Appendix A

US Census

Table DP-1. Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000
Geographic area: Spring Brook town, Dunn County, Wisconsin

[For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see text]

Subject	Number	Percent
Total population	**1,320**	**100.0**
SEX AND AGE		
Male	692	52.4
Female	628	47.6
Under 5 years	76	5.8
5 to 9 years	90	6.8
10 to 14 years	124	9.4
15 to 19 years	120	9.1
20 to 24 years	55	4.2
25 to 34 years	168	12.7
35 to 44 years	227	17.2
45 to 54 years	226	17.1
55 to 59 years	60	4.5
60 to 64 years	44	3.3
65 to 74 years	87	6.6
75 to 84 years	38	2.9
85 years and over	5	0.4
Median age (years)	36.2	(X)
18 years and over	941	71.3
Male	485	36.7
Female	456	34.5
21 years and over	895	67.8
62 years and over	156	11.8
65 years and over	130	9.8
Male	66	5.0
Female	64	4.8
RACE		
One race	1,313	99.5
White	1,306	98.9
Black or African American	-	-
American Indian and Alaska Native	-	-
Asian	2	0.2
Asian Indian	1	0.1
Chinese	1	0.1
Filipino	-	-
Japanese	-	-
Korean	-	-
Vietnamese	-	-
Other Asian [1]	-	-
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	-	-
Native Hawaiian	-	-
Guamanian or Chamorro	-	-
Samoan	-	-
Other Pacific Islander [2]	-	-
Some other race	5	0.4
Two or more races	7	0.5
Race alone or in combination with one or more other races: [3]		
White	1,313	99.5
Black or African American	1	0.1
American Indian and Alaska Native	1	0.1
Asian	5	0.4
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	-	-
Some other race	7	0.5

Subject	Number	Percent
HISPANIC OR LATINO AND RACE		
Total population	**1,320**	**100.0**
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	11	0.8
Mexican	6	0.5
Puerto Rican	-	-
Cuban	1	0.1
Other Hispanic or Latino	4	0.3
Not Hispanic or Latino	1,309	99.2
White alone	1,302	98.6
RELATIONSHIP		
Total population	**1,320**	**100.0**
In households	1,320	100.0
Householder	468	35.5
Spouse	337	25.5
Child	452	34.2
Own child under 18 years	358	27.1
Other relatives	21	1.6
Under 18 years	12	0.9
Nonrelatives	42	3.2
Unmarried partner	17	1.3
In group quarters	-	-
Institutionalized population	-	-
Noninstitutionalized population	-	-
HOUSEHOLD BY TYPE		
Total households	**468**	**100.0**
Family households (families)	376	80.3
With own children under 18 years	191	40.8
Married-couple family	337	72.0
With own children under 18 years	166	35.5
Female householder, no husband present	18	3.8
With own children under 18 years	13	2.8
Nonfamily households	92	19.7
Householder living alone	69	14.7
Householder 65 years and over	20	4.3
Households with individuals under 18 years	202	43.2
Households with individuals 65 years and over	87	18.6
Average household size	2.82	(X)
Average family size	3.15	(X)
HOUSING OCCUPANCY		
Total housing units	**489**	**100.0**
Occupied housing units	468	95.7
Vacant housing units	21	4.3
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	6	1.2
Homeowner vacancy rate (percent)	0.8	(X)
Rental vacancy rate (percent)	2.6	(X)
HOUSING TENURE		
Occupied housing units	**468**	**100.0**
Owner-occupied housing units	394	84.2
Renter-occupied housing units	74	15.8
Average household size of owner-occupied units	2.87	(X)
Average household size of renter-occupied units	2.55	(X)

- Represents zero or rounds to zero. (X) Not applicable.
[1] Other Asian alone, or two or more Asian categories.
[2] Other Pacific Islander alone, or two or more Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander categories.
[3] In combination with one or more of the other races listed. The six numbers may add to more than the total population and the six percentages

may add to more than 100 percent because individuals may report more than one race.

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

Table DP-2. Profile of Selected Social Characteristics: 2000
Geographic area: Spring Brook town, Dunn County, Wisconsin

[Data based on a sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see text]

Subject	Number	Percent
SCHOOL ENROLLMENT		
Population 3 years and over enrolled in school	**388**	**100.0**
Nursery school, preschool	22	5.7
Kindergarten	18	4.6
Elementary school (grades 1-8)	183	47.2
High school (grades 9-12)	109	28.1
College or graduate school	56	14.4
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT		
Population 25 years and over	**835**	**100.0**
Less than 9th grade	18	2.2
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	58	6.9
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	339	40.6
Some college, no degree	191	22.9
Associate degree	86	10.3
Bachelor's degree	94	11.3
Graduate or professional degree	49	5.9
Percent high school graduate or higher	90.9	(X)
Percent bachelor's degree or higher	17.1	(X)
MARITAL STATUS		
Population 15 years and over	**1,015**	**100.0**
Never married	223	22.0
Now married, except separated	687	67.7
Separated	2	0.2
Widowed	28	2.8
Female	20	2.0
Divorced	75	7.4
Female	23	2.3
GRANDPARENTS AS CAREGIVERS		
Grandparent living in household with one or more own grandchildren under 18 years	**16**	**100.0**
Grandparent responsible for grandchildren	2	12.5
VETERAN STATUS		
Civilian population 18 years and over	**923**	**100.0**
Civilian veterans	105	11.4
DISABILITY STATUS OF THE CIVILIAN NONINSTITUTIONALIZED POPULATION		
Population 5 to 20 years	**359**	**100.0**
With a disability	22	6.1
Population 21 to 64 years	**750**	**100.0**
With a disability	96	12.8
Percent employed	72.9	(X)
No disability	654	87.2
Percent employed	83.8	(X)

Subject	Number	Percent
NATIVITY AND PLACE OF BIRTH		
Total population	**1,313**	**100.0**
Native	1,297	98.8
Born in United States	1,293	98.5
State of residence	1,048	79.8
Different state	245	18.7
Born outside United States	4	0.3
Foreign born	16	1.2
Entered 1990 to March 2000	3	0.2
Naturalized citizen	11	0.8
Not a citizen	5	0.4
REGION OF BIRTH OF FOREIGN BORN		
Total (excluding born at sea)	**16**	**100.0**
Europe	3	18.8
Asia	7	43.8
Africa	-	-
Oceania	-	-
Latin America	4	25.0
Northern America	2	12.5
LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME		
Population 5 years and over	**1,232**	**100.0**
English only	1,218	98.9
Language other than English	14	1.1
Speak English less than "very well"	5	0.4
Spanish	7	0.6
Speak English less than "very well"	2	0.2
Other Indo-European languages	7	0.6
Speak English less than "very well"	3	0.2
Asian and Pacific Island languages	-	-
Speak English less than "very well"	-	-
ANCESTRY (single or multiple)		
Total population	**1,313**	**100.0**
Total ancestries reported	*1,594*	*121.4*
Arab	-	-
Czech[1]	23	1.8
Danish	20	1.5
Dutch	15	1.1
English	90	6.9
French (except Basque)[1]	39	3.0
French Canadian[1]	6	0.5
German	582	44.3
Greek	-	-
Hungarian	11	0.8
Irish[1]	71	5.4
Italian	8	0.6
Lithuanian	-	-
Norwegian	403	30.7
Polish	43	3.3
Portuguese	-	-

Population 65 years and over	**123**	**100.0**	Russian	1	0.1
With a disability	32	26.0	Scotch-Irish	15	1.1
			Scottish	18	1.4
RESIDENCE IN 1995			Slovak	-	-
Population 5 years and over	**1,232**	**100.0**	Subsaharan African	-	-
Same house in 1995	937	76.1	Swedish	47	3.6
Different house in the U.S. in 1995	294	23.9	Swiss	2	0.2
Same county	150	12.2	Ukrainian	7	0.5
Different county	144	11.7	United States or American	80	6.1
Same state	106	8.6	Welsh	8	0.6
Different state	38	3.1	West Indian (excluding Hispanic groups)	-	-
Elsewhere in 1995	1	0.1	Other ancestries	105	8.0

-Represents zero or rounds to zero. (X) Not applicable.
[1]The data represent a combination of two ancestries shown separately in Summary File 3. Czech includes Czechoslovakian. French includes Alsatian. French Canadian includes Acadian/Cajun. Irish includes Celtic.

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

Table DP-3. Profile of Selected Economic Characteristics: 2000

Geographic area: Spring Brook town, Dunn County, Wisconsin

[Data based on a sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see text]

Subject	Number	Percent	Subject	Number	Percent
EMPLOYMENT STATUS			INCOME IN 1999		
Population 16 years and over	**993**	**100.0**	**Households**	**470**	**100.0**
In labor force	756	76.1	Less than $10,000	14	3.0
Civilian labor force	756	76.1	$10,000 to $14,999	10	2.1
Employed	712	71.7	$15,000 to $24,999	65	13.8
Unemployed	44	4.4	$25,000 to $34,999	79	16.8
Percent of civilian labor force	5.8	(X)	$35,000 to $49,999	90	19.1
Armed Forces	-	-	$50,000 to $74,999	124	26.4
Not in labor force	237	23.9	$75,000 to $99,999	59	12.6
			$100,000 to $149,999	17	3.6
Females 16 years and over	**463**	**100.0**	$150,000 to $199,999	4	0.9
In labor force	347	74.9	$200,000 or more	8	1.7
Civilian labor force	347	74.9	Median household income (dollars)	46,600	(X)
Employed	325	70.2			
			With earnings	425	90.4
Own children under 6 years	**86**	**100.0**	Mean earnings (dollars)[1]	52,717	(X)
All parents in family in labor force	56	65.1	With Social Security income	95	20.2
			Mean Social Security income (dollars)[1]	12,263	(X)
COMMUTING TO WORK			With Supplemental Security Income	10	2.1
Workers 16 years and over	**697**	**100.0**	Mean Supplemental Security Income (dollars)[1]	7,600	(X)
Car, truck, or van - - drove alone	556	79.8	With public assistance income	4	0.9
Car, truck, or van - - carpooled	46	6.6	Mean public assistance income (dollars)[1]	925	(X)
Public transportation (including taxicab)	-	-	With retirement income	58	12.3
Walked	29	4.2	Mean retirement income (dollars)[1]	14,019	(X)
Other means	3	0.4			
Worked at home	63	9.0	**Families**	**385**	**100.0**
Mean travel time to work (minutes)[1]	21.0	(X)	Less than $10,000	6	1.6
			$10,000 to $14,999	4	1.0
Employed civilian population 16 years and over	**712**	**100.0**	$15,000 to $24,999	46	11.9
OCCUPATION			$25,000 to $34,999	51	13.2
Management, professional, and related occupations	222	31.2	$35,000 to $49,999	76	19.7
Service occupations	85	11.9	$50,000 to $74,999	117	30.4
Sales and office occupations	173	24.3	$75,000 to $99,999	56	14.5
Farming, fishing, and forestry occupations	46	6.5	$100,000 to $149,999	17	4.4
Construction, extraction, and maintenance occupations	68	9.6	$150,000 to $199,999	4	1.0
			$200,000 or more	8	2.1

Production, transportation, and material moving occupations	118	16.6	Median family income (dollars)	51,250	(X)
			Per capita income (dollars)[1]	19,936	(X)
INDUSTRY			*Median earnings (dollars):*		
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining	101	14.2	Male full-time, year-round workers	31,607	(X)
Construction	47	6.6	Female full-time, year-round workers	22,788	(X)
Manufacturing	85	11.9			
Wholesale trade	24	3.4			
Retail trade	113	15.9			
Transportation and warehousing, and utilities	39	5.5			
Information	4	0.6			
Finance, insurance, real estate, and rental and leasing	25	3.5			
Professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste management services	29	4.1			
Educational, health and social services	158	22.2			
Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation and food services	40	5.6			
Other services (except public administration)	25	3.5			
Public administration	22	3.1			
CLASS OF WORKER					
Private wage and salary workers	536	75.3			
Government workers	101	14.2			
Self-employed workers in own not incorporated business	67	9.4			
Unpaid family workers	8	1.1			

Subject	Number below poverty level	Percent below poverty level
POVERTY STATUS IN 1999		
Families	9	2.3
With related children under 18 years	3	1.5
With related children under 5 years	-	-
Families with female householder, no husband present	3	13.6
With related children under 18 years	3	17.6
With related children under 5 years	-	-
Individuals	41	3.1
18 years and over	38	4.1
65 years and over	6	4.9
Related children under 18 years	3	0.8
Related children 5 to 17 years	3	1.0
Unrelated individuals 15 years and over	20	18.7

-Represents zero or rounds to zero. (X) Not applicable.
[1]If the denominator of a mean value or per capita value is less than 30, then that value is calculated using a rounded aggregate in the numerator. See text.
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census 2000.

Table DP-4. Profile of Selected Housing Characteristics: 2000
Geographic area: Spring Brook town, Dunn County, Wisconsin

[Data based on a sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see text]

Subject	Number	Percent
Total housing units	**490**	**100.0**
UNITS IN STRUCTURE		
1-unit, detached	417	85.1
1-unit, attached	1	0.2
2 units	8	1.6
3 or 4 units	2	0.4
5 to 9 units	-	-
10 to 19 units	-	-
20 or more units	-	-
Mobile home	62	12.7
Boat, RV, van, etc	-	-
YEAR STRUCTURE BUILT		
1999 to March 2000	8	1.6
1995 to 1998	30	6.1
1990 to 1994	33	6.7
1980 to 1989	68	13.9
1970 to 1979	93	19.0
1960 to 1969	26	5.3
1940 to 1959	74	15.1
1939 or earlier	158	32.2

Subject	Number	Percent
OCCUPANTS PER ROOM		
Occupied housing units	**466**	**100.0**
1.00 or less	453	97.2
1.01 to 1.50	13	2.8
1.51 or more	-	-
Specified owner-occupied units	**209**	**100.0**
VALUE		
Less than $50,000	25	12.0
$50,000 to $99,999	103	49.3
$100,000 to $149,999	56	26.8
$150,000 to $199,999	16	7.7
$200,000 to $299,999	5	2.4
$300,000 to $499,999	4	1.9
$500,000 to $999,999	-	-
$1,000,000 or more	-	-
Median (dollars)	91,000	(X)
MORTGAGE STATUS AND SELECTED MONTHLY OWNER COSTS		
With a mortgage	140	67.0

ROOMS			Less than $300	-	-
1 room	-	-	$300 to $499	15	7.2
2 rooms	4	0.8	$500 to $699	32	15.3
3 rooms	8	1.6	$700 to $999	37	17.7
4 rooms	51	10.4	$1,000 to $1,499	48	23.0
5 rooms	96	19.6	$1,500 to $1,999	6	2.9
6 rooms	86	17.6	$2,000 or more	2	1.0
7 rooms	90	18.4	Median (dollars)	894	(X)
8 rooms	60	12.2	Not mortgaged	69	33.0
9 or more rooms	95	19.4	Median (dollars)	304	(X)
Median (rooms)	6.5	(X)	**SELECTED MONTHLY OWNER COSTS AS A PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN 1999**		
Occupied housing units	**466**	**100.0**	Less than 15.0 percent	92	44.0
YEAR HOUSEHOLDER MOVED INTO UNIT			15.0 to 19.9 percent	42	20.1
1999 to March 2000	26	5.6	20.0 to 24.9 percent	30	14.4
1995 to 1998	114	24.5	25.0 to 29.9 percent	25	12.0
1990 to 1994	90	19.3	30.0 to 34.9 percent	6	2.9
1980 to 1989	85	18.2	35.0 percent or more	14	6.7
1970 to 1979	88	18.9	Not computed	-	-
1969 or earlier	63	13.5			
			Specified renter-occupied units	**42**	**100.0**
VEHICLES AVAILABLE			**GROSS RENT**		
None	5	1.1	Less than $200	3	7.1
1	59	12.7	$200 to $299	2	4.8
2	199	42.7	$300 to $499	12	28.6
3 or more	203	43.6	$500 to $749	11	26.2
			$750 to $999	-	-
HOUSE HEATING FUEL			$1,000 to $1,499	-	-
Utility gas	5	1.1	$1,500 or more	-	-
Bottled, tank, or LP gas	279	59.9	No cash rent	14	33.3
Electricity	21	4.5	Median (dollars)	463	(X)
Fuel oil, kerosene, etc	113	24.2			
Coal or coke	-	-			
Wood	48	10.3	**GROSS RENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN 1999**		
Solar energy	-	-			
Other fuel	-	-	Less than 15.0 percent	16	38.1
No fuel used	-	-	15.0 to 19.9 percent	4	9.5
			20.0 to 24.9 percent	4	9.5
SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS			25.0 to 29.9 percent	2	4.8
Lacking complete plumbing facilities	-	-	30.0 to 34.9 percent	-	-
Lacking complete kitchen facilities	-	-	35.0 percent or more	2	4.8
No telephone service	-	-	Not computed	14	33.3

-Represents zero or rounds to zero. (X) Not applicable.

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

4

U.S. Census Bureau

Appendix B

Survey and Visioning Results

First Survey March, 2003

TOWN OF SPRING BROOK CITIZEN OPINION SURVEY

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESITONS BY CHECKING THE BOX THAT BEST CORRESPONDS TO YOUR FEELINGS.	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
1. Town of Spring Brook should preserve as much farmland as possible.	19	58	163	141
2. A landowner or farmer should have the right to sell his or her farmland for purposes other than farming.	21	28	239	102
3. There should be a limit as to how many farm animals can exist on a farm.	81	135	137	39
4. Productive farmland should not be converted to non-farm uses.	41	142	136	70
5. There is a conflict between farm and non-farm neighbors regarding dust, noise and odors.	51	158	146	31

6. Agricultural land should not be used for residential housing purposes.	43	170	118	63
7. Agricultural land should not be used for commercial/industrial purposes.	43	117	124	104
8. More single family housing is needed in the Town of Spring Brook.	62	170	121	20
9. There is a need for affordable start-up types of homes for young families.	66	61	228	20
10. There are too many mobile homes in the Town of Spring Brook.	27	130	134	71
11. The Town of Spring Brook should regulate the minimum size of a lot for rural housing.	79	85	148	88
12. Landowners should be allowed to sell their land to whomever they choose, regardless of how the land will be used.	70	108	141	74
13. Business/commercial development should be allowed only in designated areas.	32	72	184	106
14. Agri-business development should be allowed only in designated areas.	37	108	182	65
15. I am satisfied with the way things are happening in the Town of Spring Brook regarding land use and growth.	26	16	190	49
16. Land use/regulations, governing development in the Town of Spring Brook should be more restrictive.	76	126	141	42
17. Land use policies and regulations should be relaxed so that development can respond more freely to market conditions.	61	195	87	34
18. Land use policies and regulations should emphasize preserving the rural and agricultural character of the Town of Spring Brook.	28	50	185	112
19. There is a problem with contamination of ground-water in the Town of Spring Brook.	42	168	112	32
20. There is a problem with pollution of rivers and streams in the Town of Spring Brook.	47	182	17	32
21. Trees and "open" spaces are more important to me than neighboring houses.	17	38	179	148
22. It is important to preserve woodlands and environmentally sensitive areas in the Town of Spring Brook.	18	29	182	151
23. Gravel pit(s) should be allowed to operate in the Town of Spring Brook.	45	66	232	42
24. Unlicensed salvage or junkyards should be allowed to operate in the Town of Spring Brook.	169	149	40	27
25. More parks, recreational areas and green spaces are needed in the Town of Spring Brook.	56	161	128	40
26. I would be willing to pay taxes to expand or improve public lands in the Town of Spring Brook.	143	180	56	19
27. Traffic is increasing on the roads in the Town of Spring Brook.	4	38	246	102
28. Town of Spring Brook roads are adequate to meet my needs.	13	39	297	44
29. The roads and highways in the Town of Spring Brook adequately meet the needs of the citizens and businesses.	13	40	295	42
30. I like living in the Town of Spring Brook.	2	6	214	165
31. I would find value in receiving a semi-annual newsletter.	18	63	217	75

32. What should be the minimum lot size for single family homes in the Town of Spring Brook? (check only one)

1 acre	3 acre	5 acre	10 acre	35 acre	open
109	73	104	31	13	60

 Other, please state:

33. What kind of housing development should be allowed in the Town of Spring Brook? (more than one response allowed.)

single family	cluster housing	sub-divisions	duplex homes	apartment
348	79	97	88	42

 Other, please state:

34. How many acres of land do you own in the Town of Spring Brook? _____ acres

35. Do you anticipate subdividing or selling your land in the Town of Spring Brook for development within the next 5 years?

21 YES 356 NO

36. If you answered yes to #35, check the statements that best describe you plans:

1	Subdivide all for residential use	8	Subdivide part for residential use
	Subdivide all for commercial/industrial use		Subdivide part for commercial/industrial use
2	Sell to someone else for development	9	Not sure

37. Currently the Town of Spring Brook does not have a comprehensive plan which sets out community goals and strategies to guide growth and development. Such a comprehensive plan is advisory and does not have enforcement powers. Do you think the town should develop such a plan? 241 YES 154 NO

38. Currently the Town of Spring Brook does not have land use ordinances regulating the use and development of land. Do you think the town should enact such ordinances? 220 YES 178 NO

39. Are you a resident of the Town of Spring Brook? 336 YES 33 NO

40. How long have you lived in the Town of Spring Brook?

 _____Years

1. Where do you live (check one):	farm	residential area	mobile home court	sub-division	rural non-farm area
	148	58	3	21	144

2. Ages of household members? (Enter number of individuals in each group.)

69	0-5	64	14-18	117	30-39	148	50-59	104	70+
73	6-13	91	19-29	175	40-49	83	60-69		

3. Why do you live where you do? (check all that apply)

117	Farm here	116	Reasonable cost of living	121	School District	253	Pleasant Surroundings
95	Born here	162	Easy access to work	180	Safe Area		

Other, please list:

4. What roles should elected officials of the Town of Spring Brook play in land use planning? (mark all appropriate)	educational	advisory	regulatory	no role
	159	234	154	74

5. Would you be willing to serve on a land use committee for the Town of Spring Brook?

65 Yes 292 No

If yes,	Name:	Phone:

6. Do you have any comments regarding land use or questions being asked in the survey? (Attach additional page if needed.)

Thank you for taking the time to share your thoughts.

Please return this survey in the enclosed stamped and addressed envelope.

Visioning Session Results March/April 2003

The residents of the Town of Spring Brook would like to see agriculture stay pretty much as it is. Residents would like to encourage new forms of farming that are economically feasible and environmentally sensitive. Residents feel farmers are good stewards of the land. While they believe landowners should have the right to control what is done with their land, residents would like to see as much productive farm land as possible remain in farming. These statements were agreed to by a consensus of the 28 residents who attended the two visioning sessions.

RESULTS OF TOWN OF SPRING BROOK DEVELOPMENT PLANNING SURVEY -- AUG. 2004

1. As we noted in the last newsletter, the cost for maintaining roads in our township is the largest item in the town budget. Greater than 60% of the money spent by the town goes towards roads. The town receives state aid for road maintenance, but this aid has only covered 55% of the cost the past few years. The largest single cost is for repaving roads which runs approximately $60,000 per mile. Would you be willing to see some of our more rural roads revert back to gravel as a cost savings measure? Yes/No

Yes 101 (46%) No 106 (48%) No Response 13 (6%)

---

2. Our town does not currently have an ordinance covering the construction of new roads in the township. When land is developed and new roads and streets are constructed by the developer, there are currently few requirements as to how these roads and streets should be built. The township is typically expected to take over ownership/maintenance of these roads, and if they aren't built to acceptable standards, the maintenance costs could be excessive. Would you support development and adoption of an ordinance that would establish standards for construction of new roads in our township? Yes/no

Yes 190 (86%) No 20 (9%) No Response 10 (5%)

---

3. This year's annual town meeting attracted 54 residents, with 48 of them voting to take village powers away from the town board. The town board adopted village powers at the 2001 annual town meeting in order to qualify for a planning grant and start the comprehensive planning effort. Twelve residents attended the 2001 annual meeting. With village powers the town board may exercise various powers, including "police powers" to regulate for the public health, safety and welfare of its residents, and the following land use powers:

[illegible] - establishing a plan commission to engage in planning efforts;
[illegible] - enacting a subdivision or other land division ordinance
[illegible] - enacting a town zoning ordinance
[illegible] - enacting a site plan review ordinance

The planning grant requires that the Town, by ordinance, adopt a Comprehensive Plan by May 2005. Right now the plan is approximately 70% complete, but without village powers the Town will be unable to adopt the plan as either an advisory or enforceable document. If the Town fails to adopt its Comprehensive Plan the Town will have to repay all grant money received, approximately $12,500. Do you feel the town board should have village powers? Yes/No

Yes 124 (56%) No 75 (34%) No Response 21 (10%)

RESULTS OF TOWN OF SPRING BROOK
DEVELOPMENT PLANNING SURVEY -- AUG. 2004

4. Village Powers can only be adopted at an annual or special town meeting. The next annual meeting will be in April 2005. The plan commission feels it is questionable whether we could complete the planning process in May 2005 with the village powers issue in question. Would you favor calling a special town meeting before the April 2005 annual meeting for the purpose of discussing and possibly re-adopting village powers? Yes/No

Yes 141 (64%) No 56 (25%) No Response 23 (11%)

5. Our township is unique in that it has a large area of flat/open land ideal for raising agricultural crops. The land use map that has been developed by the agriculture subcommittee indicates 70% or more of the land in our township is currently used for agriculture. Would you like to see ordinances enacted to limit residential development of agricultural land in the Town of Spring Brook? Yes/No

Yes 141 (64%) No 66 (30%) No Response 13 (6%)

6. As the Chippewa Valley grows, the Town of Spring Brook will likely be an attractive place for residential development. Do you feel our school systems are adequate to serve the potential increase in population without having to expand buildings or build more schools?

Menomonie Schools Yes/No **Yes-93 (42%) No-25 (11%) No Response-102 (47%) [illegible]**

Elk Mound Schools Yes/No **Yes-114 (52%) No-62 (28%) No Response-44 (20%)**

---

7. Do you feel that:

A. As a landowner, you should have the freedom to use your property in any way and for any purpose you deem fit.

B. As a landowner, you should consider the rights of your neighbors when making decisions about use of your property.

Please circle A or B

A 75 (34%) B 134 (61%) No Response 11 (5%)

---

8. In the first survey, the majority of respondents indicated a desire for minimum lot size limits of 5 acres or less. Please circle as many of the following choices that describe your interest in a lot size limit:

A. Concern for potential groundwater contamination (Some feel dense residential development utilizing septic systems can have a negative effect on groundwater)
110 Responses out of 220

B. Minimize land consumption/Sprawl **119 Responses** out of 220

C. I prefer no limit **41 Responses** out of 220

D. Maintain the rural character of the township **147 Responses** out of 220

E. Privacy through larger lots **96 Responses** out of 220

F. Other __(see comments page)

---

9. Would you like to see the town produce a brief "Guide to Rural Living" that could be given to new residents to help prepare them for life in a township like ours?" Yes/No
Yes " 118 (54%)"" "No " 82 (37%)" ""No Response " 20 (9%)

Appendix C

Agricultural, Natural and Cultural Resources Sub Committee

TOWN OF SPRING BROOK
Agricultural Narrative
May 27, 2005

Agriculture, Natural and Cultural Resources Committee

John McMartin, Chairman
Chris Friberg
Cindy Brown
Luther Grohn
Tom Kopp
Roger Cummings
Dan Sieveretson

In the 1860"s to the early 1900"s, land ownership in the township was a combination of homestead and purchased railroad land." Families chose land near water, a spring fed pond, or a creek or land that was swampy. This was needed to provide water for the livestock and family."

The Chippewa River was used to transport both goods and passengers into the area." One of the main river ports, Rumsey"s Landing, was located in the township." It was the shipping point for the wheat produced in Spring Brook and the surrounding area." When the railroad was built, the river lost its popularity." Rumsey"s Landing fell by the wayside and the City of Menomonie became the trading center.

The 1930"s signaled a change in agriculture in the Town of Spring Brook." Horse drawn equipment was giving way to small tractors." Families that had been able to hold their farms together during the depression were feeling a bit more prosperous and were looking forward to adding mechanization to increase productivity by the end of the decade." The farms were diverse, and most included cows, hogs, chickens, or horses." Crops were produced to feed the livestock." The farm was sustainable in nature, the entire family was employed, and very little was purchased." The only cash the family had to pay real estate taxes and make outside purchases with came from what little excess production the farm had.

In the 1940"s, prices increased and prosperity returned to farms in Spring Brook as well as the rest of America." The increase in prosperity was a result of WWII combined with the exodus from horsepower to mechanization." That continued into the 1950"s when the size of the equipment increased and stationary threshing machines were replaced by combines reducing the need for as much farm labor." It was also a time when farmers started using fertilizer.

Agricultural productivity continued to increase." The decade of the 1960"s saw an increased use of crop inputs, better hybrid seeds, fertilizers and pesticides." Sprinkler irrigation came to the township in 1966." The previously unproductive sandy loam soil of the Fall City Prairie blossomed with water." In the mid-1960"s, the Federal government formulated an Ag Policy that encouraged U.S. farmers to produce food to feed the world." Lenders were willing to make loans for capital improvements." A number of farmers with dairy operations in the township upgraded their facilities and added cows.

Residential homes started to appear in the 1970"s." City people seeking cheap land to build homes on moved into the country." Agricultural technology helped land that previously had limited production increase outputs." Irrigation expanded, farms and equipment got bigger, and the value of prime farmland rose dramatically." Heavy soils were no longer the most prized." Irrigated, sandy, well-drained soils combined with technological improvements were more productive and were in higher demand as farm size grew." As cash crop farming grew in the township, animal production declined."

Dairy farms continued to decrease through the 1980"s, 1990"s and early into 2000." Few dairy farms were passed on to the next generation." As profit margins dwindled, dairy farmers either rented or sold their land and took jobs in town." Their life style improved." They worked less hours, had more money, and received fringe benefits." These were all things that a small dairy farm could not easily provide."" Specialty crop farms producing kidney beans, potatoes and horseradish grew while rotating land with traditional grain crops such as corn and soybeans." City people, envisioning an idyllic life style, continued to move to the country." Homes were being built primarily on the land least suited for agricultural production.

Twenty years from now there will be less land farmed in the Town of Spring Brook." As farmers age, they will be more interested in selling their land for development than for production agriculture." It"s not uncommon to hear a farmer say that their land is their 401K." The profits they made from farming were plowed back into the farm instead of into a retirement account." They

intend to maximize the value of that investment as they reach retirement age.&#65533; More residences will be built as city people want to live in the country and enjoy nature.

Highly productive, irrigated land will continue to be farmed.&#65533; If current trends continue, farms will be larger in size and may have diversified into some type of processing that will add value to the crops they grow.&#65533; There will probably be very few, if any, large dairy or livestock farms given the difficulty of siting such facilities.

A map showing active farmland, farmsteads, and non-farm residences has been developed.&#65533; This was done to see if agricultural trends exist, such as where land is likely to stay in farming, or if there are areas where more development will likely occur (see map).

Productive farmland has been defined, identified and mapped. The USDA-Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) and the Dunn County Land Conservation Office assisted in identifying important farmland by using the Dunn County Soil Survey.&#65533; The program that was used to determine important farmland is called LESA, which stands for Land Evaluation and Site Assessment.&#65533; The Land Evaluation and Site Assessment system was developed by the USDA-NRCS in collaboration with land use planners from Arizona State University and Oregon State University.&#65533; It is a numeric rating system for scoring sites to help in formulating policy or making land-use decisions on farmlands.&#65533; The system is designed to take into account both soil quality and other factors affecting a site&#65533;s importance for agriculture.&#65533; Currently, there are over 200 LESA systems being used in 26 states.&#65533; **LESA is an analytical tool, not a farmland protection program.**&#65533; Its role is to provide systematic and objective procedures to rate and rank sites for agricultural importance in order to help officials make decisions.

Soil quality factors are grouped under Land Evaluation (LE).&#65533; The other factors are grouped under Site Assessment (SA).&#65533; The SA factors are of three types:&#65533; non-soil factors related to agricultural use of a site, factors related to development pressures, and other public values of a site.&#65533; Site assessment factors include:&#65533; &#65533;SA-1&#65533; factors other than soil-based qualities measuring limitations on agricultural productivity or farm practices; &#65533;SA-2&#65533; factors measuring development pressure or land conversion; and, &#65533;SA-3&#65533; factors measuring other public values such as historic or scenic values.

The Land Evaluation (LE) component of the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) system rates the soil-based qualities for agricultural use.&#65533; The four common kinds of classifications used for land evaluation are land capability classes, soil productivity ratings, soil potential ratings, and important farmland classes.

For purposes of comprehensive planning, soils are considered to be of high or medium production if they meet 3 criteria:

1) **Considered to be &#65533;Prime Farmland&#65533;**:&#65533; This factor is defined in the USDA-NRCS-Wisconsin Technical Guide, Section 2, Dunn County Cropland Interpretations-Prime Farmland, Pages 1-2, Dated 11/22/95.

   Prime farmland is defined as land that has the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for producing food, feed, forage, fiber, and oilseed crops and that is also available for these uses (the land could be cropland, pastureland, rangeland, forest land, or other land but not urban or built-up land or water areas).&#65533; It has the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yields of crops in an economic manner when treated and managed, including water, according to acceptable farming methods.

   In general, prime farmlands have an adequate and dependable water supply from precipitation or irrigation, a favorable temperature and growing season, acceptable levels of acidity or alkalinity, an acceptable content of salt and sodium, and few or no rocks.&#65533; They have soils that are permeable to water and air.&#65533; Prime farmland is not excessively erodible or saturated with water for a long period of time, and it either does not flood or is protected from flooding.

&#65533;&#65533;&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; 2)&#65533;&#65533; **Productivity for Corn:**&#65533; This factor is from the USDA-NRCS-Wisconsin Technical Guide, Section 2, Dunn County Cropland Interpretations-Yields Per Acre, Pages 1-13, Dated 11/22/96.&#65533; Production for corn is determined by a ten year average on soil test plots using high level management.&#65533; Actual filed measurements are used to determine the annual yield.&#65533; This is the same yield data which is used by UW-Extension Soil Testing Labs.&#65533; All soils were assigned a relative yield based on the most productive soil in Dunn County (which has a yield of 150 bushels per acre).

3)&#65533;&#65533; **Capability Class:**&#65533; Land capability classes are practical groupings of soil limitations based on such characteristics as erosion hazard, droughtiness, wetness, stoniness, and response to management.&#65533; Classes range from 1 to 8.&#65533; These classes reflect the land&#65533;s relative suitability for crops, grazing, forestry, and wildlife.&#65533; For a summary of limitations and the recommended management practices, see table 1-1.

   Class I land has the widest range of use with the least risk of being damaged.&#65533; It is level or nearly level, well-drained, and productive.&#65533; Land in this class can be cultivated with almost no risk of erosion and will remain productive if managed with normal care.

   Class II land can be cultivated regularly, but certain physical conditions give it more limitations than Class I land.&#65533; Some Class II land may be gently sloping so it will need moderate erosion control.&#65533; Other soils in this class may be slightly droughty, slightly wet, or somewhat limited in depth.

   Class III land can be cropped regularly, but it has a narrower range of safe alternative uses than Class I or II land.&#65533; This land usually requires extensive use of conservation practices to control erosion or provide drainage.

   Class IV land should be cultivated only occasionally or under very careful management.&#65533; Generally, it is best adapted for pastures and forests.

   Class V land is not suited to ordinary cultivation because it is too wet or too stony, or because the growing season is too short.&#65533; It can produce good pasture and trees.

Class VI or VII land use is severely limited because of erosion hazards. Some kind of permanent cover should be kept on these soils. With very special management, including elaborate soil and water conservation practices, improved pastures can, in some instances, be established by renovation.

Class VIII land is not suited to economic crops. It is usually severely eroded or is extremely sandy, wet, arid, rough, steep, or stony. Much of it is valuable for wildlife food and cover, watershed protection, or for recreation.

Generally, soils with a Capability Class of I and II are considered to be of high agricultural importance. Soils with a Capability Class of III are considered to be of medium importance, and soils with a Class greater than IV are poorly suited for agriculture production. This factor is from the USDA-NRCS-Wisconsin Technical Guide, Section 2, Dunn County Soil Descriptions Non-Technical, Pages 1-26, Dated 11/22/95.

These 3 factors were combined in a mathematical formula with a maximum score of 100 points. Prime farmland represents 10% of the score. Production for corn represents 45% of the score, and Capability Class represents 45% of the score.

See Appendix A for Formula Description.. See Appendix Z for the mathematical formula for determining soils of high and medium production. See Soil Productivity Map for soils of high and medium production.

A series of maps has been developed that contain both our productive soils and where agriculture is still the predominant land use.

The majority of the people who responded to the Citizen Opinion Survey said that they wanted to protect agriculture, important farmland, and rural character, which led to the following recommendations:

- Publish an informational brochure on the community's beliefs, values, and culture to convey the expectations of being part of this community.

  Commentary: It is important to realize that people will continue to build in our Town and that, somehow, the Town should alert them before they purchase land that the current residents share certain principles that are inherent in most rural communities.

  Some issues that new residents need to understand are wind erosion, aerial spraying, noise and machinery traffic that runs around the clock during spring planting and fall harvest, line fence maintenance if the neighboring landowner has cattle, nitrate contamination caused by overloading soils with septic systems that do not remove nitrates, and building homes along stream terraces and on perched water table soils.

- Protect agricultural areas by limiting the amount of non-farm development that takes place in these areas.

  Commentary: It will be difficult to achieve this recommendation because of agricultural economics. This is not saying no new development can occur in these areas, but the Plan Commission should give careful thought to the impacts of development in these areas.
  It would be preferable that people not build homes in the middle of productive fields. It would be preferable to encourage non-farm development to be close to roads, on field edges, or on the edges of woodlots.

- Develop a Right-to-Farm Ordinance to protect our farmers.

- Develop an Ag Survey.

  Commentary: Poll farmers on topics such as: Do they plan to continue farming? If so, for how long? Do they intend on staying in dairy farming? Are they willing to have any building restrictions on their land? Do they have any additional questions that could be helpful to the Plan Commission?

- Continue working with Dunn County to implement a Comprehensive Plan to protect our quality of life and agricultural livelihood

We sincerely hope you are pleased with the work that was done by this Committee. If this report and the maps meet your expectations for agriculture, we will consider this job completed and move on to natural and cultural resources.

TOWN OF SPRING BROOK
NATURAL RESOURCES

The Town of Spring Brook is representative of the prairie topography that borders the Chippewa River. Its topography, to a large extent, is responsible for its intense agricultural use. The large open prairies and irrigation make it highly desirable for row and specialty crops. The floodplain of the Chippewa River is also cropped. Because of this, there has been little residential development except along the Chippewa River and Elk Creek.

The Town has one of the two prairie lakes that are mapped in Dunn County. It also has several large prairie potholes. In addition, there is a large wetland complex associated with Muddy Creek. The western border of the Township has a rolling topography which consists of agricultural land that is interspersed with woodlands and wetlands. It is these unique natural resources that define the rural character for this Township.

The significant resources of the Town of Spring Brook have been identified and, when possible, mapped. Mapped resources include productive soils, surface water, water quality management areas, steep slopes, wetlands, areas that are occasionally and frequently flooded, and woodlands that are greater than 10 acres.

SOIL EROSION

Much of the land on the Fall City Prairie is more susceptible to wind erosion than water erosion because of the lack of woodlands to provide shelter from the winds.

WATER QUALITY

See NR 151 (Wisconsin's Runoff Rules); ATCP 50 (A listing of conservation practices); Water Quality Goals from the "State of the Lower Chippewa River Basin Report", 2001, PUBL #WT 554-00; and, Committee Recommendations.

STEEP SLOPES

Areas with slopes greater than 20% are considered as environmentally sensitive. These areas are subject to severe erosion from tillage, road construction, and home construction unless precautions are taken. Most slopes are wooded. Some are pastured while few, if any, are cultivated. These slopes are prevalent throughout the Township but less so in the southeast corner.

WETLANDS

Wetlands are a valuable resource because they store flood waters, filter sediment and nutrients, and serve as groundwater recharge areas. These are areas that have hydric soils (water at or near the surface through most of the growing season) and support hydrophytic vegetation (plants that thrive in wet conditions).

FLOODPLAINS

Floodplains are lands that are generally adjacent to creeks, rivers, lakes, and wetlands and that are susceptible to flood flow (floodway) or areas of slack water (flood fringe). For purposes of this plan, it includes areas which are subject to occasional or frequent flooding (based on soils).

WOODLANDS

Woodlands, for the purpose of this plan, are woodlots that are 10 acres or greater in size. This acreage was selected because this is the minimum acreage that can be enrolled in the State's Managed Forest Program.

HYDROLOGY

Although hydrology refers to both surface and groundwater, for purposes of this plan and mapping, it refers to those rivers and streams which are designated on the 7.5 Minute USGS Topographic Maps.

WILDLIFE

All land and water, whether cropland, woodland, wetlands, rivers and streams, floodplains, and even residential yards, supports wildlife. The following types of wildlife are common in the Town of Spring Brook: big game such as deer and black bear; small game such as rabbits and squirrels; upland birds such as turkeys and ruffed grouse; a large variety of songbirds and waterfowl; birds of prey such as owls, red-tailed hawks, and eagles; and, fur bearing animals such as raccoon, opossum, beaver, mink, red and gray fox, and coyote.

GROUNDWATER

Groundwater is the water that saturates the tiny spaces between alluvial material (sand, gravel, silt, clay) or the crevices or fractures in rock. It is vital for all of us. We depend on its good quality and quantity for drinking, recreation, use in industry, and growing crops. It is also vital to sustaining the natural systems on and under the earth's surface.

Although no specific maps are available at the town or county level showing groundwater, other than soils attenuation maps or groundwater elevations based on USGS topographic maps, it is known that groundwater tends to be localized, often following the same watershed boundaries as surface water.

NONMETALLIC MINING DEPOSITS

The Town of Spring Brook has sand and gravel deposits which can be found on outwash plains.

ENDANGERED RESOURCES

The Endangered Resources Program works to conserve Wisconsin's biodiversity for present and future generations. The State's goal is to identify, protect, and manage native plants, animals, and natural communities from the very common to the critically endangered. They desire to work with others to promote knowledge, appreciation, and stewardship of Wisconsin's native species and ecosystems.

WISCONSIN'S ENDANGERED SPECIES

Endangered species are any species whose continued existence as a viable component of this State's wild animals or wild plants is determined by the Department of Natural

Resources to be in jeopardy on the basis of scientific evidence.

WISCONSIN'S THREATENED SPECIES

Threatened species are any species which appear likely within the foreseeable future, on the basis of scientific evidence, to become endangered.

No threatened or endangered species are known to exist within the Township. For additional information, contact local DNR representatives.

In addition to Agriculture, Natural and Cultural Resources being a required element of a Comprehensive Plan, every county in the State of Wisconsin is required to have a Land and Water Resource Management Plan which identifies its resource concerns and strategies for addressing and correcting the problems. The Towns Comprehensive Plans will be consolidated into Dunn County's Land and Water Resource Management Plan. The County plan will provide an educational strategy, a voluntary program to achieve compliance with applicable State and County standards, and a regulatory approach should the first two approaches fail.

Committee Recommendations

-

- Coordinate with the Dunn County Land Conservation Division to provide training on the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE) and the importance of residue management and no till in controlling soil erosion.
- The Committee would like to see the re-establishment of grassed waterways as a high priority best management practice. They would also like this practice to be given a high priority for State and Federal cost sharing assistance.
- Coordinate with the Land Conservation Division to educate landowners on the advantages of participating in the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP).
- Coordinate with the USDA-Natural Resources Conservation Service and the Dunn County Land Conservation Division to educate landowners and help them qualify for the Conservation Security Program, so that when the Spring Brook River Basin is selected, landowners can take advantage of the incentive payments.
- Work with all landowners, living near streams, to voluntarily participate in an Adopt a Stream Program to achieve the water quality goals within the Township. If all of the landowners living near a stream volunteer to participate as a group, they should be given priority for State and Federal cost sharing programs.
- Encourage woodland owners to work with the DNR Forester to remove those trees that are most likely to be defoliated and killed by a gypsy moth infestation, Dutch Elm Disease, oak wilt, bark beetle, blister rust, and other woodland management problems.
- Work with the DNR Foresters to educate landowners about the Managed Forest Program.
- Work with the Department of Natural Resources, USDA-NRCS, and the Land Conservation Division to become aware of what plants are considered invasive and to become educated on their control.
- Recommend educating landowners on the importance of allowing hunting to control wildlife populations.

Appendix D

Topography and Geology

Topography and Geology

Dunn County contains 870 square miles near Mississippi. Most of Dunn County is composed of land known as Western Coulees and Ridges, "characterized by highly eroded, driftless (unglaciated) topography, relatively extensive forested landscape, and big rivers and a wide river valley. This includes the Mississippi and Chippewa. Some areas contain cold streams fed by springs. Silt loam (loess) and sandy loam soils cover sandstone resting on top of dolomite. "Vegetation consists of bluff prairie, oak-forest, oak savanna, and some mesic forest." "Relic conifer forests are present. There are floodplains with connected wetlands." Agriculture, including dairy and beef forms, is the primary use of land on the ridge tops and stream valleys. Some croplands and pasture lands are set aside in the Crop Reserve Program (CRP). "Wooded slopes are often managed for oak-hardwood production."

Dunn County lies within a roughly S-shaped transition belt known as "the tension zone" where Northern Forests and Southern Forests meet. "Early forest surveys indicate that Northern forests consisted of a mosaic of young, mature, and 'old growth' forests composed of pines, maples, oaks, birch, hemlock, and other hardwood and conifer species." "Southern Forests are distinct from the Northern forests because of the predominance of oaks and general absence of conifers. They are relatively open or have a park-like appearance, created by the lack of small trees and shrubs. Examples of southern Forest biological communities are found within southern Dunn county."

The Mt. Simon Sandstone Formation, about 25 feet thick, underlies the entire county. It consists of medium to coarse-grained sandstone with some fine-grained sandstone. The Formation yields moderate to large amounts of water to wells.

The Eau Claire Sandstone Formation, overlying the Mt. Simon, is present throughout the County except in some areas along pre-glacial stream valleys where erosion has greatly thinned or entirely removed it. The Eau Claire Sandstone is about 100 to 150 feet thick and consist of medium to fine-grained sandstone and shale. It generally yields only small quantities of water to wells, but moderate yields may be obtained where shale is absent from the formation.

The Galesville Sandstone Formation ranges in thickness from about 30 to 50 feet. It is present under the southwestern part of the County and probably in the bedrock hills elsewhere in the County. The Galesville Formation generally yields moderate amounts of water to wells, but it is missing in most areas where soils and topography indicate

irrigation to be most feasible. The unit consists of coarse to fine-grained sandstone.

The Franconia Sandstone Formation, Trempeauleau Foundation, and Prairie du Chien Group consist of sandstone, siltstone, and dolomite. These formations occur in the western and southwestern parts of the County and in highland areas. Moderate to small amounts of water can be obtained from the Franconia Formation, but the Trempealeau Formation and the Prairie du Chien Group yield only small amounts.

Glacial deposits in highland areas of Dunn County are very thin, generally less than 30 to 50 feet deep, but they are very thick in the buried bedrock valleys. Apparently, the pre-glacial Chippewa River flowed through a broad, deep channel and was the principal river draining the area. Deep tributary river valleys joining the pre-glacial Chippewa include the present Eau Galle River Valley, the present Red Cedar Valley (approximately from Irvington to Downsville), and a river valley trending from a point about two miles northeast of Knapp to north Menomonie and then southeastward to the Chippewa River. These pre-glacial stream valleys contain 100 to 200 feet of glacial material over much of their area.

Water in the groundwater reservoir moves by gravity from areas of recharge down the hydraulic gradient to areas of discharge. Recharge occurs over most of the County, and generally the hydraulic gradient is from topographically high to topographically low areas. Therefore, groundwater is moving through the water-bearing rocks from the water divides in the highland areas of Dunn County to the streams where it is discharged.

Curtis, John C. *The Vegetation of Wisconsin.* Madison:
 The University of Wisconsin Press, 1959.