Columbus*	0	0	0	10	36
C. Fox Lake	1,181	1,242	1,373	1,279	1,454
C. Hartford*	0	0	0	9	10
C. Horicon	2,996	3,356	3,584	3,873	3,775
C. Juneau	1,718	2,043	2,045	2,157	2,485
C. Mayville	3,607	4,139	4,333	4,374	4,902
C. Watertown*	3,968	4,373	5,911	6,754	8,063
C. Waupun*	5,849	5,481	5,439	6,086	7,436
Dodge County	63,170	69,004	75,064	76,559	85,897
Wisconsin	3,951,777	4,417,731	4,705,642	4,891,769	5,363,675

 Table 1-1: Population Trends, Dodge County, 1960-2000

Source: Wisconsin Department of Administration, 1960, 1970, and 1980. U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990 and 2000. \*Municipality crosses county line, only includes portion in Dodge County.

		pulation	Unange	, Douge	County	, 1970-2	
F. Ashippun42928.6%.146-7.6%52529.4%T. Burnett424.8%672.2%34311.1%T. Burnett424.8%-20.2%40.4%T. Calamus14315.3%-68-6.3%-4-0.4%T. Chyman-74-7.5%-184-18.8%16320.5%T. Clyman-74-7.5%-184-18.8%16320.5%T. Elba687.1%-64-6.2%12212.7%T. Fox Lake17311.5%25415.2%47424.6%T. Herman-84-6.9%-4-0.4%807.1%T. Hubbard20715.9%-118-7.8%25318.2%T. Lebanon24018.8%1127.4%342.1%T. Lowira14411.5%-85-7.7%918.9%T. Lowell-49-3.9%-71-5.9%353.1%T. Oak Grove70.5%-133-10.0%-74-6.2%T. Portland616.7%181.8%11211.3%T. Rubicon19512.5%-50-2.8%29617.3%T. Trenton-87-6.2%-20-1.5%20.2%T. Westford19719.6%453.7%15212.2%T. Westford19719.6%453.7%15212.2%T. Westford19719.6%		1970-1	1980	1980-1990		1990-2	2000
T. Beaver Dam $1,097$ $56.8\%$ $67$ $2.2\%$ $343$ $11.1\%$ T. Burnett $42$ $4.8\%$ $-2$ $-0.2\%$ $4$ $0.4\%$ T. Calamus $143$ $15.3\%$ $-68$ $-6.3\%$ $-4$ $-0.4\%$ T. Calamus $143$ $15.3\%$ $-68$ $-6.3\%$ $-4$ $-0.4\%$ T. Chester $-79$ $-7.5\%$ $-184$ $-18.8\%$ $163$ $20.5\%$ T. Chyan $-74$ $-8.3\%$ $-73$ $-9.0\%$ $107$ $14.4\%$ T. Eiba $68$ $7.1\%$ $-64$ $-6.2\%$ $122$ $12.7\%$ T. Emmet $39$ $3.7\%$ $-75$ $-6.9\%$ $207$ $20.4\%$ T. Harman $-84$ $-6.9\%$ $-4$ $-0.4\%$ $80$ $7.1\%$ T. Hubbard $207$ $15.9\%$ $-118$ $-7.8\%$ $253$ $18.2\%$ T. Hubbard $207$ $15.9\%$ $-118$ $-7.8\%$ $253$ $18.2\%$ T. Lowina $144$ $11.5\%$ $-111$ $-8.0\%$ $-52$ $-4.1\%$ T. Lowell $-49$ $-3.9\%$ $-71$ $-5.9\%$ $35$ $3.1\%$ T. Oak Grove7 $0.5\%$ $-133$ $10.0\%$ $-74$ $-6.2\%$ T. Nubicon $195$ $12.5\%$ $-50$ $-2.8\%$ $296$ $17.3\%$ T. Rubicon $195$ $12.5\%$ $-50$ $-2.8\%$ $20.2\%$ T. Rubicon $195$ $12.5\%$ $-50$ $-2.8\%$ $20.2\%$ T. Weifford $197$ $19.6\%$ $-51.5\%$ $20.2$		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
T. Burnett424.8%-2-0.2%40.4%T. Clamus14315.3%-68-6.3%-4-0.4%T. Chester-79-7.5%-184-18.8%16320.5%T. Clyman-74-8.3%-73-9.0%10714.4%T. Elba687.1%-64-6.2%12212.7%T. Fox Lake17311.5%25415.2%47424.6%T. Hutbard20715.9%-118-7.8%25318.2%T. Hustisford22822.1%-53-4.2%17014.1%T. Lebanon24018.8%1127.4%342.1%T. Lowira14411.5%-111-8.0%-52-4.1%T. Lowell-49-3.9%-71-5.9%353.1%T. Oak Grove70.5%-133-10.0%-74-6.2%T. Portland6167%13-10.0%-74-6.2%T. Tenton18-3.0%-84-14.4%5410.8%T. Trenton19512.5%-50-2.8%29617.3%T. Shields-118-3.0%-84-14.4%5410.8%T. Trenton-87-6.2%-20-1.5%20.2%Westford19719.6%453.7%15212.2%V. Westford19719.6%453.7%15212.2%V. Westford8510.8% </td <td>T. Ashippun</td> <td>429</td> <td>28.6%</td> <td>-146</td> <td>-7.6%</td> <td>525</td> <td>29.4%</td>	T. Ashippun	429	28.6%	-146	-7.6%	525	29.4%
T. Calamus14315.3%-68-6.3%-4-0.4%T. Clyman.79.7.5%.184.18.8%16320.5%T. Clyman.74-8.3%.73-9.0%10711.4.4%T. Elba.687.1%-64-6.2%12212.7%T. Emmet.393.7%.75-6.9%20720.4%T. Fox Lake.17311.5%.25415.2%47424.6%T. Hubbard.20715.9%-118.7.8%25318.2%T. Hustisford.228.22.1%.53.4.2%17014.1%T. Leroy.36.3.1%.85.7.7%918.9%T. Lomira.144.11.5%.111.8.0%.52.4.1%T. Lowell.49.3.9%.71.5.9%.35.1.5%T. Oak Grove.70.5%.133.10.0%.74.6.2%T. Rubicon.95.2.5%.50.2.8%.226.7.3%T. Trenton.76.6.2%.20.1.5%.20.2%T. Westford.19719.6%.45.3.7%.152.12.2%T. Westford.197.19.6%.45.3.7%.152.22.%T. Westford.197.9.6%.2.1%.155.37.3%V. Clyman.11.3.4%.5316.7%18.4.9%V. Horsia.362.3.4%.966.6%.691.44.8%V. Stord.85 <td>T. Beaver Dam</td> <td>1,097</td> <td>56.8%</td> <td>67</td> <td>2.2%</td> <td>343</td> <td>11.1%</td>	T. Beaver Dam	1,097	56.8%	67	2.2%	343	11.1%
T. Chester-79-7.5%-184-18.8%16320.5%T. Clyman.74-8.3%-73-9.0%10714.4%T. Ebba687.1%-64-6.2%12212.7%T. Emmet393.7%-75-6.9%20720.4%T. Fox Lake17311.5%25415.2%47424.6%T. Hurman-84-6.9%-4-0.4%807.1%T. Hubbard20715.9%-118-7.8%25318.2%T. Hustisford22822.1%-53-4.2%17014.1%T. Lebanon24018.8%1127.4%342.1%T. Lomira14411.5%-111-8.0%-52-4.1%T. Lowell-49-3.9%-71-5.9%353.1%T. Oak Grove70.36%-133-10.0%-74-6.2%Portland616.7%181.8%11211.3%T. Rubicon19512.5%-50-2.8%29617.3%T. Trenton-87-6.2%-20-1.5%20.2%T. Westford19719.6%453.7%15212.2%T. Westford19719.6%44-4.2%15537.3%V. Brownsville5915.8%-18+4.2%15537.3%V. Clyman-11-3.4%5316.7%184.9%V. Hustisford8510.8	T. Burnett	42	4.8%	-2	-0.2%	4	0.4%
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	T. Calamus	143	15.3%	-68	-6.3%	-4	-0.4%
T. Elba687.1%-64-6.2%12212.7%T. Emmet393.7%-756.9%20720.4%T. Fox Lake17311.5%25415.2%47424.6%T. Hurman-84-6.9%-4-0.4%807.1%T. Hubbard20715.9%-118-7.8%25318.2%T. Hubbard20715.9%-118-7.8%25318.2%T. Lebanon24018.8%1127.4%342.1%T. Leroy-36-3.1%-85-7.7%918.9%T. Lowira14411.5%-111-8.0%-52-4.1%T. Lowell-49-3.9%-71-5.9%353.1%T. Oak Grove70.5%-133-10.0%-74-6.2%T. Portland616.7%181.8%11211.3%T. Rubicon19512.5%-50-2.8%29617.3%T. Theresa-22-1.9%-69-6.0%-3-0.3%T. Trenton-87-6.2%-20-1.5%20.2%T. Williamstown-2-0.3%355.3%-46-6.6%V. Brownsville5915.8%-18-4.2%15537.3%V. Clyman-11-3.4%5316.7%184.9%V. Hustisford8510.8%10512.0%15615.9%V. Iron Ridge28659.6%	T. Chester	-79	-7.5%	-184	-18.8%	163	20.5%
T. Emmet39 $3.7\%$ $.75$ $-6.9\%$ 207 $20.4\%$ T. Fox Lake173 $11.5\%$ $254$ $15.2\%$ $474$ $24.6\%$ T. Herman $-84$ $-6.9\%$ $-4$ $-0.4\%$ $80$ $7.1\%$ T. Hubbard207 $15.9\%$ $-118$ $-7.8\%$ $253$ $18.2\%$ T. Hustisford $228$ $22.1\%$ $-53$ $-4.2\%$ $170$ $14.1\%$ T. Lebanon $240$ $18.8\%$ $112$ $7.4\%$ $34$ $2.1\%$ T. Lomira $144$ $11.5\%$ $-111$ $-8.0\%$ $-52$ $-4.1\%$ T. Lowell $-49$ $-3.9\%$ $-71$ $-5.9\%$ $35$ $3.1\%$ T. Oak Grove7 $0.5\%$ $-133$ $-10.0\%$ $-74$ $-6.2\%$ T. Portland61 $6.7\%$ $18$ $1.8\%$ $112$ $11.3\%$ T. Rubicon $195$ $12.5\%$ $-50$ $-2.8\%$ $296$ $17.3\%$ T. Trenton $87$ $-6.2\%$ $-20$ $-1.5\%$ $2$ $0.2\%$ T. Trenton $87$ $-6.2\%$ $-20$ $-1.5\%$ $2$ $0.2\%$ T. Westford $197$ $19.6\%$ $45$ $3.7\%$ $152$ $12.2\%$ T. Williamstown $-2$ $-0.3\%$ $35$ $5.3\%$ $-46$ $-6.6\%$ V. Brownsville $59$ $15.8\%$ $18$ $-4.2\%$ $155$ $37.3\%$ V. Clyman $-11$ $-3.4\%$ $53$ $16.7\%$ $18$ $4.9\%$ V. Iwestford $85$ $10.8\%$ $121$	T. Clyman	-74	-8.3%	-73	-9.0%	107	14.4%
T. Fox Lake17311.5%25415.2%47424.6%T. Hurman-84-6.9%-4-0.4%807.1%T. Hubbard20715.9%-118-7.8%25318.2%T. Hustisford22822.1%-53-4.2%17014.1%T. Lebanon24018.8%1127.4%342.1%T. Leroy-36-3.1%-85-7.7%918.9%T. Lomira14411.5%-111-8.0%52-4.1%T. Lowell-49-3.9%-71-5.9%353.1%T. Oak Grove70.5%-133-10.0%-74-6.2%T. Portland616.7%181.8%11211.3%T. Rubicon19512.5%-50-2.8%29617.3%T. Theresa-22-1.9%-69-6.0%-3-0.3%T. Tenton-87-6.2%-20-1.5%20.2%T. Westford19719.6%453.7%15212.2%T. Williamstown-2-0.3%355.3%-46-6.6%V. Brownsville5915.8%-118-4.2%15537.3%V. Clyman-11-3.4%5316.7%184.9%V. Honsford8510.8%12115.8%11112.5%V. Lowell41.2%-14-4.3%5417.3%V. Lowell41.2% <td>T. Elba</td> <td>68</td> <td>7.1%</td> <td>-64</td> <td>-6.2%</td> <td>122</td> <td>12.7%</td>	T. Elba	68	7.1%	-64	-6.2%	122	12.7%
T. Herman-84-6.9%-4-0.4%807.1%T. Hubbard20715.9%-118-7.8%25318.2%T. Hustisford22822.1%-534.2%17014.1%T. Lebanon24018.8%1127.4%342.1%T. Leroy-36-3.1%-85-7.7%918.9%T. Lowira14411.5%-111-8.0%-52-4.1%T. Low ell-49-3.9%-71-5.9%353.1%T. Oak Grove70.5%-133-10.0%-74-6.2%T. Portland616.7%181.8%11211.3%T. Rubicon19512.5%-50-2.8%29617.3%T. Trenton-87-6.2%-20-1.5%20.2%T. Westford19719.6%453.7%15212.2%T. Williamstown-2-0.3%355.3%-46-6.6%V. Brownsville5915.8%-18-4.2%15537.3%V. Clyman-11-3.4%5316.7%184.9%V. Hustisford8510.8%10512.0%15615.9%V. Iron Ridge28659.6%12115.8%11112.5%V. Keoskee-9-3.9%-6-2.7%-49-22.5%V. Lowira36233.4%966.66%69144.8%V. Clyman115 <t< td=""><td>T. Emmet</td><td>39</td><td>3.7%</td><td>-75</td><td>-6.9%</td><td>207</td><td>20.4%</td></t<>	T. Emmet	39	3.7%	-75	-6.9%	207	20.4%
T. Hubbard207 $15.9\%$ $-118$ $-7.8\%$ 253 $18.2\%$ T. Hustisford228 $22.1\%$ $-53$ $-4.2\%$ $170$ $14.1\%$ T. Leonon240 $18.8\%$ $112$ $7.4\%$ $34$ $2.1\%$ T. Leroy $-36$ $-3.1\%$ $-85$ $-7.7\%$ $91$ $8.9\%$ T. Lomira $144$ $11.5\%$ $-111$ $-8.0\%$ $-52$ $-4.1\%$ T. Lowell $-49$ $-3.9\%$ $-71$ $-5.9\%$ $35$ $3.1\%$ T. Oak Grove7 $0.5\%$ $-133$ $-10.0\%$ $-74$ $-6.2\%$ T. Portland61 $6.7\%$ $18$ $1.8\%$ $112$ $11.3\%$ T. Rubicon $195$ $12.5\%$ $-50$ $-2.8\%$ $296$ $17.3\%$ T. Shields $-18$ $-3.0\%$ $-84$ $-14.4\%$ $54$ $10.8\%$ T. Theresa $-22$ $-1.9\%$ $-69$ $-6.0\%$ $-3$ $-0.3\%$ T. Trenton $-87$ $-6.2\%$ $-20$ $-1.5\%$ $2$ $0.2\%$ T. Weitford $197$ $19.6\%$ $45$ $3.7\%$ $152$ $12.2\%$ V. Clyman $-11$ $-3.4\%$ $53$ $16.7\%$ $18$ $4.9\%$ V. Low silferd $85$ $10.8\%$ $105$ $12.0\%$ $156$ $15.9\%$ V. Lowing $86$ $59.6\%$ $121$ $15.8\%$ $111$ $12.5\%$ V. Low silferd $117$ $10.7\%$ $21$ $1.7\%$ $19$ $9.7\%$ V. Resore $-9$ $-3.9\%$ $-6$ <	T. Fox Lake	173	11.5%	254	15.2%	474	24.6%
T. Hustisford22822.1%-53-4.2%17014.1%T. Lebanon24018.8%1127.4%342.1%T. Leroy-36-3.1%-85-7.7%918.9%T. Lomira14411.5%-111-8.0%-52-4.1%T. Lowell-49-3.9%-71-5.9%353.1%T. Oak Grove70.5%-133-10.0%-74-6.2%T. Portland616.7%181.8%11211.3%T. Rubicon19512.5%-50-2.8%29617.3%T. Shields-18-3.0%-84-14.4%5410.8%T. Theresa-22-1.9%-69-6.0%-3-0.3%T. Trenton-87-6.2%-20-1.5%20.2%T. Weitford19719.6%453.7%15212.2%T. Williamstown-2-0.3%355.3%-46-6.6%V. Brownsville5915.8%-18-4.2%15537.3%V. Clyman-11-3.4%5316.7%184.9%V. Iron Ridge28659.6%12115.8%11112.5%V. Lowell41.2%-14-4.3%5417.3%V. Neosho17543.8%8314.4%-65-9.9%V. Lowell41.2%-14-4.3%5417.3%V. Neosho17543.8% </td <td>T. Herman</td> <td>-84</td> <td>-6.9%</td> <td>-4</td> <td>-0.4%</td> <td>80</td> <td>7.1%</td>	T. Herman	-84	-6.9%	-4	-0.4%	80	7.1%
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	T. Hubbard	207	15.9%	-118	-7.8%	253	18.2%
T. Leroy $-36$ $-3.1\%$ $-85$ $-7.7\%$ $91$ $8.9\%$ T. Lomira $144$ $11.5\%$ $-111$ $-8.0\%$ $-52$ $-4.1\%$ T. Lowell $-49$ $3.9\%$ $-71$ $-5.9\%$ $35$ $3.1\%$ T. Oak Grove7 $0.5\%$ $-133$ $-10.0\%$ $-74$ $-6.2\%$ T. Portland $61$ $6.7\%$ $18$ $1.8\%$ $112$ $11.3\%$ T. Rubicon $195$ $12.5\%$ $-50$ $-2.8\%$ $296$ $17.3\%$ T. Shields $-18$ $-3.0\%$ $-84$ $-14.4\%$ $54$ $10.8\%$ T. Trenton $-87$ $-6.2\%$ $-20$ $-1.5\%$ $2$ $0.2\%$ T. Westford $197$ $19.6\%$ $45$ $3.7\%$ $152$ $12.2\%$ T. Williamstown $-2$ $-0.3\%$ $35$ $5.3\%$ $-46$ $-6.6\%$ V. Brownsville $59$ $15.8\%$ $-18$ $-4.2\%$ $155$ $37.3\%$ V. Clyman $-11$ $-3.4\%$ $53$ $16.7\%$ $18$ $4.9\%$ V. Hustisford $85$ $10.8\%$ $105$ $12.0\%$ $156$ $15.9\%$ V. Lowell $4$ $1.2\%$ $-14$ $-4.3\%$ $54$ $17.3\%$ V. Neosho $175$ $43.8\%$ $83$ $14.4\%$ $-65$ $-9.9\%$ V. Lowell $4$ $1.2\%$ $-14$ $-4.3\%$ $54$ $17.3\%$ V. Recesville $83$ $14.7\%$ $24$ $3.7\%$ $30$ $4.5\%$ V. Recesville $83$ $14.7\%$ <td< td=""><td>T. Hustisford</td><td>228</td><td>22.1%</td><td>-53</td><td>-4.2%</td><td>170</td><td>14.1%</td></td<>	T. Hustisford	228	22.1%	-53	-4.2%	170	14.1%
T. Lomira14411.5%-111-8.0%-52-4.1%T. Lowell-49-3.9%-71-5.9%353.1%T. Oak Grove70.5%-133-10.0%-74-6.2%T. Portland616.7%181.8%11211.3%T. Rubicon19512.5%-50-2.8%29617.3%T. Shields-18-3.0%-84-14.4%5410.8%T. Theresa-22-1.9%-69-6.0%-3-0.3%T. Trenton-87-6.2%-20-1.5%20.2%T. Westford19719.6%453.7%15212.2%T. William stown-2-0.3%355.3%-46-6.6%V. Brownsville5915.8%-18-4.2%15537.3%V. Clyman-11-3.4%5316.7%184.9%V. Hustisford8510.8%10512.0%15615.9%V. Ion Ridge28659.6%12115.8%11112.5%V. Lowira36233.4%966.66%69144.8%V. Lowell41.2%-14-4.3%5417.3%V. Reeseville8314.7%243.7%304.5%V. Lowell41.2%-14-4.3%5417.3%V. Reeseville8314.7%243.7%304.5%V. Lowell41.2% <td>T. Lebanon</td> <td>240</td> <td>18.8%</td> <td>112</td> <td>7.4%</td> <td>34</td> <td>2.1%</td>	T. Lebanon	240	18.8%	112	7.4%	34	2.1%
T. Lowell $-49$ $-3.9\%$ $-71$ $-5.9\%$ $35$ $3.1\%$ T. Oak Grove7 $0.5\%$ $-133$ $-10.0\%$ $-74$ $-6.2\%$ T. Portland61 $6.7\%$ $18$ $1.8\%$ $112$ $11.3\%$ T. Rubicon $195$ $12.5\%$ $-50$ $-2.8\%$ $296$ $17.3\%$ T. Shields $-18$ $-3.0\%$ $-84$ $-14.4\%$ $54$ $10.8\%$ T. Theresa $-22$ $-1.9\%$ $-69$ $-6.0\%$ $-3$ $-0.3\%$ T. Trenton $-87$ $-6.2\%$ $-20$ $-1.5\%$ $2$ $0.2\%$ T. Westford $197$ $19.6\%$ $45$ $3.7\%$ $152$ $12.2\%$ T. William stown $-2$ $-0.3\%$ $35$ $5.3\%$ $-46$ $-6.6\%$ V. Brownsville $59$ $15.8\%$ $-18$ $-4.2\%$ $155$ $37.3\%$ V. Clyman $-11$ $-3.4\%$ $53$ $16.7\%$ $18$ $4.9\%$ V. Hustisford $85$ $10.8\%$ $105$ $12.0\%$ $156$ $15.9\%$ V. Iron Ridge $286$ $59.6\%$ $121$ $15.8\%$ $111$ $12.5\%$ V. Lowira $362$ $33.4\%$ $96$ $6.6\%$ $691$ $44.8\%$ V. Lowell $4$ $1.2\%$ $-14$ $-4.3\%$ $54$ $17.3\%$ V. Kekoskee $-9$ $-3.9\%$ $-6$ $-2.7\%$ $49$ $-22.5\%$ V. Lowell $4$ $1.2\%$ $1.7\%$ $119$ $9.7\%$ V. Reseville $83$ $14.7\%$ $24$	T. Leroy	-36	-3.1%	-85	-7.7%	91	8.9%
T. Oak Grove7 $0.5\%$ $-133$ $-10.0\%$ $.74$ $-6.2\%$ T. Portland61 $6.7\%$ 18 $1.8\%$ $112$ $11.3\%$ T. Rubicon195 $12.5\%$ $-50$ $-2.8\%$ 296 $17.3\%$ T. Shields $-18$ $-3.0\%$ $-84$ $-14.4\%$ $54$ $10.8\%$ T. Theresa $-22$ $-1.9\%$ $-69$ $-6.0\%$ $-3$ $-0.3\%$ T. Trenton $-87$ $-6.2\%$ $-20$ $-1.5\%$ $2$ $0.2\%$ T. Westford19719.6% $45$ $3.7\%$ $152$ $12.2\%$ T. Williamstown $-2$ $-0.3\%$ $35$ $5.3\%$ $-46$ $-6.6\%$ V. Brownsville $59$ $15.8\%$ $-18$ $-4.2\%$ $155$ $37.3\%$ V. Clyman $-11$ $-3.4\%$ $53$ $16.7\%$ $18$ $4.9\%$ V. Hustisford $85$ $10.8\%$ $105$ $12.0\%$ $156$ $15.9\%$ V. Ion Ridge $286$ $59.6\%$ $121$ $15.8\%$ $111$ $12.5\%$ V. Lowell $4$ $1.2\%$ $-14$ $-4.3\%$ $54$ $17.3\%$ V. Ncosho $175$ $43.8\%$ $83$ $14.4\%$ $-65$ $-9.9\%$ V. Randolph* $117$ $10.7\%$ $21$ $1.7\%$ $119$ $9.7\%$ V. Reeseville $83$ $14.7\%$ $24$ $3.7\%$ $30$ $4.5\%$ C. Columbus*0 $0.0\%$ 10 $0.0\%$ $45.\%$ $5.5\%$ C. Hartford*0 $0.0\%$ $9$ <t< td=""><td>T. Lomira</td><td>144</td><td>11.5%</td><td>-111</td><td>-8.0%</td><td>-52</td><td>-4.1%</td></t<>	T. Lomira	144	11.5%	-111	-8.0%	-52	-4.1%
T. Portland $61$ $6.7\%$ $18$ $1.8\%$ $112$ $11.3\%$ T. Rubicon $195$ $12.5\%$ $-50$ $-2.8\%$ $296$ $17.3\%$ T. Shields $-18$ $-3.0\%$ $-84$ $-14.4\%$ $54$ $10.8\%$ T. Theresa $-22$ $-1.9\%$ $-69$ $-6.0\%$ $-3$ $-0.3\%$ T. Trenton $-87$ $-6.2\%$ $-20$ $-1.5\%$ $2$ $0.2\%$ T. Westford $197$ $19.6\%$ $45$ $3.7\%$ $152$ $12.2\%$ T. Williamstown $-2$ $-0.3\%$ $35$ $5.3\%$ $-46$ $-6.6\%$ V. Brownsville $59$ $15.8\%$ $-18$ $-4.2\%$ $155$ $37.3\%$ V. Clyman $-11$ $-3.4\%$ $53$ $16.7\%$ $18$ $4.9\%$ V. Hustisford $85$ $10.8\%$ $105$ $12.0\%$ $156$ $15.9\%$ V. Iron Ridge $286$ $59.6\%$ $121$ $15.8\%$ $111$ $12.5\%$ V. Lowell $4$ $1.2\%$ $-14$ $-4.3\%$ $54$ $17.3\%$ V. Lowell $4$ $1.2\%$ $-14$ $-4.3\%$ $54$ $17.3\%$ V. Neosho $175$ $43.8\%$ $83$ $14.4\%$ $-65$ $-9.9\%$ V. Randolph* $117$ $10.7\%$ $21$ $1.7\%$ $119$ $9.7\%$ V. Reserville $83$ $14.7\%$ $24$ $3.7\%$ $30$ $4.5\%$ V. Lowell $4$ $1.2\%$ $-94$ $-6.8\%$ $175$ $13.7\%$ C. Beaver Dam $-116$ $-0.8\%$	T. Lowell	-49	-3.9%	-71	-5.9%	35	3.1%
T. Rubicon19512.5%-50-2.8%29617.3%T. Shields-18-3.0%-84-14.4%5410.8%T. Theresa-22-1.9%-69-6.0%-3-0.3%T. Trenton-87-6.2%-20-1.5%20.2%T. Westford19719.6%453.7%15212.2%T. Williamstown-2-0.3%355.3%-46-6.6%V. Brownsville5915.8%-18-4.2%15537.3%V. Clyman-11-3.4%5316.7%184.9%V. Hustisford8510.8%10512.0%15615.9%V. Iron Ridge28659.6%12115.8%11112.5%V. Lowira36233.4%966.6%69144.8%V. Lowell41.2%-14-4.3%5417.3%V. Reaseville8314.7%243.7%304.5%V. Reeseville8314.7%243.7%304.5%V. Theresa15525.4%50.7%48162.4%C. Beaver Dam-116-0.8%470.3%9736.9%C. Columbus*00.0%100.0%26260.0%C. Fox Lake13110.5%-94-6.8%17513.7%C. Hartford*00.0%90.0%111.1%C. Juneau20.1% <td>T. Oak Grove</td> <td>7</td> <td>0.5%</td> <td>-133</td> <td>-10.0%</td> <td>-74</td> <td>-6.2%</td>	T. Oak Grove	7	0.5%	-133	-10.0%	-74	-6.2%
T. Shields $-18$ $-3.0\%$ $-84$ $-14.4\%$ $54$ $10.8\%$ T. Theresa $-22$ $-1.9\%$ $-69$ $-6.0\%$ $-3$ $-0.3\%$ T. Trenton $-87$ $-6.2\%$ $-20$ $-1.5\%$ $2$ $0.2\%$ T. Westford $197$ $19.6\%$ $45$ $3.7\%$ $152$ $12.2\%$ T. Westford $197$ $19.6\%$ $45$ $3.7\%$ $152$ $12.2\%$ T. Williamstown $-2$ $-0.3\%$ $35$ $5.3\%$ $-46$ $-6.6\%$ V. Brownsville $59$ $15.8\%$ $-18$ $-4.2\%$ $155$ $37.3\%$ V. Clyman $-11$ $-3.4\%$ $53$ $16.7\%$ $18$ $4.9\%$ V. Hustisford $85$ $10.8\%$ $105$ $12.0\%$ $156$ $15.9\%$ V. Iron Ridge $286$ $59.6\%$ $121$ $15.8\%$ $111$ $12.5\%$ V. Lomira $362$ $33.4\%$ $96$ $6.6\%$ $691$ $44.8\%$ V. Lowell4 $1.2\%$ $-14$ $-4.3\%$ $54$ $17.3\%$ V. Resolub $175$ $43.8\%$ $83$ $14.4\%$ $-65$ $-9.9\%$ V. Resolub $175$ $43.8\%$ $83$ $14.4\%$ $-65$ $-9.9\%$ V. Resolub $13$ $10.7\%$ $21$ $1.7\%$ $119$ $9.7\%$ V. Resolub $131$ $10.5\%$ $-94$ $-6.8\%$ $175$ $13.7\%$ C. Golumbus*0 $0.0\%$ 10 $0.0\%$ $26$ $260.0\%$ C. Fox Lake $131$ $10.5\%$	T. Portland	61	6.7%	18	1.8%	112	11.3%
T. Theresa $-22$ $-1.9\%$ $-69$ $-6.0\%$ $-3$ $-0.3\%$ T. Trenton $-87$ $-6.2\%$ $-20$ $-1.5\%$ $2$ $0.2\%$ T. Westford $197$ $19.6\%$ $45$ $3.7\%$ $152$ $12.2\%$ T. Williamstown $-2$ $-0.3\%$ $35$ $5.3\%$ $-46$ $-6.6\%$ V. Brownsville $59$ $15.8\%$ $-18$ $-4.2\%$ $155$ $37.3\%$ V. Clyman $-11$ $-3.4\%$ $53$ $16.7\%$ $18$ $4.9\%$ V. Hustisford $85$ $10.8\%$ $105$ $12.0\%$ $156$ $15.9\%$ V. Iron Ridge $286$ $59.6\%$ $121$ $15.8\%$ $111$ $12.5\%$ V. Lomira $362$ $33.4\%$ $96$ $6.6\%$ $691$ $44.8\%$ V. Lowell $4$ $1.2\%$ $-14$ $-4.3\%$ $54$ $17.3\%$ V. Neosho $175$ $43.8\%$ $83$ $14.4\%$ $-65$ $-9.9\%$ V. Reserville $83$ $14.7\%$ $24$ $3.7\%$ $30$ $4.5\%$ V. Theresa $155$ $25.4\%$ $5$ $0.7\%$ $481$ $62.4\%$ C. Beaver Dam $-116$ $-0.8\%$ $47$ $0.3\%$ $973$ $6.9\%$ C. Columbus* $0$ $0.0\%$ $10$ $0.0\%$ $1$ $11.1\%$ C. Hartford* $0$ $0.0\%$ $9$ $0.0\%$ $1$ $11.1\%$ C. Hartford* $0$ $0.0\%$ $9$ $9.25\%$ $32.8$ $15.2\%$ C. Mayville $194$ $4.7\%$	T. Rubicon	195	12.5%	-50	-2.8%	296	17.3%
T. Trenton $-87$ $-6.2\%$ $-20$ $-1.5\%$ $2$ $0.2\%$ T. Westford19719.6\%45 $3.7\%$ 152 $12.2\%$ T. Williamstown $-2$ $-0.3\%$ $35$ $5.3\%$ $-46$ $-6.6\%$ V. Brownsville $59$ $15.8\%$ $-18$ $-4.2\%$ $155$ $37.3\%$ V. Clyman $-11$ $-3.4\%$ $53$ $16.7\%$ $18$ $4.9\%$ V. Hustisford $85$ $10.8\%$ $105$ $12.0\%$ $156$ $15.9\%$ V. Iron Ridge $286$ $59.6\%$ $121$ $15.8\%$ $111$ $12.5\%$ V. Lowira $362$ $33.4\%$ $96$ $6.6\%$ $691$ $44.8\%$ V. Lowell $4$ $1.2\%$ $-14$ $-4.3\%$ $54$ $17.3\%$ V. Neosho $175$ $43.8\%$ $83$ $14.4\%$ $-65$ $-9.9\%$ V. Reeshulle $83$ $14.7\%$ $24$ $3.7\%$ $30$ $4.5\%$ V. Theresa $155$ $25.4\%$ $5$ $0.7\%$ $481$ $62.4\%$ C. Beaver Dam $-116$ $-0.8\%$ $47$ $0.3\%$ $973$ $6.9\%$ C. Columbus* $0$ $0.0\%$ $1$ $11.1\%$ $11.1\%$ C. Hartford* $0$ $0.0\%$ $9$ $0.6\%$ $1$ $11.1\%$ C. Hartford* $0$ $0.0\%$ $98$ $-2.5\%$ $2.2\%$ C. Juneau $2$ $0.1\%$ $112$ $5.5\%$ $328$ $15.2\%$ C. Wattrown* $1,538$ $35.2\%$ $843$ $14.3\%$ $1,309$	T. Shields	-18	-3.0%	-84	-14.4%	54	10.8%
T. Westford19719.6%45 $3.7\%$ 15212.2%T. Williamstown-2-0.3%35 $5.3\%$ -46-6.6%V. Brownsville5915.8%-18-4.2%155 $37.3\%$ V. Clyman-11-3.4%5316.7%18 $4.9\%$ V. Hustisford8510.8%10512.0%15615.9%V. Iron Ridge28659.6%12115.8%11112.5%V. Kekoskee-9-3.9%-6-2.7%-49-22.5%V. Lomira36233.4%966.66%69144.8%V. Lowell41.2%-14-4.3%5417.3%V. Neosho17543.8%8314.4%-65-9.9%V. Randolph*11710.7%211.7%1199.7%V. Reseeville8314.7%243.7%304.5%C. Beaver Dam-116-0.8%470.3%9736.9%C. Columbus*00.0%100.0%26260.0%C. Fox Lake13110.5%-94-6.8%17513.7%C. Juneau20.1%1125.5%32815.2%C. Mayville1944.7%410.9%52812.1%C. Mayville1944.7%410.9%52812.1%C. Mayville1944.7%410.9%52812.1%C. Mayville194 <td>T. Theresa</td> <td>-22</td> <td>-1.9%</td> <td>-69</td> <td>-6.0%</td> <td>-3</td> <td>-0.3%</td>	T. Theresa	-22	-1.9%	-69	-6.0%	-3	-0.3%
T. William stown $-2$ $-0.3\%$ $35$ $5.3\%$ $-46$ $-6.6\%$ V. Brownsville $59$ $15.8\%$ $-18$ $-4.2\%$ $155$ $37.3\%$ V. Clyman $-11$ $-3.4\%$ $53$ $16.7\%$ $18$ $4.9\%$ V. Hustisford $85$ $10.8\%$ $105$ $12.0\%$ $156$ $15.9\%$ V. Iron Ridge $286$ $59.6\%$ $121$ $15.8\%$ $111$ $12.5\%$ V. Kekoskee $-9$ $-3.9\%$ $-6$ $-2.7\%$ $-49$ $-22.5\%$ V. Lomira $362$ $33.4\%$ $96$ $6.6\%$ $691$ $44.8\%$ V. Lowell4 $1.2\%$ $-14$ $-4.3\%$ $54$ $17.3\%$ V. Neosho $175$ $43.8\%$ $83$ $14.4\%$ $-65$ $-9.9\%$ V. Randolph* $117$ $10.7\%$ $21$ $1.7\%$ $119$ $9.7\%$ V. Reeseville $83$ $14.7\%$ $24$ $3.7\%$ $30$ $4.5\%$ V. Theresa $155$ $25.4\%$ $5$ $0.7\%$ $481$ $62.4\%$ C. Beaver Dam $-116$ $-0.8\%$ $47$ $0.3\%$ $973$ $6.9\%$ C. Columbus* $0$ $0.0\%$ $10$ $0.0\%$ $26$ $260.0\%$ C. Hartford* $0$ $0.0\%$ $9$ $0.0\%$ $1$ $11.1\%$ C. Hartford* $0$ $0.0\%$ $9$ $0.0\%$ $1$ $11.1\%$ C. Hartford* $0$ $0.0\%$ $9$ $10.5\%$ $328$ $15.2\%$ C. Mayville $194$ $4.7\%$ $4$	T. Trenton	-87	-6.2%	-20	-1.5%	2	0.2%
V. Brownsville59 $15.8\%$ $-18$ $-4.2\%$ $155$ $37.3\%$ V. Clyman $-11$ $-3.4\%$ $53$ $16.7\%$ $18$ $4.9\%$ V. Hustisford $85$ $10.8\%$ $105$ $12.0\%$ $156$ $15.9\%$ V. Iron Ridge $286$ $59.6\%$ $121$ $15.8\%$ $111$ $12.5\%$ V. Kekoskee $-9$ $-3.9\%$ $-6$ $-2.7\%$ $-49$ $-22.5\%$ V. Lomira $362$ $33.4\%$ $96$ $6.6\%$ $691$ $44.8\%$ V. Lowell4 $1.2\%$ $-14$ $-4.3\%$ $54$ $17.3\%$ V. Neosho $175$ $43.8\%$ $83$ $14.4\%$ $-65$ $-9.9\%$ V. Randolph* $117$ $10.7\%$ $21$ $1.7\%$ $119$ $9.7\%$ V. Reeseville $83$ $14.7\%$ $24$ $3.7\%$ $30$ $4.5\%$ V. Theresa $155$ $25.4\%$ $5$ $0.7\%$ $481$ $62.4\%$ C. Beaver Dam $-116$ $-0.8\%$ $47$ $0.3\%$ $973$ $6.9\%$ C. Columbus*0 $0.0\%$ 10 $0.0\%$ $26$ $260.0\%$ C. Hartford*0 $0.0\%$ $9$ $0.0\%$ $1$ $11.1\%$ C. Horicon $228$ $6.8\%$ $289$ $8.1\%$ $-98$ $-2.5\%$ C. Juneau2 $0.1\%$ $112$ $5.5\%$ $328$ $15.2\%$ C. Mayville $194$ $4.7\%$ $41$ $0.9\%$ $528$ $12.1\%$ C. Watertown* $1,538$ $35.2\%$ $843$	T. Westford	197	19.6%	45	3.7%	152	12.2%
V. Clyman $-11$ $-3.4\%$ $53$ $16.7\%$ $18$ $4.9\%$ V. Hustisford $85$ $10.8\%$ $105$ $12.0\%$ $156$ $15.9\%$ V. Iron Ridge $286$ $59.6\%$ $121$ $15.8\%$ $111$ $12.5\%$ V. Kekoskee $-9$ $-3.9\%$ $-6$ $-2.7\%$ $-49$ $-22.5\%$ V. Lomira $362$ $33.4\%$ $96$ $6.6\%$ $691$ $44.8\%$ V. Lowell4 $1.2\%$ $-14$ $-4.3\%$ $54$ $17.3\%$ V. Neosho $175$ $43.8\%$ $83$ $14.4\%$ $-65$ $-9.9\%$ V. Randolph* $117$ $10.7\%$ $21$ $1.7\%$ $119$ $9.7\%$ V. Reeseville $83$ $14.7\%$ $24$ $3.7\%$ $30$ $4.5\%$ V. Theresa $155$ $25.4\%$ $5$ $0.7\%$ $481$ $62.4\%$ C. Beaver Dam $-116$ $-0.8\%$ $47$ $0.3\%$ $973$ $6.9\%$ C. Columbus*0 $0.0\%$ 10 $0.0\%$ $26$ $260.0\%$ C. Hartford*0 $0.0\%$ 9 $0.0\%$ 1 $11.1\%$ C. Horicon $228$ $6.8\%$ $289$ $8.1\%$ $-98$ $-2.5\%$ C. Juneau2 $0.1\%$ $112$ $5.5\%$ $328$ $15.2\%$ C. Mayville $194$ $4.7\%$ $41$ $0.9\%$ $528$ $12.1\%$ C. Watertown* $1,538$ $35.2\%$ $843$ $14.3\%$ $1,309$ $19.4\%$ C. Waupun* $-42$ $-0.8\%$ $647$ <td< td=""><td>T. Williamstown</td><td>-2</td><td>-0.3%</td><td>35</td><td>5.3%</td><td>-46</td><td>-6.6%</td></td<>	T. Williamstown	-2	-0.3%	35	5.3%	-46	-6.6%
V. Hustisford       85       10.8%       105       12.0%       156       15.9%         V. Iron Ridge       286       59.6%       121       15.8%       111       12.5%         V. Kekoskee       -9       -3.9%       -6       -2.7%       -49       -22.5%         V. Lomira       362       33.4%       96       6.6%       691       44.8%         V. Lowell       4       1.2%       -14       -4.3%       54       17.3%         V. Neosho       175       43.8%       83       14.4%       -65       -9.9%         V. Randolph*       117       10.7%       21       1.7%       119       9.7%         V. Reeseville       83       14.7%       24       3.7%       30       4.5%         V. Theresa       155       25.4%       5       0.7%       481       62.4%         C. Beaver Dam       -116       -0.8%       47       0.3%       973       6.9%         C. Columbus*       0       0.0%       10       0.0%       26       260.0%         C. Hartford*       0       0.0%       9       0.0%       1       11.1%         C. Hartford*       0       0.0%	V. Brownsville	59	15.8%	-18	-4.2%	155	37.3%
V. Iron Ridge       286       59.6%       121       15.8%       111       12.5%         V. Kekoskee       -9       -3.9%       -6       -2.7%       -49       -22.5%         V. Lomira       362       33.4%       96       6.6%       691       44.8%         V. Lowell       4       1.2%       -14       -4.3%       54       17.3%         V. Neosho       175       43.8%       83       14.4%       -65       -9.9%         V. Randolph*       117       10.7%       21       1.7%       119       9.7%         V. Reeseville       83       14.7%       24       3.7%       30       4.5%         V. Theresa       155       25.4%       5       0.7%       481       62.4%         C. Beaver Dam       -116       -0.8%       47       0.3%       973       6.9%         C. Columbus*       0       0.0%       10       0.0%       26       260.0%         C. Fox Lake       131       10.5%       -94       -6.8%       175       13.7%         C. Hartford*       0       0.0%       9       0.0%       1       11.1%         C. Juneau       2       0.1%	V. Clyman	-11	-3.4%	53	16.7%	18	4.9%
V. Kekoskee-9-3.9%-6-2.7%-49-22.5%V. Lomira $362$ $33.4\%$ 96 $6.6\%$ $691$ $44.8\%$ V. Lowell4 $1.2\%$ -14 $-4.3\%$ $54$ $17.3\%$ V. Neosho $175$ $43.8\%$ $83$ $14.4\%$ -65 $-9.9\%$ V. Randolph* $117$ $10.7\%$ $21$ $1.7\%$ $119$ $9.7\%$ V. Reeseville $83$ $14.7\%$ $24$ $3.7\%$ $30$ $4.5\%$ V. Theresa $155$ $25.4\%$ $5$ $0.7\%$ $481$ $62.4\%$ C. Beaver Dam $-116$ $-0.8\%$ $47$ $0.3\%$ $973$ $6.9\%$ C. Columbus*0 $0.0\%$ 10 $0.0\%$ $26$ $260.0\%$ C. Fox Lake $131$ $10.5\%$ $-94$ $-6.8\%$ $175$ $13.7\%$ C. Hartford*0 $0.0\%$ 9 $0.0\%$ 1 $11.1\%$ C. Horicon $228$ $6.8\%$ $289$ $8.1\%$ $-98$ $-2.5\%$ C. Juneau2 $0.1\%$ $112$ $5.5\%$ $328$ $15.2\%$ C. Mayville $194$ $4.7\%$ $41$ $0.9\%$ $528$ $12.1\%$ C. Watertown* $1,538$ $35.2\%$ $843$ $14.3\%$ $1,309$ $19.4\%$ C. Waupun* $-42$ $-0.8\%$ $647$ $11.9\%$ $1,350$ $22.2\%$ Dodge County $6,060$ $8.8\%$ $1,495$ $2.0\%$ $9,338$ $12.2\%$	V. Hustisford	85	10.8%	105	12.0%	156	15.9%
V. Lomira36233.4%966.6%69144.8%V. Lowell41.2%-14-4.3%5417.3%V. Neosho17543.8%8314.4%-65-9.9%V. Randolph*11710.7%211.7%1199.7%V. Reeseville8314.7%243.7%304.5%V. Theresa15525.4%50.7%48162.4%C. Beaver Dam-116-0.8%470.3%9736.9%C. Columbus*00.0%100.0%26260.0%C. Fox Lake13110.5%-94-6.8%17513.7%C. Hartford*00.0%90.0%111.1%C. Horicon2286.8%2898.1%-98-2.5%C. Juneau20.1%1125.5%32815.2%C. Mayville1944.7%410.9%52812.1%C. Watertown*1,53835.2%84314.3%1,30919.4%C. Waupun*-42-0.8%64711.9%1,35022.2%Dodge County6,0608.8%1,4952.0%9,33812.2%	V. Iron Ridge	286	59.6%	121	15.8%	111	12.5%
V. Lowell4 $1.2\%$ $-14$ $-4.3\%$ $54$ $17.3\%$ V. Neosho $175$ $43.8\%$ $83$ $14.4\%$ $-65$ $-9.9\%$ V. Randolph* $117$ $10.7\%$ $21$ $1.7\%$ $119$ $9.7\%$ V. Reeseville $83$ $14.7\%$ $24$ $3.7\%$ $30$ $4.5\%$ V. Theresa $155$ $25.4\%$ $5$ $0.7\%$ $481$ $62.4\%$ C. Beaver Dam $-116$ $-0.8\%$ $47$ $0.3\%$ $973$ $6.9\%$ C. Columbus* $0$ $0.0\%$ $10$ $0.0\%$ $26$ $260.0\%$ C. Fox Lake $131$ $10.5\%$ $-94$ $-6.8\%$ $175$ $13.7\%$ C. Hartford* $0$ $0.0\%$ $9$ $0.0\%$ $1$ $11.1\%$ C. Horicon $228$ $6.8\%$ $289$ $8.1\%$ $-98$ $-2.5\%$ C. Juneau $2$ $0.1\%$ $112$ $5.5\%$ $328$ $15.2\%$ C. Mayville $194$ $4.7\%$ $41$ $0.9\%$ $528$ $12.1\%$ C. Watertow n* $1,538$ $35.2\%$ $843$ $14.3\%$ $1,309$ $19.4\%$ C. Waupun* $-42$ $-0.8\%$ $647$ $11.9\%$ $1,350$ $22.2\%$ Dodge County $6,060$ $8.8\%$ $1,495$ $2.0\%$ $9,338$ $12.2\%$	V. Kekoskee	-9	-3.9%	-6	-2.7%	-49	-22.5%
V. Neosho17543.8%8314.4%-65-9.9%V. Randolph*11710.7%211.7%1199.7%V. Reeseville8314.7%243.7%304.5%V. Theresa15525.4%50.7%48162.4%C. Beaver Dam-116-0.8%470.3%9736.9%C. Columbus*00.0%100.0%26260.0%C. Fox Lake13110.5%-94-6.8%17513.7%C. Hartford*00.0%90.0%111.1%C. Horicon2286.8%2898.1%-98-2.5%C. Juneau20.1%1125.5%32815.2%C. Mayville1944.7%410.9%52812.1%C. W atertow n*1,53835.2%84314.3%1,30919.4%C. W aupun*-42-0.8%64711.9%1,35022.2%Dodge County6,0608.8%1,4952.0%9,33812.2%	V. Lomira	362	33.4%	96	6.6%	691	44.8%
V. Randolph*11710.7%211.7%1199.7%V. Reeseville8314.7%243.7%304.5%V. Theresa15525.4%50.7%48162.4%C. Beaver Dam-116-0.8%470.3%9736.9%C. Columbus*00.0%100.0%26260.0%C. Fox Lake13110.5%-94-6.8%17513.7%C. Hartford*00.0%90.0%111.1%C. Horicon2286.8%2898.1%-98-2.5%C. Juneau20.1%1125.5%32815.2%C. Mayville1944.7%410.9%52812.1%C. Watertown*1,53835.2%84314.3%1,30919.4%C. Waupun*-42-0.8%64711.9%1,35022.2%Dodge County6,0608.8%1,4952.0%9,33812.2%	V.Lowell	4	1.2%	-14	-4.3%	54	17.3%
V. Reeseville83 $14.7\%$ 24 $3.7\%$ 30 $4.5\%$ V. Theresa155 $25.4\%$ 5 $0.7\%$ $481$ $62.4\%$ C. Beaver Dam $-116$ $-0.8\%$ $47$ $0.3\%$ $973$ $6.9\%$ C. Columbus*0 $0.0\%$ 10 $0.0\%$ $26$ $260.0\%$ C. Fox Lake131 $10.5\%$ $-94$ $-6.8\%$ $175$ $13.7\%$ C. Hartford*0 $0.0\%$ 9 $0.0\%$ 1 $11.1\%$ C. Horicon228 $6.8\%$ $289$ $8.1\%$ $-98$ $-2.5\%$ C. Juneau2 $0.1\%$ $112$ $5.5\%$ $328$ $15.2\%$ C. Mayville194 $4.7\%$ $41$ $0.9\%$ $528$ $12.1\%$ C. Watertown* $1,538$ $35.2\%$ $843$ $14.3\%$ $1,309$ $19.4\%$ C. Waupun* $-42$ $-0.8\%$ $647$ $11.9\%$ $1,350$ $22.2\%$ Dodge County $6,060$ $8.8\%$ $1,495$ $2.0\%$ $9,338$ $12.2\%$	V. Neosho	175	43.8%	83	14.4%	-65	-9.9%
V. Theresa15525.4%50.7%48162.4%C. Beaver Dam-116-0.8%470.3%9736.9%C. Columbus*00.0%100.0%26260.0%C. Fox Lake13110.5%-94-6.8%17513.7%C. Hartford*00.0%90.0%111.1%C. Horicon2286.8%2898.1%-98-2.5%C. Juneau20.1%1125.5%32815.2%C. Mayville1944.7%410.9%52812.1%C. Watertow n*1,53835.2%84314.3%1,30919.4%C. Waupun*-42-0.8%64711.9%1,35022.2%Dodge County6,0608.8%1,4952.0%9,33812.2%	V. Randolph*	117	10.7%	21	1.7%	119	9.7%
C. Beaver Dam $-116$ $-0.8\%$ $47$ $0.3\%$ $973$ $6.9\%$ C. Columbus*0 $0.0\%$ 10 $0.0\%$ 26 $260.0\%$ C. Fox Lake131 $10.5\%$ $-94$ $-6.8\%$ 175 $13.7\%$ C. Hartford*0 $0.0\%$ 9 $0.0\%$ 1 $11.1\%$ C. Horicon228 $6.8\%$ 289 $8.1\%$ $-98$ $-2.5\%$ C. Juneau2 $0.1\%$ $112$ $5.5\%$ $328$ $15.2\%$ C. Mayville194 $4.7\%$ 41 $0.9\%$ $528$ $12.1\%$ C. Watertown* $1,538$ $35.2\%$ $843$ $14.3\%$ $1,309$ $19.4\%$ C. Waupun* $-42$ $-0.8\%$ $647$ $11.9\%$ $1,350$ $22.2\%$ Dodge County $6,060$ $8.8\%$ $1,495$ $2.0\%$ $9,338$ $12.2\%$	V. Reeseville	83	14.7%	24	3.7%	30	4.5%
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	V. Theresa	155	25.4%	5	0.7%	481	62.4%
C. Fox Lake13110.5%-94-6.8%17513.7%C. Hartford*00.0%90.0%111.1%C. Horicon2286.8%2898.1%-98-2.5%C. Juneau20.1%1125.5%32815.2%C. Mayville1944.7%410.9%52812.1%C. Watertown*1,53835.2%84314.3%1,30919.4%C. Waupun*-42-0.8%64711.9%1,35022.2%Dodge County6,0608.8%1,4952.0%9,33812.2%	C. Beaver Dam	-116	-0.8%	47	0.3%	973	6.9%
C. Hartford*00.0%90.0%111.1%C. Horicon2286.8%2898.1%-98-2.5%C. Juneau20.1%1125.5%32815.2%C. Mayville1944.7%410.9%52812.1%C. Watertown*1,53835.2%84314.3%1,30919.4%C. Waupun*-42-0.8%64711.9%1,35022.2%Dodge County6,0608.8%1,4952.0%9,33812.2%	C. Columbus*	0	0.0%	10	0.0%	26	260.0%
C. Horicon2286.8%2898.1%-98-2.5%C. Juneau20.1%1125.5%32815.2%C. Mayville1944.7%410.9%52812.1%C. Watertown*1,53835.2%84314.3%1,30919.4%C. Waupun*-42-0.8%64711.9%1,35022.2%Dodge County6,0608.8%1,4952.0%9,33812.2%	C. Fox Lake	131	10.5%	-94	-6.8%	175	13.7%
C. Juneau20.1%1125.5%32815.2%C. Mayville1944.7%410.9%52812.1%C. Watertown*1,53835.2%84314.3%1,30919.4%C. Waupun*-42-0.8%64711.9%1,35022.2%Dodge County6,0608.8%1,4952.0%9,33812.2%	C. Hartford*	0	0.0%	9	0.0%	1	11.1%
C. Mayville1944.7%410.9%52812.1%C. Watertown*1,53835.2%84314.3%1,30919.4%C. Waupun*-42-0.8%64711.9%1,35022.2%Dodge County6,0608.8%1,4952.0%9,33812.2%	C. Horicon	228	6.8%	289	8.1%	-98	-2.5%
C. Watertown*1,53835.2%84314.3%1,30919.4%C. Waupun*-42-0.8%64711.9%1,35022.2%Dodge County6,0608.8%1,4952.0%9,33812.2%	C. Juneau	2	0.1%	112	5.5%	328	15.2%
C. Waupun*-42-0.8%64711.9%1,35022.2%Dodge County6,0608.8%1,4952.0%9,33812.2%	C. Mayville	194	4.7%	41	0.9%	528	
C. Waupun*-42-0.8%64711.9%1,35022.2%Dodge County6,0608.8%1,4952.0%9,33812.2%	C. Watertown*	1,538	35.2%	843	14.3%	1,309	19.4%
Dodge County6,0608.8%1,4952.0%9,33812.2%	C. Waupun*	-42	-0.8%	647	11.9%		22.2%
	_	6,060	8.8%	1,495	2.0%		
		287,911	6.5%	186,127	4.0%	471,906	9.6%

Table 1-2: Population Change, Dodge County, 1970-2000

Source: Wisconsin Department of Administration, 1970 and 1980. U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990 and 2000. \*Municipality crosses county line, only includes portion in Dodge County.

From 1960-2000, Ashippun's population increased from 1,376 residents to 2,308. The rate of population growth varied widely during that time, decreasing 7.6 percent during the 1980s but jumping to 29.4 percent during the 1990s. Surrounding towns experienced similar growth patterns from 1960 – 2000.

#### **Population Estimates**

Every year the Wisconsin Department of Administration (WDOA), Demographic Services Center develops population estimates for every municipality and county in the state. The 2003 population estimate for the Town of Ashippun was 2,359 residents, an increase of 2.2 percent from 2000. The 2003 estimate for Dodge County was 87,599 residents, an increase of 1.98 percent from 2000. Population estimates from the Wisconsin Department of Administration should be utilized as the primary source for population information until the release of the 2010 Census.

#### Age Distribution

A shifting age structure can affect a variety of services and needs within the community. A shifting age structure is a national trend that is also prevalent in Wisconsin. The baby-boomer generation, which is the largest segment of the overall population, is nearing retirement age. As this age group gets older the demand for services such as health care will increase and a younger workforce will need to take the place of retirees. It will become increasingly important to recognize if these trends are taking place and to determine how to deal with the effects.

Table 1-3 displays the population by age cohort for the Town of Ashippun and Dodge County.

	Town of	Ashippun	Dodge	County
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
Under 5	163	7%	5,098	5.9%
5 to 14	330	14%	12,095	14.0%
15 to 24	249	11%	11,174	13.0%
25 to 34	314	14%	11,746	13.7%
35 to 44	426	18%	15,018	17.5%
45 to 54	335	15%	11,341	13.2%
55 to 64	255	11%	7,439	8.7%
65+	236	10%	11,986	14.0%
Total	2,308	100%	85,897	100.0%
Median Age	37.4		3'	7.0

# Table 1-3: Population by Age Cohort, Town of Ashippun and Dodge County, 2000

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000.

The largest percentage (18 percent) of Town of Ashippun residents is between the ages of 35 to 44, the next largest age cohort is ages 45 to 54. The largest percentage of Dodge County's residents is in the 35 to 44 age category, 17.5 percent. The Town of Ashippun is similar since 18

percent of its residents are in the same age category. Also, 14 percent of the Town's population is 5 to 14 years of age, comparable to the County's percentage. The Town of Ashippun median age is 37.4, which is slightly higher than Dodge County's median age of 37.

#### **Educational Attainment**

Approximately 46.8 percent of Ashippun residents have attained a high school level education, comparable to the 43.6 percent in Dodge County with the same education level. The second largest percentage (21 percent) of education attainment in the Town of Ashippun is some college, no degree. The Town has 9.1 percent of its residents obtaining a bachelor's degree, which is lower than the Dodge County percentage of 9.5. The Town of Ashippun had a lower percentage of residents with 12<sup>th</sup> grade or less and no diploma than the County. Table 1-4 indicates the education levels for the Town of Ashippun and Dodge County.

	T. As	T. Ashippun		Dodge County	
		Percent of		Percent of	
Attainment Level	Number	Total	Number	Total	
Less than 9th grade	83	5.3%	4,025	7.0%	
9th grade to 12th grade, no diploma High school graduate (includes	126	8.1%	6,128	10.7%	
equivalency)	733	46.8%	25,031	43.6%	
Some college, no degree	328	21.0%	10,588	18.4%	
Associate degree	94	6.0%	4,079	7.1%	
Bachelor's degree	143	9.1%	5,476	9.5%	
Graduate or professional degree	58	3.7%	2,126	3.7%	
Total Persons 25 and over	1,565	100.0%	57,453	100.0%	

# Table 1-4: Educational Attainment,Town of Ashippun and Dodge County, 2000

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000. Only includes persons age 25 and over.

#### **Household Income**

Table 1-5 displays the 1999 household income and median household income for the Town of Ashippun and Dodge County as reported by the 2000 Census. The highest percentage (28.9 percent) of residents in the Town of Ashippun had a household income between \$50,000 to \$74,999. The next largest percentage (20.1 percent) of household income was \$35,000 to \$49,999, which was slightly lower than the County's percentage of 20.4 percent of the same income level. Approximately 11.4 percent of the households in the Town of Ashippun had a household income of \$100,000 or greater. This exceeded the County's 6.9 percent of households that made \$100,000 or more. The median household income for the Town of Ashippun was \$55,982. The median income for Dodge County was \$45,190, slightly higher than the State's reported median income of \$43,791. The Town of Ashippun has a fewer percentage of households earning \$35,000 or less than the County.

Town of Ashippun and Dodge County, 1999							
	T. Ash	ippun	Dodge County				
	NT 1	% of					
	Number	Total	Number	% of Total			
Less than \$10,000	28	3.3%	1,659	5.3%			
\$10,000 to \$14,999	23	2.7%	1,627	5.2%			
\$15,000 to \$24,999	63	7.5%	3,579	11.4%			
\$25,000 to \$34,999	89	10.6%	4,434	14.1%			
\$35,000 to 49,999	169	20.1%	6,420	20.4%			
\$50,000 to \$74,999	243	28.9%	8,326	26.4%			
\$75,000 to \$99,999	131	15.6%	3,305	10.5%			
\$100,000 to \$149,999	63	7.5%	1,605	5.1%			
\$150,000 or More	33	3.9%	558	1.8%			
Total	842	100.0%	31,513	100.2%			
Median Household	Median Household						
Income	\$55,	982	\$4	5,190			

# Table 1-5: Household Income, Town of Ashippun and Dodge County, 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000.

\*Percentages may not add up to 100%, due to rounding.

#### **Population Projections**

=

Population projections are based on past and current population trends and are not predictions, rather they extend past growth trends into the future and their reliability depends on the continuation of these past growth trends. Projections are therefore most accurate in periods of relative socio-economic and cultural stability. Projections should be considered as one of many tools used to help anticipate and predict change within the community.

Table 1-6 displays the population trends in the Town of Ashippun and Dodge County, 1990 – 2003.

	Town of As	shippun	Dodge C	ounty	Wisco	nsin
Year	Population	%	Population	%	Population	%
		Change		Change		Change
1990	1,783		76,559		4,891,769	
1991	1,788	.28	76,884	0.42	4,920,507	0.59
1992	1,836	2.68	78,032	1.49	4,968,224	0.97
1993	1,843	.38	78,738	0.90	5,020,994	1.06
1994	1,912	3.74	78,945	0.06	5,061,451	0.81
1995	1,974	3.24	79,915	1.23	5,101,581	0.79
1996	2,025	2.58	80,839	1.16	5,142,999	0.81
1997	2,089	3.16	82,147	1.62	5,192,298	0.96
1998	2,141	2.48	83,348	1.46	5,234,350	0.81
1999	2,157	.74	84,312	1.16	5,274,827	0.77
2000	2,308	7	85,897	1.88	5,363,675	1.68
2001	2,315	.3	86,476	0.67	5,400,004	0.68
2002	2,347	1.38	87,083	0.70	5,453,896	0.99
2003	2,359	.51	87,599	0.59	5,490,000	0.66
Total Change	576	32.3	11,040	14.42	598,231	12.23

# Table 1-6: Population Trends,Town of Ashippun and Dodge County, 1990-2003

Source: Official Population Estimates, Demographic Services Center, Wisconsin Department of Administration

In the years 1990 and 2000 the Town of Ashippun population was verified by a census, the other years listed are estimates by the Wisconsin Department of Administration. In 2000, the Town's population was much higher than the estimated increases of the other years. Overall, the Town of Ashippun has had an increase in its population from 1990 to 2003. Compared to the County, the Town has had a considerably higher percent change in its population.

#### Wisconsin Department of Administration, Population Projections

In 2002 the Wisconsin Department of Administration (WDOA) Demographic Services Center prepared baseline population projections to the year 2025 for the communities and counties of Wisconsin. The WDOA utilized a projection formula that calculates the annual population change over three varying time spans. From this formula, the average annual numerical population change is calculated, which was used to give communities preliminary population projections for a future date. Table 1-7 shows the WDOA population projection for the Town of Ashippun.

# Table 1-7: WDOA Population Projection Town of Ashippun, 2000-2025

2000 Population	2010	2015	2020	2025	% Change 2000-2020	Total New Persons 2000-2020
2,308	2,552	2,669	2,779	2,885	25.0	577

Source: Wisconsin Department of Administration, Demographics Services Center, Preliminary Population Projections for Wisconsin Municipalities: 2000-2020

The Town of Ashippun had a 25.0 percent increase in population from 2000 to 2025. According to the WDOA Population Projection, the Town of Ashippun will have 2,885 residents by 2025. The WDOA shows the Town will gain 577 new persons by 2025.

#### **Census/Population Estimate Projections**

Projections were created by using the 1990 and 2000 census population data along with the 2003 population estimate and increasing or decreasing population counts by the annual percentage rate of increase or decrease. Therefore, projections are based directly on historical population trends. Table 1-8 displays the resulting projections from the 2000 population to the 2030 projection.

2000 Population	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	% Change 2000-2030	Total New Persons 2000-2030
2,308	2,767	3,102	3,477	3,897	4,367	89.2	2,059
,	=,	3,102 Planning and	2,	2,22	4,367	89.2	2,05

# Table 1-8: Census/Population Estimate ProjectionTown of Ashippun, 2000-2030

The Foth & Van Dyke and Dodge County Planning and Development Staff used the Town of Ashippun yearly growth percentages from 1990 to 2003 to determine the Town's future population. The Town of Ashippun had an estimated 2.31 percent annual increase from 1990 to 2003. According to the average yearly growth rate, the Town of Ashippun will have 4,367 residents by 2030, a significant increase from its 2000 population.

#### **Alternate Population Projection**

The alternate population projection was produced by Foth & Van Dyke and Dodge County Planning and Development Staff to give County and local officials another population projection model. The alternate population projection utilizes current average household size and the Land Use Permit data from 1994 to 2003 (See Section 8.4) to create a new population projection model. The average household size in 2000 was multiplied by the average number of new housing units built annually to produce the alternate population projection. Table 1-9 displays the Alternate Population Projection for the Town of Ashippun.

				- <b></b> ,					
2000 Population	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	% Change 2000-2030	Total New Persons 2000-2030		
2,308	2,788	3,028	3,268	3,508	3,748	62.4	1,440		
Source: Fot	Source: Foth & Van Dyke and Dodge County Planning and Development Staff								

# Table 1-9: Alternate Population ProjectionTown of Ashippun, 2000-2030

The Alternate Population Projection shows Ashippun having an 62.4 percent increase in population between 2000 and 2030. According to the Alternate Population projection, the Town of Ashippun will have 3,748 residents in 2030, an increase of 1,440 residents from 2000. The Alternate Population Projection shows a lower percentage increase in population than the Census/Population Estimate Projection.

# **1.5 Housing Characteristics**

Table 1-10 displays the number of housing units found in the Town of Ashippun and Dodge County for 1990 and 2000. The table also includes the number of occupied and vacant homes.

The U.S. Census Bureau classifies housing units as a house, apartment, mobile home or trailer, a group of rooms, or a single room occupied as separate living quarters, or if vacant, intended for occupancy as separate living quarters. Separate living quarters are those in which the occupants live separately from any other individuals in the building and which have direct access from outside the building or through a common hall.

# Table 1-10: Housing Supply, Occupancy and TenureTown of Ashippun and Dodge County, 1990-2000

#### T. Ashippun

		Percent of		Percent of	# Change	% Change
	1990	Total	2000	Total	1990-00	1990-00
Total housing units	622	100.0%	880	100.0%	258	41.5%
Occupied housing						
units	601	96.6%	845	96.0%	244	40.6%
Owner-occupied	481	77.3%	665	75.6%	184	38.3%
Renter-occupied	120	19.3%	180	20.5%	60	50.0%
Vacant housing units	21	3.4%	35	4.0%	14	66.7%
Seasonal units	4	0.6%	7	0.8%	3	75.0%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000.

#### **Dodge County**

		Percent of		Percent of	# Change	% Change
	1990	Total	2000	Total	1990-00	1990-00
Total housing units	28,720	100.0%	33,672	100.0%	4,952	17.2%
Occupied housing						
units	26,853	93.5%	31,417	93.3%	4,564	17.0%
Owner-occupied	19,632	68.4%	23,067	68.5%	3,435	17.5%
Renter-occupied	7,221	25.1%	8,350	24.8%	1,129	15.6%
Vacant housing units	1,867	6.5%	2,255	6.7%	388	20.8%
Seasonal units	950	3.3%	815	2.4%	-135	-14.2%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000.

In 2000, the Town of Ashippun had 880 housing units, a 41.5 percent increase from 1990. In 2000, approximately 96 percent of the community's housing units were occupied. Of this figure, approximately 75.6 percent were occupied by owners and 20.5 percent were occupied by individuals renting the housing unit. Vacant units accounted for 4 percent of the total housing supply. Only 0.8 percent of the housing units within the community were for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use.

Table 1-11 displays the average household size found in the Town of Ashippun and Dodge County for 1990 and 2000.

# Table 1-11 Average Household Size,Town of Ashippun and Dodge County, 1990 and 2000

	1990	2000
Town of Ashippun	2.97	2.73
Dodge County	2.71	2.56
Courses U.C. Dourses of	the Comment 1000 20	000

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990-2000.

The size of households have decreased from years ago, families are having fewer children than the large traditional families. The Town of Ashippun average household size has decreased by approximately .24 persons since 1990. The Town's average household size has decreased at a faster rate than that of the County. In 2000, the Town of Ashippun had a higher average household size than the County's 2.56 persons and the State of Wisconsin's 2.50 persons.

#### **Housing Unit Projections**

Housing unit projections are an important element in preparing the comprehensive plan for the community. Specifically, they are used as a guide to estimate required acreage to accommodate future residential development, as well as prepare for future demands growth may have on public facilities and services throughout the planning period. Similar to population projections, it is important to note that housing projections are based on past and current trends, and therefore should only be used as a guide for planning.

Please refer to Table 2-5 for the linear housing unit projection and Table 2-6 for the alternate housing unit projection utilizing building permit data.

# **1.6 Employment Characteristics**

Employment by industry within an area illustrates the structure of the economy. Historically, Dodge County has had a high concentration of employment in the manufacturing and agricultural sectors of the economy. Recent state and national trends indicate a decreasing concentration of employment in the manufacturing sector while employment within the services sector is increasing. This trend is partly attributed to the aging of the population.

Table 1-12 displays the number and percent of employed persons by industry group in the Town of Ashippun and Dodge County for 2000.

The manufacturing sector supplied the most jobs (29.5 percent) and educational, health and social services provided the second most jobs (14.2 percent) in the Town of Ashippun. The greatest percentage of employment for the county was also in the manufacturing sector (33.2 percent), followed by the educational, health, and social services (16.0 percent). The agricultural, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining sector provided 5.0 percent of the employment by industry in the County. However, in the Town of Ashippun the agricultural, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining sector claimed 8 percent.

# Table 1-12: Employment by Industrial Sector,Town of Ashippun and Dodge County, 2000

	T. Ashippun		Dodge	e County
	Percent of			Percent of
Industry	Number	Total	Number	Total
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and				
mining	104	8.0%	2,148	5.0%
Construction	128	9.8%	2,840	6.6%
Manufacturing	385	29.5%	14,359	33.2%
Wholesale trade	61	4.7%	1,142	2.6%
Retail trade	120	9.2%	4,668	10.8%
Transportation and warehousing, and utilities	38	2.9%	1,584	3.7%
Information	4	0.3%	792	1.8%
Finance, insurance, real estate, and rental and				
leasing	53	4.1%	1,523	3.5%
Professional, scientific, management,				
administrative,				• • • •
and waste management services	71	5.4%	1,691	3.9%
Educational, health and social services	185	14.2%	6,929	16.0%
Arts, entertainment, recreation,				
accommodation and food services	72	5.5%	2,235	5.2%
Other services (except public administration)	74	5.7%	1,555	3.6%
Public administration	11	0.8%	1,731	4.0%
Total	1,306	100.0%	43,197	99.9%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000.

\*Percentages may not add up to 100%, due to rounding.

### **1.7** Issues and Opportunities Trends

Identified below are some of the population and demographic trends that can be anticipated over the next 30 years in the Town of Ashippun:

• Ashippun's population is projected to rise steadily according to the WDOA,

Census/Population, and Alternate Population Projections.

- School attainment percentages will gradually change, with more of the population attaining education beyond high school.
- Household income will slowly rise.
- The number of births will continue to support the rise in population, and deaths will rise due to the aging of the baby boomer generation.

- The 65-plus population will increase slowly up to 2010, and then grow dramatically as the baby boomers join the ranks of the elderly.
- The population aged 85 and over will continue to rise in the Town.

# 2. Housing

# 2.1 Introduction

This section contains an inventory of housing characteristics in the Town of Ashippun. It is intended that this inventory will help identify deficiencies and opportunities relative to meeting the community's housing needs.

# 2.2 Housing Characteristics

#### **Housing Supply**

The U.S. Census Bureau classifies housing units as a house, apartment, mobile home or trailer, a group of rooms, or a single room occupied as separate living quarters, or if vacant, intended for occupancy as separate living quarters. Separate living quarters are those in which the occupants live separately from any other individuals in the building and which have direct access from outside the building or through a common hall.

In 2000, the Town of Ashippun had 880 housing units, a 41.5 percent increase from 1990. In 2000, approximately 96 percent of the community's housing units were occupied. Of this figure, approximately 75.6 percent were occupied by owners and 20.5 percent were occupied by individuals renting the housing unit. Vacant units accounted for 4 percent of the total housing supply. Only 0.8 percent of the housing units within the community were for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use.

Table 2-1 displays the number of housing units found in the Town of Ashippun and Dodge County for 1990 and 2000. The table also includes the number of occupied and vacant homes.

# Table 2-1: Housing Supply, Occupancy and TenureTown of Ashippun and Dodge County, 1990-2000

#### T. Ashippun

		Percent of		Percent of	# Change	% Change
	1990	Total	2000	Total	1990-00	1990-00
Total housing units	622	100.0%	880	100.0%	258	41.5%
Occupied housing						
units	601	96.6%	845	96.0%	244	40.6%
Owner-occupied	481	77.3%	665	75.6%	184	38.3%
Renter-occupied	120	19.3%	180	20.5%	60	50.0%
Vacant housing units	21	3.4%	35	4.0%	14	66.7%
Seasonal units	4	0.6%	7	0.8%	3	75.0%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000.

#### **Dodge County**

		Percent of		Percent of	# Change	% Change
	1990	Total	2000	Total	1990-00	1990-00
Total housing units Occupied housing	28,720	100.0%	33,672	100.0%	4,952	17.2%
units	26,853	93.5%	31,417	93.3%	4,564	17.0%
Owner-occupied	19,632	68.4%	23,067	68.5%	3,435	17.5%
Renter-occupied	7,221	25.1%	8,350	24.8%	1,129	15.6%
Vacant housing units	1,867	6.5%	2,255	6.7%	388	20.8%
Seasonal units	950	3.3%	815	2.4%	-135	-14.2%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000.

\*Percentages may not add up to 100%, due to rounding.

#### **Units in Structure**

Table 2-2 displays the number of units within structure for the Town of Ashippun and Dodge County for 2000. Detached housing units are defined as one-unit structures detached from any other house, with open space on four sides. Structures are considered detached even if they have an attached garage or contain a business unit.

	Town of .	Ashippun	Dodge	County
		% of		% of
	Number	Total	Number	Total
1-unit detached	692	79%	23,983	71.2%
1-unit attached	25	3%	676	2.0%
2 units	25	3%	2,598	7.7%
3 or 4 units	66	8%	930	2.8%
5 to 9 units	45	5%	1,539	4.6%
10 to 19 units	20	2%	1,245	3.7%
20 to 49 units	0	0%	598	1.8%
50 or more units	0	0%	504	1.5%
Mobile home	0	0%	1,567	4.7%
Boat, RV, van, etc.	0	0%	32	0.1%
Total	873	100%	33,672	100.1%

# Table 2-2: Units in StructureTown of Ashippun and Dodge County, 2000

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000.

\*Percentages may not add up to 100%, due to rounding.

The predominant housing structure in both the Town of Ashippun and Dodge County is the oneunit detached structure, making up 79 percent and 71.2 percent of all housing structures, respectively. Three or four unit structures come in a distant second, comprising of eight percent of the housing structures in the Town of Ashippun.

#### Age of Housing Units

An examination of the age of the community's housing stock will provide an indication of its overall condition. The age of the housing stock is an important element to be analyzed when planning for a future housing supply. If there is a significant amount of older housing units within the housing supply they will most likely need to be replaced, rehabilitated, or abandoned for new development within the planning period. Allowing for a newer housing supply also requires planning regarding infrastructure, land availability, community utilities, transportation routes, and a variety of other things which are affected by new housing development.

Table 2-3 details the year that structures were built in the Town of Ashippun and Dodge County according to the 2000 Census.

	Town of	f Ashippun	Dodge	County
	Number	Number % of Total		% of Total
Built 1995 to March				
2000	162	18.6%	3,587	10.7%
Built 1990 to 1994	104	11.9%	2,289	6.8%
Built 1980 to 1989	45	5.2%	2,707	8.0%
Built 1970 to 1979	104	11.9%	5,023	14.9%
Built 1960 to 1969	64	7.3%	3,129	9.3%
Built 1950 to 1959	42	4.8%	3,123	9.3%
Built 1940 to 1949	26	3.0%	2,126	6.3%
Built 1939 or earlier	326	37.3%	11,688	34.7%
Total	873	100.0%	33,672	100.0%
Median year	1	967	1	960

# Table 2-3: Year Structures BuiltTown of Ashippun and Dodge County, 2000

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000.

Taking into account the area's settlement history, it is not surprising that the greatest percentage (approximately one third) of both Ashippun's and Dodge County's existing housing units were built prior to 1940. Both the Town and the County experienced building spurts during the 1970s when roughly 11.9 percent of current housing stock was erected. More recently, Ashippun added 18.6 percent of its current housing stock during the period 1995-2000; Dodge County added 10.7 percent from 1995-2000. The median year of structures built is 1967 for Ashippun, 1960 for Dodge County.

#### **Housing Value**

Housing costs are typically the single largest expenditure for individuals. It is therefore assumed that a home is the single most valuable asset for homeowners. While many people in Wisconsin enjoy a good housing situation, many are struggling. According to the State of Wisconsin's 2000 Consolidated Plan: For the State's Housing and Community Development Needs, households in the low-income range have great difficulty finding adequate housing within their means that can accommodate their needs. A lack of affordable housing not only affects these individuals, but also has effects on population and migration patterns, economic development, and the local tax base.

Table 2-4 provides housing values of specified owner-occupied units for 2000. A housing unit is owner-occupied if the owner or co-owner lives in the unit even if it is mortgaged or not fully paid for. The U.S. Bureau of the Census determines value by the respondents estimate of how much the property (house and lot, mobile home and lot, or condominium unit) would sell for if it were for sale.

	Town of	Ashippun	Dodge County	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
Less than \$49,999	4	0.9%	519	2.9%
\$50,000 to \$69,999	7	1.5%	1528	8.6%
\$70,000 to \$89,999	36	7.8%	3,760	21.2%
\$90,000 to \$99,999 \$100,000 to	35	7.6%	2,250	12.7%
\$124,999	68	14.7%	3,566	20.1%
\$125,000 to \$149,999	135	29.2%	2,664	15.0%

17.5%

19.0%

99.9%

1.7%

2,308

988

174

\$105.800

17,757

13.0%

5.6%

0.9%

100.1%

# Table 2-4: Housing Value for Specified Owner-Occupied UnitsTown of Ashippun and Dodge County, 2000

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000.

\*Percentages may not add up to 100%, due to rounding.

81

88

8

\$140,000

462

The Town of Ashippun had a large percentage (29.2 percent) of homes valued between \$125,000 to \$149,999. Whereas Dodge County had the largest percentage (21.2 percent) of its homes valued between \$70,000 and \$89,999. The median value of homes in the Town of Ashippun is noticeably higher than Dodge County's, which may be due to the Town's proximity to the greater Milwaukee area. Attracting affordable housing to the Town may be difficult, since the Town has a higher median housing value than Dodge County.

# 2.3 Housing Unit Projections

\$150,000 to \$199,999

\$200,000 to

Median value

\$300,000 or more

\$299,999

Total

Housing unit projections are an important element in preparing the comprehensive plan for the community. Specifically, they are used as a guide to estimate required acreage to accommodate future residential development, as well as to prepare for future demands growth may have on public facilities and services throughout the planning period. Similar to population projections, it is important to note that housing projections are based on past and current trends, and therefore should only be used as a guide for planning.

#### **Linear Housing Unit Projection**

Linear projections were created by using the 1990 and 2000 Census, and increasing and decreasing housing unit counts by a constant value that is based on the selected Census counts. Table 2-5 displays the resulting linear projections from the 2000 Census count to the estimated 2030 projection.

2000 Housing Units	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	% Change 2000-2030	Total New Units 2000-2030
880	1,138	1,267	1,396	1,525	1,654	88.0	774
Source: U.S. But	reau of the	Census, 199	0 and 2000	. Linear pr	ojections c	ompleted by Foth	& Van Dyke.

# Table 2-5: Linear Housing Unit ProjectionTown of Ashippun, 2000-2030

The Town of Ashippun had a 88 percent increase in housing units from 2000 to 2030. According to the Linear Housing Unit Projection, the Town of Ashippun will have 1,654 housing units by 2030, an increase of 774 new units.

### **Alternate Housing Unit Projection**

The alternate housing unit projection was created by obtaining land use permit information from 1994 to 2003 for Ashippun. This information was then used to calculate the total number of new housing units built annually over that time period. A five year average growth rate was then determined and used to project the number of new housing units gained for each five year period from 2010 to 2030. If Ashippun communities continue to grow the way they have in the previous 10 years, this projection shows the number of housing units there will be by 2030. Table 2-6 shows the Alternate Housing Unit Projection for the Town of Ashippun.

# Table 2-6: Alternate Housing Unit ProjectionTown of Ashippun, 2000-2030

2000 Housing Units	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	% Change 2000-2030	Total New Units 2000-2030
880	1,056	1,144	1,232	1,320	1,408	60.0	528

Completed by Foth & Van Dyke and Dodge County Planning and Development office.

The Alternate Housing Unit Projection shows the Town of Ashippun with 1,408 housing units in 2030, an increase of 528 units from 2000. The Alternate Housing Unit Projection projects an 60 percent increase in housing units, which is 28 percent lower than the Linear Housing Projection of 88 percent.

# 2.4 Housing Trends

There were a number of changes in the State of Wisconsin, Dodge County, and Town of Ashippun with regard to housing from 1990 to 2000. Housing trends that need to be considered as part of the planning process are identified below:

- Increased pressure to convert farmland to residential use;
- Increased need to remodel and rehabilitate the older housing stock in the Town;

- Increased demand to build housing in rural areas;
- Demographic trends and an aging population will increase the need for more choices relative to elderly housing, rental units, and starter homes;
- Highway improvements will make commuting easier and increase rural development pressures.

# 3. Transportation

# 3.1 Introduction

The transportation system which serves the Town of Ashippun provides for the transport of goods and people into, out of, and within the Town. The transportation system contains multiple modes involving air, land, and water transport. Many elements of the system are not located in the Town itself; however the Town's proximity to these elements is an important consideration in evaluating and planning for the Town's transportation system.

# **3.2 Transportation Programs**

#### PASER Program

The PASER (Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating) Program is a system for communities to evaluate and schedule road maintenance on local roads. The program requires Town officials to evaluate the condition of Town roads based on observing characteristics of the road such as the texture of the road surface or the spacing of cracks. The officials then assign a rating on a scale of 1 to 10. These ratings, along with information on traffic volumes, are used to schedule the maintenance and reconstruction of Town roads.

#### **Dodge County Capital Improvement Program**

Dodge County annually updates a Capital Improvement Program. The program prioritizes the allocation of financial resources for various projects over a five year time frame. In terms of the Town of Ashippun, three transportation projects are scheduled to receive funding under the program. These projects include the engineering and purchasing of right of way for CTH P in 2003, the resurfacing of CTH O between CTH R and STH 67 in 2004, and the reconstruction of CTH O between STH 67 and CTH P in 2007.

#### Town of Ashippun Land Division Ordinance

This ordinance regulates the division of land within the Town. It also provides standards for the construction of new roads such as street width and grade requirements. Under the Town's Land Division Ordinance streets/roads within Ashippun are classified into three separate categories; Arterial Streets, Collector Streets, and Minor Streets. Paved roads, except cul-de-sacs, are required to have a width of 24 feet. Additionally, three feet of shoulder area is mandatory on both sides of the road, unless curb and gutter are required by the Town Board. Additional road construction standards are included within the ordinance.

# **3.3 State and Regional Transportation Plans**

State and regional transportation plans that affect the Town of Ashippun are the responsibility of the Wisconsin Department of Transportation. The DOT has capital improvement plans for each county in the state. There is one state highway in the Town of Ashippun, STH 67. There are no plans in the 2002-2007 Highway Improvement Plan for STH 67 in the Town of Ashippun.

However, it should be noted that the Dodge County Comprehensive Plan calls for a new roadway in the Town of Ashippun. In particular, the Dodge County Plan calls for the construction of a collector road through the southwestern part of the Town. This new road would by pass the unincorporated village of Ashippun on the east side. The proposed roadway would split off of STH 67 is section 32 of the Town, by pass the unincorporated village on its east side and reconnect with STH 67 in the southwest corner of section 17.

Dodge County is not served by a Regional Planning Commission.

# **3.4 Functional Classification of Highways**

Vehicular travel on the public highway system is the transportation mode for the vast majority of trips by Town of Ashippun residents. Road and highway transportation systems primarily serve two basic functions, - to provide access to adjacent properties and to provide for the movement of vehicular traffic. Roads and highways are grouped into three functional classes (local, collector, and arterial streets) which are described below. Map 3-1, Appendix, shows the location of local, collector, and arterial roadways in the Town.

#### Local Roads

Local roads primarily provide access to adjacent properties and only secondarily provide for the movement of vehicular traffic. Since access is their primary function, through traffic should be discouraged. Traffic volume is expected to be light and should not interfere with the access function of these streets. Franklin Road and Washington Road are examples of local roads in the Town of Ashippun.

#### **Collector Roads**

Collector roads and highways carry vehicular traffic into and out of residential neighborhoods and commercial and industrial areas. These streets gather traffic from the local streets and funnel it to arterial streets. Access to adjacent properties is a secondary function of collector streets. Collector streets are further divided into major or minor collectors depending on the amount of traffic they carry. CTH O and CTH P are examples of major collector highways in the Town. CTH EE is an example of a minor collector highway.

#### Arterial Highways

Arterial highways serve primarily to move through traffic. Traffic volumes are generally heavy and traffic speeds are generally high. Arterial highways are further divided into principal or minor arterials depending on the traffic volume and the amount of access provided. STH 67 is a minor arterial roadway in the Town.

# 3.5 Traffic Volumes

Traffic volume is also an important consideration for land use planning. The volume of traffic on a particular roadway and the associated noise, fumes, safety level, and other such concerns are considerations that need to be addressed in deciding how land should be used. Map 3-2, Appendix, shows the average daily traffic counts of major traffic corridors within the Town.

Traffic volumes vary considerably on the different roadways within the Town. STH 67 is the major thoroughfare in the Town, carrying the largest volume of traffic. CTH P also carries considerable large traffic. The volume of traffic on a particular roadway can be significantly influenced by its intersection with other roadways. For example, the average daily traffic volume on CTH P increases by 600 vehicles south of its intersection with CTH O.

# 3.6 Traffic Safety

Traffic safety at particular intersections can be a concern within the Town of Ashippun. No particular intersection was listed on the Dodge County Accident Listings; however, a total of 332 accidents occurred within the Town between January 1997 and December of 2002. Over that six year period, there was an average of 55.3 automobile accidents per year. The Town may wish to address these issues through contacting County highway officials about improving safety at intersections and increasing the level of speed limit enforcement.

Traffic safety and efficiency in the Town can also be improved by discouraging the creation of new parcels that require access to County Trunk Highways or Town roads where sight distance is limited. This practice restricts the access points to these roadways, thereby reducing accident potential and the need to reduce speed limits to improve safety. New parcels should be encouraged only where access can be provided by an existing Town road or where a new Town road will be constructed by the sub divider.

Safety concerns on heavily traveled highways in the Town can also be addressed by examining the role the particular highway plays in the transportation network of the County.

### 3.7 Town Road and County Highway Standards

Subsection 7.6.3 of the Dodge County Land Use Code shows the street design standards for roadways in the County. The design standards vary among roadways, as different roads serve different functions within the transportation system. These standards are outlined in Table 3-1.

# TABLE 3-1 Dodge County Minimum Street Design Standards

Street Type	Right-of-Way Minimum Width	Minimum Pavement Width	
Arterial or Highway	120 feet	Dual 24 feet, two 5-foot outside shoulders, 4-foot inside shoulders (20-foot median)	
Collector	80 feet	24 feet, two 5-foot outside shoulders	
Minor (local)	70 feet	24 feet, two 4-foot outside shoulders	

The minimum street design standards, outlined in Table 3-2 below, are those set forth by Wisconsin State Statute 86.26 (1).

# **TABLE 3-2**

#### **State of Wisconsin Minimum Street Design Standards**

Street Type	Right-of-Way Minimum Width	Minimum Pavement Width	
Arterial or Highway	66 feet	24 feet, two 5-foot outside shoulders	
Collector	66 feet	22 feet, two 4-foot outside shoulders	
Minor (local)	49.5 feet	16 feet, two 4-foot outside shoulders	

The Town of Ashippun's minimum street design standards for minor (local) roads, shown below in Table 3-3, are set forth in Section 5.4 of the Town's Land Division Ordinance.

# TABLE 3-3Town of Ashippun Minimum Street Design Standards

Street Type	Right-of-Way Minimum Width	Minimum Pavement Width
Minor (local)	66 feet	24 feet, two 3-foot outside shoulders (unless curb & gutter is required)

### 3.8 Town Road and County Highway Deficiencies

The Town of Ashippun used the pacer program to evaluate which roads are in need of repairs in the Town. The roadways in the Town were given a number between 1 to 10, with 1 needing the most repairs and 10 being a new road. Each number rating has specific criteria the road must meet to be assigned that rating. Roads with a rating of 1 to 4 are in need of major repairs and

reconstruction, compared to roads rated 5 or higher. Below is a list of roads in the Town that qualify for ratings 1 through 4.

Roads assigned a rating of 1 are roads in that have failed and have severe loss of surface integrity. There are no roads, with sections that have been assigned a rating of 1 in the Town of Ashippun:

Deteriorated roads that are in need of being reconstructed are assigned a rating of 2. There are no roads, with segments that have been assigned a rating of 2 in the Town:

Roads that are rated as a 3 will need to structural improvements. The following are roads with sections that have a rating 3 in the Town:

- Bluebird Bay
- Indian Road
- Roosevelt Road

Roads that receive the rating of 4 are showing signs of needing strengthening. The following is a list of roads with sections that have a rating of 4:

- Kohler Road
- Paine Road

#### Substandard Roadways

Town road and County highway standards are designed to require that roadways be constructed to minimum standards that will provide adequate levels of service based on current transportation needs. The level of service needed on a particular type of road is based on the amount of traffic the road carries as well as other issues. However, many of the existing Town roads and County highways were developed at an earlier time when the levels of service requirements were not as great as today. As a result many roadways within the Town have some form of deficiency when compared to the State of Wisconsin's minimum street design standards.

One standard that is used to identify deficiencies is right-of-way width. The Wisconsin State Statutes list minimum right-of-way widths of 49.5 feet for local roads, and 66 feet for collector roads. Where it is practical, acquisition of additional right-of-way should be done. It should be noted that it may not always be practical or desirable to attempt to widen the right-of-way of some of the substandard roadways within the Town. All new roads and highways should be required to meet current right-of-way width standards before they are accepted by the Town.

Another standard that can be easily used to identify deficiencies in roadways is pavement width. The Wisconsin State Statutes establish minimum pavement widths of 16 feet for local roads, and 22 feet for collector roads. Where it is practical, road pavement should be widened to the required standard as it is reconstructed. However, it may not be practical or desirable to widen the pavement on all of the roadways. Likewise, the damage done to existing developed areas by widening the pavement would destroy the character of the area. Furthermore, all new Town roads and County highways should be required to meet the current minimum pavement width before they are accepted by the Town.

Shoulder width is a third standard used for identifying roadway deficiencies. The Wisconsin State Statutes list minimum shoulder widths of two four-foot outside shoulders for local roads and collector roads. Road shoulders should be widened to the required standard as they are reconstructed when it is a practical option. However, it may not be practical or desirable to widen the shoulder area on all of the roadways. Likewise, the damage done to existing developed areas by widening the shoulders of the existing road would destroy the character of the area. It should be required that all new Town roads and County highways meet the current minimum shoulder width before they are accepted by the Town.

# 3.9 The Transportation System

The transportation system which serves the Town of Ashippun provides for the transport of goods and people into, out of, and within the Town. Many elements of the system are not located in the Town itself. While the Town has little direct influence on transportation links outside its boundaries, it may be in its best interest to influence the improvement of these links to better serve the residents of the Town of Ashippun. The transportation system operates in the air and on land and water. Land based transport includes pedestrian, bicycles, and rail as well as highway.

#### Seaports

Water born transport of goods is efficient, but the waterway systems in the Town of Ashippun are not suitable for commercial transportation. The nearest international seaport is the Port of Milwaukee, approximately 35 miles from the Town of Ashippun.

#### Airports

Air transportation for both goods and people is very fast. Its use is substantial and increasing. Convenient access to at least a general airport is critical to many businesses. The Town of Ashippun does not contain an airport. The nearest general airport is the Hartford Airport, located about 5 miles from the Town of Ashippun. Dane County Regional Airport in Madison provides commercial aviation services. It is approximately 30 miles southwest of the Town. General Mitchell Field in Milwaukee also offers commercial airline service, but is also an international airport. It is located about 35 miles southeast of the Town.

#### Railroads

The Union Pacific Railroad crosses the Town of Ashippun in a northwest-southeast direction between Milwaukee and Minneapolis metropolitan areas. Rail transportation is an efficient and inexpensive method of transporting goods long distances. Many manufacturers favor railroad access for their plants. There are no rail sidings in the Town of Ashippun.

High-speed rail passenger service has been proposed between Milwaukee and Madison. The train would make a stop in Watertown to drop off or pick-up passengers. This could create an impact on residential development in the Town.

A number of at-grade railroad crossings interrupt traffic on roads and highways in the Town. The most important of these is the crossing at STH 67 in the unincorporated village of Ashippun. A grade separation at this location is not feasible at this point, but the crossing is well marked. Appendix, Map 3-1, shows the location of railroads in the Town of Ashippun.

## Trucking

Trucking on the highway system is the preferred method of transporting freight, particularly for short hauls. Several trucking companies are located in the area.

### **Public Transit**

The nearest bus services are provided by Badger Bus Lines in Johnson Creek. There are no taxi services in the Town of Ashippun.

### Bicycles

Bicycle traffic is quite limited in the Town of Ashippun. Shoulder areas on Town roads are usually narrow and unpaved making bicycle travel difficult. County highways in the Town tend to have wider shoulders, but traffic levels on these roads make bicycle traffic unsafe or undesirable. The Wild Goose State Trail is approximately seven miles northwest of the Town and is the closest bicycle transportation facility in Dodge County. The Town of Ashippun could designate bike routes throughout the Town on lightly traveled roads. Once designated, shoulder areas on these roads could be widened as the roads are periodically reconstructed.

The Dodge County Bike and Pedestrian Plan was designed to promote and improve conditions for bicycling and walking throughout Dodge County. The intention of the Bike and Pedestrian Plan is to increase transportation safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists. Infrastructure improvements such as designated bikeways, bike lanes, paved shoulders, improved crosswalks, and traffic and informational signs are among the type of facilities being recommended to improve conditions for bicyclists, walkers, and motorists alike. In the Town of Ashippun, the Dodge County Bike and Pedestrian Plan identifies CTH P as a bicycle route to receive bicycle route improvements.

#### **Pedestrian Transportation**

No pedestrian transportation system exists in the Town of Ashippun. The dispersed nature of the Town prohibits the development of an effective pedestrian transportation system. However, the Dodge County Bike and Pedestrian Plan does suggest pedestrian friendly design standards for creating a walkable Dodge County.

### Transportation for the Disabled

The Dodge County Human Services Department provides transportation for the disabled in the Town of Ashippun. This department has volunteer drivers who use their own cars, as well as county employed drivers in county owned wheelchair accessible vans that provide transportation to the disabled. These drivers also provide transportation to people who are unable to drive due to a medical condition, are in nursing homes, or receive W-2.

### 3.10 Transportation Trends

The future transportation system will be effected by a number of factors including demographics, the economy, and overall development patterns. The following are anticipated trends that can affect the transportation system in the Town of Ashippun over the planning period:

- Reduced funding for transportation projects is anticipated due to County, State, and Federal budget constraints.
- As vehicle ownership continues to increase and trips become longer, congestion on major roadways is anticipated to increase.
- The demand for para-transit services will increase as the population ages and the babyboomers move into older age groups.
- There will be continued demand for quality trucking routes as manufacturing continues to be a major sector of the economy.
- Routes between cities and villages are likely to continue to grow in traffic volume.
- Concerns raised by local residents are likely to center around controlling traffic speeds and intersection safety.
- Major highway intersections will continue to be target locations for new commercial and industrial development.
- New driveways onto town and county roads will continue to increase.
- Issues regarding agricultural transport, such as milk and manure hauling, may increase.
- Conflicts between automobiles and slower farm equipment are likely to increase.
- Interest in designating local roads for ATV and snowmobile use is likely to increase.

# 4. Utilities and Community Facilities

# 4.1 Introduction

This element contains information about existing utilities and community facilities in the Town of Ashippun. Facilities discussed in this element include administrative facilities, public buildings, police, fire, and emergency medical services, schools, quasi public facilities, parks, solid waste and recycling, communication and power facilities, sanitary sewer, water, stormwater management, and health and day care facilities.

# 4.2 Administrative Facilities and Services

The Town of Ashippun Town Hall and administrative facilities are located at W1266 Co. Road O. Town employees include two full-time and one part-time highway employee and seven part-time recycling employees.

### Committees, Commissions, and Boards

- Planning Commission
- Historical Committee

### **Public Buildings**

Town owned and maintained buildings include the Town hall, recycling building, town storage building, and a shelter at the community park.

# 4.3 Protective Services

#### **Police Services**

Five officers and a chief staff the Neosho-Rubicon-Ashippun (NRA) Police Department. Hours vary and all staff is part-time. The department has two fully equipped squad cars. Funding for the department is split three ways between the communities.

The Dodge County Sheriff's Department serves as backup to the NRA Police Department. There are several major divisions of the county sheriff's department including the administration division, criminal investigation division, jail division, radio communications division, snowmobile patrol, and traffic division.

The Sheriff's Department provides 24-hour service to all communities in the county that do not have their own police department. The Sheriff also provides service to communities that do have their own department when requested. The radio communications division dispatches all squads and police personnel within the county with the exception of the City of Waupun, City of Watertown, and the City of Beaver Dam, who have their own full time personnel. In the absence of a dispatcher in the remaining communities, this division would provide the police dispatching services. In addition to the police dispatching, this division also dispatches emergency medical services and fire departments.

### Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services

The Town contracts with the Ashippun Fire Department for fire protection. The Ashippun Fire Department was organized December 4, 1917. It has 45 members. In 1954, a new fire station was built to house 4 trucks, meeting room and kitchen facilities. In 1972, an addition was built to accommodate 3 more trucks, new meeting room, offices, and kitchen. The fire house is now 60' x 128'. The Department has mutual aid contracts with Dodge, Jefferson, and Waukesha Counties. The department protects part of the Towns of Lebanon, Oconomowoc, Erin, and all of Ashippun.

Equipment used by the Ashippun Department includes a 1966 International Tandem with a 750 gpm pump and a 1,500 gallon tank; a 1967 1,300 gallon tanker; a 1979 Chevrolet step van with a 16' body used to carry the coats and equipment; a 1992 GMC rescue van used by the first responders; a 1982 Mach Pierce with 1,000 gpm pump, a 2,500 gallon tank and top mount controls; a 1986 Mack DM model tanker with a 3,000 gallon Equalizer II tank; and a 1989 Ford F250 combination grass fire truck and crash rescue truck equipped with a 200 gallon poly tank, 6 gallon foam tank, a 200 gpm pump, and ability to carry rescue tools and a hydraulic ram. 1996 Pierce Saber 1250, 1,000 gallons top mount, six man.

The Town of Lebanon, City of Hartford, and City of Oconomowoc provide ambulance services to the Town.

Map 4-1, Appendix, displays fire emergency service areas in Dodge County, and Map 4-2, Appendix, displays emergency medical service areas in Dodge County.

# 4.4 School Facilities

The Town of Ashippun is served by the Hartford School District, the Oconomowoc Area School District, and the Neosho J3 School District.

Map 4-3, Appendix, shows the school district boundaries in Dodge County.

### **Hartford School District**

The Hartford School District contains the Lincoln Elementary School, Rossman Elementary School, the Central Middle School, the Passage Middle School, and the Hartford Union High School. As of the 2002-2003 school year, the Hartford School District had a total of 3,276 students, with 1,000 students enrolled in the elementary school, 575 students enrolled in the middle/junior high school, and 1,701 students enrolled in the high school.

### **Oconomowoc Area School District**

The Oconomowoc Area School District contains the Greenland Elementary School, Ixonia Elementary School, Meadow View Elementary School, Park Lawn Elementary School, Summit Elementary School, the Oconomowoc Middle School, and the Oconomowoc High School. As of the 2002-2003 school year, the Oconomowoc Area School District had a total of 4,074 students, with 1,949 students enrolled in the elementary school, 659 students enrolled in the middle/junior high school, and 1,466 students enrolled in the high school.

#### Neosho J3 School District

The Neosho J3 School District contains the Neosho Elementary school, and as of the 2002-2003 school year the elementary school had 205 students enrolled.

There is one abandoned school facility located in the Town, Ashippun Elementary School. This school was within the Oconomowoc School District.

# 4.5 Quasi Public Facilities

#### Libraries

There are no libraries located in the Town. The majority of residents utilize the Hartford or Oconomowoc Libraries for services.

#### **Churches and Cemeteries**

- St. John's Lutheran Church and Cemetery
- Zion Lutheran Church
- St Olof's Church and Cemetery
- St. Paul's Episcopalian Church and Cemetery

There are four abandoned cemeteries located in the town.

#### Campgrounds

There are no campgrounds located in the Town.

#### **Post Offices**

The Ashippun Post Office is located on Highway 67.

#### **Civic Organizations and Other Clubs**

- Lion's Club
- ♦ 4-H Club
- Ashippun Sportsmen Club
- Forever Young Club
- Stonebank Sportsman's Club

# 4.6 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space

- Community Park, includes a ball diamond
- Steinway Park, includes a ball diamond
- Town Hall Park, includes a soccer field
- Amanda Street Park

Map 4-4, Appendix, shows county, state and federal recreational areas in Dodge County.
## 4.7 Solid Waste Management and Recycling

The Town is the designated responsible unit for recycling. The Town recycling drop-off site is located in section 30, along County Highway O. The Town contracts with a private provider for solid waste management.

## 4.8 Communication and Power Facilities

Verizon provides telephone service to the town. WE Energies provides both natural gas and electric service to the Town.

See Map 4-5, Appendix, for telephone service providers, Map 4-6, Appendix, for electric utilities and cooperatives, and Map 4-7, Appendix, for natural gas providers.

## 4.9 Sanitary Sewer Service

Ashippun Sanitary District (lagoon treatment), provides sewer services to residents of the district. Map 4-8, Appendix, displays the location of the public sewer district and water facilities in the Town.

## 4.10 Private Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems (POWTS)

Private onsite wastewater treatment systems, or POWTS, are systems that receive domestic quality wastewater and either retain it in a holding tank, or treat it and discharge it into the soil, beneath the ground surface. The Wisconsin Department of Commerce has administrative rules, Comm 83, for building plumbing and nonmunicipal sewer lines, and for private onsite wastewater treatment systems. Any system with a final discharge exposing treated wastewater upon the ground surface, or discharging directly into surface waters of the state, is subject to DNR regulation. Additionally, certain POWTS are subject to both Department of Commerce and Department of Natural Resources review and regulation.

Wisconsin Administrative Code Comm 83 was revised during the 1990s to add provisions for new system technologies and land suitability criteria and, came into effect on July 1, 2000. Unlike the code it replaced, the new rules prescribe end results - the purity of groundwater discharged from the system - instead of the specific characteristics of the installation.

## 4.11 Public Water Supply

There are no publicly operated water supply facilities located in the Town. Residents must rely upon private wells for water.

## 4.12 Stormwater Management

There are no storm sewers located in the Town. The primary method of stormwater management is through culverts and ditches. There is some curb and gutter proved in newer subdivisions in the Town.

## 4.13 Health Care Facilities

There are no health care facilities located in the Town. A full range of medical services are available in the City of Watertown. Regional medical services are available in the City of Madison and Milwaukee.

## 4.14 Day Care Facilities

There are no commercial day care facilities located in the Town.

Map 4-9, Appendix, for utilities and community facilities located in the Town of Ashippun.

## 4.15 Utilities and Community Facilities Trends

The following trends need to be anticipated with regard to planning for future utilities and community facilities in the Town of Ashippun:

- Local government budget constraints will drive the need for intergovernmental cooperation for services and programs;
- There will be an increased need for communities and other jurisdictions to coordinate the development of trails and other recreational facilities;
- Increased development in rural areas will create the need for more police and other governmental services;
- Increasing residential development in rural areas may cause the need for more school transportation resources, such as more buses and bus drivers.

## 5. Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources

## 5.1 Introduction

This element provides an inventory and assessment of the agricultural, natural, and cultural resources for the Town of Ashippun. Land development patterns are directly linked to the resource base; therefore, these features need to be considered before making any decisions concerning future development within the Town. The Town's agricultural, natural, and cultural resources contribute greatly to its residents' quality of life.

## 5.2 Soils

Soil is composed of varying proportions of sand, gravel, silt, clay, and organic material. The composition of a soil must be evaluated prior to any development, as varying limitations exist for each soil. Dodge County soils are products of the deposits left after the glacier receded about 12,000 years ago. These deposits consisted of sand, gravel, large rocks, clay, limestone fragments, and igneous and metamorphic rocks. The deposits have prompted mineral and sand and gravel extraction throughout some of the communities in Dodge County.

The majority of soils in the Town of Ashippun are upland silt loam considered good for agricultural uses. Topsoil generally ranges between 10 and 14 inches in depth. The seven general soil associations found in the Town include Fox-Casco-Rodman, McHenry-Pella, Plano-Mendota, Houghton-Pella, St. Charles-LeRoy-Lomira, Theresa-Lamartine-Hochheim, and St. Charles-Miami-Elburn.

## 5.3 Prime Agricultural Soils

The soils in Dodge County are classified by the United States Department of Agriculture to represent different levels of agricultural use. Class I, II, or III soils are all considered good soils for agricultural production. This classification system is based on criteria of production potential, soil conditions, and other basic production related criteria. All the soils classified as Class I and Class II are identified as prime agricultural soils. Whereas only some of the Class III soils are considered prime agricultural soils and the remaining soil is considered farmland of statewide importance. Map 5-1, Appendix, shows the prime agricultural soils in the Town of Ashippun.

Agricultural farming practices are usually in conjunction with prime agricultural soils. Many of the dairy farm operations in the Town of Ashippun are on good agricultural land. The 2003 Wisconsin dairy farm data show the Town of Ashippun having approximately 14 active dairy farms.

## 5.4 Forests

The Town of Ashippun is covered by approximately 3,281 acres of wooded area. Wooded areas have been cleared in the Town to make room for agricultural fields and residential uses. Only

about 13.49 percent of the Town's surface area is in woodland use. Map 5-2, Appendix, shows the woodlots in the Town of Ashippun.

There is limited economic potential from the remaining woodlots since they tend to be small and widely scattered. Many contain residential development or are located in public parks and recreation areas.

## 5.5 Metallic and Nonmetallic Mineral Resources

Wisconsin Administrative Code NR 135 requires that all counties adopt and enforce a Nonmetallic Mining Reclamation Ordinance that establishes performance standards for the reclamation of active and future nonmetallic mining sites. It is intended that NR 135 will contribute to environmental protection, stable non-eroding sites, productive end land use, and the potential to enhance habitat and increase land values and tax revenues.

Dodge County has a Nonmetallic Mining Reclamation Overlay District as part of its adopted Land Use Code. The purpose of this overlay district is to establish a local program to ensure the effective reclamation of nonmetallic mining sites in Dodge County.

The Town of Ashippun currently has one active nonmetallic mine covering approximately four acres. Map 4-9, Appendix, illustrates the location of the non-metallic mine in the Town of Ashippun.

## 5.6 Wetlands

According to the United States Environmental Protection Agency, wetlands are areas where water covers the soil, or is present either at or near the surface of the soil all year or for varying periods of time during the year, including during the growing season. Water saturation (hydrology) largely determines how the soil develops and the types of plant and animal communities living in and on the soil. Wetlands may support both aquatic and terrestrial species. The prolonged presence of water creates conditions that favor the growth of specially adapted plants (hydrophytes) and promote the development of characteristic wetland (hydric) soils.

Wetlands may be seasonal or permanent and are commonly referred to as swamps, marshes, fens, or bogs. Wetland plants and soils have the capacity to store and filter pollutants ranging from pesticides to animal wastes. Wetlands can make lakes, rivers, and streams cleaner, and drinking water safer. Wetlands also provide valuable habitat for fish, plants, and animals. In addition, some wetlands can also replenish groundwater supplies. Groundwater discharge from wetlands is common and can be important in maintaining stream flows, especially during dry months.

Local, state, and federal regulations place limitations on the development and use of wetlands and shorelands. The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) has inventory maps for each community that identify wetlands two acres and larger. The wetland inventory map should be consulted whenever development proposals are reviewed in order to identify wetlands and to ensure their protection from development. Map 5-3, Appendix, displays wetlands, watersheds, streams, and surface water in the Town.

## 5.7 Floodplains

For planning and regulatory purposes, the floodplain is normally defined as those areas, excluding the stream channel, that are subject to inundation by the 100-year recurrence interval flood event. This event has a one percent chance of occurring in any given year. Because of this chance of flooding, development in floodplain should be discouraged and the development of park and open space in these areas encouraged. The floodplain includes the floodway and flood fringe. The floodway is the portion of the floodplain that carries flood water or flood flows, while the flood fringe is the portion of the floodplain outside the floodway, which is covered by waters during a flood event. The flood fringe is generally associated with standing water rather than rapidly flowing water.

Wisconsin Statute 87.30 requires Counties, Cities, and Villages to implement floodplain zoning. In addition, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has developed flood hazard data. The floodplain areas in the Town of Ashippun are parallel to the waterways and the wetland areas. The floodplain areas of the Town of Ashippun are shown in Map 5-4, Appendix.

## 5.8 Watersheds and Drainage

The Town of Ashippun is located in the Upper Rock River Basin. This basin includes 13 surface watersheds. The Upper Rock River Basin encompasses about 1,890 square miles. The Rock River Basin covers 3,700 square miles.

A report from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources titled *The State of the Rock River Basin* was completed in April of 2002. According to the report, the most serious challenges facing the Basin include:

- Water quality impacts and increased runoff quantity from agriculture and urban land uses, such that many of the rivers and streams are not meeting water quality standards.
- Loss of agricultural lands impacts wildlife habitat, recreational usages, the rural landowners, and the economy because it changes the nature of the basin.
- Loss of critical, sensitive habitat and connection between habitats.
- Significant groundwater contamination in areas of the Basin.
- Lower urban groundwater levels due to increased use and decreased groundwater infiltration due to more acres of impervious land.

## 5.9 Surface Water Features

There are approximately 108 acres of surface water in the Town of Ashippun, including four lakes/ponds and five named rivers/creeks. The following is a description of the more prominent lakes, rivers, and streams in the Town of Ashippun.

### Lakes

Collins Lake is a 28 acre lake located in Section 1 of the Town and the Alderly Mill Pond is 16 acres in area. There are also two smaller unnamed lakes in the Town.

### **Rivers and Streams**

There are many miles of rivers, streams and creeks that can be found in the Town of Ashippun. The most prominent is the Ashippun River. Other named waterways include Mud Run Creek, Mud Lake Creek, Dawson Creek, and Davy Creek.

## Waterway Classification

The Dodge County Planning and Development Department completed a waterway classification project in 2003. The goal of the waterway classification project was to provide the County with a method of categorizing or classifying each lake, river and stream by their unique characteristics. The classification of lakes, rivers and streams was based on criteria developed by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR). The Existing Development Criterion was used with the Total Lake or Stream Sensitivity Criteria to develop the final classification of Class 1, 2, or 3 for each waterway. Using this method, a lake, river or streams level of existing development is given the same importance or weight as its sensitivity to future development impacts based on physical characteristics.

A Class 1 waterway is the most sensitive to future development and has a lower level of existing development. A Class 3 waterway is the least sensitive to future development and has a higher level of existing development. The following listing contains the Town of Ashippun waterways that were classified and their final classification:

Collins Lake – Class 1 Unnamed Lake (Section 4) – Class 1 Unnamed Lake (Section 14) – Class 1 Alderly Mill Pond – Class 2 Ashippun River – Class 1 Mud Run Creek – Class 1 Davy Creek – Class 2 Dawson Creek – Class 3 Mud Lake Creek – Class 3

## 5.10 Groundwater Resources

The source of all groundwater is precipitation, which percolates down through the soil until it reaches the saturated zone called an aquifer, where it is then contained. Water in an aquifer travels from its source to a discharge point such as a well, wetland, spring, or lake. During periods of increased precipitation or thaw, this vast resource is replenished with water moving by gravity through permeable soils which is called a water table system. In some instances, groundwater moves because of pressure created by a confining layer of impervious rock which is called an artesian system. The availability of groundwater within the Town of Ashippun should be investigated before any development occurs.

Most groundwater contamination is related to poorly sited land uses. For example, agricultural manure, petroleum, and salt storage in areas of high groundwater tables or fractured bedrock are all potential sources of groundwater pollution. Contamination of groundwater reserves can also result from such sources as percolation of water through improperly placed or maintained landfill sites, private waste disposal (septic effluent), runoff from livestock yards and urban areas, improper application of agricultural pesticide or fertilizers, excessive lawn and garden fertilizers and pesticides, leaks from sewer pipes, and seepage from mining operations. Runoff from leaking petroleum storage tanks and spills can also add organic and chemical contaminants in locations where the water table is near the surface. Once groundwater contamination has occurred, successful remediation is expensive and can take years, or may never occur, depending upon the pollutant. Therefore, when considering specific land uses for an area, it is vital to consider the physical characteristics of the area and the relationships between the land and the proposed/actual use in order to ensure that groundwater contamination does not occur.

Within Dodge County there are areas that have natural occurring and human influenced well contaminations. According to studies performed by University of Wisconsin-Extension offices, there are multiple types of contaminations in Dodge County. One major contamination is nitrates, which are mainly human influenced and a major concern in parts of Dodge County. Currently, the Town of Ashippun has somewhat average nitrate levels. Also, the Town has few areas with high chloride levels. These two types of contaminants. Another contamination that raises concern is the high number of positive bacteria samples in an area. The Town of Ashippun has a few areas with a high number of positive bacteria samples. Some of these contaminations can be linked to unique bedrock or groundwater features, or current or past land use practices in the area. To help control future well contaminations the Town of Ashippun should conduct testing to identify contaminated areas and reduce development in those areas.

## 5.11 Air Quality

Air quality, especially good air quality, is often taken for granted. The eastern portion of Wisconsin experiences high concentrations of ground-level ozone. Ground-level ozone, or smog, forms when pollutants emitted from vehicle exhaust, power plants, factories, and other combustion sources combine in the hot summer sun. In addition, warm weather causes an increase in air conditioner usage, which can increase harmful emissions from these sources.

To manage the state's air quality, the DNR uses both a network of air quality monitors and a series of air pollution control rules that limit emissions from air pollution sources based on various criteria. There is one air monitoring site in Dodge County, located in the City of Mayville.

## 5.12 Environmental Corridors/Sensitive Areas

Environmental corridors are continuous systems of open space that often include environmentally sensitive lands including woodlands, wetlands and habitat areas, natural and cultural resources requiring protection from disturbance and development, and lands needed for open space and recreational use. Environmental corridors serve multiple functions. Protection and preservation of environmental corridors contribute to water quality through reduction of nonpoint source pollution and protection of natural drainage systems. Environmental corridors can also protect and preserve sensitive natural resource areas such as wetlands, floodplains, woodlands, steep slopes, native grasslands, prairies, prairie savannas, groundwater recharge areas, and other areas that would impair habitat and surface or groundwater quality if disturbed or developed. Map 5-5, Appendix, identifies environmental corridors and natural limitations for building site development in the Town of Ashippun.

## 5.13 Threatened and Endangered Species

The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) lists species as "endangered" when the continued existence of that species as a viable component of the state's wild animals or wild plants is determined to be in jeopardy on the basis of scientific evidence. "Threatened" species are listed when it appears likely based on scientific evidence that the species may become endangered within the foreseeable future. The WDNR also lists species of "special concern" of which some problem of abundance or distribution is suspected but not yet proved; the intent of this classification is to focus attention on certain species before becoming endangered or threatened.

Table 5-1 shows the rare, threatened, and endangered species that may be found in the Town of Ashippun and Dodge County.

	Wisconsin Status	Taxa
Plants		
Lesser Fringed Gentian	Special Concern	
Richardson Sedge	Special Concern	
Showy Lady's-Slipper	Special Concern	
Slim-Stem Small-Reedgrass	Special Concern	
Small White Lady's-Slipper	Threatened	
Wafer-Ash	Special Concern	
Yellow Gentian	Threatened	
Animals		
Cantrall's Bog Beetle	Special Concern	Beetle
Giant Carrion Beetle	Endangered	Beetle
Barn Owl	Endangered	Bird
Black-Crowned Night-Heron	Special Concern	Bird
Forster's Tern	Endangered	Bird
Great Egret	Threatened	Bird
Red-Shouldered Hawk	Threatened	Bird
Gorgone Checker Spot	Special Concern	Butterfly
Side-Swimmer	Special Concern	Crustacean
American Eel	Special Concern	Fish
Banded Killfish	Special Concern	Fish
Least Darter	Special Concern	Fish
Pugnose Minnow	Special Concern	Fish
Redfin Shiner	Threatened	Fish
River Redhorse	Threatened	Fish
Slender Madtom	Endangered	Fish
Striped Shiner	Endangered	Fish
Week Shiner	Special Concern	Fish
Blanchard's Cricket Frog	Endangered	Frog
Arctic Shrew	Special Concern	Mammal
Franklin's Ground Squirrel	Special Concern	Mammal
Pigmy Shrew	Special Concern	Mammal
Prairie Vole	Special Concern	Mammal
Ellipse	Threatened	Mussel
Blanding's Turtle	Threatened	Turtle

# Table 5-1: Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species,Town of Ashippun and Dodge County

Source: Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.

## 5.14 Wildlife Habitat and Recreational Areas

Wildlife habitat can be simply defined as the presence of enough food, cover, and water to sustain a species. The wetland areas of the Town of Ashippun are accommodating to many types of waterfowl, such as geese, ducks, herons, egrets, and swans. The Town also has upland habitat areas suited for pheasants. The Town of Ashippun is also home to a variety of song birds and the typical upland animals of southern Wisconsin, including deer, rabbit, fox, raccoon, squirrel, and muskrat.

The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources identifies State Natural Areas, which are defined as tracts of land in a natural or near natural state and which are managed to serve several purposes including scientific research, teaching of resource management, and preservation of rare native plants and ecological communities. There are no State Natural Areas in the Town of Ashippun.

## 5.15 Historic Places

### State and National Register of Historic Places

The National Register of Historic Places recognizes properties of local, state, and national significance. Properties are listed in the National Register because of their associations with significant persons or events, because they contain important information about our history or prehistory, or because of their architectural or engineering significance. The National Register also lists important groupings of properties as historic districts. In addition, the National Park Service highlights properties that have significance to the nation as a whole by conferring on them the status of National Historic Landmark.

The Wisconsin State Register of Historic Places parallels the National Register. However, it is designed to enable state-level historic preservation protection and benefits. Most of the properties in Wisconsin listed in the National Register are also listed in the State Register. There are no sites in the Town of Ashippun that are listed on the State or National Register.

#### Wisconsin Architecture & History Inventory

The Wisconsin Architecture & History Inventory (AHI) provided by the Wisconsin Historical Society lists historical and architectural information on properties in Wisconsin. The AHI contains data on buildings, structures, and objects that illustrate Wisconsin's unique history. The majority of properties listed are privately owned. Listed properties convey no special status, rights, or benefits. These sites should be periodically reviewed for possible designation on state or national registers.

According to the AHI, the Town of Ashippun has 21 sites on the Wisconsin Architecture & History Inventory. To get a description of the AHI sites in the Town of Ashippun, see the AHI website: www.wisconsinhistory.org/index.html

## 5.16 Cultural Resources

#### **Cultural Facilities**

Cultural amenities enhance the quality of life, encourage residential development and attract tourism. Such amenities are limited in the Town of Ashippun since it lacks the support populations needed for diverse cultural opportunities. The primary cultural facilities in the Town of Ashippun consist of the Honey Acres (Museum) and are included on Map 5-6, Appendix.

As shorter trips and historical attractions continue to become more popular, local museums will likely be in greater demand as recreational destinations. A present problem with most local museums is the very limited amount of time they are open to the public due to the number of available volunteers and low or non-existent staffing budgets. As demand increases, the museums should be made more convenient and accessible as a local recreation facility.

## 5.17 Community Design

The Town of Ashippun is located in the southeast portion of Dodge County. The Town is approximately 36 square miles in size, and is surrounded by Dodge County to the north and west, Washington County to the east and Waukesha County to the south. The Town of Ashippun has large tracts of agricultural land and open space. The Ashippun River flows through the eastern portion of the Town and Collins Lake is located in the northeast corner of the Town.

## 5.18 Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Trends

The following are anticipated trends in regard to agricultural, natural, and cultural resources in the Town of Ashippun for the planning period:

- The number of farms will continue to decline;
- The size of the average farm will continue to show moderate increases;
- Pressure to convert farmland to other uses will increase;
- The number of dairy farms will continue to decline;
- Dairy herd sizes will continue to increase;
- Dairy herd production will continue to increase;
- Interest in farmland preservation programs will decrease;
- Interest in cash cropping will increase;
- Interest in specialty farming will increase;

- Interest in "value-added" businesses to complement small dairy and general farming operations will increase;
- Large dairies required to obtain Wisconsin Point Discharge Elimination System (WPDES) permits will increase;
- Interest in voluntary management programs that supply a property tax break, such as Managed Forest Law (MFL), will increase;
- Interest in using waterways for recreational purposes will continue;
- The Town's river fronts, woodlands, and highland areas will be desired as residential building sites;
- Challenges to groundwater resources will grow including increasing quantity of withdrawal and increasing of potential contamination sources;
- Highway expansion and increased traffic will have a negative impact on air quality;
- The recognized value of historic and cultural resources will grow, demanding more attention to their preservation.

## 6. Economic Development

## 6.1 Introduction

This section contains an inventory of economic characteristics found in the Town of Ashippun. Analysis and inventory information contained within this section will help in identifying deficiencies and opportunities for economic development within the community.

## 6.2 Labor Force and Employment Status

### **Civilian Labor Force**

The labor force, according to the Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development definition, includes those who are either working or looking for work, but does not include individuals who have made a choice to not work. This may include retirees, homemakers, and students. The labor force does not include institutional residents, military personnel, or discouraged job seekers.

					# Change	% Change
	1999	2000	2001	2002	1999-02	1999-02
Dodge County						
Labor Force	47,110	47,651	48,384	48,607	1,497	3.2%
Employment	45,932	46,142	45,837	46,060	128	0.3%
Unemployment	1,178	1,509	2,547	2,547	1,369	116.2%
Unemployment Rate	2.5	3.2	5.3	5.2	2.7	108.0%
Wisconsin						
Labor Force	2,889,812	2,934,931	2,990,578	3,062,314	172,502	6.0%
Employment	2,801,777	2,831,162	2,854,473	2,904,549	102,772	3.7%
Unemployment	88,035	103,769	136,105	157,766	69,731	79.2%
Unemployment Rate	3.0	3.5	4.6	5.1	2.1	71.4%

## Table: 6-1: Civilian Labor Force Annual AveragesDodge County and Wisconsin, 1999-2002

Source: Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development, Bureau of Workforce Information, Local Area Unemployment Statistics, 1999-2002.

The labor force of Dodge County has increased by 1,497 persons since 1999, or 3.2%.

#### **Unemployment Rates**

The number of unemployed in the county includes not only those who are receiving unemployment benefits, but also any resident who actively looked for a job and did not find one. Unemployment rates by month for 2002 are illustrated in Figure 6-1.



## Figure 6-1: Monthly Unemployment Rates Dodge County and Wisconsin, 2002

Source: Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development, Bureau of Workforce Information, Local Area Unemployment Statistics, 2002.

Dodge County experienced an unemployment rate during 2002 that was very similar to the state as a whole. Unemployment is generally lower in the summer due to seasonal work such as tourism, agriculture, and construction, a trend typically found throughout Wisconsin.

#### Income

Table 6-2 displays the 1999 household income and median household income for the Town of Ashippun and Dodge County as reported by the 2000 Census. The highest percentage (28.9 percent) of residents in the Town of Ashippun had a household income between \$50,000 to \$74,999. The next largest percentage (20.1 percent) of household income was \$35,000 to \$49,999, which was slightly lower than the County's percentage of 20.4 percent. Approximately 11.4 percent of the households in the Town of Ashippun had a household income of \$100,000 or greater; this exceeded the County's rate of 6.9 percent. The median household income for the Town of Ashippun was \$55,982. The median income for Dodge County was \$45,190, slightly higher than the State's reported median income of \$43,791.

#### T. Ashippun Dodge County % of Number Total Number % of Total Less than \$10,000 28 3.3% 1,659 5.3% \$10,000 to \$14,999 23 2.7% 1,627 5.2% \$15,000 to \$24,999 63 7.5% 3,579 11.4% \$25,000 to \$34,999 89 10.6% 4,434 14.1% \$35,000 to 49,999 169 20.1% 6,420 20.4% \$50,000 to \$74,999 28.9% 8,326 243 26.4% \$75,000 to \$99,999 131 15.6% 3,305 10.5% \$100,000 to \$149,999 63 7.5% 1,605 5.1% \$150,000 or More 3.9% 33 558 1.8%Total 842 100.1% 31,513 100.2% Median Household Income \$55.982 \$45,190

## Table 6-2: Household IncomeTown of Ashippun and Dodge County, 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000.

\*Percentages may not add up to 100%, due to rounding.

#### **Travel Time to Work**

For most of the general population, the location of their home depends on the location of their work. Knowing the amount of time people are willing to travel to work can serve as an indicator for the future location of housing and economic development. Travel time to work is also an indicator of what residents are willing to sacrifice for location. Individuals are often willing to allow for longer commute times to live in a particular area.

Table 6-3 displays the travel time to work for residents of the Town of Ashippun.

	Town of	Ashippun	Dodge County		
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
Less than 5					
minutes	32	2.5%	3,454	8.1%	
5 to 9 minutes	54	4.2%	7,955	18.7%	
10 to 14 minutes	84	6.6%	6,884	16.2%	
15 to 19 minutes	223	17.4%	5,212	12.2%	
20 to 24 minutes	237	18.5%	5,043	11.8%	
25 to 29 minutes	97	7.6%	2,015	4.7%	
30 to 34 minutes	154	12.0%	3,268	7.7%	
35 to 39 minutes	95	7.4%	960	2.3%	
40 to 44 minutes	55	4.3%	1,124	2.6%	
45 to 59 minutes	137	10.7%	2,530	5.9%	
60 to 89 minutes	41	3.2%	1,498	3.5%	
90 or more					
minutes	26	2.0%	731	1.7%	
Worked at home	45	3.5%	1,924	4.5%	
Total	1,280	99.9%	42,598	99.9%	

# Table 6-3: Travel Time To WorkTown of Ashippun and Dodge County, 2000

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000.

\*Percentages may not add up to 100%, due to rounding.

Of those traveling to work in the Town of Ashippun, most had a commute time of 20 to 24 minutes, where 18.7 percent of the residents in Dodge County traveled five to nine minutes to work. There were 3.5 percent of residents in the Town of Ashippun that work at home, which is less than the percentage (4.5 percent) that work at home in the County. The Town of Ashippun has a mean travel time to work of 27.2 minutes; the County's mean travel time to work is 20.8. The Town's residents may have a higher travel time since the residents must travel to nearby cities for employment.

## 6.3 Economic Base Analysis

#### **Employment by Industrial Sector**

Employment by industry within an area illustrates the structure of the economy. Historically, Dodge County has had a high concentration of employment in the manufacturing and agricultural sectors of the economy. Recent state and national trends indicate a decreasing concentration of employment in the manufacturing sector while employment within the services sector is increasing. This trend is partly attributed to the aging of the population.

Table 6-4 displays the number and percent of employed persons by industry group in the Town of Ashippun and Dodge County for 2000.

	T. Ashippun		Dodge	e County
		Percent of		Percent of
Industry	Number	Total	Number	Total
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and				
mining	104	8.0%	2,148	5.0%
Construction	128	9.8%	2,840	6.6%
Manufacturing	385	29.5%	14,359	33.2%
Wholesale trade	61	4.7%	1,142	2.6%
Retail trade	120	9.2%	4,668	10.8%
Transportation and warehousing, and utilities	38	2.9%	1,584	3.7%
Information	4	0.3%	792	1.8%
Finance, insurance, real estate, and rental and				
leasing	53	4.1%	1,523	3.5%
Professional, scientific, management,				
administrative, and waste management services	71	5.4%	1,691	3.9%
Educational, health, and social services	185	14.2%	6,929	16.0%
Arts, entertainment, recreation,				
accommodation, and food services	72	5.5%	2,235	5.2%
Other services (except public administration)	74	5.7%	1,555	3.6%
Public administration	11	0.8%	1,731	4.0%
Total	1,306	100.1%	43,197	99.9%

# Table 6-4: Employment by Industrial SectorTown of Ashippun and Dodge County, 2000

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000.

\*Percentages may not add up to 100%, due to rounding.

The manufacturing sector supplied the most jobs (29.5 percent) and educational, health and social services provided the second most jobs (14.2 percent) in the Town of Ashippun. The greatest percentage of employment for the county was also in the manufacturing sector (33.2 percent), followed by the educational, health, and social services (16.0 percent). The agricultural, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining sector provided 5.0 percent of the employment by industry in the County. However, in the Town of Ashippun the agricultural, forestry, fishing and hunting sector claimed 8 percent. Figure 6-2 also displays employment by industry for the Town of Ashippun in 2000.



## Figure 6-2: Employment by Industry, Town of Ashippun, 2000

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000.

#### **Employment by Occupation**

The previous section, Employment by Industry, described employment by the type of business or industry, or sector, of commerce. What people do, or what their occupation is within those sectors, can also reveal factors that influence incomes and overall employment. Table 6-5 displays the number and percent of employed persons by occupation in the Town of Ashippun and Dodge County for 2000.

# Table 6-5: Employment by OccupationTown of Ashippun and Dodge County, 2000

	T. Ash	T. Ashippun		e County
		Percent of		Percent of
Occupation	Number	Total	Number	Total
Management, professional, and related				
occupations	303	23.2%	10,911	25.3%
Service occupations	188	14.4%	5,979	13.8%
Sales and office occupations	326	25.0%	9,298	21.5%
Farming, fishing, and forestry occupations	42	3.2%	660	1.5%
Construction, extraction, and				
maintenance occupations	185	14.2%	4,158	9.6%
Production, transportation, and				
material moving occupations	262	20.1%	12,191	28.2%
Total	1,306	100.1%	43,197	99.9%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000.

\*Percentages may not add up to 100%, due to rounding.

The Sales and office occupations accounted for 25 percent of the employment of the residents in the Town of Ashippun. The occupation with the greatest percentage of employment in Dodge County was in production, transportation, and material moving occupations, containing 28.2 percent of total employment. In the Town of Ashippun, management, professional, and related occupations contained 23.2 percent of the employment, where as the County had a higher percentage of 25.3 percent in that occupation. The County also has approximately one-quarter of its residents employed in the management, professional, and related occupations.

#### Wages

The wages that are provided by a particular industry in a particular area can offer several insights. For example, higher wages within an industry, when compared to neighboring communities, can indicate strengths in a particular economic segment. That wage can also be used to attract commuters and new residents to the area. A higher than average wage and a dependence on a particular industry can also lead to local recession if there should be a downturn within the industry. Lower than average wages can indicate a lower quality of life in the area or a lack of highly qualified labor.

Table 6-6 displays the annual average wage by industry in the Dodge County and Wisconsin.

# Table 6-6: Annual Average Wage By Industry DivisionDodge County and Wisconsin, 2002

	Dodge County	Wisconsin	Percent of	1-Year	5-Year
	Annual Average	Annual Average	State	Percent	Percent
	Wage	Wage	Average	Change	Change
All industries*	\$29,566	\$30,922	95.6%	1.5%	20.0%
Agriculture, Forestry, & Fishing	\$25,070	\$22,565	111.1%	0.4%	17.2%
Construction	\$44,962	\$39,011	115.3%	2.8%	25.3%
Manufacturing	\$35,955	\$39,739	90.5%	0.9%	15.2%
Transportation, Communications, & Utilities	\$27,962	\$36,639	76.3%	0.1%	14.3%
Wholesale Trade	\$32,405	\$40,521	80.0%	3.2%	46.1%
Retail Trade	\$13,652	\$14,596	93.5%	4.3%	20.5%
Finance, Insurance, & Real Estate	\$24,988	\$40,933	61.0%	5.1%	11.6%
Services	\$22,769	\$28,775	79.1%	4.8%	27.0%
Total Government	\$30,724	\$33,785	90.9%	0.5%	22.1%

Source: Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development, *Employment, Wages, and Taxes Due covered by Wisconsin's U.C. Law*, 2002.

\*Mining excluded from table since wages were suppressed to maintain confidentiality in every county.

The construction and manufacturing industries in Dodge County offered the highest annual average wages in 2002. The agriculture, forestry, and fishing industry along with the construction industry had an annual average wage greater than the State of Wisconsin as a whole. The greatest disparity in wages between Dodge County and the state was in the finance, insurance, and real estate industry.

#### Acres of Agricultural and Residential Land

In 1992, there were 16,449 acres of agricultural land and 1,709 acres of residential land in the Town according to the Wisconsin Department of Revenue, Bureau of Property Tax. In 2002, there were 14,715 acres of agricultural land and 2,178 acres of residential land. The Town lost 1,734 acres of land classified as agricultural over the 10 year period, or 10.5 percent. The amount of residential land increased by 469 acres or 27.4 percent.

#### **Number of Dairy Farms**

The number of dairy farms is constantly decreasing throughout the State of Wisconsin. Many dairy farmers are seeking other ways to make a living. In 2003 there were 14 active dairy farms in the Town of Ashippun, which was a 26.3 percent decrease in the number of active dairy farms since 1997. This decrease is similar to the 27.8 percent decrease of dairy farms in Dodge County during the same time frame.

#### **Environmentally Contaminated Sites for Commercial or Industrial Use**

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) encourage the clean-up and use of environmentally contaminated sites for commercial and industrial use. The WDNR has created the Bureau for Remediation and Redevelopment Tracking System (BRRTS) which identifies environmentally contaminated sites for communities in Wisconsin. The most commonly listed types of sites are the following:

- Spills, a discharge of a hazardous substances that may adversely impact, or threaten to adversely impact, public health, welfare, or the environment. Spills are usually cleaned up quickly.
- LUST, a Leaking Underground Storage Tank that has contaminated soil and/or groundwater with petroleum. Some LUST cleanups are reviewed by the DNR and some are reviewed by the Dept. of Commerce.
- ERP, Environmental Repair Program sites are sites other than LUSTs that have contaminated soil and/or groundwater. Often, these are old historic releases to the environment.
- VPLE, Voluntary Property Liability Exemptions apply to sites in which property owners conducts an environmental investigation and cleanup of an entire property and then receives limits on their future liability.
- Superfund, a federal program created by Congress in 1980 to finance cleanup of the nation's worst hazardous waste sites. Thirty-nine sites are currently found in Wisconsin.

According to the BRRTS database, there are 655 environmentally contaminated sites in Dodge County. Of the 655 sites, 308 are closed. Closed sites have completed all clean up requirements and have received a case closure letter from the DNR. The remaining 347 sites are open sites. Open sites are in need of clean up or clean up is underway. There are therefore 347 sites that could have potential for commercial or industrial use. However, some sites will be more adequately suited than others. Of the 347 open sites 247 are reported spill sites, 60 are LUST sites, 34 are ERP sites, 4 are VPLE, and 2 are Superfund sites. Table 6-7 lists open sites in the Town of Ashippun. For more information review the available DNR database for sites that are located within the community (http://www.dnr.state.wi.us/org/aw/rr/brrts/index.htm)

	Site Name or Location	Туре	Spill Source Description/Cause
1)	ASHIPPUN TN LF	ERP	
2)	STH 67 & CTH 0	SPILLS	Soil Contamination/ Fuel Line Broke
3)	OCONOMOWOC	ERP/	***
	ELECTROPLATING CO	SUPERFUND	
	INC		
4)	PRODUCTION	ERP	Chlorinated Solvents
	ENTERPRISES INC		
5)	W HILL CREST RD	SPILLS	Soil Contamination/ Rear End Cap of
			Fiberglass Fell Off

## Table 6-7 Contaminated Sites in the Town of Ashippun

## 6.4 Economic Development Trends

Agriculture dominated the Dodge County and Town of Ashippun economy until the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century, at which point, manufacturing became a major source of employment and income. Trade and services have begun to emerge as major economic components. These trends formed the base of the current local economy. Over the next 20 years a number of economic trends are anticipated that will affect the existing economic base:

- The composition of the labor force will change due to continued decreases in family size and the aging of the population.
- Ashippun will likely continue to depend heavily on the manufacturing sector of the economy. International and national economic trends will continue to affect the manufacturers found in Dodge County and the Town.
- Increases in automation and technology in manufacturing will change the existing manufacturing base and affect the labor force.
- Tourism will likely increase as a factor in the economy.
- The Town of Ashippun will continue to be a desirable place to live, and transportation improvements will increase the ability of individuals to work outside the county resulting in travel time to work and an increased population.
- The service-based sector of the economy will continue to grow, particularly health-related services, as the population ages.

## 7. Intergovernmental Cooperation

## 7.1 Introduction

This element identifies planning activities in and around the Town of Ashippun, and provides a description of Wisconsin's statutes associated with intergovernmental cooperation.

In general terms, intergovernmental cooperation is any arrangement by which officials of two or more jurisdictions coordinate plans, policies, and programs to address and resolve issues of mutual interest. It can be as simple as communicating and sharing information, or it can involve entering into formal intergovernmental agreements and sharing resources such as equipment, buildings, staff, and revenue. It can even involve consolidating services, jurisdictions, or transferring territory.

Many issues cross jurisdictional boundaries, affecting more than one community. For example, air, water, and wildlife pass over the landscape regardless of boundaries so that one jurisdiction's activities with regard to air, water, and wildlife impacts other jurisdictions downwind or downstream.

Today, increased communication technologies and personal mobility mean that people, money, and resources also move across jurisdictions, as quickly and freely as air and water. Persons traveling along roadways use a network of transportation routes, moving between jurisdictions without even realizing it.

Frequently, the action of one governmental unit impacts others. Increasingly, we have come to the realization that many vital issues are regional in nature. Watersheds, economic conditions, commuter patterns, housing, media markets, and effects from growth and change are all issues that spill over municipal boundaries and impact the region as a whole.

Dodge County has 44 units of government, and special purpose districts defined as follows:

- ♦ 24 Towns
- 9 Cities
- ♦ 11 Villages
- 19 School districts
- ♦ 10 Sanitary districts
- ♦ 36 Drainage districts
- 3 Lake protection districts

Having so many governmental units allows for very local representation and means that Dodge County and Town residents have numerous opportunities to participate in local decision-making. However, the number of governmental units with overlapping decision-making authority presents challenges. More governmental units can make communication, coordination, and effective action more difficult, creating a greater potential for conflict. Instead of communicating ideas within one jurisdiction, communication needs to move across multiple jurisdictions and involve multiple boards, commissions, committees, executives, administrators, and citizens. Goals between communities may differ and present challenges. More governmental units may also mean unwanted and wasteful duplication in the delivery of community services. Cooperation can help avoid this.

#### **Intergovernmental Cooperation Benefits**

There are many reasons intergovernmental cooperation makes sense. The following are some examples:

- Cost savings Cooperation can save money by increasing efficiency and avoiding unnecessary duplication. Cooperation can enable some communities to provide their residents with services that would otherwise be too costly.
- Address regional issues By communicating and coordinating their actions, and working with county, regional and state jurisdictions, local communities are able to address and resolve issues which are regional in nature.
- Early identification of issues Cooperation enables jurisdictions to identify and resolve potential conflicts at an early stage, before affected interests have established rigid positions, before the political stakes have been raised, and before issues have become conflicts or crises.
- Reduced litigation Communities that cooperate are able to resolve issues before they become mired in litigation. Reducing the possibility of costly litigation can save a community money, as well as the disappointment and frustration of unwanted outcomes.
- Consistency Cooperation can lead to consistency of the goals, objectives, plans, policies, and actions of neighboring communities and other jurisdictions.
- Predictability Jurisdictions that cooperate provide greater predictability to residents, developers, businesses, and others. Lack of predictability can result in lost time, money, and opportunity.
- Understanding As jurisdictions communicate and collaborate on issues of mutual interest, they become more aware of one another's needs and priorities. They can better anticipate problems and work to avoid them.
- Trust Cooperation can lead to positive experiences and results that build trust between jurisdictions.
- History of success When jurisdictions cooperate successfully in one area, the success creates positive feelings and an expectation that other intergovernmental issues can be resolved as well.
- Service to citizens The biggest beneficiaries of intergovernmental cooperation are citizens for whom government was created in the first place. They may not understand, or even care about, the intricacies of particular intergovernmental issues, but all County residents can

appreciate their benefits, such as costs savings, provision of needed services, a healthy environment, and a strong economy.

## 7.2 Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Building Process

In order to facilitate meaningful opportunities for intergovernmental cooperation, the Dodge County Comprehensive Plan and 19 local plans were partially built utilizing a regional meeting approach. This approach grouped the participating communities into one of five regions (See Appendix, Map 1-2, Multi-jurisdictional Plan Groupings). The regions were arranged based on: their location in the county, common features such as agriculture, highways and river corridors, and shared service areas for utilities and emergency services.

The regional meeting approach provided an excellent forum for communities to discuss and resolve issues. Each meeting involved three phases. During the first phase, general trends and other information were presented at the beginning of each meeting. The second phase involved "breakout" sessions, whereby each community met with an assigned planner to work through issues and concerns specific to each community. The third phase involved the communities getting back together to present findings and solutions.

## 7.3 Wisconsin Intergovernmental Agreement Statutes

## **Intergovernmental Cooperation**

Wisconsin Statute, 66.0301 permits local agreements between the state, cities, villages, towns, counties, regional planning commissions, and certain special districts, including school districts, public library systems, public inland lake protection and rehabilitation districts, sanitary districts, farm drainage districts, metropolitan sewerage districts, sewer utility districts, Indian tribes or bands, and others.

Intergovernmental agreements prepared in accordance with s. 66.0301, formerly s. 66.30, are the most common form of agreement and have been used by communities for years, often in the context of sharing public services such as police, fire, or rescue. This type of agreement can also be used to provide for revenue sharing, determine future land use within a subject area, and to set temporary municipal boundaries. However, the statute does not require planning as a component of any agreement and boundary changes have to be accomplished through the normal annexation process.

## **Boundary Agreements Pursuant to Approved Cooperative Plan**

Under 66.0307, Wisconsin Statutes, combinations of municipalities may prepare cooperative boundary plans or agreements. Each city, village, or town that intends to participate in the preparation of a cooperative plan must adopt a resolution authorizing its participation in the planning process.

Cooperative boundary plans or agreements involve decisions regarding the maintenance or change of municipal boundaries for a period of 10 years or more. The cooperative plan must include a plan for the physical development of the territory covered by the plan, a schedule for changes to the boundary, plans for the delivery of services, an evaluation of environmental

features, and a description of any adverse environmental consequences that may result from the implementation of the plan. It must also address the need for safe and affordable housing. The participating communities must hold a public hearing prior to its adoption. Once adopted, the plan must be submitted to the Wisconsin Department of Commerce for State approval. Upon approval, the cooperative plan has the force and effect of a contract.

## Creation, Organization, Powers, and Duties of a Regional Planning Commission

Wisconsin Statute 66.0309 permits local governments to petition the governor to create a regional planning commission (RPC). If local support for a commission is unanimous, the governor may create it by executive order. The governor may also create a commission if local governments representing over 50% of the population or assessed valuation of the proposed region consent to the creation. Commission members are appointed by either local governments or the governor.

State Statutes require the RPC to perform three major functions:

- Make and adopt a comprehensive plan for the physical development of the region.
- If requested by a local unit, report recommendations to that local unit on the location of or acquisition of land for any of the items or facilities which are included in the adopted regional comprehensive plan.
- Make an annual report of its activities to the legislative bodies of the local governmental units within the region.

RPCs are also authorized to perform several other functions, however, by law, they serve a strictly advisory role.

Dodge, Columbia, Jefferson, Rock, and Sauk Counties are the only counties in the state that are not part of a Regional Planning Commission.

## Municipal Revenue Sharing

Wisconsin Statute, 66.0305, Municipal Revenue Sharing, gives authority to cities, villages, and towns to enter into agreements to share revenue from taxes and special charges with each other. The agreements may also address other matters, including agreements regarding services to be provided or the location of municipal boundaries.

Boundaries of the shared revenue area must be specified in the agreement and the term of the agreement must be for at least 10 years. The formula or other means for sharing revenue, the date of payment of revenues, and the means by which the agreement was made may be invalidated after the minimum 10-year period.

## Annexation

Wisconsin Statute, 66.021, Annexation of Territory, provides three petition methods by which annexation may occur. Annexation involves the transfer of one or more tax parcels from a town to a city or village. Cities and villages cannot annex property without the consent of landowners as required by the following petition procedures:

- 1. Unanimous approval A petition is signed by all of the electors residing in the territory and the owners of all of the real property included within the petition.
- 2. Notice of intent to circulate petition (direct petition for annexation) The petition must be signed by a majority of electors in the territory and the owners of one-half of the real property either in value or in land area. If no electors reside in the territory, then only the landowners need sign the petition.
- 3. Annexation by referendum A petition requesting a referendum election on the question of annexation may be filed with the city or village when signed by at least 20 percent of the electors in the territory.

### Incorporation

Wisconsin Statutes, 66.0201, Incorporation of Villages and Cities; Purpose and Definitions, and 66.0211, Incorporation Referendum Procedure, regulate the process of creating new villages and cities from town territory. Wisconsin Statute, 66.0207, Standards to be applied by the department, identifies the criteria that have to be met prior to approval of incorporation.

The incorporation process requires filing an incorporation petition with circuit court. Then, the incorporation must meet certain statutory criteria reviewed by the Municipal Boundary Review Section of the Wisconsin Department of Administration. These criteria include:

- Minimum standards of homogeneity and compactness, and the presence of a "well developed community center;"
- Minimum density and assessed valuation standards for territory beyond the core;
- A review of the budget and tax base in order to determine whether or not the area proposed for incorporation could support itself financially;
- An analysis of the adequacy of government services compared to those available from neighboring jurisdictions;
- An analysis of the impact incorporation of a portion of the town would have on the remainder, financially or otherwise; and
- An analysis of the impact the incorporation would have on the metropolitan region.

#### **Extraterritorial Zoning**

Wisconsin Statute, 62.23(7a), Extraterritorial Zoning, allows a city with a population of 10,000 or more to adopt zoning in town territory, three miles beyond a city's corporate limits. A city or village with a population less than 10,000 may adopt zoning 1.5 miles beyond its corporate limits. If the extraterritorial area of two municipalities overlaps, jurisdiction is divided between them as provided under s. 66.0105.

Under extraterritorial zoning authority, a city or village may enact an interim zoning ordinance that freezes existing zoning, or, if there is no zoning, existing uses while a plan and regulations are developed. The statute provides that the interim ordinance may be for two years.

A joint extraterritorial zoning committee must be established consisting of three city or village plan commission members and three town members. The city or village plan commission works with the joint committee in preparing the plan and regulations. The joint committee must approve the plan and regulations by a majority vote before they take affect.

The City of Hartford does utilize its extraterritorial zoning jurisdiction in a portion of the Town of Ashippun. See Map 7-1, Appendix A, for Extraterritorial Jurisdiction.

## **Extraterritorial Subdivision Review**

Wisconsin Statute, 236.10, Approvals Necessary, allows a city or village to exercise its extraterritorial plat review authority in the same geographic area as defined within the extraterritorial zoning statute. However, extraterritorial zoning requires town approval of the zoning ordinance, while extraterritorial plat approval applies automatically if the city or village adopts a subdivision ordinance or official map. The town does not approve the subdivision ordinance for the city or village. The city or village may waive its extraterritorial plat approval authority if it does not wish to use it.

The purpose of extraterritorial plat approval jurisdiction is to help cities and villages influence the development pattern of areas outside their boundaries that will likely be annexed to the city or village. Overlapping authority by incorporated municipalities is prohibited. This situation is handled by drawing a line of equal distance from the boundaries of the city and/or village so that not more than one ordinance will apply.

A portion of Ashippun is subject to the plat review authority of the City of Hartford.

## 7.4 Inventory of Plans for Communities in Dodge County

In Dodge County, 19 of 44 communities are participating in the development of the Dodge County Multi-jurisdiction Comprehensive Plan (See Appendix, Map 1-2, Multi-jurisdiction Plan Groupings). Of the remaining 25 communities, six have land use plans, six have comprehensive plans that are not "Smart Growth" compliant, six have Comprehensive "Smart Growth" Plans, and seven do not have any plans (See Appendix, Map 7-2, Status of Planning in Dodge County).

#### Land Use Plans

• Town of Calamus, Town of Clyman, Town of Hubbard, Town of Lowell, Village of Hustisford, and City of Hartford.

#### **Comprehensive Plans**

• Town of Chester, Town of Theresa, Town of Williamstown, City of Beaver Dam, City of Horicon, and City of Waupun.

#### "Smart Growth" Comprehensive Plans

• Town of Beaver Dam, Town of Emmet, Town of Lebanon, City of Columbus, City of Fox Lake, and City of Watertown.

### <u>No Plans</u>

• Town of Oak Grove, Town of Westford, Village of Clyman, Village of Kekoskee, Village of Lowell, Village of Randolph, and Village of Reeseville.

## 7.5 Inventory of Existing Intergovernmental Agreements

Mutual aid agreements exist between communities throughout the county to address police, fire, and ambulance services. Mutual aid agreements allow communities to share equipment and resources.

Various informal and formal agreements exist between communities throughout the county to address sharing services and facilities such as parks, road maintenance, snowplowing, and library funding.

The Town of Ashippun does not have boundary agreements with the nearby villages or cities.

## 7.6 Analysis of the Town of Ashippun's Relationship with School Districts, Local Governmental Units, Other Jurisdictions, Neighboring Counties, Region, and State

### Adjacent Governmental Units

The Town of Ashippun shares borders with the Town of Rubicon to the north, Washington County to the east, Waukesha County to the south, and the Town of Lebanon to the west. The City of Hartford is located to the northeast of the Town.

#### Relationship

The Town of Ashippun's relationship with the adjacent towns can be characterized as one of mutual respect. Towns are not incorporated and cannot annex land. Therefore, the borders between the Town of Ashippun and adjacent towns are fixed and boundary disputes are virtually nonexistent. The providing of public services such as snow plowing or road maintenance are conducted individually by each Town, however, some cooperation does exist at the borders between towns.

#### Sitting and Building Public Facilities

The Town of Ashippun does not currently share any public facilities with other governmental units. Likewise no plans exists to jointly site any public facility with another governmental unit.

#### **Sharing Public Services**

The Town of Ashippun currently shares police protection with the Town of Rubicon and the Village of Neosho. The department is called NRA (Neosho, Rubicon, and Ashippun) has two fully equipped squad cars and funding for the department is split between the three municipalities.

Currently the Town of Ashippun provides its own fire protection and emergency medical services. The Fire Department also provides fire protection for parts of the Town of Lebanon, Oconomowoc, and Erin.

County Departments such as Planning and Development and Highway offer services for assistance beyond the required level of service. For towns that have adopted the County Land Use Code, the County administers the land use regulations in those towns. The Planning and Development Department also provides planning services for a fee to any municipality. Many communities have taken advantage of this service over the years.

The County Highway Department maintains the County highway system, a public service all County citizens utilize. The County Highway Department also installs driveway culverts and road name signs for those towns that choose to pay for such an additional service.

The Dodge County Sheriff's Department provides police protection to the Town of Ashippun, as well as most other municipalities in the County.

#### **School Districts**

A majority of the Town of Ashippun is located within the Oconomowoc School District. However, some of the Town is covered by two other school districts. These districts include the Hartford and Neosho School Districts.

#### Relationship

The Town of Ashippun's relationship with the school districts can be characterized as limited. The school districts tend to operate rather independently and interaction with the Town tends to be minimal.

#### **Siting School Facilities**

The siting of new school facilities is mainly conducted by the school districts. The Town has historically had little input into the location of new school facilities.

#### **Sharing School Facilities**

No formal agreement between the School Districts and the Town exists for the shared use of school facilities. The schools outdoor recreational facilities also provide opportunities to residents of the Town.

#### Region

The Town of Ashippun is located in the south-central region of the State of Wisconsin. The Town of Ashippun is located in the central southwest portion of Dodge County. Dodge County and the Town of Ashippun are not part of a regional planning commission. Therefore, the Town's relationship with the region is quite limited as there is no regional entity for the Town to be involved with.

### State

The Town of Ashippun's relationship with the State of Wisconsin mainly involves state aids for local roads and the administering of various state mandates to Towns.

## 7.7 Intergovernmental Cooperation Trends

The following intergovernmental trends are anticipated during the planning period in the Town:

- Intergovernmental cooperation will increase as state, county, and local governments strive to spend less money more efficiently.
- Comprehensive planning will help communities share information and identify opportunities for shared services and facilities.
- The City of Hartford is continuing to grow, therefore annexation and other land use conflicts may occur between the Town and the City.
- Demand for public services will increase.

## 8. Land Use

## 8.1 Introduction

This element provides an analysis of existing land use in the Town of Ashippun. Transportation networks, ownership patterns (public and private), natural resources, market forces, existing ordinances, and resource management activities all contribute to the pattern of development that occurs in the Town.

## 8.2 Existing Land Use

Land use is a means of broadly classifying different types of activities relating to how land is used. The type, location, density, and geographic extent of developed and undeveloped lands influence community character, quality of life, public service needs (e.g., roads, utilities, parks, emergency services), tax base, and availability of jobs throughout the Town.

The land use pattern in Ashippun consists mostly of agricultural land and scattered residential development. The unincorporated village of Ashippun in the Town has a greater amount of residential development. The existing land uses in Ashippun are shown on Map 8-1, Appendix.

Land Use Category	Acreage	% of Total
Single Family Residential	680.3	3.0%
Two Family Residential	5.8	0.0%
Multi-Family Residential	16.5	0.1%
Mobile Home Parks	0.0	0.0%
Commercial	24.2	0.1%
Industrial & Quarries	254.0	1.1%
Public & Quasi-Public	54.2	0.2%
Transportation	855.0	3.7%
Parks & Recreation	262.9	1.1%
Communication & Utilities	17.6	0.1%
Water Features	108.7	0.5%
Agricultural & Other Resource Land	20,582.5	90.0%
Total	22,861.7	100.0%

## Table 8-1: Existing Land Use, Town of Ashippun, 2004

#### **Agricultural and Other Resource Land**

By far the largest of the land use categories is the combined total for agriculture and other resource land, which is a reflection of the large amount of prime agricultural soils found in the Town. This category also includes wetlands and open space areas. Agriculture and other

resource land accounts for 20,582.5 acres of land or 90 percent of the Town of Ashippun's 22,862 acres. The question of how much land is converted to urban type uses and where this conversion takes place is a key element of the land use planning process.

#### Residential

Residential development in the Town of Ashippun consists almost exclusively of single family housing, including farmsteads. Residential development is mostly scattered throughout the Town, and generally follows transportation corridors. However, greater concentrations of residential development can be found in the unincorporated village of Ashippun. Residential land uses account for 702.6 acres of land or three percent of the land area in the Town.

### Commercial

Commercial uses make up only .1 percent or 24.2 acres of the land area in the Town. Most of the commercial operations located in the Town are centered near the unincorporated village of Ashippun.

### Industrial

Industrial development uses make up only 1.1 percent or 254 acres of land area in the Town.

### **Public and Quasi-Public**

Public and Quasi-Public land uses occupy 54.2 acres, for .2 percent of the land area in the Town. Public and Quasi-Public land uses perform a support function to the people living and working in both urban and rural environments. Land uses within this classification include hospitals, schools, cemeteries, and churches, along with government offices, prisons, and public buildings. The amount of land devoted to these uses is not large in comparison to the other land use categories, but these facilities provide critical support and employment opportunities to the residents of the Town.

#### **Parks and Recreation**

The Town of Ashippun has 262.9 acres of land that are dedicated for use as parks and recreational land. The effects of a growing population, growing interest in outdoor activities, and increased mobility will place greater demands on recreational facilities in the Town. The preservation of public recreational areas as the Town continues to grow is a key element in maintaining the quality of life in Ashippun.

#### Transportation

Transportation related land use features include local roads, county and state highways, and railroad corridors. In the Town of Ashippun, transportation related land uses occupy 855 acres of land or 3.7 percent of the total land area.

### **Communication and Utilities**

Communication and utilities land use features include power lines, electrical substations, wastewater treatment plants, water towers, recycling centers and telecommunication towers. In the Town of Ashippun, communication and utility land uses occupy 17.6 acres of land or .1 percent of the total land area.

## 8.3 Supply, Demand, and Price Trends of Land

Table 8-2 displays information on agricultural land sales in Dodge County from 1998 to 2001.

					# Change	% Change
	1998	1999	2000	2001	1998-01	1998-01
Ag Land Continuing in Ag Use						
Number of Transactions	78	65	46	39	-39	-50.0%
Acres Sold	6,379	5,633	4,171	2,917	-3,462	-54.3%
Dollars per Acre	\$2,114	\$2,165	\$2,112	\$2,665	\$551	26.1%
Ag Land Being Diverted to Other Uses						
Number of Transactions	17	16	27	17	0	0.0%
Acres Sold	858	749	1,404	624	-234	-27.3%
Dollars per Acre	\$3,113	\$2,822	\$3,389	\$3,358	\$245	7.9%
Total of all Ag Land						
Number of Transactions	95	81	73	56	-39	-41.1%
Acres Sold	7,237	6,382	5,575	3,541	-3,696	-51.1%
Dollars per Acre	\$2,232	\$2,242	\$2,434	\$2,788	\$556	24.9%

## Table 8-2: Agricultural Land Sales, Dodge County, 1998-2001

Source: Wisconsin Agricultural Statistics Service, Agricultural Land Sales, 1998-2001.

As indicated in Table 8-1, the amount of agricultural land sold in Dodge County has been decreasing since 1998. However, the value of the acres sold has been increasing. In 2001, the value of agricultural land that is sold for other uses is valued higher than agricultural land that continues in agricultural use. However, the value of agricultural land continuing in agricultural use increased by 26.1% from 1998-2001, while the value of land diverted to other uses rose only 7.9%.

## Supply of Land

The supply of land in the Town of Ashippun is fixed. Unincorporated municipalities such as Towns do not have the power to annex land. The Town of Ashippun does not contain or abut any incorporated communities that could annex land from the Town. It should be noted, the Town does have a large amount of undeveloped land that is currently being used for agricultural purposes.

#### **Demand for Land**

Demand for land in the Town of Ashippun can be classified as high. The Town's location near the Cities of Hartford and Oconomowoc and a quiet rural setting make the Town a desirable

place to locate a residence. The demand for agricultural land will depend on the price farmers receive for their crops. High prices will lead to high demand for farmland; low prices will lead to more farmland being offered for other uses.

### Price of Land

There is a high demand for rural lots in the Town of Ashippun. Unimproved rural lots usually range between one to five acres in size and do not have public services such as sewer or water. Generally, these unimproved vacant lots have selling prices around \$50,000 in the Ashippun area. In addition, agricultural property in the Town of Ashippun area has seen increased competition among agricultural interests in the area. Recently, agricultural land has been selling for approximately \$6,000 an acre.

### **Opportunities for Redevelopment**

Opportunities for redevelopment of land in the Town of Ashippun are limited. Little developed land exists that is not currently being utilized in some manner. No significant areas of land are in need of redevelopment in the Town.

## 8.4 Land Use Programs

Land development and building activity in the Town of Ashippun is subject to both Town and County regulations. Land use within the Town is regulated by the Dodge County Land Use Code. The Town Land Division Ordinance is administered by the Town of Ashippun and the Dodge County Land Use Code is administered by the Dodge County Planning and Development Department. All land divisions in Ashippun require both Town and County review and approval. The County land use regulations are described in more detail below.

#### **Dodge County Land Use Code**

The Dodge County Land Use Code was adopted by the Dodge County Board in March of 2000. The Code establishes 10 primary use districts, as well as 7 overlay districts. The A-1 Prime Agricultural, Wetland, and A-2 General Agricultural Districts comprise the three largest zoning districts found in the Town. The Airport Height Limitation Overlay district is not currently used in the Town of Ashippun. All other sections of the Land Use Code apply in the Town of Ashippun and are described below.

Under the Dodge County Land Use Code, land development and building activity require the issuance of a Land Use Permit. The application can be filed with the County Land Use Administrator. Figure 8-1 shows the Land Use Permit activity in the Town of Ashippun from 1994 to 2003. Over this 10 year period, an average of 17.6 new housing units was constructed each year.





Source: Dodge County Planning and Development Department

#### **Floodplain Overlay District**

The Floodplain Overlay District was originally adopted as the Floodplain Zoning Ordinance by the Dodge County Board in 1981 in response to a mandate by the state. The Floodplain Overlay District is in effect within the 100 year floodplain as identified on the Flood Insurance Rate Map developed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The Floodplain Overlay District sets up guidelines, restrictions, and criteria for development within the 100 year floodplain.

#### **Shoreland-Wetland Overlay District**

The County Shoreland-Wetland Overlay District was originally adopted as the Shoreland-Wetland Ordinance by the Dodge County Board in 1984, also in response to a mandate by the state. The Shoreland-Wetland Overlay District is in effect within 1,000 feet of a navigable lake, pond, or flowage, within 300 feet of a navigable river or stream, or within floodplain areas. Wetlands documented in the Wisconsin Wetland Inventory of 1994 and located within a shoreland area are protected, with few exceptions, from draining, filling and grading under the Shoreland-Wetland Overlay District.

#### **Subdivision Design and Improvement Regulations**

The Subdivision Design and Improvement Regulations were originally adopted as the Subdivision Control Ordinance by the Dodge County Board in 1968 and were revised in 1973. These regulations control the divisions of land within unincorporated areas for the purpose of: facilitating provision of public services, facilitating orderly divisions and developments, and restricting building sites in environmentally sensitive areas or on lands poorly suited for development.

Under these regulations, the County requires the recording of approved certified survey maps for minor subdivisions which create less than five parcels. Minor subdivision approval begins with the filing of a letter of intent. The County Planning and Development Committee decides whether to grant or deny the proposal. Upon approval by the Committee, a certified survey map is submitted

for final approval and recorded. Table 8-2 shows the land divisions for the past five years in the Town of Ashippun. Since 1999, there have been a total of 32 letters of intent, an average of 6.4 per year. A total of 23 certified survey maps have been approved since 1999, an average of 4.6 approvals per year.

Major subdivisions resulting in five or more lots are also regulated under the Land Use Code. Chapter 236 of the Wisconsin Statutes requires platting when there are five or more lots of 1.5 acres or less. The County Subdivision Design and Improvement Regulations within the Land Use Code go beyond the requirements of Chapter 236 in requiring platting when five or more lots are created regardless of their size. However, the County Planning and Development Committee can waive the additional platting requirement.

TABLE 8-3
Letters of Intent and Certified Survey Maps
Town of Ashippun, 1999-2003

Year	Letters of Intent	Certified Survey Maps
1999	5	6
2000	12	7
2001	3	5
2002	6	2
2003	6	3
Total	32	23

Source: Dodge County Planning and Development Department

#### **Sanitary Facilities Overlay District**

The Sanitary Facilities Overlay District assists in guiding development to lands with appropriate soil conditions. The Sanitary Facilities Overlay District was originally adopted as the County Sanitary Ordinance in 1968 and is a state mandate in effect on all lands within Dodge County. This Overlay District regulates the location, construction, installation, alteration, design and use of all private sewage disposal systems. Table 8-3 summarizes the number of permits issued for new and replacement private sanitary systems within the Town of Ashippun over the past 10 years. Mound systems have accounted for about 37.7 percent of the new and replacement systems since 1994, while conventional systems have accounted for about 52.6 percent.

### **TABLE 8-4**

YEAR	Conventional	At-Grade	Mound	Holding Tank	Other	Total
1994	12	0	8	0	0	20
1995	10	0	10	0	0	20
1996	12	0	4	0	0	16
1997	9	0	1	1	1	12
1998	6	0	8	0	0	14
1999	5	0	6	0	1	12
2000	3	1	4	1	1	10
2001	11	1	6	1	3	22
2002	6	0	7	2	0	15
2003	7	1	4	0	1	13
Carrier Da	daa Caunty Dlanning					

## Number of Permits Issued for On-Site Sanitary Systems by Year Town of Ashippun, 1994-2003

Source: Dodge County Planning and Development

#### **Town of Ashippun Subdivision Ordinance**

The Town of Ashippun Subdivision Ordinance was adopted by the Town Board in 1979. The ordinance regulates the division of land to promote the public health, safety, morals, prosperity, aesthetics and general welfare within the Town. Furthermore, the Town Land Division Ordinance helps to facilitate the provision of public services, and to restrict building sites in environmentally sensitive areas or on lands poorly suited for development.

The minor subdivision process, for the creation of less than five parcels, begins with the filing of a Letter of Intent and a sketch map of the proposal. The Town Plan Commission reviews the proposal for conformance with the Town's ordinances, and then gives its recommendation to the Town Board. The Town Board decides whether to approve or deny the proposal. As a condition of approval the Town may require the recording of an approved certified survey map with the Dodge County Register of Deeds.

Major subdivisions resulting in five or more new parcels are also regulated under the Town's Land Division Ordinance. A preliminary plat of the proposed lots as well as a final plat must be reviewed and approved by both the Town Plan Commission and the Town Board. The final plat is then recorded with the Dodge County Register of Deeds.

#### 8.5 Land and Resource Management

Land and resource management takes place under both private and public land ownership. Public and private land and resource management programs are important in preserving the county's rural character and natural resource base. There are three voluntary management programs, Managed Forest Law (MFL), Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), and the Agricultural Preservation Program which occur throughout Dodge County.

### Managed Forest Law (MFL)

The MFL program is administered by the WDNR. The purpose of the Managed Forest Law is to promote sound forestry management practices by providing property tax reduction incentives to landowners. Wooded parcels at least 10 acres in size are eligible to be enrolled in the program. At least 80% of the land must be productive forest land in order to be eligible for the program. Lands may be enrolled for either 25 or 50-year periods. This requires a long-term commitment from the property owners, but also provides long term protection from property tax escalations.

Preparation of an approved forestry management plan is required, which can be prepared by a WDNR forester at no charge. Practices identified in the plan must be carried out for the duration of the contract period. Mandatory management activities required by the law include cutting mature timber, thinning plantations and natural stands, pine releases, planting, post harvest treatments, and soil conservation practices. Landowners have the right to close up to 80 acres of their land to the public, otherwise the land is classified as open, and public access is permitted for hunting, fishing, cross-county skiing, sight seeing, and hiking.

### **Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)**

The CRP is the Federal Government's largest environmental protection program in existence. Administered by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the purpose of the program is to provide wildlife benefits, tree planting benefits, water quality benefits, and economic benefits. CRP is a voluntary approach to improving the environment using partnerships between government and private landowners. The program provides incentives to farmers for establishing conservation practices, which benefit resources both on and off the farm. Incentives are in the form of annual rental payments and cost-share assistance in return for establishing long-term, resource conserving measures on eligible lands. Rental payments are based on the agricultural rental value of the land, and cost-share assistance is provided in the amount up to 50% of the participant's costs to establish approved practices. The contract duration is from 10-15 years.

#### **Farmland Preservation Program**

The Farmland Preservation Program is available to landowners who own at least 35 acres of land zoned for exclusive agricultural uses, or land that is under a long term preservation agreement with the state, and can show \$6,000 gross farm profits from the land per year. Land must remain in agricultural use or zoned for exclusive agricultural use and cropland must be farmed so that soil erosion rates comply with conservation standards. In Dodge County this program is managed by the Dodge County Land Conservation Department, and the Planning and Development Department.

Appendix, Map 8-2, shows the properties participating in the program.

## 8.6 Existing and Potential Land Use Conflicts

The following list represents existing and potential land use conflicts that need to be considered by the Town of Ashippun when planning for the future.

- Increasing pressure to convert farmland to residential use is expected.
- An increase in the number of large animal confinement operations may have a negative impact on nearby non-farm residences.
- Future Industrial and commercial development may increase in or near the unincorporated village of Ashippun.
- Development along STH 67 may conflict with existing land uses along the transportation corridor.
- Intervention by the County and the State relative to local land use issues.
- The prices of land for residential and recreational uses will outpace the price of land continuing in agriculture.
- The Town will continue to experience increased traffic volumes on all local, county, and state roads which will in turn require additional local road maintenance and construction costs.

## 8.7 Land Use Trends

Changes in land use are related to changes in population, housing, transportation, community services, agriculture, natural resources, and economic development. The following land use trends are anticipated in Ashippun over the next 20 to 25 years.

- Ashippun population and the number of housing units will continue to grow.
- The number of persons per household will continue to decrease requiring more housing units and more land to accommodate the Town's growing population.
- The Town's river frontage, woodlands and highland areas will be desired for residential development.
- Agriculture will maintain a presence in Ashippun. There will likely be a decreasing number of total farms, but an increasing number of large farms. The number of horse farms and hobby farms will increase.

## 9. Implementation

## 9.1 Introduction

The implementation section of this plan outlines the tools that are at the disposal of the Town in its efforts to achieve the goals and objectives stated in this plan. In addition, this section provides a basic description of what each of these tools can achieve for the Town. The manner in which the Town chooses to use each of these implementation tools will determine its effectiveness. Programs and specific actions are listed in this section in their intended order of completion.

## 9.2 Implementation and Specific Actions

### **Dodge County Land Use Code**

Zoning is probably the single most commonly used legal device for controlling land uses in a community. A zoning ordinance should be designed to promote the health, safety, morals, prosperity, aesthetics, and general welfare of the community. Each regulation in the zoning ordinance must bear a reasonable relationship to these ends.

Wisconsin State Statute 66.0295 requires any community that engages in land use regulations, including zoning, to have an adopted comprehensive plan as defined by the State of Wisconsin by January 1, 2010. This Comprehensive Plan satisfies the State's requirements. As of January 1, 2010, all land use decisions, including rezonings, must be consistent with the comprehensive plan. Any decision inconsistent with the comprehensive plan may not be considered legally defensible under the statutes.

The first implementation action would involve requesting the County to amend the Town of Ashippun Zoning Map to be consistent with the Town's Future Land Use Map that is included in this plan.

Map 9-1, Appendix, display's the Town's existing zoning map.

#### Town of Ashippun Subdivision Ordinance

Another method of regulating land uses is through regulating the division of land within the Town. The owner of a property is not allowed to divide or sell land that is not in conformance with the subdivision regulations. These regulations serve a wide range of purposes. In the interest of planning, they serve to control minimum lot sizes in the Town as well as the internal design of each new development so that the pattern of streets, lots, and public facilities will be compatible.

The Town has its own Subdivision Ordinance. Ashippun is also subject to the County Subdivision Regulations. The regulations contained in the Town Subdivision Ordinance must be

consistent with the recommendations and policies in the Comprehensive Plan. Therefore the second implementation action for the Town would involve amending the Town Subdivision Ordinance as necessary to ensure consistency with this plan.

## **Design Review Ordinances**

Article V of the Town's Land Division Ordinance outlines the required design standards. These standards apply to any street, block, or lot designs which are proposed to be built within the Town of Ashippun. The design review guidelines are incorporated into the Town's land division regulations, and are reviewed at the same time as a subdivision proposal. Furthermore, Chapter 7 of the Dodge County Land Use Code lays out the design standards that are required by the County.

The third implementation action for the Town would involve amending the Town Subdivision Ordinance as necessary to ensure consistency with this plan.

## **Erosion/Storm Water Control Ordinances**

Section 7.9 of the Dodge County Land Use Code addresses soil erosion control and storm water management. Section 5.12 of the Town's Land Division Ordinance details construction site erosion control standards as well as storm water control standards.

To help implement this plan, the Town should consider developing a storm water management plan to help address current problems and to prevent future storm water problems in newly developed areas.

## Site Plan Regulations

All Letters of Intent for Land Divisions require site plan approval by the Town of Ashippun Plan Commission in accordance with the requirements of Subsection 3.2 B) of the Town's Land Division Ordinance.

Contained within Section 2.3 of the Dodge County Land Use Code are the site plan requirements for submittal of rezoning requests, Land Use Permits, Conditional Use Permits, Planned Unit Developments, as well as land divisions.

An implementation action for the Town would involve amending the site plan regulation section of the Town Subdivision Ordinance as necessary to ensure consistency with both the County's Land Use Code and this plan.

## **Building Codes**

The State of Wisconsin has a uniform dwelling code which must be followed for the construction and inspection of all one and two-family dwellings. Local communities have certain responsibilities for enforcement of this code. The Dodge County Land Use Code does not reference these building codes, however, it does require the submittal of a stamped copy of the State approved building plans for commercial development. The Town of Ashippun regulates the compliance of building codes in the Town.

## **Housing Codes**

The Dodge County Land Use Code and the Town of Ashippun's Land Division Ordinance do not address minimum standards for basic equipment, lighting, ventilation, heating, electrical service, or maintenance guidelines. These standards are enforced through the State of Wisconsin's Uniform Dwelling Code and should be consistent with this plan. An inspector for the Town of Ashippun ensures compliance with the Uniform Dwelling Code.

### **Sanitary Codes**

Dodge County's Sanitary Facilities Overlay District assists in guiding development to lands with appropriate soil conditions. The Sanitary Facilities Overlay District was originally adopted as the County Sanitary Ordinance in 1968 and is a state mandate in effect on all lands within Dodge County. This Overlay District regulates the location, construction, installation, alteration, design, and use of all private sewage disposal systems. Both the Town and the County require connection to public sewer in areas where the service is available. Therefore, an implementation action for the Town would involve amending the applicable section of the Town Land Division Ordinance as necessary to ensure consistency with both the County's Land Use Code and this plan.

### **Mechanical Codes**

Neither Dodge County's Land Use Code nor Ashippun's Land Division Ordinance contain sections pertaining to mechanical codes.

## Sign Regulations

Section 8.9 of the Dodge County Land Use Code outlines the regulations for the placement of signs in the Town.

An implementation action in this case would involve the review of each proposal to ensure consistency with the Dodge County Code and this plan.

#### **Historic Preservation Ordinances**

In order to promote the use and preservation of historic sites, structures, landmarks, and districts within the County, Subsection 8.10 of the County's Land Use Code was created. There are no historic preservation regulations contained in the Town of Ashippun's Land Division Ordinance.

An implementation action may include the development of a historical preservation provision within the Town's Land Division Ordinance to ensure consistency with both the Dodge County Land Use Code as well as this plan.

## **Capital Improvement Program**

The Capital Improvement Program provides a systematic means for evaluating and scheduling the acquisition and development of community facilities, programs, and utilities over a period of years. The program is implemented through a yearly review and adoption of a one year capital improvement budget. The recommendations specified in this plan should be prioritized. Once priorities have been established, a five year capitol improvement program can be developed based on the priorities. This will allow the Town to carry out the activities proposed in this plan in an economically feasible manner. Furthermore, The Town is encouraged to apply for state and federal grant money available for certain programs such as the purchase of park land.

## Official Map

The official maps, including amendments, for the Town of Ashippun are on file in the Dodge County Planning and Development Department. Additionally, a certificate showing that the official map has been established is on file with the Dodge County Register of Deeds.

To ensure consistency with the Town's future land use map, the Town should request that the County amend the Town of Ashippun zoning map as necessary.

## 9.3 Integration and Consistency of Plan Elements

Integration and consistency of the plan elements should be considered when reviewing development proposals. The nine elements of this plan should be used in conjunction with one another. A development proposal that may meet the goals and objectives of one element needs to meet the goals and objectives of all the other elements. The nine elements of this plan do not operate independently, but rather complement one another. Any inconsistencies that are discovered between the elements of this plan should be addressed in future updates of the plan.

## 9.4 Measurement of Plan Success

Successful implementation of this Comprehensive Plan can be measured in several ways. The primary method for measuring success of the plan is through regular review and updating of the plan. Through this process, the errors, inconsistencies, and aspects of the plan that have not worked can be evaluated and changes can be made. Success of the plan can also be measured by tracking the number of changes to the plan that are granted by the Town Board each year. A large number of changes can indicate a problem with the plan that may need to be addressed. Comparing future population growth and the number of new housing units in the Town to the figures and projections presented in this plan can also aid in determining the success of this plan.

## 9.5 Updating of the Plan

This plan should be updated as needed to include any significant data changes such as Census data when they become available and should be reviewed, updated, or revised at least every ten years. However, various circumstances and certain opportunities may warrant changes to the plan prior to the next scheduled update or revision. Changes or amendments to this plan require a petition to the Town Board. The petition shall specify the change requested and reasons for the change. It should be noted that this plan should only be amended a maximum of two times per year in order to prevent an excessive number of changes to the plan. An excessive number of changes or amendments may lead to undesirable development within the Town.

The Town Board shall hold a public hearing upon publishing a Class I notice at least 30 days prior to the hearing after giving the Town Planning Committee an opportunity to review and comment on the petition. When deemed appropriate by the Town Board, written notification of the public hearing shall be sent to user groups, organizations, municipalities, or individuals believed to be directly or adversely affected by the proposed change.

After the public hearing and consideration of the comments of the Town Planning Committee, the Town Board shall vote on passage of the proposed change or amendment. The change or amendment shall be effective upon passage.