

Parks Committee Agenda  
Jefferson County  
Jefferson County Courthouse  
311 S. Center Avenue, Room 202  
Jefferson, WI 53549

Date: Monday, December 12, 2016

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Committee members: Foelker, Matt  
Kelly, Mike  
Nass, Steve  
Payne, Laura  
Tietz, Augie

1. Call to order
2. Roll call (establish a quorum)
3. Certification of compliance with the Open Meetings Law
4. Approval of the agenda
5. Approval of Park Committee minutes for November 7, 2016
6. Communications
7. Public comment (Members of the public who wish to address the Committee on specific agenda items must register their request at this time)
8. Discussion and Possible Action in responding to correspondence received by Beth Shropshire regarding roaming dogs and privacy of adjoining landowners at Korth park
9. Discussion and Possible Action on Dogs at Large in County Parks
10. Discussion and Possible Action on the installation of a controlled dusk to dawn gate at Carnes East and ownership of Jones Lane as it pertains to the Town of Jefferson
11. Discussion and Possible Action on Foraging in County Parks
12. Discussion and Possible Action on Transfer of an 8-mile Segment of Snowmobile Trail Corridor 9 from Waukesha County to Jefferson County
13. Discussion and Possible Action on Pohlmann Park Silo
14. Discussion on GPS-ing of the Snowmobile Trails
15. Discussion on Shelter Rental Fees
16. Discussion on Holzhueter Easement
17. Discussion on Interurban Trail
18. Discussion on Glacial Heritage Area (GHA) –Friends of GHA
19. Discussion on 2017 Dog Park Tag Sales and Donations
20. Discussion and Possible Action on Stewardship Grant Application for the 5.7 acre Addition to the Garman Nature Preserve
21. Review of Financial Statements (October 2016) and Department Update – Parks Department
22. Adjourn

Next scheduled meetings: January, 2017  
February, 2017  
March, 2017

***A Quorum of any Jefferson County Committee, Board, Commission or other body, including the Jefferson County Board of Supervisors, may be present at this meeting.***

***Individuals requiring special accommodations for attendance at this meeting should contact the County Administrator 24 hours prior to the meeting at 920-674-7101 so appropriate arrangements can be made.***

Parks Committee Minutes  
Jefferson County  
Jefferson County Courthouse  
311 S. Center Avenue, Room 202  
Jefferson, WI 53549

#5

Date: Monday, November 7, 2016

Time: 9:30 a.m.

Committee members: Foelker, Matt  
Kelly, Mike  
Nass, Steve  
Payne, Laura  
Tietz, Augie

1. **Call to order**

Tietz called the meeting to order at 9:30am

2. **Roll call (establish a quorum)**

Present: Tietz, Foelker, Kelly, Payne (@9:32am)

Absent: Nass

Others Present: Nehmer, Nimm, Hutter, Wiesmann, Wehmeier, Ward

3. **Certification of compliance with the Open Meetings Law**

Meeting was noticed and posted according to law.

4. **Approval of the agenda**

Agenda approved as written.

5. **Approval of Park Committee minutes for September 15, 2016 & October 3, 2016**

Foelker motioned to approve the 9/15/2016 and 10/3/2016 minutes. Tietz seconded. Motion passes 3/0

6. **Communications**

Included in packet for review.

7. **Public comment (Members of the public who wish to address the Committee on specific agenda items must register their request at this time)**

No Public Comment

8. **Discussion on Holzhueter Easement**

Nehmer – opened the discussion stating that there is lack of clarity as to who owns the driveway at Holzhueter as it relates to the Wise property

Sharene Smith (WIDNR) – stated the park property was purchased by the WIDNR with hopes that the DNR would own the driveway. Research shows easement was granted mostly for agriculture purposes. WIDNR Legal does not think a public park use is allowable. The legal document states that we (WIDNR/Jefferson County) can petition for a Town Road and the property owner has to support the petition. This could be the only way the public can use the road.

Nehmer – 2013 easement agreement was not completed due to lack of understanding as to who owns driveway.

Kelly – asked if the easement question has been resolved.

Smith – Wises' own the driveway, DNR has easement.

David Wise – referenced an email from Smith noting “if there was no other practical way to get onto the property” and followed that with the comment that there is considering you (WIDNR) own property at end of my driveway.

Wise stated that he does not see the need to take away “our land” given there is practical access.

Nehmer – never anticipated that primary access would be from east to get to the west.

Wise – Cheryl Housley (WIDNR) tried to get a signed conditional use agreement which would have given access to entry at driveway. There is access to the states property from the homestead to the east of Wise driveway. This will make it more difficult to get to the mountain bike area, and there is no need to take our property.

Nehmer – originally it was stated as DNR owned drive with Wise access.

Kelly – new driveway to west of the Wise driveway?

Nehmer – is ROW wide enough to install new road and use same access point?

Smith – DNR could survey to see if there is an option to share ingress/egress within ROW and install new road to the west.

Nehmer – Other options are driveway to east and/or driveway to the west.

Wise – concerned about problems in park at night. County could install a time locked gate at road that clearly defines the property ownership. Wises would like low impact uses such hiking and hunting that won't erode the hillside to the west.

Tietz – Smith will survey and County will talk to township.

#### **9. Discussion and Possible Action on Stewardship Grant Application for the 5.7 acre Addition to the Garman Nature Preserve**

Nehmer – The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources requires the 5 NBOA's (hunt, fish, trap, hike, cross country skiing) for properties purchased with Stewardship funds. We submitted a grant request for \$16,000 to be used to be used as cash match to repay funding source. The 5.7 acre parcel is wooded and hilly and will have new trail for hiking. Hunting would not be safe on the 5.7 acre parcel. DNR would mandate hunting on the parcel, within the city limits. Safety warden will assess the situation. If safety warden thinks it is safe, then we have to allow hunting.

Funding party does not want hunting. City would work with County to allow hunting for purposes of obtaining the funds. Neighboring business has laborers in the adjacent fields in the spring and fall during hunting seasons.

Tietz – if the funds were granted, we were going to give it back to the granting party. What are their thoughts on repayment?

Wehmeier – we are obligated as a county to repay.

Nehmer – we cannot remove the deed restriction per B. Ward.

Kelly – is there hunting in Garman?

Nehmer – only if there is an overabundance that needs to be addressed.

Payne – if DNR deems the property not safe will we be granted the funds?

Tietz – is it possible to limit hunting?

Kelly – does the deed restriction make this a moot point?

Foelker – not in favor of hunting the 5.7 acres.

Payne – if the donors have expressed an opinion, we need to respect their wishes. Is there another avenue to raise the funds in question?

Nehmer – must first look at safety, and then must pay respect to the wishes of those who funded the parks.

Ward – will discuss in December meeting if it is determined by the safety warden that there is no safety issue.

#### **10. Discussion and Possible Action on Foraging in County Parks**

Nimm noted that she received a phone call requesting permission to forage in the county park. The person asking, noted that they would like access to more than "personal quantities".

Tietz – invite the person to come into the committee to ask and/or put into writing the request.

Foelker – not in favor of one person taking whatever they want.

Kelly – overharvesting an endangered species is dangerous.

Fuller – do not want to upset the balance of the ecosystems. Have concerns.

Wiesmann – want to keep people on trails to avoid transfer of invasive plant seeds. This might be a time that speaks to not removing species from the parks.

#### **11. Discussion on Rock River National Water Trail**

Nehmer – Frank Sheer, founder of the RRNWT is in very poor health, and the board is hoping for his recovery.

David Schreiber, Dane County/Schreiber Anderson, had an unfortunate accident and has passed. Both are leaders of the organization. Now is the time to show strong partnership. In the packet there is the Grand Opening Event announcement on June 3, 2017 which is National trails day. Nehmer, Wiesmann, Nimm and Hutter approached the Jefferson County Tourism Council with a request for their assistance in making events happen along the Rock River throughout the county.

Kelly – questioned the RRNWT signs – placement and size. Supportive of the RRNWT and supportive of the event.

Tietz – Watertown Tourism is possibly planning an event.

#### **12. Discussion on Interurban Trail**

Tietz – Watertown received funding for Trailhead from two Rotary Clubs. The City decided to hold off on the trailhead, considering there was no trail. The City has built and opened the trail 1.3 miles to the Rock River. WIDNR

has given their ok for trail use. City is still working on the trailhead facility. Hoping with funding, the bridge will be installed and the trail will be extended to River Road.

Nehmer – waiting to hear on funding with hopes that we are close to have funds for the first bridge.

Tietz – met with City of Oconomowoc, Waukesha County, and WIDNR. Hopeful that the partners will continue to support and start their one mile section.

(Adjacent Property Owner) Darryl Pernat – Questioned if there will be fencing where he pastures near ski slide road expressing a concern that people/kids will go into his pasture.

**13. Discussion on Shelter Rentals**

Nehmer – currently scheduling rentals through 2017. Korth Park is popular for weddings. Parties want to stay later into the night, parties want to install tents. Demands are real.

Nimm noted that there are now parties trying to book into 2018. As this time, the Parks Department only books ahead through the calendar year and on July 1 of each year they take requests for the following calendar year.

Nehmer – our pavilion price is probably below market.

Tietz – requested a comparison of pavilion rental fees with others and bring back to committee.

**14. Discussion on Pohlmann Park Silo**

Nehmer and Ward will be at Town of Jefferson Meeting to speak about past actions of the Parks Committee. Spoke with Nancy Emmons about funding the rehab options for of the silo. Unsure of where the Township stands on the subject.

**15. Discussion on Camping in County Parks**

Ward – good experience with DATCP as it relates to camping at Cappies and Carnes and requirements for toilet facilities at both parks. Carnes was approved as is. Approved as is at Cappies with a limit to the number of campers.

Wiesmann – submitted the variance which was approved. Paperwork for signage was approved and signage is posted.

**16. Discussion on Mountain Bike Park**

Wiesmann – has been working with volunteers on building the trails at the county property by UW-EX and Human Services. Participation is low at this time.

Fuller – suggested the Hoofers Outdoor Club as a possible volunteer group.

**17. Discussion on Glacial Heritage Area (GHA) –Friends of GHA**

Fuller – Friends may re-structure the group with the attempts of being more helpful to Jefferson County.

**18. Review of Financial Statements (September 2016) and Department Update – Parks Department**

Nehmer – looks good. Last week, funds were used in the Carlin Weld account to pave the parking lot.

**19. Adjourn**

Foelker motioned to adjourn at 10:52am. Kelly seconded. Motion passes on a 4/0 vote.

Next scheduled meetings: December 12, 2016

*Respectfully Submitted,*

*Mary S. Nimm  
Program Assistant*

**SET, SPIKE**  
| Olympics' spikers  
tournament | B1



**JEFFERSON:** Stray animals seeking loving homes | A6  
**FORT:** Middle school's quarterly honor roll announced | A9  
**KID SCOOP:** Recycle unwanted crayons for children | A10

# Daily Jefferson County Union

[www.dailyunion.com](http://www.dailyunion.com)

**TUESDAY**

ince 1870

Fort Atkinson, Wis.

November 29, 2016

Vol. 146 No. 180

75 Cents

an  
dies  
sh

lombia (AP)  
ne carrying a  
rison soccer  
ide Medellin  
the finals of  
ment, killing  
ian officials  
people ini-  
t one of them  
pital.

erspace 146  
operated by a  
amed PaMia,  
gency and lost  
st before 10  
00 GMT) be-  
rical failure,  
es said.

hich had de-  
te Cruz, Bo-



#6

VOLUNTEER SERVICE —

authorities said. Santa Cruz, Bonse soccer team from Brazil for the first leg of a two-game Copa Libertadores final against Nacional of Medellin. as supposed to be a has turned into a Medellin Mayor Ferrerrez said from the rescue command

said in a brief state-Facebook page that accompany our athletes, journalists and s traveling with our America's soccer federation its condo the entire Chapmunity and said its (continued A8)

**VOLUNTEER SERVICE** — Employees of Beaver Tree Service of Fort Atkinson, owned by Jeffrey Schemm, spent Monday helping clear and widen a public parking area at the end of Vinnie Ha Ha Road in the Town of Koshkonong ... for free. The parking area often is utilized by ice fishers to access Lake Koshkonong during the winter months. The land cleared is owned by Jefferson County. Shown above, Brian Heinz, in the Bobcat, watches a tree being chewed into woodchips while Justin Judkins manages the woodchipper. Directly at right, Heinz uses the Bobcat to grab a tree trunk. At far right, Mike Koch tells Jefferson County Parks Department director Joe Nehmer what area the three workers planned to clear. — Union photos by Alexa Zoellner.



## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

### A GREAT SERVICE!

Editor, Daily Union: I would like to thank Jeff Schemm, owner of Beaver Tree Service, for a great job he and his crew did of clearing out all the overhanging trees and brush at the parking lot at the Vinnie HaHa Road so now more people can park ... donating his equipment and labor.

What a great service he did for the sportsmen and fishermen.

We have these accesses and the DNR, Jefferson County and Town of Koshkonong should be ashamed of not maintaining these public areas.

It takes a private citizen and private business owner to do our government's job once again!

Well done, Mr. Jeff Schemm. — Jeff Langholff and sons, Town of Koshkonong residents.

**Mary Nimm**

---

**Subject:** FW: accident

**From:** Joe Nehmer  
**Sent:** Monday, November 28, 2016 11:29 AM  
**To:** 'Beth Shropshire'  
**Subject:** RE: accident

Beth,

I am sorry for this event. I will forward this concern to field staff for additional consideration.

Please let me know if you would like me to present the idea of sharing the cost for a fence with our attorney. I will do so promptly at your request.

Respectfully,

Joe

---

**From:** Beth Shropshire [<mailto:bshire@hotmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 28, 2016 9:19 AM  
**To:** Joe Nehmer  
**Subject:** re: accident

Dear Joe,

I am writing to inform you that our dairy goat was attacked yesterday by a large black dog that came through Korth Park into our yard. She sustained injuries to her leg and the dog & owner are "off the hook" for damages done.

I thought you were going to be proactive? I see you placed only one dogs must be leashed sign. Trouble is no one sees it because it only faces our house. We thought the placement of the sign is in poor taste. When we asked for help with roaming dogs & privacy with a tree barrier .

Perhaps the Jefferson Co. Park Dept would be interested in paying for half of a fence line instead to keep our animals safe?

Beth Shropshire  
W8498 Korth Lane  
Lake Mills, WI. 53551



## CHAPTER 90

## FENCES

90.01	Fence viewers.	90.10	Compulsory repair of fence.
90.02	Legal fences; space between ground and bottom.	90.11	Cost of repairs.
90.03	Partition fences; when required.	90.12	Apportionment of cost of fence.
90.035	Public fences.	90.13	Partition fence on newly enclosed land.
90.04	Effect of fences on action for trespass by animals.	90.14	Fence on town line.
90.05	How partition made.	90.15	Fees of viewers; neglect of duty.
90.06	Relocation of fence.	90.16	Record of partition.
90.07	Division of partition fence.	90.20	Fencing of farm–raised deer that are not white–tailed deer.
90.08	Partition of fences in water.	90.21	Fencing of farm–raised deer; white–tailed deer.
90.09	Partition when land bounded by water.		

**90.01 Fence viewers.** The supervisors in their respective towns, the alderpersons of cities in their respective aldermanic districts, and the trustees of villages in their respective villages shall be fence viewers.

**History:** 1971 c. 304 s. 29 (1); 1993 a. 184.

Town supervisors are not authorized by this chapter to settle boundary disputes. 70 Atty. Gen. 187.

**90.02 Legal fences; space between ground and bottom. (1)** In this section, “high tensile wire” means wire with a tensile strength of 1,235 to 1,450 mega pascals or 179,000 to 210,000 pounds per square inch.

**(1m)** The following and none other are legal and sufficient fences:

(a) A fence of strong woven wire not less than 26 inches wide with 3 barbed wires or 3 high tensile wires above.

(b) A fence of strong woven wire not less than 30 inches wide with 2 barbed wires or 2 high tensile wires above.

(c) A fence of strong woven wire not less than 46 inches wide with one barbed wire or one high tensile wire above.

(d) A fence of strong woven wire not less than 50 inches wide.

(e) A fence of boards firmly fastened to posts well set, not more than 8 feet apart, the space between the boards to the height of 30 inches to be not more than 6 inches and at no point to be more than 10 inches.

(f) A fence of 2 boards with 3 barbed wires or 3 high tensile wires above, firmly fastened to sufficient posts well set not more than 8 feet apart, the space between the boards to be not more than 6 inches.

(g) A fence of 3 or more wires not less than No. 12, with pickets not less than 4 feet long properly woven in or fastened thereto, and set not more than 6 inches apart.

(h) All fences consisting of rails, boards, wires or walls, or any combination thereof, and all brooks, rivers, ponds, creeks, ditches, or hedges, which shall, in the judgment of the fence viewers, be equivalent to either of the fences before mentioned.

(i) The following minimum requirements shall constitute a standard electric fence and shall be a legal fence when agreed to in writing by the adjoining property owners. Such a fence shall consist of 2 strands of strong, tightly stretched wire, charged by a standard approved electric or battery fencer, and the top wire not over 36 inches and not less than 34 inches from the ground, measured at the post, and firmly fastened with insulators to sufficient post, firmly set, and not over 2 rods apart.

(j) A fence not less than 48 inches high of 4 or more barbed wires or high tensile wires spaced evenly on a steel post of any diameter or on a wood post at least 3 inches in diameter. Existing fences of a lesser standard are legal until they are rebuilt, repaired or replaced.

**(2)** The strands of woven wire shall not be smaller than No. 12 wire and the cross wires shall not be smaller than No. 16 wire; the

strands shall not be more than 8 inches apart, and the cross wires not more than 12 inches apart. All wires must be tightly stretched and securely fastened to sufficient posts firmly set not more than 16 feet apart, except as provided in sub. (1m) (f) or (i) and except that the posts may be set not more than 20 feet apart if the wire is high tensile wire. The space between barbed wires or high tensile wires shall not exceed 8 inches; and the space between the top board or upper edge of woven wire and the bottom barbed wire or high tensile wire shall not exceed 6 inches.

**(3)** Fences shall not be less than 50 inches high, and the bottom of the fence shall be not more than 4 inches from the ground, measurements to be made at the posts.

**History:** 1995 a. 41, 225, 417.

**90.03 Partition fences; when required.** The respective occupants of adjoining lands used and occupied for farming or grazing purposes, and the respective owners of adjoining lands when the lands of one of such owners is used and occupied for farming or grazing purposes, shall keep and maintain partition fences between their own and the adjoining premises in equal shares so long as either party continues to so occupy the lands, except that the occupants of the lands may agree to the use of markers instead of fences, and such fences shall be kept in good repair throughout the year unless the occupants of the lands on both sides otherwise mutually agree.

**History:** 1995 a. 41.

**90.035 Public fences.** Where the 2 parties, one of whom is the state or a subdivision thereof, agree that a fence is reasonably necessary, the duty to erect and maintain partition fences shall apply equally to the state, as provided in s. 90.03, and its subdivisions as occupants of lands whenever such lands are bounded by privately owned agricultural or grazing lands.

**90.04 Effect of fences on action for trespass by animals.** Owners of lands who do not maintain and keep in repair lawful partition fences may not recover any damages for trespasses by the animals of owners of any adjoining lands with whom partition fences might have been maintained if such lands had been enclosed; but the construction of such a fence does not relieve the owner of swine, horses, sheep or goats from liability for any damage they commit upon the enclosed premises of an adjoining owner.

**History:** 1995 a. 148.

**90.05 How partition made. (1)** (a) Every partition of a fence or of the line upon which partition fences are to be built between owners of adjoining lands, after being recorded in the town clerk’s office, obligates the owners, their heirs and assigns to build and maintain the fence in accordance with the partition, if any of the following conditions is met:

1. The partition is made by the owners of the adjoining lands and is in writing, signed and sealed by the owners and witnessed by 2 witnesses.

2. The partition is made by fence viewers in the manner provided under this chapter and is in writing under their hands.

(b) A partition made in accordance with par. (a) shall remain in effect so long as the adjoining land on each side respectively remains in the same ownership, and after a severance of ownership until a new partition of the fence is made.

(c) An owner, or the owner's heirs or assigns, are not obligated to build or maintain any part of a partition fence during any time when none of the adjoining lands is occupied for farming or grazing.

(2) If a fence is constructed by a subdivider under a town ordinance adopted under s. 60.23 (19) and the land adjoining the subdivision is not subdivided, the partition under sub. (1) shall require that an undivided one-half of the fence be maintained by the owner of the adjoining land not subdivided and one-half of the fence divided into equal shares be maintained by all of the owners of the adjoining subdivided land.

History: 1977 c. 229; 1983 a. 532 s. 36; 1991 a. 316; 1997 a. 253.

**90.06 Relocation of fence.** (1) When any owner or occupant of land builds a fence before a boundary line has been located between that land and any adjoining land and the location of the boundary line establishes that the fence is located on the adjoining land, the person who built the fence or that person's grantee, devisee or heirs shall be the owner of the fence. The owner of the fence shall relocate the fence to the boundary line within 30 days after service of written notice of the location of the fence upon the owner of the fence by the owner or occupant of the land upon which the fence is located.

(2) The notice under sub. (1) shall be served personally on the fence owner or by leaving a copy of the notice at the fence owner's usual place of abode with some member of the fence owner's family who is of suitable age and discretion. If the notice is left with a family member, the family member shall be informed of the contents of the notice.

(3) If the relocation of the fence is not made within 30 days after service of the notice under sub. (2), the party who served or caused the notice to be served may relocate the fence to the boundary line and recover the expense of doing so from the fence owner. However, no fence that is subject to relocation under this section shall be relocated by the party giving the notice during a time when annual crops will be damaged unless the owners or occupants of the adjoining lands mutually agree.

History: 1991 a. 316; 1997 a. 253.

**90.07 Division of partition fence.** (1) A division of a partition fence, or the line upon which a partition fence between adjoining lands shall be built, may be made by fence viewers in the following cases:

(a) When a division of a partition fence, or the line upon which a partition fence between adjoining lands shall be built, shall not have been made in the manner prescribed by s. 90.05, either of the owners of adjoining lands may have the line between that person's land and the adjoining land of any other person divided, and the portion upon which the respective owners shall erect their share of the partition fence assigned, regardless of whether that person's land be enclosed or not and regardless of whether such adjoining land be enclosed or not.

(b) When any lands belonging to different persons in severalty shall have been occupied in common or without a partition fence between them and one of the occupants shall be desirous to occupy that occupant's part in severalty, and the other shall refuse or neglect, on demand, to divide with the desiring occupant the line where the fence ought to be built or to build a sufficient fence on the part of the line belonging to the other occupant, when divided, the occupant desiring it may have the same divided and the share of each assigned.

(c) When any controversy shall arise about the right of the respective occupants in partition fences or their obligation to

maintain the same, either party may have the line divided and the share of each assigned.

(2) In either such case application may be made to 2 or more fence viewers of the town where the lands lie or to 2 or more fence viewers of 2 towns, if the lands lie in 2 towns, who, after 8 days' notice in writing to each party to be served as a summons is in a civil action in a court of record or by registered mail with return receipt requested in the case of a party who does not reside in this state, shall, in writing, divide the partition fence or line and assign to each owner or occupant that party's share thereof; and in each of said cases they shall also therein direct the time within which each party shall build or repair, as may be proper, that party's share of the fence, having regard to the season of the year, and shall file such decision in the town clerk's office, who shall record the same. If either party refuses or neglects to build or repair within the time so assigned that party's part of the fence the other may, after having completed his or her own part, build or repair such part and recover the expense thereof as provided in s. 90.11.

(3) Whenever practicable, in determining the division of a new line fence, when facing a farm, going around the farm to the right, the first one-half of the line fence belongs to the farm faced.

History: 1991 a. 316.

**90.08 Partition of fences in water.** Where a partition fence running into the water is necessary to be made the same shall be done in equal shares unless otherwise agreed by the parties, and in case either party shall refuse or neglect to make or maintain the share belonging to that party similar proceedings shall be had as in case of other fences and with the like effect.

History: 1991 a. 316.

**90.09 Partition when land bounded by water.** (1) When the boundary line between enclosed lands owned by different persons is a river, brook, pond or creek, which of itself is not a sufficient fence, and it is impracticable, without unreasonable expense, for a partition fence to be built on the true boundary line, and either owner or occupant refuses to join in making a partition fence on either side of the river, brook, pond or creek, or they disagree respecting making a partition fence, either party may apply to 2 or more fence viewers of the town, who, after giving notice as provided in s. 90.07, shall proceed to view the river, brook, pond or creek.

(2) If the fence viewers determine that the river, brook, pond or creek is not a sufficient fence and that it is impracticable, without unreasonable expense, to build a fence on the true boundary line, the fence viewers shall, in writing under their hands, determine how or on which side of the river, brook, pond or creek the fence shall be built or whether the fence shall be built partly on one side and partly on the other side. The fence viewers shall assign to each owner or occupant that owner's or occupant's share of the fence and the time within which the respective parties shall build the fence. The fence viewers shall file their determination in the office of the town clerk, who shall record the determination.

(3) If either party refuses or neglects to build that party's part of the fence within the time assigned by the fence viewers, the other party may, after having completed his or her own part, build the other party's part and recover the expense of building the other party's part of the fence as provided under s. 90.11.

(4) If the fence viewers determine that it is impracticable, either from the formation of the banks of the river, brook, pond or creek or for any other reason, to maintain any fence along or near the boundary line, they shall give written notice to the parties of that determination.

History: 1991 a. 316; 1997 a. 253.

**90.10 Compulsory repair of fence.** If any person neglects to repair or rebuild any partition fence that by law that person is required to maintain, the aggrieved party may complain to 2 or more fence viewers of the town, who, after giving notice as provided in s. 90.07, shall examine the fence. If the fence viewers determine that the fence is insufficient, they shall inform the delin-

quent party of the insufficiency and direct the delinquent party to repair or rebuild the fence within a time that the fence viewers determine is reasonable. If the fence is not repaired or rebuilt within the time fixed by the fence viewers, the complainant may repair or rebuild the fence and recover the expense of repairing or rebuilding the fence as provided under s. 90.11.

**History:** 1991 a. 316; 1997 a. 253.

**90.11 Cost of repairs.** (1) (a) Whenever any owner or occupant of land has built, repaired or rebuilt any fence, pursuant to the provisions of this chapter, that the adjoining owner or occupant has been lawfully directed by fence viewers to build, repair or rebuild but has failed to do within the time prescribed, the owner or occupant who built, repaired or rebuilt the fence may complain to any 2 or more fence viewers of the town.

(b) The fence viewers complained to under par. (a) shall, after having given notice to the defaulting adjoining owner or occupant as provided in s. 90.07, examine the fence and ascertain the expense of building, repairing or rebuilding the fence. If the fence viewers adjudge the fence sufficient they shall give to the complaining party a certificate under their hands of their decision and of the amount of the expense of building, repairing or rebuilding the fence and of the fees of the fence viewers.

(c) Upon receipt of the fence viewers' certificate, the complaining party may demand the amount of the expense determined by the fence viewers, together with the fence viewers' fees, from the defaulting, adjoining owner or occupant. If the adjoining owner or occupant fails to pay the expenses and fees for one month after the complaining party has demanded payment, the amount of expenses and fees together with interest at the rate of 1 percent per month shall constitute a special charge and lien against the adjoining owner's or occupant's lands and may be recovered in the manner provided in sub. (2).

(2) (a) The complaining party may file the certificate executed and delivered to him or her under sub. (1) (b) with the clerk of the town in which the lands charged with the expense and fees set forth in the certificate are located. Upon the filing of the certificate, the town clerk shall issue a warrant for the amount of the listed expenses and fees upon the town treasurer payable to the person to whom the certificate was executed and delivered.

(b) The amount paid by the town treasurer under par. (a) together with interest at the rate of 1 percent per month shall be included by the town clerk in the next tax roll as a special charge against the lands charged with the expense and fees. The special charge shall be collected by the town treasurer with the other taxes in the town. Any special charge under this paragraph remaining unpaid shall be added to the list of delinquent taxes returned to the county treasurer. The county treasurer shall collect the delinquent special charge or sell the land as for delinquent taxes. All proceedings in relation to the sale of land for a delinquent special charge shall be the same in all respects as in the case of land sold for other delinquent taxes. Every county treasurer who shall collect or receive any moneys on account of delinquent charges under this subsection shall pay the moneys received to the treasurer of the proper town.

**History:** 1991 a. 316; 1997 a. 253.

The remedy in this section is the exclusive remedy available for the recovery of costs of repairing a fence that an adjoining owner or occupant had been lawfully directed by fence viewers to build or repair. The fence viewers' determination of recoverable expenses is subject to common law certiorari review. *Tomaszewski v. Giera*, 2003 WI App 65, 260 Wis. 2d 569, 659 N.W.2d 882, 02–2409.

**90.12 Apportionment of cost of fence.** When, in any controversy that may arise between occupants of adjoining lands as to their respective rights in any partition fence, it shall appear to the fence viewers that either of the occupants had, before any complaint made to them, voluntarily erected the whole fence, or more than that occupant's just share of the same, or otherwise become proprietor thereof, the other occupant shall pay for so much as may be assigned to him or her to repair or maintain; the just value

thereof which the other occupant ought to pay shall be ascertained by proceeding as prescribed in s. 90.11.

**History:** 1991 a. 316.

**90.13 Partition fence on newly enclosed land.**

(1) When any previously unenclosed land is enclosed, the owner or occupant of the newly enclosed land shall pay for 50 percent of each partition fence standing upon the line between that owner's or occupant's land and the enclosure of any other owner or occupant, unless the line has been previously divided. If the line has been previously divided, the owner or occupant of the newly enclosed land shall pay the value of the fence on the part of the line previously assigned to that owner or occupant. In either case, the value of the fence at the time shall be ascertained on the application of either adjoining owner or occupant as provided in s. 90.11, if the parties do not agree.

(2) If the responsible owner or occupant fails to pay the value for 60 days after the value has been ascertained and demand made, the proprietor of the fence may recover the value with the fence viewers' fees and costs.

**History:** 1991 a. 316; 1997 a. 253.

**90.14 Fence on town line.** In all cases where the line upon which a partition fence is to be made or to be divided is the boundary line between towns or partly in one town and partly in another a fence viewer shall be taken from each town; and divisions of such fences by them or by agreement of the parties shall be recorded in the office of the clerk of each town.

**90.15 Fees of viewers; neglect of duty.** A fence viewer is entitled to the following fees and expenses for services rendered under this chapter: daily employment, mileage, service of notice or process and folios written. The rate of pay for the fees and expenses shall be set by the viewer's city, village or town. The fees and expenses shall be paid equally by the parties to the controversy, and if any of them neglect to pay the same within 30 days after the services are performed, each fence viewer may recover from delinquent parties jointly double the amount of the fees and expenses. A fence viewer who neglects to perform his or her duties shall forfeit \$5 and be liable to the injured party for damages. Fence viewers may administer oaths for purposes of this chapter.

**History:** 1979 c. 221.

**90.16 Record of partition.** Every partition of a division fence or line made by fence viewers, signed and recorded as hereinbefore provided, and the record or a certified copy thereof, shall be presumptive evidence of the regularity of all the proceedings prior to the making thereof.

**90.20 Fencing of farm-raised deer that are not white-tailed deer.** (1) **DEFINITIONS.** In this section:

(a) "Farm-raised deer" has the meaning given in s. 95.001 (1) (ag).

(b) "Heavily galvanized" means having a zinc coating weighing 230 grams per square meter or 0.8 ounces per square foot.

(c) "High tensile" means having a tensile strength of 179,000 to 210,000 pounds per square inch.

(d) "Medium tensile" means having a tensile strength of 101,000 to 123,000 pounds per square inch.

(2) **SPECIFICATIONS.** Unless s. 90.21 or 95.55 (1) (c) applies, any person who keeps farm-raised deer shall keep the farm-raised deer enclosed by a fence that meets all of the following requirements:

(a) Except for animals of the genus *rangifer*, the fence is at least 7 feet 10 inches high and is a woven wire fence that satisfies sub. (3), is a high tensile fence that satisfies sub. (4) or, if made of other materials, is of a design and level of strength that provides equivalent retentive capacity. The top 6 inches of the fence may consist of a single strand of smooth high tensile wire.

**90.20 FENCES**

Updated 13–14 Wis. Stats. 4

(b) For animals of the genus *rangifer*, the fence is at least 5 feet high and is a woven wire fence that satisfies sub. (3), is a high tensile fence that satisfies sub. (4) or, if made of other materials, is of a design and level of strength that provides equivalent retentive capacity.

(c) If the fence is made with wood posts, all of the following apply:

1. The posts are at least 12 feet long.
2. The tops of the line posts are, if rectangular, at least 3.5 inches in the smallest dimension or, if round, at least 3.5 inches in diameter.
3. The tops of the corner and gate posts are, if rectangular, at least 5.5 inches in the smallest dimension or, if round, at least 5.5 inches in diameter.
4. The wires are held securely to the posts, allowing for free movement of the horizontal line wires, using 9-gauge staples of at least 1.5 inch size.

(d) If the fence is made with steel or iron posts, the posts are at least 11 feet long or, if the posts are of the type known as T post, the posts are at least 10 feet long.

(e) The wires are installed on the side of the fence toward the farm-raised deer except at corners.

**(3) WOVEN WIRE FENCE.** A woven wire fence satisfies the requirements of this subsection if all of the following apply:

- (a) The wire is 14 1/2 gauge or heavier.
- (b) If the wire is 14 1/2 gauge, the mesh is not larger than 36 square inches.
- (c) If the wire is heavier than 14 1/2 gauge, the mesh is not larger than 48 square inches.
- (d) The posts are not more than 12 feet apart.

**(4) HIGH TENSILE FENCE.** A high tensile fence satisfies the requirements of this subsection if all of the following apply:

- (a) The horizontal line wires are not less than 2.5 millimeters in size and are heavily galvanized high tensile wire.
- (b) The vertical stay wires are not less than 2.5 millimeters in size and are heavily galvanized medium tensile wire.
- (c) The knot wire is not less than 2.24 millimeters in size and is heavily galvanized mild steel.
- (d) The distance between vertical stay wires is not more than 6 inches.
- (e) The distance between horizontal line wires is not more than 4 inches in the bottom foot of the fence, is not more than 6.5 inches in the next 2 feet of the fence and is not more than 8.5 inches in the rest of the fence.
- (f) The posts are not more than 20 feet apart.

**History:** 1995 a. 79; 2001 a. 56; 2005 a. 409.

**90.21 Fencing of farm-raised deer; white-tailed deer.**

**(1) DEFINITIONS.** In this section:

- (a) “Department” means the department of natural resources.
- (b) “Farm-raised deer” has the meaning given in s. 95.001 (1) (ag).

**(2) REQUIREMENTS.** (a) No person may keep farm-raised deer if any of the farm-raised deer are white-tailed deer unless all of the farm-raised deer are contained in a fenced area for which the person holds a valid fence inspection certificate issued by the department under this section.

(b) The department may not issue a fence inspection certificate under this section for a fence that is used to contain farm-raised deer that are white-tailed deer unless the fence meets the requirements established by the department by rule under sub. (6).

(c) No person may apply for registration under s. 95.55 in order to keep farm-raised deer that are white-tailed deer without being first issued a fence inspection certificate under this section.

(d) Notwithstanding pars. (a) and (b), a person may keep farm-raised deer and the department shall issue a fence inspection certificate under this section if the fence complies with s. 95.55 (1) (c) 2.

**(3) FEES.** (a) The fee for a fence inspection certificate issued under this section is \$50 for a fenced area that is less than 80 acres in size and \$100 for a fenced area that is 80 acres or more in size.

(b) If a person expands a fenced area that is less than 80 acres in size during the period that the fence inspection certificate issued under this section is valid so that the fenced area is 80 acres or more in size, the person shall apply for a new fence inspection certificate and pay an additional fee of \$50.

(c) A fence inspection certificate issued under par. (a) or (b) shall be valid from the date of issuance until the 10th December 31 following the date of issuance.

**(4) NEW OPERATIONS; DRIVING OUT OF WILD DEER.** A person who is starting an operation to keep farm-raised deer that are white-tailed deer and who is applying for a fence inspection certificate under this section shall make a reasonable effort to drive any wild white-tailed deer from the area to be fenced before the area is completely closed. No person may place any baiting material in attempt to attract white-tailed deer to remain in the fenced area. If the department issues a certificate under this section, the department shall determine whether any white-tailed deer remaining in the area after the area is completely closed will be killed or will be sold to the holder of the certificate. If the white-tailed deer are to be killed, the department shall determine how the deer will be killed. If the white-tailed deer are to be sold, the holder of the certificate shall pay the department the fair market value for each deer.

**(5) EXISTING OPERATIONS.** A person who holds a license under s. 29.871, 1999 stats., on January 1, 2003, may continue to keep white-tailed deer, and the department shall automatically issue the person a fence inspection certificate under this section that will be valid during the period beginning on January 1, 2003, and ending on the 30th day after the effective date of the rules promulgated under sub. (6).

**(6) RULES.** The department shall promulgate rules to establish requirements for fences for which fence inspection certificates are issued under this section. If the rules include provisions authorizing the placement of fences in navigable bodies of water, s. 30.12 does not apply to fences placed in compliance with these rules.

**(7) ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.** If a fence fails to comply with the requirements established by rule under sub. (6), the department may issue an order directing the person who is required to maintain the fence to bring the fence into compliance within 10 days after the issuance of the order. If the person fails to comply with the order within 10 days of its issuance, the department may revoke the applicable fence inspection certificate.

**(8) PENALTIES.** (a) Any person who violates this section, or a rule promulgated under this section, shall be subject to a forfeiture of not more than \$200.


(b) In addition to or in lieu of the forfeiture specified in par. (a), a court may suspend a fence inspection certificate issued under this section, a registration issued under s. 95.55 that authorizes the defendant to keep farm-raised deer, or both, for a period of up to 3 years.











(c) The department may revoke any fence inspection certificate issued under this section to which any of the following applies:


1. The holder fails to comply with an order issued under sub. (7).
2. The department determines that the certificate was fraudulently procured, or erroneously issued.

**History:** 2001 a. 56, 105; 2005 a. 409.

# Jefferson County Land Information



- |  |   |
|--|---|
|  Municipal Boundaries  |  Section Lines       |
|  Property Boundary     |  Surface Water       |
|  Old Lot/Meander Lines |  Map Hooks           |
|  Rail Right of Ways    |  Tax Parcels         |
|  Road Right of Ways    |  Streams and Ditches |



**From:** [Joe Nehmer](#)  
**To:** [Kaela Hutter](#); [Kevin Wiesmann](#); [Mary Nimm](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Caller Complaint  
**Date:** Friday, November 11, 2016 9:10:49 AM

---

Please have this as an agenda item in December.

---

**From:** Kaela Hutter  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 10, 2016 3:02 PM  
**To:** Kevin Wiesmann; Mary Nimm; Joe Nehmer  
**Subject:** Caller Complaint

Just thought I'd share with you all a phone call I just received:

The caller stated him and his wife walk Dorothy Carnes park every afternoon. He stated in the past 2 weeks he has seen 9 dogs without leashes, and 2 of those dogs jumped on him and his wife, almost knocking his wife on the ground.

He was upset that they may have to stop their every afternoon walk for their safety.

I told him it is hard to be able to do much when we don't have names of people as there are already signs posted stating dogs must be on leashes, but thanked him for calling and letting us know.

He understood that, and just wanted to pass the message on and asked if it was possible for a parks worker to remind people of the leash rule.....

He did have one vehicle license #

Kaela



## Waukesha County

### *Department of Parks and Land Use*

November 17, 2016

Joe Nehmer  
Jefferson County Parks Director  
320 S. Main Street Room 204  
Jefferson WI 53551

Dear Joe:

Please accept this letter as confirmation that Waukesha County agrees transfer jurisdiction of an 8-mile segment of snowmobile trail corridor number 9 that runs through Jefferson County for the 2017-2018 snowmobile operation season. The number 9 Trail Corridor runs from north to south through the Towns of Ixonia and Concord. Lake LaBelle Cooney Riders have established a 4.5-mile in the Town of Ixonia and 3.5 miles in the Town of Concord ending at Highway DR (the "Ixonia-Concord Trail Segment") (see attached map).

State funded snowmobile trails need to be designated for use by snowmobile operators by the governmental agency having jurisdiction. Currently, the Lake LaBelle Cooney Riders established, maintain and insure the Ixonia-Concord Trail Segment and will receive their 2016-17 funding through the Waukesha County Snowmobile Association. The Waukesha County Snowmobile Association will work cooperatively with Jefferson County for the 2017-18 snowmobile season.

For the 2016-2017 season, and with Jefferson County's permission, Waukesha County will fund the Ixonia-Concord Trail Segment with the Waukesha County Snowmobile Association. In 2017 Waukesha County will deduct 8-miles of State trail funding and Jefferson County will add 8-miles to your State trail funding request. Please know, Waukesha County Snowmobile Association has always been very professional in their management and operation of their trail grooming operations.

If you are in agreement with this transfer, please respond to me in writing and copy Ann Loechler, Faith Murray and Catherine Burrow, all with the State of Wisconsin to complete this agreement.


Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Duane A. Grimm", is written over a horizontal line.

Duane A. Grimm  
Parks Manager  
Waukesha County Parks and Land Use  
515 W. Moreland Blvd Room AC230  
Waukesha WI 53188

#### **Park System**

515 W Moreland Blvd., AC 230 • Waukesha, Wisconsin 53188-3878  
Phone: (262) 548-7790 • Fax: (262) 896-8071 • [www.waukeshacountyparks.com](http://www.waukeshacountyparks.com)





# IXONIA

## T-8-N • R-16-E

© Farm & Home Publishers, Ltd.

See Page 76-78 For Additional Names.



-88.6523 NORTH SIDE DR

CONCORD PAGE 22

STATE OF Wisconsin  
Olin Sang Ruby  
TN of Ixonia  
STATE OF Wisconsin  
R+B Mallow  
R. Wahn  
B. Guse  
J. Marks TN. of Ixonia

**LCE LAKE COUNTRY ENGINEERING, INC.**  
\* Over 40 years of experience in Southeastern Wisconsin \*  
**Rob Davy, P.E.**                      **Mark Powers, R.L.S.**  
\* Surveying \* Residential \* Civil Engineering \* Commercial  
(262) 569-9331    www.LCE.biz  
970 S. Silver Lake St., Suite 105, Oconomowoc, WI 53066

D. Perrat  
R. Sauer  
J. Holzhueter  
S. Perrat  
4.5 miles



Steve Fernat  
 W.O. Roha & Exc.  
 D+M Wegner  
 D+M Wegner  
 D+M Wegner



**CONCORD**  
 T-7-N • R-16-E

TN. of Concord  
 R. Naekbarth  
 TN. of Concord  
 3.5 miles

C/R Trail ends at DR

See Page 70-72 For Additional Names.

IXONIA PAGE 27



SULLIVAN PAGE 18

**Dunneisen Excavating LLC.**  
**RANDY DUNNEISEN**  
 General Grading, Excavating and Trucking Contractor  
 HOME & OFFICE: W8697 Island Road  
 (920) 478-3074 • CELL: (920) 988-0372  
 SHOP: W8889 Highway 89  
 (920) 478-2544  
 Waterloo, Wisconsin 53594

**LCE LAKE COUNTRY ENGINEERING, INC.**  
 \* Over 40 years of experience in Southeastern Wisconsin \*  
**Rob Davy, P.E.**      **Mark Powers, R.L.S.**  
 \* Surveying \* Residential \* Civil Engineering \* Commercial  
 (262) 569-9331      www.LCE.biz  
 970 S. Silver Lake St., Suite 105, Oconomowoc, WI 53066

TOWN OF JEFFERSON  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE TOWN BOARD  
Monday, November 7, 2016 at 6:00PM  
St Coletta Cabin, Town of Jefferson Meeting Hall  
434 County Road Y Jefferson, WI 53549

Chair Nancy Emons called the Monday, November 7, 2016 Town of Jefferson Board Meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Board members present: Chair Nancy Emons, Supervisors Tyson Barnes, Jim Mode, Donna Hollinger and Tracie Stammer;, Clerk Tina Barnes. Treasurer Alice Fischer was absent.

Chair Emons said the meeting was posted October 31, 2016 and in compliance with the Open Meeting Law.

Supervisor Donna Hollinger moved to approve the Monday, November 7, 2016 Board Meeting Agenda. Seconded by Supervisor Tracie Stammer; carried on voice vote.

Supervisor Tyson Barnes moved to approve the Monday October 3, 2016 Board Meeting Minutes. Seconded by Supervisor Jim Mode; carried on voice vote.

Clerk Tina Banes read the bills totaling \$135,792.13. Supervisor Mode moved to approve payment of bills as presented. Seconded by Supervisor Stammer. Motion carried with roll call vote, 5 yes.

**Clerk Report/Correspondence:**

Clerk Tina Barnes reminded everyone there is an Election tomorrow. She reported processing 99 Absentee Ballots of which 54 were in-person and 45 mailed. This compared to the April Election number of Absentee Ballots totaling 39. Clerk Barnes asked the Board to consider moving the Town Board meeting date if it falls the night before an Election. Also stated for consideration, possibly hiring a Deputy Clerk to help with November Elections.

Clerk Barnes reported receiving an e-mail for Ted Behncke, St Coletta CEO, in regards to the gravel aprons that were installed along the driveway for St Coletta Cabin. Ted had asked the Town Board to consider paying for half the cost of the aprons. St Coletta will cover the cost of labor. Clerk Barnes will put this item on the December agenda for discussion.

Clerk Barnes also reported receiving more paper work for the 2016 Levy book.

Clerk Barnes read a letter of resignation from Nancy Emons for the Helenville Fire District Board. Supervisor Mode moved to accept the letter of resignation from Nancy Emons for the Helenville Fire District Board. Seconded by Supervisor Tyson Barnes; carried on voice vote.

Chair Emons handed out a copy of the WI Statement of Assessment report for the Town of Jefferson. She found the information from the report interesting.

**Board Reports:**

Supervisor Mode reported the County Board introduced the 2017 budget. They held a second meeting which was a public hearing on the 2017 budget and no one showed up. Supervisor Mode also reported the UW Extension reduced their staff by two employees and cut \$3 million dollars. The County Board also passed a Resolution to increase funding for children needing alternate care.

**Public Comment:**

Brian Jongetjes, Johns Disposal, presented material for the 2017 refuse and recycling services. The request is for a \$.20 per unit monthly increase. The cost would go from \$13.25 to \$13.45 per unit. Brain also presented the option of no price increase for 2017 and 2018 if the Town agrees to a new 6 year contract extension. The current contract ends on 12/31/17. Options for weekly garbage service were also given.

Assessor John Pounder gave assessment updates. Assessor Pounder provided the Wisconsin Department of Revenue Preliminary Major Class Comparison chart. The Town of Jefferson is in compliance with a 92.93 rating for residential and 110.53 rating for commercial. Next year the residential may be considered non-compliant. Assessor Pounder stated the most economical and best option to choose is the Interim Market Update plan. The Maintenance Contract will be provided at the December Board meeting. Supervisor Tyson Barnes asked about the cost of revaluations. Assessor Pounder stated he can provide the information for a Full Value Maintenance Contract. This contract would provide a 25% revaluation of all class properties with all revaluations being completed by the fourth year.

Frankie Fuller, Buena Vista Road, inquired about the roadside mowing. “Who decides when the mowing is done?” She has a concern with garlic mustard and the fear it will be spread by the mowing equipment. Chair Emons stated Jefferson County Highway Department does the mowing for the Town of Jefferson. Ms. Fuller stated she would contact the Jefferson County Highway Department about the mowing.

**Appoint Brian Mattke to Helenville Fire District Board:**

All Town Board members were in agreement to the appointment of Brian Mattke to the Helenville Fire District Board with the recent resignation of Nancy Emons.

**Plan Commission Report/ Zoning Requests:**

Chair Emons provided the Plan Commission minutes from the Thursday November 3, 2016 meeting. The Plan Commission recommended approval of the request by Jeffrey Reinkemeyer, N4096 Duck Creek Rd, Helenville, WI, for a variance to allow an addition to a non-conforming structure in excess of 50% and which will reduce the required setbacks from Markert Road right-of-way and center line. After discussion, Supervisor Tyson Barnes moved to approve the request by Jeffrey Reinkemeyer, N4096 Duck Creek Rd, Helenville, WI, for a variance to allow an addition to a non-conforming structure in excess of 50% and which will reduce the required setbacks from Markert Road right-of-way and center line. Seconded by Supervisor Mode; carried on voice vote.

**Jefferson County Parks Department- Request to cede right-of-way for Pohlman Park Silo:**

Blair Ward, Jefferson County Corporation Counsel, presented cost options for Pohlman Park Silo. The cost for restoration of the silo would be approximately \$27,800.00. Demolition of the silo would be approximately \$2,000.00. Another option presented was for the Town of Jefferson to cede the right of way to the Jefferson County Parks Department. Supervisor Mode asked if the whole distance of the park right-of-way would be needed. No, just enough space around the silo for maintenance work. Supervisor Mode moved to cede the necessary footage of right-of-way to maintain the silo if the silo is kept and not demolished. Seconded by Supervisor Hollinger. Motion carried with roll call vote, 5 yes.

Supervisor Tyson Barnes moved to amend the agenda and move item number 14 to follow item number 9. Seconded by Supervisor Mode; carried on voice vote.

**Popp Road/ Crawfish River Project:**

Supervisor Tyson Barnes stopped by the project site after the two and a half inches of rain was received. The soil had slid down to the top of the rocks. The seeding had not been completed. Water was seeping out of the side of the bank. Supervisor Tyson Barnes met with representatives from Ayres Associates, Michels Corporation and Highway Landscaping. Several options were discussed including adding more rock for thickness and to increase the rock level to the 100 year flood level. Supervisor Tyson Barnes reported the matting was installed horizontally and not vertically. Chair Emons reported Ayres had not signed off on the project since it was not complete. Michels and Highway Landscaping are still liable for the project site.

Cyndi Pitzner, a resident on Popp Road, brought forth concerns. She stated the rock level on the project is not sufficient. It is harvest time and the big machinery is having a hard time traveling down Popp Road. The road is not wide enough for a car to pass the farm machinery. Ms. Pitzner asked if added signage for farm machinery and lower speed limits could be installed. She also stated the guardrail is too short. Someone is going to run into the guardrail or run off the road into the river.

The Board had questions about the grant money covering any added project expenses. Chair Emons reported having talked with Jeff Soellner, grant manager. He stated that if the adjustment to scope is approved, 50% of the cost for the bank stabilization could be covered. Any type of signage or shoulder work on the road would not be covered.

Supervisor Tyson Barnes moved to provide more signage for Popp Road if needed as determined by the Highway Supervisor. Seconded by Supervisor Hollinger. Motion carried with roll call vote, 5 yes.

Supervisor Hollinger moved to add reflectors to the guardrail if needed on Popp Road. Seconded by Supervisor Mode. Motion carried with roll call vote, 5 yes.

**2017 Contracts/Agreements:**

Assessor John Pounder will present the 2017 Assessor's Contract at the December Town Board meeting.

Supervisor Tyson Barnes moved to continue the existing contract with Johns Disposal with an increase of \$.20 per unit increase. Seconded by Supervisor Hollinger. Motion carried with roll call vote, 5 yes.

The contract for the Jefferson County Humane Society will be held until the December Town Board meeting.

The City of Jefferson Fire Department contract update will be held until the December Town Board meeting. There is a meeting scheduled with the Towns and the Jefferson Fire Department staff on Wednesday November 9<sup>th</sup>.

The contract for the Jefferson EMS will continue as is. Supervisor Tyson Barnes questioned Sue Reinen, Jefferson EMS, about the coverage area. It appears the sections are wrong for the Town of Jefferson. Sue explained the boundaries are set by the Land Information Office. She will check into the problem and let Clerk Barnes know what she finds out.

No action needed for the Fort Atkinson Fire Department contract.

No action needed for the Ryan Brothers Ambulance Service contract.

Supervisor Tracie Stammer moved to accept and have Chair Emons sign the Joint Powers Agreement for 911 Services. Seconded by Supervisor Hollinger; carried on voice vote.

Clerk Tina Barnes presented the latest software upgrade, TownCMS v5, from TownWeb Design. The upgrade for the Town's website includes "Mobile Responsive Design." After discussion, the proposal from TownWeb Design will be held until the December Town Board meeting. Treasurer Alice Fischer was not in attendance. Financial questions arose about the current contract and the payments made to TownWeb Design.

**Preliminary 2017 Budget Review:**

The Board did not suggest any changes to the Town of Jefferson 2017 Preliminary Budget. Supervisor Tyson Barnes did mention there is not enough money for road maintenance.

**Set Time for 2017 Budget Hearing in December:**

Supervisor Tyson Barnes moved to set the time for the Town of Jefferson Budget Hearing on December 5, 2016 for 6:00 pm. Seconded by Supervisor Stammer; carried on voice vote.

**2016 Town Road Maintenance and Improvement Plan:**

Supervisor Stammer presented the updated 2016 Town Road Maintenance and Improvement Plan. Supervisor Stammer also presented the estimate from Dan Buss to finish brushing Paradise Road and Scheel Lane. The cost estimate was \$2100.00 or \$250.00 an hour. Walther and Bear Hole Roads would be an extra \$300.00. Supervisor Stammer moved to authorize Dan's Tree Service to finish brushing Paradise Road and Scheel Lane adding the brushing for Walther and Bear Hole Roads not to exceed \$2,400.00. Seconded by Supervisor Hollinger. Motion carried with roll call vote: Chair Emons-Yes, Supervisor Stammer-Yes, Supervisor Mode-Yes, Supervisor Hollinger-Yes, Supervisor Barnes-No, 4 yes and 1 no.

Supervisor Mode moved to adjourn the Monday November 7, 2016 Board Meeting at 8:53 p.m. Seconded by Supervisor Stammer; carried on voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Tina Barnes  
Clerk, Town of Jefferson

**Mary Nimm**

---

**Subject:** FW: Snowmobile Trail GPS - test results  
**Attachments:** TrailEditor.pdf; Courthouse.pdf

**From:** Gerald Kokkonen  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 06, 2016 2:14 PM  
**To:** Kevin Wiesmann  
**Cc:** Joe Nehmer; Mary Nimm  
**Subject:** RE: Snowmobile Trail GPS - test results

Hi Kevin,

On the aerial here the two methods side by side. Green is the Garmin 76; while the Gold is the higher end model.

My impressions:

- The Garmin can capture straight lines that are relatively close to the map grade gps, but any curves/corners are cut-off
- The Mapping gps unit is much better in gathering the corners and turns. You will notice up on the hill where things did not work out as planned. I attribute that to operator technical error. When I popped it on after filling up with gas it gathered data pretty much right on the road centerline with little deviation in the corners or at road speeds.

My suggestion is to use the mapping grade gps, due to these factors: accuracy & consistency; battery life; storage capacity allows for a full day's work; data is easily convertible to County data specs.

The Garmin could be used as a back-up or if things go wrong out in the field.

Give me a call with questions or other stuff.

*Gerry K*  
7117

### SHELTER PRICE COMPARRISONS

Location	Rental Price Range	Deposit Price Range	Tent Additional Charges	Park Rental Hours	Additional Information	4 Season or Pavillions?
JEFFERSON COUNTY	\$35-\$275	\$50-\$150	\$50 places in designated area	1/2 hour before sunrise to 1/2 after sunset		Pavillions
Portage County	\$65.00-110.00	\$100.00	Tent Rental \$25 a day	8am-11pm	Same price no matter group size	
Richland Center Community	\$45-\$80	Unknown	Tent Rental \$50 a day	Half hour before sunrise to midnight	200 max capacity	
Winnebago County	\$50-\$255	\$25	\$0	7am-11pm		
Middleton	\$75-\$175	\$50	\$0 if placed in designated area	8am-10pm	200 max capacity/ \$75 bounce house	
Wisconsin Rapids	\$80-\$125	\$100	unknown	8am-11pm		Both
Dodge County	\$50-\$250	\$100	\$0	7am-8:30pm		Pavillions
Wausaw & Marathon County	\$50-\$250	\$20 key/must \$200 deposit	\$0, \$200 deposit if damage is done	7:30am-midnight		
Rock County	\$75-\$125	\$50	unknown	5am-10pm	Over 500 guests requires a special event fee	Both
Dane County	\$60-\$200	non mentioned	There is a fee, you must call to get that	10am-9:30pm	Alcohol permit required/\$25 cancelation fee	Pavillions

2016



**Donations**

	\$5.00
	\$5.00
	\$5.00
	\$5.00
	\$5.00
	\$5.00
	\$5.00
	\$10.00
	\$10.00
	\$10.00
	\$10.00
	\$10.00
	\$10.00
	\$10.00
	\$10.00
	\$10.00
	\$20.00
	\$15.00
	\$15.00
	\$15.00
	\$25.00
	\$30.00
	\$35.00
	\$40.00
	\$50.00
	\$55.00
	\$100.00
	\$100.00
<b>\$</b>	<b>615.00</b>

**2017 Tags as of 12/9 = 254**

**2016 Tags as of 12/9 = 182**

State of Wisconsin  
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
3911 Fish Hatchery Road  
Fitchburg WI 53711

Scott Walker, Governor  
Cathy Stepp, Secretary  
Telephone 608-266-2621  
Toll Free 1-888-936-7463  
TTY Access via relay - 711



November 18, 2016

Joe Nehmer  
Jefferson Co. Parks  
311 S. Center Ave, Room 204  
Jefferson, WI 53549

Re: 2016 Knowles-Nelson Stewardship Application – Addition to Garman Nature Preserve

Dear Joe:

I am pleased to inform you that the County's Stewardship application for the 5.7 acre Addition to Garman Nature Preserve project has been tentatively selected to receive a grant in the amount of \$16,500 from the Urban Green Space Grant Program. The 2016 grant cycle was very competitive. The Department received 71 applications requesting over \$14 million in grant assistance for public outdoor recreation projects.


This letter represents tentative selection of your project for grant funding. Prior to execution of a final grant agreement, I will work closely with you to update project details and complete all reviews, approvals, and consultations required under applicable federal laws, state statutes, and administrative rules. This award is contingent on successful completion of this review and approval process. Please note that the final grant amount may change based on updated project information and detailed review of eligible project costs, and the appraisal review. I will contact you shortly to discuss next steps. If the County hasn't already done it, please order an appraisal report on the subject 5.7 acre property. Please contact me for additional details and appraisal guidelines.

**You should not purchase any lands, prior to execution of a signed grant agreement unless you are willing to assume the risk of absorbing those costs.**

If you are no longer interested in receiving this grant, please let me know as soon as possible so that the Department can contact others on the ranked list of projects regarding a tentative grant award.

I will remain as your primary Department point of contact for this project. Please call me at 608-275-3218 at any time. Again, congratulations on the tentative selection of your project. I look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,



Cheryl Housley  
Community Services Specialist

cc: Mary Nimm – Jefferson Co. Parks

## Mary Nimm

---

**Subject:** FW: 5.7 acre Garman Preserve Addition

**From:** Mo Hansen [<mailto:cityhall@waterloowi.us>]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 21, 2016 3:19 PM  
**To:** Joe Nehmer; Blair Ward  
**Cc:** Mary Nimm; Timothy Fenner  
**Subject:** RE: 5.7 acre Garman Preserve Addition

Joe & Blair,

After consulting with City of Waterloo Attorney, Tim Fenner, I'm am replying here to Cheryl Housley's City items mentioned below, and Mary's earlier email.

1. Fishing is permitted in areas zoned Conservancy.
2. Trapping, hiking and CC-skiing are permissible.
3. Addressing Mary Nimm's morning email.
  - a. See [§278-2 Possession and use of firearms and other dangerous weapons](#). Discharge of a firearm is prohibited. The granting of a conditional use would allow for an exception. The Mayor today express reservations about creating an exception. Alderperson Tim Thomas (chair of public safety committee) has not replied back.
  - b. §278-2(D)(2)(c) Bow hunting is not allowed on public property.

*Mo Hansen*  
Clerk/Treasurer  
City of Waterloo  
office: 920.478.3025  
[CityHall@Waterloowi.us](mailto:CityHall@Waterloowi.us)

*Follow Waterloo on Facebook >*  
**| WEB | [INFO ALERTS SIGN-UP](#) |**

---

136 North Monroe Street • Waterloo, WI 53594-1198 • Fax: 920.478.2021

**From:** Joe Nehmer [<mailto:JoeN@jeffersoncountywi.gov>]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 21, 2016 1:17 PM  
**To:** Blair Ward <[JBlairW@jeffersoncountywi.gov](mailto:JBlairW@jeffersoncountywi.gov)>  
**Cc:** Benjamin Wehmeier <[BenjaminW@jeffersoncountywi.gov](mailto:BenjaminW@jeffersoncountywi.gov)>; Mary Nimm <[maryn@jeffersoncountywi.gov](mailto:maryn@jeffersoncountywi.gov)>; Augie Tietz <[AugieT@jeffersoncountywi.gov](mailto:AugieT@jeffersoncountywi.gov)>; City Hall ([cityhall@waterloowi.us](mailto:cityhall@waterloowi.us)) <[cityhall@waterloowi.us](mailto:cityhall@waterloowi.us)>  
**Subject:** FW: 5.7 acre Garman Preserve Addition

Blair,

Your assistance is needed.

Thank you,

Joe

---

**From:** Housley, Cheryl - DNR [<mailto:Cheryl.Housley@wisconsin.gov>]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 21, 2016 1:08 PM  
**To:** Joe Nehmer

Cc: Mary Nimm

Subject: RE: 5.7 acre Garman Preserve Addition

Hi Joe,

As we are navigating this "use" issue on the Garman Preserve Addition property and other grant acquisition projects, we asking grant sponsors to confirm with their legal counsel ordinances and NBOA use info. just so we are certain that we are correctly representing any prohibitions in our public notice and to the Natural Resources Board. In this case for the Garman Addition, I would appreciate information/documentation by that confirms the following:

- Please confirm that County does not have an ordinance that prohibits NBOAs proposed at Garman Addition prop. (hiking, trapping, cc-ckiing & fishing).
- Please confirm with the City of Waterloo Attorney that hunting is prohibited under their ordinance. Please also confirm that trapping is allowed under the City's ordinances at Garman Addition prop., as well as hiking, cc-skiing, & fishing.

An email or letter from legal staff regarding the County and City ordinances is appreciated to document a more formal local rule review before we go out for public notice. I would appreciate the legal reviews on or before 12/7/2016.

Thank you.

-Cheryl

**We are committed to service excellence.**

Visit our survey at <http://dnr.wi.gov/customersurvey> to evaluate how I did.

*Cheryl Housley*

(📞) phone: (608) 275-3218

(✉️) e-mail: [Cheryl.Housley@Wisconsin.gov](mailto:Cheryl.Housley@Wisconsin.gov)

---

**From:** Joe Nehmer [<mailto:JoeN@jeffersoncountywi.gov>]

**Sent:** Friday, November 18, 2016 11:40 AM

**To:** Housley, Cheryl - DNR

**Cc:** James Schroeder; Augie Tietz; Benjamin Wehmeier; Kevin Wiesmann; Kaela Hutter; Mary Nimm; Joni Crave ([cjbcrave@gmail.com](mailto:cjbcrave@gmail.com))

**Subject:** RE: 5.7 acre Garman Preserve Addition

Hi Cheryl,

As we spoke yesterday, Jefferson County intends to open the parcel to permitted trapping. Our plans are to do this in consultation with DNR staff.

Sincerely,

Joe

---

**From:** Housley, Cheryl - DNR [<mailto:Cheryl.Housley@wisconsin.gov>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 12:44 PM

**To:** Joe Nehmer

**Subject:** RE: 5.7 acre Garman Preserve Addition

Hi Joe – I met today with the Regional Warden Staff regarding Nature Based Outdoor Activities as required by NR52 for Stewardship funded properties.

They can support the County's prohibition of archery and firearms on the 5.7 acres because of safety reasons, however they indicated the parcel could safely support trapping even once the trail loop is developed on the property. Dog's are permitted in the park, but must be on leash, so there is not a perceived use conflict with dog walkers.

I respectfully ask you to consider opening the 5.7 acre parcel for trapping in order for it to be eligible for a Stewardship grant award.

If you determine trapping is contrary to the spirit and intent of the deed restriction, then I respectfully ask for the County to withdraw its application for Stewardship grant funds.

Thank you,

-Cheryl

**We are committed to service excellence.**

Visit our survey at <http://dnr.wi.gov/customersurvey> to evaluate how I did.

*Cheryl Housley*

(📞) phone: (608) 275-3218

(✉️) e-mail: [Cheryl.Housley@Wisconsin.gov](mailto:Cheryl.Housley@Wisconsin.gov)

---

**From:** Joe Nehmer [<mailto:JoeN@jeffersoncountywi.gov>]

**Sent:** Friday, November 04, 2016 3:44 PM

**To:** Housley, Cheryl - DNR

**Subject:** RE: 5.7 acre Garman Preserve Addition

Thank you, Cheryl.

---

**From:** Housley, Cheryl - DNR [<mailto:Cheryl.Housley@wisconsin.gov>]

**Sent:** Friday, November 04, 2016 3:37 PM

**To:** Joe Nehmer

**Subject:** RE: 5.7 acre Garman Preserve Addition

Thanks Joe for this response and clarifying the deed terms with your corp. counsel.

I will take your reply to our grant management and safety warden and get back with you next week.

Enjoy this great fall weather!

-Cheryl

**We are committed to service excellence.**

Visit our survey at <http://dnr.wi.gov/customersurvey> to evaluate how I did.

*Cheryl Housley*

(📞) phone: (608) 275-3218

(✉️) e-mail: [Cheryl.Housley@Wisconsin.gov](mailto:Cheryl.Housley@Wisconsin.gov)

---

**From:** Joe Nehmer [<mailto:JoeN@jeffersoncountywi.gov>]

**Sent:** Friday, November 04, 2016 10:26 AM

**To:** Housley, Cheryl - DNR; Mary Nimm

**Cc:** Blair Ward

**Subject:** RE: 5.7 acre Garman Preserve Addition

Hi Cheryl,

I have spoken with our corporation counsel about your questions. I believe his comment answers both questions. Attorney Blair Ward informed me that Jefferson County does not have the authority to lift the deed restrictions.

We desire the Stewardship grant, and believe hunting and trapping should only be allowed to reduce the population of an overabundant species. Should such a situation arise, we would close the entire nature preserve while addressing the matter.

Please note on the attachment the plan to extend our trail system into the 5.7 acre addition. We feel this is too small of an area to allow for safe hunting and trapping.

We will await your further guidance.

Sincerely,

Joe

---

**From:** Housley, Cheryl - DNR [<mailto:Cheryl.Housley@wisconsin.gov>]

**Sent:** Monday, October 24, 2016 3:28 PM

**To:** Joe Nehmer; Mary Nimm

**Subject:** 5.7 acre Garman Preserve Addition

Mary and Joe,

Thanks for the conversation last week regarding the County's application to aide with funding the 5.7-acre Fiedorowicz addition to Garman Preserve.

Per the application, hunting is prohibited and trapping would be allowed by County permit (City ordinance is silent on the issue of trapping).

Here is the explanation of why we have these questions:

Pursuant to Wis. Stats 29.0916, lands acquired Stewardship funds are to be open to the public for all Nature Based Outdoor Activities (NBOAs) including hunting, fishing, trapping, hiking, and cross country skiing as defined in NR52. As it has been explained to me, NR 52.05(1) only allows the NRB to approve a prohibition for two reasons: 1) for public safety OR 2) to protect unique animal or plant communities. If there is no public safety concern for hunting/trapping on this 5.7 acre property (likely few safety concerns only a small area of the parcel w/in 300' radius of residence) and there were no unique animal/plant communities on the subject property that require protection indicated in the application; then the NRB cannot approve the prohibition...even if they thought it was a good idea.

I think I may have given the NRB more oversight on this issue in our conversation earlier, and it is really NR52 that is the precluding rule which creates this problem for the CO's application.

These are the two questions that we would like to have the County answer in order to know if the parcels fits Stewardship's NBOA requirements:

*1)Does the County have the authority to lift the deed restriction?*

*And*

*2)Once restriction removed, would the County be willing to open the 5.7 acres to hunting (work with the City to allow hunting by County permit)?*

Thank you for taking the time to consider these changes to the proposed uses if funded with a Stewardship grant.  
-Cheryl

**We are committed to service excellence.**

Visit our survey at <http://dnr.wi.gov/customersurvey> to evaluate how I did.

*Cheryl Housley*

Community Services Specialist - Community and Financial Assistance Bureau/CAES Division

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources - South Central Region

(☎) **phone:** (608) 275-3218

(☎) **fax:** (608) 275-3338


(✉) **e-mail:** [Cheryl.Housley@Wisconsin.gov](mailto:Cheryl.Housley@Wisconsin.gov)















[dnr.wi.gov](http://dnr.wi.gov)



# Private Residences Adjacent To GNP




- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  Municipal Boundaries  |  Section Lines       |  2 ft contour interval |
|  Property Boundary     |  Surface Water       |   |
|  Old Lot/Meander Lines |  Map Hooks           |   |
|  Rail Right of Ways    |  Tax Parcels         |   |
|  Road Right of Ways    |  Streams and Ditches |   |






# GNP Trail Concept



- |                       |                     |                       |
|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Municipal Boundaries  | Section Lines       | 2 ft contour interval |
| Property Boundary     | Surface Water       |                       |
| Old Lot/Meander Lines | Map Hooks           |                       |
| Rail Right of Ways    | Tax Parcels         |                       |
| Road Right of Ways    | Streams and Ditches |                       |



Jefferson County Geographic Information System

DISCLAIMER: This map is not a substitute for an actual field survey or onsite investigation. The accuracy of this map is limited to the quality of the records from which it was assembled. Other inherent inaccuracies occur during the compilation process. Jefferson County makes no warranty whatsoever concerning this information.

Printed on: ~~9~~ October 26, 2016  
 Author: Public User

Jefferson County  
Parks Totals

Date Ran 11/21/2016  
Period 10  
Year 2016

Business Unit	Description	Current Period Actual	Current Period Budget	YTD Actual	YTD Budget	Prorated Variance	Total Budget	Annual Remaining	Percentage Of Budget
1801 Parks	Revenue	(62,848.81)	(63,568.50)	(670,027.10)	(635,685.00)	(34,342.10)	(762,822.00)	(92,794.90)	87.84%
	Expenditures	63,776.11	75,822.75	643,346.26	758,227.50	(114,881.24)	909,873.00	266,526.74	70.71%
	Other Finances	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	#DIV/0!
<b>Total</b>		<b>927.30</b>	<b>12,254.25</b>	<b>(26,680.84)</b>	<b>122,542.50</b>	<b>(149,223.34)</b>	<b>147,051.00</b>	<b>173,731.84</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
1806 Carol Liddle	Revenue	(29.93)	-	(279.48)	-	(279.48)	-	279.48	#DIV/0!
	Expenditures	-	6,802.33	-	68,023.26	(68,023.26)	81,627.91	81,627.91	0.00%
	Other Finances	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	#DIV/0!
<b>Total</b>		<b>(29.93)</b>	<b>6,802.33</b>	<b>(279.48)</b>	<b>68,023.26</b>	<b>(68,302.74)</b>	<b>81,627.91</b>	<b>81,907.39</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
1809 Carlin Weld	Revenue	-	(2,083.33)	(75.60)	(20,833.33)	20,757.73	(25,000.00)	(24,924.40)	0.30%
	Expenditures	-	4,166.67	205.00	41,666.67	(41,461.67)	50,000.00	49,795.00	0.41%
	Other Finances	-	2,083.33	-	20,833.33	(20,833.33)	25,000.00	25,000.00	0.00%
<b>Total</b>		<b>-</b>	<b>4,166.67</b>	<b>129.40</b>	<b>41,666.67</b>	<b>(41,537.27)</b>	<b>50,000.00</b>	<b>49,870.60</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
1811 Korth Park	Revenue	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	#DIV/0!
	Expenditures	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	#DIV/0!
	Other Finances	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	#DIV/0!
<b>Total</b>		<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
1812 Carnes Park	Revenue	(11,666.66)	(5,688.00)	(25,630.65)	(56,880.00)	31,249.35	(68,256.00)	(42,625.35)	37.55%
	Expenditures	3,629.23	21,802.29	130,139.56	218,022.94	(87,883.38)	261,627.53	131,487.97	49.74%
	Other Finances	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	#DIV/0!
<b>Total</b>		<b>(8,037.43)</b>	<b>16,114.29</b>	<b>104,508.91</b>	<b>161,142.94</b>	<b>(56,634.03)</b>	<b>193,371.53</b>	<b>88,862.62</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
1813 Park Buildings	Revenue	(1,392.67)	(1,392.67)	(14,666.70)	(13,926.67)	(740.03)	(16,712.00)	(2,045.30)	87.76%
	Expenditures	807.22	1,392.67	10,812.20	13,926.67	(3,114.47)	16,712.00	5,899.80	64.70%
	Other Finances	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	#DIV/0!
<b>Total</b>		<b>(585.45)</b>	<b>(0.00)</b>	<b>(3,854.50)</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>(3,854.50)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,854.50</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
1814 Garman Nature	Revenue	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	#DIV/0!
	Expenditures	-	41.67	-	416.67	(416.67)	500.00	500.00	0.00%
	Other Finances	-	(14.23)	-	(142.34)	142.34	(170.81)	(170.81)	0.00%
<b>Total</b>		<b>-</b>	<b>27.43</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>274.33</b>	<b>(274.33)</b>	<b>329.19</b>	<b>329.19</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
1816 Glacial Heritage	Revenue	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	#DIV/0!
	Expenditures	-	1,837.83	-	18,378.33	(18,378.33)	22,054.00	22,054.00	0.00%
	Other Finances	-	(278.75)	-	(2,787.50)	2,787.50	(3,345.00)	(3,345.00)	0.00%
<b>Total</b>		<b>-</b>	<b>1,559.08</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>15,590.83</b>	<b>(15,590.83)</b>	<b>18,709.00</b>	<b>18,709.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
1821 Snowmobile Trails	Revenue	-	(3,806.25)	(45,640.96)	(38,062.50)	(7,578.46)	(45,675.00)	(34.04)	99.93%
	Expenditures	-	3,806.25	45,640.96	38,062.50	7,578.46	45,675.00	34.04	99.93%
	Other Finances	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	#DIV/0!
<b>Total</b>		<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
1824 Bike Trail	Revenue	(60.00)	(116,666.67)	(98,026.42)	(1,166,666.67)	1,068,640.25	(1,400,000.00)	(1,301,973.58)	7.00%
	Expenditures	-	116,989.58	1,537.32	1,169,895.83	(1,168,358.51)	1,403,875.00	1,402,337.68	0.11%
	Other Finances	-	746.11	-	7,461.11	(7,461.11)	8,953.33	8,953.33	0.00%
<b>Total</b>		<b>(60.00)</b>	<b>1,069.03</b>	<b>(96,489.10)</b>	<b>10,690.28</b>	<b>(107,179.38)</b>	<b>12,828.33</b>	<b>109,317.43</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
1826 Dog Park	Revenue	(4,092.47)	(3,275.00)	(41,821.30)	(32,750.00)	(9,071.30)	(39,300.00)	2,521.30	106.42%
	Expenditures	8,496.75	8,512.42	28,676.04	85,124.17	(56,448.13)	102,149.00	73,472.96	28.07%
	Other Finances	-	(469.25)	-	(4,692.47)	4,692.47	(5,630.96)	(5,630.96)	0.00%
<b>Total</b>		<b>4,404.28</b>	<b>4,768.17</b>	<b>(13,145.26)</b>	<b>47,681.70</b>	<b>(60,826.96)</b>	<b>57,218.04</b>	<b>70,363.30</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
1840 Groundskeeping	Revenue	(6,640.95)	(4,160.50)	(50,920.56)	(41,605.00)	(9,315.56)	(49,926.00)	994.56	101.99%
	Expenditures	6,661.51	4,160.50	51,481.11	41,605.00	9,876.11	49,926.00	(1,555.11)	103.11%
	Other Finances	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	#DIV/0!
<b>Total</b>		<b>20.56</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>560.55</b>	<b>(0.00)</b>	<b>560.55</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>(560.55)</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
Total All Business Units	Revenue	(86,731.49)	(200,640.92)	(947,088.77)	(2,006,409.17)	1,059,320.40	(2,407,691.00)	(1,460,602.23)	39.34%
	Expenditures	83,370.82	245,334.95	911,838.45	2,453,349.53	(1,541,511.08)	2,944,019.44	2,032,180.99	30.97%
	Other Finances	-	2,067.21	-	20,672.13	(20,672.13)	24,806.56	24,806.56	0.00%
<b>Grand Total Parks</b>		<b>(3,360.67)</b>	<b>46,761.25</b>	<b>(35,250.32)</b>	<b>467,612.50</b>	<b>(502,862.82)</b>	<b>561,135.00</b>	<b>596,385.32</b>	<b>-6.28%</b>