

APPENDIX A

TOWN OF POY SIPPI

SURVEY RESULTS

JANUARY 2001

Prepared by the
East Central Wisconsin
Regional Planning Commission

The Town of Poy Sippi and Waushara County are working with East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission to prepare a Land Management Plan. In order to gain citizen input and involve property owners in the planning process, a survey was conducted to gather opinions regarding land use and development issues. Each property owner was asked to complete one survey. Five hundred and nineteen surveys were distributed and 218 were returned, resulting in a 42 percent response rate. The survey contained 15 questions. Some respondents did not answer all of the questions on the survey.

How this report is organized:

The survey results are tabulated using the SPSS statistical software package. Each response is entered into a database, from which frequencies and other statistical analysis can be completed. The next page of this report begins with the actual question from the survey followed by a frequency table(s). Each table is labeled by a shortened heading describing the response choices provided in the survey. Reading the frequency table from left to right, the following are brief explanations of the terms included in each frequency table:

- Column 1: Total – Total number of answers received for the question
 Missing System – Number reflecting how many times the questions was **not** answered (non-responses)
 Total – Grand total of answers and non-responses to the question
- Column2: Frequency – Number of times the response provided was chosen
- Column 3: Percent – Percent each response is of the total number of responses
- Column 4: Valid Percent – Percent of each response to all **answered** responses. This is the percentage to focus on.
- Column 5: Cumulative Percent – Percent of all successive responses

Summary of Findings

- ◆ Most of the respondents (76.1%) are residents of the Town of Poy Sippi.
- ◆ Thirty-nine percent of the respondents have owned their parcel of land for more than 20 years.
- ◆ The largest share of the respondents were 65 years of age or older followed by those who were 45-54 and 55-64 years of age.
- ◆ The majority of respondents (51.6%) have a general residence followed by 18 percent who have land that is used primarily for hunting/recreational purposes.
- ◆ Twenty-five percent of the respondents reported to have ½ to 1 acre sized parcel followed by 18 percent who own 80 acres or more.

- ◆ A majority of the respondents choose "No Significant Growth" in reference to farms and agriculture, residential, recreational opportunities, industry, seasonal homes, and open space land uses. Only in reference to business did "Greater Growth" (46.4%) exceed "No Significant Growth" (44.4%).
- ◆ For future business location, most respondents chose the unincorporated Village of Poy Sippi. For future industrial location, most chose along STH 49 as the preferred location.
- ◆ Single family housing was the overwhelming preference for future housing development. "Do not Support" received the most responses for the remaining choices of subdivisions, multi-family housing, mobile homes, cluster site housing, seasonal homes, and hunting cabins.
- ◆ For all of the following issues, "Support" received the greatest share of responses: small business opportunities, publicly owned recreational land, land use planning, preservation of wetlands, farmlands, forestland, streams and historic/cultural sites.
- ◆ Tools for the protection of resources from wetlands to undeveloped resources was, generally, evenly divided among "Voluntary Management", "Financial Tax Incentives" and "Needing More Information".
- ◆ Questions 14 and 15 were often skipped or answered only in part, appearing to reflect the respondents' familiarity with the facility or service in question. "Average" was chosen by most for all of the services/facilities listed in questions 14 and 15 with the exception of fire protection, which received an "Above Average" rating for current service provision.

Frequency Table

1. Are you a resident of the Town of Poy Sippi?

Residential Status

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	159	72.9	76.1	76.1
	No	50	22.9	23.9	100.0
	Total	209	95.9	100.0	
Missing	System	9	4.1		
Total		218	100.0		

2. How long have you been a property owner?

Tenure of Property Ownership

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0-2 years	17	7.8	7.8	7.8
	3-5 years	30	13.8	13.8	21.7
	6-10 years	40	18.3	18.4	40.1
	11-20 years	46	21.1	21.2	61.3
	More than 20 years	84	38.5	38.7	100.0
	Total	217	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.5		
Total		218	100.0		

3. Please identify your age group:

Age of Respondent

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 25 years	2	.9	.9	.9
	25-34 years	18	8.3	8.3	9.3
	35-44 years	40	18.3	18.5	27.8
	45-54 years	50	22.9	23.1	50.9
	55-64 years	44	20.2	20.4	71.3
	65 and older	62	28.4	28.7	100.0
	Total	216	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.9		
Total		218	100.0		

4. What best describes the primary use of your property?

Primary Use of Property

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	General Residence	110	50.5	51.6	51.6
	Farmstead	34	15.6	16.0	67.6
	Agriculture land w/o Residence	14	6.4	6.6	74.2
	Home and Business	16	7.3	7.5	81.7
	Hunting/Recreational	36	16.5	16.9	98.6
	Business/Commercial	1	.5	.5	99.1
	Vacant/Parcel	2	.9	.9	100.0
	Total	213	97.7	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.3		
Total		218	100.0		

5. What is the size of your property?

Size of Property

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 1/2 acre	21	9.6	9.8	9.8
	1/2 acre to 1 acre	54	24.8	25.1	34.9
	1-4.99 acres	35	16.1	16.3	51.2
	5-9.99 acres	7	3.2	3.3	54.4
	10-39.99 acres	35	16.1	16.3	70.7
	40-79.99 acres	24	11.0	11.2	81.9
	80 acres or larger	39	17.9	18.1	100.0
	Total	215	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.4		
Total		218	100.0		

Frequency Table

6. How would you like the town to look over the course of the next twenty years?

Farms and Agriculture

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Greater Overall Growth	63	28.9	30.7	30.7
	No Significant Growth	136	62.4	66.3	97.1
	Decrease in Amount of Growth	6	2.8	2.9	100.0
	Total	205	94.0	100.0	
Missing	System	13	6.0		
Total		218	100.0		

Residential Homes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Greater Overall Growth	58	26.6	28.2	28.2
	No Significant Growth	112	51.4	54.4	82.5
	Decrease in Amount of Growth	36	16.5	17.5	100.0
	Total	206	94.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	5.5		
Total		218	100.0		

Recreational Opportunities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Greater Overall Growth	79	36.2	39.3	39.3
	No Significant Growth	101	46.3	50.2	89.6
	Decrease in Amount of Growth	21	9.6	10.4	100.0
	Total	201	92.2	100.0	
Missing	System	17	7.8		
Total		218	100.0		

Business

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Greater Overall Growth	96	44.0	46.4	46.4
	No Significant Growth	92	42.2	44.4	90.8
	Decrease in Amount of Growth	19	8.7	9.2	100.0
	Total	207	95.0	100.0	
Missing	System	11	5.0		
Total		218	100.0		

Industry

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Greater Overall Growth	48	22.0	24.4	24.4
	No Significant Growth	100	45.9	50.8	75.1
	Decrease in Amount of Growth	49	22.5	24.9	100.0
	Total	197	90.4	100.0	
Missing	System	21	9.6		
Total		218	100.0		

Seasonal Homes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Greater Overall Growth	21	9.6	10.5	10.5
	No Significant Growth	108	49.5	54.0	64.5
	Decrease in Amount of Growth	71	32.6	35.5	100.0
	Total	200	91.7	100.0	
Missing	System	18	8.3		
Total		218	100.0		

Open Space

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Greater Overall Growth	72	33.0	36.5	36.5
	No Significant Growth	104	47.7	52.8	89.3
	Decrease in Amount of Growth	21	9.6	10.7	100.0
	Total	197	90.4	100.0	
Missing	System	21	9.6		
Total		218	100.0		

Frequency Table

7. If more business, retail, commercial type services were to develop, what would be the most appropriate general pattern of development for them?

Locations for Business Development

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unincorporated Village of Poy Sippi	81	37.2	38.9	38.9
	Along STH 49	48	22.0	23.1	62.0
	Unincorporated Village of Borth	6	2.8	2.9	64.9
	Dispersed	27	12.4	13.0	77.9
	No additional development	46	21.1	22.1	100.0
	Total	208	95.4	100.0	
Missing	System	10	4.6		
Total		218	100.0		

8. If more light or heavy industrial type uses were to develop, what would be the most appropriate general pattern of development for them?

Locations for Industrial Development

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unincorporated Village of Poy Sippi	45	20.6	21.5	21.5
	Along STH 49	72	33.0	34.4	56.0
	Unincorporated Village of Borth	9	4.1	4.3	60.3
	Dispersed	25	11.5	12.0	72.2
	No additional development	58	26.6	27.8	100.0
	Total	209	95.9	100.0	
Missing	System	9	4.1		
Total		218	100.0		

The responses to questions 9 and 10 are placed at the back of this packet because they are open-ended questions.

Frequency Table

11. If more homes were to be developed, please indicate your preference regarding the following types of housing development:

Single Family Housing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Support	119	54.6	58.0	58.0
	Do Not Support but Accept	45	20.6	22.0	80.0
	Do Not Support	34	15.6	16.6	96.6
	Need More Info	7	3.2	3.4	100.0
	Total	205	94.0	100.0	
Missing	System	13	6.0		
Total		218	100.0		

Subdivision Development

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Support	35	16.1	17.9	17.9
	Do Not Support but Accept	37	17.0	19.0	36.9
	Do Not Support	114	52.3	58.5	95.4
	Need More Info	9	4.1	4.6	100.0
	Total	195	89.4	100.0	
Missing	System	23	10.6		
Total		218	100.0		

MF Housing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Support	20	9.2	10.5	10.5
	Do Not Support but Accept	33	15.1	17.3	27.7
	Do Not Support	127	58.3	66.5	94.2
	Need More Info	11	5.0	5.8	100.0
	Total	191	87.6	100.0	
Missing	System	27	12.4		
Total		218	100.0		

Mobile Homes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Support	16	7.3	8.2	8.2
	Do Not Support but Accept	28	12.8	14.4	22.7
	Do Not Support	144	66.1	74.2	96.9
	Need More Info	6	2.8	3.1	100.0
	Total	194	89.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	11.0		
Total		218	100.0		

Cluster Site Housing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Support	46	21.1	23.6	23.6
	Do Not Support but Accept	30	13.8	15.4	39.0
	Do Not Support	108	49.5	55.4	94.4
	Need More Info	11	5.0	5.6	100.0
	Total	195	89.4	100.0	
Missing	System	23	10.6		
Total		218	100.0		

Seasonal Homes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Support	52	23.9	26.4	26.4
	Do Not Support but Accept	63	28.9	32.0	58.4
	Do Not Support	76	34.9	38.6	97.0
	Need More Info	6	2.8	3.0	100.0
	Total	197	90.4	100.0	
Missing	System	21	9.6		
Total		218	100.0		

Hunting Cabins

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Support	52	23.9	26.7	26.7
	Do Not Support but Accept	63	28.9	32.3	59.0
	Do Not Support	71	32.6	36.4	95.4
	Need More Info	9	4.1	4.6	100.0
	Total	195	89.4	100.0	
Missing	System	23	10.6		
Total		218	100.0		

Frequency Table

12. Please indicate your preference regarding the following issues:

Small Business Opportunitites

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Support	154	70.6	74.4	74.4
	Do Not Support but Accept	25	11.5	12.1	86.5
	Do Not Support	21	9.6	10.1	96.6
	Need More Info	7	3.2	3.4	100.0
	Total	207	95.0	100.0	
Missing	System	11	5.0		
Total		218	100.0		

Publicly Owned Recreation Land

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Support	109	50.0	54.5	54.5
	Do Not Support but Accept	44	20.2	22.0	76.5
	Do Not Support	35	16.1	17.5	94.0
	Need More Info	12	5.5	6.0	100.0
	Total	200	91.7	100.0	
Missing	System	18	8.3		
Total		218	100.0		

Land Use Planning

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Support	110	50.5	55.8	55.8
	Do Not Support but Accept	38	17.4	19.3	75.1
	Do Not Support	23	10.6	11.7	86.8
	Need More info	26	11.9	13.2	100.0
	Total	197	90.4	100.0	
Missing	System	21	9.6		
Total		218	100.0		

Preserve Wetlands

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Support	165	75.7	82.1	82.1
	Do Not Support but Accept	20	9.2	10.0	92.0
	Do Not Support	10	4.6	5.0	97.0
	Need More Info	6	2.8	3.0	100.0
	Total	201	92.2	100.0	
Missing	System	17	7.8		
Total		218	100.0		

Preserve Farmlands

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Support	175	80.3	86.2	86.2
	Do Not Support but Accept	14	6.4	6.9	93.1
	Do Not Support	3	1.4	1.5	94.6
	Need More Info	11	5.0	5.4	100.0
	Total	203	93.1	100.0	
Missing	System	15	6.9		
Total		218	100.0		

Preserve Forestland

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Support	177	81.2	87.2	87.2
	Do Not Support but Accept	16	7.3	7.9	95.1
	Do Not Support	4	1.8	2.0	97.0
	Need More Info	6	2.8	3.0	100.0
	Total	203	93.1	100.0	
Missing	System	15	6.9		
Total		218	100.0		

Stream Protection

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Support	180	82.6	89.1	89.1
	Do Not Support but Accept	11	5.0	5.4	94.6
	Do Not Support	3	1.4	1.5	96.0
	Need More Info	8	3.7	4.0	100.0
	Total	202	92.7	100.0	
Missing	System	16	7.3		
Total		218	100.0		

Preserve Historic/Cultural Sites

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Support	161	73.9	80.1	80.1
	Do Not Support but Accept	22	10.1	10.9	91.0
	Do Not Support	2	.9	1.0	92.0
	Need More Info	16	7.3	8.0	100.0
	Total	201	92.2	100.0	
Missing	System	17	7.8		
Total		218	100.0		

Frequency Table

13. How should the town support the protection of the following resources?

Wetlands

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Financial Tax Incentives	52	23.9	26.7	26.7
	Land Acquisitions	54	24.8	27.7	54.4
	Voluntary Management	50	22.9	25.6	80.0
	Need More Information	39	17.9	20.0	100.0
	Total	195	89.4	100.0	
Missing	System	23	10.6		
Total		218	100.0		

Floodplains

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Financial Tax Incentives	34	15.6	17.4	17.4
	Land Acquisitions	34	15.6	17.4	34.9
	Voluntary Management	61	28.0	31.3	66.2
	Need More Information	66	30.3	33.8	100.0
	Total	195	89.4	100.0	
Missing	System	23	10.6		
Total		218	100.0		

Productive Farmlands

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Financial Tax Incentives	68	31.2	34.0	34.0
	Land Acquisitions	19	8.7	9.5	43.5
	Voluntary Management	80	36.7	40.0	83.5
	Need More Information	33	15.1	16.5	100.0
	Total	200	91.7	100.0	
Missing	System	18	8.3		
Total		218	100.0		

Woodlands/Wildlife Habitat

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Financial Tax Incentives	52	23.9	26.5	26.5
	Land Acquisitions	54	24.8	27.6	54.1
	Voluntary Management	59	27.1	30.1	84.2
	Need More Info	31	14.2	15.8	100.0
	Total	196	89.9	100.0	
Missing	System	22	10.1		
Total		218	100.0		

Areas adjacent to water features

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Financial Tax Incentives	31	14.2	16.1	16.1
	Land Acquisitions	51	23.4	26.4	42.5
	Voluntary Management	64	29.4	33.2	75.6
	Need More Info	47	21.6	24.4	100.0
	Total	193	88.5	100.0	
Missing	System	25	11.5		
Total		218	100.0		

Groundwater resources

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Financial Tax Incentives	34	15.6	17.4	17.4
	Land Acquisitions	31	14.2	15.9	33.3
	Voluntary Management	61	28.0	31.3	64.6
	Need More Info	69	31.7	35.4	100.0
	Total	195	89.4	100.0	
Missing	System	23	10.6		
Total		218	100.0		

Undeveloped Open Space

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Financial Tax Incentives	25	11.5	12.9	12.9
	Land Acquisitions	35	16.1	18.0	30.9
	Voluntary Management	74	33.9	38.1	69.1
	Need More Info	60	27.5	30.9	100.0
	Total	194	89.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	11.0		
Total		218	100.0		

Frequency Table

14. How would you rate the current facilities and public services available to town residents?

Town Hall

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below Average	18	8.3	10.4	10.4
	Average	114	52.3	65.9	76.3
	Above Average	21	9.6	12.1	88.4
	Very Good	20	9.2	11.6	100.0
	Total	173	79.4	100.0	
Missing	System	45	20.6		
Total		218	100.0		

Town Rds, condition

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below Average	26	11.9	13.8	13.8
	Average	109	50.0	57.7	71.4
	Above Average	33	15.1	17.5	88.9
	Very Good	21	9.6	11.1	100.0
	Total	189	86.7	100.0	
Missing	System	29	13.3		
Total		218	100.0		

Town Rds, snow removal

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below Average	23	10.6	12.5	12.5
	Average	99	45.4	53.8	66.3
	Above Average	37	17.0	20.1	86.4
	Very Good	25	11.5	13.6	100.0
	Total	184	84.4	100.0	
Missing	System	34	15.6		
Total		218	100.0		

Public Recreational Land

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below Average	18	8.3	10.0	10.0
	Average	103	47.2	57.2	67.2
	Above Average	39	17.9	21.7	88.9
	Very Good	20	9.2	11.1	100.0
	Total	180	82.6	100.0	
Missing	System	38	17.4		
Total		218	100.0		

Garbage/Recycling

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below Average	16	7.3	8.8	8.8
	Average	103	47.2	56.9	65.7
	Above Average	37	17.0	20.4	86.2
	Very Good	25	11.5	13.8	100.0
	Total	181	83.0	100.0	
Missing	System	37	17.0		
Total		218	100.0		

County Roads

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below Average	18	8.3	9.7	9.7
	Average	104	47.7	56.2	65.9
	Above Average	44	20.2	23.8	89.7
	Very Good	19	8.7	10.3	100.0
	Total	185	84.9	100.0	
Missing	System	33	15.1		
Total		218	100.0		

Fire Protection

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below Average	4	1.8	2.2	2.2
	Average	55	25.2	29.9	32.1
	Above Average	74	33.9	40.2	72.3
	Very Good	51	23.4	27.7	100.0
	Total	184	84.4	100.0	
Missing	System	34	15.6		
Total		218	100.0		

Law Enforcement

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below Average	44	20.2	24.4	24.4
	Average	89	40.8	49.4	73.9
	Above Average	25	11.5	13.9	87.8
	Very Good	22	10.1	12.2	100.0
	Total	180	82.6	100.0	
Missing	System	38	17.4		
Total		218	100.0		

EMS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below Average	6	2.8	3.3	3.3
	Average	71	32.6	39.4	42.8
	Above Average	60	27.5	33.3	76.1
	Very Good	43	19.7	23.9	100.0
	Total	180	82.6	100.0	
Missing	System	38	17.4		
Total		218	100.0		

Adult Education Opportunities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below Average	65	29.8	38.5	38.5
	Average	81	37.2	47.9	86.4
	Above Average	12	5.5	7.1	93.5
	Very Good	11	5.0	6.5	100.0
	Total	169	77.5	100.0	
Missing	System	49	22.5		
Total		218	100.0		

Post Office

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below Average	11	5.0	6.1	6.1
	Average	105	48.2	58.0	64.1
	Above Average	36	16.5	19.9	84.0
	Very Good	29	13.3	16.0	100.0
	Total	181	83.0	100.0	
Missing	System	37	17.0		
Total		218	100.0		

Library

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below Average	16	7.3	8.8	8.8
	Average	102	46.8	56.0	64.8
	Above Average	36	16.5	19.8	84.6
	Very Good	28	12.8	15.4	100.0
	Total	182	83.5	100.0	
Missing	System	36	16.5		
Total		218	100.0		

Frequency Table

15. How would you rate these same facilities and public services' ability to meet future needs of the town residents?

Town Hall

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below Average	36	16.5	21.8	21.8
	Average	94	43.1	57.0	78.8
	Above Average	22	10.1	13.3	92.1
	Very Good	13	6.0	7.9	100.0
	Total	165	75.7	100.0	
Missing	System	53	24.3		
Total		218	100.0		

Town Rds, condition

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below Average	33	15.1	18.9	18.9
	Average	98	45.0	56.0	74.9
	Above Average	27	12.4	15.4	90.3
	Very Good	17	7.8	9.7	100.0
	Total	175	80.3	100.0	
Missing	System	43	19.7		
Total		218	100.0		

Town Rds, snow removal

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below Average	25	11.5	14.5	14.5
	Average	98	45.0	56.6	71.1
	Above Average	32	14.7	18.5	89.6
	Very Good	18	8.3	10.4	100.0
	Total	173	79.4	100.0	
Missing	System	45	20.6		
Total		218	100.0		

Public Recreational Land

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below Average	21	9.6	12.2	12.2
	Average	105	48.2	61.0	73.3
	Above Average	30	13.8	17.4	90.7
	Very Good	16	7.3	9.3	100.0
	Total	172	78.9	100.0	
Missing	System	46	21.1		
Total		218	100.0		

Garbage/Recycling

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below Average	19	8.7	11.1	11.1
	Average	100	45.9	58.5	69.6
	Above Average	34	15.6	19.9	89.5
	Very Good	18	8.3	10.5	100.0
	Total	171	78.4	100.0	
Missing	System	47	21.6		
Total		218	100.0		

County Roads

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below Average	18	8.3	10.3	10.3
	Average	105	48.2	60.3	70.7
	Above Average	33	15.1	19.0	89.7
	Very Good	18	8.3	10.3	100.0
	Total	174	79.8	100.0	
Missing	System	44	20.2		
Total		218	100.0		

Fire Protection

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below Average	10	4.6	5.9	5.9
	Average	67	30.7	39.6	45.6
	Above Average	58	26.6	34.3	79.9
	Very Good	34	15.6	20.1	100.0
	Total	169	77.5	100.0	
Missing	System	49	22.5		
Total		218	100.0		

Law Enforcement

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below Average	42	19.3	25.0	25.0
	Average	80	36.7	47.6	72.6
	Above Average	28	12.8	16.7	89.3
	Very Good	18	8.3	10.7	100.0
	Total	168	77.1	100.0	
Missing	System	50	22.9		
Total		218	100.0		

EMS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below Average	13	6.0	7.7	7.7
	Average	80	36.7	47.6	55.4
	Above Average	45	20.6	26.8	82.1
	Very Good	30	13.8	17.9	100.0
	Total	168	77.1	100.0	
Missing	System	50	22.9		
Total		218	100.0		

Adult Education Opportunities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below Average	59	27.1	36.2	36.2
	Average	74	33.9	45.4	81.6
	Above Average	18	8.3	11.0	92.6
	Very Good	12	5.5	7.4	100.0
	Total	163	74.8	100.0	
Missing	System	55	25.2		
Total		218	100.0		

Post Office

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below Average	23	10.6	13.5	13.5
	Average	101	46.3	59.4	72.9
	Above Average	26	11.9	15.3	88.2
	Very Good	20	9.2	11.8	100.0
	Total	170	78.0	100.0	
Missing	System	48	22.0		
Total		218	100.0		

Library

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below Average	30	13.8	17.4	17.4
	Average	88	40.4	51.2	68.6
	Above Average	30	13.8	17.4	86.0
	Very Good	24	11.0	14.0	100.0
	Total	172	78.9	100.0	
Missing	System	46	21.1		
Total		218	100.0		

9. Please provide a short summary of the primary reason(s) that you choose to live or own property in the Town of Poy Sippi?

- Being able to choose our own life style.
- Open country and the water (Lake Poygan)
- Quiet, very little traffic, open and one can enjoy the wildlife, natural beauty.
- Peaceful, quiet.
- My agricultural land, which I wanted to use for recreational use in the future, is rapidly being surrounded by residential homes.
 - We like the area.
 - East to good shopping, Berlin hospital, reasonably quiet.
 - Recreational opportunities fishing and hunting.
 - To get out of the city we love the country.
 - I enjoy the country atmosphere. Knowing all my neighbors.
 - Schools, stores, bank, good neighbors.
 - Peace and quiet.
 - Small quiet town.
 - Property has been in family for four generations.
 - This area is a nice area to live in. It meets all our needs.
 - It is a very quiet place.
 - Small town feeling, knowing your neighbors, knowing most residents by first names.
 - Good as any.
 - A nice place to live – “quiet” and has good neighbors.
 - Like the location and small town atmosphere.
 - Business and home.
 - We choose to live in Poy Sippi 30 years ago because there were several stores, beauty shop, hardware, and bank. Now there is nothing. We must go out of town to shop.

- Peace and quiet low traffic, good schools, great library, helpfulness between neighbors.
Wouldn't live elsewhere.
- Not overdeveloped with subdivisions where there are multiple houses right next to each other.
- Quiet; trust my neighbors, beautiful land (no malls).
- Close to good hunting and fishing.
- The small town feeling and the school.
- Hunting and Fishing.
- Purchased for good fishing and hunting cottage – nice location, quiet area.
- I bought a farm at a reasonable price and I like being out in the country.
- Quiet area with very little development – hunting land.
- None
- Reasonable price, no close neighbors.
- I enjoy hunting and fishing.
- The opportunities for hunting and fishing.
- Friendly people, good hunting, relatives.
- Small town atmosphere.
- Sell lots for new homeowners.
- Not crowded small town feeling, friendly people.
- Small community with nearby conveniences – gas station store, elementary school, proximity to the Fox Valley.
- Love open space and country living.
- I have lived here all my life and owned this place for 50 years with my husband and we enjoy the area.
- It's a small area where neighbors know one another and keep an eye for each other.
- Quiet area with excellent recreational opportunities.

- The clean atmosphere – Christian influence through the churches long standing presence.
Lovely setting.
- I was born here and never left.
- I purchased my property because I enjoy the serenity of the woodlands and surrounding farms. Property tax is affordable.
- Small community with good ambulance/fire dept. Easy to bank, post office, store. If larger town even better.
- I have lived there 52 years it's my home it's easy access to Berlin and other cities.
- Hunting.
- I was born here and it is a good location for outdoor sports, like hunting and fishing.
- Live on lake.
- Peace and quiet.
- It's a quiet area with a wonderful school.
- Little development, privacy, woods and fields.
- Enjoy nature. The small town feel from knowing your neighbors. No traffic noise.
- I was born and raised here, I have lived and worked in other areas of the state, including the Milwaukee, Madison and Fox Valley Metro areas – small town life is good!
- Bought part of family farm from dad. Enjoy fishing and hunting, Willow Creek area.
- Don't live in Poy Sippi, but always admired the cozy and warm atmosphere, and the friendly people. Can remember folks coming to Poy Sippi 70 years ago.
- Open Space and water – beautiful area peace and quiet.
- Clean area, good schools friendly people.
- Great recreational opportunities, quiet area.
- Poy Sippi is a quiet and pleasant area to raise a family.
- Watching wildlife.
- I like the quiet farming community.

- Quiet atmosphere. Not many subdivisions. Please keep Poy Sippi from becoming a bedroom community weekend people and permanent residents get along well.
- My parents lived there – I inherited it. What's good – property is cheap.
- Clean, friendly, private – quiet area.
- People are friendly but still mind their own business.
- Making a living.
- It is nice and quiet place, farming and wildlife should be left alone. If we start to develop our country there will be no county!
- Quiet living peaceful – near to our business!
- Not crowded small town.
- Poy Sippi
- The small town feeling, open concept scenery.
- Affordable housing close to public school.
- That was in our price range.
- It is a small community with little business/factory influence.
- It's on the outskirts of town and it's just a good place to live. (Small town living).
- Grew up here, quiet, peaceful, pretty, I have always lived here and I have no desire to ever leave.
- Like living in the country with no or few neighbors and low cost housing.
- Peace and quiet of open, undeveloped countryside.
- Quiet recreational area close to my home community.
- We both lived in this general area and for the school system we have here.
- It's the "rural country" whey we chose to build here 50 years ago. "Borth Haven" developed after that time.
- Open Space, recreation.
- Quality of life in a rural atmosphere.
- Quiet rural life without city traffic or crime problems.

- It's pretty good hunting area. Leave it that way!
- Beautiful town located along the Pine River. Excellent school, excellent fire dept., close to fishing, hunting & ski resort.
- The peace and quiet.
- Lived here all my life – has been a pleasant and friendly place to live.
- We are away from heavy traffic.
- Peace and quiet – small town atmosphere.
- Quiet, friendly, small town atmosphere which also has basic amenities – great place to raise a family away, but close enough to major cities.
- The quiet – lack of traffic, development.
- We purchased an existing aqua-cultural farm.
- We like living in a small town with most of the things we need.
- Born here never got work done so had time to move.
- Centrally located.
- Quiet, private, friendly, trusting.
- I own this property because it was my family home.
- Was born and raised here. There is a post office, general store and banks. Also a school and close to hospital and doctors. Also have a fine fire department and ambulance services churches.
- It's a nice quiet rural area that's just beautiful.
- Open space, agricultural land.
- The community is clean and the business people that are here in town provide very good service.
- Mid nineteenth century homestead. Wonderful and friendly neighbors! Clean Air! Willow Creek, the Pine River and Lake Poygan. (The young must leave for careers and good paying jobs, however Poy Sippi is still home as family members stay.)
- Quiet and beautiful.

- I enjoy the un-populated peace of the country.
- Small town/family atmosphere, heritage and because it is not all grown up.
- Small town, open spaces, friendly people.
- I own the property for recreation and also it had been in the family for over 75 years.
- I was born and raised here and the people are always friendly.
- Quiet surrounding – good neighbors.
- We like the area. Open space. Not too crowded yet.
- Having very good neighbors.
- We bought a business in Poy Sippi and we moved here. Nice small friendly town.
- Nice community – friendly area – pretty.
- Nice little community and close to everything here, friendly people.
- Small town that has all the necessities for living here, without having to travel far.
- Good neighbors and the quiet.
- If we ever do move up there, it's just beautiful and peaceful and good environment.
- We moved from a big city, because we wanted a small town. We have been coming to Poy Sippi for over 30 years.
- It's quiet and peaceful. Not crowded. Friendly people, perfect the way it is.
- It quiet and quaint.
- Moved here 6 months ago from larger city for the peace and quiet.
- I have lived around this area for 40 years.
- Good farmland conducive to agricultural scenic environment – clean water and air.
- Small town with no big business, and no stop lights. Few fences.
- It is a clean, friendly area. I have friends and relatives living in the area. I grew up there.
- Live here all my life.
- Was uncrowded! Peace and quiet – neighbors that want the same "country living" as we do.
- Family has been here about 140 years and anyplace else would be about the same, it's what you make it, not where you are.

- The diversity of area.
- I was born here.
- Quiet – Home.
- Excellent retirement area.
- Have Lake Property will be all year round soon.
- Nice quiet – everyone says – “hello have a nice day”.
- Lack of business – commercial and heavy industrial.
- Beautiful, scenic area with low crime, clean air and water. It’s close to the larger cities without large city influence. Quiet except for the large trucks that speed through town.
- It’s a quiet peaceful place to live.
- It’s a small, quiet and close enough to drive to the Fox Valley. Hunting and fishing are readily available. Poy Sippi has a good elementary school, and overall this is a good place to raise a family.
- Small town friendliness.
- Quiet
- Rural living, access to valley. Quiet with little intrusion by tourist’s “recreationing”.
- The beauty of the area, good roads, good services and shopping.
- Moved from Oshkosh love the peace and quiet and not many houses in the area.
- Hunting
- Friendly people, I grew up there. Slower pace.
- Our club members have been hunting and fishing the area for forty years.
- Good place to raise a family.
- Lake Poygan.
- It’s a nice area – close to Oshkosh nice and rural – but too many houses are springing up.
- I like to hunt and my land is mostly marsh.
- Quiet small town atmosphere, close to excellent outdoors-recreational areas.
- Country living – fresh air.

- Rural environment, small town, you know and trust your neighbors.
- Privacy, quiet and unintrusive.
- Because of the quiet, open spaces, I can walk out my back door and hunt. Neighbors are not all packed in tight. Everyone is friendly.
- It is not too crowded, it is quiet, we have good neighbors, and they are friendly and easy to get along with. We help one another when it is needed.
- Small town quality of life.
- Being able to walk to Post Office, grocery store, etc.
- Small town – knowing who your neighbors are – small school and classrooms.
- Small community, safe, friendly, good service from town Gov., good town board and fire dept. and rescue squad.
- I like to live here because it's still small and quiet. Not a lot of businesses and new homes. Now I can still relax easier.
- Out of the city and yet still have neighbors but not too close.
- Because of the lake.
- A safe place to live and all services are within walking distances.
- A place to get away from the hustle/fast pace" life style of the Fox River Valley and I would like it to stay that way.
- Farm and country oriented – friendly people.
- Open spaces
- Nice area
- Quiet, not too populated.
- Quiet, not too many people yet.
- Open space – minimal development.
- Being out in the country with few neighbors. Price of taxes.
- Great people, small town atmosphere, great location for growth.
- Quiet, rural, price was good.

- A quiet small town (like it to stay that way).
- Large areas of open country should be preserved – wildlife etc., but development is also needed.
- Quiet small town atmosphere.
- People are friendly and helpful to each other.
- Open spaces, wilderness, very little noise, congestion or pollution peaceful.
- We enjoy the “hometown” feeling and the general safety of the area.
- Low Crime rate – excellent fire and ambulance service – beauty of area – availability of services (banks – churches etc.)
- Far from the city, i.e. Appleton/Oshkosh, far from congestion, people. Neighbors are very good people, town in general is very laid back atmosphere with helpful people. It’s a nice place to live.
- We love not have close neighbors. Love the solitude. This is why we live here!
- Like the small quiet rural setting.
- Rural setting close to Fox cities.

10. What problems or concerns exist currently within the Town of Poy Sippi that you feel should be given immediate attention?

- We have no problems.
- Property which is not properly taken care of – (looks like “shanty town” in some areas)
- Nothing
- Rural security concerns.
- There should be an ordinance that would make residents responsible for keeping their pets from running loose and messing on other resident’s property.
- None
- Traffic on Highway D. People aren’t doing the speed limit, plus pass on yellow lines! People trashing public land, throwing garbage everywhere, furniture in the creek.
- Too much residential building.
- Sewer prices.
- Cats and dogs running loose in the area. Residents should be responsible for keeping their pets on their own property.
- I think they should deposit fish in our pond to attract more fishermen.
- Jealousy between people – don’t want someone to do better or have more than someone else.
- Its OK.
- Really don’t know – I never lived there – right now because I’m older – I would pass property on to my children.
- Better law enforcement.
- We have to go out of town for almost everything.
- People traveling through town see our poorest kept homes and other buildings. Where is pride of ownership on our main street?
- Unauthorized junkyards and people are throwing junk in ditches beside the road, should be stopped.

- People not thinking before building a house out in the low lands!
- Lights and better care of public boat landing at Badger Drive and 35th.
- Its OK.
- Some town roads lack maintenance.
- Prejudice town chair members.
- Timely snow removal.
- The taxes I pay are too high and are getting worse every year, for the seasonal property I own.
- People walking their dogs unleashed.
- Township roads need improvement.
- Warning sirens that can be heard outside the Village of Poy Sippi in all directions.
- None
- Lack of law enforcement due to location at Far East end of county.
- None
- The current (and continuing) troubles with vandalism, theft, etc.
- Maintenance of current facilities needs to be improved cases in point – the boat landing at end of Badger Drive.
- We could use more businesses – money would stay in our community.
- None
- No business or retail of any kind.
- It all good.
- Nothing
- Inconvenience for major shopping, it's about 13 to 20 miles from the cities of Berlin, Weyauwega, Winneconne and Omro.
- Have not found any real problems. Lately a large number of homes filling the area.
- None

- It would be nice to have a closer location to get milk, and staples. I miss the old grocery stores on 49.
- It is already growing to fast.
- Need more recreational opportunities for young people in the village – try to reduce the amount of vandalism at the parks, etc.
- Chemicals and fertilizer used on farms near wetlands.
- No comment.
- Not very much police protection, slow response time.
- DNR and the county, giving out over 100 doe permits to individuals who own less than 60 acres, for wildlife damage to crops. In today's farming world, 60 acres is not a farming operation it's a hobby! Why ruin everyone's hunting chances, for the benefit of a few people. I think the policies of handing out massive amounts of free Doe permits (over 100) to individuals who own less than 500 acres should be stopped. Deer are by nature browsers not hogs! Last year our Deer Season was ruined. We hunted 7 days by Poy Sippi and saw 1 deer. A neighboring farmer, who owns about 60 acres, with about 1/2 planted in corn, received 100 permits to shoot deer. Approximately 4 hunters harvested approximately 100 deer over the summer. This is outrageous, If this policy continued, I know many hunters that will band together to fight this.
- We need to travel a minimum of 15-20 miles for modern convenience.
- The amount of houses being built where farms used to be, but people have to live somewhere (and throwing junk out the back door).
- No local police force.
- I miss water coming over the dam for the little electricity that's generated; lack of skilled trades – electricians/carpenters; its gotten noisy/rowdy late at night again like it was 20 years ago no village. Change in atmosphere since I was a kid – you don't see hardly any kids out during the day or adults just our around (like Merrill Paulson) – Main Street seems deserted – people don't mix or wonder around. I haven't said this very well but it just feels different in

Poy Sippi – Now it's more like a collection of buildings than a community. I never see a pickup ball game or somebody out chopping ice off the sidewalks or talking.

- Taxes snow removal, lack of cooperation for telephone and electricity hook up.
- Outsiders dumping their garbage on people's land.
- None – good job.
- Not any place to pick up things to eat like the Pig. Maybe a small store.
- Very poor "Police" surveillance. No control "speed" "rowdyism" being born.
- Need a factory or industry for people to work at rather than having to drive a distance.
- None as of now – we feel additional people/industry will create problems.
- Hwy. 49 should not have parking on it.
- The repair of roads.
- The price of sewer use.
- I have no problems living here.
- I do not know of any concerns in the town of Poy Sippi.
- No recreational activities for children or teens.
- Any new residence should be required to have a minimum of 20 acres to build outside the Village of Poy Sippi.
- More bike lanes on Cty. D instead of gravel for walking and biking – lack of cable lines (for cable TV) – Election process should be more automated. A computerized listing of residents and their addresses should be printed out so that everything doesn't have to be handwritten when you register. The current method slows down the process.
- Farmers owning or renting additional land joining their farm, should use a driveway (land) to go from one to the next and not the county or state road. The manure or mud from in or out the fields that "drops off" on the public road is certainly littering! Farmers within the village should not be allowed to haul out and spread rotten manure on the fields on days when the wind is in direction of blowing the odor in direction of a residence. The odor penetrates closed windows and even central air conditioning.

- Law Enforcement – lack there of.
- More and more houses.
- Too many houses going up!
- Traffic control and no police protection. Fix Street signs that are tipped, it doesn't present a good appearance.
- High property taxes and sewer.
- Junk cars parked along streets – people leaving their property looking like junkyards.
- Sanitary sewer bills are too expensive.
- Shopping opportunities.
- Some residences have broken down vehicles in yards and street, the sight of old, dilapidated homes on Hwy. 49 as people drive through town are unsightly.
- There should be more control on people keeping their property clean – garbage picked-up – not having so many junk cars.
- None
- To many new homes in rural areas.
- To many empty buildings on Main Street. The traffic going through town at high speed.
- New commercial development.
- The sidewalks are deplorable and also their current condition is hazardous.
- Water drainage on Welsch Road! No flowing ditches – awful.
- County and back roads need to be kept plowed. No cable TV in country.
- For our needs it is perfect.
- It has become almost totally a “bedroom” community a community pride has suffered.
- It's dying; there's no shopping, fast food, and no work. You have to travel for all of this.
- Would be better if roadsides were cut often – weeds need to be kept down.
- Our taxes are to high they keep going up every year.
- Nothing.
- More unattractive housing over the past years, un kept places.

- Two many dogs barking.
- Sidewalk's – better lights for streets – benches to sit on and rest while out walking.
- None (we love it).
- More police patrols, to know if there is a crime something will be done about it.
- Need better roads.
- Need more law enforcement – “too many speeders”.
- People can mind their own business around the area keep their noses out.
- The vacant buildings are becoming eyesores, the poor condition – broken sidewalks, the ugly streetlights and poles. The township does not spend money to improve the appearance of the town.
- More trees downtown better holiday decorations. Bowling alley front is eyesore.
- Building homes on less than 10 acres of land.
- Up keep of roads poor – (not snow removal) regular maintenance.
- Lack of police patrols – starting to get to crowded.
- Taxes are too high; the roads are better than they need to be, save the salt. People can put chains on if they need to travel in winter.
- No food stores.
- I don't live there.
- Can't think of any reasons.
- None.
- Don't know of any – love it here.
- Not any at this time.
- We need traffic control – too many semis using their Jake breaks. The town has much money but does not spend it on town improvements such as curbs, sidewalks, street lights, no police no postal delivery.
- People breaking up large pieces of land and selling small parcels for people to build houses on.

- Not enough police coverage.
- Satisfied as it is.
- Vandalism, speeding on roads.
- Nothing
- Great place
- Lack of job opportunities, low-income level. Lack of entertainment, culture.
- None
- Have to travel too far for services.
- Too many houses springing up all over the rural landscape.
- None
- Street lights, sidewalks, more police presence.
- Lack of future vision, this town will grow; will we be prepared for the change?
- Too much development in Village of Borth.
- All is well and we have room enough to enjoy life.
- Need for crossing walks in Poy Sippi (on Main Street).
- County H (Pine River side) – traffic is way too fast.
- Starting to get big city people with city problems coming with them.
- The party's that go on late on weekend nights down at the park in the picnic area. The drunks get too noisy.
- Traffic, they speed thru Borth even though it's only 30 mph. Too many children in the area – not enough patrol.
- More stores, doctors more things to do.
- Slowing auto traffic down on side streets because of the large amount of pedestrian traffic (at least 2 blocks from Main Street).
- Fed up with the greed associated with developers without any regard to nature or earth preservation.

- New homes on farmland, beauty of countryside is slipping away – heavy traffic and pollution starting to show.
- Winter road plowing. One year ago, new gravel was placed on road shoulders the week after Thanksgiving, one week later we had snow and all new gravel was plowed into ditches, great waste of money. Our mailbox has been replaced twice in past 5 years after being bent by plows.
- None
- Too many new houses being built in or near Borth.
- Employment opportunities.
- Do not maintain roads. Cutting grass or roadsides.
- Park, Dam, Bridge, Roads, Factory's, for growth of town plastic molding and fabricating plant.
- Property tax too high – but that is not town of Poy Sippi's fault.
- Phone service is more expensive.
- Poor policing and speed limits.
- Rapid, unchecked growth is going to ruin the very reason why many people move/live here.
- When there are problems law enforcement seem to take an extra long time to respond.
- Traffic
- Lots of vacationers during the summer, lots of traffic due to this, but not much the town can do about this problem.
- No problems – seems fine.
- Sewer and water.
- Plow Big Horn Road pay taxes can't get to it to hunt and cut wood spring to wet summer to hot fall to wet.
- Tax equality on open land – recreation vs. pastureland and farmland use taxation.

ISSUES & OPPORTUNITIES

APPENDICES

- Table B-1 Waushara County Population by MCD, 1950 to 2005
- Table B-2 Net Migration by Sex and Age, Waushara County, 1990 to 2000
- Table B-3 Population Density, 2000
- Table B-4 Population by Age Cohort, 1990
- Table B-5 Population by Age Cohort, 2000
- Table B-6 Persons per Household, 1990
- Table B-7 Persons per Household, 2000
- Table B-8 Households by Type, 1990
- Table B-9 Households by Type, 2000
- Table B-10 Waushara County Population by Race, 1990
- Table B-11 Population by Race, 2000
- Table B-12 First Ancestry* Reported, Top 6 in Waushara County, 2000
- Table B-13 Top 5 Ancestries for Each Group D Communities
- Table B-14 Persons of Hispanic Origin, 1990 and 2000
- Table B-15 Earnings as a Portion of Household Income, 1999
- Table B-16 Comparative Income Characteristics, 1989 and 1999
- Table B-17 Household Income by Range, 1999

Table B-18 Poverty Status, 1989

Table B-19 Persons in Poverty by Age as a Share of the Total Population,
1989

Table B-20 Poverty Status, 1999

Table B-21 Persons in Poverty by Age as a Share of the Total Population,
1999

Table B-22 Population Estimates, Waushara County 1970 to 2030

Table B-23 Total Number of Households in Waushara County, 1970 to 2000

Table B-24 Estimated Households by MCD, Waushara County, 2000 to 2030

Table B-1. Waushara County Population by MCD, 1950 to 2005

Jurisdiction	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	DOA 2001	DOA 2002	DOA 2003	DOA 2004	DOA 2005	Percent Change 1990-2000
C. Berlin (pt.)	33	45	41	91	67	83	83	85	86	84	83	23.88%
C. Wautoma	1,376	1,466	1,624	1,629	1,784	1,998	2,070	2,118	2,110	2,115	2,096	12.00%
V. Coloma	338	312	336	367	383	461	460	467	461	467	469	20.37%
V. Hancock	449	367	404	419	382	463	462	463	462	460	453	21.20%
V. Lohrville	206	225	213	336	368	408	409	409	415	414	411	10.87%
V. Plainfield	680	660	642	813	839	899	898	896	899	894	893	7.15%
V. Redgranite	648	588	645	976	1,009	1,040	1,037	2,001	2,011	2,019	2,051	3.07%
V. Wild Rose	582	594	585	741	753	765	754	756	759	758	746	1.59%
T. Aurora	731	780	802	890	846	971	980	1,005	1,038	1,061	1,057	14.78%
T. Bloomfield	801	770	798	931	922	1,018	1,020	1,027	1,032	1,045	1,043	10.41%
T. Coloma ^a	339	355	382	437	499	660	758	699	704	722	735	32.26%
T. Dakota	400	521	752	994	1,092	1,259	1,262	1,273	1,272	1,265	1,269	15.29%
T. Deerfield	417	340	367	445	454	629	639	650	653	653	666	38.55%
T. Hancock	480	354	346	426	467	531	539	547	546	560	566	13.70%
T. Leon	546	520	651	844	992	1,281	1,312	1,355	1,371	1,389	1,411	29.13%
T. Marion	746	700	877	1,333	1,478	2,065	2,077	2,121	2,129	2,163	2,207	39.72%
T. Mount Morris	451	422	517	685	767	1,092	1,112	1,133	1,125	1,121	1,119	42.37%
T. Oasis	389	364	346	403	389	405	403	403	402	396	399	4.11%
T. Plainfield	476	449	447	574	529	533	534	547	549	549	558	0.76%
T. Poy Sippi	830	809	823	913	929	972	974	974	971	974	971	4.63%
T. Richford	386	317	322	404	455	588	595	602	606	608	608	29.23%
T. Rose	420	287	319	515	486	595	597	600	606	611	615	22.43%
T. Saxeville	535	506	612	776	846	974	982	991	997	999	1,014	15.13%
T. Springwater	389	366	584	924	1,011	1,389	1,401	1,405	1,413	1,420	1,423	37.39%
T. Warren	636	708	637	573	550	675	693	707	710	712	708	22.73%
T. Wautoma	636	672	723	1,087	1,088	1,312	1,314	1,326	1,329	1,347	1,347	20.59%
Waushara County ^a	13,920	13,497	14,795	18,526	19,385	23,066	23,365	24,560	24,656	24,806	24,918	18.99%
Region ^a	366,887	413,397	475,090	511,033	542,712	609,438	614,213	622,920	628,125	633,581	638,699	12.29%
Wisconsin ^a	3,434,575	3,951,777	4,417,821	4,705,642	4,891,769	5,363,701	5,400,004	5,453,896	5,490,718	5,532,955	5,580,000	9.65%

^a 2000 Census numbers have been adjusted through the Count Question Resolution Program (CQR) 8/30/02.

Source: U.S. Census: 1950, 1960, 1970, 1980, 1990, 2000; WI DOA 2001, 2005.

Table B-2. Net Migration by Sex and Age, Waushara County, 1990 to 2000

Age, 1990	Age, 2000	Male Net Migration	Female Net Migration	Total Net Migration	Age Group	Total Pop Change
B95-00	0-4	-1	23	22	0-4	-83
B90-95	5-9	153	128	281	5-9	62
0-4	10-14	288	246	534	10-14	333
5-9	15-19	132	86	218	15-19	428
10-14	20-24	-246	-299	-545	20-24	-3
15-19	25-29	-93	-70	-163	25-29	-242
20-24	30-34	164	184	348	30-34	-177
25-29	35-39	316	227	543	35-39	396
30-34	40-44	247	210	457	40-44	548
35-39	45-49	184	216	400	45-49	694
40-44	50-54	175	176	351	50-54	599
45-49	55-59	176	222	398	55-59	303
50-54	60-64	273	257	530	60-64	209
55-59	65-69	268	134	402	65-69	101
60-64	70-74	103	48	151	70-74	250
65-69	75-79	5	-45	-40	75-79	130
70-74	80-84	-30	-36	-66	80-84	87
75-79	85-89	-46	-33	-79	85-89	34
80-84	90-94	-16	-16	-32	90 & Over	100
85-89	95-99	-3	-20	-23		
90 & over	100 & over	0	0	0		
Total Population		2,049	1,638	3,687	Total	3,769

Source: WI DOA, 2005.

Table B-3. Population Density, 2000

Jurisdiction	Pop '00	Land area in sq. mi	Persons per sq mi
C. Berlin (pt.)	83	0.76	109
C. Wautoma	1,998	2.5	799
V. Coloma	461	1.06	435
V. Hancock	463	1.09	425
V. Lohrville	408	1.22	334
V. Plainfield	899	1.3	692
V. Redgranite	1,040	2.22	468
V. Wild Rose	765	1.32	580
T. Aurora	971	34.23	28
T. Bloomfield	1,018	35.41	29
T. Coloma	660	33.07	20
T. Dakota	1,259	33.16	38
T. Deerfield	629	34.67	18
T. Hancock	531	33.45	16
T. Leon	1,281	36	36
T. Marion	2,065	33.55	62
T. Mount Morris	1,092	34.22	32
T. Oasis	405	35.03	12
T. Plainfield	533	33.95	16
T. Poy Sippi	972	32.3	30
T. Richford	588	34.57	17
T. Rose	595	34.88	17
T. Saxeville	974	36.07	27
T. Springwater	1,389	33.53	41
T. Warren	675	32.54	21
T. Wautoma	1,312	33.94	39
Waushara County	23,066	626.04	37
Wisconsin	5,363,701	65,497.82	82

Source: U. S. Census, 2000.

Table B-4. Population by Age Cohort, 1990

Jurisdiction	Less Than 5 yrs	5 to 19 yrs	20 to 24 yrs	25 to 44 yrs	45 to 64 yrs	65 yrs and Older	Total Population	Median Age
C. Berlin (pt.)	5	19	6	22	10	5	67	30.3
C. Wautoma	114	314	90	479	286	501	1,784	40.0
V. Coloma	15	87	12	111	68	90	383	39.7
V. Hancock	34	74	22	85	89	78	382	36.4
V. Lohrville	24	83	23	116	66	56	368	34.0
V. Plainfield	59	217	43	234	132	154	839	33.9
V. Redgranite	71	224	48	255	189	222	1,009	36.7
V. Wild Rose	40	127	31	165	131	182	676	42.0
T. Aurora	49	203	59	245	178	112	846	35.3
T. Bloomfield	60	232	51	263	202	114	922	33.6
T. Coloma	28	119	16	146	131	59	499	37.6
T. Dakota	84	244	57	298	242	167	1,092	35.2
T. Deerfield	32	79	11	131	113	88	454	41.2
T. Hancock	34	95	24	130	102	82	467	37.8
T. Leon	56	180	45	274	273	164	992	40.7
T. Marion	57	233	51	369	423	345	1,478	46.8
T. Mount Morris	50	119	16	193	214	175	767	45.8
T. Oasis	26	96	14	116	83	54	389	35.2
T. Plainfield	51	126	37	156	105	54	529	31.1
T. Poy Sippi	65	200	45	286	175	158	929	35.1
T. Richford	54	108	27	125	91	50	455	31.4
T. Rose	20	110	17	139	107	93	486	39.6
T. Saxeville	49	185	47	229	210	126	846	37.3
T. Springwater	58	152	36	237	300	305	1,088	50.6
T. Warren	34	112	19	154	126	105	550	40.3
T. Wautoma	70	222	34	301	240	221	1,088	40.5
Waushara County	1,239	3,960	881	5,259	4,286	3,760	19,385	38.6
Wisconsin	365,622	1,077,027	363,969	1,544,897	890,098	650,156	4,891,769	32.9

Source: U. S. Census, 1990.

Table B-5. Population by Age Cohort, 2000

Jurisdiction	Less Than 5 yrs	5 to 19 yrs	20 to 24 yrs	25 to 44 yrs	45 to 64 yrs	65 yrs and Older	Total Population	Median Age
C. Berlin (pt.)	8	13	4	34	15	9	83	35.5
C. Wautoma	116	426	126	509	351	470	1,998	38.8
V. Coloma	37	86	20	125	98	95	461	39.1
V. Hancock	21	111	12	112	114	93	463	40.9
V. Lohrville	21	83	15	100	107	82	408	42.5
V. Plainfield	60	222	59	255	168	135	899	34.5
V. Redgranite	57	230	53	256	215	229	1,040	39.3
V. Wild Rose	42	156	26	174	163	204	765	43.2
T. Aurora	51	226	41	285	259	109	971	37.6
T. Bloomfield	57	226	38	297	275	125	1,018	40.1
T. Coloma ⁺	20	140	21	154	223	190	748	48.2
T. Dakota	78	282	56	320	314	209	1,259	39.8
T. Deerfield	18	126	9	168	189	119	629	44.1
T. Hancock	21	124	11	123	171	81	531	42.8
T. Leon	68	216	41	307	417	232	1,281	45.4
T. Marion	78	353	58	447	629	500	2,065	48.4
T. Mount Morris	43	201	32	228	356	232	1,092	47.2
T. Oasis	16	108	14	99	105	63	405	39.4
T. Plainfield	23	140	27	142	134	67	533	36.8
T. Poy Sippi	53	208	42	289	227	153	972	38.7
T. Richford	42	176	22	139	128	81	588	37.2
T. Rose	26	108	25	150	187	99	595	44.0
T. Saxeville	53	188	22	263	281	167	974	42.6
T. Springwater	43	252	35	293	417	349	1,389	48.7
T. Warren	39	139	32	176	180	109	675	40.3
T. Wautoma	71	253	44	328	363	253	1,312	43.4
Waushara County	1,162	4,793	885	5,773	6,086	4,455	23,154	42.1
Wisconsin	342,340	1,189,753	357,292	1,581,690	1,190,047	702,553	5,363,675	36.0

⁺Coloma Pop not yet corrected for age cohort data

Source: U. S. Census, 2000.

Table B-6. Persons per Household, 1990

Jurisdiction	Household Size												Total Households	Average Household Size
	1 Person		2 Person		3 Person		4 Person		5 Person		6 or more Person			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
C. Berlin (pt.)	4	18.18%	8	36.36%	0	0.00%	3	13.64%	7	31.82%	0	0.00%	22	3.05
C. Wautoma	254	33.96%	256	34.22%	109	14.57%	78	10.43%	35	4.68%	16	2.14%	748	2.25
V. Coloma	53	33.33%	44	27.67%	24	15.09%	23	14.47%	14	8.81%	1	0.63%	159	2.41
V. Hancock	58	35.37%	52	31.71%	18	10.98%	22	13.41%	10	6.10%	4	2.44%	164	2.33
V. Lohrville	30	21.13%	55	38.73%	23	16.20%	18	12.68%	11	7.75%	5	3.52%	142	2.59
V. Plainfield	94	29.01%	95	29.32%	49	15.12%	47	14.51%	29	8.95%	10	3.09%	324	2.55
V. Redgranite	130	30.88%	146	34.68%	60	14.25%	50	11.88%	18	4.28%	17	4.04%	421	2.40
V. Wild Rose	125	40.45%	89	28.80%	42	13.59%	35	11.33%	14	4.53%	4	1.29%	309	2.15
T. Aurora	42	14.19%	109	36.82%	56	18.92%	49	16.55%	26	8.78%	14	4.73%	296	2.86
T. Bloomfield	55	17.46%	97	30.79%	62	19.68%	49	15.56%	33	10.48%	19	6.03%	315	2.93
T. Coloma	31	17.13%	70	38.67%	30	16.57%	29	16.02%	12	6.63%	9	4.97%	181	2.76
T. Dakota	84	20.44%	167	40.63%	58	14.11%	50	12.17%	30	7.30%	22	5.35%	411	2.66
T. Deerfield	33	18.54%	71	39.89%	39	21.91%	20	11.24%	10	5.62%	5	2.81%	178	2.55
T. Hancock	30	16.85%	75	42.13%	27	15.17%	31	17.42%	9	5.06%	6	3.37%	178	2.62
T. Leon	78	19.65%	174	43.83%	64	16.12%	49	12.34%	20	5.04%	12	3.02%	397	2.50
T. Marion	133	20.75%	318	49.61%	90	14.04%	65	10.14%	32	4.99%	3	0.47%	641	2.31
T. Mount Morris	76	23.24%	154	47.09%	38	11.62%	34	10.40%	18	5.50%	7	2.14%	327	2.35
T. Oasis	19	13.97%	52	38.24%	24	17.65%	20	14.71%	15	11.03%	6	4.41%	136	2.86
T. Plainfield	46	24.08%	61	31.94%	21	10.99%	37	19.37%	15	7.85%	11	5.76%	191	2.77
T. Poy Sippi	71	20.06%	137	38.70%	50	14.12%	58	16.38%	27	7.63%	11	3.11%	354	2.62
T. Richford	23	15.33%	55	36.67%	15	10.00%	32	21.33%	12	8.00%	13	8.67%	150	3.03
T. Rose	49	25.52%	66	34.38%	36	18.75%	20	10.42%	14	7.29%	7	3.65%	192	2.53
T. Saxeville	58	18.35%	124	39.24%	45	14.24%	55	17.41%	21	6.65%	13	4.11%	316	2.68
T. Springwater	98	22.58%	199	45.85%	64	14.75%	51	11.75%	17	3.92%	5	1.15%	434	2.33
T. Warren	35	16.67%	90	42.86%	36	17.14%	30	14.29%	9	4.29%	10	4.76%	210	2.62
T. Wautoma	75	17.86%	176	41.90%	59	14.05%	79	18.81%	20	4.76%	11	2.62%	420	2.59
Waushara County	1,784	23.42%	2,940	38.60%	1,139	14.96%	1,034	13.58%	478	6.28%	241	3.16%	7,616	2.52
Wisconsin	443,673	24.35%	596,883	32.76%	302,563	16.61%	284,151	15.59%	129,821	7.12%	65,027	3.57%	1,822,118	2.61

Source: U.S. Census, 1990

Table B-7. Persons per Household, 2000

Jurisdiction	Household Size												Total Households	Average Household Size
	1 Person		2 Person		3 Person		4 Person		5 Person		6 or more Person			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
C. Berlin (pt.)	14	38.89%	8	22.22%	6	16.67%	5	13.89%	3	8.33%	0	0.00%	36	2.31
C. Wautoma	326	40.45%	242	30.02%	93	11.54%	82	10.17%	38	4.71%	25	3.10%	806	2.20
V. Coloma	51	27.57%	63	34.05%	34	18.38%	23	12.43%	10	5.41%	4	2.16%	185	2.42
V. Hancock	58	30.05%	73	37.82%	27	13.99%	16	8.29%	11	5.70%	8	4.15%	193	2.40
V. Lohrville	38	22.62%	72	42.86%	27	16.07%	19	11.31%	7	4.17%	5	2.98%	168	2.43
V. Plainfield	98	28.65%	120	35.09%	38	11.11%	43	12.57%	26	7.60%	17	4.97%	342	2.60
V. Redgranite	143	32.50%	154	35.00%	63	14.32%	47	10.68%	19	4.32%	14	3.18%	440	2.30
V. Wild Rose	115	36.86%	92	29.49%	53	16.99%	28	8.97%	15	4.81%	9	2.88%	312	2.26
T. Aurora	49	13.92%	144	40.91%	65	18.47%	53	15.06%	29	8.24%	12	3.41%	352	2.76
T. Bloomfield	73	19.06%	144	37.60%	67	17.49%	61	15.93%	27	7.05%	11	2.87%	383	2.65
T. Coloma	49	19.29%	126	49.61%	27	10.63%	32	12.60%	9	3.54%	11	4.33%	254	2.51
T. Dakota	111	22.52%	200	40.57%	67	13.59%	64	12.98%	27	5.48%	24	4.87%	493	2.55
T. Deerfield	48	18.25%	136	51.71%	27	10.27%	37	14.07%	12	4.56%	3	1.14%	263	2.39
T. Hancock	52	24.64%	89	42.18%	25	11.85%	21	9.95%	8	3.79%	16	7.58%	211	2.52
T. Leon	127	23.56%	249	46.20%	61	11.32%	58	10.76%	30	5.57%	14	2.60%	539	2.38
T. Marion	216	23.79%	459	50.55%	104	11.45%	75	8.26%	28	3.08%	26	2.86%	908	2.27
T. Mount Morris	118	24.53%	245	50.94%	42	8.73%	39	8.11%	26	5.41%	11	2.29%	481	2.27
T. Oasis	32	21.05%	61	40.13%	17	11.18%	19	12.50%	16	10.53%	7	4.61%	152	2.66
T. Plainfield	38	19.19%	78	39.39%	33	16.67%	25	12.63%	14	7.07%	10	5.05%	198	2.69
T. Poy Sippi	91	23.21%	148	37.76%	66	16.84%	57	14.54%	22	5.61%	8	2.04%	392	2.48
T. Richford	26	13.68%	87	45.79%	14	7.37%	26	13.68%	16	8.42%	21	11.05%	190	3.09
T. Rose	49	20.08%	115	47.13%	35	14.34%	26	10.66%	8	3.28%	11	4.51%	244	2.44
T. Saxeville	71	18.07%	184	46.82%	59	15.01%	48	12.21%	23	5.85%	8	2.04%	393	2.48
T. Springwater	157	25.45%	296	47.97%	69	11.18%	54	8.75%	30	4.86%	11	1.78%	617	2.25
T. Warren	53	20.31%	103	39.46%	45	17.24%	34	13.03%	15	5.75%	11	4.21%	261	2.59
T. Wautoma	119	22.75%	221	42.26%	75	14.34%	62	11.85%	31	5.93%	15	2.87%	523	2.46
Waushara County	2,322	24.87%	3,909	41.87%	1,239	13.27%	1,054	11.29%	500	5.36%	312	3.34%	9,336	2.43
Wisconsin	557,875	26.76%	721,452	34.61%	320,561	15.38%	290,716	13.95%	127,921	6.14%	66,019	3.17%	2,084,544	2.50

Source: U.S. Census, 2000.

Table B-8. Households by Type, 1990

Jurisdiction	Total Households	Family Households			Nonfamily Households	
		Married-couple family	Male Householder, no wife present	Female Householder, no husband present	Total Nonfamily households	Householder Age 65+ Living Alone
C. Berlin (pt.)	22	13	2	2	5	3
C. Wautoma	748	371	21	77	279	169
V. Coloma	159	89	4	10	56	29
V. Hancock	164	91	1	6	66	40
V. Lohrville	142	83	3	13	43	13
V. Plainfield	324	169	8	46	101	68
V. Redgranite	421	222	13	38	148	90
V. Wild Rose	309	139	11	28	131	88
T. Aurora	296	216	11	15	54	18
T. Bloomfield	315	223	12	11	69	29
T. Coloma	181	126	6	7	42	15
T. Dakota	411	267	14	30	100	40
T. Deerfield	178	126	7	8	37	19
T. Hancock	178	123	6	12	37	21
T. Leon	397	274	10	20	93	41
T. Marion	641	456	6	29	150	73
T. Mount Morris	327	210	18	17	82	38
T. Oasis	136	96	5	12	23	13
T. Plainfield	191	118	6	11	56	21
T. Poy Sippi	354	244	9	17	84	44
T. Richford	150	115	4	5	26	15
T. Rose	192	113	7	15	57	28
T. Saxeville	316	221	6	20	69	21
T. Springwater	434	296	9	15	114	58
T. Warren	210	142	12	15	41	13
T. Wautoma	420	291	14	29	86	42
Waushara County	7,616	4,834	225	508	2,049	1,049
Wisconsin	1,822,118	1,048,010	52,632	174,530	546,946	192,072

Source: U. S. Census, 1990, STF 1A.

Table B-9. Households by Type, 2000

	Total Households	Family Households			Nonfamily Households	
		Married-couple family	Male Householder, no wife present	Female Householder, no husband present	Total Nonfamily households	Householder Age 65+ Living Alone
C. Berlin (pt.)	36	20	1	1	14	7
C. Wautoma	806	304	37	89	376	162
V. Coloma	185	105	8	15	57	29
V. Hancock	193	96	9	17	71	36
V. Lohrville	168	100	10	13	45	15
V. Plainfield	342	172	18	41	111	50
V. Redgranite	440	205	13	51	171	78
V. Wild Rose	312	137	15	35	125	61
T. Aurora	352	250	16	16	70	23
T. Bloomfield	383	267	15	16	85	31
T. Coloma	254	170	11	14	59	18
T. Dakota	493	317	16	24	136	51
T. Deerfield	263	178	9	17	59	24
T. Hancock	211	132	6	10	63	19
T. Leon	539	349	15	21	154	56
T. Marion	908	587	34	34	253	111
T. Mount Morris	481	304	12	29	136	55
T. Oasis	152	101	5	7	39	18
T. Plainfield	198	122	13	12	51	13
T. Poy Sippi	392	239	17	31	105	43
T. Richford	190	141	7	10	32	13
T. Rose	244	156	9	17	62	25
T. Saxeville	393	278	14	20	81	27
T. Springwater	617	377	18	35	187	71
T. Warren	261	170	12	11	68	27
T. Wautoma	523	325	17	38	143	46
Waushara County	9,336	5,602	357	624	2,753	1,109
Wisconsin	2,084,544	1,108,597	200,300	77,918	697,729	207,206

Source: U. S. Census, 2000, STF 1A.

Table B-10. Waushara County Population by Race, 1990

Jurisdiction	White	African American	Native American	Asian/Pacific Islander	Other Races	Total Population
C. Berlin (pt.)	67	0	0	0	0	67
C. Wautoma	1,756	0	6	1	21	1,784
V. Coloma	382	0	0	0	1	383
V. Hancock	371	0	0	0	11	382
V. Lohrville	357	0	7	1	3	368
V. Plainfield	824	1	3	5	6	839
V. Redgranite	990	4	3	2	10	1,009
V. Wild Rose	649	0	2	14	11	676
T. Aurora	839	0	5	2	0	846
T. Bloomfield	921	0	1	0	0	922
T. Coloma	499	0	0	0	0	499
T. Dakota	1,058	2	6	3	23	1,092
T. Deerfield	449	2	2	1	0	454
T. Hancock	457	0	3	0	7	467
T. Leon	967	11	6	2	6	992
T. Marion	1,461	3	8	0	6	1,478
T. Mount Morris	761	0	5	1	0	767
T. Oasis	383	0	1	0	5	389
T. Plainfield	498	0	0	4	27	529
T. Poy Sippi	920	1	5	1	2	929
T. Richford	455	0	0	0	0	455
T. Rose	481	2	3	0	0	486
T. Saxeville	841	0	0	1	4	846
T. Springwater	1,085	0	0	2	1	1,088
T. Warren	548	0	2	0	0	550
T. Wautoma	1,075	3	2	3	5	1,088
Waushara County	19,094	29	70	43	149	19,385
Wisconsin	4,512,523	244,539	39,387	53,583	41,737	4,891,769

Source: U. S. Census, 1990, STF 1A.

Table B-11. Population by Race, 2000

Jurisdiction	White	African American	Native American	Asian/Pacific Islander	Other Races	Two or More Races	Total Population
C. Berlin (pt.)	79	0	0	0	3	1	83
C. Wautoma	1,879	22	14	17	40	26	1,998
V. Coloma	458	0	0	1	1	1	461
V. Hancock	427	0	5	1	20	10	463
V. Lohrville	395	0	1	0	5	7	408
V. Plainfield	829	1	0	10	56	3	899
V. Redgranite	987	9	12	0	7	25	1,040
V. Wild Rose	744	6	1	2	7	5	765
T. Aurora	948	0	1	11	3	8	971
T. Bloomfield	1,009	0	2	2	0	5	1,018
T. Coloma	730	1	0	0	9	8	748
T. Dakota	1,175	0	2	6	68	8	1,259
T. Deerfield	613	2	2	1	2	9	629
T. Hancock	514	0	2	2	12	1	531
T. Leon	1,266	0	6	0	0	9	1,281
T. Marion	2,026	2	9	10	3	15	2,065
T. Mount Morris	1,073	0	3	2	0	14	1,092
T. Oasis	390	1	2	2	6	4	405
T. Plainfield	515	0	0	1	16	1	533
T. Poy Sippi	944	2	2	1	13	10	972
T. Richford	558	7	5	5	12	1	588
T. Rose	581	2	0	0	6	6	595
T. Saxeville	964	0	0	0	3	7	974
T. Springwater	1,373	3	0	1	3	9	1,389
T. Warren	664	0	1	1	5	4	675
T. Wautoma	1,272	4	2	11	14	9	1,312
Waushara County	22,413	62	72	87	314	206	23,154
Wisconsin	4,769,857	304,460	47,228	90,393	84,842	66,895	5,363,675

Source: U. S. Census, 2000, STF 1A.

Table B-12. First Ancestry* Reported, Top 6 in Waushara County, 2000

Jurisdiction	German	Unclassified or not reported	Polish	Irish	United States or American	English	Persons Reporting First ancestry	Total Population in Sample	Percent of Population Within Top 6 Categories
C. Berlin (pt.)	31	13	8	2	4	0	55	68	85.29%
C. Wautoma	532	537	158	79	97	80	1,421	1,958	75.74%
V. Coloma	173	138	2	31	31	14	348	486	80.04%
V. Hancock	171	90	6	42	14	49	395	485	76.70%
V. Lohrville	135	89	33	24	31	19	332	421	78.62%
V. Plainfield	228	149	58	44	46	79	709	858	70.40%
V. Redgranite	378	242	120	45	51	28	829	1,071	80.67%
V. Wild Rose	267	192	27	41	24	30	598	790	73.54%
T. Aurora	484	164	100	17	50	30	820	984	85.87%
T. Bloomfield	527	190	37	47	22	18	827	1,017	82.69%
T. Coloma	214	198	28	24	35	54	495	693	79.80%
T. Dakota	550	209	113	72	43	47	1,035	1,244	83.12%
T. Deerfield	241	125	60	40	28	55	520	645	85.12%
T. Hancock	195	93	84	25	21	26	449	542	81.92%
T. Leon	560	211	66	64	49	47	1,064	1,275	78.20%
T. Marion	773	354	127	107	133	69	1,693	2,047	76.36%
T. Mount Morris	420	169	72	46	63	28	950	1,119	71.31%
T. Oasis	159	65	41	20	20	15	345	410	78.05%
T. Plainfield	182	112	62	25	12	30	457	569	74.34%
T. Poy Sippi	431	168	80	48	63	23	811	979	83.04%
T. Richford	260	159	23	14	34	6	411	570	87.02%
T. Rose	191	85	59	16	13	72	503	588	74.15%
T. Saxeville	407	175	52	63	34	75	797	972	82.92%
T. Springwater	543	224	89	77	56	76	1,144	1,368	77.85%
T. Warren	214	166	89	37	38	11	487	653	84.99%
T. Wautoma	539	312	87	51	43	57	1,030	1,342	81.15%
Waushara County	8,805	4,629	1,681	1,101	1,055	1,038	18,525	23,154	79.07%
Wisconsin	1,775,722	826,719	326,038	298,177	189,283	184,574	4,536,956	5,363,675	67.13%

*Includes individuals who only reported one ancestry and the first response listed for those who reported multiple ancestries.

Source: U.S. Census, 2000 STF 3A.

Note: Table includes top 6 in Waushara County and are not necessarily top 6 in the individual communities.

Table B-13. Top 5 Ancestries for Each Group F Communities

Minor Civil Division	Ancestry	Total Population in Sample	Percent of Population
T. Aurora	German	484	49.19%
	Unclassified or Not reported	164	16.67%
	Polish	100	10.16%
	United States or American	50	5.08%
	Other groups ⁺	31	3.15%
	Total Population	984	100.00%
T. Bloomfield	German	527	51.82%
	Unclassified or Not reported	190	18.68%
	Norwegian	48	4.72%
	Irish	47	4.62%
	Polish	37	3.64%
	Total Population	1,017	100.00%
T. Poy Sippi	German	431	44.02%
	Unclassified or Not reported	168	17.16%
	Polish	80	8.17%
	United States or American	63	6.44%
	Irish	48	4.90%
	Total Population	979	100.00%
Waushara County	German	8,805	38.03%
	Unclassified or Not reported	4,629	19.99%
	Polish	1,681	7.26%
	Irish	1,101	4.76%
	United States or American	1,055	4.56%
	Total Population	23,154	100.00%

**Includes individuals who only reported one ancestry and the first response listed for those who reported multiple ancestries.*

⁺ Includes individuals whose response did not fit within an ancestry category. Examples include persons answering with a religious affiliation or an answer that fits in the race or Hispanic Origin tables.

Source: U.S. Census, 2000 STF 3A

Table B-14. Persons of Hispanic Origin, 1990 and 2000

Jurisdiction	1990		2000	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
C. Berlin (pt.)	0	0.00%	4	4.82%
C. Wautoma	41	2.30%	144	7.21%
V. Coloma	16	4.18%	14	3.04%
V. Hancock	22	5.76%	40	8.64%
V. Lohrville	4	1.09%	9	2.21%
V. Plainfield	37	4.41%	161	17.91%
V. Redgranite	40	3.96%	32	3.08%
V. Wild Rose	12	1.59%	17	2.22%
T. Aurora	7	0.83%	19	1.96%
T. Bloomfield	0	0.00%	1	0.10%
T. Coloma	0	0.00%	27	3.61%
T. Dakota	58	5.31%	109	8.66%
T. Deerfield	0	0.00%	7	1.11%
T. Hancock	14	3.00%	25	4.71%
T. Leon	8	0.81%	9	0.70%
T. Marion	10	0.68%	27	1.31%
T. Mount Morris	1	0.13%	9	0.82%
T. Oasis	5	1.29%	11	2.72%
T. Plainfield	42	7.94%	52	9.76%
T. Poy Sippi	12	1.29%	20	2.06%
T. Richford	0	0.00%	24	4.08%
T. Rose	0	0.00%	17	2.86%
T. Saxeville	12	1.42%	11	1.13%
T. Springwater	4	0.40%	7	0.50%
T. Warren	5	0.91%	15	2.22%
T. Wautoma	29	2.67%	37	2.82%
Waushara County	379	1.96%	848	3.66%
Wisconsin	93,194	1.91%	192,921	3.60%

Source: U. S. Census, 1990, 2000, STF 1A.

Table B-15. Earnings as a Portion of Household Income, 1999

Jurisdiction	Total Households	Households With Earnings		Aggregate Household Income		Average Household Income	Average Earnings Per Household	Percent of Income from Earnings
		Number	Percent	Total household income	Income From Earnings			
C. Berlin (pt.)	34	24	70.59%	\$1,643,100	\$1,208,900	\$48,326	\$50,371	73.57%
C. Wautoma	795	591	74.34%	\$29,945,300	\$20,618,400	\$37,667	\$34,887	68.85%
V. Coloma	187	139	74.33%	\$7,060,700	\$5,072,000	\$37,758	\$36,489	71.83%
V. Hancock	193	144	74.61%	\$7,405,700	\$5,861,200	\$38,372	\$40,703	79.14%
V. Lohrville	161	114	70.81%	\$6,006,600	\$4,152,700	\$37,308	\$36,427	69.14%
V. Plainfield	331	260	78.55%	\$13,704,700	\$10,556,000	\$41,404	\$40,600	77.02%
V. Redgranite	455	296	65.05%	\$14,902,500	\$10,636,200	\$32,753	\$35,933	71.37%
V. Wild Rose	303	229	75.58%	\$13,478,000	\$10,773,000	\$44,482	\$47,044	79.93%
T. Aurora	356	296	83.15%	\$19,998,600	\$16,023,900	\$56,176	\$54,135	80.13%
T. Bloomfield	382	320	83.77%	\$19,397,000	\$16,145,600	\$50,777	\$50,455	83.24%
T. Coloma	238	186	78.15%	\$10,672,600	\$8,151,500	\$44,843	\$43,825	76.38%
T. Dakota	485	364	75.05%	\$22,734,400	\$16,153,200	\$46,875	\$44,377	71.05%
T. Deerfield	266	198	74.44%	\$13,414,100	\$8,142,000	\$50,429	\$41,121	60.70%
T. Hancock	216	176	81.48%	\$9,893,800	\$7,932,900	\$45,805	\$45,073	80.18%
T. Leon	530	414	78.11%	\$23,330,000	\$16,709,600	\$44,019	\$40,361	71.62%
T. Marion	903	637	70.54%	\$44,028,800	\$25,619,500	\$48,758	\$40,219	58.19%
T. Mount Morris	481	368	76.51%	\$23,161,600	\$15,389,400	\$48,153	\$41,819	66.44%
T. Oasis	153	125	81.70%	\$6,713,400	\$4,911,900	\$43,878	\$39,295	73.17%
T. Plainfield	216	189	87.50%	\$9,593,300	\$7,431,600	\$44,413	\$39,321	77.47%
T. Poy Sippi	387	300	77.52%	\$17,928,800	\$13,710,200	\$46,328	\$45,701	76.47%
T. Richford	200	155	77.50%	\$8,213,700	\$5,384,500	\$41,069	\$34,739	65.56%
T. Rose	242	184	76.03%	\$10,332,800	\$7,703,300	\$42,698	\$41,866	74.55%
T. Saxeville	405	304	75.06%	\$20,164,500	\$15,077,900	\$49,789	\$49,598	74.77%
T. Springwater	616	439	71.27%	\$28,287,100	\$18,250,900	\$45,921	\$41,574	64.52%
T. Warren	252	207	82.14%	\$10,417,900	\$7,942,200	\$41,341	\$38,368	76.24%
T. Wautoma	525	389	74.10%	\$23,735,000	\$17,470,300	\$45,210	\$44,911	73.61%
Waushara County	9,312	7,048	75.69%	416,164,000	\$297,028,900	\$44,691	\$42,144	71.37%
Wisconsin	2,086,304	1,706,803	81.81%	\$112,374,261,000	\$90,604,137,400	\$53,863	\$53,084	80.63%

Source: U. S. Census, 2000, STF 3A.

Table B-16. Comparative Income Characteristics, 1989 and 1999

Jurisdiction	Median Household Income		Median Family Income		Per Capita Income	
	1989	1999	1989	1999	1989	1999
C. Berlin (pt.)	\$ 21,875	\$45,000	\$ 36,667	\$53,125	\$ 8,982	\$23,859
C. Wautoma	\$ 19,712	\$31,723	\$ 22,115	\$37,500	\$ 9,984	\$16,006
V. Coloma	\$ 17,333	\$33,295	\$ 25,250	\$38,542	\$ 10,337	\$14,766
V. Hancock	\$ 12,917	\$35,341	\$ 21,591	\$36,250	\$ 7,351	\$14,889
V. Lohrville	\$ 21,406	\$34,479	\$ 24,063	\$36,500	\$ 9,033	\$14,386
V. Plainfield	\$ 17,409	\$36,328	\$ 25,774	\$43,977	\$ 9,634	\$15,563
V. Redgranite	\$ 19,259	\$26,726	\$ 22,083	\$34,875	\$ 9,485	\$13,994
V. Wild Rose	\$ 17,857	\$30,655	\$ 25,096	\$37,361	\$ 10,220	\$18,887
T. Aurora	\$ 27,685	\$49,583	\$ 29,583	\$52,500	\$ 10,606	\$20,146
T. Bloomfield	\$ 26,136	\$42,222	\$ 30,511	\$49,643	\$ 11,104	\$19,161
T. Coloma	\$ 21,250	\$36,406	\$ 26,250	\$39,118	\$ 10,744	\$16,290
T. Dakota	\$ 20,513	\$34,931	\$ 23,036	\$37,000	\$ 9,282	\$18,401
T. Deerfield	\$ 25,114	\$41,324	\$ 25,795	\$44,318	\$ 11,194	\$20,781
T. Hancock	\$ 21,696	\$43,889	\$ 23,750	\$45,556	\$ 9,774	\$18,345
T. Leon	\$ 23,750	\$39,524	\$ 27,279	\$45,938	\$ 9,543	\$18,445
T. Marion	\$ 23,397	\$37,534	\$ 25,833	\$41,926	\$ 11,868	\$21,714
T. Mount Morris	\$ 21,625	\$39,732	\$ 24,375	\$45,114	\$ 11,959	\$20,713
T. Oasis	\$ 25,375	\$38,472	\$ 26,875	\$41,563	\$ 13,537	\$16,480
T. Plainfield	\$ 23,750	\$38,462	\$ 28,750	\$41,406	\$ 9,068	\$16,432
T. Poy Sippi	\$ 24,318	\$40,489	\$ 27,639	\$47,250	\$ 10,986	\$18,625
T. Richford	\$ 20,417	\$37,656	\$ 22,500	\$38,929	\$ 8,992	\$14,503
T. Rose	\$ 23,750	\$34,792	\$ 30,694	\$40,417	\$ 11,161	\$17,630
T. Saxeville	\$ 26,618	\$39,688	\$ 28,542	\$46,827	\$ 10,832	\$20,514
T. Springwater	\$ 21,917	\$35,714	\$ 25,250	\$40,385	\$ 11,462	\$20,586
T. Warren	\$ 23,594	\$38,438	\$ 26,375	\$43,833	\$ 9,138	\$15,672
T. Wautoma	\$ 25,143	\$39,185	\$ 28,214	\$44,063	\$ 10,792	\$17,981
Waushara County	\$ 21,888	\$37,000	\$ 26,042	\$42,416	\$ 10,408	\$18,144
Wisconsin	\$ 29,442	\$43,791	\$ 35,082	\$52,911	\$ 13,276	\$21,271

Source: U.S. Census, 2000

Table B-17. Household Income by Range, 1999

	Less than \$10,000	\$10,000 to \$19,999	\$20,000 to \$29,999	\$30,000 to \$39,999	\$40,000 to \$44,999	\$45,000 to \$59,999	\$60,000 to \$74,999	\$75,000 to \$99,999	\$100,000 to \$124,999	\$125,000 to \$149,999	\$150,000 or more	Total Households in Sample
C. Berlin (pt.)	3	3	6	3	2	6	4	7	0	0	0	34
C. Wautoma	89	160	103	168	66	101	47	31	13	2	15	795
V. Coloma	21	34	26	31	20	23	22	5	3	0	2	187
V. Hancock	17	31	32	35	12	38	15	8	3	0	2	193
V. Lohrville	9	22	32	34	11	35	9	9	0	0	0	161
V. Plainfield	39	51	56	34	26	57	41	13	4	2	8	331
V. Redgranite	68	97	86	51	29	78	25	16	2	0	3	455
V. Wild Rose	31	53	62	55	20	24	26	16	11	0	5	303
T. Aurora	15	31	42	40	23	77	63	38	12	5	10	356
T. Bloomfield	22	38	61	54	20	78	44	42	4	8	11	382
T. Coloma	14	29	41	59	29	33	7	10	10	0	6	238
T. Dakota	36	74	97	73	30	80	52	27	7	0	9	485
T. Deerfield	23	26	36	39	28	52	24	18	9	4	7	266
T. Hancock	14	25	14	31	32	57	18	13	10	2	0	216
T. Leon	40	63	74	92	38	100	61	43	10	5	4	530
T. Marion	56	127	124	181	72	155	79	52	18	15	24	903
T. Mount Morris	27	74	71	70	44	62	53	48	18	5	9	481
T. Oasis	22	11	26	23	16	17	13	13	7	5	0	153
T. Plainfield	9	28	35	44	17	47	15	12	3	2	4	216
T. Poy Sippi	38	58	45	48	27	80	30	41	12	2	6	387
T. Richford	10	35	31	39	19	41	14	6	3	0	2	200
T. Rose	18	36	47	41	6	36	37	12	2	5	2	242
T. Saxeville	36	52	61	55	23	71	43	42	9	2	11	405
T. Springwater	50	109	98	90	50	78	52	48	11	10	20	616
T. Warren	29	26	32	44	27	40	25	25	2	0	2	252
T. Wautoma	43	80	63	84	40	92	50	42	18	0	13	525
Waushara County	779	1,373	1,401	1,518	727	1,558	869	637	201	74	175	9,312
Wisconsin	148,964	248,535	274,230	269,250	129,319	339,492	253,518	226,374	94,628	39,091	62,903	2,086,304

Source: U.S. Census, 2000.

Table B-18. Poverty Status, 1989

Jurisdiction	Total Persons		Total Persons Below Poverty		Total Families		Total Families Below Poverty	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
C. Berlin (pt.)	81	100.00%	0	0.00%	18	100.00%	0	0.00%
C. Wautoma	1,399	100.00%	301	21.52%	466	100.00%	64	13.73%
V. Coloma	340	100.00%	53	15.59%	108	100.00%	4	3.70%
V. Hancock	245	100.00%	120	48.98%	88	100.00%	23	26.14%
V. Lohrville	320	100.00%	52	16.25%	105	100.00%	14	13.33%
V. Plainfield	737	100.00%	103	13.98%	229	100.00%	25	10.92%
V. Redgranite	826	100.00%	160	19.37%	266	100.00%	27	10.15%
V. Wild Rose	587	100.00%	78	13.29%	171	100.00%	16	9.36%
T. Aurora	744	100.00%	75	10.08%	225	100.00%	13	5.78%
T. Bloomfield	827	100.00%	124	14.99%	255	100.00%	21	8.24%
T. Coloma	424	100.00%	51	12.03%	141	100.00%	11	7.80%
T. Dakota	872	100.00%	214	24.54%	320	100.00%	42	13.13%
T. Deerfield	414	100.00%	43	10.39%	140	100.00%	12	8.57%
T. Hancock	407	100.00%	54	13.27%	136	100.00%	13	9.56%
T. Leon	861	100.00%	132	15.33%	287	100.00%	27	9.41%
T. Marion	1,319	100.00%	159	12.05%	496	100.00%	39	7.86%
T. Mount Morris	680	100.00%	84	12.35%	250	100.00%	23	9.20%
T. Oasis	363	100.00%	18	4.96%	123	100.00%	7	5.69%
T. Plainfield	390	100.00%	129	33.08%	131	100.00%	25	19.08%
T. Poy Sippi	799	100.00%	123	15.39%	268	100.00%	28	10.45%
T. Richford	353	100.00%	130	36.83%	136	100.00%	31	22.79%
T. Rose	449	100.00%	53	11.80%	130	100.00%	8	6.15%
T. Saxeville	743	100.00%	59	7.94%	233	100.00%	13	5.58%
T. Springwater	884	100.00%	125	14.14%	324	100.00%	32	9.88%
T. Warren	478	100.00%	93	19.46%	173	100.00%	18	10.40%
T. Wautoma	979	100.00%	109	11.13%	342	100.00%	28	8.19%
Waushara County	16,521	100.00%	2,642	15.99%	5,561	100.00%	564	10.14%
Wisconsin	4,754,103	100.00%	508,545	10.70%	1,284,297	100.00%	97,466	7.59%

Source: U.S. Census, 1990.

Table B-19. Persons in Poverty by Age as a Share of the Total Population, 1989

Jurisdiction	Total Persons Number	Persons Under 18				Persons Under 65				Persons Age 65 and Older			
		Total Persons		Below Poverty		Total Persons		Below Poverty		Total Persons		Below Poverty	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
C. Berlin (pt.)	81	26	32.1%	0	0.0%	72	88.9%	0	0.0%	9	11.1%	0	0.0%
C. Wautoma	1,399	410	29.3%	118	28.8%	1,015	72.6%	253	24.9%	384	27.4%	48	12.5%
V. Coloma	340	103	30.3%	12	11.7%	262	77.1%	38	14.5%	78	22.9%	15	19.2%
V. Hancock	245	103	42.0%	46	44.7%	189	77.1%	106	56.1%	56	22.9%	14	25.0%
V. Lohrville	320	106	33.1%	19	17.9%	274	85.6%	44	16.1%	46	14.4%	8	17.4%
V. Plainfield	737	268	36.4%	35	13.1%	620	84.1%	78	12.6%	117	15.9%	25	21.4%
V. Redgranite	826	253	30.6%	50	19.8%	638	77.2%	128	20.1%	188	22.8%	32	17.0%
V. Wild Rose	587	133	22.7%	19	14.3%	425	72.4%	46	10.8%	162	27.6%	32	19.8%
T. Aurora	744	187	25.1%	30	16.0%	622	83.6%	71	11.4%	122	16.4%	4	3.3%
T. Bloomfield	827	280	33.9%	46	16.4%	728	88.0%	103	14.1%	99	12.0%	21	21.2%
T. Coloma	424	102	24.1%	11	10.8%	377	88.9%	34	9.0%	47	11.1%	17	36.2%
T. Dakota	872	293	33.6%	99	33.8%	718	82.3%	201	28.0%	154	17.7%	13	8.4%
T. Deerfield	414	108	26.1%	14	13.0%	326	78.7%	41	12.6%	88	21.3%	2	2.3%
T. Hancock	407	118	29.0%	16	13.6%	335	82.3%	46	13.7%	72	17.7%	8	11.1%
T. Leon	861	227	26.4%	29	12.8%	738	85.7%	104	14.1%	123	14.3%	28	22.8%
T. Marion	1,319	274	20.8%	44	16.1%	1,001	75.9%	132	13.2%	318	24.1%	27	8.5%
T. Mount Morris	680	148	21.8%	30	20.3%	499	73.4%	77	15.4%	181	26.6%	7	3.9%
T. Oasis	363	93	25.6%	2	2.2%	307	84.6%	13	4.2%	56	15.4%	5	8.9%
T. Plainfield	390	170	43.6%	61	35.9%	361	92.6%	114	31.6%	29	7.4%	15	51.7%
T. Poy Sippi	799	240	30.0%	45	18.8%	673	84.2%	91	13.5%	126	15.8%	32	25.4%
T. Richford	353	169	47.9%	61	36.1%	321	90.9%	112	34.9%	32	9.1%	18	56.3%
T. Rose	449	117	26.1%	20	17.1%	363	80.8%	43	11.8%	86	19.2%	10	11.6%
T. Saxeville	743	192	25.8%	23	12.0%	632	85.1%	50	7.9%	111	14.9%	9	8.1%
T. Springwater	884	184	20.8%	38	20.7%	673	76.1%	107	15.9%	211	23.9%	18	8.5%
T. Warren	478	163	34.1%	42	25.8%	400	83.7%	80	20.0%	78	16.3%	13	16.7%
T. Wautoma	979	266	27.2%	39	14.7%	777	79.4%	90	11.6%	202	20.6%	19	9.4%
Waushara County	16,521	4,733	28.6%	949	20.1%	13,346	80.8%	2,202	16.5%	3,175	19.2%	440	13.9%
Wisconsin	4,754,103	1,271,165	26.7%	188,863	14.9%	4,152,291	87.3%	453,739	10.9%	604,812	12.7%	54,806	9.1%

Source: U.S. Census, 1990.

Table B-20. Poverty Status, 1999

Jurisdiction	Total Persons		Total Persons Below Poverty		Total Families		Total Families Below Poverty	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
C. Berlin (pt.)	68	100.00%	3	4.41%	22	100.00%	0	0.00%
C. Wautoma	1,793	100.00%	207	11.54%	430	100.00%	22	5.12%
V. Coloma	486	100.00%	81	16.67%	128	100.00%	16	12.50%
V. Hancock	485	100.00%	46	9.48%	122	100.00%	7	5.74%
V. Lohrville	415	100.00%	13	3.13%	123	100.00%	2	1.63%
V. Plainfield	850	100.00%	97	11.41%	231	100.00%	17	7.36%
V. Redgranite	1,069	100.00%	119	11.13%	269	100.00%	17	6.32%
V. Wild Rose	728	100.00%	48	6.59%	187	100.00%	8	4.28%
T. Aurora	978	100.00%	43	4.40%	282	100.00%	11	3.90%
T. Bloomfield	1,009	100.00%	82	8.13%	298	100.00%	17	5.70%
T. Coloma	690	100.00%	83	12.03%	195	100.00%	6	3.08%
T. Dakota	1,233	100.00%	153	12.41%	357	100.00%	27	7.56%
T. Deerfield	643	100.00%	45	7.00%	204	100.00%	14	6.86%
T. Hancock	542	100.00%	20	3.69%	148	100.00%	0	0.00%
T. Leon	1,273	100.00%	98	7.70%	385	100.00%	15	3.90%
T. Marion	2,031	100.00%	138	6.79%	655	100.00%	22	3.36%
T. Mount Morris	1,118	100.00%	82	7.33%	345	100.00%	20	5.80%
T. Oasis	410	100.00%	24	5.85%	113	100.00%	4	3.54%
T. Plainfield	569	100.00%	65	11.42%	147	100.00%	16	10.88%
T. Poy Sippi	977	100.00%	68	6.96%	287	100.00%	10	3.48%
T. Richford	568	100.00%	127	22.36%	158	100.00%	22	13.92%
T. Rose	584	100.00%	60	10.27%	182	100.00%	6	3.30%
T. Saxeville	967	100.00%	89	9.20%	312	100.00%	17	5.45%
T. Springwater	1,361	100.00%	114	8.38%	430	100.00%	24	5.58%
T. Warren	646	100.00%	49	7.59%	193	100.00%	6	3.11%
T. Wautoma	1,340	100.00%	130	9.70%	380	100.00%	20	5.26%
Waushara County	22,833	100.00%	2,084	9.13%	6,583	100.00%	346	5.26%
Wisconsin	5,211,603	100.00%	451,538	8.66%	1,386,815	100.00%	78,188	5.64%

Source: U.S. Census, 2000, STF 3A.

Table B-21. Persons in Poverty by Age and as a Share of Total Population, 1999

Jurisdiction	Total Persons	Persons Under 18				Persons Under 65				Persons Age 65 and Older			
		Total Persons		Below Poverty		Total Persons		Below Poverty		Total Persons		Below Poverty	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
C. Berlin (pt.)	68	12	17.6%	0	0.0%	56	82.4%	1	1.8%	12	17.6%	2	16.7%
C. Wautoma	1,793	459	25.6%	49	10.7%	1,405	78.4%	136	9.7%	388	21.6%	71	18.3%
V. Coloma	486	139	28.6%	34	24.5%	398	81.9%	65	16.3%	88	18.1%	16	18.2%
V. Hancock	485	142	29.3%	16	11.3%	401	82.7%	33	8.2%	84	17.3%	13	15.5%
V. Lohrville	415	102	24.6%	0	0.0%	327	78.8%	7	2.1%	88	21.2%	6	6.8%
V. Plainfield	850	244	28.7%	25	10.2%	714	84.0%	78	10.9%	136	16.0%	19	14.0%
V. Redgranite	1,069	264	24.7%	21	8.0%	839	78.5%	96	11.4%	230	21.5%	23	10.0%
V. Wild Rose	728	193	26.5%	8	4.1%	595	81.7%	31	5.2%	133	18.3%	17	12.8%
T. Aurora	978	247	25.3%	8	3.2%	861	88.0%	35	4.1%	117	12.0%	8	6.8%
T. Bloomfield	1,009	243	24.1%	24	9.9%	888	88.0%	69	7.8%	121	12.0%	13	10.7%
T. Coloma	690	106	15.4%	2	1.9%	487	70.6%	40	8.2%	203	29.4%	43	21.2%
T. Dakota	1,233	308	25.0%	71	23.1%	1,011	82.0%	145	14.3%	222	18.0%	8	3.6%
T. Deerfield	643	145	22.6%	6	4.1%	527	82.0%	38	7.2%	116	18.0%	7	6.0%
T. Hancock	542	124	22.9%	0	0.0%	468	86.3%	14	3.0%	74	13.7%	6	8.1%
T. Leon	1,273	265	20.8%	29	10.9%	1,054	82.8%	79	7.5%	219	17.2%	19	8.7%
T. Marion	2,031	375	18.5%	44	11.7%	1,547	76.2%	102	6.6%	484	23.8%	36	7.4%
T. Mount Morris	1,118	241	21.6%	24	10.0%	892	79.8%	73	8.2%	226	20.2%	9	4.0%
T. Oasis	410	109	26.6%	0	0.0%	344	83.9%	20	5.8%	66	16.1%	4	6.1%
T. Plainfield	569	164	28.8%	32	19.5%	511	89.8%	62	12.1%	58	10.2%	3	5.2%
T. Poy Sippi	977	247	25.3%	11	4.5%	820	83.9%	52	6.3%	157	16.1%	16	10.2%
T. Richford	568	176	31.0%	68	38.6%	481	84.7%	119	24.7%	87	15.3%	8	9.2%
T. Rose	584	112	19.2%	9	8.0%	478	81.8%	47	9.8%	106	18.2%	13	12.3%
T. Saxeville	967	216	22.3%	34	15.7%	800	82.7%	81	10.1%	167	17.3%	8	4.8%
T. Springwater	1,361	256	18.8%	34	13.3%	1,008	74.1%	85	8.4%	353	25.9%	29	8.2%
T. Warren	646	153	23.7%	7	4.6%	543	84.1%	34	6.3%	103	15.9%	15	14.6%
T. Wautoma	1,340	325	24.3%	28	8.6%	1,081	80.7%	80	7.4%	259	19.3%	50	19.3%
Waushara County	22,833	5,367	23.5%	584	10.9%	18,536	81.2%	1,622	8.8%	4,297	18.8%	462	10.8%
Wisconsin	5,211,603	1,342,950	25.8%	150,166	11.2%	4,548,790	87.3%	402,293	8.8%	662,813	12.7%	49,245	7.4%

Source: U.S. Census, 2000, STF 3A.

Table B-22. Population Estimates, Waushara County 1970 to 2030

Minor Civil Division	Census 1970	Census 1980	Census 1990	Census 2000	ECWRPC 2005	ECWRPC 2010	ECWRPC 2015	ECWRPC 2020	ECWRPC 2025	ECWRPC 2030	Percent Change 2000 to 2030
C. Berlin (pt.)	41	91	67	83	86	89	91	92	93	93	12.53%
C. Wautoma	1,624	1,629	1,784	1,998	2,182	2,302	2,409	2,502	2,588	2,649	32.59%
V. Coloma	336	367	383	461	482	511	536	559	580	595	29.09%
V. Hancock	404	419	382	463	471	477	480	479	476	469	1.21%
V. Lohrville	213	336	368	408	425	436	443	447	450	449	9.94%
V. Plainfield	642	813	839	899	912	907	894	873	848	814	-9.46%
V. Redgranite	645	976	1,009	1,040	2,071	2,123	2,159	2,180	2,193	2,184	110.03%
V. Wild Rose	585	741	753	765	773	770	759	742	722	694	-9.26%
T. Aurora	802	890	846	971	1,092	1,139	1,178	1,210	1,238	1,255	29.20%
T. Bloomfield	798	931	922	1,018	1,068	1,076	1,074	1,064	1,050	1,025	0.65%
T. Coloma ^a	382	437	499	660	748	807	862	913	962	1,002	51.83%
T. Dakota	752	994	1,092	1,259	1,293	1,300	1,296	1,282	1,263	1,230	-2.33%
T. Deerfield	367	445	454	629	674	711	745	774	801	820	30.40%
T. Hancock	346	426	467	531	576	601	621	637	652	660	24.30%
T. Leon	651	844	992	1,281	1,435	1,528	1,612	1,687	1,758	1,812	41.46%
T. Marion	877	1,333	1,478	2,065	2,230	2,345	2,446	2,532	2,612	2,666	29.08%
T. Mount Morris	517	685	767	1,092	1,155	1,213	1,263	1,306	1,345	1,370	25.50%
T. Oasis	346	403	389	405	403	397	388	374	359	340	-15.99%
T. Plainfield	447	574	529	533	563	574	581	584	585	580	8.77%
T. Poy Sippi	823	913	929	972	994	993	982	964	941	908	-6.57%
T. Richford	322	404	455	588	627	658	686	709	731	746	26.79%
T. Rose	319	515	486	595	627	645	659	668	675	675	13.36%
T. Saxeville	612	776	846	974	1,026	1,059	1,084	1,102	1,116	1,119	14.88%
T. Springwater	584	924	1,011	1,389	1,460	1,519	1,566	1,604	1,637	1,653	19.02%
T. Warren	637	573	550	675	733	763	789	809	827	837	23.98%
T. Wautoma	723	1,087	1,088	1,312	1,380	1,406	1,420	1,424	1,423	1,407	7.26%
Waushara County ^a	14,795	18,526	19,385	23,066	25,483	26,349	27,024	27,518	27,925	28,051	21.61%

Source: U. S. Census, 1970, 1980, 1990, 2000; WI DOA, 2004; ECWRPC.

1015/04

Table B-23. Total Number of Households in Waushara County, 1970 to 2000

Minor Civil Division	1970		1980		1990		2000		1970 to 2000	
	No. HH	Persons per HH	No. HH	Persons per HH	No. HH	Persons per HH	No. HH	Persons per HH	Change in HHs	Percent
C. Berlin (pt.)	15	2.73	31	2.94	22	3.05	36	2.31	21	140.00%
C. Wautoma	570	2.76	695	2.18	748	2.25	806	2.20	236	41.40%
V. Coloma	139	2.42	159	2.31	159	2.41	185	2.42	46	33.09%
V. Hancock	136	2.87	167	2.51	164	2.33	193	2.40	57	41.91%
V. Lohrville	62	3.15	127	2.65	142	2.59	168	2.43	106	170.97%
V. Plainfield	250	2.57	318	2.52	324	2.55	342	2.60	92	36.80%
V. Redgranite	231	2.79	367	2.66	421	2.40	440	2.30	209	90.48%
V. Wild Rose	224	2.61	275	2.45	309	2.15	312	2.26	88	39.29%
T. Aurora	239	3.36	303	2.94	296	2.86	352	2.76	113	47.28%
T. Bloomfield	223	3.58	301	3.09	315	2.93	383	2.65	160	71.75%
T. Coloma	114	3.35	145	3.01	181	2.76	254	2.51	140	122.81%
T. Dakota	238	3.16	379	2.62	411	2.66	493	2.55	255	107.14%
T. Deerfield	123	2.98	162	2.75	178	2.55	263	2.39	140	113.82%
T. Hancock	125	2.77	157	2.71	178	2.62	211	2.52	86	68.80%
T. Leon	215	3.03	315	2.68	397	2.50	539	2.38	324	150.70%
T. Marion	310	2.83	542	2.46	641	2.31	908	2.27	598	192.90%
T. Mount Morris	173	2.99	275	2.49	327	2.35	481	2.27	308	178.03%
T. Oasis	107	3.23	131	3.08	136	2.86	152	2.66	45	42.06%
T. Plainfield	144	3.10	191	2.99	191	2.77	198	2.69	54	37.50%
T. Poy Sippi	267	3.05	325	2.81	354	2.62	392	2.48	125	46.82%
T. Richford	90	3.58	139	2.91	150	3.03	190	3.09	100	111.11%
T. Rose	108	2.95	179	2.88	192	2.53	244	2.44	136	125.93%
T. Saxeville	194	3.15	273	2.84	316	2.68	393	2.48	199	102.58%
T. Springwater	205	2.85	365	2.53	434	2.33	617	2.25	412	200.98%
T. Warren	176	3.72	198	2.89	210	2.62	261	2.59	85	48.30%
T. Wautoma	232	3.12	385	2.82	420	2.59	523	2.46	291	125.43%
Waushara County	4,910	3.00	6,904	2.65	7,616	2.52	9,336	2.43	4,426	90.14%

Source: U. S. Census: 1970, 1980, 1990 and 2000.

Note: Corrections to 1990 pphh for T. Springwater and V. Wild Rose made on 11/27/06. Group quarter population for V. Wild Rose was incorrectly assigned to T. Springwater.

Table B-24. Estimated Households by MCD, Waushara County, 2000 to 2030

Minor Civil Division	2000		2005		2010		2015		2020		2025		2030	
	No. HH	Persons per HH	No. HH	Persons per HH	No. HH	Persons per HH	No. HH	Persons per HH	No. HH	Persons per HH	No. HH	Persons per HH	No. HH	Persons per HH
C. Berlin (pt.)	36	2.31	37	2.34	40	2.20	44	2.07	47	1.98	49	1.90	51	1.82
	36	2.31	38	2.29	39	2.26	41	2.23	42	2.21	43	2.19	43	2.18
C. Wautoma	806	2.20	863	2.24	929	2.20	989	2.16	1,037	2.14	1,075	2.14	1,101	2.14
	806	2.20	889	2.18	952	2.15	1,010	2.12	1,060	2.10	1,105	2.08	1,138	2.07
V. Coloma	185	2.42	189	2.47	204	2.43	217	2.39	228	2.37	237	2.37	243	2.38
	185	2.42	195	2.40	209	2.37	222	2.34	234	2.32	244	2.30	252	2.29
V. Hancock	193	2.40	192	2.45	200	2.39	205	2.34	207	2.31	207	2.31	203	2.30
	193	2.40	198	2.38	203	2.35	207	2.32	209	2.30	209	2.28	207	2.27
V. Lohrville	168	2.43	172	2.47	183	2.38	192	2.30	199	2.25	204	2.21	207	2.17
	168	2.43	176	2.41	183	2.38	189	2.35	192	2.33	195	2.31	195	2.30
V. Plainfield	342	2.60	340	2.65	346	2.60	347	2.55	342	2.53	332	2.53	317	2.54
	342	2.60	350	2.58	352	2.55	351	2.52	346	2.50	338	2.48	327	2.47
V. Redgranite	440	2.30	471	2.40	490	2.41	503	2.41	509	2.43	509	2.45	502	2.47
	440	2.30	495	2.28	525	2.25	548	2.22	562	2.20	572	2.18	572	2.17
V. Wild Rose	312	2.26	309	2.30	317	2.24	321	2.18	319	2.14	313	2.12	303	2.11
	312	2.26	318	2.24	321	2.21	321	2.18	317	2.16	310	2.14	300	2.13
T. Aurora	352	2.76	388	2.81	419	2.72	447	2.64	469	2.58	488	2.54	500	2.51
	352	2.76	399	2.74	421	2.71	440	2.68	455	2.66	469	2.64	477	2.63
T. Bloomfield	383	2.65	395	2.69	417	2.57	435	2.46	446	2.38	453	2.31	454	2.25
	383	2.65	405	2.63	413	2.60	417	2.57	417	2.55	414	2.53	406	2.52
T. Coloma	254	2.51	283	2.55	317	2.46	351	2.37	382	2.31	410	2.26	434	2.23
	254	2.51	290	2.49	317	2.46	343	2.43	366	2.41	388	2.39	407	2.38
T. Dakota	493	2.55	498	2.60	517	2.52	531	2.44	536	2.39	535	2.36	527	2.33
	493	2.55	511	2.53	521	2.50	525	2.47	524	2.45	519	2.43	509	2.42
T. Deerfield	263	2.39	277	2.43	304	2.34	330	2.26	352	2.20	372	2.15	387	2.12
	263	2.39	284	2.37	304	2.34	323	2.31	338	2.29	353	2.27	363	2.26
T. Hancock	211	2.52	225	2.57	242	2.48	258	2.40	271	2.35	282	2.31	289	2.28
	211	2.52	231	2.50	243	2.47	255	2.44	264	2.42	271	2.40	276	2.39
T. Leon	539	2.38	593	2.42	654	2.34	713	2.26	764	2.21	810	2.17	848	2.14
	539	2.38	608	2.36	656	2.33	701	2.30	741	2.28	777	2.26	806	2.25
T. Marion	908	2.27	965	2.31	1,049	2.24	1,127	2.17	1,192	2.12	1,248	2.09	1,289	2.07
	908	2.27	991	2.25	1,057	2.22	1,118	2.19	1,168	2.17	1,214	2.15	1,247	2.14
T. Mount Morris	481	2.27	500	2.31	543	2.23	583	2.17	616	2.12	645	2.09	666	2.06
	481	2.27	514	2.25	547	2.22	577	2.19	603	2.17	625	2.15	641	2.14
T. Oasis	152	2.66	149	2.70	154	2.58	157	2.47	157	2.38	156	2.30	152	2.23
	152	2.66	153	2.64	152	2.61	150	2.58	146	2.56	141	2.54	135	2.53
T. Plainfield	198	2.69	205	2.74	218	2.63	229	2.54	237	2.46	243	2.41	245	2.37
	198	2.69	211	2.67	218	2.64	223	2.61	226	2.59	227	2.57	227	2.56
T. Poy Sippi	392	2.48	394	2.52	409	2.43	420	2.34	425	2.27	424	2.22	418	2.17
	392	2.48	404	2.46	409	2.43	410	2.40	405	2.38	399	2.36	387	2.35
T. Richford	190	3.09	199	3.16	214	3.07	229	3.00	241	2.95	250	2.92	257	2.90
	190	3.09	204	3.07	217	3.04	228	3.01	238	2.99	246	2.97	252	2.96
T. Rose	244	2.44	253	2.48	270	2.39	286	2.30	298	2.24	307	2.20	312	2.16
	244	2.44	259	2.42	270	2.39	279	2.36	286	2.34	291	2.32	292	2.31
T. Saxeville	393	2.48	407	2.52	437	2.42	465	2.33	487	2.26	504	2.21	516	2.17
	393	2.48	417	2.46	436	2.43	452	2.40	464	2.38	473	2.36	477	2.35
T. Springwater	617	2.25	638	2.29	687	2.21	732	2.14	768	2.09	797	2.05	817	2.02
	617	2.25	655	2.23	691	2.20	722	2.17	747	2.15	768	2.13	781	2.12
T. Warren	261	2.59	278	2.64	299	2.55	319	2.47	334	2.42	347	2.38	356	2.35
	261	2.59	285	2.57	301	2.54	314	2.51	325	2.49	335	2.47	341	2.46
T. Wautoma	523	2.46	541	2.50	572	2.41	599	2.33	616	2.27	627	2.23	630	2.19
	523	2.46	556	2.44	574	2.41	587	2.38	594	2.36	597	2.34	594	2.33
Waushara County	9,336	2.43	9,760	2.48	10,430	2.40	11,030	2.33	11,479	2.28	11,824	2.25	12,023	2.21
	9,336	2.43	10,034	2.41	10,532	2.37	10,954	2.34	11,268	2.32	11,522	2.30	11,651	2.29

Source: U.S. Census, 2000; ECWRPC.

11/22/2004

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT APPENDICES

Table C-1 Educational Attainment, 2000

Table C-2 Total Civilian Labor Force, 1990 and 2000

Table C-3 Employment Status, 16 Years and Older, 1990

Table C-4 Employment Status, 16 Years and Older, 2000

Table C-5 Location of Workplace, 1990 and 2000

Table C-6 Travel Time to Work, 1990

Table C-7 Travel Time to Work, 2000

Table C-8 Economic Development Organizations

Table C-1. Educational Attainment, 2000

Jurisdiction	Less than 9th Grade		9 - 12 Grade, No Diploma		High School Graduate		College				Total Persons Age 25 and Older		High School Graduation Rate	
							1 - 3 Years		4 Years or More					
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
C. Berlin (pt.)	1	1.85%	6	11.11%	24	44.44%	15	27.78%	8	14.81%	54	100.00%	47	87.04%
C. Wautoma	114	8.62%	206	15.58%	542	41.00%	269	20.35%	191	14.45%	1,322	100.00%	1,002	75.79%
V. Coloma	20	6.29%	45	14.15%	140	44.03%	90	28.30%	23	7.23%	318	100.00%	253	79.56%
V. Hancock	20	6.25%	77	24.06%	132	41.25%	68	21.25%	23	7.19%	320	100.00%	223	69.69%
V. Lohrville	20	6.76%	47	15.88%	167	56.42%	55	18.58%	7	2.36%	296	100.00%	229	77.36%
V. Plainfield	50	9.31%	105	19.55%	222	41.34%	90	16.76%	70	13.04%	537	100.00%	382	71.14%
V. Redgranite	63	8.69%	183	25.24%	289	39.86%	164	22.62%	26	3.59%	725	100.00%	479	66.07%
V. Wild Rose	43	7.89%	77	14.13%	209	38.35%	146	26.79%	70	12.84%	545	100.00%	425	77.98%
T. Aurora	38	5.73%	75	11.31%	275	41.48%	205	30.92%	70	10.56%	663	100.00%	550	82.96%
T. Bloomfield	45	6.47%	87	12.52%	344	49.50%	167	24.03%	52	7.48%	695	100.00%	563	81.01%
T. Coloma	56	10.22%	112	20.44%	186	33.94%	145	26.46%	49	8.94%	548	100.00%	380	69.34%
T. Dakota	78	9.33%	122	14.59%	349	41.75%	205	24.52%	82	9.81%	836	100.00%	636	76.08%
T. Deerfield	26	5.37%	69	14.26%	191	39.46%	134	27.69%	64	13.22%	484	100.00%	389	80.37%
T. Hancock	19	4.90%	38	9.79%	212	54.64%	57	14.69%	62	15.98%	388	100.00%	331	85.31%
T. Leon	63	6.64%	134	14.12%	410	43.20%	233	24.55%	109	11.49%	949	100.00%	752	79.24%
T. Marion	71	4.54%	168	10.74%	678	43.35%	408	26.09%	239	15.28%	1,564	100.00%	1,325	84.72%
T. Mount Morris	30	3.65%	88	10.69%	358	43.50%	209	25.39%	138	16.77%	823	100.00%	705	85.66%
T. Oasis	17	6.30%	52	19.26%	103	38.15%	67	24.81%	31	11.48%	270	100.00%	201	74.44%
T. Plainfield	14	3.76%	49	13.17%	180	48.39%	101	27.15%	28	7.53%	372	100.00%	309	83.06%
T. Poy Sippi	66	9.90%	66	9.90%	297	44.53%	160	23.99%	78	11.69%	667	100.00%	535	80.21%
T. Richford	68	19.05%	34	9.52%	149	41.74%	69	19.33%	37	10.36%	357	100.00%	255	71.43%
T. Rose	44	10.35%	56	13.18%	185	43.53%	95	22.35%	45	10.59%	425	100.00%	325	76.47%
T. Saxeville	37	5.17%	74	10.35%	333	46.57%	157	21.96%	114	15.94%	715	100.00%	604	84.48%
T. Springwater	29	2.78%	130	12.46%	495	47.46%	251	24.07%	138	13.23%	1,043	100.00%	884	84.76%
T. Warren	37	8.30%	78	17.49%	217	48.65%	91	20.40%	23	5.16%	446	100.00%	331	74.22%
T. Wautoma	65	6.86%	145	15.30%	347	36.60%	257	27.11%	134	14.14%	948	100.00%	738	77.85%
Waushara County	1,134	6.95%	2,323	14.24%	7,034	43.13%	3,908	23.96%	1,911	11.72%	16,310	100.00%	12,853	78.80%
Wisconsin	186,125	5.35%	332,292	9.56%	1,201,813	34.58%	976,375	28.09%	779,273	22.42%	3,475,878	100.00%	2,957,461	85.09%

Source: U.S. Census, 2000

Table C-2. Total Civilian Labor Force, 1990 and 2000

Jurisdiction	1990			2000			1990 to 2000 Change			1990 to 2000 Percent Change		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
C. Berlin (pt.)	38	24	14	45	20	25	7	-4	11	18.42%	-16.67%	78.57%
C. Wautoma	761	390	371	901	457	444	140	67	73	18.40%	17.18%	19.68%
V. Coloma	163	88	75	249	134	115	86	46	40	52.76%	52.27%	53.33%
V. Hancock	143	89	54	234	127	107	91	38	53	63.64%	42.70%	98.15%
V. Lohrville	178	103	75	193	106	87	15	3	12	8.43%	2.91%	16.00%
V. Plainfield	366	180	186	425	235	190	59	55	4	16.12%	30.56%	2.15%
V. Redgranite	396	200	196	489	242	247	93	42	51	23.48%	21.00%	26.02%
V. Wild Rose	295	144	151	351	170	181	56	26	30	18.98%	18.06%	19.87%
T. Aurora	420	247	173	565	311	254	145	64	81	34.52%	25.91%	46.82%
T. Bloomfield	469	292	177	512	290	222	43	-2	45	9.17%	-0.68%	25.42%
T. Coloma	242	135	107	386	200	186	144	65	79	59.50%	48.15%	73.83%
T. Dakota	477	267	210	598	320	278	121	53	68	25.37%	19.85%	32.38%
T. Deerfield	212	128	84	288	152	136	76	24	52	35.85%	18.75%	61.90%
T. Hancock	199	119	80	288	167	121	89	48	41	44.72%	40.34%	51.25%
T. Leon	457	264	193	686	374	312	229	110	119	50.11%	41.67%	61.66%
T. Marion	680	368	312	922	478	444	242	110	132	35.59%	29.89%	42.31%
T. Mount Morris	313	170	143	538	299	239	225	129	96	71.88%	75.88%	67.13%
T. Oasis	180	86	94	201	97	104	21	11	10	11.67%	12.79%	10.64%
T. Plainfield	220	127	93	277	145	132	57	18	39	25.91%	14.17%	41.94%
T. Poy Sippi	443	255	188	517	276	241	74	21	53	16.70%	8.24%	28.19%
T. Richford	195	116	79	257	156	101	62	40	22	31.79%	34.48%	27.85%
T. Rose	246	149	97	284	160	124	38	11	27	15.45%	7.38%	27.84%
T. Saxeville	390	219	171	483	276	207	93	57	36	23.85%	26.03%	21.05%
T. Springwater	464	256	208	615	347	268	151	91	60	32.54%	35.55%	28.85%
T. Warren	256	152	104	326	192	134	70	40	30	27.34%	26.32%	28.85%
T. Wautoma	514	306	208	649	331	318	135	25	110	26.26%	8.17%	52.88%
Waushara County	8,717	4,874	3,843	11,279	6,062	5,217	2,562	1,188	1,374	29.39%	24.37%	35.75%
Wisconsin	2,517,238	1,355,109	1,162,129	2,869,236	1,505,853	1,363,383	351,998	150,744	201,254	13.98%	11.12%	17.32%

Source: U.S. Census, 1990 and 2000.

Table C-3. Employment Status, 16 Years and Older, 1990

Jurisdiction	Total Civilian Labor Force			Employed Persons						Unemployed Persons					
				Total		Male		Female		Total		Male		Female	
	Total	Male	Female	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
C. Berlin (pt.)	38	24	14	38	100.00%	24	100.00%	14	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
C. Wautoma	761	390	371	704	92.51%	368	94.36%	336	90.57%	57	7.49%	22	5.64%	35	9.43%
V. Coloma	163	88	75	157	96.32%	86	97.73%	71	94.67%	6	3.68%	2	2.27%	4	5.33%
V. Hancock	143	89	54	121	84.62%	75	84.27%	46	85.19%	22	15.38%	14	15.73%	8	14.81%
V. Lohrville	178	103	75	161	90.45%	90	87.38%	71	94.67%	17	9.55%	13	12.62%	4	5.33%
V. Plainfield	366	180	186	334	91.26%	164	91.11%	170	91.40%	32	8.74%	16	8.89%	16	8.60%
V. Redgranite	396	200	196	334	84.34%	169	84.50%	165	84.18%	62	15.66%	31	15.50%	31	15.82%
V. Wild Rose	295	144	151	269	91.19%	125	86.81%	144	95.36%	26	8.81%	19	13.19%	7	4.64%
T. Aurora	420	247	173	388	92.38%	227	91.90%	161	93.06%	32	7.62%	20	8.10%	12	6.94%
T. Bloomfield	469	292	177	441	94.03%	272	93.15%	169	95.48%	28	5.97%	20	6.85%	8	4.52%
T. Coloma	242	135	107	225	92.98%	133	98.52%	92	85.98%	17	7.02%	2	1.48%	15	14.02%
T. Dakota	477	267	210	432	90.57%	236	88.39%	196	93.33%	45	9.43%	31	11.61%	14	6.67%
T. Deerfield	212	128	84	205	96.70%	123	96.09%	82	97.62%	7	3.30%	5	3.91%	2	2.38%
T. Hancock	199	119	80	173	86.93%	108	90.76%	65	81.25%	26	13.07%	11	9.24%	15	18.75%
T. Leon	457	264	193	431	94.31%	249	94.32%	182	94.30%	26	5.69%	15	5.68%	11	5.70%
T. Marion	680	368	312	648	95.29%	353	95.92%	295	94.55%	32	4.71%	15	4.08%	17	5.45%
T. Mount Morris	313	170	143	303	96.81%	162	95.29%	141	98.60%	10	3.19%	8	4.71%	2	1.40%
T. Oasis	180	86	94	169	93.89%	83	96.51%	86	91.49%	11	6.11%	3	3.49%	8	8.51%
T. Plainfield	220	127	93	202	91.82%	120	94.49%	82	88.17%	18	8.18%	7	5.51%	11	11.83%
T. Poy Sippi	443	255	188	407	91.87%	229	89.80%	178	94.68%	36	8.13%	26	10.20%	10	5.32%
T. Richford	195	116	79	185	94.87%	110	94.83%	75	94.94%	10	5.13%	6	5.17%	4	5.06%
T. Rose	246	149	97	231	93.90%	139	93.29%	92	94.85%	15	6.10%	10	6.71%	5	5.15%
T. Saxeville	390	219	171	367	94.10%	207	94.52%	160	93.57%	23	5.90%	12	5.48%	11	6.43%
T. Springwater	464	256	208	435	93.75%	233	91.02%	202	97.12%	29	6.25%	23	8.98%	6	2.88%
T. Warren	256	152	104	246	96.09%	146	96.05%	100	96.15%	10	3.91%	6	3.95%	4	3.85%
T. Wautoma	514	306	208	483	93.97%	283	92.48%	200	96.15%	31	6.03%	23	7.52%	8	3.85%
Waushara County	8,717	4,874	3,843	8,089	92.80%	4,514	92.61%	3,575	93.03%	628	7.20%	360	7.39%	268	6.97%
Wisconsin	2,517,238	1,355,109	1,162,129	2,386,439	94.80%	1,280,407	94.49%	1,106,032	95.17%	130,799	5.20%	74,702	5.51%	56,097	4.83%

Source: U.S. Census, 1990

Table C-4. Employment Status, 16 Years and Older, 2000

Jurisdiction	Total Civilian Labor Force			Employed Persons						Unemployed Persons					
				Total		Male		Female		Total		Male		Female	
	Total	Male	Female	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
C. Berlin (pt.)	45	20	25	43	95.56%	20	100.00%	23	92.00%	2	4.44%	0	0.00%	2	8.00%
C. Wautoma	901	457	444	798	88.57%	412	90.15%	386	86.94%	103	11.43%	45	9.85%	58	13.06%
V. Coloma	249	134	115	218	87.55%	117	87.31%	101	87.83%	31	12.45%	17	12.69%	14	12.17%
V. Hancock	234	127	107	219	93.59%	120	94.49%	99	92.52%	15	6.41%	7	5.51%	8	7.48%
V. Lohrville	193	106	87	192	99.48%	106	100.00%	86	98.85%	1	0.52%	0	0.00%	1	1.15%
V. Plainfield	425	235	190	384	90.35%	210	89.36%	174	91.58%	41	9.65%	25	10.64%	16	8.42%
V. Redgranite	489	242	247	446	91.21%	227	93.80%	219	88.66%	43	8.79%	15	6.20%	28	11.34%
V. Wild Rose	351	170	181	335	95.44%	159	93.53%	176	97.24%	16	4.56%	11	6.47%	5	2.76%
T. Aurora	565	311	254	536	94.87%	287	92.28%	249	98.03%	29	5.13%	24	7.72%	5	1.97%
T. Bloomfield	512	290	222	483	94.34%	269	92.76%	214	96.40%	29	5.66%	21	7.24%	8	3.60%
T. Coloma	386	200	186	273	70.73%	149	74.50%	124	66.67%	113	29.27%	51	25.50%	62	33.33%
T. Dakota	598	320	278	560	93.65%	294	91.88%	266	95.68%	38	6.35%	26	8.13%	12	4.32%
T. Deerfield	288	152	136	276	95.83%	144	94.74%	132	97.06%	12	4.17%	8	5.26%	4	2.94%
T. Hancock	288	167	121	273	94.79%	155	92.81%	118	97.52%	15	5.21%	12	7.19%	3	2.48%
T. Leon	686	374	312	672	97.96%	366	97.86%	306	98.08%	14	2.04%	8	2.14%	6	1.92%
T. Marion	922	478	444	875	94.90%	449	93.93%	426	95.95%	47	5.10%	29	6.07%	18	4.05%
T. Mount Morris	538	299	239	525	97.58%	290	96.99%	235	98.33%	13	2.42%	9	3.01%	4	1.67%
T. Oasis	201	97	104	195	97.01%	93	95.88%	102	98.08%	6	2.99%	4	4.12%	2	1.92%
T. Plainfield	277	145	132	256	92.42%	135	93.10%	121	91.67%	21	7.58%	10	6.90%	11	8.33%
T. Poy Sippi	517	276	241	502	97.10%	264	95.65%	238	98.76%	15	2.90%	12	4.35%	3	1.24%
T. Richford	257	156	101	240	93.39%	144	92.31%	96	95.05%	17	6.61%	12	7.69%	5	4.95%
T. Rose	284	160	124	267	94.01%	147	91.88%	120	96.77%	17	5.99%	13	8.13%	4	3.23%
T. Saxeville	483	276	207	458	94.82%	253	91.67%	205	99.03%	25	5.18%	23	8.33%	2	0.97%
T. Springwater	615	347	268	595	96.75%	330	95.10%	265	98.88%	20	3.25%	17	4.90%	3	1.12%
T. Warren	326	192	134	311	95.40%	182	94.79%	129	96.27%	15	4.60%	10	5.21%	5	3.73%
T. Wautoma	649	331	318	598	92.14%	306	92.45%	292	91.82%	51	7.86%	25	7.55%	26	8.18%
Waushara County	11,279	6,062	5,217	10,530	93.36%	5,628	92.84%	4,902	93.96%	749	6.64%	434	7.16%	315	6.04%
Wisconsin	2,869,236	1,505,853	1,363,383	2,734,925	95.32%	1,428,493	94.86%	1,306,432	95.82%	134,311	4.68%	77,360	5.14%	56,951	4.18%

Source: U.S. Census, 2000

Table C-5 Location of Workplace, 1990 and 2000

Location of Workplace	Town of Poy Sippi				Waushara County			
	1990		2000		1990		2000	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Worked in Waushara County	158	39.30%	146	29.44%	4,683	58.71%	5,398	52.47%
City of Wautoma	11	2.74%	4	0.81%	1,320	16.55%	1,661	16.15%
Remainder of Waushara County	147	36.57%	142	28.63%	3,363	42.16%	3,737	36.32%
Worked in Adams County	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	43	0.54%	105	1.02%
Worked in Portage County	0	0.00%	2	0.40%	317	3.97%	505	4.91%
City of Stevens Point	0	0.00%	2	0.40%	119	1.49%	250	2.43%
Remainder of Portage County	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	198	2.48%	255	2.48%
Worked in Waupaca County	17	4.23%	14	2.82%	561	7.03%	654	6.36%
Worked in Appleton-Oshkosh MSA	125	31.09%	188	37.90%	797	9.99%	1,490	14.48%
City of Appleton	7	1.74%	16	3.23%	60	0.75%	145	1.41%
City of Oshkosh	73	18.16%	85	17.14%	421	5.28%	686	6.67%
City of Neenah	11	2.74%	13	2.62%	66	0.83%	115	1.12%
Remainder of Calumet County	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	0.03%	3	0.03%
Remainder of Outagamie County	5	1.24%	25	5.04%	71	0.89%	188	1.83%
Remainder of Winnebago County	29	7.21%	49	9.88%	177	2.22%	353	3.43%
Worked in Green Lake County	84	20.90%	109	21.98%	781	9.79%	926	9.00%
City of Berlin	72	17.91%	76	15.32%	634	7.95%	696	6.77%
Remainder of Green Lake County	12	2.99%	33	6.65%	147	1.84%	230	2.24%
Worked in Green Bay, WI, SMSA	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	13	0.16%	35	0.34%
City of Green Bay	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	7	0.09%	14	0.14%
Remainder of Green Bay, WI, SMSA	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	6	0.08%	21	0.20%
Worked in Marquette County	0	0.00%	2	0.40%	205	2.57%	317	3.08%
Worked in Wood County	0	0.00%	4	0.81%	102	1.28%	91	0.88%
Worked in Fond du Lac County	17	4.23%	17	3.43%	197	2.47%	277	2.69%
Worked in Wausau, WI, SMSA	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	15	0.19%	19	0.18%
Worked Elsewhere	1	0.25%	14	2.82%	263	3.30%	471	4.58%
Place of Work Not Reported		0.00%		0.00%				
Total Employed Persons	402	100.00%	496	100.00%	7,977	100.00%	10,288	100.00%

Source: U.S. Census, 1990 and 2000.

Table C-6. Travel Time to Work, 1990

Jurisdiction	Travel Time																Total 16 Years and Older		
	Less than 5 min.		5 to 9 minutes		10 to 14 minutes		15 to 19 minutes		20 to 29 minutes		30 to 44 minutes		45 to 59 minutes		60 minutes or more			Worked at home	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
C. Berlin (pt.)	0	0.00%	16	42.11%	9	23.68%	0	0.00%	3	7.89%	6	15.79%	0	0.00%	4	10.53%	0	0.00%	38
C. Wautoma	104	15.14%	229	33.33%	91	13.25%	52	7.57%	45	6.55%	54	7.86%	57	8.30%	20	2.91%	35	5.09%	687
V. Coloma	25	16.78%	21	14.09%	8	5.37%	19	12.75%	31	20.81%	20	13.42%	7	4.70%	8	5.37%	10	6.71%	149
V. Hancock	21	17.36%	21	17.36%	20	16.53%	13	10.74%	16	13.22%	9	7.44%	8	6.61%	7	5.79%	6	4.96%	121
V. Lohrville	16	10.06%	21	13.21%	9	5.66%	19	11.95%	26	16.35%	29	18.24%	23	14.47%	8	5.03%	8	5.03%	159
V. Plainfield	26	7.93%	98	29.88%	39	11.89%	16	4.88%	45	13.72%	78	23.78%	16	4.88%	2	0.61%	8	2.44%	328
V. Redgranite	23	7.08%	37	11.38%	28	8.62%	49	15.08%	66	20.31%	67	20.62%	35	10.77%	5	1.54%	15	4.62%	325
V. Wild Rose	43	16.54%	82	31.54%	12	4.62%	28	10.77%	47	18.08%	13	5.00%	14	5.38%	10	3.85%	11	4.23%	260
T. Aurora	35	8.97%	59	15.13%	64	16.41%	44	11.28%	62	15.90%	68	17.44%	18	4.62%	11	2.82%	29	7.44%	390
T. Bloomfield	25	5.72%	15	3.43%	36	8.24%	64	14.65%	66	15.10%	69	15.79%	47	10.76%	14	3.20%	101	23.11%	437
T. Coloma	23	10.22%	40	17.78%	24	10.67%	27	12.00%	35	15.56%	32	14.22%	13	5.78%	11	4.89%	20	8.89%	225
T. Dakota	39	9.18%	64	15.06%	70	16.47%	48	11.29%	57	13.41%	50	11.76%	33	7.76%	20	4.71%	44	10.35%	425
T. Deerfield	17	8.50%	15	7.50%	21	10.50%	39	19.50%	21	10.50%	19	9.50%	14	7.00%	12	6.00%	42	21.00%	200
T. Hancock	11	6.36%	24	13.87%	29	16.76%	18	10.40%	14	8.09%	45	26.01%	2	1.16%	13	7.51%	17	9.83%	173
T. Leon	12	2.80%	13	3.03%	44	10.26%	51	11.89%	115	26.81%	76	17.72%	51	11.89%	39	9.09%	28	6.53%	429
T. Marion	37	5.75%	96	14.91%	114	17.70%	88	13.66%	88	13.66%	61	9.47%	43	6.68%	88	13.66%	29	4.50%	644
T. Mount Morris	4	1.36%	13	4.41%	79	26.78%	65	22.03%	34	11.53%	21	7.12%	24	8.14%	25	8.47%	30	10.17%	295
T. Oasis	19	11.24%	19	11.24%	15	8.88%	25	14.79%	13	7.69%	34	20.12%	10	5.92%	4	2.37%	30	17.75%	169
T. Plainfield	12	6.00%	42	21.00%	26	13.00%	19	9.50%	32	16.00%	38	19.00%	5	2.50%	13	6.50%	13	6.50%	200
T. Poy Sippi	32	7.96%	26	6.47%	9	2.24%	59	14.68%	69	17.16%	118	29.35%	37	9.20%	11	2.74%	41	10.20%	402
T. Richford	12	6.49%	18	9.73%	17	9.19%	31	16.76%	33	17.84%	11	5.95%	9	4.86%	21	11.35%	33	17.84%	185
T. Rose	8	3.49%	29	12.66%	37	16.16%	47	20.52%	35	15.28%	11	4.80%	8	3.49%	32	13.97%	22	9.61%	229
T. Saxeville	7	1.92%	21	5.77%	21	5.77%	50	13.74%	103	28.30%	65	17.86%	30	8.24%	22	6.04%	45	12.36%	364
T. Springwater	22	5.13%	75	17.48%	57	13.29%	35	8.16%	102	23.78%	39	9.09%	33	7.69%	29	6.76%	37	8.62%	429
T. Warren	20	8.33%	30	12.50%	16	6.67%	30	12.50%	44	18.33%	39	16.25%	25	10.42%	13	5.42%	23	9.58%	240
T. Wautoma	52	10.97%	142	29.96%	85	17.93%	47	9.92%	42	8.86%	24	5.06%	19	4.01%	36	7.59%	27	5.70%	474
Waushara County	645	8.09%	1,266	15.87%	980	12.29%	983	12.32%	1,244	15.59%	1,096	13.74%	581	7.28%	478	5.99%	704	8.83%	7,977
Wisconsin	130,968	5.57%	386,108	16.43%	439,464	18.70%	398,660	16.97%	443,436	18.87%	282,678	12.03%	83,031	3.53%	71,179	3.03%	114,167	4.86%	2,349,691

Source: U.S. Census, 1990

Table C-7. Travel Time to Work, 2000

Jurisdiction	Travel Time																Total 16 Years and Older		
	Less than 5 min.		5 to 9 minutes		10 to 14 minutes		15 to 19 minutes		20 to 29 minutes		30 to 44 minutes		45 to 59 minutes		60 minutes or more			Worked at home	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
C. Berlin (pt.)	8	18.60%	9	20.93%	5	11.63%	2	4.65%	4	9.30%	6	13.95%	0	0.00%	9	20.93%	0	0.00%	43
C. Wautoma	137	17.34%	222	28.10%	98	12.41%	55	6.96%	54	6.84%	121	15.32%	31	3.92%	52	6.58%	20	2.53%	790
V. Coloma	29	13.81%	26	12.38%	10	4.76%	32	15.24%	42	20.00%	42	20.00%	4	1.90%	9	4.29%	16	7.62%	210
V. Hancock	21	10.14%	14	6.76%	32	15.46%	15	7.25%	50	24.15%	50	24.15%	6	2.90%	15	7.25%	4	1.93%	207
V. Lohrville	2	1.05%	32	16.84%	8	4.21%	13	6.84%	47	24.74%	17	8.95%	32	16.84%	34	17.89%	5	2.63%	190
V. Plainfield	45	12.00%	66	17.60%	50	13.33%	21	5.60%	64	17.07%	88	23.47%	21	5.60%	6	1.60%	14	3.73%	375
V. Redgranite	23	5.35%	61	14.19%	24	5.58%	69	16.05%	60	13.95%	87	20.23%	60	13.95%	31	7.21%	15	3.49%	430
V. Wild Rose	39	12.19%	81	25.31%	38	11.88%	34	10.63%	59	18.44%	13	4.06%	15	4.69%	25	7.81%	16	5.00%	320
T. Aurora	18	3.45%	40	7.66%	84	16.09%	43	8.24%	98	18.77%	157	30.08%	32	6.13%	26	4.98%	24	4.60%	522
T. Bloomfield	16	3.41%	40	8.53%	23	4.90%	54	11.51%	65	13.86%	121	25.80%	70	14.93%	26	5.54%	54	11.51%	469
T. Coloma	34	12.83%	31	11.70%	18	6.79%	35	13.21%	51	19.25%	36	13.58%	13	4.91%	28	10.57%	19	7.17%	265
T. Dakota	30	5.44%	90	16.33%	104	18.87%	53	9.62%	68	12.34%	80	14.52%	57	10.34%	48	8.71%	21	3.81%	551
T. Deerfield	14	5.11%	27	9.85%	52	18.98%	44	16.06%	28	10.22%	45	16.42%	17	6.20%	21	7.66%	26	9.49%	274
T. Hancock	6	2.21%	25	9.23%	41	15.13%	25	9.23%	53	19.56%	67	24.72%	12	4.43%	21	7.75%	21	7.75%	271
T. Leon	10	1.51%	31	4.68%	47	7.09%	75	11.31%	142	21.42%	143	21.57%	111	16.74%	67	10.11%	37	5.58%	663
T. Marion	56	6.57%	107	12.54%	148	17.35%	100	11.72%	149	17.47%	95	11.14%	72	8.44%	98	11.49%	28	3.28%	853
T. Mount Morris	8	1.60%	44	8.80%	92	18.40%	73	14.60%	78	15.60%	59	11.80%	60	12.00%	65	13.00%	21	4.20%	500
T. Oasis	10	5.26%	31	16.32%	13	6.84%	38	20.00%	34	17.89%	25	13.16%	14	7.37%	13	6.84%	12	6.32%	190
T. Plainfield	7	2.85%	52	21.14%	34	13.82%	22	8.94%	35	14.23%	67	27.24%	3	1.22%	15	6.10%	11	4.47%	246
T. Poy Sippi	33	6.65%	30	6.05%	12	2.42%	44	8.87%	99	19.96%	164	33.06%	58	11.69%	28	5.65%	28	5.65%	496
T. Richford	14	6.11%	17	7.42%	31	13.54%	22	9.61%	40	17.47%	28	12.23%	16	6.99%	22	9.61%	39	17.03%	229
T. Rose	0	0.00%	41	15.71%	52	19.92%	39	14.94%	39	14.94%	40	15.33%	10	3.83%	18	6.90%	22	8.43%	261
T. Saxeville	18	3.95%	22	4.82%	30	6.58%	50	10.96%	103	22.59%	98	21.49%	50	10.96%	66	14.47%	19	4.17%	456
T. Springwater	37	6.38%	70	12.07%	47	8.10%	74	12.76%	111	19.14%	62	10.69%	52	8.97%	73	12.59%	54	9.31%	580
T. Warren	12	3.91%	16	5.21%	55	17.92%	29	9.45%	39	12.70%	70	22.80%	33	10.75%	26	8.47%	27	8.79%	307
T. Wautoma	66	11.19%	151	25.59%	103	17.46%	45	7.63%	42	7.12%	68	11.53%	37	6.27%	52	8.81%	26	4.41%	590
Waushara County	693	6.74%	1,376	13.37%	1,251	12.16%	1,106	10.75%	1,654	16.08%	1,849	17.97%	886	8.61%	894	8.69%	579	5.63%	10,288
Wisconsin	135,194	5.02%	398,697	14.82%	476,569	17.71%	440,637	16.38%	531,628	19.76%	369,375	13.73%	120,028	4.46%	113,181	4.21%	105,395	3.92%	2,690,704

Source: U.S. Census, 2000

Table C-8. Economic Development Organizations

Organization Name	Structure	Funding	Focus Audience	Focus Area	Current Activities	Anticipated Activities
<u>Berlin Business Improvement District</u> (920) 361-3636	Staff and Volunteers	Properties in Business Improvement District / City of Berlin	commercial businesses / businesses located in Business Improvement District	Business Improvement District (Downtown)	business recruitment and retention / facade improvements / special events / promotion	business recruitment and retention / facade improvements / special events / promotion / joint ventures with Berlin Chamber
<u>Berlin Chamber of Commerce</u> (920) 361-3636	Staff and Volunteers	Membership Dues	commercial and industrial businesses	Berlin Area	business recruitment and retention / group insurance / tourism / networking / special events	business recruitment and retention / group insurance / tourism / networking / special events / joint ventures with Berlin BID
<u>Berlin Community Development Corporation</u> (920) 361-5430	Staff and Volunteer Board of Directors	City of Berlin / State / Federal	startup, recruited and existing businesses	City of Berlin	revolving loan for matching amounts / business development programs / business recruitment / business retention / lease - purchase option on build-to-suit facilities / market industrial park sites in the City of Berlin	revolving loan for matching amounts / business development programs / business recruitment / business retention / lease - purchase option on build-to-suit facilities / market industrial park sites in the City of Berlin
Bureau of Migrant Services (920) 787-3338	Staff	State	migrant workers and employers of migrant workers	Region	regulatory and technical assistance for migrant workers and their employers	regulatory and technical assistance for migrant workers and their employers
<u>CAP Services</u> (920) 787-7461	Staff	Community Development Block Grants / County / Service Fees	startup businesses for low to moderate income individuals / recruit businesses which employ or could employ low & moderate income individuals	Region	micro business incubator / micro business recruitment / business startup counseling / revolving loan fund for smaller amounts (\$100-\$7,500) / industrial property development	micro business incubator / micro business recruitment / micro business startup counseling / revolving loan fund for smaller amounts (\$100-\$30,000) / industrial property development
<u>Coloma Industrial Development Corporation</u> (715) 228-4167	Volunteers	Village of Coloma / State / Donations	business interested in access to I-39 and industrial park	Coloma	business recruitment for industrial park	business recruitment / industrial park development
<u>Farm Service Agency - Waushara County</u> (608) 296-2819	Staff	Federal - USDA	agricultural businesses	Waushara County	provide loans to farmers / administrator all federal farm programs / information distribution	provide loans to farmers / administrator all federal farm programs / information distribution

Table C-8. Economic Development Organizations

Organization Name	Structure	Funding	Focus Audience	Focus Area	Current Activities	Anticipated Activities
<u>Fox Valley Technical College</u> (920) 787-3319	Staff	Area Taxes / Tuition and Fees	secondary & postsecondary students / business & industry with training needs / community & individuals interested in self-enrichment activities	Region	on-campus, video, internet, and correspondence, courses towards a degree / continuing education / customized training / career counseling	degree attainable in Wautoma / specific training for local businesses / specific community & self-enrichment activities
<u>Experience Works</u> (920) 787-0484	Staff	Federal - Dept. of Labor thru. Older Americans Act	seniors (Individuals age 55 and over)	Region	develop employment opportunities for seniors / job placement for seniors	develop employment opportunities for seniors / job placement for seniors
Highway 21 Corridor Project	Volunteers	7 Towns, Villages, & Cities along Highway 21 / GEM Grant	tourists, commercial businesses and municipalities along Highway 21 or with in 8 miles of Highway 21	7 participating Municipalities & Towns along or with in 8 miles of Hwy 21	joint tourism promotion	joint tourism promotion
<u>Village of Hancock</u> (715) 249-5521	Village Board	Village of Hancock	commercial and industrial businesses	Village of Hancock	business recruitment and retention	business recruitment and retention
Village of Plainfield (715) 335-6707	Village Board	Village of Plainfield	commercial and industrial businesses	Village of Plainfield	business recruitment and retention	business recruitment and retention
<u>Redgranite Economic Development Committee</u> (920) 566-2381	Volunteers	Village of Redgranite / Private Donations	small to midsize commercial and industrial businesses	Village of Redgranite	2 TIF districts / business recruitment / business retention	land use planning / downtown rehab / TIF districts / business recruitment / business retention
<u>Tri-County Regional Economic Development Corporation</u> (920) 382-0963	Staff and Volunteers	Green Lake, Marquette, and Waushara County Economic Development Corporations/ Private Donations	commercial and industrial businesses	Green Lake, Marquette, and Waushara Counties	work with public and private entities / promotes and advocates for the three county region / business recruitment / business retention / assistance for existing and future businesses in the region	work with public and private entities / promotes and advocates for the three county region / business recruitment / business retention / assistance for existing and future businesses in the region

Table C-8. Economic Development Organizations

Organization Name	Structure	Funding	Focus Audience	Focus Area	Current Activities	Anticipated Activities
<u>UW Extension - Waushara County</u> (920) 787-0416	Staff	Waushara County / State / Federal	individuals, groups, schools, and local government	Waushara County	educational programs based on university research, knowledge, & resources to address community, natural resources, economic development, agricultural, youth, & family issues	educational programs based on university research, knowledge, & resources to address community, natural resources, economic development, agricultural, youth, & family issues
<u>Waushara Area Chamber of Commerce</u> (920) 787-3488	Staff and Volunteers	Membership Dues	county businesses and member businesses	Waushara County	tourism promotion / economic development programs / business networking	tourism promotion / economic development programs / business networking
<u>Waushara Convention and Visitors Bureau</u> (920) 787-3488	Staff and Volunteers	Waushara Area Chamber of Commerce	County businesses and organizations	Waushara County	tourism promotion	tourism promotion
<u>Waushara County Economic Development Corporation</u> (920) 787-6500	Volunteer Board of Directors	Community Development Block Grant / State / County	startup, recruited and existing businesses which employ or could employ a number of new or local residents	Waushara County	revolving loan for larger amounts (\$20,000-\$750,000) / community profiles	coordinate economic development efforts in the county / revolving loan for larger amounts (\$20,000-\$750,000) / community profiles / business retention and expansion assistance / macro business recruitment
<u>Waushara County Farm Bureau</u> (920) 787-4664	Staff	Membership Dues	agricultural businesses	Waushara County	advocate for farms / agricultural education	advocate for farms / agricultural education
<u>Waushara County Office of the Wisconsin Job Center</u> (920) 787-3338	Staff	Waushara County / State / Federal	businesses looking for employees / people looking for employment	Waushara County & State	resume and application assistance for job seekers / job placement services / apprenticeship programs / public assistance programs / labor market information / GED and HSED program / training for special populations	advise job center on activities / direct W-2 program activities / employment application assistance / job placement services / employee recruitment for businesses
<u>Wautoma Industrial Development Corporation</u> (920) 787-4044	Volunteers	City of Wautoma	commercial and industrial businesses	City of Wautoma	business recruitment and follow up contact for City of Wautoma industrial parks	business recruitment and follow up contact for City of Wautoma industrial parks

Table C-8. Economic Development Organizations

Organization Name	Structure	Funding	Focus Audience	Focus Area	Current Activities	Anticipated Activities
<u>Wild Rose Economic Development Committee</u> (920) 787-622-4183	Village Board	Village of Wild Rose	commercial and industrial businesses	Village of Wild Rose	business recruitment for industrial park	business recruitment for industrial park

Source: Waushara County UW-Extension, www.uwex.edu/ces/cty/waushara/cnred/ed/organizations.html

HOUSING APPENDICES

Table D-1	Occupied Dwelling Units by Age, 1990
Table D-2	Occupied Dwelling Units by Age, 2000
Table D-3	Total Dwelling Units by Structural Type, 1990
Table D-4	Total Dwelling Units by Structural Type, 2000
Table D-5	Occupancy Status, 1990
Table D-6	Occupancy Status, 2000
Table D-7	Total Vacancy Status, 1990
Table D-8	Total Vacancy Status, 2000
Table D-9	Owner-Occupied Housing Stock Value, 2000
Table D-10	Households Paying a Disproportionate Share of Their Income for Housing
Table D-11	Plumbing Facilities by Occupants Per Room, 2000
Table D-12	Housing Stress Index
Table D-13	Waushara County Composite Index, 2000

Table D-1. Occupied Dwelling Units by Age, 1990

Jurisdiction	Less Than 5 Years		6-10 yrs		11-20 yrs		21-30 yrs		31-40 yrs		40+ yrs		Total Occupied Units	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
C. Berlin (pt.)	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	9	39.13%	0	0.00%	4	17.39%	10	43.48%	23	100.00%
C. Wautoma	45	6.02%	79	10.56%	129	17.25%	108	14.44%	86	11.50%	301	40.24%	748	100.00%
V. Coloma	2	1.32%	8	5.30%	38	25.17%	14	9.27%	16	10.60%	73	48.34%	151	100.00%
V. Hancock	5	3.21%	7	4.49%	28	17.95%	19	12.18%	11	7.05%	86	55.13%	156	100.00%
V. Lohrville	9	6.12%	22	14.97%	56	38.10%	13	8.84%	17	11.56%	30	20.41%	147	100.00%
V. Plainfield	12	3.58%	33	9.85%	65	19.40%	21	6.27%	38	11.34%	166	49.55%	335	100.00%
V. Redgranite	46	11.08%	29	6.99%	107	25.78%	54	13.01%	17	4.10%	162	39.04%	415	100.00%
V. Wild Rose	41	13.76%	22	7.38%	43	14.43%	28	9.40%	30	10.07%	134	44.97%	298	100.00%
T. Aurora	15	5.23%	12	4.18%	57	19.86%	48	16.72%	38	13.24%	117	40.77%	287	100.00%
T. Bloomfield	16	4.89%	27	8.26%	89	27.22%	27	8.26%	11	3.36%	157	48.01%	327	100.00%
T. Coloma	13	6.95%	30	16.04%	52	27.81%	13	6.95%	4	2.14%	75	40.11%	187	100.00%
T. Dakota	30	7.30%	48	11.68%	163	39.66%	70	17.03%	22	5.35%	78	18.98%	411	100.00%
T. Deerfield	27	15.52%	13	7.47%	44	25.29%	19	10.92%	3	1.72%	68	39.08%	174	100.00%
T. Hancock	23	12.64%	18	9.89%	50	27.47%	15	8.24%	14	7.69%	62	34.07%	182	100.00%
T. Leon	32	8.10%	33	8.35%	135	34.18%	37	9.37%	33	8.35%	125	31.65%	395	100.00%
T. Marion	47	7.33%	100	15.60%	235	36.66%	75	11.70%	34	5.30%	150	23.40%	641	100.00%
T. Mount Morris	26	7.90%	44	13.37%	88	26.75%	32	9.73%	41	12.46%	98	29.79%	329	100.00%
T. Oasis	11	7.69%	22	15.38%	34	23.78%	0	0.00%	11	7.69%	65	45.45%	143	100.00%
T. Plainfield	15	7.85%	18	9.42%	41	21.47%	32	16.75%	32	16.75%	53	27.75%	191	100.00%
T. Poy Sippi	8	2.26%	26	7.34%	83	23.45%	28	7.91%	29	8.19%	180	50.85%	354	100.00%
T. Richford	17	10.63%	15	9.38%	51	31.88%	4	2.50%	6	3.75%	67	41.88%	160	100.00%
T. Rose	7	3.78%	32	17.30%	52	28.11%	17	9.19%	7	3.78%	70	37.84%	185	100.00%
T. Saxeville	24	7.89%	37	12.17%	74	24.34%	33	10.86%	24	7.89%	112	36.84%	304	100.00%
T. Springwater	48	11.06%	61	14.06%	136	31.34%	61	14.06%	47	10.83%	81	18.66%	434	100.00%
T. Warren	23	10.50%	20	9.13%	49	22.37%	14	6.39%	15	6.85%	98	44.75%	219	100.00%
T. Wautoma	29	6.90%	48	11.43%	139	33.10%	38	9.05%	41	9.76%	125	29.76%	420	100.00%
Waushara County	571	7.50%	804	10.56%	2,047	26.88%	820	10.77%	631	8.29%	2,743	36.02%	7,616	100.00%
Wisconsin	198,198	12.00%	177,085	10.72%	263,431	15.94%	243,835	14.76%	166,000	10.05%	603,712	36.54%	1,652,261	100.00%

Source: U.S. Census, 1990

Table D-2. Occupied Dwelling Units by Age, 2000

Jurisdiction	Less Than 5 Years		6-10 yrs		11-20 yrs		21-30 yrs		31-40 yrs		40+ yrs		Total Occupied Units	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
C. Berlin (pt.)	15	45.45%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4	12.12%	3	9.09%	11	33.33%	33	100.00%
C. Wautoma	48	6.02%	31	3.88%	114	14.29%	163	20.43%	76	9.52%	366	45.86%	798	100.00%
V. Coloma	10	5.38%	19	10.22%	19	10.22%	33	17.74%	7	3.76%	98	52.69%	186	100.00%
V. Hancock	30	15.63%	34	17.71%	19	9.90%	15	7.81%	5	2.60%	89	46.35%	192	100.00%
V. Lohrville	4	2.42%	13	7.88%	32	19.39%	54	32.73%	13	7.88%	49	29.70%	165	100.00%
V. Plainfield	15	4.53%	13	3.93%	23	6.95%	44	13.29%	30	9.06%	206	62.24%	331	100.00%
V. Redgranite	37	8.24%	32	7.13%	41	9.13%	100	22.27%	26	5.79%	213	47.44%	449	100.00%
V. Wild Rose	48	15.34%	8	2.56%	34	10.86%	32	10.22%	15	4.79%	176	56.23%	313	100.00%
T. Aurora	42	11.80%	20	5.62%	23	6.46%	41	11.52%	43	12.08%	187	52.53%	356	100.00%
T. Bloomfield	59	15.53%	42	11.05%	26	6.84%	52	13.68%	31	8.16%	170	44.74%	380	100.00%
T. Coloma	42	17.21%	24	9.84%	35	14.34%	60	24.59%	22	9.02%	61	25.00%	244	100.00%
T. Dakota	45	9.16%	42	8.55%	76	15.48%	139	28.31%	52	10.59%	137	27.90%	491	100.00%
T. Deerfield	47	18.08%	30	11.54%	29	11.15%	46	17.69%	15	5.77%	93	35.77%	260	100.00%
T. Hancock	35	16.06%	17	7.80%	42	19.27%	31	14.22%	10	4.59%	83	38.07%	218	100.00%
T. Leon	86	16.14%	46	8.63%	82	15.38%	103	19.32%	55	10.32%	161	30.21%	533	100.00%
T. Marion	125	13.71%	95	10.42%	166	18.20%	238	26.10%	55	6.03%	233	25.55%	912	100.00%
T. Mount Morris	64	13.20%	73	15.05%	85	17.53%	85	17.53%	28	5.77%	150	30.93%	485	100.00%
T. Oasis	17	10.76%	7	4.43%	22	13.92%	28	17.72%	18	11.39%	66	41.77%	158	100.00%
T. Plainfield	17	8.21%	18	8.70%	23	11.11%	39	18.84%	39	18.84%	71	34.30%	207	100.00%
T. Poy Sippi	21	5.38%	19	4.87%	27	6.92%	63	16.15%	24	6.15%	236	60.51%	390	100.00%
T. Richford	26	13.27%	25	12.76%	28	14.29%	46	23.47%	3	1.53%	68	34.69%	196	100.00%
T. Rose	49	20.50%	13	5.44%	28	11.72%	49	20.50%	16	6.69%	84	35.15%	239	100.00%
T. Saxeville	46	11.47%	30	7.48%	58	14.46%	82	20.45%	29	7.23%	156	38.90%	401	100.00%
T. Springwater	85	13.89%	39	6.37%	113	18.46%	152	24.84%	54	8.82%	169	27.61%	612	100.00%
T. Warren	33	12.64%	24	9.20%	33	12.64%	43	16.48%	35	13.41%	93	35.63%	261	100.00%
T. Wautoma	49	9.32%	67	12.74%	86	16.35%	99	18.82%	41	7.79%	184	34.98%	526	100.00%
Waushara County	1,095	11.73%	781	8.37%	1,264	13.54%	1,841	19.72%	745	7.98%	3,610	38.67%	9,336	100.00%
Wisconsin	188,002	9.02%	153,270	7.35%	222,167	10.66%	355,484	17.05%	247,765	11.89%	917,856	44.03%	2,084,544	100.00%

Source: U.S. Census, 2000

Table D-3. Total Dwelling Units by Structural Type, 1990

Jurisdiction	Single Family Units		2 to 4 Units		5 or More Units		Mobile Home, Trailer or Other		Total Housing Units	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
C. Berlin (pt.)	26	96.30%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	3.70%	27	100.00%
C. Wautoma	584	71.66%	121	14.85%	78	9.57%	32	3.93%	815	100.00%
V. Coloma	151	77.04%	8	4.08%	25	12.76%	12	6.12%	196	100.00%
V. Hancock	187	80.60%	3	1.29%	0	0.00%	42	18.10%	232	100.00%
V. Lohrville	99	56.90%	1	0.57%	0	0.00%	74	42.53%	174	100.00%
V. Plainfield	301	81.35%	31	8.38%	16	4.32%	22	5.95%	370	100.00%
V. Redgranite	327	68.99%	28	5.91%	12	2.53%	107	22.57%	474	100.00%
V. Wild Rose	229	66.76%	26	7.58%	59	17.20%	29	8.45%	343	100.00%
T. Aurora	295	87.02%	12	3.54%	0	0.00%	32	9.44%	339	100.00%
T. Bloomfield	356	85.58%	11	2.64%	0	0.00%	49	11.78%	416	100.00%
T. Coloma	338	75.62%	5	1.12%	0	0.00%	104	23.27%	447	100.00%
T. Dakota	425	65.08%	18	2.76%	1	0.15%	209	32.01%	653	100.00%
T. Deerfield	306	85.00%	4	1.11%	0	0.00%	50	13.89%	360	100.00%
T. Hancock	319	93.55%	0	0.00%	1	0.29%	21	6.16%	341	100.00%
T. Leon	665	82.00%	5	0.62%	0	0.00%	141	17.39%	811	100.00%
T. Marion	1,219	86.03%	14	0.99%	0	0.00%	184	12.99%	1,417	100.00%
T. Mount Morris	753	86.85%	9	1.04%	2	0.23%	103	11.88%	867	100.00%
T. Oasis	245	94.59%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	14	5.41%	259	100.00%
T. Plainfield	174	76.32%	4	1.75%	0	0.00%	50	21.93%	228	100.00%
T. Poy Sippi	349	83.29%	9	2.15%	19	4.53%	42	10.02%	419	100.00%
T. Richford	212	86.89%	2	0.82%	0	0.00%	30	12.30%	244	100.00%
T. Rose	246	78.34%	2	0.64%	1	0.32%	65	20.70%	314	100.00%
T. Saxeville	524	89.57%	7	1.20%	0	0.00%	54	9.23%	585	100.00%
T. Springwater	880	79.42%	6	0.54%	0	0.00%	222	20.04%	1,108	100.00%
T. Warren	196	67.12%	2	0.68%	0	0.00%	94	32.19%	292	100.00%
T. Wautoma	460	89.32%	11	2.14%	0	0.00%	44	8.54%	515	100.00%
Waushara County	9,866	80.57%	339	2.77%	214	1.75%	1,827	14.92%	12,246	100.00%
Wisconsin	1,392,610	67.74%	277,221	13.48%	256,616	12.48%	129,327	6.29%	2,055,774	100.00%

Source: U.S. Census, 1990

Table D-4. Total Dwelling Units by Structural Type, 2000

Jurisdiction	Single Family Units		2 to 4 Units		5 or More Units		Mobile Home, Trailer or Other		Total Housing Units	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
C. Berlin (pt.)	17	48.57%	3	8.57%	15	42.86%	0	0.00%	35	100.00%
C. Wautoma	583	67.40%	104	12.02%	142	16.42%	36	4.16%	865	100.00%
V. Coloma	173	84.39%	1	0.49%	12	5.85%	19	9.27%	205	100.00%
V. Hancock	197	76.36%	1	0.39%	13	5.04%	47	18.22%	258	100.00%
V. Lohrville	99	54.10%	7	3.83%	0	0.00%	77	42.08%	183	100.00%
V. Plainfield	298	82.78%	26	7.22%	21	5.83%	15	4.17%	360	100.00%
V. Redgranite	360	71.57%	22	4.37%	23	4.57%	98	19.48%	503	100.00%
V. Wild Rose	253	73.55%	21	6.10%	35	10.17%	35	10.17%	344	100.00%
T. Aurora	349	89.72%	9	2.31%	0	0.00%	31	7.97%	389	100.00%
T. Bloomfield	414	90.99%	13	2.86%	0	0.00%	28	6.15%	455	100.00%
T. Coloma	423	86.86%	2	0.41%	0	0.00%	62	12.73%	487	100.00%
T. Dakota	495	71.95%	13	1.89%	3	0.44%	177	25.73%	688	100.00%
T. Deerfield	447	90.85%	4	0.81%	0	0.00%	41	8.33%	492	100.00%
T. Hancock	348	92.31%	3	0.80%	0	0.00%	26	6.90%	377	100.00%
T. Leon	750	88.13%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	101	11.87%	851	100.00%
T. Marion	1,456	88.78%	12	0.73%	0	0.00%	172	10.49%	1,640	100.00%
T. Mount Morris	911	91.28%	4	0.40%	2	0.20%	81	8.12%	998	100.00%
T. Oasis	260	98.11%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	5	1.89%	265	100.00%
T. Plainfield	206	85.12%	6	2.48%	0	0.00%	30	12.40%	242	100.00%
T. Poy Sippi	374	86.37%	20	4.62%	26	6.00%	13	3.00%	433	100.00%
T. Richford	254	90.39%	2	0.71%	2	0.71%	23	8.19%	281	100.00%
T. Rose	267	78.30%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	74	21.70%	341	100.00%
T. Saxeville	554	90.67%	8	1.31%	0	0.00%	49	8.02%	611	100.00%
T. Springwater	991	69.84%	8	0.56%	2	0.14%	418	29.46%	1,419	100.00%
T. Warren	235	70.36%	5	1.50%	0	0.00%	94	28.14%	334	100.00%
T. Wautoma	574	93.94%	9	1.47%	0	0.00%	28	4.58%	611	100.00%
Waushara County	11,288	82.59%	303	2.22%	296	2.17%	1,780	13.02%	13,667	100.00%
Wisconsin	1,609,407	69.34%	281,936	12.15%	325,633	14.03%	104,168	4.49%	2,321,144	100.00%

Source: U.S. Census, 2000

Table D-5.Occupancy Status, 1990

Jurisdiction	Total Occupied Housing Units		Owner-Occupied Units		Renter Occupied Units		Vacant Housing Units		Total Housing Units
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
C. Berlin (pt.)	22	81.48%	19	70.37%	3	11.11%	5	18.52%	27
C. Wautoma	748	91.78%	474	58.16%	274	33.62%	67	8.22%	815
V. Coloma	159	81.12%	107	54.59%	52	26.53%	37	18.88%	196
V. Hancock	164	70.69%	127	54.74%	37	15.95%	68	29.31%	232
V. Lohrville	142	81.61%	118	67.82%	24	13.79%	32	18.39%	174
V. Plainfield	324	87.57%	227	61.35%	97	26.22%	46	12.43%	370
V. Redgranite	421	88.82%	324	68.35%	97	20.46%	53	11.18%	474
V. Wild Rose	309	90.09%	183	53.35%	126	36.73%	34	9.91%	343
T. Aurora	296	87.32%	249	73.45%	47	13.86%	43	12.68%	339
T. Bloomfield	315	75.72%	263	63.22%	52	12.50%	101	24.28%	416
T. Coloma	181	40.49%	152	34.00%	29	6.49%	266	59.51%	447
T. Dakota	411	62.94%	322	49.31%	89	13.63%	242	37.06%	653
T. Deerfield	178	49.44%	158	43.89%	20	5.56%	182	50.56%	360
T. Hancock	178	52.20%	151	44.28%	27	7.92%	163	47.80%	341
T. Leon	397	48.95%	349	43.03%	48	5.92%	414	51.05%	811
T. Marion	641	45.24%	575	40.58%	66	4.66%	776	54.76%	1417
T. Mount Morris	327	37.72%	288	33.22%	39	4.50%	540	62.28%	867
T. Oasis	136	52.51%	117	45.17%	19	7.34%	123	47.49%	259
T. Plainfield	191	83.77%	148	64.91%	43	18.86%	37	16.23%	228
T. Poy Sippi	354	84.49%	274	65.39%	80	19.09%	65	15.51%	419
T. Richford	150	61.48%	135	55.33%	15	6.15%	94	38.52%	244
T. Rose	192	61.15%	162	51.59%	30	9.55%	122	38.85%	314
T. Saxeville	316	54.02%	265	45.30%	51	8.72%	269	45.98%	585
T. Springwater	434	39.17%	381	34.39%	53	4.78%	674	60.83%	1108
T. Warren	210	71.92%	179	61.30%	31	10.62%	82	28.08%	292
T. Wautoma	420	81.55%	369	71.65%	51	9.90%	95	18.45%	515
Waushara County	7,616	62.19%	6,116	49.94%	1,500	12.25%	4,630	37.81%	12,246
Wisconsin	1,822,118	88.63%	1,215,350	59.12%	606,768	29.52%	233,656	11.37%	2,055,774

Source: U.S. Census, 1990

Table D-6. Occupancy Status, 2000

Jurisdiction	Total Occupied Housing Units		Owner-Occupied Units		Renter Occupied Units		Vacant Housing Units		Total Housing Units
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
C. Berlin (pt.)	36	90.00%	17	42.50%	19	47.50%	4	10.00%	40
C. Wautoma	806	91.90%	452	51.54%	354	40.36%	71	8.10%	877
V. Coloma	185	93.91%	133	67.51%	52	26.40%	12	6.09%	197
V. Hancock	193	75.98%	141	55.51%	52	20.47%	61	24.02%	254
V. Lohrville	168	87.50%	156	81.25%	12	6.25%	24	12.50%	192
V. Plainfield	342	91.69%	239	64.08%	103	27.61%	31	8.31%	373
V. Redgranite	440	89.25%	315	63.89%	125	25.35%	53	10.75%	493
V. Wild Rose	312	92.04%	209	61.65%	103	30.38%	27	7.96%	339
T. Aurora	352	91.67%	318	82.81%	34	8.85%	32	8.33%	384
T. Bloomfield	383	84.36%	342	75.33%	41	9.03%	71	15.64%	454
T. Coloma	254	50.80%	218	43.60%	36	7.20%	246	49.20%	500
T. Dakota	493	71.14%	430	62.05%	63	9.09%	200	28.86%	693
T. Deerfield	263	54.00%	245	50.31%	18	3.70%	224	46.00%	487
T. Hancock	211	54.95%	184	47.92%	27	7.03%	173	45.05%	384
T. Leon	539	63.34%	503	59.11%	36	4.23%	312	36.66%	851
T. Marion	908	55.71%	834	51.17%	74	4.54%	722	44.29%	1,630
T. Mount Morris	481	48.39%	431	43.36%	50	5.03%	513	51.61%	994
T. Oasis	152	58.91%	134	51.94%	18	6.98%	106	41.09%	258
T. Plainfield	198	86.09%	169	73.48%	29	12.61%	32	13.91%	230
T. Poy Sippi	392	89.91%	323	74.08%	69	15.83%	44	10.09%	436
T. Richford	190	67.62%	168	59.79%	22	7.83%	91	32.38%	281
T. Rose	244	69.12%	220	62.32%	24	6.80%	109	30.88%	353
T. Saxeville	393	64.43%	355	58.20%	38	6.23%	217	35.57%	610
T. Springwater	617	43.45%	553	38.94%	64	4.51%	803	56.55%	1420
T. Warren	261	78.14%	233	69.76%	28	8.38%	73	21.86%	334
T. Wautoma	523	86.73%	476	78.94%	47	7.79%	80	13.27%	603
Waushara County	9,336	68.31%	7,798	57.06%	1,538	11.25%	4,331	31.69%	13,667
Wisconsin	2,084,544	89.81%	1,426,361	61.45%	658,183	28.36%	236,600	10.19%	2,321,144

Source: U.S. Census, 2000

D-7. Total Vacancy Status, 1990

Jurisdiction	For Rent		For Sale		Seasonal Units		Other		Total Vacant Units	Vacancy Rates	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Homeowne	Rental
C. Berlin (pt.)	1	20.00%	3	60.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%	5	15.79%	33.33%
C. Wautoma	16	23.88%	9	13.43%	15	22.39%	27	40.30%	67	1.90%	5.84%
V. Coloma	11	29.73%	4	10.81%	8	21.62%	14	37.84%	37	3.74%	21.15%
V. Hancock	6	8.82%	4	5.88%	49	72.06%	9	13.24%	68	3.15%	16.22%
V. Lohrville	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	27	84.38%	5	15.63%	32	0.00%	0.00%
V. Plainfield	19	41.30%	10	21.74%	3	6.52%	14	30.43%	46	4.41%	19.59%
V. Redgranite	4	7.55%	10	18.87%	19	35.85%	20	37.74%	53	3.09%	4.12%
V. Wild Rose	17	50.00%	6	17.65%	5	14.71%	6	17.65%	34	3.28%	13.49%
T. Aurora	6	13.95%	3	6.98%	27	62.79%	7	16.28%	43	1.20%	12.77%
T. Bloomfield	4	3.96%	4	3.96%	84	83.17%	9	8.91%	101	1.52%	7.69%
T. Coloma	3	1.13%	5	1.88%	244	91.73%	14	5.26%	266	3.29%	10.34%
T. Dakota	10	4.13%	17	7.02%	193	79.75%	22	9.09%	242	5.28%	11.24%
T. Deerfield	1	0.55%	5	2.75%	161	88.46%	15	8.24%	182	3.16%	5.00%
T. Hancock	1	0.61%	3	1.84%	156	95.71%	3	1.84%	163	1.99%	3.70%
T. Leon	2	0.48%	6	1.45%	368	88.89%	38	9.18%	414	1.72%	4.17%
T. Marion	1	0.13%	25	3.22%	725	93.43%	25	3.22%	776	4.35%	1.52%
T. Mount Morris	10	1.85%	7	1.30%	502	92.96%	21	3.89%	540	2.43%	25.64%
T. Oasis	0	0.00%	2	1.63%	102	82.93%	19	15.45%	123	1.71%	0.00%
T. Plainfield	1	2.70%	1	2.70%	28	75.68%	7	18.92%	37	0.68%	2.33%
T. Poy Sippi	3	4.62%	4	6.15%	41	63.08%	17	26.15%	65	1.46%	3.75%
T. Richford	2	2.13%	3	3.19%	71	75.53%	18	19.15%	94	2.22%	13.33%
T. Rose	1	0.82%	2	1.64%	28	22.95%	91	74.59%	122	1.23%	3.33%
T. Saxeville	1	0.37%	4	1.49%	244	90.71%	20	7.43%	269	1.51%	1.96%
T. Springwater	6	0.89%	10	1.48%	643	95.40%	15	2.23%	674	2.62%	11.32%
T. Warren	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	74	90.24%	8	9.76%	82	0.00%	0.00%
T. Wautoma	2	2.11%	6	6.32%	69	72.63%	18	18.95%	95	1.63%	3.92%
Waushara County	128	2.76%	153	3.30%	3,886	83.93%	463	10.00%	4,630	2.50%	8.53%
Wisconsin	29,795	12.75%	14,692	6.29%	150,761	64.52%	38,408	16.44%	233,656	1.20%	4.70%

Source: U.S. Census, 1990

D-8. Total Vacancy Status, 2000

Jurisdiction	For Rent		For Sale		Seasonal Units		Other		Total Vacant Units	Vacancy Rates	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Homeowner	Rental
C. Berlin (pt.)	2	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	50.00%	4	0.00%	10.53%
C. Wautoma	31	43.66%	9	12.68%	8	11.27%	23	32.39%	71	1.99%	8.76%
V. Coloma	2	16.67%	0	0.00%	6	50.00%	4	33.33%	12	0.00%	3.85%
V. Hancock	3	4.92%	4	6.56%	53	86.89%	1	1.64%	61	2.84%	5.77%
V. Lohrville	0	0.00%	7	29.17%	11	45.83%	6	25.00%	24	4.49%	0.00%
V. Plainfield	7	22.58%	7	22.58%	8	25.81%	9	29.03%	31	2.93%	6.80%
V. Redgranite	7	13.21%	12	22.64%	14	26.42%	20	37.74%	53	3.81%	5.60%
V. Wild Rose	12	44.44%	5	18.52%	5	18.52%	5	18.52%	27	2.39%	11.65%
T. Aurora	2	6.25%	3	9.38%	21	65.63%	6	18.75%	32	0.94%	5.88%
T. Bloomfield	2	2.82%	3	4.23%	53	74.65%	13	18.31%	71	0.88%	4.88%
T. Coloma	0	0.00%	2	0.81%	206	83.74%	38	15.45%	246	0.92%	0.00%
T. Dakota	4	2.00%	12	6.00%	144	72.00%	40	20.00%	200	2.79%	6.35%
T. Deerfield	0	0.00%	7	3.13%	206	91.96%	11	4.91%	224	2.86%	0.00%
T. Hancock	2	1.16%	3	1.73%	156	90.17%	12	6.94%	173	1.63%	7.41%
T. Leon	0	0.00%	10	3.21%	289	92.63%	13	4.17%	312	1.99%	0.00%
T. Marion	6	0.83%	21	2.91%	653	90.44%	42	5.82%	722	2.52%	8.11%
T. Mount Morris	3	0.58%	6	1.17%	468	91.23%	36	7.02%	513	1.39%	6.00%
T. Oasis	0	0.00%	2	1.89%	97	91.51%	7	6.60%	106	1.49%	0.00%
T. Plainfield	2	6.25%	5	15.63%	18	56.25%	7	21.88%	32	2.96%	6.90%
T. Poy Sippi	6	13.64%	3	6.82%	19	43.18%	16	36.36%	44	0.93%	8.70%
T. Richford	3	3.30%	0	0.00%	72	79.12%	16	17.58%	91	0.00%	13.64%
T. Rose	1	0.92%	2	1.83%	94	86.24%	12	11.01%	109	0.91%	4.17%
T. Saxeville	1	0.46%	4	1.84%	209	96.31%	3	1.38%	217	1.13%	2.63%
T. Springwater	1	0.12%	11	1.37%	772	96.14%	19	2.37%	803	1.99%	1.56%
T. Warren	0	0.00%	2	2.74%	48	65.75%	23	31.51%	73	0.86%	0.00%
T. Wautoma	7	8.75%	7	8.75%	63	78.75%	3	3.75%	80	1.47%	14.89%
Waushara County	104	2.40%	147	3.39%	3,693	85.27%	387	8.94%	4,331	1.89%	6.76%
Wisconsin	38,714	16.57%	17,172	7.35%	142,313	60.91%	35,457	15.17%	233,656	1.20%	5.60%

Source: U.S. Census, 2000

D-9. Owner-Occupied Housing Stock Value, 2000

Jurisdiction	Less than \$50,000	\$50,000 to \$99,999	\$100,000 to \$149,999	\$150,000 to \$199,999	\$200,000 to \$299,999	\$300,000 to \$499,999	\$500,000 or More	Specified owner- occupied units	1990 Median Housing Value	2000 Median Housing Value
C. Berlin (pt.)	0	2	2	0	6	0	0	10	\$48,800	\$208,300
C. Wautoma	105	283	20	9	0	0	0	417	\$40,800	\$60,700
V. Coloma	21	81	11	4	0	0	0	117	\$35,600	\$67,900
V. Hancock	44	54	15	0	0	0	0	113	\$26,300	\$56,900
V. Lohrville	19	46	15	0	0	0	0	80	\$28,800	\$66,700
V. Plainfield	60	110	34	6	0	0	0	210	\$37,700	\$64,200
V. Redgranite	88	117	18	0	2	0	0	225	\$33,300	\$59,100
V. Wild Rose	54	104	21	5	2	1	0	187	\$37,900	\$60,100
T. Aurora	18	80	50	14	13	0	0	175	\$55,200	\$94,800
T. Bloomfield	10	68	61	13	6	0	0	158	\$46,300	\$100,600
T. Coloma	16	37	24	10	2	0	0	89	\$50,000	\$85,000
T. Dakota	17	116	57	15	13	2	0	220	\$51,300	\$92,100
T. Deerfield	9	46	57	15	14	2	0	143	\$50,400	\$109,600
T. Hancock	8	48	34	8	3	0	0	101	\$48,200	\$96,100
T. Leon	21	153	59	29	15	0	0	277	\$43,400	\$88,100
T. Marion	39	234	161	95	65	22	3	619	\$57,600	\$111,400
T. Mount Morris	11	117	56	36	45	7	0	272	\$53,500	\$108,000
T. Oasis	6	52	16	2	0	3	0	79	\$48,500	\$79,200
T. Plainfield	26	49	18	15	2	0	0	110	\$46,600	\$67,900
T. Poy Sippi	32	126	36	5	0	2	0	201	\$41,400	\$78,300
T. Richford	10	39	21	0	2	0	0	72	\$40,600	\$79,100
T. Rose	11	64	22	0	3	0	0	100	\$50,000	\$82,400
T. Saxeville	23	72	60	17	20	9	4	205	\$52,700	\$104,500
T. Springwater	14	114	68	55	42	12	2	307	\$61,100	\$119,300
T. Warren	7	55	14	11	0	0	2	89	\$45,500	\$91,300
T. Wautoma	29	168	83	20	7	2	0	309	\$52,100	\$91,500
Waushara County	698	2,435	1,033	384	262	62	11	4,885	\$45,300	\$85,100
Wisconsin	73,450	396,893	343,993	173,519	95,163	30,507	8,942	1,122,467	\$62,100	\$112,200

Source: U.S. Census, 2000

D-10. Households Paying a Disproportionate Share of their Income for Housing

	Households for which owner costs are not affordable				Number of Households in Sample		Households for which renter costs are not affordable				Number of Households in Sample	
	1989		1999				1989		1999			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	1989	1999	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	1989	1999
C. Berlin (pt.)	0	n.a.	4	40.00%	16	10	0	n.a.	6	37.50%	0	16
C. Wautoma	87	20.71%	59	14.15%	420	417	102	37.50%	90	26.32%	272	342
V. Coloma	13	13.83%	31	26.50%	94	117	18	37.50%	10	20.83%	48	48
V. Hancock	36	34.29%	18	15.93%	105	113	13	32.50%	12	22.22%	40	54
V. Lohrville	9	14.06%	12	15.00%	64	80	5	20.83%	6	54.55%	24	11
V. Plainfield	28	12.79%	31	14.76%	219	210	33	36.67%	23	22.12%	90	104
V. Redgranite	30	14.15%	51	22.67%	212	225	30	31.91%	40	31.75%	94	126
V. Wild Rose	19	13.01%	25	13.37%	146	187	79	59.40%	17	17.71%	133	96
T. Aurora	21	17.80%	18	10.29%	118	175	7	25.00%	6	20.00%	28	30
T. Bloomfield	19	18.45%	41	25.95%	103	158	12	27.27%	5	20.00%	44	25
T. Coloma	21	30.88%	22	24.72%	68	89	13	56.52%	2	7.69%	23	26
T. Dakota	29	18.95%	36	16.36%	153	220	28	35.00%	6	10.53%	80	57
T. Deerfield	4	5.80%	30	20.98%	69	143	2	13.33%	0	0.00%	15	13
T. Hancock	15	17.65%	24	23.76%	85	101	10	52.63%	1	4.76%	19	21
T. Leon	45	26.95%	65	23.47%	167	277	7	21.88%	6	20.00%	32	30
T. Marion	73	18.25%	122	19.71%	400	619	12	21.05%	19	30.65%	57	62
T. Mount Morris	19	10.38%	85	31.25%	183	272	9	30.00%	12	26.09%	30	46
T. Oasis	10	19.61%	21	26.58%	51	79	1	10.00%	4	21.05%	10	19
T. Plainfield	12	17.39%	28	25.45%	69	110	5	17.86%	6	26.09%	28	23
T. Poy Sippi	32	19.88%	48	23.88%	161	201	24	34.78%	16	28.57%	69	56
T. Richford	16	34.04%	7	9.72%	47	72	0	0.00%	2	25.00%	12	8
T. Rose	4	9.09%	16	16.00%	44	100	4	23.53%	5	23.81%	17	21
T. Saxeville	22	16.67%	42	20.49%	132	205	2	9.09%	4	15.38%	22	26
T. Springwater	30	15.87%	48	15.64%	189	307	8	19.05%	9	15.79%	42	57
T. Warren	6	9.84%	15	16.85%	61	89	8	61.54%	6	20.00%	13	30
T. Wautoma	37	15.81%	64	20.71%	234	309	12	29.27%	11	28.21%	41	39
Waushara County	637	17.65%	963	19.71%	3,610	4,885	444	34.61%	324	23.38%	1,283	1,386
Wisconsin	140,026	15.08%	199,967	17.81%	928,494	1,122,467	209,438	35.96%	207,242	32.30%	582,371	641,672

Source: U.S. Census, 1990 and 2000

Table D-11. Plumbing Facilities by Occupants Per Room, 2000

Jurisdiction	1 or Fewer Persons per Room						More than 1 Persons per Room						Total Occupied
	Units Not Lacking		Units Lacking		Total Units		Units Not Lacking		Units Lacking		Total Units		
C. Berlin (pt.)	33	100.00%	0	0.00%	33	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	33
C. Wautoma	773	96.87%	0	0.00%	773	96.87%	25	3.13%	0	0.00%	25	3.13%	798
V. Coloma	175	94.09%	2	1.08%	177	95.16%	9	4.84%	0	0.00%	9	4.84%	186
V. Hancock	180	93.75%	0	0.00%	180	93.75%	12	6.25%	0	0.00%	12	6.25%	192
V. Lohrville	165	100.00%	0	0.00%	165	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	165
V. Plainfield	321	96.98%	0	0.00%	321	96.98%	10	3.02%	0	0.00%	10	3.02%	331
V. Redgranite	442	98.44%	0	0.00%	442	98.44%	7	1.56%	0	0.00%	7	1.56%	449
V. Wild Rose	310	99.04%	0	0.00%	310	99.04%	3	0.96%	0	0.00%	3	0.96%	313
T. Aurora	352	98.88%	0	0.00%	352	98.88%	4	1.12%	0	0.00%	4	1.12%	356
T. Bloomfield	370	97.37%	5	1.32%	375	98.68%	5	1.32%	0	0.00%	5	1.32%	380
T. Coloma	234	95.90%	5	2.05%	239	97.95%	5	2.05%	0	0.00%	5	2.05%	244
T. Dakota	470	95.72%	0	0.00%	470	95.72%	21	4.28%	0	0.00%	21	4.28%	491
T. Deerfield	254	97.69%	0	0.00%	254	97.69%	6	2.31%	0	0.00%	6	2.31%	260
T. Hancock	215	98.62%	0	0.00%	215	98.62%	3	1.38%	0	0.00%	3	1.38%	218
T. Leon	521	97.75%	3	0.56%	524	98.31%	9	1.69%	0	0.00%	9	1.69%	533
T. Marion	891	97.70%	9	0.99%	900	98.68%	12	1.32%	0	0.00%	12	1.32%	912
T. Mount Morris	482	99.38%	3	0.62%	485	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	485
T. Oasis	158	100.00%	0	0.00%	158	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	158
T. Plainfield	195	94.20%	4	1.93%	199	96.14%	5	2.42%	3	1.45%	8	3.86%	207
T. Poy Sippi	390	100.00%	0	0.00%	390	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	390
T. Richford	180	91.84%	3	1.53%	183	93.37%	9	4.59%	4	2.04%	13	6.63%	196
T. Rose	226	94.56%	7	2.93%	233	97.49%	6	2.51%	0	0.00%	6	2.51%	239
T. Saxeville	397	99.00%	0	0.00%	397	99.00%	4	1.00%	0	0.00%	4	1.00%	401
T. Springwater	605	98.86%	1	0.16%	606	99.02%	4	0.65%	2	0.33%	6	0.98%	612
T. Warren	248	95.02%	5	1.92%	253	96.93%	8	3.07%	0	0.00%	8	3.07%	261
T. Wautoma	504	95.82%	6	1.14%	510	96.96%	16	3.04%	0	0.00%	16	3.04%	526
Wausara County	9,091	97.38%	53	0.57%	9,144	97.94%	183	1.96%	9	0.10%	192	2.06%	9,336
Wisconsin	2,025,159	97.15%	9,312	0.45%	2,034,471	97.60%	48,737	2.34%	1,336	0.06%	50,073	2.40%	2,084,544

Source: U.S. Census, 2000


Table D-12. Housing Stress Index

Variables	Variable Weighting Score	Concentration Weight			
		1% to 10% of Units	11% to 25% of Units	26% to 50% of Units	Greater than 50% of units
Vacancy Rates					
Rental Vacancy Rate => 5%	0	0	0	0	0
Rental Vacancy Rate >3%< 5%	1	0	0	0	0
Rental Vacancy Rate >1%< 3%	5	0	0	0	0
Rental Vacancy Rate< 1%	10	0	0	0	0
Owner Occupied Vacancy Rate => 1.5%	0	0	0	0	0
Owner Occupied Vacancy Rate >1%< 1.5%	1	0	0	0	0
Owner Occupied Vacancy Rate >0.5%< 1%	5	0	0	0	0
Owner Occupied Vacancy Rate <0.5%	10	0	0	0	0
Affordability					
Rental Costs <30% of hh Income	0	0	0	0	0
Rental Costs >30% of hh Income	1	1	5	10	15
Homeowner Costs <30% of hh Income	0	0	0	0	0
Homeowner Costs >30% of hh Income	1	1	5	10	15
Age + Value (lowest % prevails)					
% units <\$50,000 & % units >40 yrs <25%	0	0	0	0	0
% units <\$50,000 & % units >40 yrs >25%<50%	1	0	0	0	0
% units <\$50,000 & % units >40 yrs >50%<75%	5	0	0	0	0
% units <\$50,000 & % units >40 yrs >75%	10	0	0	0	0
Overcrowding					
Rental units with <1 persons per room	0	0	0	0	0
Rental units with 1+ persons per room	1	1	5	10	15
Owner-occupied units with <1 persons per room	0	0	0	0	0
Owner-occupied units with 1+ persons per room	1	1	5	10	15
Plumbing					
Housing Units with Complete Plumbing Facilities	0	0	0	0	0
Housing Units Lacking Complete Plumbing Facilities	1	1	5	10	15

D-13. Waushara County Composite Index, 2000

Jurisdiction	Vacancy Index		Affordability Index		Age + Value Index	Overcrowding Index		Plumbing Index	Total Score
	Rental	Owner Occupied	Rental	Owner Occupied		Rental	Owner Occupied		
C. Berlin (pt.)	0	10	10	10	0	0	0	0	30
C. Wautoma	0	0	10	5	1	1	1	1	19
V. Coloma	1	10	5	10	0	1	1	1	29
V. Hancock	0	0	5	5	1	0	1	0	12
V. Lohrville	10	0	15	5	0	0	0	0	30
V. Plainfield	0	0	5	5	1	1	1	0	13
V. Redgranite	0	0	10	5	1	0	1	0	17
V. Wild Rose	0	0	5	5	1	0	1	0	12
T. Aurora	0	5	5	1	0	0	1	0	12
T. Bloomfield	1	5	5	5	0	0	1	1	18
T. Coloma	10	5	1	5	0	0	1	1	23
T. Dakota	0	0	1	5	0	1	1	0	8
T. Deerfield	10	0	0	5	0	5	1	0	21
T. Hancock	0	0	1	5	0	0	1	0	7
T. Leon	10	0	5	5	0	0	1	0	21
T. Marion	0	0	10	5	0	1	1	0	17
T. Mount Morris	0	1	10	10	0	0	0	0	21
T. Oasis	10	1	5	10	0	0	0	0	26
T. Plainfield	0	0	10	5	0	5	1	1	22
T. Poy Sippi	0	5	10	5	0	0	0	0	20
T. Richford	0	10	5	1	0	0	1	1	18
T. Rose	1	5	5	5	0	0	1	1	18
T. Saxeville	5	1	5	5	0	0	1	0	17
T. Springwater	5	0	5	5	0	1	1	0	17
T. Warren	10	5	5	5	0	0	1	1	27
T. Wautoma	0	1	10	5	0	1	1	1	19
Waushara County	0	0	5	5	0	1	1	0	12

Source: ECWRPC, 2003



The information contained in this data set and information produced from this dataset were created for the official use of the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT). Any other use while not

Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species and Natural Communities

The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Inventory (NHI) is an on-line database which provides statewide inventory of KNOWN locations and conditions of rare and endangered species. All areas of the state have not yet been inventoried. Thus, the absence of a species within this database does not indicate that particular species or communities are not present within the listed towns. Nor does the presence of one element imply that other elements were surveyed for but not found. Despite these limitations, the NHI is the state's most comprehensive database on biodiversity and is widely used. Species are listed by their type, scientific name, and common name; the last observed record is indicated.

Table F-1. Town of Poy Sippi NHI Inventory.

Community or Species Type	Scientific Name	Common Name	Observation Date
Community	<i>Southern Sedge Meadow</i>		2000
Community	<i>Wet-Mesic Prairie</i>		2000
Fish	<i>Acipenser fluvescens</i>	Lake sturgeon	1978
Fish	<i>Erimyzon sucetta</i>	Lake chubsucker	1979
Fish	<i>Fundulus diaphanus</i>	Banded killfish	1979
Fish	<i>Luxilus chrysocephalus</i>	Striped shiner	
Fish	<i>Moxostoma valenciennesi</i>	Greater redhorse	1974
Fish	<i>Notropis anogenus</i>	Pugnose shiner	1963
Fish	<i>Opsopoeodus emiliae</i>	Pugnose minnow	1978

* In most cases, locations for species and natural communities surveyed and listed in the NHI are available down to the town level. The exception are those species whose locations are considered to be sensitive (particularly vulnerable to collection or disturbance). Locations of these species or natural communities are generalized down to the county level in order to minimize impacts to them.

LAND USE APPENDICES

Table G-1	Equalized Value, 1980
Table G-2	Equalized Value, 1990
Table G-3	Equalized Value, 2000
Table G-4	Equalized Value, 2005
Table G-5	Land Use Acres by Real Estate Class, 1980
Table G-6	Land Use Acres by Real Estate Class, 1990
Table G-7	Land Use Acres by Real Estate Class, 2000
Table G-8	Land Use Acres by Real Estate Class, 2005
Table G-9	Town of Poy Sippi – Historic Land Prices, 1980 to 2005

Table G-1. Equalized Value, 1980

REAL ESTATE	T Aurora	C Berlin pt.	T Bloomfield	V Coloma	T Coloma	T Dakota	T Deerfield	V Hancock	T Hancock	T Leon	V Lohrville	T Marion	T Mt Morris	T Oasis	V Plainfield	T Plainfield	T Poy Sippl	V Redgranite	T Richford	T Rose	T Saxeville	T Springwater	T Warren	C Wautoma	T Wautoma	V Wild Rose	Waushara Co.
RESIDENTIAL																											
LAND	1,080,100	138,600	1,766,300	553,400	3,579,100	4,669,800	3,478,800	561,500	3,081,600	6,726,800	527,200	15,439,000	9,204,400	1,584,700	1,127,900	415,100	1,515,600	1,169,800	971,600	1,371,300	4,204,100	12,255,300	792,400	3,549,200	2,765,300	2,030,500	84,559,400
IMP	5,288,100	494,500	4,668,300	3,854,000	5,927,800	8,530,500	6,725,900	3,449,000	3,683,100	12,466,400	2,017,400	27,958,900	13,792,100	3,427,500	7,086,200	2,446,100	5,471,600	6,878,700	2,973,700	3,659,700	9,984,400	17,566,900	2,697,700	15,849,000	9,113,000	4,969,300	190,979,800
TOTAL	6,368,200	633,100	6,434,600	4,407,400	9,506,900	13,200,300	10,204,700	4,010,500	6,764,700	19,193,200	2,544,600	43,397,900	22,996,500	5,012,200	8,214,100	2,861,200	6,987,200	8,048,500	3,945,300	5,031,000	14,188,500	29,822,200	3,490,100	19,398,200	11,878,300	6,999,800	275,539,200
COMMERCIAL																											
LAND	238,800	6,600	81,600	241,100	114,000	977,200	232,000	110,500	71,100	344,800	19,300	248,600	25,800		181,900	156,100	154,800	211,000	202,200	193,100	59,600	1,050,000	12,600	667,300	242,000	391,000	6,233,000
IMP	595,500	13,500	292,700	1,382,500	289,200	1,149,400	124,800	605,300	176,600	165,400	85,300	741,100	158,300		1,556,400	917,100	664,800	1,002,200	157,100	117,700	216,500	1,271,500	66,200	6,269,900	1,689,200	3,194,000	22,902,200
TOTAL	834,300	20,100	374,300	1,623,600	403,200	2,126,600	356,800	715,800	247,700	510,200	104,600	989,700	184,100	0	1,738,300	1,073,200	819,600	1,213,200	359,300	310,800	276,100	2,321,500	78,800	6,937,200	1,931,200	3,585,000	29,135,200
MANUFACTURING																											
LAND	0	0	8,200	0	12,300	7,700	0	5,000	22,800	0	0	0	0	26,000	0	0	7,000	51,400	0	4,000	0	0	5,200	49,800	70,000	79,300	348,700
IMP			44,100		107,300	35,600		13,800	86,200					165,900			84,000	830,300	18,800			19,700	1,163,300	229,600	851,200	3,649,800	
TOTAL	0	0	52,300	0	119,600	43,300	0	18,800	109,000	0	0	0	0	191,900	0	0	91,000	881,700	0	22,800	0	0	24,900	1,213,100	299,600	930,500	3,998,500
AGRICULTURAL																											
LAND	10,235,400	142,400	9,101,900	146,700	5,607,000	4,637,000	7,494,100	138,700	9,300,000	4,141,700	170,300	5,646,500	4,530,000	14,354,000	201,600	11,667,400	8,421,800	337,400	5,115,100	5,368,400	5,599,500	4,694,100	6,592,000		5,181,600	204,000	129,028,600
IMP	4,212,900	59,000	3,864,000	22,200	2,524,700	1,758,000	2,391,000	63,500	2,306,000	1,300,500	22,000	2,295,100	2,197,900	3,858,700	299,000	2,547,700	3,341,500	25,000	2,303,600	2,322,500	2,253,800	2,759,800	2,757,200		3,070,000	59,700	48,615,300
TOTAL	14,448,300	201,400	12,965,900	168,900	8,131,700	6,395,000	9,885,100	202,200	11,606,000	5,442,200	192,300	7,941,600	6,727,900	18,212,700	500,600	14,215,100	11,763,300	362,400	7,418,700	7,690,900	7,853,300	7,453,900	9,349,200	0	8,251,600	263,700	177,643,900
SWAMP & WASTE																											
LAND	885,700	0	418,300	0	40,600	381,900	19,000	0	45,000	56,300	0	187,300	276,400	10,900	0	107,800	551,600	0	100,400	54,800	407,700	145,500	607,400	0	43,500	0	4,340,100
IMP																											0
TOTAL	885,700	0	418,300	0	40,600	381,900	19,000	0	45,000	56,300	0	187,300	276,400	10,900	0	107,800	551,600	0	100,400	54,800	407,700	145,500	607,400	0	43,500	0	4,340,100
FOREST																											
LAND	1,064,800	0	1,866,400	0	4,034,000	3,686,800	4,286,200	0	1,935,200	4,852,100	0	3,501,100	4,810,700	2,602,300	0	2,476,500	773,500	0	4,390,100	3,652,800	3,713,200	4,739,200	2,122,900	0	3,771,300	0	58,279,100
IMP																											0
TOTAL	1,064,800	0	1,866,400	0	4,034,000	3,686,800	4,286,200	0	1,935,200	4,852,100	0	3,501,100	4,810,700	2,602,300	0	2,476,500	773,500	0	4,390,100	3,652,800	3,713,200	4,739,200	2,122,900	0	3,771,300	0	58,279,100
OTHER																											
LAND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IMP																											0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL REAL ESTATE																											
LAND	13,504,800	287,600	13,242,700	941,200	13,387,000	14,360,400	15,510,100	815,700	14,455,700	16,121,700	716,800	25,022,500	18,847,300	18,577,900	1,511,400	14,822,900	11,424,300	1,769,600	10,779,400	10,644,400	13,984,100	22,884,100	10,132,500	4,266,300	12,073,700	2,704,800	282,788,900
IMP	10,096,500	567,000	8,869,100	5,258,700	8,849,000	11,473,500	9,241,700	4,131,600	6,251,900	13,932,300	2,124,700	30,995,100	16,148,300	7,452,100	8,941,600	5,910,900	9,561,900	8,736,200	5,434,400	6,118,700	12,454,700	21,598,200	5,540,800	23,282,200	14,101,800	9,074,200	266,147,100
TOTAL	23,601,300	854,600	22,111,800	6,199,900	22,236,000	25,833,900	24,751,800	4,947,300	20,707,600	30,054,000	2,841,500	56,017,600	34,995,600	26,030,000	10,453,000	20,733,800	20,986,200	10,505,800	16,213,800	16,763,100	26,438,800	44,482,300	15,673,300	27,548,500	26,175,500	11,779,000	548,936,000

Source: Table II, 18=1980 Statement of Equalized Value as Set by the WDOR, 1980 Statistical Report of Property Values, Waushara County Wisconsin, WDOR

TableG-2. Equalized Value, 1990

REAL ESTATE	T Aurora	C Berlin pt	T Bloomfield	V Coloma	T Coloma	T Dakota	T Deerfield	V Hancock	T Hancock	T Leon	V Lohrville	T Marion	T Mt Morris	T Oasis	V Plainfield	T Plainfield	T Poy Sippi	V Redgranite	T Richford	T Rose	T Saxeville	T Springwater	T Warren	C Wautoma	T Wautoma	V Wild Rose	Waushara Co.
RESIDENTIAL																											
LAND	1,110,655	224,800	1,709,700	646,100	6,101,325	4,814,755	4,118,970	811,560	2,949,700	8,446,250	658,150	23,309,740	13,511,800	2,081,750	741,425	680,900	1,113,900	2,109,300	1,857,925	2,053,100	5,599,200	17,043,400	985,700	3,017,700	3,169,280	1,498,300	110,365,385
IMP	7,173,200	657,600	5,793,500	4,833,325	9,510,700	14,364,000	8,351,870	4,307,700	7,154,240	17,387,800	2,822,475	38,971,150	21,120,300	4,370,700	7,310,850	3,738,800	7,423,658	8,455,450	4,536,730	4,785,400	12,736,450	26,283,300	3,850,150	18,408,600	12,465,830	7,048,100	263,861,878
TOTAL	8,283,855	882,400	7,503,200	5,479,425	15,612,025	19,178,755	12,470,840	5,119,260	10,103,940	25,834,050	3,480,625	62,280,890	34,632,100	6,452,450	8,052,275	4,419,700	8,537,558	10,564,750	6,394,655	6,838,500	18,335,650	43,326,700	4,835,850	21,426,300	15,635,110	8,546,400	374,227,263
COMMERCIAL																											
LAND	192,300	16,700	68,700	228,850	139,200	1,051,310	114,000	106,800	76,100	235,400	19,800	134,580	42,100		185,825	196,700	149,500	373,000	238,200	219,200	74,600	1,028,200	30,900	1,038,300	250,750	504,900	6,715,915
IMP	1,522,860	4,600	345,700	1,789,250	355,875	1,960,790	125,630	694,800	312,300	390,700	158,800	661,675	170,700		2,404,450	2,772,000	1,064,890	2,188,100	213,300	75,600	342,700	819,800	146,000	9,413,300	1,648,520	4,553,900	34,136,240
TOTAL	1,715,160	21,300	414,400	2,018,100	495,075	3,012,100	239,630	801,600	388,400	626,100	178,600	796,255	212,800	0	2,590,275	2,968,700	1,214,390	2,561,100	451,500	294,800	417,300	1,848,000	176,900	10,451,600	1,899,270	5,058,800	40,852,155
MANUFACTURING																											
LAND	0	0	8,500	22,800	13,500	0	0	0	32,100	0	0	29,900	5,800	36,300	0	14,100	3,700	60,300	0	4,600	0	0	5,600	105,500	44,900	30,000	417,600
IMP			60,600	304,200	161,900				2,049,800			105,100	71,800	126,400		96,300	12,200	887,200		34,200			24,500	1,916,400	228,800	262,200	6,341,600
TOTAL	0	0	69,100	327,000	175,400	0	0	0	2,081,900	0	0	135,000	77,600	162,700	0	110,400	15,900	947,500	0	38,800	0	0	30,100	2,021,900	273,700	292,200	6,759,200
AGRICULTURAL																											
LAND	7,224,905	31,700	7,402,900	79,225	6,596,175	4,270,285	7,311,020	107,800	9,571,515	4,395,200	162,340	4,831,360	3,842,600	14,805,400	82,700	12,518,200	6,336,684	367,200	4,708,875	6,219,100	5,334,680	4,499,700	5,287,550	0	5,209,530	143,400	121,340,044
IMP	6,068,590	62,500	5,345,800	11,400	1,288,500	1,302,800	3,536,850	86,100	2,079,190	1,659,500	18,000	2,431,420	2,044,900	3,859,100	275,400	2,134,400	4,720,549	96,600	2,665,300	2,724,200	3,297,600	1,545,900	3,096,300	0	3,031,190	25,200	53,407,289
TOTAL	13,293,495	94,200	12,748,700	90,625	7,884,675	5,573,085	10,847,870	193,900	11,650,705	6,054,700	180,340	7,262,780	5,887,500	18,664,500	358,100	14,652,600	11,057,233	463,800	7,374,175	8,943,300	8,632,280	6,045,600	8,383,850	0	8,240,720	168,600	174,747,333
SWAMP & WASTE																											
LAND	1,483,805	0	322,700	0	31,900	525,925	32,480	0	52,100	192,800	0	116,985	154,900	6,700	0	48,000	517,172	0	229,500	28,100	331,900	19,900	411,350	0	358,000	22,500	4,886,717
IMP																	3,000										3,000
TOTAL	1,483,805	0	322,700	0	31,900	525,925	32,480	0	52,100	192,800	0	116,985	154,900	6,700	0	48,000	520,172	0	229,500	28,100	331,900	19,900	411,350	0	358,000	22,500	4,889,717
FOREST																											
LAND	403,175	0	2,303,700	0	3,201,475	2,553,200	2,524,640	0	2,060,900	5,126,450	0	3,202,015	3,620,900	1,606,300	0	1,955,400	1,028,135		2,811,728	3,586,600	3,388,200	3,893,100	1,699,250	0	2,754,120	0	47,719,288
IMP	700						7,000		1,900	200			25,400				4,205					52,900					92,305
TOTAL	403,875	0	2,303,700	0	3,201,475	2,553,200	2,531,640	0	2,062,800	5,126,650	0	3,202,015	3,646,300	1,606,300	0	1,955,400	1,032,340	0	2,811,728	3,586,600	3,388,200	3,946,000	1,699,250	0	2,754,120	0	47,811,593
OTHER																											
LAND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IMP																											0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL REAL ESTATE																											
LAND	10,414,840	273,200	11,816,200	976,975	16,083,575	13,215,475	14,101,110	1,026,160	14,742,415	18,396,100	840,290	31,624,580	21,178,100	18,536,450	1,009,950	15,413,300	9,149,091	2,909,800	9,846,228	12,110,700	14,728,580	26,484,300	8,420,350	4,161,500	11,786,580	2,199,100	291,444,949
IMP	14,765,350	724,700	11,545,600	6,938,175	11,316,975	17,627,590	12,021,350	5,088,600	11,597,430	19,438,200	2,999,275	42,169,345	23,433,100	8,356,200	9,990,700	8,741,500	13,228,502	11,627,350	7,415,330	7,619,400	16,376,750	28,701,900	7,116,950	29,738,300	17,374,340	11,889,400	357,842,312
TOTAL	25,180,190	997,900	23,361,800	7,915,150	27,400,550	30,843,065	26,122,460	6,114,760	26,339,845	37,834,300	3,839,565	73,793,925	44,611,200	26,892,650	11,000,650	24,154,800	22,377,593	14,537,150	17,261,558	19,730,100	31,105,330	55,186,200	15,537,300	33,899,800	29,160,920	14,088,500	649,287,261

Source: WI DOR Final Statement of Assessment Report 1990.

Table G-3. Equalized Value, 2000

REAL ESTATE	T Aurora	C Berlin pt.	T Bloomfield	V Coloma	T Coloma	T Dakota	T Deerfield	V Hancock	T Hancock	T Leon	V Lohrville	T Marion	T Mt Morris	T Oasis	V Plainfield	T Plainfield	T Poy Sippi	V Redgranite	T Richford	T Rose	T Saxeville	T Springwater	T Warren	C Wautoma	T Wautoma	V Wild Rose	Waushara Co.
RESIDENTIAL																											
LAND	2,346,600	1,019,600	5,498,000	1,233,300	13,386,500	9,329,900	15,181,200	1,782,200	9,462,400	17,397,400	1,020,800	62,805,700	34,796,600	6,678,600	1,420,400	2,216,900	4,449,300	3,592,700	4,599,500	3,960,400	19,724,000	58,361,800	1,849,800	4,063,000	9,262,700	2,341,900	297,781,200
IMP	22,013,300	2,367,800	22,970,200	9,251,800	27,084,000	34,969,000	28,002,000	7,615,300	19,478,200	51,765,700	8,084,800	121,904,900	78,350,000	12,794,800	15,176,600	11,561,400	19,947,300	17,918,100	15,073,800	20,140,300	41,016,200	77,463,100	13,627,400	27,514,400	33,590,200	11,316,700	750,997,300
TOTAL	24,359,900	3,387,400	28,468,200	10,485,100	40,470,500	44,298,900	43,183,200	9,397,500	28,940,600	69,163,100	9,105,600	184,710,600	113,146,600	19,473,400	16,597,000	13,778,300	24,396,600	21,510,800	19,673,300	24,100,700	60,740,200	135,824,900	15,477,200	31,577,400	42,852,900	13,658,600	1,048,778,500
COMMERCIAL																											
LAND	488,500	45,200	163,600	307,700	211,400	1,601,600	207,400	209,700	202,400	276,700	329,800	742,900	71,700	67,900	297,400	386,100	213,300	1,368,000	146,100	370,000	83,200	1,051,300	70,900	2,473,900	2,055,300	601,200	14,043,200
IMP	2,481,600	502,800	620,000	2,547,000	351,400	4,465,400	221,300	1,590,900	437,200	729,000	666,500	1,576,000	381,600	204,200	3,064,500	4,070,500	2,938,700	8,427,600	624,700	19,700	408,200	2,883,900	561,700	17,589,600	10,231,800	6,264,800	73,860,600
TOTAL	2,970,100	548,000	783,600	2,854,700	562,800	6,067,000	428,700	1,800,600	639,600	1,005,700	996,300	2,318,900	453,300	272,100	3,361,900	4,456,600	3,152,000	9,795,600	770,800	389,700	491,400	3,935,200	632,600	20,063,500	12,287,100	6,866,000	87,903,800
MANUFACTURING																											
LAND	0	176,100	15,000	46,900	20,300	14,200	10,000	4,500	22,700	0	10,300	8,000	9,500	0	0	11,900	4,800	35,400	34,400	55,600	0	0	15,000	100,000	40,000	41,900	676,500
IMP		3,797,300	51,200	938,800	145,200	124,600	86,200	49,500	2,631,300		73,500	16,700	51,300			36,400	5,200	1,280,400	250,600	528,600			133,000	3,297,100	156,000	501,600	14,154,500
TOTAL	0	3,973,400	66,200	985,700	165,500	138,800	96,200	54,000	2,654,000	0	83,800	24,700	60,800	0	0	48,300	10,000	1,315,800	285,000	584,200	0	0	148,000	3,397,100	196,000	543,500	14,831,000
AGRICULTURAL																											
LAND	3,455,600	2,000	4,701,400	4,100	2,252,400	2,343,100	3,469,800	0	3,905,200	1,830,900	19,200	3,057,500	1,782,800	6,135,100	54,800	4,680,500	3,962,900	95,100	2,375,100	2,177,100	3,127,000	2,075,800	3,442,100	0	3,114,600	25,100	58,089,200
IMP																											0
TOTAL	3,455,600	2,000	4,701,400	4,100	2,252,400	2,343,100	3,469,800	0	3,905,200	1,830,900	19,200	3,057,500	1,782,800	6,135,100	54,800	4,680,500	3,962,900	95,100	2,375,100	2,177,100	3,127,000	2,075,800	3,442,100	0	3,114,600	25,100	58,089,200
UNDEVELOPED																											
LAND	6,142,000	17,900	1,945,200	11,300	2,109,800	2,343,200	557,500	30,500	499,400	3,111,000	34,100	377,600	2,406,800	577,100	44,800	1,269,000	3,435,300	700	2,186,100	3,327,800	2,736,600	452,900	3,660,800	0	379,900	10,000	37,667,300
IMP																											0
TOTAL	6,142,000	17,900	1,945,200	11,300	2,109,800	2,343,200	557,500	30,500	499,400	3,111,000	34,100	377,600	2,406,800	577,100	44,800	1,269,000	3,435,300	700	2,186,100	3,327,800	2,736,600	452,900	3,660,800	0	379,900	10,000	37,667,300
AG FOREST																											
LAND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IMP																											0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FOREST																											
LAND	4,221,600	7,500	5,122,900	68,900	5,437,700	5,902,400	5,495,400	6,500	3,807,600	12,641,200	98,500	6,477,500	9,999,800	3,734,900	52,000	4,391,600	2,618,000	320,000	6,751,700	9,397,600	8,321,900	8,754,000	5,135,000	0	6,449,800	31,400	115,245,400
IMP																											0
TOTAL	4,221,600	7,500	5,122,900	68,900	5,437,700	5,902,400	5,495,400	6,500	3,807,600	12,641,200	98,500	6,477,500	9,999,800	3,734,900	52,000	4,391,600	2,618,000	320,000	6,751,700	9,397,600	8,321,900	8,754,000	5,135,000	0	6,449,800	31,400	115,245,400
OTHER																											
LAND	843,600	0	1,403,000	0	189,000	326,900	399,000	0	269,500	361,200	0	416,500	402,800	395,900	27,000	283,500	812,700	2,400	350,000	147,000	720,000	119,000	825,000	0	633,500	0	8,927,500
IMP	6,165,600	0	10,006,900	0	1,379,500	2,218,300	3,615,300	0	2,380,200	2,400,200	0	1,831,000	2,832,800	5,469,800	297,400	2,365,600	6,021,500	7,900	3,141,000	1,299,100	4,740,000	1,889,900	4,988,200		4,686,300		67,736,500
TOTAL	7,009,200	0	11,409,900	0	1,568,500	2,545,200	4,014,300	0	2,649,700	2,761,400	0	2,247,500	3,235,600	5,865,700	324,400	2,649,100	6,834,200	10,300	3,491,000	1,446,100	5,460,000	2,008,900	5,813,200	0	5,319,800	0	76,664,000
TOTAL REAL ESTATE																											
LAND	17,497,900	1,268,300	18,849,100	1,672,200	23,607,100	21,861,300	25,320,300	2,033,400	18,169,200	35,618,400	1,512,700	73,885,700	49,470,000	17,589,500	1,896,400	13,239,500	15,496,300	5,414,300	16,442,900	19,435,500	34,712,700	70,814,800	14,998,600	6,636,900	21,935,800	3,051,500	532,430,300
IMP	30,660,500	6,667,900	33,648,300	12,737,600	28,960,100	41,777,300	31,924,800	9,255,700	24,926,900	54,894,900	8,824,800	125,328,600	81,615,700	18,468,800	18,538,500	18,033,900	28,912,700	27,634,000	19,090,100	21,987,700	46,164,400	82,236,900	19,310,300	48,401,100	48,664,300	18,083,100	906,748,900
TOTAL	48,158,400	7,936,200	52,497,400	14,409,800	52,567,200	63,638,600	57,245,100	11,289,100	43,096,100	90,513,300	10,337,500	199,214,300	131,085,700	36,058,300	20,434,900	31,273,400	44,409,000	33,048,300	35,533,000	41,423,200	80,877,100	153,051,700	34,308,900	55,038,000	70,600,100	21,134,600	1,439,179,200

Source: WI DOR Statement of Changes in Equalized Values by Class and Item. Hpptps://www2.dor.state.wi.us/Eq Value2/application

Table G-4. Equalized Value, 2005

REAL ESTATE	T Aurora	C Berlin pt.	T Bloomfield	V Coloma	T Coloma	T Dakota	T Deerfield	V Hancock	T Hancock	T Leon	V Lohrville	T Marion	T Mt Morris	T Oasis	V Plainfield	T Plainfield	T Poy Sippi	V Redgranite	T Richford	T Rose	T Saxeville	T Springwater	T Warren	C Wautoma	T Wautoma	V Wild Rose	Waushara Co.
RESIDENTIAL																											
LAND	7,179,700	1,426,200	9,186,900	1,813,500	24,028,700	16,342,000	24,972,900	3,689,700	13,885,500	26,730,700	1,683,800	99,858,800	62,097,500	8,820,400	2,119,000	3,378,300	6,595,400	3,977,600	9,057,500	5,976,800	39,258,900	105,421,900	4,355,200	8,865,500	14,877,100	3,141,500	508,741,000
IMP	39,018,500	3,137,400	39,986,100	12,957,400	41,174,400	47,111,200	38,595,200	10,484,600	33,026,000	97,599,800	11,103,300	189,756,100	103,875,300	21,296,500	22,116,600	16,763,200	28,380,500	21,269,300	22,946,700	31,772,900	65,409,500	116,394,100	19,112,900	35,677,800	56,242,200	13,735,400	1,138,942,900
TOTAL	46,198,200	4,563,600	49,173,000	14,770,900	65,203,100	63,453,200	63,568,100	14,174,300	46,911,500	124,330,500	12,787,100	289,614,900	165,972,800	30,116,900	24,235,600	20,141,500	34,975,900	25,246,900	32,004,200	37,749,700	104,668,400	221,816,000	23,468,100	44,543,300	71,119,300	16,876,900	1,647,683,900
COMMERCIAL																											
LAND	543,100	85,700	389,300	533,600	182,200	3,325,100	250,900	219,900	494,200	734,400	271,400	1,171,000	134,600	90,200	344,600	854,100	331,600	1,917,600	448,800	563,300	152,100	2,008,900	142,900	8,577,100	4,155,300	1,039,300	28,961,200
IMP	2,669,500	648,600	1,459,500	3,346,400	538,000	7,834,100	252,200	1,736,500	649,200	1,172,200	678,800	3,679,800	718,300	189,600	3,817,800	5,352,100	3,648,000	12,455,600	1,313,100	14,700	634,100	3,861,900	1,235,000	27,559,300	17,738,800	6,959,300	110,162,400
TOTAL	3,212,600	734,300	1,848,800	3,880,000	720,200	11,159,200	503,100	1,956,400	1,143,400	1,906,600	950,200	4,850,800	852,900	279,800	4,162,400	6,206,200	3,979,600	14,373,200	1,761,900	578,000	786,200	5,870,800	1,377,900	36,136,400	21,894,100	7,998,600	139,123,600
MANUFACTURING																											
LAND	70,800	182,400	15,000	57,800	27,000		10,000	0	37,800	0	12,800	29,800	10,000	0	0	11,900	4,800	45,400	34,400	59,400	0	0	16,500	107,200	53,500	56,900	843,400
IMP	610,200	3,898,700	59,200	921,100	183,200		110,000		2,576,800		195,000	165,500	68,000		37,500		6,000	1,702,800	311,200	548,400			140,500	3,781,300	225,300	540,700	16,081,400
TOTAL	681,000	4,081,100	74,200	978,900	210,200	0	120,000	0	2,614,600	0	207,800	195,300	78,000	0	0	49,400	10,800	1,748,200	345,600	607,800	0	0	157,000	3,888,500	278,800	597,600	16,924,800
AGRICULTURAL																											
LAND	1,526,900	2,200	1,575,400	1,400	747,200	786,300	1,281,000	0	1,396,100	894,600	1,900	653,200	573,800	2,179,900	20,000	1,648,600	1,334,800	59,600	727,900	676,500	1,054,900	592,300	1,107,300	2,800	766,600	3,500	19,614,700
IMP	0																										0
TOTAL	1,526,900	2,200	1,575,400	1,400	747,200	786,300	1,281,000	0	1,396,100	894,600	1,900	653,200	573,800	2,179,900	20,000	1,648,600	1,334,800	59,600	727,900	676,500	1,054,900	592,300	1,107,300	2,800	766,600	3,500	19,614,700
UNDEVELOPED																											
LAND	3,737,300	15,600	2,972,500	10,600	2,252,400	1,714,600	535,000	0	969,600	2,696,800	95,200	2,235,900	2,849,300	566,400	47,600	1,162,400	2,630,100	0	2,087,100	3,907,800	2,894,900	1,410,600	3,042,300	65,100	2,552,900	0	40,452,000
IMP																											0
TOTAL	3,737,300	15,600	2,972,500	10,600	2,252,400	1,714,600	535,000	0	969,600	2,696,800	95,200	2,235,900	2,849,300	566,400	47,600	1,162,400	2,630,100	0	2,087,100	3,907,800	2,894,900	1,410,600	3,042,300	65,100	2,552,900	0	40,452,000
AG FOREST																											
LAND	765,000	0	1,174,800	0	1,042,800	2,140,800	1,027,000	0	1,013,300	1,617,500	4,200	1,497,300	1,704,300	1,418,000	0	1,351,400	771,000	0	1,942,800	13,800	1,910,300	1,302,800	1,305,000	0	1,382,400	0	23,384,500
IMP																											0
TOTAL	765,000	0	1,174,800	0	1,042,800	2,140,800	1,027,000	0	1,013,300	1,617,500	4,200	1,497,300	1,704,300	1,418,000	0	1,351,400	771,000	0	1,942,800	13,800	1,910,300	1,302,800	1,305,000	0	1,382,400	0	23,384,500
FOREST																											
LAND	4,168,400	0	5,981,900	0	6,652,800	5,812,800	4,857,600	201,600	5,495,700	13,665,000	113,400	10,340,000	12,238,200	3,900,800	75,900	4,477,200	2,432,700	0	7,428,000	14,962,500	8,459,100	14,507,300	4,820,400	0	9,580,800	0	140,172,100
IMP																											0
TOTAL	4,168,400	0	5,981,900	0	6,652,800	5,812,800	4,857,600	201,600	5,495,700	13,665,000	113,400	10,340,000	12,238,200	3,900,800	75,900	4,477,200	2,432,700	0	7,428,000	14,962,500	8,459,100	14,507,300	4,820,400	0	9,580,800	0	140,172,100
OTHER																											
LAND	1,219,800	0	1,863,200	0	193,500	435,000	658,000	0	270,000	647,800	0	192,500	402,000	508,500	31,500	378,000	1,360,400	3,000	441,000	160,000	1,416,800	325,000	1,232,000	0	620,000	0	12,358,000
IMP	10,128,800		12,897,400		1,778,000	2,849,600	4,643,300		2,998,100	2,951,100		2,106,800	1,898,400	6,672,000	286,400	2,950,600	7,462,200	8,800	4,787,600	1,452,600	7,007,600	1,880,000	6,455,200		4,668,000		85,882,500
TOTAL	11,348,600	0	14,760,600	0	1,971,500	3,284,600	5,301,300	0	3,268,100	3,598,900	0	2,299,300	2,300,400	7,180,500	317,900	3,328,600	8,822,600	11,800	5,228,600	1,612,600	8,424,400	2,205,000	7,687,200	0	5,288,000	0	98,240,500
TOTAL REAL ESTATE																											
LAND	19,211,000	1,712,100	23,159,000	2,416,900	35,126,600	30,556,600	33,592,400	4,111,200	23,562,200	46,986,800	2,182,700	115,978,500	80,009,700	17,484,200	2,638,600	13,261,900	15,460,800	6,003,200	22,167,500	26,320,100	55,147,000	125,568,800	16,021,600	17,617,700	33,988,600	4,241,200	774,526,900
IMP	52,427,000	7,684,700	54,402,200	17,224,900	43,673,600	57,794,900	43,600,700	12,221,100	39,250,100	101,723,100	11,977,100	195,708,200	106,560,000	28,158,100	26,220,800	25,103,400	39,496,700	35,436,500	29,358,600	33,788,600	73,051,200	122,136,000	26,943,600	67,018,400	78,874,300	21,235,400	1,351,069,200
TOTAL	71,638,000	9,396,800	77,561,200	19,641,800	78,800,200	88,351,500	77,193,100	16,332,300	62,812,300	148,709,900	14,159,800	311,686,700	186,569,700	45,642,300	28,859,400	38,365,300	54,957,500	41,439,700	51,526,100	60,108,700	128,198,200	247,704,800	42,965,200	84,636,100	112,862,900	25,476,600	2,125,596,100

Source: 2005 Statement of Equalized Values as Set by the WDOR.

Table G-5. Land Use Acres by Real Estate Class, 1980

Minor Civil Division	Residential	Commercial	Manufacturing	Agricultural	Swamp & Waste	Forest Land	Other	Total
Aurora town	186	46		14,898	5,681	944		21,755
Berlin city, pt.	22	3		117				142
Bloomfield town	264	10	3	17,321		4,990		22,588
Coloma village	144	11		251				406
Coloma town	2,101	105	13	8,936	159	8,177		19,491
Dakota town	838	196	4	9,338	3,298	6,045		19,719
Deerfield town	882	12		13,087	6,884			20,865
Hancock village			2	314				316
Hancock town	558		36	13,519	292	3,654		18,059
Leon town	3,150	57		11,399		7,641		22,247
Lohrville village	240	4		319				563
Marion town	114	2		10,506	519	6,694		17,835
Mount Morris town	243			11,244	602	6,607		18,696
Oasis town	348		40	16,862	61	4,212		21,523
Plainfield village	29	16		216				261
Plainfield town	220	35		14,047	665	5,768		20,735
Poy Sippi town	241	10	1	16,851	903			18,006
Redgranite village				37	594			631
Richford town	765	287		11,023	270	7,859		20,204
Rose town	2,314	349	11	11,962	214	5,914		20,764
Saxeville town	1,484	76		14,781	15	6,389		22,745
Springwater town								-
Warren town	471	26	10	11,454	3,624	5,076		20,661
Wautoma city			16					16
Wautoma town	1,141	23	108	11,150	1,347	6,097		19,866
Wild Rose village	2	1	69	195	26	48		341
Waushara County	15,757	1,269	313	219,827	25,154	86,115	0	348,435

Source: Table II, 1980 Clerk's Statement of Assessment as Reported on or Before September 19, 1980; WI DOR 1980 Statistical Report of Property Values

Table G-6. Land Use Acres by Real Estate Class, 1990

Minor Civil Division	Residential	Commercial	Manufacturing	Agricultural	Swamp & Waste	Forest Land	Other	Total
Aurora town	406	41		13,110	6,981	1,335		21,873
Berlin city, pt.	116	10		31				157
Bloomfield town	607	5	4	12,853	3,197	5,727		22,393
Coloma village	138	52	2	157				349
Coloma town	2,300	32	14	9,458	107	5,907		17,818
Dakota town	1,579	190		9,246	2,552	5,110		18,677
Deerfield town	1,689	10		13,079	66	5,307		20,151
Hancock village	30	10		306				346
Hancock town	691	27	18	12,627	214	3,827		17,404
Leon town	2,612	30		7,704	556	9,573		20,475
Lohrville village				339				339
Marion town	2,670	25	39	10,346	465	5,486		19,031
Mount Morris town	1,766	32	2	8,782	840	7,017		18,439
Oasis town	685		40	16,667	50	3,401		20,843
Plainfield village	47	17		231				295
Plainfield town	605	117	8	14,797	218	4,594		20,339
Poy Sippi town	251	19	1	12,789	1,971	2,618		17,649
Redgranite village	155	10	25	685				875
Richford town	1,386	277		9,912	1,114	5,909		18,598
Rose town	1,870	335	5	11,410	136	5,723		19,479
Saxeville town	1,438	67		11,436	1,177	7,277		21,395
Springwater town	1,656	263		7,757	197	6,875		16,748
Warren town	565	27	10	12,114	2,283	4,676		19,675
Wautoma city			36					36
Wautoma town	1,777	40	79	10,850	1,099	5,796		19,641
Wild Rose village	46	58	20	226	48			398
Waushara County	25,085	1,694	303	206,912	23,271	96,158	-	353,423

Source: WI DOR Final Statement of Assessment Report

Table G-7. Land Use Acres by Real Estate Class, 2000

Minor Civil Division	Residential	Commercial	Manufacturing	Agricultural	Undevelop	Ag Forest	Forest	Other	Total
Aurora town	711	72	-	9,604	7,554	-	3,487	121	21,549
Berlin city, pt.	120	9	31	17	17	-	-	-	194
Bloomfield town	995	7	3	11,582	3,297	-	4,796	338	21,018
Coloma village	188	40	15	16	65	-	-	-	324
Coloma town	2,739	28	14	6,447	2,894	-	4,212	45	16,379
Dakota town	2,115	195	4	7,131	3,416	-	4,403	88	17,352
Deerfield town	3,912	10	4	9,544	777	-	3,899	160	18,306
Hancock village	239	26	-	-	47	-	-	-	312
Hancock town	934	85	15	11,438	789	-	3,058	142	16,461
Leon town	2,326	38	-	5,422	3,634	-	7,826	92	19,338
Lohrville village	108	68	2	278	-	-	-	-	456
Marion town	3,526	119	2	7,323	1,421	-	5,762	50	18,203
Mount Morris town	2,249	44	2	4,993	3,249	-	6,582	107	17,226
Oasis town	451	49	-	16,033	917	-	3,040	110	20,600
Plainfield village	149	49	-	139	53	-	43	7	440
Plainfield town	1,094	142	5	13,195	1,909	-	3,629	63	20,037
Poy Sippi town	475	21	1	8,666	4,718	-	2,642	206	16,729
Redgranite village	260	16	18	504	-	-	-	1	799
Richford town	6,906	149	17	7,169	2,909	-	5,232	80	22,462
Rose town	2,042	333	36	5,896	4,162	-	5,522	31	18,022
Saxeville town	2,925	22	-	7,950	3,630	-	5,347	185	20,059
Springwater town	1,911	342	-	6,873	372	-	5,917	66	15,481
Warren town	644	38	10	8,393	5,584	-	4,512	175	19,356
Wautoma city	-	-	30	9	-	-	-	-	39
Wautoma town	2,389	246	5	6,614	3,248	-	5,436	140	18,078
Wild Rose village	259	88	9	20	-	-	-	-	376
Waushara County	39,667	2,236	223	155,256	54,662	-	85,345	2,207	339,596

Source: Statement of Assessment -- Updated Clerk's Values, WDOR.

Table G-8. Land Use Acres by Real Estate Class, 2005

Minor Civil Division	Residential	Commercial	Manufacturing	Agricultural	Undeveloped	Ag Forest	Forest	Other	Total
Aurora town	1,043	66	23	9,355	7,553	869	2,392	178	21,479
Berlin city, pt.	114	23	31	17	17	-	-	-	202
Bloomfield town	1,082	14	3	10,514	4,541	1,270	3,116	274	20,814
Coloma village	187	52	15	14	15	-	-	-	283
Coloma town	3,015	36	14	6,425	2,737	897	2,706	43	15,873
Dakota town	2,136	206	-	6,762	3,295	1,799	2,415	87	16,700
Deerfield town	3,578	10	4	9,986	740	893	2,124	139	17,474
Hancock village	207	27	0	0	0	0	96	0	330
Hancock town	1,027	155	15	10,087	1,565	965	2,617	60	16,491
Leon town	2,605	39	-	6,747	3,683	1,306	5,460	81	19,921
Lohrville village	301	24	2	22	158	4	54	-	565
Marion town	3,632	169	4	6,049	2,295	1,219	4,105	44	17,517
Mount Morris town	2,346	41	2	4,550	3,528	1,311	4,707	67	16,552
Oasis town	486	41	-	16,008	1,046	1,234	1,696	113	20,624
Plainfield village	114	31	-	139	59	14	19	7	383
Plainfield town	1,081	158	5	13,073	1,926	1,287	2,132	84	19,746
Poy Sippi town	569	24	1	8,321	4,826	906	1,411	180	16,238
Redgranite village	356	40	18	473	-	-	-	1	888
Richford town	2,467	212	17	6,047	2,836	1,619	3,112	98	16,408
Rose town	2,042	312	36	5,196	3,965	1,051	4,952	35	17,589
Saxeville town	2,982	28	-	7,425	3,929	1,415	2,998	182	18,959
Springwater town	2,132	347	-	4,768	1,889	964	5,350	50	15,500
Warren town	788	41	10	7,696	6,387	1,447	2,695	179	19,243
Wautoma city	-	-	26	26	59	-	-	-	111
Wautoma town	2,600	248	9	6,225	3,016	1,152	3,966	124	17,340
Wild Rose village	252	126	9	21	-	-	-	-	408
Waushara County	37,142	2,470	244	145,946	60,065	21,622	58,123	2,026	327,638

Source: WI DOR Final Statement of Assessment Report

Table G-9 Town of Poy Sippi - Historic Land Prices, 1980 to 2005

Real Estate Class	No. of Acres (Land)	Equalized Value (\$)	\$/Parcel
1980			
Residential	241	1,515,600	6,289
Commercial	10	154,800	15,480
Manufacturing	1	7,000	7,000
Agricultural	16,851	8,421,800	500
Swamp & Waste	903	551,600	611
Forest	0	773,500	NA
Totals	18,006	11,424,300	634
1990			
Residential	251	1,113,900	4,438
Commercial	19	149,500	7,868
Manufacturing	1	3,700	3,700
Agricultural	12,789	6,336,684	495
Swamp & Waste	1,971	517,172	262
Forest	2,618	1,028,135	393
Total	17,649	9,149,091	518
2000			
Residential	475	4,449,300	9,367
Commercial	21	213,300	10,157
Manufacturing	1	4,800	4,800
Agricultural	8,666	3,962,900	457
Undeveloped	4,718	3,435,300	728
Forest	2,642	2,618,000	991
Other	206	812,700	3,945
Total	16,729	15,496,300	926
2005			
Residential	569	6,595,400	11,591
Commercial	24	331,600	13,817
Manufacturing	1	4,800	4,800
Agricultural	8321	1,334,800	160
Undeveloped	4826	2,630,100	545
Forest	2317	3,203,700	1,383
Other	180	1,360,400	7,558
Total	16,238	15,460,800	952

Source: 1980 Statistical Report of Property Values, WI DOR

WI DOR Final Statement of Assessment and/or Statement
of Equalized Assessment for 1990, 2000 and 2005.

**TOWN OF POY SIPPI
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

Please Take Notice That the Poy Sippi Town Board will hold a public hearing on the proposed adoption of the *Town of Poy Sippi 20-year Comprehensive Plan*. The public hearing will be held on Thursday, May 31, 2007, at 7:30 p.m. at the Town Hall. The Town Board will take action following the public hearing on the proposed adoption of the plan at the monthly Town Board meeting on Monday, June 11, 2007 at 8:00 p.m.

The Comprehensive Plan is a statement of public policy concerning the conservation and development of the town. The plan provides a guide to where future growth and development should occur within and around the town over the next 20 years. When the town makes future decisions concerning land use development, the plan will be consulted. The plan inventoried and analyzed the town's physical setting, natural features, land use, population figures, economics, housing stock, transportation and community facilities. Using these inventories and the plan's goals and objectives, the town developed a preferred land use plan for the Town of Poy Sippi.

The town of Poy Sippi Plan Commission, together with the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, worked to develop the *Town of Poy Sippi, 20-year Comprehensive Plan* within a two year timeframe. If anyone would like additional information regarding the proposed comprehensive plan, please contact Eric Fowle at East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, phone: 920-751-4770 or e-mail: efowle@eastcentralrpc.org

Copies of the proposed *Town of Poy Sippi, 20-year Comprehensive Plan* are available for review at the following locations:

- Poy Sippi Town Hall, N4398 Spring St., May 31, 2007 - 7:30 p.m.
- Poy Sippi Public Library, W2251 Commercial St.
- University of Wis. Extension, 209 S. St. Marie St., Wautoma, WI -(Room 34, Waushara Co. Courthouse)
- East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, 132 Main St., Menasha

**Any questions feel free to contact Sue Albright, Clerk - 920-987-5522.
Publish: April 19, 2007**

1.0.0.1

ne this 2

007

blc.

ies.....1..

GREEN LAKE COUNTY

IN THE MATTER OF

PROOF OF PUBLICATION

Filed.....

Waushara County
Land Conservation & Zoning
P.O. Box 1109
Wautoma, WI 54982-1109
(920) 787-0453
Fax (920) 787-6516

E mail lcdzoning.courthouse@co.waushara.wi.us

DATE: 5/8/2007

TO: Kathy Thunes, P.E., Associate Planner, ECWRPC

RE: Town of Poy Sippi Land Use Plan

This letter is in regards to the draft land use plan for the Town of Poy Sippi. It is an extremely busy time of year for our office, so I will be unable to offer detailed comments on this plan. However, I can offer some general comments on this plan, as follows:

1. As with all of the other previous land use plans, many of the goals and strategies are a little too generic to serve as good guidelines or direction for future development in the Township. As examples, when strategies begin with phases such as "support and assist, consider, should consider, encourage where possible, where feasible, continue to explore, as needed, and where appropriate" these are too generic and are doubtful that they will ever be implemented. If the Township is serious about accomplishing these strategies, they should be re-defined and be more specific.
2. It would be helpful in the overall goals section to not only list the related objectives (ED 1.1, etc.), but also the page number on which it is found, so the complete objective can be found and referenced more easily.
3. Many of the strategies listed to be accomplished have already been done, and need to be re-phrased to say something like "Encourage the County to continue to enforce", rather than listing them as new strategies.
4. Many of the strategies will be impossible to administer because of their high costs. Things like purchase of development rights are very expensive land use tools, and should be carefully considered before putting into a land use plan.
5. Many of the strategies will also be difficult, if not impossible, to administer without significant staffing increases at either the Town or County level, or both. Although I recognize the desire to "throw in the kitchen sink" when writing these plans, I also believe we need to be a bit more realistic, and only try to list strategies we can reasonably achieve within the life of the plan, otherwise leave them out. They serve no purpose if they can never be accomplished.

-
6. I also have difficulty with several suggestions involving architectural, lighting and other similar proposed land use regulations. When you start infringing on people's rights to choose the color of their house or the type of light bulb they put in their yard, I think we have gone a little too far. These may be fine in more metropolitan areas, but Poy Sippi is not Milwaukee or Racine. I do not feel they have a place in communities like Poy Sippi. I suggest you stick to the basics.
 7. In the margins beside many of the proposed strategies I have simply written the word "How?" The plan lists a broad objective or strategy, but fails to say how that is going to be achieved. If we want it to look good on paper, leave them the way they are, but if the Town is truly serious about accomplishing these things, then they need to be much more specific on a large percentage of these strategies. Otherwise they have no real chance of ever being achieved.

In conclusion, I believe the Poy Sippi draft comprehensive plan has started in the right direction, but in order for it to truly be a guide for the future direction of the Township, many of the strategies need to be taken to the next level if the intention of creating this plan is to be a tool that will be used by the Township and the County. If the goal of the plan, however, is merely to meet the requirements of the smart growth legislation, then no further work is needed.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on this document, and look forward to working with you and the Township in the future.



Mark Schumacher, Director
Waushara County Land Conservation & Zoning

cc: Larry Albright, Chairman, Town of Poy Sippi
Patrick Nehring, Waushara County UWEX
Deb Behringer, Waushara County Personnel / Administrative Coordinator
Ruth Zouski, Waushara County Corporation Counsel
Waushara County Planning and Zoning Committee

Ordinance 2007

An ordinance To adopt the Comprehensive Plan of the Town of Poy Sippi, WI
Pursuant To Wis. St. 66.1001

Whereas on June 11, 2007, the Town of Poy Sippi approved a contract with the East Central Regional Planning Commission to prepare a Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Poy Sippi under the guidelines of WI. St. 66.1001; and, Whereas has adopted written procedures designed to foster public participation in every stage of the preparation of a comprehensive plan as required by Section 66.1001(4)(a) of the WI. St. which addressed provisions for the wide distributions of the proposed elements of the comprehensive plan and provided an opportunity for written comments to be received from the public & for the Town to respond to such comments; and

Whereas on May 31, 2007 the Town of Poy Sippi Plan Commission recommended to the Town Board adoption of the Comprehensive plan by resolution, which vote is recorded in the official minutes of the plan commission; and.

Whereas, the Poy Sippi Town Board held a public hearing on May 31, 2007, which was preceded by a Class 1 notice provided as described in WI ST. chapter 985 that was published at least 30 days before the hearing was held and the notice included the following:

1. Held at Poy Sippi Town hall, N4398 Spring St.
2. May 31, 2007 = 7:30 pm.
3. Plans available for review at the following locations:
 - * Poy Sippi Town Hall = N4398 Spring St.
 - * Poy Sippi Public Library = W2251 Commercial St
 - * Univ. of Wis. Ext. = 209 S. St. Marie, Wautoma Rm. 34
 - * East Central Wis. Regional Planning Commission,
132 Main St., Menasha

Whereas the Town Board of the Town of Poy Sippi, having carefully reviewed the recommendation of the Town plan commission, having determined that all procedural requirements and notice have been satisfied, having given the matter due consideration, including consideration of the plan elements related to issues and opportunities; economic development; housing; transportation; utilities and community facilities; agricultural, natural and cultural resources; land use; inter governmental cooperation and implementation and having determined that the comprehensive plan will serve the general purposes of guiding and accomplishing a coordinated adjusted and harmonious development of the Town of Poy Sippi which will in accordance with existing and future needs, best promote the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity and the general welfare, as well as efficiency and economy in the process of development.

The Town Board of Town of Poy Sippi does ordain as follows:

Section 1 - pursuant to Sections 62.23(2)+(3) of the WIS. ST., the Town of Poy Sippi is authorized to adopt its Comprehensive plan as defined in Sections 66.1001(4)(a) of the WIS. ST.

Section 2 - The plan commission of the Town of Poy Sippi by a majority vote of the entire commission as recorded in its official minutes, has adopted a resolution recommending to the town board the amendment of the document entitled "Town of Poy Sippi Comprehensive Plan 2025;" containing all the elements of section 66.1001(2) of the WIS. ST.

Section 3 - The Town Clerk is directed to file a copy of the plan with all the following:

Every governmental body that is located in whole or in part within the boundaries of the Town of Poy Sippi;

1. the clerk of every local governmental unit that is adjacent to the Town of Poy Sippi;
2. the WIS land council
3. the WIS Dept. of Admin.
4. the East Central WIS Regional Planning Commission
5. the public libraries that serve the area in which Town of Poy Sippi is located
6. the Waushara Co. Zoning & land Conservation Dept.

Section 4 = Severability. Several sections of this Ordinance are declared to be severable. If any section or portion thereof shall

be declared by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, unlawful, or unenforceable, such decision shall only apply to the specific section or portion thereof directly specified in the decision, and shall not affect the validity of any other provisions, sections or portions thereof of the ordinance. The remainder of the ordinance shall remain in full force and effect. Any other ordinances whose terms are in conflict with the provisions of the ordinance are hereby repealed as to those terms in conflict.

Section 5 - The Town Board of Poy Sippi, does by the enactment of this ordinance formally amends the document entitled "Town of Poy Sippi Comprehensive Plan 2025", pursuant to section 66.1001(4)(c) of the WIS. ST. with modifications recommended by the Plan Commission.

Section 6 - This ordinance shall take effect upon passage by majority vote of the membership of the Town Board and the publication/posting as required by law.

Adopted June 11, 07

Signed by - Larry Albright, Chr.
Raymond Jorgensen, Sup I
Cheryl Nitzke, Sup II
Sue Albright, Clerk

PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 1-2007
TOWN OF POY SIPPI, WISCONSIN

Recommending the adoption of the *Town of Poy Sippi Comprehensive Plan of 2025*, by the Poy Sippi Town Board

WHEREAS, pursuant to sections 62.23(2) and (3) of the Wisconsin Statutes, the Town of Poy Sippi is authorized to prepare and adopt a comprehensive plan as defined in sections 66.1001(1)(a) and 66.1001(2) of the Wisconsin Statutes for the general purpose of guiding and accomplishing coordinated and harmonious development of the Town;

WHEREAS, the Comprehensive has been prepared by the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission to include proposals, programs, descriptions, maps, and explanatory matter regarding natural resources, population, housing, economic development, transportation, land use, public facilities, outdoor recreation, and a Future Land Use Map for the 20 year planning period;

WHEREAS, the Plan Commission held a public meeting on the Comprehensive Plan at its meeting on June 11 2007 to accept public comments on the plan;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Plan Commission has reviewed the document and recommends to the Town Board of the Town of Poy Sippi that the *Town of Poy Sippi Comprehensive Plan 2025*, including all maps and supporting materials and all elements of the document be adopted.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, one copy of the adopted comprehensive plan shall be sent to all of the following: every governmental body that is located in whole or in part within the boundaries of the town; the clerk of every local governmental unit that adjacent to the town; the Wisconsin Land Council; the Wisconsin Department of Administration; and the Poy Sippi Public Library.

Passed and adopted on this 11 day of June, 2007.



Plan commissioner head person

June 11, 07
(Date)

(Approved X, Veto)

Attest: Sue Hare Angela Nehring Cherone Blish
Plan Commission member Plan Commission member Plan Commission member

Charles J. Nitzke
Plan Commission member

Ordinance No. 1-2007

AN ORDINANCE TO ADOPT THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF THE
TOWN OF POY SIPPI, WISCONSIN
PURSUANT TO WISCONSIN STATUTES § 66.1001

WHEREAS, in June 11 the Town Board for the Town of Poy Sippi approved a contract with the East Central Regional Planning Commission to prepare a Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Poy Sippi under the guidelines of Wisconsin Statutes § 66.1001; and,

WHEREAS, has adopted written procedures designed to foster public participation in every stage of the preparation of a comprehensive plan as required by section 66.1001(4) (a) of the Wisconsin Statutes which addressed provisions for a wide distribution of the proposed elements of the Comprehensive Plan, and provided an opportunity for written comments to be received from the public and for the Town to respond to such comments; an,

WHEREAS, on May 31, 2007, the Town of Poy Sippi Plan Commission recommended to the Town Board adoption of the Comprehensive Plan by resolution, which vote is recorded in the official minutes of the Plan Commission; and,

WHEREAS, the Poy Sippi Town Board held a public hearing on May 31 2007, which was preceded by a Class 1 Notice provided as described in Wisconsin Statutes Chapter 985 that was published at least 30 days before the hearing was held, and the notice included all of the following information:

1. The time, date, and location of the hearing;
2. A summary of the proposed Comprehensive Plan;
3. The name of the individual employed by the Town of Poy Sippi who may provide additional information regarding the proposed ordinance;
4. Information relating to when and where the proposed Comprehensive Plan could be inspected before the hearing, and how a copy of the Plan could be obtained; and

WHERE AS, the Town Board of the Town of Poy Sippi, having carefully reviewed the recommendation of the Town Plan Commission, having determined that all procedural requirements and notice have been satisfied, having given the matter due consideration, including consideration of the plan elements related to issues and opportunities; economic development; housing; transportation; utilities and community facilities; agricultural, natural, and cultural resources; land use; intergovernmental cooperation, and implementation, and having determined that the Comprehensive Plan will serve the general purposes of guiding and accomplishing a coordinated, adjusted, and harmonious development of the Town of Poy Sippi which will, in accordance with existing and future needs, best promote the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity, and the general welfare , as well as efficiency and economy in the process of development.

The Town Board of the Town of Poy Sippi, Wisconsin does ordain as follows:

SECTION 1. Pursuit to sections 62.23(2) and (3) of the Wisconsin Statutes, the Town of Poy Sippi is authorized to adopt its Comprehensive Plan as defined in sections 66.1001(4)(a) of the Wisconsin Statutes.

SECTION 2. The plan commission of the Town of Poy Sippi, by a majority vote of the entire commission as recorded in its official minutes, has adopted a resolution recommending to the town board the amendment of the document entitled *Town of Poy Sippi Comprehensive Plan 2025*, containing all of the elements of section 66.1001(2) of the Wisconsin Statutes.

SECTION 3. The Town Clerk is directed to file a copy of the Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Poy Sippi with all of the following entities:

Every governmental body that is located in whole or in part within the boundaries of the Town of Poy Sippi;

1. The Clerk of every local governmental unit that is adjacent to the Town of Poy Sippi;
2. The Wisconsin Land Council;
3. The Wisconsin Department of Administration;
4. The East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission;
5. The public libraries that serve the area in which the Town of Poy Sippi is located
6. The Waushara County Zoning and Land Conservation Department

SECTION 4. SEVERABILITY. Several sections of this ordinance are declared to be severable. If any section or portion thereof shall be declared by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, unlawful, or unenforceable, such decision shall only apply to the specific section or portion thereof directly specified in the decision, and shall not affect the validity of any other provisions, sections, or portions thereof of the ordinance. The remainder of the ordinance shall remain in full force and effect. Any other ordinances whose terms are in conflict with the provisions of the ordinance are hereby repealed as to those terms in conflict.

SECTION 5. The town board of the Town of Poy Sippi, Wisconsin, does, by the enactment of this ordinance, formally amends the document entitled, "Town of Poy Sippi Comprehensive Plan 2025", pursuant to section 66.1001(4)(c) of the Wisconsin Statutes with modifications recommended by the plan commission.


SECTION 6. This ordinance shall take effect upon passage by majority vote of the membership of the town board and the publication/posting as required by law.

ADOPTED this 11 day of June, 2007.



Larry Albright, Chairman

June 11, 07
(Date)

(Approved ☒, Veto ☐)

Attest: 
Raymond Jorgensen, Supervisor


Cheryl Nitzke, Supervisor


Sue Albright, Clerk



Center *for* Land Use Education

The Land Use Tracker

Volume 1, Issue 4
Spring 2002

IN THIS ISSUE:

CASE LAW UPDATE

➔ [MORATORIA AND TAKINGS](#)

GENERAL ARTICLES

➔ [MANAGING RURAL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT](#)

➔ [PUBLIC LANDS AND PROPERTY TAXES: WHAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP?](#)

➔ [LAND USE EDUCATION COURSE GROUP OFFERED THIS SUMMER AT UWSP](#)

➔ [CALENDAR OF EVENTS](#)

➔ [ARTICLE SUBMISSIONS](#)

➔ [OUR STAFF](#)

➔ [CONTACT US BY E-MAIL](#)



[CLUE HOMEPAGE](#)

[PREVIOUS ARTICLE](#) [FRONT PAGE](#) [NEXT ARTICLE](#)

Managing Rural Residential Development

By Anna L. Haines, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, UW-Stevens Point
and Extension Specialist, Center for Land Use Education

As many communities begin to prepare their comprehensive plans and consider the various elements required under the comprehensive planning law, the relationship between agricultural or open space preservation with housing can be both confusing and contentious. Especially for those communities that are experiencing growth pressure struggling to manage rural residential development along with other community concerns can be difficult. One primary goal of many communities is to balance residential development with agricultural needs, open space, and natural resources while trying to retain a sense of place. Several plan implementation tools are available that local governments can use including, but not limited to: Large minimum lot size, purchase of and transfer of development rights, overlay zones for shorelands, hillsides, and other environmentally sensitive areas, and conservation subdivisions.

This is the first of two articles addressing rural residential development. In this article, I provide a brief definition of each tool, how each tool works, potential benefits, limitations, and references. In the following article, we will provide a more in-depth look at one of these tools – conservation subdivisions.

Which Tool is “Right” for Our Community?

Each community should decide on the types of tools they want to use. Recognize that your community can use these tools together – they are not mutually exclusive. It

is reasonable, for example, to have a purchase of development rights program in place along with overlay zones and a conservation subdivision ordinance. Below is a list of criteria to consider when choosing plan implementation tools:

- Does your community have an accepted plan that identifies rural residential development or at least sprawl as an issue?
- Does the plan specify goals and objectives that address how your community will contend with rural residential development?
- Will the tool accomplish any of your community's goals and objectives?
- Is the tool politically acceptable?
- Can the local government or some other organization administer the new tool given current personnel or is another position or committee necessary?
- Are there any enforcement issues the local government personnel would need to contend with?
- To be effective, would the same tool need to be used by adjoining communities and is a cooperative effort possible?

Answering the above questions will give you a better idea which tools are appropriate to use in your community. Avoid choosing to use any plan implementation tool before you have done your homework and understand how that tool works and the implications for administering and enforcing it.

Tools for Managing Rural Residential Development

(See table below.)

For Further Reading

Daniels, Tom and Deborah Bowers. 1997. **Holding Our Ground: Protecting America's Farms and Farmland.** Washington, D.C.: Island Press.

Michigan State University Extension. "Better Designs for Development in Michigan."
www.msue.msu.edu/msue/aoe/landuse/landresource.html

Minnesota Land Trust. 2000. "Preserving Minnesota Landscapes Through Creative Development: An Introduction." Conservation Design Portfolio.
www.mnland.org/cdp-sum1.pdf

Minnesota Planning. 2000. "From policy to reality: model ordinances for sustainable development."
<http://www.mnplan.state.mn.us/Report.html?Id=1927>

Natural Lands Trust, Inc. "Growing Greener: Putting Conservation into Local Codes."
www.natlands.org/planning/planning.html

Ohm, Brian. 2000. "An Ordinance for a Conservation Subdivision." www.wisc.edu/urpl/ to people to Brian Ohm to projects.

Ohm, Brian. 1999. **Guide to Community Planning in Wisconsin**. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin.
www.wisc.edu/urpl/ to people to Brian Ohm to selected publications.

Schiffman, Irving. 1999. **Alternative Techniques for Managing Growth**. Berkeley, CA: Institute of Governmental Studies Press.

All comments and suggestions are appreciated for those who reviewed this article.

Tools for Managing Rural Residential Development

Tool	Definition	How it Works	Potential Benefits	Limitations
Large minimum lot size	<p>A common type of agricultural zoning that says that a farm cannot be broken into parcels below a certain size for farming purposes.</p> <p>Daniels and Bowers 1997: 117.</p>	<p>Designate minimum lot size within an agricultural zone.</p> <p>Determined by legal and political acceptance balanced with effective land protection.</p> <p>Examples: some Oregon counties – 80-acre minimum;</p> <p>McHenry County, IL – 40-acre minimum; Pennsylvania – 50-acre minimum.</p>	<p>Can be changed over time as circumstances change.</p> <p>Keep farmland in large blocks to maintain economic viability.</p> <p>Easy to administer.</p>	<p>Can be ineffective if lot size is reduced to a size that makes farming impossible.</p>
Purchase of development rights	<p>A landowner agrees to sell the rights to develop his/her property to a local government, land trust or DNR. The development rights to a piece of property can be separated from the bundle of rights that go with the land. With the sale of that development right, a conservation easement is put into effect which restricts development in perpetuity. The value of the development right is determined by the difference between the market value and agricultural value of the farmland.</p>	<p>Local government or land trust must determine how to buy development rights, bonds, impact fees, additional levy on property are some possibilities.</p> <p>A local ordinance designates how funds are to be allocated and which agency will operate the program.</p> <p>The PDR agency drafts program regulations and guidelines and selects criteria for making decisions on appropriate land to preserve.</p> <p>The PDR agency solicits and receives applications and ranks them.</p> <p>An appraisal of the development rights is conducted by a independent appraiser.</p>	<p>Seller gets sale price and possibly property and estate tax reduction. Voluntary and permanent means of land use control. Avoids property rights outcry that zoning can elicit. Equitable method of containing sprawl, protecting valuable farmland and openspace. Property is retained on tax rolls and is privately owned and managed. Can separate funding and managing conservation easements from administration of program.</p>	<p>Substantial acquisition costs involved.</p> <p>Can result in scattered preservation if only some landowners participate.</p> <p>Property owners may not donate development rights if they know they can be paid.</p> <p>Can undermine the power of regulation by creating incentive-based expectations.</p> <p>A challenge to administer and find funds.</p>

Tools for Managing Rural Residential Development (continued)

Transfer of development rights	<p>Similar to a PDR program in that the property owner agrees to separate his/her development rights from the bundle of rights that go with the land and a conservation easement is put into effect. Rather than the local government purchasing the development rights to a property, a TDR program transfer the "rights to develop" from one area to another. The property owner still sells his/her development rights, but those rights are bought by a developer. In turn, the developer can use those development rights to create a denser subdivision, for example.</p> <p>Daniels and Bowers 1997.</p>	<p>Must have a comprehensive plan in place.</p> <p>Transfer the "rights to develop" from one area – a "sending" or preservation area - to another – "receiving" or development area.</p> <p>The costs of purchasing the easements are recovered from developers who receive the building bonus.</p> <p>Buying development rights is similar to a PDR program, but more controlled than PDR.</p> <p>Designate sending and receiving areas. The components of a TDR program include a preservation zone, a growth area, a pool of development rights, and a procedure for transferring development rights.</p>	<p>Provides certainty about where development will happen</p> <p>Creates incentive for developers to buy development rights rather than the local government needing to find a source of funds to purchase them.</p> <p>Allows higher density (developer incentive) than zoning ordinance might allow.</p> <p>Creates a competitive market between sellers and buyers.</p>	<p>Lack of community willpower to designate a "receiving" area.</p> <p>Misconceptions about the concept of density and meaning of "higher" density.</p> <p>Program depends on a stable and predictable real estate environment.</p> <p>A consensus is necessary to place conservation easements on agricultural areas while allowing for an increase in development densities or "bonuses" in other areas.</p> <p>Can be a challenge to administer.</p>
Overlay zones	<p>A set of zoning requirements that is described in the ordinance text, is mapped, and is imposed in addition to those of the underlying district. It is a technique for imposing more restrictive standards for a certain area than those specified under basic zoning. Development within the overlay zone must conform to the requirements of both zones or the more restrictive of the two. It usually is employed to deal with special physical or cultural characteristics present in the underlying zone, such as flood plains, fragile environments, or historical areas.</p> <p>Schiffman 1999.</p>	<p>In Wisconsin a typical overlay zone is shoreland zoning. Shoreland zoning is overlaid onto usually already zoned areas, such as a residential zone around a lake.</p> <p>The ordinance must specify and map the area that is within the overlay zone.</p> <p>Other types of overlay zones include:</p> <p>Hazards overlay zones, such as floodplains;</p> <p>Hillside/slope overlay zones;</p> <p>Historic preservation overlay zones;</p> <p>Woodland protection overlay zones; and</p> <p>Groundwater overlay zones.</p>	<p>Communities can provide additional protection to environmentally sensitive areas without changing underlying zoning.</p> <p>Straightforward to administer.</p>	<p>Property owners, developers and other may not understand with which regulations they need to work.</p> <p>Like zoning, variances are possible and can dilute the power and usefulness of this type of zoning.</p>

Tools for Managing Rural Residential Development (continued)

Conservation subdivisions	The purpose of a conservation subdivision is to protect natural resources while allowing for the maximum number of residences under current community zoning and subdivision regulations.	<p>Can be formalized within an ordinance.</p> <p>One of the more popular methods advocated by Randall Arendt is a four step process that identifies primary and secondary conservation areas, designs open space to protect them, arrange houses outside of those protected areas and finally lay out streets, lots and infrastructure.</p> <p>Minnesota Land Trust and University of Minnesota 2001.</p>	<p>Achieves a community goal of preserving openspace at the same density standard.</p> <p>None of the land is taken for public use unless the developer/owners want it to be.</p> <p>There are a variety of ownership choices: The original landowner, a farmer, for example, can retain ownership of up to 70% of the land and continue to work that land as a farm; and/or a homeowner's association, a local government, or a land trust can manage the property.</p> <p>If implemented under a plan and with conservation as the motivation, potential benefits include: "does not require public expenditure of funds; does not depend on landowner charity; does not involve complicated regulations for shifting rights to other parcels; does not depend upon the cooperation of two or more adjoining landowners to make it work.</p> <p>Better Designs for Development in Michigan</p>	<p>It is not a panacea.</p> <p>Conservation subdivision design should take place with a planning framework and conservation goals in place.</p> <p>These subdivisions should connect to a broader network of conservation areas, if not a community will have a chopped up landscape.</p> <p>Conservations subdivisions not attached to already developed areas and not connected to services result in poor land use practices.</p> <p>May not provide any affordable housing.</p>
---------------------------	---	---	--	---



Center for Land Use Education

The Land Use Tracker

Volume 2, Issue 1
Summer 2002

IN THIS ISSUE:

- ➔ [AN INNOVATIVE TOOL FOR MANAGING RURAL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT: A LOOK AT CONSERVATION SUBDIVISIONS](#)
- ➔ [WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT RULING: AGRICULTURAL USE VALUE ASSESSMENT](#)
- ➔ [COURT OF APPEALS UPHOLDS RULES FOR PRIVATE ONSITE WASTEWATER TREATMENT SYSTEMS](#)
- ➔ [IMPERVIOUS SURFACE - AN ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR](#)
- ➔ [CALENDAR OF EVENTS](#)
- ➔ [ARTICLE SUBMISSIONS](#)
- ➔ [OUR STAFF](#)
- ➔ [WHAT'S NEW AT THE CENTER](#)
- ➔ [CONTACT US BY E-MAIL](#)



[CLUE HOMEPAGE](#)

[FRONT PAGE](#) | [NEXT ARTICLE](#)

An Innovative Tool for Managing Rural Residential Development: A Look at Conservation Subdivisions

by Anna Haines, Ph.D.

This is the second of two articles addressing rural residential development. The [previous article on rural residential development](#) provided a definition of four related management tools (large minimum lot size, purchase of and transfer of development rights, and conservation subdivisions), and explained briefly how each tool worked, its potential benefits and limitations, and provided a list of references. In this article, I will provide a more in-depth look at conservation subdivisions.

The comprehensive planning law (or "Smart Growth" law) specifies nine elements that must be in the comprehensive plan. Among them is the implementation element that needs to outline the types of plan implementation tools a community will use to implement its plan. One primary goal of many communities is to balance residential development with agricultural needs, open space, and natural resources while trying to retain a sense of place. This kind of goal can make an important link between the housing, and agriculture, cultural and natural resources element of the comprehensive plan.

Consideration of the goals and objectives within the comprehensive plan is necessary as the community considers the types of tools it will use to achieve its plan. One potentially useful tool to achieve the above goal is to describe conservation subdivisions as a *floating* zoning district or a conditional use in residential districts in the local zoning or land division code.

A model conservation subdivision ordinance was prepared by UW Extension. Local governments are not required to adopt this ordinance (see Ohm 2000), but may find it useful in crafting their own conservation subdivision ordinance.

Conservation Subdivisions: A Definition

Conservation subdivisions are characterized by common open space and clustered compact lots. The purpose of a conservation subdivision is to protect farmland and/or natural resources while allowing for the maximum number of residences under current community zoning and subdivision regulations. In


some cases a greater density (density bonus) may be offered in the local ordinance to encourage this approach to residential development planning. Generally, this tool is used for parcels 40 acres or larger.

Development Density

One interesting feature of conservation subdivisions is that they are density neutral (except where a density bonus is offered). What does density neutral mean? Many people assume that a conservation subdivision automatically implies a reduction in the number of lots allowed on a parcel of land. Actually, the same numbers of lots are built in a conservation subdivision as would be built in a conventional subdivision. Thus, a conservation subdivision maintains the same level of density as a conventional subdivision. Conventional lot-by-lot subdivisions spread development evenly throughout a parcel without consideration to environmental or cultural features (Ohm 2000).

The primary difference between conservation subdivisions and conventional ones involves the location of the homes on one part of the parcel, i.e., the homes are clustered. Other changes involve management and ownership of the land that has been left for preservation.

Figure 1: Conservation vs. Conventional Subdivision Layout



Source: SEWRPC. 2002. "Model Zoning Ordinance For Rural Cluster Development"
www.sewrpc.org/modelordinances/default.htm

Open Space Design, Use and Ownership Options

Conservation subdivision ordinances generally require permanent dedication of 40% or more of the total development parcel as open space. Open space design requirements often include contiguity and connection to other open space or conservation areas. Open space uses may include agriculture, forestry or outdoor recreation and in some cases has included use for waste water disposal or sports facilities in urbanizing areas. There are a variety of ownership choices for the open space (individual residential lots are owned as in conventional subdivisions): The original landowner can retain ownership of the land and continue to use it as a farm, for example (usually agricultural use is limited; a confined animal feed lot is an inappropriate use, while a vegetable farm is appropriate); a homeowner's association could manage it, it can be held as individual outlots for each of the building lots, or a local government or a land trust can manage the property for conservation purposes or outdoor recreation.

Consolidated infrastructure and reduced development costs

Clustering homes reduces the amount of infrastructure. For example, the linear miles of road are reduced; thus, the associated costs of construction, operations and maintenance are also reduced. As well it is possible to share wells and septic systems in these clustered developments. However, placement of wells and septic systems must be carefully designed to prevent unwanted uptake of wastewater into private wells.

Marketing amenities

Conservation subdivisions are desirable from a developer/realtor perspective. They appeal to potential homeowners who want easy access to open space for the views and/or for a range of outdoor activities, i.e., a "golf course" development without the golf course.

How it works

One of the more popular methods is advocated by Randall Arendt who has outlined a four step process. The process begins with the community identifying the cultural and natural resources that are valued on a specific parcel earmarked for development. This communication results in (i) identifying primary and secondary conservation areas, (ii) designing open space to protect them, (iii) arranging houses outside of those protected areas, and (iv) finally laying out streets, lots and infrastructure. Often between 40% to 80% of the site is permanently set aside for open space (Ardt 1992, Minnesota Land Trust 2000, Natural Lands Trust).

Potential Benefits

Conservation development or subdivisions **potentially** can benefit a community in a variety of ways:

- Achieves a community goal of preserving open space at the same density standard as is outlined in current ordinances.
- Establishes an open space network, if done within the context of a comprehensive plan and these types of developments/subdivisions are purposefully linked together. Continuous open space (farmland, forest or other natural resources) allows for greater benefits for the environment, i.e., habitat preservation for wildlife, and for a local economy if

dependent on agriculture and/or tourism. This open space network also can extend and join recreational trails.

- None of the land is taken for public use unless the developer/owners want it to be.
- Does not require public expenditure of funds.
- Does not depend on landowner charity.
- Does not involve complicated regulations for shifting rights to other parcels.
- Does not depend upon the cooperation of two or more adjoining landowners to make it work.
- Provides a quality residential and recreational environment.


Source: Better Designs for Development in Michigan and Minnesota Land Trust and University of Minnesota 2001.

Limitations

While conservation subdivisions can achieve a variety of benefits, there are a number of limitations to consider:

- Conservation subdivisions are not a panacea. Used alone they cannot fully accomplish goals related to establishing and preserving open space or managing residential development.
- These subdivisions should connect to a broader network of conservation areas, if not a community will have a chopped up landscape.
- Conservation subdivisions not attached to already developed areas and not connected to services can result in poor land use practices.
- If one goal of your community is to create affordable housing, conservation subdivisions may not provide this housing option. Many conservation subdivisions are expensive, and are marketed to “high end consumers.” On the other hand, there is no reason why these types of subdivisions cannot include more affordable housing.
- If a goal of the community is to promote development that is less dependent on the automobile, conservation subdivisions may not help.
- Technical assistance is important. Poorly designed conservation subdivisions may not achieve open space goals of the community.

Figure 2: Good vs. Poor Cluster Design



Guidelines for conservation subdivision development and design:

- Conservation design is not a panacea
- Setting goals in the community's planning framework is critical.
- It is important to have good resource information
- Think big and plan for a large open space network
- Ordinances should create incentives and reduce barriers
- Open space should be diligently designed, not just set aside
- Water quality and quantity is paramount
- The management of the protected areas is critical
- Conservation development must be profitable
- Many of the barriers to change are not technical, but institutional

Source: Minnesota Land Trust, 2000.

Is This Tool "Right" for Our Community?

Each community should decide on the types of land management tools they

want to use. Recognize that your community should choose a number of tools rather than rely on one exclusively. The reason to choose a group of tools is to bring strength where one tool is weak and to send consistent signals to the development community and property owners regarding appropriate and planned uses for particular parcels. It is reasonable, for example, to have a purchase of development rights program in place along with overlay zones and a conservation subdivision ordinance. Below is a list of criteria to consider when choosing plan implementation tools, including conservation subdivisions:

- Does your community have an accepted plan that identifies rural residential development, open space, or sprawl as an issue?
- Does the plan specify goals and objectives that address how your community will contend with rural residential development?
- Will the tool accomplish any of your community's goals and objectives?

Is the tool politically acceptable?

Can the local government or some other organization administer the new tool given current personnel or is another position or committee necessary?

Are there any enforcement issues local government personnel would need to contend with?

To be effective, would the same tool need to be used by adjoining communities and/or is a cooperative effort possible?

Answering the above questions will give you a better idea which tools are appropriate to use in your community. Avoid choosing any plan implementation tool before you have done your homework. Understand how that tool works and the implications for administering and enforcing it.

Resources

Arndt, Randall. "Open Space" Zoning: What it is & Why it Works: www.plannersweb.com/articles/are015.html (from Planning Commissioners Journal, Issue 5, July/August 1992, page 4)

Countryside Program, The. Conservation Development Resource Manual: The Western Reserve RC & D, 1998.

Foth and Van Dyke. "Conservation Design/Clustering To Preserve Environmental Features," www.foth.com/client/nasewaupee/default.asp

Michigan State University Extension. "Better Designs for Development in Michigan." www.msue.msu.edu/msue/aoe/landuse/landresource.html

Minnesota Land Trust. 2000. "Preserving Minnesota Landscapes Through Creative Development: An Introduction." Conservation Design Portfolio. www.mnland.org/cdp-sum1.pdf

Minnesota Planning. 2000. "From policy to reality: model ordinances for sustainable development." www.mnplan.state.mn.us/Report.html?id=1927

Natural Lands Trust, Inc. "Growing Greener: Putting Conservation into Local Codes." www.natlands.org/planning/planning.html

Ohm, Brian. 2000. "An Ordinance for a Conservation Subdivision." www.wisc.edu/urpl/people/ohm/projects/consub.pdf

SEWRPC. 2002. "Model Zoning Ordinance For Rural Cluster Development" www.sewrpc.org/modelordinances/default.htm


Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. "Position on 'Cluster Development.'" www.dnr.state.wi.us/org/es/science/landuse/tools/index.htm

Alicia Acken contributed to an earlier draft of this article. DNR's Land Use Team, Michael Dresen, Gary Korb, Lynn Markham and Brian Ohm reviewed this article for form and content. Any errors, mistakes and omissions remain the responsibility of the author.

[FRONT PAGE](#) | [NEXT ARTICLE](#)

BETTER DESIGNS FOR DEVELOPMENT IN MICHIGAN

PUTTING CONSERVATION INTO LOCAL LAND USE REGULATIONS



Local communities can take control of their destinies so that conservation goals will be achieved simultaneously with development objectives, in a manner that is fair to all parties concerned. This “bird’s-eye” perspective shows a new way of designing residential developments which differ dramatically from the current land consumptive approach typical of most Michigan communities. In the subdivision shown above, the developer can build the maximum number of homes permitted under the community’s zon-

ing, while at the same time permanently protecting over half of the property, adding it to an interconnected network of conservation lands. The property illustrated above has been used elsewhere in this booklet to demonstrate the principles of “conservation planning/design.” If you would prefer to see new development create more livable communities and in the process conserve irreplaceable natural resources such as prime farmlands, forest land and wildlife habitat, this approach may be right for your community.

THE CONSERVATION PLANNING/DESIGN CONCEPT

Each time a property is developed (especially for residential purposes), an opportunity exists for adding land to a community-wide network of conservation lands. Although such opportunities are seldom taken in most communities, this situation could be reversed fairly easily by making several small but significant changes to a community's land use plan and regulations

Simply stated, Conservation Planning/Design rearranges the development on each parcel as it is

being planned so that only half (or less) of the buildable land is consumed by lots and streets. Without controversial "down zoning," the same number of lots can be developed, but in a less land consumptive manner, allowing the balance of the property to be permanently protected and added to an interconnected network of conservation lands. This "density neutral" approach provides a fair and equitable way to balance conservation and development objectives.

FOUR KEY CONSERVATION TOOLS

Experience around the country has shown communities which are likely to be successful at conserving significant amounts of land on an on-going basis incorporate the following techniques into their community planning:

1 *Envisioning the Future: Performing "Community Audits"*

Successful communities have a realistic understanding of their future. The audit projects past and current development trends into the future so that officials and residents may easily see the long-term results of continuing with current land use regulations. Communities use this knowledge to periodically review and adjust their goals and strategies for conservation and development.

2 *Identifying Networks of Conservation Lands*

Successful communities have a good understanding of their important natural, scenic and historic resources. They establish reasonable goals for conservation and development that reflect their special resources, existing land use patterns and anticipated growth. Their Land Use Plans document these resources, goals and policies. The plan contains language about the kinds of ordinance updating and conservation programs necessary for those goals to be realized. A key part of the Land Use plan is a Map of Potential Conservation Lands that is intended to identify the location of potential conservation lands in each development as it is being laid out.

3 *Conservation Zoning: A "Menu of Choices"*

Successful communities have legally defensible, well-written zoning regulations that meet their "fair share" of future growth and provide for a logical balance between community goals and private landowner interests. They incorporate resource suitabilities, flexibility, and incentives to require the inclusion of permanent conservation lands into new development. The four zoning options summarized in this publication, and described in detail in the Better Designs for Development manual, respect the property rights of landowners and developers without unduly impacting the remaining natural areas that make our communities such special places in which to live, work and recreate.

4 *Conservation Design: A Four Step Process*

Successful communities recognize that both design standards and the design process play an important part in conserving a community's natural and scenic resources. Such communities adopt land use regulations which require site planning while identifying the special features of each property, and introduce a simple methodology showing how to lay out new development, so that the majority of those special features will be permanently protected in designated conservation areas or preserves. To a considerable extent, these areas can be pre-identified in the Land Use Plans' Map of Potential Conservation Lands so that as each area is developed it will form an integral part of a community-wide network of protected conservation lands, as noted above. 

ENVISIONING THE FUTURE

PERFORMING "COMMUNITY AUDITS"

The future that faces most communities in Michigan under current zoning practices is the systematic conversion of every unprotected acre of buildable land into developed uses. Most local ordinances allow, encourage and in many cases mandate standardized layouts of "wall-to-wall lots." Over a period of time this process produces a broader pattern of "wall-to-wall sprawl" (see Figure 1). The "community audit" visioning process helps local officials and residents see the ultimate result of continuing to implement current land-use policies. The process helps start discussions about how current trends can be modified so that a more desirable future is ensured.




Figure 1 The pattern of "wall-to-wall subdivisions" that evolves over time with zoning and subdivision ordinances which require developers to provide nothing more than houselots and streets.

No community active plans to become a bland expanse of suburban-type "sprawl." However, most zoning codes program exactly this outcome. Communities can perform audits to see the future before it happens, so that they will be able to judge whether a mid-course correction is needed. A community audit entails:

Numerical Analysis

The first step involves a numerical analysis of growth projections, both in terms of the number of dwelling units and the number of acres that will probably be converted into houselots and streets under present codes.

Written Evaluation

The second step consists of a written evaluation of the land-use regulations that are currently on the books, identifying their strengths and weaknesses and offering constructive recommendations about how they can incorporate the conservation techniques described in this booklet. It should also include a realistic appraisal of the extent to which private conservation efforts are likely to succeed in protecting lands from development through various non-regulatory approaches such as purchases or donations of conservation easements or fee title interests.

"Build-Out" Maps

The third step entails mapping future development patterns on a map of the entire community (see Figure 2). Alternatively, the "build-out map" could focus only on selected areas in the community where development is of the greatest immediate interest, perhaps due to the presence of special features identified in the Land Use Plan or vulnerability due to development pressures.



Figure 2 A matching pair of graphics, taken from an actual "build-out map," showing existing conditions (mostly undeveloped land) contrasted with the potential development pattern of "checkerboard suburbia" created through conventional zoning and subdivision regulations.

The following parts of this booklet describe practical ways in which communities can take control of their destinies so that conservation goals will be achieved simultaneously with development objectives, in a manner that is fair to all parties concerned.

IDENTIFYING NETWORKS OF CONSERVATION LANDS

Although many communities in Michigan have adopted Land Use Plans which outline the need to protect their natural, aesthetic and historic resources, very few have taken the next logical step of identifying these areas and creating a Map of Potential Conservation Lands.

Such a map is the first step for any community interested in conserving natural and aesthetic resources in an interconnected network. The Map of Potential Conservation Lands serves as the tool which guides decisions regarding which land to protect in order for the network to eventually take form and have substance.

A Map of Potential Conservation Lands usually starts with information contained in the community's existing planning documents. The next task is to identify two kinds of resource areas. Primary Conservation Areas comprise only the most severely constrained lands, where development is typically restricted under current codes and laws (such as wetlands, flood plains, and areas where slopes exceeding 20-25% predominate). Secondary Conservation Areas include all other locally noteworthy or significant features of the natural or cultural landscape. This may include features such as mature woodlands, wildlife habi-

tats and scenic roadways, prime and unique farmlands, prime timberlands, groundwater recharge areas, greenways and trails, river and stream corridors, historic sites and buildings, and scenic viewsheds. These Secondary Conservation Areas are often best understood by the local residents who may be directly involved in their identification. Usually under most community land use regulations these resource areas are totally unprotected and are simply zoned for one kind of development or another.

A base map is then prepared on which the Primary Conservation Areas have been added to an inventory of lands which are already protected (such as parks, land trust preserves, and properties under conservation easement). Clear acetate sheets (or GIS Data Layer) showing each kind of Secondary Conservation Area are then laid on top of the base map in an order reflecting the community's preservation priorities (as determined through public discussion).

This "sieve mapping" process will reveal certain situations where two or more conservation features appear together (such as woodlands and wildlife habitats, or farmland and scenic viewsheds). It will also reveal gaps where no features appear.

Although this exercise is not an exact science, it frequently helps local officials and residents visualize how various kinds of resource areas are spatially related to one another, and enables them to tentatively identify both broad swaths and narrow corridors of resource land that could be protected in a variety of ways. Figure 3 illustrates a portion of a township map which has followed this approach.

The planning techniques which can best implement the community-wide Map of Potential Conservation Lands are **Conservation Zoning** and **Conservation Design**. These techniques, which work hand in hand, are described in detail below. Briefly stated, **Conservation Zoning** expands the range of development choices available to landowners and developers. And just as importantly, it also eliminates the option of creating full-density suburban sprawl layouts that convert all land within new developments into new lots and streets.

The second technique, **Conservation Design**, devotes half or more of the buildable land area within a development as undivided permanent conservation lands. Not surprisingly, the most important step in designing a new development using this approach is to identify the land that is to be preserved. By using the community-wide Map of Potential Conservation Lands as a template for the layout



Figure 3 Part of a Map of Potential Conservation Lands showing roads, parcel lines, historic structures (large dots), and the following resource areas: wetlands/floodplains (dark gray), woodlands (medium gray), open fields and pastures (white), and prime farming soils (diagonal hatched lines).

and design of conservation areas within new developments, an interconnected network of conservation lands spanning the entire community is eventually created.

Figure 4 shows how the conservation lands in three adjoining developments has been designed to connect, and illustrates the way in which the Map of Potential Conservation Lands can become a reality.

Figure 5 provides a bird's-eye view of a landscape where an interconnected network of conservation lands has been gradually protected through the steady application of conservation zoning techniques and conservation design standards.




Figure 4 The conservation lands (shown in gray) were deliberately laid out to form part of an interconnected network of open space in these three adjoining subdivisions.




Figure 5 The end-result of applying the techniques described in this booklet is illustrated in this perspective sketch prepared by the Montgomery County Planning Commission.

CONSERVATION ZONING

A "MENU" OF CHOICES

As mentioned previously the main reason that most new development in Michigan consists of nothing more than new lots and streets is that most communities have adopted a very limited planning model whose sole purpose is to convert natural lands into developed properties. Little if anything is asked in respect to conserving natural resources or providing neighborhood amenities (see Figure 9).

Communities wishing to discourage this type of development pattern need to consider modifying their zoning to require new development to set aside at least 50 percent of the buildable land as permanently protected conservation lands. The development potential that could normally be realized in this area is "transferred" to the remaining 50 percent of the buildable lands on the property.

Following this approach, a municipality would first calculate a site's yield using traditional zoning. A developer would then be permitted full density only if at least 50 percent (or more) of the buildable land is maintained as undivided conservation lands (illustrated in Figure 6: "Option 1"). Under certain conditions communities might also consider offering as much as a 100 percent density bonus for protecting 70 percent of the land (Figure 7: "Option 2").

It is noteworthy that the 36 village-like lots in Option 2 occupy less land than the 18 lots in Option 1, and that Option 2 therefore contributes more significantly to the goal of creating community-wide networks of conservation lands. The village-scale lots in Option 2 are based on traditional neighborhood design principles and are modeled after historic hamlet and village layouts. This type of development has proven to be particularly popular with empty nesters, single-parent households, and couples with young children.

Developers wishing to serve the large lot market have a "country properties" option (Figure 8: "Option 3"). Under this option up to 20 percent of the properties gross area (10 acres in this case) may be split into small lots. The average size of these small lots may be no less than two acres. The remainder of the property may remain as a single contiguous parcel or if area allows this parcel may be split into large lots a minimum of 25 acres in area..

Under conservation zoning, absent from this menu of choices is the conventional full-density development providing no conservation lands (Figure 9). Because that kind of development causes the largest loss of resource lands and poses the greatest obstacle to conservation efforts, it is not included as an option under this approach.




Figure 6
Option 1 Density-neutral with Pre-existing Zoning
18 Lots Lot Size Range: 20,000 to 40,000 sq. ft.
50% undivided open space




Figure 8
Option 3 County Properties
A maximum of 5 lots may be created on 10 acres
The remainder of the land remains as a single parcel or may be divided into lots 25 acres or greater in area




Figure 7
Option 2 Hamlet or Village
36 Lots Lot Size Range: 6,000 to 12,000 sq. ft.
70% undivided open space




Figure 9 The kind of subdivision most frequently created in Michigan is the type which blankets the development parcel with houselots, and which pays little if any attention to designing around the special features of the property. However, such a sketch can provide a useful estimate of a site's capacity to accommodate new houses at the base density allowed under zoning—and is therefore known as a "Yield Plan."

CONSERVATION DESIGN, A FOUR-STEP PROCESS

Designing developments around the central organizing principle of land conservation is not difficult. However, it is essential that ordinances contain clear standards to guide the conservation design process. The four-step approach described below has been proven to be effective in laying out new full-density developments where all the significant natural and cultural features have been preserved.

Step One consists of identifying the land that should be permanently protected. The developer incorporates areas pre-identified on the community-wide Map of Potential Conservation Land and then performs a site analysis in order to precisely locate features to be conserved. The developer first identifies all the Primary Conservation Areas (Figure 10). He then identifies Secondary Conservation Areas (Figure 11) which comprise noteworthy features of the property that are typically unprotected under current codes. These include: mature woodlands, greenways and trails, river and stream corridors, prime farmland, hedgerows and individual free-standing trees or tree groups, wildlife habitats and travel corridors, historic sites and structures, scenic viewsheds, etc. After “greenlining” these conservation elements, the remaining




Figure 10
Step One, Part One
Identifying Primary Conservation Areas




Figure 11
Step One, Part Two
Identifying Secondary Conservation Areas




Figure 12
Outline Potential Development Areas
for Options 1 & 2

part of the property becomes the Potential Development Area (Figure 13).

Step Two involves locating sites of individual building envelopes within the Potential Development Area so that their views of the conservation lands are maximized (Figure 13). The number of building envelopes is a function of the density permitted within the zoning district, as shown on a Yield Plan (Figure 9).

Step Three simply involves “connecting the dots” with streets and informal trails (Figure 14), while **Step Four** consists of drawing in the lot lines (Figure 15).

This approach reverses the sequence of steps in laying out conventional developments, where the street system is the first thing to be identified, followed by lot lines fanning out to encompass every square foot of ground into new lots. When communities require nothing more than “new lots and streets,” that is all they receive. By setting community standards higher and requiring 50 to 70 percent conservation lands as a precondition for achieving full density, officials can effectively encourage the conservation of natural and scenic resources in their community. The protected conservation lands in each new development become building blocks that add new acreage to a community-wide network of interconnected conservation lands each time a property is developed.




Figure 14
Step Three
Aligning Streets and Trails




Figure 13
Step Two
Locating House Sites




Figure 15
Step Four
Drawing in the Lot Lines

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

ABOUT CONSERVATION DEVELOPMENT DESIGN

Q. Does conservation planning/design involve a “takings”?

A. No. People who do not fully understand this conservation-based approach to development may mistakenly believe that it constitutes “a taking of land without compensation.” This misunderstanding may stem from the fact that conservation developments, as described in this booklet, involve either large percentages of undivided conservation lands or lower overall building densities.

There are two reasons why this approach does not constitute a “takings.”

First, no density is taken away. Conservation zoning is fundamentally fair because it allows landowners and developers to achieve full density under the municipality’s current zoning and, in some cases even to increase that density significantly through several different “as-of-right” options. Of the three options previously described, two provide for either full or enhanced densities. The other option offers the developer the choice to lower densities and increased lot sizes. Although conservation zoning precludes full density layouts that do not include conservation

lands, this is legal because there is no constitutional “right to sprawl.”

Second, no land is taken for public use. None of the land which is required to be designated for conservation purposes becomes public (or even publicly accessible) unless the landowner or developer wants it to be. In the vast majority of situations, communities themselves have no desire to own and manage such conservation land, which they generally feel should be a neighborhood responsibility. In cases where local officials wish to provide community recreational facilities (such as ballfields or trails) within conservation developments, the community must negotiate with the developer for the purchase of that land on a “willing seller/willing buyer” basis. To facilitate such negotiations, conservation zoning ordinances can be written to include density incentives to persuade developers to designate specific parts of their conservation land for public ownership or for public access and use.

Q. How can a community ensure permanent protection for conservation lands?

A. The most effective way to ensure that the conservation of land in a new development will

remain undeveloped forever is to place a permanent conservation easement on it. Such easements run with the chain of title, in perpetuity, and specify the various uses that may occur on the property. These restrictions supersede zoning ordinances and continue in force even if legal densities rise in future years. Easements are typically held by land trusts and units of government. Sometimes adjacent property owners are also easement co-holder in conjunction with the local unit of government or land trust. Deed restrictions and covenants are, by comparison, not as effective as easements, and are not recommended for this purpose. Easements can be modified only within the spirit of the original agreement, and only if all the co-holders agree.

Q. What are the ownership, maintenance, tax and liability issues?

A. Among the most commonly expressed concerns about developments with permanently protected conservation lands are questions about who will own and maintain the conservation land, and who will be responsible for the potential liability and payment of property

taxes. The short answer is that whoever owns the conservation land is responsible for the above.

Q. But who owns this land?

A. *Ownership Choices*

There are basically four options, which may be combined within the same development where that makes the most sense.

1. Individual Landowner

At its simplest level, the original landowner (a farmer, for example) can retain ownership of 70 to 100 percent of the conservation land to keep it in the family. (In these cases up to 30 percent of the conservation lands could be reserved for common neighborhood use by development residents.) That landowner can also pass this property on to sons or daughters, or sell it to other individual landowners, with permanent conservation easements running with the land and protecting it from development under future owners.

2. Homeowners’ Associations

Most conservation land within developments is owned and managed by homeowners’ associations

(HOAs). A few basic ground rules encourage a good performance record. First, membership must be automatic, a precondition of property purchase in the development. Second, zoning should require that bylaws give such associations the legal right to place liens on properties of members who fail to pay their dues. Third, facilities should be minimal (ballfields and trails rather than clubhouses and swimming pools) to keep annual dues low. And fourth, detailed maintenance plans for conservation areas should be required by the community as a condition of approval. The community should have enforcement rights and may place a lien on the property should the HOA fail to perform their obligations to maintain the conservation land.

3. Land Trusts

Although homeowners' associations are generally the most logical recipients of conservation land within developments, occasionally situations arise where such ownership most appropriately resides with a land trust (such as when a particularly rare or significant natural area is involved). Land trusts are private, charitable groups whose principal purpose is to protect land under its stewardship from inappropriate change. Their most common role is to hold easements or fee

simple title on conservation lands within new developments and elsewhere in the community.

To cover their costs in maintaining land they own or in monitoring land they hold easements on, land trusts typically require some endowment funding. When conservation zoning offers a density bonus, developers can donate the proceeds from the additional "endowment lots" to such trusts for maintenance or monitoring.

4. Municipality or Other Public Agency

In special situations a local government might desire to own part of the conservation land within a new development, such as when that land has been identified in a Land Use Plan as a good location for a neighborhood park or for a link in a community trail network. Developers can be encouraged to sell or donate certain acreage to communities through additional density incentives, although the final decision would remain the developer's.

5. Combinations of the Above

As illustrated in Figure 18, the conservation land within new developments could involve multiple ownerships, including (1) "non-common" conservation lands such as cropland retained by the original farmer, (2) common conservation lands such as ballfields owned by an

HOA, and (3) a trail corridor owned by either a land trust or by the community.

Tax Concerns

Property tax assessments on conservation developments should not differ, in total, from those on conventional developments. This is because the same number of houses and acres of land are involved in both cases (except when part of the conservation lands is owned by a public entity, which is uncommon). Although the conservation lands in conservation developments is usually taxed at a lower rate because easements prevent it from being developed, the adjacent lots usually are taxed at a higher rate since their location next to permanently protected conservation lands usually result in them being more desirable.

Q. How does this conservation approach differ from "clustering"?

A. The conservation approach described in the previous pages differs dramatically from the kind of "clustering" that has occurred in many communities throughout Michigan over the past several decades. The principal points of difference are as follows:

Higher Percentage and Quality of Conservation lands

In contrast with typical cluster codes, conservation

zoning establishes higher standards for both the quantity and quality of conservation lands that is to be preserved. Under conservation zoning, 50 to 70 percent of the unconstrained land is permanently set aside. This compares with cluster provisions that frequently require only 25 to 30 of the gross land area be conserved. That minimal land area usually ends up including all of the most unusable land as conservation lands, and sometimes also includes undesirable, left-over areas such as stormwater management facilities and land under high-tension power lines.

Conservation lands Pre-Determined to Form Community-wide Conservation Network

Although clustering has at best typically produced a few small "green islands" here and there in any community, conservation zoning can protect




Figure 16 Various private and public entities can own different parts of the open space within conservation subdivisions, as illustrated above.

blocks and corridors of permanent conservation lands. These areas can be pre-identified on in the community's Map of Potential Conservation Lands so that each new development will add to rather than subtract from the community's conservation lands acreage.

Eliminates the Standard Practice of Full-Density with No Conservation lands

Under this new system, full density is only achievable for layouts in which 50 percent or more of the unconstrained land is conserved as permanent, undivided conservation lands. By contrast, cluster zoning provisions are typically only optional alternatives within ordinances that permit full density, by right, for stan-

dard "cookie-cutter" designs with no conservation lands.

Q. How do residential values in conservation developments compare to conventional developments?


A. Another concern of many people is that homes in conservation developments will differ in value from those in the rest of the community. Some believe that because so much land is set aside as conservation lands, the homes in a conservation developments will be prohibitively priced and the community will become a series of elitist enclaves. Other people take the opposite view, fearing that these homes will be smaller and less expensive than their own because of the

more compact lot sizes offered in conservation developments.

Both concerns are understandable but they miss the mark. Developers will build what the market is seeking at any given time, and they often base their decision about selling price on the character of surrounding neighborhoods and the amount they must pay for the land.

In conservation developments with substantial open space, there is little or no correlation between lot size and price. These developments have sometimes been described as "golf course communities without the golf course," underscoring the idea that a house on a small lot with a great view is frequently worth as much or more than the same house on a

larger lot which is boxed in on all sides by other houses.

It is a well-established fact of real estate that people pay more for park-like settings, which offset their tendency to pay less for smaller lots. Successful developers know how to market homes in conservation developments by emphasizing the conservation lands. Rather than describing a house on a half-acre lot as such, the product is described as a house with 20 and one-half acres, the larger figure reflecting the area of conservation land that has been protected in the development. When that conservation area abuts other similar land, as in the township-wide conservation lands network, a further marketing advantage exists. 


RELATIONSHIP OF THE BETTER DESIGNS


APPROACH TO OTHER PLANNING TECHNIQUES

Successful communities employ a wide array of conservation planning techniques simultaneously, over an extended period of time. Communities should continue their efforts to preserve special properties in their entirety whenever possible, such as by working with landowners interested in donating easements or fee title to a local conservation group, purchasing development rights or fee title with county, state or federal grant money, and transferring development rights to certain "receiving areas" with increased density. While these techniques can be effective, their potential for influencing the "big picture" is limited.

The conservation approach outlined above offers great potential because it:

1. does not require public expenditure of funds
2. does not depend upon landowner charity
3. does not involve complicated regulations for shifting rights to other parcels
4. does not depend upon the cooperation of two or more adjoining landowners to make it work

The conservation planning/design approach offers communities a practical way of protecting large acreages of land in a methodical and coordinated manner. 



A look at the realities of living in the
countryside of rural Illinois.



Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	3
<i>1 Access</i>	4
<i>2 Utilities</i>	7
<i>3 Property</i>	12
<i>4 Nature</i>	16
<i>5 Agriculture</i>	18
<i>6 Government</i>	21
<i>7 Neighbors</i>	22
<i>8 Information</i>	23

This information was compiled by



*For more insights into the specific considerations in your area,
contact your local county Farm Bureau®.*

*For information about reprints or distribution, contact
Illinois Farm Bureau® at:*

PO Box 2901

Bloomington, IL 61702-2901

Phone: 309-557-3343 FAX: 309-557-3729

E-mail: krundifb@aol.com

Web Site: <http://www.fb.com/ilfb/>

February 1999

The Code of Country Living

Settlers on the Illinois prairie lived by a code suited to their own livelihood and lifestyle in the rural countryside. Though that way of life has evolved over two centuries, there remains a code, a way of living, that rural Illinois residents still honor.

Living in the country can be a wonderful way of life—if your expectations are in-line with reality. Reality seldom measures up to the romanticized version of almost any idea or ideal—as is frequently discovered by those who move from an urban setting to the country. People often intend to get away from it all and enjoy the serenity of an agrarian countryside. What they'll likely find, however, is that they are only trading the benefits and drawbacks of city living for those of the country.

In rural Illinois, you'll find working farms. You'll also find a level of infrastructure and services generally below that provided through the collective wealth of an urban community. Many other factors, too, make the country living experience very different from what may be found in the city.

This booklet is provided to help you make an informed lifestyle decision about purchasing a home or a homesite in rural Illinois. Though it cannot convey the entirety of the understanding borne from a lifetime of rural living, it can give you a glimpse of what it takes to live by what might be called the Code of Country Living.





Access

1

You'll enjoy the lower traffic volumes on rural roads. That makes walking more enjoyable and allows you to observe the growing crops and the beautiful sunrises. The major purpose of the road—to provide a way to get to and from your rural property—will vary with road types. Changing conditions and generally lower design level roads mean that you, your guests and emergency service vehicles will not necessarily have easy access at all times.

Rural Roads

Don't expect rural roads to be maintained at the same level as city streets. Counties, townships and road districts have primary responsibility for road maintenance in rural areas. Some roads may be privately owned—requiring private maintenance funding. Seldom do rural roads include the amenities found in urban settings such as: wide lanes, curb and gutter, striping and lighting. And, the funds to maintain those roads will come primarily from the property taxes you and your neighbors pay.

Narrow roads and bridge weight limits often restrict travel. Large construction vehicles cannot navigate in some areas. If you plan to build, it's best to check out construction access well in advance.

Gravel roads generate dust and dings. Some road jurisdictions treat gravel roads to suppress the dust when traffic levels reach specific volumes, but dust is still a fact of life for many rural residents. Loose gravel on these roads regularly chips vehicle paint, at times may crack windshields and can pose dangerous travel conditions. If your homesite is located along a gravel road, know that dust will invade your home and your vehicles.


Whatever the design of your road, don't expect that it will be improved in the foreseeable future. Check carefully with officials of the road jurisdiction to verify any claim that a road will be paved, bridges replaced, or other improvements made in the near term.

Weather Impacts

Illinois' fluctuating weather conditions can destroy roads. Midwestern spring freeze/thaw cycles leave low-grade roads subject to heavy damage and can even temporarily close some roads. Vehicle weights are often severely limited during the spring thaw period. In the summer, the hot sun can soften oil and chip road surfaces leaving them subject to damage by traffic and causing oil splatters on vehicles.

In extreme winter weather, rural roads can become impassable. The Illinois prairie is subject to drifting snow that closes roads, causes delays and creates serious travel hazards. Depending on the degree of drifting, it could be days before roads are cleared. Freezing rain, too, can create extremely dangerous travel conditions. Few rural road jurisdictions can afford the widespread use of salt to fight icy conditions.

Roadway flooding is not uncommon. Illinois' abundance of rivers, creeks and waterways makes its rural areas prone to roadway flooding. Heavy rains in flatland areas can easily cover roads with water, blocking or even destroying them.



Private Drives

Access to or from public roads is regulated by the state, county or road district jurisdiction responsible for the road. If planning to build, be sure to check in advance with the proper officials about authorization and placement of private drives and culverts.

Emergency Service Access

Response times of emergency service providers (sheriff, fire fighters,

medical care, etc.) will likely be longer than in the city. Distances traveled and the volunteer nature of most rural services can add to that response time. Under some extreme conditions, you may find that emergency response is slow and expensive. A 9-1-1 emergency call-in service may not be available in all areas.

A few rural areas are not covered by fire protection or ambulance services. Besides the obvious problems that could create, your property insurance premiums might also be higher because of it.

Easements

The legal aspects of access can cause problems, especially if you gain access across property belonging to others. Get legal advice prior to purchasing and understand the easements that may be necessary when these questions arise.

Pickups & Deliveries

Building a residence in a rural area may be more expensive and time consuming due to delivery fees and the time required for contractors and construction workers to reach your building site.

School buses generally can reach most rural homes, though long private lanes or rural subdivision settings may force school children to walk to the pickup site. And those trips to school can be long. Consolidation of school districts in rural areas means your children's school could be half a county from your home. Learn which school district serves your area.

Mail delivery is generally available in all rural areas though timing may suffer in some locations.

Direct, daily newspaper delivery is not always available in rural areas. US Postal delivery of newspapers is an option but generally causes a one-day delay. Check with the newspaper of your choice before assuming you can get same-day delivery.

Standard parcel and overnight package delivery in the country may vary from city standards. Check with the carrier to find what service level can be expected.



Utilities

2

The fresh air and sunshine in the country is plentiful and free. And, when utilities are functioning properly, they help to make life in the country as comfortable and modern as anywhere else. But, water, sewer, electric, telephone and other utilities may be unavailable or operate at lower than urban standards – and they can often cost you more

Locating Utilities

In order to get electric power or other utilities to your home site, it may be necessary to cross property owned by others. It is important to make sure that the proper easements are in place or can be secured to allow lines to be built to your own property.


Electrical power lines, telephone lines and pipelines may cross over, under, or nearby your property. Be aware of easements to the property and those nearby and what they allow the utility providers to do in the way of access, maintenance and expansion.

At least 48 hours prior to doing any digging, call *JULIE* (Joint Utilities Locating Information for Excavators) in order to locate underground utility lines. You can reach JULIE 24 hours a day, seven days a week at 800-892-0123.

Water Supply

You will have to locate a supply of potable water adequate to serve your needs. The most common method is through the use of a water well. Permits for wells may be required by the county health department or a local water authority serving your area. The cost for drilling and pumping can be considerable. Be sure to use a licensed well driller.

The quality and quantity of well water can vary significantly from location to location and from season to season. Mineral, bacterial and other quality issues should be measured and then determine whether practical solutions exist for all of the problems you might discover.



In some areas of the state water wells are wholly impractical or unreliable. Because of your absolute reliance on a good supply of water, it is strongly advised that you research this issue carefully before purchasing!

Most often well water will require some form of treatment. Having a water softening system is almost always advisable. In extreme cases, some form of chemical treatment may be required to deal with high levels of bacteria.

Some areas of the state are served by water districts. These districts supply potable water through a rural network of supply lines. In these areas, certain additional taxes and/or fees may be required. Expect to pay a tapping fee. You may also find that your monthly cost of service can be more expensive when compared to urban systems.

As a last resort, your potable water may need to be trucked to your property and stored in a tank or cistern. Depending on the supplier and their distance from your property, buying and trucking water could prove to be the most expensive and least reliable method in the long run.

Sewer & Septic

Sewer service is rarely available. If it is, it may be relatively expensive to connect to the system and routine fees could be relatively high compared to city rates.

If sewer service is not available, you will need to use an approved septic system or other waste treatment process. These can add substantial cost to establishing your homesite. The type of soil you have available for a

leach field will be very important in determining the cost and function of your system. Ask for planning assistance from the County Health Department if one exists and have existing systems checked—or a new system installed—by a reliable installer.


Septic system requirements vary. Some counties may have significant regulations stipulating the type and size of the septic or treatment system you must have. Conditions could dictate that a sand filter system be installed – an expensive addition to the cost of the home. In some cluster housing settings or on certain soil types, septic systems may not be allowed at all.

Locating the septic system requires careful planning. Sufficient area will be needed for locating the septic tank and drain field a suitable distance from the residence. Floodplains, wetlands, trees and manmade structures may limit where the septic system can be placed. Also, access will be needed to the septic tank for future clean out operations. Location of the septic system in relation to wells is also an important consideration.

Telephone


Telephone communications can pose certain problems. Small, local area phone service suppliers may not provide the most modern telecommunications equipment—limiting your options. It could be difficult to obtain a second line for phone, FAX or computer modem uses. Even cellular phones will not work well in all rural areas because of the often greater distances to cell phone towers.

Links to Internet provider services via phone line may require a long-distance phone connection. Often older rural telecommunications systems restrict computer modems to operating at less than top speeds. Not all rural communities have a local Internet access provider, though many school systems and libraries do offer some connection options.



Electricity

Electric service is generally available to all rural areas. However, a power company asked to serve some remote areas may demand a share of the infrastructure cost be borne by the user. It is important to determine the proximity of an electrical power supply. It can be very expensive to extend power lines to remote areas.



Electric power may not be available in a three-phase service configuration. If you have special power requirements, it is important to know what level of service can be provided and at what cost.

In addition to a monthly charge for energy consumed, the cost of electric service usually includes a fee to hook into the system. Some utilities charge further for the cost of establishing service lines and poles on your property. Check to see what supplier provides power to the area then consider all costs before making a decision to purchase property in the country.

Power outages can occur with more frequency in rural areas than in urban settings. A loss of electric power can interrupt your well, furnace, and other appliances dependant on electrical power. If you live in the country, it is important to be prepared to survive for several days or longer in severe cold without electrical power. Depending on the duration of the outage, you might also lose food in freezers or refrigerators. Such outages or current spikes can cause problems with computers and other home electronics.

Gas

Natural gas may not be available. You could, instead, rely on electric power which is often more expensive (for heat-producing appliances.) The common alternative is having Liquid Propane Gas or heating oil delivered by truck and stored in a tank on your property. The cost of such fuel is often higher on a BTU basis than is natural gas. If relying on gas deliveries,

you must be certain that your supply is adequate to get you through winter's periodic snow storms when access for replenishing supplies may be limited.

Gas appliances may need to be converted. If you choose to use Liquid Propane Gas as your energy source, all appliances set up to operate on natural gas will need to be converted to operate on the Liquid Propane Gas.

Trash & Recycling

Routine trash removal may not be available in all rural areas. Where it is, it most often requires a separate fee. Trash pickup is seldom provided as a government service in rural areas and is not covered by the taxes you pay. It is illegal to create your own trash dump, even on your own land. Burning of trash may be prohibited and risks fire damage to mature crops and nearby buildings. In some cases, your only option may be to haul your trash to the landfill yourself.

Recycling may be difficult in rural areas. Recycling pick-up is not likely available and rural areas generally have few recycling centers.



Property

3

Property ownership is a treasured right in rural areas. The wide open expanses there generally allow you to own a larger tract than you might otherwise be able to in urban areas. And the open space can give you a sense of freedom not available in a crowded city setting. However your rural property can be impacted by a myriad of issues—some commonly shared in urban areas, and some quite different.

Zoning

Building a home may not be possible on all sites. The area may not be suitable for building or may not be zoned residential. Where there is zoning you must check with the county or township zoning, planning and/or building department(s) to know whether a parcel of land may be developed. A building permit may be required. In those counties that are zoned, that requirement is likely for all structures and improvements. Check with the county or township zoning, planning and/or building department(s) for additional information.

Zoning can be a mixed bag. Only about half the counties in Illinois are zoned. In some unzoned counties, townships have established zoning. While zoning imposes limitations, it also provides some safeguards against undesirable use of neighboring property. In those counties or townships which are not zoned, there may be virtually no local restriction on what your adjoining neighbors may do on their property—regardless of its impact on you and the value of your property.

The view from your property may change. Nearby properties will probably not remain as they are indefinitely. Check with the county or township zoning, planning and/or building department(s) to find out how

the properties are zoned and to see what future developments may be planned.

City zoning may apply in rural areas. In un-zoned counties, a municipality that is zoned may generally impose its zoning regulations for up to one and one half miles outside its corporate limits.

Easements

Easements should be considered. These could limit how you can use your property and may require you to allow construction rights-of-way across your land. Roads, railroads, habitat protection, view sheds, power lines, gas lines, water lines, and sewer lines are a few of the things for which easements can be established.

Be aware of easements on nearby parcels, too. Learn what the easement allows the easement owner to do in the way of access, maintenance and expansion and check for limits the easement may imposed on the use of your own property. Not all contracts are in writing. There may be verbal commitments to easements that are not of record.

Mineral Rights

The mineral rights under your property may be owned by someone else. Owners of mineral rights generally have the ability to change the surface characteristics in order to extract their minerals. It is very important to know what minerals may be located under the land and who owns them. Much of the rural land in Illinois can be used for coal or aggregate mining or for oil drilling—however, a special review by the county board is usually required.

Property Lines & Fences

Respect private property rights. Many people are unaware of property boundaries when first arriving in the area. It is your responsibility to know who's land you are on – whether or not it is fenced.



You may be provided with a plat of your property, but unless the land

has been surveyed and pins placed by a licensed surveyor, you should not assume that the plat is accurately reflected by your current boundary markings.

What appear to be boundary fences are not necessarily accurately placed. Some merely approximate those boundaries. A survey of the land is the only way to confirm the location of your property lines. The Illinois law of “Adverse Possession” could actually cause you to lose some land to an adjacent owner over a period of years if property boundaries are not properly determined and defended.

What you think of as your neighbor’s fence may cost you money. Illinois’ fence law requires that adjoining landowners share in a “just proportion” of the cost of constructing and maintaining a property line fence. That applies despite the fact that you may have no use for nor desire for the fence.


Local Covenants

Many rural subdivisions have covenants that limit the use of the property. It is important to obtain a copy of the covenants (or confirm there are none) and make sure you can live with those rules. Not having a covenant doesn’t eliminate all problems, it simply means you’ll lack a powerful tool that could be used to settle disputes between neighbors.

Homeowners’ Associations (HOAs) in some rural subdivisions are required to take care of common elements, private roads, open space, etc. A dysfunctional homeowners’ association or poor covenants can cause problems for you and even involve you in expensive litigation. Dues are almost always a requirement for those residing in areas served by an HOA. The by-laws of the HOA should tell you how the organization operates and how the dues are set.


Floodplains & Drainage

Watch for areas designated as “floodplains.” Local, state and federal regulations may prohibit or limit the types of structures built in floodplains. If allowed at all, certain—often expensive—modifications to the design may be required. Also, your mortgage lender could require you to purchase government flood insurance.



Your drainage practices must conform with the Illinois Drainage Code. Generally, landowners must accept the natural flow of water onto their property and discharge it from their property at its natural point and rate of flow. Contact your county Soil and Water Conservation District for information.


Maintenance of others' drainage structures could impact you. If there is a drainage ditch or underground drainage tile crossing your property there is a good possibility that the owners have the right to come onto your property to maintain it. Heavy equipment might be used leaving considerable damage. While Illinois law generally requires compensation, you may have to negotiate settlement for damages. On the other hand, if you disturb the drainage ditch or tile—during construction or otherwise—you could be held responsible for damages that result to crops and property.



Your property may be situated within a drainage district. If so, your property would be subject to the taxes levied by the district for maintenance of local drainage systems.

Fire Protection

Fire protection is a serious property issue. Though most rural areas of the state are served by a volunteer fire protection unit, some pockets remain without any coverage. Buildings and other structures on property that is not within a fire protection district may be subject to higher insurance rates and be at greater risk in the event of fire than those within a district. As a general rule, property protected by a volunteer fire protection unit is subject to higher insurance rates than that served by a full-time professional force.



Nature

4

The country is prized for giving its residents the ability to witness the flora and fauna of nature firsthand. But, when the elements and earth turn unfriendly, rural residents can experience more problems than their city cousins.

Soils

Illinois soils vary from deep, rich silt loam to shallow, rocky clay. Each requires special building considerations. Some may hinder the construction of basements due to drainage restrictions. Building in many areas requires an engineered foundation. You can learn the soil conditions on your property if you have a soil test performed. Check with a qualified contractor for foundation needs which will influence building design.

Storms & Wind

Tornadoes and other severe storms are not unique to rural areas, but you will find that few rural areas are provided with the advanced warning systems found in many urban communities.

The predominant wind direction in Illinois is from southwest to northeast. Situate and plan your homesite accordingly.

Flooding

The lay of the land can tell you where the water will flow. However, runoff from the flat prairie lands of Illinois is often difficult to predict. "Sheet" drainage over flat land may cause stormwater to spread over wide areas. The lack of significant slope also makes the area slow to drain. Property owners who want to fill in low areas may first be required to obtain proper local, state, and federal permits and provide for wetland mitigation.

Flash flooding can occur during the heavy rains of the spring or summer months, turning a dry low-lying area into a lake. Spring run-off can cause a small creek to become a fast-flowing river. Consider this before planning your building site.

Residents sometimes use sand bags to protect their homes. Local governments are not generally obligated to provide sand bags, equipment or people to protect private property from flooding.

Animals

Wild animals can make wonderful neighbors. However, even the most attractive of such animals can cause serious problems. Rural development encroaches on the traditional habitat of coyotes, deer, ticks, raccoon, opossum and other animals that can be dangerous and you need to learn how to deal with them. In general, it is best to enjoy wildlife from a distance.

Wild animals can pose serious threats to pets, livestock, vegetation, and vehicles. Waterfowl can be particularly damaging to vegetation along flyways. Deer are ubiquitous in Illinois. They damage vegetation and often bolt across a road unexpectedly causing traffic accidents. Fox and coyote can be serious threats to livestock and pets. Raccoon have little fear of human surroundings and are insistent visitors to anything that resembles food — no matter how close to your home or well protected. Snakes, opossum, field mice, groundhogs and skunks are some of nature's other inhabitants in rural Illinois.

Dog packs pose a threat to pets, livestock, and potentially to humans. These are often formed by free roaming pets, stray dogs or even coydogs (the offspring of coyotes and domesticated dogs). The packs roam freely through the countryside looking for food. Where dog pack problems can be identified, counties may offer some form of assistance in eradication or monetary compensation for damages.



Agriculture

5

Through hard work and perseverance of the early settlers, the Illinois prairie has become one of the richest food-producing areas on earth. Its rich soils and abundant rainfall are unique to the Midwest making this a vital agricultural region on a global scale. Illinois farmers make their living from the land—making their good stewardship of the land an integral part of their livelihood. Owning rural land means learning how to care for it. It also means your neighbors may be farmers. There are a few things you need to know about Illinois agriculture.

This is Farm Country

Agriculture is an integral part of Illinois. If you choose to live in the country, you choose to live among the farms of our rural countryside. Do not expect government to intervene in the normal day-to-day operations of your agri-business neighbors. In fact, Illinois has “*Right to Farm*” legislation that helps to protect established farm operations using good management practices from nuisance and liable suits. It helps enable them to responsibly continue producing food and fiber for the nation and the world.

Having a rural residence means you’re part of farm country. Here, farmers sometimes work around the clock. Often that work involves the use of large farm implements. Your daytime and night-time peace and quiet can be disturbed by common agricultural practices, especially during the spring and fall field work seasons.

Sights, Smells and Sounds

Tillage, harvesting, haying and other operations can result in dust, especially during windy and dry weather. That dust can easily invade your home and vehicles.

Some farmers occasionally burn their ditches and grassy areas to keep them free of weeds or to promote growth of plants native to the Illinois prairie. This burning may create smoke that you could find objectionable.

Crop production and protection products are used in growing Illinois' abundant and healthy crops. These products are applied by licensed applicators who take precautions to properly handle and apply them. Learning more about the safety of these products can be as simple as contacting the University of Illinois Extension Service.



Animals and their manure can cause objectionable odors. Farmers use best management practices to limit that odor and follow government guidelines during field application to minimize odor impacts. Manure serves as a valuable source of organic fertilizer and its use lowers dependency on synthetic nutrients. Still, the uninitiated nose may find it disagreeable. Check carefully before buying a rural homesite to be sure it is located a reasonable distance from livestock operations. Keep in mind prevailing winds.

Weed Control

Before buying land you should know whether it has noxious weeds that you may be required to control. Some plants are even poisonous to livestock, pets or humans. Illinois' "Noxious Weed Law" requires the land owner to control or eradicate certain weeds on their own property.



Slow Moving Vehicles

Farm equipment may slow your travel on rural roads. These large, slow-moving pieces of machinery help to make Illinois one of the leading food producing areas of the world. Farm tractors generally move at top speeds of from 15 to 20 miles per hour so you can over take them quickly

from the rear. Watch for them and be patient—farmers will let you pass as soon as it's safe for them to pull over.

Look for the Slow Moving Vehicle (SMV) emblem displayed on the rear of farm equipment. The SMV emblem has a red-orange fluorescent triangle at its center surrounded by a highly reflective red border.



That's a sign you need to know when driving rural roads. Farm equipment and certain other slow moving vehicles are required to display the SMV emblem when they share the road with other traffic. It warns you to slow down. Learn to recognize it and heed its warning.

To protect the meaning and significance of the SMV emblem for traffic safety, Illinois law prohibits the use of that emblem for other purposes. For instance, it is illegal to use the SMV emblem as a lane marker or gate sign.



Government

6

Illinois has more than 6,600 units of local government—far more than any other state in the nation. In rural areas, your home may be found to be in a dozen or more taxing districts—each one providing some service and taxing your property to fund it. That fact generates a number of things you should consider.

Property Taxes

Illinois is a high property tax state—in part, due to its reliance on local government. Local government relies heavily on the property tax for its revenue—especially where sales taxes and other revenue sources are not available to special purpose governmental units. That means rural property owners often incur a large share of the cost of providing local government services, especially in the less-densely populated areas.

Keeping Track

Illinois counties most often encompass dozens of local governmental units. It is sometimes difficult to know which unit to turn to for a particular service or to address a particular problem. Unlike urban areas in which the city is the primary provider of most services, in rural areas, different services may each be provided by a separate unit of government. Exercising your civic duty to keep an eye on all those units can be a daunting task.

Service Levels

Few rural governmental units have the financial resources of their urban counterparts. Generally, fewer services can be offered and the level of service may be less than that found in cities.



Neighbors

7

Illinois' rural residents are generally very friendly and open. Neighborliness is practiced and expected in return. They do ask, however, that privacy and private property rights be respected.

Interact

Get to know your new neighbors. Don't wait—meet those folks living near your new home as soon as you decide to buy in the country, or even before. Knowing your neighbors and letting them get to know you will speed your acceptance as a new arrival in the neighborhood and boost your own comfort level.

Learn to wave to your neighbors—it's the country thing to do. Whether you meet them on the road or driving by their home, be sure to give a friendly wave. You'll come to recognize and appreciate each neighbor's individual style.

Be a Good Neighbor

Keep your property neat. The vast majority of farmers and rural residents take pride in keeping their homesites presentable. Be a good neighbor and do your share.

Become a part of the neighborhood. Don't merely keep a house in the country while spending your time and money in some distant urban or commercial center. Get involved in local community events and organizations and patronize the local businesses.



Information

8

Where do you turn for more information about the considerations noted in this booklet? Here are some very general suggestions. Of course, resources will differ by locale so you may need to do a little research on your own.

Not all services listed are available in all counties. When in doubt, start with the county Farm Bureau or the University of Illinois Extension Service for general information about rural areas.

Local Government

- County (or Township) Office of Zoning, Planning and/or Building
- County Recorder of Deeds
- County Highway Department
- Township (or Road District) Highway Commissioner
- Local Drainage District
- County Health Department
- County Animal Control Unit
- County Sheriff's Office
- County Emergency Services and Disaster Agency/Officer
- County & Township Assessors
- Soil and Water Conservation District

Businesses

- Utilities
- Fuel contractors
- Refuse/waste haulers
- Building contractors
- Realtors

Other

- University of Illinois Extension Service
- Local Postmaster

Associations

- County Farm Bureau®
- Local Chamber of Commerce

