

Personal Communication

Date: 3/25/02

Source – Person's name, title, and phone number: [REDACTED] Town of Two Creeks Land Use Committee member. Also an NMC employee. [REDACTED]

Title of place contacted and subject discussed: NMC. Land Use tends in the Town of Two Creeks.

Personal communication with [REDACTED] TtNUS.

Detailed description of the information sought:-

[REDACTED] is one of the members of the Town of Two Creeks Land Use Planning Committee. He is also an NMC employee in Corrective Actions.

I asked [REDACTED] to describe past land use trends in the Town of Two Creeks. He said that very little has changed in land use over the last several decades and that the residents want to keep it that way. The area is largely rural and one of the largest land-owners is WEPCo. Most of the plant employees live in Two Rivers, Manitowoc City, and the Village of Mishicot.

He said that the Town does not currently have a land use plan, but that it is their goal to eventually develop one. They have gone as far as to conduct a survey, querying residents desires. Overwhelmingly, the residents voted to protect the rural character of the Town. They have little interest in seeing much growth. [REDACTED] forwarded the draft document recording the survey questions and results. He said that the money the Town receives on behalf of the plant is used primarily to provide property tax relief to the residents. It is not so much used to create new infrastructure as it is used just to maintain the current infrastructure.

## Town of Two Creeks Land Use Survey

January 2001

### Background:

As part of the state of Wisconsin's 1999-2000 biennial budget, the governor signed new legislation into effect requiring a "Smart Growth" plan to be implemented by January 1, 2010. The Smart Growth theme is centered on a desire to establish a foundation of guidance / limitation / rules that would govern the disposition and use of lands within the state to support the needs and desires of the present and future population. Rules and regulation to support this effort will be directed by the state unless local communities establish their own guidance.

The Two Creeks town board acknowledged to the Manitowoc County Planning board that they would support the project and would develop our own community guidance. In the summer of 2000 the board enlisted the support of seven town residents to work as a team in reviewing our existing land use structure, glean a prospective of town residents desires and work with the surrounding townships & municipalities in proposing a structured Town of Two Creeks Land Use Plan.

The surrounding Manitowoc County Townships of Mishicot, Gibson, Two Rivers and the village of Mishicot have also established such committees to support their specific municipality's needs.

The town's committee received a preliminary outline of the state's overall project within a single meeting conducted by a representative from the Manitowoc Count Parks and Planning Office. The Committee developed a survey and sent it out to two hundred and twenty eight (228) registered landowners (as listed on the tax roll). One hundred and seventy one (171) surveys were returned, resulting in a 75% return rate.

The enclosed results are only a compilation of raw objective facts as recorded on the surveys. These values (and additional analysis) will be used by the committee within the process of projecting the town's needs / desires against the overall state goal (legislation already enacted).

The committee was very happy with the overall response and thank you for your time and effort.

Committee members will receive additional training by the Manitowoc County Parks and Planning Department sometime later this year. Our meetings are open to the general public. Meeting dates are posted on the cable television system.

### Committee Members:

[REDACTED LIST OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS]

## Town of Two Creeks Land Use Survey Result (Summary)

January 2001

Surveys mailed = 228

Surveys returned = 171

Surveys returned with data = 159

Surveys returned that were totally blank = 12

### NOTE:

The following results are based on the 159 returns that contained data. Although data in most of the returned surveys was very complete there were some questions not answered. The following percent (%) values represent a response based on responses recorded in a given question and are rounded to the nearest tent.

All additional comments received within the survey are recorded in Attachment A

---

### Miscellaneous: (157)

Full time resident of Two Creeks =	127	(80.9%)
Part time resident =	9	( 5.7%)
Land owner only =	21	(13.4%)

Average number of years = 28.9

### Reason(s) for living in Two Creeks (701 responses averaged into the following categories):

- |                                    |        |
|------------------------------------|--------|
| a. Born & raised here              | 9.4 %  |
| b. Pleasant /friendly surroundings | 10.3 % |
| c. Rural life style                | 15.6 % |
| d. Easy access to work             | 5.7 %  |
| e. School district                 | 4.9 %  |
| f. Farm based operation            | 6.7 %  |
| g. Lake Michigan proximity         | 8.0 %  |
| h. Safe area                       | 8.9 %  |
| i. Reasonable cost of housing      | 5.9 %  |
| j. Recreation                      | 4.6 %  |
| k. Good place for children         | 7.3 %  |
| l. Tax structure                   | 12.0 % |
| m. Other                           | .9 %   |

**Demographics:**

Total number of persons in all responding households = 458

**Household breakdown:**

a. Employed	42.6 %
b. Self-employed	10.2 %
c. Not employed outside the home	3.4 %
d. In school	24.2 %
e. Pre school or home school	3.1 %
f. Retired	16.6 %
g. Other	6.8 %

**How is the household supported:**

a. Farming / home business	13.2 %
b. Big business outside the home / farm	32.9 %
c. Small business outside the home / farm	17.1 %
d. Savings / investment	7.5 %
e. Retirement	22.5 %
f. Other	6.8 %

**Age of individual in households**

0-17	26.0 %
18-24	6.7 %
25-44	23.6 %
45-64	29.8 %
65-84	12.5 %
85+	1.4 %

## Housing

Approximate age of the residence in Two Creeks: 49.7 years

Question #1: The town should support a wide variety of housing choices that meet the needs of persons or most income levels, age groups and persons of special needs. (150)

Agree 44.7 %

Disagree 55.3 %

Question #2: The town should support the development of multiple family, apartments / condos. (149)

Agree 6.7 %

Disagree 93.3 %

Question #3: The town should support the development of elderly or handicap housing. (149)

Agree 27.5 %

Disagree 72.5 %

Question #4: The town should promote the availability of land for the development of low-income housing. (151)

Agree 9.3 %

Disagree 90.7 %

Comments -- See attachment A (page #13)

**Community Facilities: (159 Responses)**

	Satisfied	Dissatisfied
Police/Sheriff	93.7 %	6.3 %
Fire Protection	99.4 %	.6 %
EMT Services	96.9 %	3.1 %
Roads	96.9 %	3.1 %
Ditch Maintenance	88.7 %	11.3 %
Road Signs	98.1 %	1.9 %
Snow Plowing	93.1 %	6.9 %
Recycling Program	94.3 %	5.7 %
Hunting & Fishing areas	91.8 %	8.2 %
Parks and Recreation areas	91.8 %	8.2 %

**Question: Do you feel that you could be more informed about town issues? (145)**

Yes        52.4 %

No        47.6 %

Comments -- See attachment A (page # 14 &15)

## Economic Development:

Question #1: Do you approve of the way land use in the Town of Two Creeks has evolved to accommodate growth over the past 10-20 years? (142)

Yes      61.3 %

No      38.7 %

Question #2: Excluding residential areas, where / when can the following types of businesses be located?

	Anywhere	Smart Growth Plan	Nowhere
Retail/Commercial large(149)	3.4 %	36.2 %	60.4 %
Retail/Commercial small (150)	10.7 %	66.0 %	23.3 %
Manufacturing / Industry (147)	4.1 %	40.1 %	55.8 %
Farming 0-50 animals (145)	53.1 %	44.8 %	2.1 %
Farming 50-100 animals (151)	44.4 %	50.3 %	5.3 %
Farming 100-500 animals (141)	16.3 %	65.3 %	18.4 %
Farming 500-1000 animals (143)	7.0 %	36.4 %	56.6 %
Farming greater than 1000 animals (142)	7.8 %	26.8 %	65.5 %
Forestry business (146)	29.5 %	46.6 %	23.9 %
Compost business (147)	11.6 %	59.8%	28.6 %
Gravel pit & Quarries (147)	5.4 %	39.5 %	55.1 %
Salvage/junkyards (150)	2.7 %	22.0 %	75.3 %
Boating or airplane services (148)	2.7 %	57.4 %	39.9 %
Hotel / Condo (149)	1.3 %	27.5 %	71.2 %
Other (3)			

Comments -- See attachment A (page #16)

## Rural Residential Housing Development:

Question #1: In comparison with the existing town structure of 9,100 acres (excluding the existing 1,580 acres of Power plant, town and state property) what formula / mix of land allocation would best represent your vision for the town over the next 10 years?

	Current	Next 10 Years
a. Industrial	0.0 %	.4 %
b. Commercial	.4 %	1.6 %
c. Agriculture	85.2 %	75.9 %
d. Residential	8.4 %	11.5 %
e. Forest land	3.1 %	7.2 %
f. Waste land	2.9 %	3.0 %
g. Other	0.0 %	.3 %

Question #2: With this vision in mind, what type of land use can co-exist with residential use?

	Anywhere	Smart growth plan	Nowhere
Public recreation area (152)	24.3 %	69.7 %	5.9 %
Services = Schools, police, fire, etc. (146)	21.2 %	75.3 %	3.4 %
Environmental features (wet lands, natural areas etc.)(147)	25.9 %	61.2 %	12.9 %
Hunting / gaming areas (149)	19.5 %	64.4 %	16.1 %
Light commercial & retail (i.e. Kwik Mart) (151)	8.0 %	64.2 %	27.8 %
Salvage & Junk yards (153)	2.6 %	20.3 %	77.1 %
Mobil trailer parks (152)	1.3 %	32.9 %	65.8 %
Camping facilities (151)	8.0 %	64.2 %	27.8 %
Home Business (150)	40.0 %	52.0 %	8.0 %
Industrial / Manufacturing (147)	2.0 %	38.8 %	59.2 %
Billboards (150)	3.3 %	45.3 %	51.3 %
Towers over 100 ft (149)	5.4 %	51.7 %	43.0 %
Airports / landing fields (151)	0.7 %	37.0 %	62.3 %
Boat launch facilities (145)	18.6 %	73.1 %	8.3 %
Composting business (144)	9.0 %	63.9 %	27.1 %
Farming 0-50 animals (139)	47.5 %	50.4 %	2.1 %
Farming 50-100 animals (148)	44.6 %	50.7 %	4.7 %
Farming 100-500 animals (143)	20.3 %	61.5 %	18.2 %
Farming 500-1000 animals (145)	8.3 %	33.8 %	57.9 %
Farming 1000 or more animals (150)	6.6 %	22.7 %	70.7 %

Question #3 As the Land Use Committee works towards promoting the interests of the town residents (as a whole), what priority should be applied towards the following subjects:

	High	Medium	Low
Promotion/protection of conservancy districts (141)	46.8 %	35.5 %	17.7 %
Protection of environmental waterways (147)	60.5 %	27.9 %	11.6 %
Limit future large farms (500 units and greater) (149)	61.1 %	18.8 %	20.1 %
Right to farm (141)	58.2 %	26.2 %	15.6 %
Set back ordinances for res. dev. near waterways (144)	51.4 %	34.0 %	14.6 %
Establishing building codes (149)	34.2 %	43.0 %	22.8 %
Septic system limitations (143)	21.0 %	55.3 %	23.8 %
Residential lot size (149)	46.3 %	34.9 %	18.8 %
Commercial / tourism / industrial development (151)	21.2 %	29.1 %	49.7 %
Regulation of mobile homes and trailer parks (149)	63.8 %	23.5 %	12.7 %
Removal of junk cars and hazardous buildings (150)	65.3 %	16.7 %	18.0 %
Billboard regulation (147)	40.8 %	39.5 %	19.7 %
Noise regulation (148)	28.4 %	41.9 %	29.7 %
Weed regulation (147)	30.6 %	44.9 %	24.5 %
Odor regulation (147)	50.3 %	35.5 %	14.3 %
HWY 42 commercial services (143)	21.7 %	53.9 %	24.5 %
Other (7)			

Question #4 Should the town limit lot size for any future new house construction: (156)

Yes 84 %

No 16 %

Question #5 If limits are applied what size lot is the minimum size: (153)

Under 1 acre	2.6 %
1 acre	13.1 %
5 acres	25.5 %
15 acres	8.5 %
35 acres	26.8 %
40 acres	23.5 %

Question #6 Should the town restrict the use of holding tanks for new home construction (answer does not reflect the use of holding tanks to repair existing systems): (138)

Yes 47.1 %

No 52.9 %

Comments -- See attachment A (page # 17 & 18)

**Agriculture:**

Question #1: How important is it to preserve farms and farmland for agriculture purposes in the Town of Two Creeks (155)

High	72.9 %
Medium	21.9 %
Low	5.2 %

Question #2: Which of the following would you support: (202)

- |  |        |
|--|--------|
| a. Farming only on productive agriculture land currently being farmed. | 41.6 % |
| b. Farming on any land available.                                      | 29.2 % |
| c. As a tool to prevent urban sprawl.                                  | 24.8 % |
| d. Other.  | 3.5 %  |
| e. None.   | .1 %   |

Question #3: Do you own Farm property that may one day be offered for sale outside the farming environment in the next 10 years: (150)

Yes	20.0 %
No	80.0 %

Question #4: If you answered yes why do you feel that you will seek to sell your property for residential or industrial development ( 14 ) See attachment A

Question #5: Should a landowner or farmer be permitted to sell his or her farmland for purposes other than farming (choose one) (149)

For any reason, it is their right. 42.3 %

Only if it doesn't conflict with the Smart Growth Comprehensive Plan for the town of Two Creeks. 49.7 %

Other 8.0 %

Comments – See attachment A (page #19)

### Natural Resources:

Question #1: How would you rank the Town of Two Creeks historical management toward the environment and natural resources: (148)

Acceptable	61.5 %
Poor	9.5 %
Unknown	29.1 %

Question #2: What priority should the Land Use Committee apply to promotion / maintenance of the following environmental features in the town:

	High	Medium	Low
Woodland (150)	52.0 %	39.3 %	8.7 %
Shore lands (150)	64.7 %	27.3 %	8.0 %
Grasslands (148)	33.1 %	50.0 %	16.9%
Floodplains (148)	30.4 %	47.3 %	22.3 %
Wetlands (150)	36.7 %	39.4 %	24.0 %
Archeological Sites (147)	34.7 %	40.1 %	25.2 %
Air Quality (148)	61.5 %	31.8 %	6.8 %
Other (2)			

Question #3: What level of priority should the Land Use Committee place on wildlife habitats in the town.

	High	Medium	Low
Wetlands (150)	37.3 %	42.0 %	20.6 %
Woodlands / forestry (150)	48.7 %	38.7 %	12.7 %
Green / Open spaces (148)	28.4 %	50.0 %	21.6 %
Shorelines (lakes and streams) (148)	54.1 %	34.5 %	11.5 %
Other (2)			

Comments -- See attachment A (page #19)

## Ground Water Protection

Question #1: Do you feel there is a problem with the contamination of groundwater in your area of the town: (153)

Yes            13.7 %

No            56.2 %

Not Sure    30.1 %

If Yes what do you feel is the cause – See comments Attachment A (page #20)

The Two Creeks Land Use Committee is currently promoting the following proposals. Do you agree or disagree?

a) Not allowing residential development in areas where groundwater contamination reaches or exceeds 2PPM nitrate levels: (150)

Agree        64.7 %

Disagree     35.3 %

b) The regulation of siting, construction and monitoring of specific potential sources of groundwater contamination's (e.g. agri-chemical storage / transportation facilities, road salt storage facilities, pipeline construction, fuel and waste oil storage facilities, livestock production, industrial operation, etc.): (149)

Agree        89.3 %

Disagree     10.7 %

c) Permits for new wells and the closing / abandonment of wells: (149)

Agree        74.5 %

Disagree     25.5 %

## **Surface Water Protection**

Shoreline setbacks should be: (148)

75 feet      35.1 %

100 feet      26.4 %

150 feet      14.2 %

300 feet      24.3 %

Shoreline Vegetation: (233 recommendations)

Restrict to natural vegetation      36.9 %

Restricted mowing along shore      18.0 %

Prohibit use of pesticides, herbicides & fertilizers      45.1 %

 Comments -- see Attachment A (page 21)

## Attachment A

### Caution:

Some of these comments may not be clear to individuals that have not been privileged to analyze them against the composite of the overall individual survey. The comments are from individuals and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the majority, but again do reflect insight into individual items of interest and concern of some of your neighbors.

Page #4

### Housing:

- Farming, Farming, Farming, not wetland or housing.
- Handicap/Elderly/ Multiple family housing serve better if located near public transportation and services.
- If we did promote this it would mean we would have to form a village to support sanitation etc.
- We should severely restrict new growth.
- Building of a home should allow the owner to build what they need and what the land will allow.
- An Elderly facility for current town residents would be acceptable.
- Our town is too small for this.
- I would agree with handicap housing.
- You have to address these needs; it is part of the Smart Growth law.
- Such development as described is impractical this far from town.
- The town should help out and keep the elderly residence in the town, especially when a lot of them are lifetimes and are forced out when they are no longer capable of up keeping their homes (example = assisted living).
- Two Creeks is good farmland and the above service is better suited for towns like Two Rivers and Mishicot.
- There are already enough available in Two Rivers and Mishicot.
- The building moratorium is just about the haves in the town stopping the have-nots in the town from building.
- The town is just too small to support this type of development.
- This type of arrangement would require a hook up to a sewer and water systems like in a village or city.
- Going ahead with some of these ideas would require strong ground rules and legal advice.
- The town should talk to the residence that look like large junkyards and tell them to clean it up.
- Keep the environment quiet.
- Hold the current tax structure.
- This area is too far away from conveniences (grocery, etc.) therefore it is better off a "getaway town"
- The township is rural with no close city to support the above-described concepts.
- Not in favor of this type of housing that may spoil the rural identity or jeopardize property tax values and public safety.

Community Facilities:

- Need more police in the area.
- Home garbage pick up would be nice.
- Park areas need improving.
- We have a nice cable channel 8. Use it more for information about the town. Go into more detail not just fire department meetings etc. Have someone keep this up full time.
- Strongly support maintenance of rural roads and scenic drives.
- The town was built as an agriculture town; it should generally be kept that way.
- Cable TV needs work, and possible Internet cable hookup would be nice.
- Channel #8 does a fair job of informing us but perhaps a screen or two of town tidbits would help.
- I find it outrageous that in the middle of the night it takes the sheriff's department 45 minutes to an hour to respond to a call.
- Town meetings could be put on TV.
- The cable channel keeps us informed.
- The recycling program should be up at the town hall for Two Creeks residence only and open every weekend till 3PM.
- A community house or place for kids to safely play / socialize/ swim. We need a youth center. It seems that Manitowoc and Green Bay are the closest areas for our youth.
- HW 42 ditch maintenance is a problem.
- Residents / Owners should be given a map of the township and locations of public lands / parks / recreational areas.
- Please get fire number signs on all residence. Some residence do not maintain a mailbox. Would a young fireman know where someone lives without a mailbox? Ditch maintenance on HW 42 is poor. We take pride in our yard and every year we have to remove wheelbarrows of gravel. Please pull up a little on the snowplow – Thank you. When we asked for permits for storage we were informed “no junk and old trucks should be on the roadside because it is an eye sore. Why doesn’t everyone have to obey this rule?
- The ditches in front of our land is not properly pitched, this is complicated because the ditches on HY 42 is also not properly pitched.
- It would be nice if the snowplow lifted its wing a little as it goes past houses to eliminate all of the stones in the driveway.
- A new net in the tennis court. Better ball field maintenance. Portable toilets in recreation area of the town hall.
- Speed limit signs on lakeshore road are needed. Some ditches hold water (standing) after rain and snow. The town provides outstanding services to it's residences, the board should be proud.
- First Responders needs. More observation and control of the power plants traffic situations. Ditches should be cut in June not wait until August or Sept. as in the past.
- Get rid of the standing water in ditches.
- Improved boat landing would enhance recreation area.
- A few more things could be posted on the local TV channel. Most of the time I think we are being fairly well informed.

- The recycling center should be opened during the week.
- The town has an excellent recycling service. Cable based Internet would be nice.
- Second shift workers cannot attend town meetings.
- A new tower is going up in the town right in the middle of farmland. People should have had the right to say yes or no.
- We miss the private snow plowing. We attend most meeting open to the public and have no problem being informed on the issues.
- We need a safe way down to the beach at both the North and South ends of the park.
- More Cable TV variety.
- More parks and space set aside for future parks.
- Garbage / recycling pickup. Clean up the litter on lakeshore road. Use the cable system to keep us more informed.
- I need to go to the town meetings.
- A better boat ramp.
- We have channel 8 that is enough.
- Recycling / trash should be open each weekend.
- Recycle center should be open every Saturday (perhaps for shorter hours).
- The town crew does work in our area in changing the roads and does not get the local residence consensus on the task / project.
- As long as someone keeps up the information on the TV that is enough. Too much gravel in the ditches from the snowplow.
- A deeper boat launch. We need a monthly town newsletter to keep residence informed of changes or pending changes / issues.
- The cable system provides us with adequate information.
- Improve the cable system.
- Hunting areas should be away from homes and farms.
- Put town board meetings on channel 8.
- It does not really matter what we the people say, the town board will do what ever they want. If they like you, you get a permit, if not, you do not.
- Need the dump open during the week. Add more channels to the cable system. A larger dump sight area.
- Would like to see the recycling center open every Saturday during the summer months.
- We need the minutes of the town board meeting published.

Economic Development:

- Anybody that hunts needs the farms with animals for their hunting lands. If it was not for dairy land we will end up with homes and keep out signs.
- There has to be a balance between growth and protection from over development.
- Present junkyards should be cleaned up.
- Most businesses when designed properly and maintained well are an asset to any town.
- We have enough junkyard looking places.
- The town should be involved in the addition of businesses.
- Small home sales such as woodcraft sales should be allowed along the road.
- Retail / Commercial small store such as a gas station or mini mart would be ok.
- Some controls should be applied or forced on properties with junk cars and dilapidated buildings.
- Anything that will better the community is good. One should be able to build on your own land as long as it is attractive to the community.
- We have a beautiful area and must be careful not to ruin it.
- Two Creeks should strive to maintain its tax structure and rural atmosphere.
- Too many residence going up already. A town law should be made that all new residence will pay property tax to stop this run away building. This type of law should have been in place from the beginning.
- Large farms should be limited.
- Most any small venture of animal husbandry or such should be allowed on you own property as in the past.
- All of the above selections should be defined through a professionally prepared land plan and written ordinance. Thanks to the tax base created by the nuclear plant Two Creeks has no further need for additional retail, commercial, manufacturing or industrial uses. Also Two Creeks should have an ordinance prohibiting all billboards and regulating other signage.
- We have family members that do woodworking and sell their items. We would not like this restricted.
- New homes are nice and well cared for but would prefer to see farm prosperity.
- There has been too much residential growth.
- Bad odor problem when too many animals are confined in a small space.

Residential development:

- We have a definite order problem in this town with one big farm.
- The farm land out there that is a small or retired farmers land should be at the owners discretion on how they want to use it, they should not be stuck having to use it only for farming because they are at the mercy of bigger farms to sell to them, thus they loose value. A retired farmer that sells his animals should have the right to sell his land for whatever purpose he chooses to get the most money for his land.
- Someone could generate a lot of business (such as a shop or gas station) from the Point Beach and Kewaunee power plants. The town could get some revenue off of that.
- If the town designates a housing development area it would be OK for smaller parcels of property to build on.
- It's a shame we have so many junkyards in the town especially on HW 42. Besides being an eye sour, they possibly are potential areas that are harboring rats and rodents.
- We should all work together to keep yards neat and clean. Remove all junk etc. This makes a community one can be proud of.
- A safe boat harbor is needed.
- There is a need to limit new construction.
- No new large farms.
- The town should only use the interest and other income to pay the bills (including property tax) and not touch the principal. If the interest is not enough then residence should make up the difference.
- Until we find a replacement for food we need to save our farmland. About 30 years ago the town had a soil survey done and we were told that it was not compatible for development. Over the last 10 years people are building whatever they can get away with. I think the houses are already too close together. I think we should be prudent in granting permits for new houses. With the construction of each new house the odds of contamination of our ground water increases due to septic tank failures. We should not put ourselves in a position where the state will make it mandatory for the town to build sewage and water treatment plants. Also attached was a copy of the 4 February 2001 Green Bay press-gazette full-page article titled "Sprawl gobble up acre after acre".
- In this area we know many homes in our township are older and with age septic systems can fail or have already failed. I question with failed and failing systems what kind of ground contaminants are present. Holding tanks are far much safer if properly cared for. When we see ground water contamination, 95 % of the time the finger is pointed at the farmer when in fact the homeowner with less legal systems are just as much at fault. I would much rather see focus placed upon inspection of systems to make sure that they are up to par to protect the environment for future generations. Running septic systems into ditches and hidden waterways should not be tolerated (no exceptions).
- Big dairy farm operation smell bad. There are no adequate regulations to control the manure and smell. For this reason big operations must not be allowed.

Holding tanks:

- If installed properly and monitored should not be a problem.
- Black water exclusive to holding tanks, gray water (second system) to drainage fields.
- You may want to think smaller plots allowed in existing population areas (Kidville / Two Creeks).
- If a parcel perks for a mound, it should be allowed, but the size should be adequate so the system will work well. Also the new low style should be promoted.
- A homeowner is far better off putting in a mound system.
- Holding tank may be the last resort on some of the soil types. This should be used with caution, so buildings are not constructed on poorly drained sites.
- It is too easy to violate the intention of a holding tank.
- Holding tanks with a hauler contract. Sewage would be removed to a sanitary system and not left to leak into the soil.
- We spend too much on wetlands now.
- If the town restricts the use of holding tanks they should help with the cost of other construction.
- Not if a conventional or mound system could be installed.
- Whatever is best for the landowner.
- Holding tanks are better than any system because they must be pumped.
- As a last resort.
- Too many tanks are not maintained.
- The town should check existing systems. Some homes do not have proper septic systems right now.
- Get all town septic systems up to date.
- Mound system or holding tank they both work.
- Holding tanks cost less to maintain than normal systems. Mounds cost \$7000. The cost of pumping a holding tank over the holding tank's life cost less per year.
- Some areas cannot have a mound system and only a holding tank can be used.
- Only if there is some assurance the tanks are maintained properly.
- Due to our tax structure holding tanks are a liability to the town. If people do not pump them the town is obligated to pick up the expense.
- If it perks they can put in whatever system they want.
- One holding tank per 40 acres with one residence.

Page #9&10

Agriculture:

- What a person does with his own property should be his own business. However the Township could make an offer to purchase at a fair price or help young farmers get a start with incentive programs.
- It is a persons right to do what they want but the Smart Growth plan could have the right of first refusal on a property sale.
- A person has a right to sell to a buying customer.
- May need the income. The land may not be farmed in the future.
- To keep the family close and to help them start a living when they move from home.
- If farming conditions do not improve we may have to sell and get out.
- Compensate farmers for allowing hedgerows to grow along fence lines for loss of tillable acreage.
- Most of the land East of HW 42 is considered wetland according to the state land office.
- The land is part of my retirement.
- May need the income.
- Money.
- Family member might buy it to build a house.
- Right now all small farmers are at the mercy of two large farms in the town (they set the price).
- Family members may want to have some land.

Page #10

Natural Resources:

- Can regulate future use of land, but cannot do much with current owners use.
- The preservation of our lands and access to these lands give older people pride and younger people the love of the land and nature.
- Hunting should be allowed on state lands.
- Cut set aside grasslands.
- Ensure development has minimal impact on nature.
- Limit duck pond/wetland. The extra wild life will be a problem some day. Consider trees if the land will be left idle.

Ground Water:

- Landowners should be allowed to drill wells and should be forced to close / seal abandon wells.
- Close watch and help should be given to large farmers to contain waste.
- Pesticides are well regulated already.
- We do not have a problem now but in the future some large farm manure pits (which are right next to a creek) may pose a problem.
- You should not need a permit to drill a new well, but I would support a permit to make sure abandon wells are closed.
- We have poor water and are currently surrounded by farms.
- Manure is what is causing the increased nitrate levels.
- Sulfur smell in the water if not treated.
- Farm pollutants are causing the problem.
- Poorly treated sewage is the problem.
- Big farms.
- Improperly abandon wells, or wells not up to state code or standards.
- Unsealed old wells (example near church in down town Two Creeks).
- Manure is the problem.
- Manure (500-1000 cows = a city of about 3000-6000 people). Abandon pits should also be eliminated.
- Big farms.
- Large farms.
- Permits only for large operations. Homeowners should be allowed to drill or close wells without.
- Do not need any more XXX regulations.
- New construction
- With proper equipment nitrates can be removed from your drinking water.
- Nitrogen fertilizers & pesticides.
- Closing of wells is very important.
- Abandon wells not properly being closed are the problem.
- Manure run off.
- Too many houses.
- Pesticides and weed killers.
- Do not tell me to drill a new well or close one, but monitoring water will be helpful.

Shoreline:

- Use common sense on how close to plant and harvest near shorelines.
- The diversity of shoreline and circumstance varies. The need for Management if the landowner needs assistance in battling erosion. The town should give assistance unless refused by landowner.
- Very difficult to regulate such things. Chemical use near waterways is important.
- General restrictions like these may be difficult and unfair but I agree some control is essential.
- Let Nature take its course.
- Existing structures should be grandfathered. Houses lost to natural disaster should be allowed to be rebuilt in the same area.
- Soil consistency may determine required distance for setback and vegetation restrictions.
- It is very important to eliminate the use of pesticides / herbicides and fertilizers near any waterway.
- Maintain a natural shoreline as much as possible.
- A large buffer & conservation practice are needed to lessen shoreline erosion.
- Use of common sense is very important. I think the town board has done a good job for years and will do so in the future. I think the taxpayers should make any changes by popular vote in case the town board has some doubts or wants more input.
- If you want to replace an existing house with a new one at the same location that should be allowed.