

TOWN OF SUMMIT
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN



JUNEAU COUNTY

Adopted
2009

Prepared by:

North Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission

TOWN OF SUMMIT

Town Board

Edwin R. Pfaff, Chair
Jeff Hansen, Supervisor
Jimmy L. Miller, Supervisor
Tammy Miller, Clerk
Elaine Rollins, Treasurer

Plan Committee

Edwin R. Pfaff, Chair
Becky Jensen
Darryl Hines
Ron Daugs
Colleen Beirs

Photos: NCWRPC

This plan was completed with the assistance of the
North Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (NCWRPC).

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2010

NORTH CENTRAL WISCONSIN
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

STATE OF WISCONSIN
Town of Summit, Juneau County

SECTION I – TITLE/PURPOSE

The title of this ordinance is the Town of Summit Comprehensive Plan Ordinance. The purpose of this ordinance is for the Town of Summit to lawfully adopt a comprehensive plan as required under s. 66.1001 (4) (c), Wis. stats.

SECTION II – AUTHORITY

The town board of the Town of Summit has authority under s. 62.04, Wis. stats., its power to appoint a plan commission under ss. 62.23 (1), Wis. stats., and under s. 66.1001 (4), Wis. stats., to adopt this ordinance. The comprehensive plan of the Town of Summit must be in compliance with s. 66.1001 (4) (c), Wis. stats., in order for the Town Board to adopt this ordinance.

SECTION III – ADOPTION OF ORDINANCE

The Town Board of the Town of Summit, by this ordinance, adopted on proper notice with a quorum and roll call vote by a majority of the town board present and voting, provides the authority for the Town of Summit to adopt its comprehensive plan under s. 66.1001 (4), Wis. stats., and provides the authority for the Town Board to order its publication.

SECTION IV – PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The town board of the Town of Summit has adopted written procedures designed to foster public participation in every stage of the preparation of a comprehensive plan as required by s. 66.1001 (4) (a), Wis. stats.

SECTION V – TOWN PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

The Plan Commission of the Town of Summit, by a majority vote of the entire commission, recorded in its official minutes, has adopted a resolution recommending to the town board the adoption of the Town of Summit Comprehensive Plan, which contains all of the elements specified in s. 66.1001 (2), Wis. stats.

SECTION VI – PUBLIC HEARING

The Town of Summit has held at least one public hearing on this ordinance, with notice in compliance with the requirements of s. 66.1001 (4) (d), Wis. stats.

SECTION VII – ADOPTION OF TOWN COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The town board of the Town of Summit, by the enactment of this ordinance, formally adopts the document entitled Town of Summit Comprehensive Plan Ordinance under pursuant to s. 66.1001 (4) (c), Wis. stats.

SECTION VIII – SEVERABILITY

If any provision of this ordinance of its application to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the invalidity does not affect other provisions or applications of this ordinance that can be given effect without the invalid provision of application, and to this end, the provisions of this ordinance are severable.


SECTION IX – EFFECTIVE DATE

This ordinance is effective on publication or posting.

The town clerk shall properly post or publish this ordinance as required under s. 60.80, Wis. stats.

Adopted this 10th day of November, 2009.

[Signatures of Town Board]



Handwritten signatures of three town board members. The middle signature is clearly legible as "Jimmy L. Miller".

Attest: Jimmy L. Miller *[Signature of town clerk]*

66.1001 (4) (b) * Resolution by plan commission to recommend adoption of comprehensive plan.

STATE OF WISCONSIN
Town of Summit
Juneau County

The Plan Commission of the Town of Summit, Juneau County, Wisconsin, by this resolution, adopted on proper notice with a quorum and by a roll call vote of a majority of the town plan commission present and voting resolves and recommends to the Town Board of the Town of Summit as follows:

Adoption of the Town of Summit Comprehensive Plan.

The Town of Summit Plan Commission, by this resolution, further resolves and orders as follows:

All maps and other materials noted and attached as exhibits to the Town of Summit Comprehensive Plan are incorporated into and made a part of the Town of Summit Comprehensive Plan.

The vote of the town plan commission in regard to this resolution shall be recorded by the clerk of the town plan commission in the official minutes of the Town of Summit Plan Commission.

The town clerk shall properly post or publish this resolution as required under s. 60.80, Wis. stats.

Adopted this 23 day of September 2009.

[Signatures of plan commission members]

Edwin [Signature]
Rebecca [Signature]
Cullen Anderson
Donald [Signature]
Daniel [Signature]
Attest: Rebecca [Signature] Plan Commission Clerk

TOWN OF SUMMIT

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

SECTIONS:

I	Issues & Opportunities.....	2
	1. Overall Plan Introduction	
	A. Purpose of the Plan	2
	B. Public Participation & Survey	2
	C. Vision Statement	4
	2. Community Profile	
	A. Description	5
	B. Demographics	5
II	Natural, Agricultural & Cultural Resources.....	13
	1. Natural Resources	
	A. Physical Geography, Geology, Non-Metallic Mining	13
	B. Climate.....	13
	C. Soils	13
	D. Surface Water.....	15
	E. Groundwater.....	15
	F. Wetlands.....	16
	G. Floodlands.....	16
	H. Forest.....	18
	I. Rare Species & Natural Communities	18
	2. Agricultural Resources	
	A. Prime Farmland, Cropland, Livestock	19
	3. Cultural Resources	
	A. Brief Community History.....	19
	B. Historical Buildings, Archeological Sites, & Century Farms	20
	4. Goals, Objectives & Policies.....	21
	5. Bibliography	21
III	Housing.....	23
	1. Housing Stock	
	A. Total Housing Units	23
	B. Year Built	23
	C. Building Type	23
	D. Tenure.....	24
	E. Value	24
	F. Vacant/Seasonal.....	25

3.	Housing Demand	
	A. Persons Per Household.....	26
	B. Projections	26
4.	Housing Programs	26
5.	Goals, Objectives & Policies	28
IV	Transportation	29
	1. Background	
	A. Summary Of Transportation Plans	29
	B. Inventory Of Transportation Facilities.....	30
	2. Goals, Objectives & Policies.....	33
	3. Bibliography	34
V	Utilities & Community Facilities	36
	1. Goals, Objectives & Policies.....	37
VI	Economic Development	38
	1. Economic Base	
	A. Juneau County	38
	B. Major Employers.....	40
	C. Employment	41
	D. SWOT.....	43
	E. Contaminated Sites	43
	2. Economic Development Programs	44
	4. Goals, Objectives & Policies.....	46
	5. Bibliography	47
VII	Land Use.....	48
	1. Land Use	
	A. Background.....	48
	B. Existing Land Use 2009	48
	C. Future Land Use 2005-2025.....	48
	D. Land Use Classifications	50
	E. Future Land Use Plan Map Overview	51
	2. Land Use Controls	
	A. Zoning/ Subdivision	53
	B. County Subdivision Ordinance.....	54
	C. Managed Forest.....	54
	3. Goals, Objectives & Policies.....	55
VIII	Intergovernmental Cooperation.....	56
	1. Background.....	56
	2. Goals, Objectives & Policies.....	57
IX	Implementation.....	58

TABLES & FIGURES:

Table 1	Historical Population Trends	5
Table 2	Population Projections, 2005-2025	5
Figure 1	Historical and Projected Population	6
Figure 2	Age Distribution, 1990-2000	6
Figure 3	Juneau County Male & Female Age Distribution, 2000	7
Figure 4	Town of Summit Male & Female Age Distribution, 2000	7
Figure 5	Educational Attainment, 2000	8
Table 3	Households	9
Table 4	Historical Household Counts & Household Projections	9
Figure 6	Householders by Age	9
Figure 7	Median Household Income	10
Table 5	Household Income	10
Table 6	Income Comparisons, 2000	10
Table 7	Top Employers in Juneau County, 2003	11
Table 8	Wage by Industry, Juneau County, 2002	11
Table 9	Juneau County Labor Force Data	12
Figure 8	Employment by Industry, Town of Summit, 2000	12
Table 10	Age of Structure by Jurisdiction, 2000	23
Table 11	Housing Tenure by Jurisdiction, 2000	24
Table 12	Median Value of Structures by Jurisdiction, 2000	24
Table 13	Population Projections	26
Table 14	Annual Average Daily Traffic at Recorded Sites	31
Table 15	Labor Force and Unemployment Trends, Juneau County, 1980-2000	38
Table 16	Employees and Firms by Industry, Juneau County, 2000	39
Figure 9	Distribution of Employment by Industrial Sector, Juneau County, 2000	40
Table 17	Major Employers in Juneau County, 2003	41
Table 18	Resident Occupation, 2000	42
Table 19	Industry by Jurisdiction, 2000	42
Table 20	Existing Land Use, 2004	48
Table 21	Land Use Projections	51




MAPS:

Map 1	Location Map	1
Map 2	Natural Resources	17
Map 3	Transportation and Community Facilities	35
Map 4	Existing Land Use.....	49
Map 5	Future Land Use	52

ATTACHMENT:

- A. 2000 Census Summary
- B. Public Participation Plan
- C. Endangered Species Map

Map 1
 Location
 Town of Summit
 Juneau County, Wisconsin



This map is neither a legally recorded map nor a survey and is not intended to be used as one. This drawing is a compilation of records, information and data used for reference purposes only. NCWRPC is not responsible for any inaccuracies herein contained.



Prepared by:
**North Central
 Wisconsin Regional
 Planning Commission**

210 McClellan St., Suite 210, Wausau, WI 54403
 715-849-5510 - staff@ncwrpc.org - www.ncwrpc.org

I. ISSUES & OPPORTUNITIES ELEMENT

1. Overall Plan Process

A. Purpose of the Plan

The Town of Summit Comprehensive Plan is intended to be the will-of-the-people in writing for land use planning. When the people's desires in this community change, so too should this document. Local officials shall use this document to save time when making land use decisions. The Plan will also assist in development and management issues of public administration by addressing short-range and long-range concerns regarding development, and preservation of the community. Numerous reasons exist for developing a comprehensive plan:

- To identify areas appropriate for development and preservation over the next 20 years;
- For recommending land uses in specific areas of the town;
- To preserve woodlands to retain forestry as a viable industry;
- To direct the appropriate mix of housing opportunities that demographics dictate;
- To guide elected officials with town derived objectives for making land use decisions.

This Comprehensive Plan was prepared under the authority granted to towns that exercise village powers in Wisconsin State Statute 60.22(3), and according to Comprehensive Planning in State Statute 66.1001 for Wisconsin.

B. Public Participation & Survey

Wisconsin's State Statute 66.1001 requires municipalities to adopt written procedures that are designed to foster a wide range of public participation throughout the planning process. The main goal is to make all town residents aware of how and when this plan is being created, so residents can make suggestions during this process. The Town formally adopted a Public Participation Plan on May ____, 2009, which provides for several methods that will enlist public input into the planning process, including posting of all meetings, press releases, newsletter articles, and posting the plan on the NCWRPC website.

In 2008 a survey was sent out to 400 property owners in the Town of Summit, of which 139 were returned, for a return rate of 34.7 percent. Roughly 72 percent of respondents have lived or owned property in the town for over ten years and sixty percent had Summit as their primary residence, 16.6 percent were part-time or seasonal residents and 23 percent were landowners only. Roughly a third lived in a farm residence and another 30.3 percent lived in non-farm, single-family residence. Asked about the people who lived in their household, only 17.2 percent were under 18 years of age. Those over 65 made up 16.8 percent of persons in respondent's households and those between 45 and 65 were 43.4 percent. Nearly half (47.3%) of those people had a high school diploma or less and 16.1 percent had a 4-year college degree or more. Thirty-nine percent of respondents made under \$50,000 a year and 27.5 percent made over \$80,000.

Three-quarters supported the minimum setback requirement for new construction. When asked if the 800 square foot minimum for new construction was acceptable 68.6 percent supported it, and just over a fifth support changing the minimum while forty percent oppose a change and 37.8 percent are unsure. Two-thirds support the 50-foot road frontage requirement, and 71.3 percent of respondents support the five-acre minimum lot size. Over forty percent support improvement to water and sanitation systems, while roughly a third are unsure. On the question of improving plans for low-income housing 35 percent agree and 37 percent disagree, while roughly half agree with encouraging elderly housing. About 85 percent agree that road access is adequate, small agriculture should be encouraged, and that the current distance between neighbors should be maintained. Nine out of ten respondents agree that quiet and rural settings should be maintained, and have a sense of security in their property.

Sixty-eight percent of respondents said that road maintenance was adequate, but nearly half (44.6%) weren't sure if funding levels were adequate and a quarter thought they were inadequate. More than three-quarters of respondents said that current roads were sufficient for walking, but 54.8 percent said they were sufficient for bicycling. About forty percent said bike paths should be discouraged and 45 percent disagreed. Forty-three percent said that roads are not adequate for ATVs and 37 percent disagreed, while 44 percent said ATV trails should be discouraged and 48 percent disagreed.

Eighty percent of respondents support pest control, 85.6 percent support the clean up of large items, and 89 percent support encouraging citizens to pick up roadside litter. Eighty-five percent thought park & recreation facilities are adequate, three-quarters said the town hall and shop are adequate, and half thought security was adequate, but a quarter questioned whether tornado and emergency alert systems are adequate (40% weren't sure about tornado warning and 36% weren't sure about emergency warnings). Seventy percent wanted Internet access improved; 62 percent wanted improved cable; and 63 percent wanted improved technology services. While 57 percent favored encouraging cell phone and satellite towers, 22 percent were opposed and 20 percent weren't sure. Nearly half (46%) wanted to encourage child-care services (38% weren't sure); 37 percent thought senior citizens services were adequate (48% weren't sure); 38 percent agreed that water & sanitation systems should be improved (the same percentage weren't sure) and a quarter disagreed.

There is overwhelming support for encouraging agriculture (95.3%), and tree farms and small-scale forestry (91.6%). There is strong support for encouraging small business (72.8%), home based businesses (70%), and recreational opportunities (65%). Broad agreement was shown on discouraging large waste disposal sites (81.7%) and large commercial businesses (64.8%). Roughly half of respondents favored limitations on large livestock & dairy operations, but 35.3 percent disagreed and 15.6 percent weren't sure.

Roughly three-quarters of respondents thought larger businesses that generate traffic should be limited to the Highway 58 corridor. The greatest support was shown for promoting small farm & livestock operations (96%), maintaining quiet residential and rural settings (94%), privacy (93%), woodland & hunting balance (93%), agricultural & residential balance (90%), preserving the environment (92.7%), and preventing run-off & contamination (89.9%). Support was strong for current setbacks (77.8%), 5-acre minimum lot size (68.2%),

providing parks & green space (76.4%), the adequacy of town roads (74.3%), and limiting “big” business to the 58-corridor (72.1%).

More than two-thirds (68.6%) want to discourage any subdivisions, and a large majority (58%) disagreed with encouraging small subdivisions. On the question of encouraging campgrounds 43 percent agreed, 37.5 percent disagreed and 19.2 percent weren’t sure. Just over thirty percent thought Summit should create more specific zoning and 22.3 percent disagreed, but 43.7 percent weren’t sure. A majority (52.3%) support stronger enforcement of ordinances (29.5% weren’t sure). Asked if the Town should increase and expand its ordinances 32 percent agreed, a quarter (25.7%) disagreed, but 42.2 percent weren’t sure.

There is very strong support (95%) for cooperation with adjoining municipalities, and strong support for improving citizen participation at Board meeting (81.5%, unsure: 16.3%). The need to promote better communication with citizens received a slightly more ambiguous response: 65.9 percent agreed, but 17.8 percent weren’t sure. Support was strong for the Town seeking available grant funding (69%).

Respondents were asked to rate a number of statements relating to their opinion about the Town of Summit and its future. Asked how they envisioned the town in twenty years the most popular answer by a considerable margin was maintain rural setting, followed by one house per five acres, maintain current road structure, more small farms, no subdivisions, stay the same, more technological services, no condominiums, and more green & recreational space.

To the question of what they value about Summit rural community was the top answer, followed closely by quiet setting, wildlife, farming, hunting, clean water, people in the community, neighborly feeling, and security: low crime. Listing what they’d like to see improved maintain rural setting was first, then more farmland preservation, more woodland preservation, preserve environment, develop ATV, horse & bike trails, and research grant programs. The biggest problems that need to be addressed by the Town were identified as roadways & maintenance, roadside litter, lack of jobs, low citizen input into local government, and the need to control pollution. The issue respondents wanted the Town Board to address was maintaining a balanced budget by a wide margin, followed by increasing citizen input, controlling growth, low taxes, less services, and having a border agreement.

C. Vision Statement

Community Vision Statement

The Town of Summit offers safe, peaceful, country-style living that provides a special place in which to raise a family. The Town values the uniqueness of its environment: the hills and valleys, the farms and forests that provide residents with a living and a home. The Town of Summit is committed to continuing growth that protects its uniqueness and quality of life.

2. Community Profile

A. Description

The following Community Profile of the Town of Summit consists of background information on the town, including population; age distribution; racial composition; educational attainment; household characteristics; employment statistics; and income levels. This serves as an introduction to the town and a starting point for developing the Town's Comprehensive Plan. In addition, the Community Profile is meant to act as a source of reference information and to be used for deriving many of the key findings and recommendations of the plan. The Community Profile is written in a manner that facilitates quick and easy reference for use during creation of this Plan and during revision of this Plan.

B. Demographics

1. Historical Population

Since 1960 the population of the Town of Summit has increased by 8.9 percent. The population has declined after peaking in 1980, rising by 3.8 percent during the 1990s. The population for the county has increased during this period, growing by over twelve percent during the 1990s.

	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	1990-2000 % Change	1990-2000 Net Change
Town of Summit	572	566	721	600	623	3.8%	23
Town of Wonewoc	836	759	778	770	783	1.7%	13
Town of Seven Mile Creek	415	376	362	383	360	-6%	-23
Juneau County	17,490	18,455	21,037	21,650	24,316	12%	2,666

Source: U.S. Census

2. Population Projections

According to population projections prepared by the DOA, the growth trend in the Town of Summit is expected to continue until 2020 when the population is expected to peak at 664. Meanwhile, the county is projected to continue increasing at its current rate until 2015 when the growth rate is expected to slow to four percent per decade.

Year	Town of Summit	Juneau County
2005	620	25,640
2010	653	27,677
2015	660	28,635
2020	664	29,449
2025	658	29,807

Source: Wisconsin Department of Administration

Figure 1
TOWN OF SUMMIT

Historic Population¹: 1960-2000
Projected Population²: 2005-2025




Figure 1 shows population trends in the Town of Summit over a 65-year period starting in 1960. After a population increase during the decade of the 1970s, population fell off again in the 1980s. It has remained relatively stable since then, and is projected to grow slowly until 2020 and declines slightly to 658 persons by 2025.

3. Population Characteristics

In 2000, the Town of Summit had 330 males and 293 females. In the 2000 U.S. Census 97 percent described themselves as white. The median age of Town residents is 39.5 years old. In comparison, Juneau County’s median age is 39.4, while the State of Wisconsin’s median age is 36.

The most striking image that comes from comparing the numbers of people in the various age cohorts between 1990 and 2000 is the steep decline in the 25 to 34 age group (47%), and a jump in the 45 to 54 and 55 to 64 age groups. Although there was a slight rise in the 15 to 24 age group, there was a decline in those under 15. Overall, there was a sixty percent increase in people between 35 and 54. The 65 to 74 age group went up by nearly two third (65.9%).

Figure 2
Age Distribution 1990-2000






Figure 3
Juneau County
Male & Female Age Distribution
2000



Source: U.S. Census

Figure 4
Town of Summit
Male & Female Age Distribution
2000




Source: U.S. Census

The population distribution of age and sex illustrated by Figure 4 shows the relatively small number of persons in the 25 to 34 age group. The most notable feature is the large cohort in the 35 to 54 group.

4. Educational Attainment

Education levels in the Town of Summit are generally similar to Juneau County. Eighty-three percent of residents over 25 have completed high school, higher than the 78.5 percent of county residents who are high school graduates. The state rate is 85 percent. For the state 22.4 percent have a bachelor's degree or more, in Juneau County it's ten percent, and in the Town of Summit seven percent of those over 25 have a bachelor's degree or more.

Figure 5
Educational Attainment, 2000
For Population Over 25 Years



Source: U.S. Census, SF-3

5. Household Characteristics

Married couples make up sixty-six percent of all households; couples with children under 18 constitute 28.4 percent of households, while single parent households are 6.4 percent. Single person households are 20.8 percent of the total. Over fifty-three percent of householders are between 35 and 54, with the largest concentrations being in the 35 to 44 age group (30.2%) and the 45 to 54 cohort (23.1%). There is also 17.6 percent of householder between 65 and 74 years of age.

The Town of Summit's average household size in 1990 was 2.88 persons, while in 2000 it was 2.71 persons.

Table 3	Households
	Town of Summit
Total Households	236
1. Family households	179
a. Married-couple family	155
i. With own children under 18 years	67
ii. Without own children under 18 years	88
b. Householder without spouse present	15
i. With own children under 18 years	9
ii. Without own children under 18 years	6
2. Nonfamily household	57
a. Householder living alone	49
b. Householder not living alone	8

Source: U.S. Census

5. Household Projections

As the size of households decreases throughout the nation and in the Town of Summit it means that the number of households will increase at a higher rate than the population. After increasing by 13.5 percent during the 1990s, the rate of increase will slow to 8.5 percent from 2000 to 2010, and then increase to twelve percent during the 2010 to 2020 decade.




Table 4	Historical Household Count 1980-2000¹							
	Household Projections 2005-2025²							
Town of Wonevoc	1980	1990	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
Households	223	208	236	239	259	269	278	280

Source: ¹U.S. Census 1980-2000

²WI Dept. of Administration


7. Income

In looking at the income structure of the Town of Summit in 2000 27.8 percent of households in the town made over \$50,000 per year. Still over forty-eight percent of households earn less than \$35,000. The highest median income is in households headed by persons between 35 and 44 with incomes dropping in the older age cohorts.

Annual Income	Households	
Less than \$10,000	20	8.4%
\$10,000 - \$24,999	53	22.1%
\$25,000 - \$34,999	43	18.1%
\$35,000 - \$49,999	56	23.5%
\$50,000 - \$99,999	56	23.6%
\$100,000 and over	10	4.2%

Source: U.S. Census, SF-3

Median household income for the Town of Summit is higher than the county and Wonewoc, but below the median for the state. The per capita income is much lower than in Wonewoc, the county or the state indicating larger households and a predominance of families in the Town of Summit.



	Per Capita Income	Median Household Income	Percent of inhabitants below poverty level
Town of Summit	\$15,584	\$38,365	9.3%
Town of Wonewoc	\$18,666	\$37,875	4.5%
Juneau County	\$17,892	\$35,335	10.1%
Wisconsin	\$21,271	\$43,791	8.7%

Source: U.S. Census, SF-3

8. Employment Statistics

Of the five largest employers in Juneau County two are governmental, two are non-profit, and one, Walker Stainless Equipment is private.

Table 7 Top Employers in Juneau County, 2003

Employer Name	Product or Service	Employment Size Range
Hess Memorial Hospital	General medical & surgical hospitals	500-999
Walker Stainless Equipment	Plate work manufacturing	250-499
Sandridge Treatment Facility	Psychiatric and substance abuse hospital	250-499
County of Juneau	Executive and General Government	250-499
School Dist. of Mauston	Elementary & secondary schools	250-499
Volk Field	National security	100-249
Necedah Public School	Elementary & secondary schools	100-249
Freudenbergnok (Farnam/Meillor)	Gasket, packing, and sealing device mfg.	100-249
Parker Hannifin	Fluid power valve and hose fitting mfg.	100-249
Brunner Drilling & Mfg.	Bolt, nut, screw, rivet, and washer mfg.	100-249

Source: WI Dept. of Workforce Development, ES-202 special report, First quarter, 2003


Juneau County wages are below state average in all sectors as shown in Table 8. The County comes the closest to average in agriculture and retail trade. It appears that agricultural wage averages have been declining rapidly in the past five years. Service and transportation / communications sectors wages have grown the most in the five-year period; however, transportation / communication wages are increasing faster than service wages in the last few years.

**Table 8 Annual Average Wage by Industry Division
Juneau County, 2002**

	County Annual Avg. Wage	State Annual Avg. Wage	Percent of State Avg.	1-year Percent Change	5-year Percent Change
All Industries (except mining)	\$25,053	\$30,922	81.0%	0.9%	20.1%
Agriculture, Forestry, and Fishing	\$20,756	\$22,565	92.0%	-7.3%	-38.5%
Construction	\$27,046	\$39,011	69.3%	1.6%	0.6%
Manufacturing	\$33,094	\$39,739	83.3%	-0.4%	26.5%
Transportation, Comm., and Utilities	\$26,637	\$36,639	72.7%	10.4%	28.1%
Wholesale Trade	\$24,807	\$40,521	61.2%	3.4%	21.3%
Retail Trade	\$13,444	\$14,596	92.1%	3.1%	23.8%
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	\$22,408	\$40,933	54.7%	2.5%	27.0%
Services	\$21,221	\$28,775	73.7%	6.4%	31.3%
Total Government	\$26,267	\$33,785	77.7%	3.9%	21.6%

Source: WI DWD 2002 and NCWRPC

**Figure 8
Employment by Industry
Town of Summit, 2000**



Source: U.S. Census

The two largest job classifications in the Town of Summit (almost identical in number) are manufacturing and agriculture, followed by retail, education, health and social services, and arts, entertainment, accommodation and food service. Construction, transportation, warehousing and utilities, and professional and management are all represented as parts of the Summit labor force.

The number of persons in the labor force continues to grow in the county. This is partially the result of increasing workforce participation, but jobs have kept pace with the increase in the number of workers and over the last twenty years unemployment rates have fallen.

	1980	1990	2000
Labor Force	8,853	10,143	12,068
Employed	8,206	9,478	11,333
Unemployed	647	665	735
Unemployment Rate	7.31%	6.56%	6.09%
Participation Rate	42.08%	46.85%	49.63%

Source: U.S. Census, and NCWRPC

II. NATURAL, AGRICULTURAL, & CULTURAL RESOURCES ELEMENT

1. Natural Resources

A. Physical geography, Geology, & Non-metallic mining

Physical Geography & Geology

The Town of Summit lies primarily within physiographic province of the Western Uplands. This unglaciated upland is a thoroughly dissected, hilly area. Steep sandstone escarpments mark the northern and eastern boundaries. At the higher elevations are remnants of the more resistant dolomite bedrock that capped these uplands. The valleys, incised 200 to 350 feet below the ridgetops, are long and V-shaped and have relatively narrow bottoms. The drainage pattern is dendritic, and most of the area is well drained. All parts of this upland area are drained by streams within the Wisconsin River drainage basin. The Baraboo River is the major tributary in this area.

Non-metallic mining

There are no non-metallic mining sites in the Town of Summit. At some quarries, dolomite limestone bedrock is blasted and crushed for gravel or ground for agricultural lime.

B. Climate

Winters are very cold, and the short summers are fairly warm. In winter, the average temperature is 19 degrees Fahrenheit and the average daily minimum temperature is 8 degrees. The summer average temperature is 69 degrees. Precipitation is fairly well distributed throughout the year, reaching a slight peak in summer. Total annual precipitation is about 33 inches. In two years out of ten, the rainfall in April through September is less than 18 inches. Thunderstorms occur on about 41 days each year. Snow generally covers the ground much of the time from late fall through early spring.

Growing Season Summary

Median date of last frost in the spring: May 12.

Last frost occurs on or after May 29 in 10% of years.

Median date of first frost in the fall: September 25.

First frost occurs on or before October 12 in 10% of years.

Median growing season: 139 days. Growing Season ranges from 102 to 175 days.

C. Soils

Soils occur in an orderly pattern that is related to the physical geography, climate, and the natural vegetation. Each kind of soil is associated with a particular kind of landscape or with

a segment of the landscape. By observing the landscape in an area, reviewing the soil map, and understanding what is possible with each soil type, relationships can be created to determine most productive use for an area.

Most of the soils in Juneau County formed under forest vegetation. This resulted in a light-colored soil that has a relatively low content of organic matter. Also, because tree roots intercept water at greater depths than grasses, there is more effective leaching. This leaching removes nutrients and allows clay accumulation at greater depths. In addition, there is an abundance of micro flora, such as bacteria and fungi, which play important roles in decomposing organic matter and recycling the nutrients.

Animals in the soil, including earthworms, insects, and rodents, mix the soil and contribute additional organic matter, thereby affecting soil structure, porosity, and content of nutrients. Human activity also affects soil formation by altering and accelerating natural soil processes. Many soils have been altered by draining, clearing, burning, and cultivating. Repeatedly removing plant cover has accelerated erosion. Over cultivation has often contributed to the loss of organic matter and has reduced the infiltration rate. In some areas, over cultivation and the use of heavy equipment have changed the loose, porous surface layer to clods.

The general soil map shows groups of soil types called associations. Each association has a distinctive pattern of soils, relief, and drainage. Each is a unique natural landscape. Typically, an association consists of one or more major soils and some minor soils. It is named for the major soils. The soils making up one association can occur in another association but then would exist in a different pattern. Because of the general soil map's small scale, it is only useful for determining suitability of large areas for general land uses. Soil maps that are located in the Juneau County Soil Survey book are large scale and therefore most appropriate for deciding specific land uses at the section level and subdivision of a section.

Soil Descriptions

Soils are primarily sandy lake deposits, some with silt-loam loess caps.

1. URNE – LA FARGE – ROZETTA association: Moderately deep and deep, gently sloping to very steep, somewhat excessively drained to moderately well drained, loamy and silty soil; on uplands.

Most areas of the gently sloping to moderately steep soils in this association are used for crops or pasture. Water erosion is the main hazard. Soil blowing is a hazard in Urne soils. Crop and forage yields are limited on the Urne and La Farge soils because of the low or moderate available water capacity. Most of the steep and very steep areas of Urne soils are used as pasture or woodland. The main problems in managing forest are slope and rooting depth, and competing vegetation.

The La Farge and Urne soils are poorly suited to septic tank absorption fields because of the depth to bedrock. The gently sloping Rozetta soils are only moderately suited to septic tanks

and to dwellings with basements because of perched water table. The moderately steep to very steep soils are poorly suited to dwellings because of the slope.

2. ETRICK – CURRAN – JACKSON association: Deep, nearly level and gently sloping, moderately well drained to very poorly drained, silty soils; on stream terraces, lake terraces, and flood plains.

This association is on low flats, in drainageways and depressions, on flood plains, on concave foot slopes, and on concave or convex side slopes. Most areas of this association are used for crops, but the cultivated areas of the Ettrick and Curran soils must be drained and protected from flooding. Some areas are undrained and support native vegetation. A few areas are used as woodland. The main problems in managing forest are the water table and competing vegetation.

The major soils in this association are poorly suited to residential development because of the water table. The Ettrick soils are unsuitable for residential development because of flooding. The areas of the Curran soils that are subject to flooding are also unsuitable.

D. Surface Water

Surface water covers about 22.5 acres, which is 0.09 percent of the land in town, floodlands cover about 270.5 acres, which is 1.14 percent of the land in town, and wetlands cover about 668.7 acres, which is 2.8 percent of the land in town.

The streams, and rivers in town are the only type of surface water. The main uses of surface water are as fish and wildlife habitat, for irrigation, and the enjoyment of anglers, boaters, hunters, and casual observers alike. Surface waters provide for drainage after heavy rains, and habitat for plants, fish, and wildlife. None of the streams or rivers has been designated as trout streams, outstanding or exceptional waters, or wild/scenic rivers.

E. Groundwater

For most users groundwater is the major source of supply, and is readily available in quantities adequate to meet domestic, agricultural, municipal, and industrial needs (Soil Survey).

Groundwater is at various depths, depending upon the general topography, the elevation above the permanent stream level, and the character of the underlying rock formation. It is in aquifers where water fills all pores and fissures in the bedrock or in unconsolidated material, such as sand. Wells drilled into these aquifers are the source of water for rural users.

The quality of ground water in the county is generally good for most domestic and industrial uses. The water is relatively soft in most of the county. Local differences in the quality of

ground water are caused by the composition, solubility, and surface area of particles of soil and rock through which the water moves and the length of time the water is in contact with these materials. Calcium, magnesium, and bicarbonate ions derived from dolomite are present. Minor water use problems are caused by hardness and locally by high concentrations of iron. Iron is in localized areas and is mainly produced by reducing conditions (chemical decomposition) in marshes and swamps, although some iron is from bedrock.

F. Wetlands

Every wetland is unique. One wetland on the north edge of town may perform different functions than another on the south edge - even though they may appear at first glance to be very similar. Wetland functional values are determined by a variety of different parameters including physical, chemical, and biological components.


Wetlands in Wisconsin were defined by the State Legislature in 1978. According to this definition, a wetland is: "an area where water is at, near, or above the land surface long enough to be capable of supporting aquatic or hydrophilic (water-loving) vegetation and which has soils indicative of wet conditions." [§ 23.32(1)] Apart from these essential common characteristics, wetlands - and wetland function - vary. Wetland functions depend on many variables (including wetland type, size, and previous physical influences/natural or human-induced) and opportunity (including the location of the wetland in landscape and surrounding land use). Wetlands also change over time and may function differently from year to year or season to season. These are very dynamic ecosystems.

G. Floodlands

The goal of Wisconsin's Floodplain Management Program is to protect people and their property from unwise floodplain development, and to protect society from the costs that are associated with developed floodplains. Through floodplain zoning, Wisconsin's counties, cities and villages are required to zone their flood-prone areas. The state has set minimum standards for local regulation, but local governments can set more restrictive standards. Floods are the most costly natural disaster. Direct costs from floods include emergency response, clean-up, rebuilding of public utilities and uninsured homes and businesses. Indirect flood costs are lost wages and sales, disruption of daily life, tax base decline if businesses relocate.

Since the floodway area can be very dangerous during a regular flood event, most structural development is not allowed. Certain activities and uses are allowed here provided they meet strict criteria. Most activities and uses are permitted in the floodfringe, provided they meet certain development standards.


Map 2
 Natural Resources
 Town of Summit
 Juneau County, Wisconsin



- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Minor Civil Divisions | Steep Slopes |
| Section Lines | Floodway |
| US & State Highways | Not Prime Farmland |
| County Highways | Prime if Drained |
| Local Roads | Prime Farmland |
| Private / Other | |
| Water | |
| WISCLAND Wetlands | |

Source: WI DNR, NCWRPC, WISCLAND Wetlands, FEMA NRCS

This map is neither a legally recorded map nor a survey and is not intended to be used as one. This drawing is a compilation of records, information and data used for reference purposes only. NCWRPC is not responsible for any inaccuracies herein contained.




Prepared by:
**North Central
 Wisconsin Regional
 Planning Commission**

210 McClellan St., Suite 210, Wausau, WI 54403
 715-849-5510 - staff@ncwrpc.org - www.ncwrpc.org

H. Forests

The majority of forestlands in town are privately owned. Some private woodlands in the county are enrolled in Managed Forest Law (MFL) and its predecessor programs. This program provides a low annual tax rate per acre and requires a management plan for the property that must include some harvesting along with allowing some public uses. When timber is harvested from MFL properties, a harvest tax is also assessed. This provides an incentive to keep woodlots in active production and allows some community access to the site in exchange for greatly reduced taxes.



Forests play a key role in the protection of environmentally sensitive areas like steep slopes, shorelands, wetlands, and flood plains. Removal of woodland cover can be detrimental to these areas in both ecological functions and visual enjoyment. The health of a forest is measured by its capacity for renewal, for recovery from a wide range of disturbances, and for retention of its ecological diversity. Specific wildlife species depend upon forests to different extents. Some types of species needs large blocks of forest habitat exclusively. Other animals are called “edge” species, because they can use small clusters of trees and brush. Deer and raccoons are edge species. Aquatic species benefit from trees that shade shoreland areas of lakes and rivers. Shoreland areas are the most biologically productive areas of lakes and rivers. At the same time forests must produce timber for various consumer uses (lumber, paper, & toothpaste), and meet current and future needs of people for desired levels of values, uses, products, and services. Arguably, invasive exotic species like garlic mustard and multiflora rose present the greatest threat to the long-term health and integrity of the forests. Invasive plants present a problem for native plants as they invade natural systems, and out-compete native species for nutrients, sunlight, and space. Usually having no natural predators, invasive species alter the food web and physical environment. Invasive species like the Gypsy moth and the Asian long-horned beetle aggressively compete with native insects for habitat.

Development patterns cause disturbances in forest patterns. Land subdivision and subsequent changes in use breaks up the continuity of forest cover, which affects forest sustainability and health. Forest health is determined by the biologic web of life that includes animals, insects, soil fungus, and tree species. Frequently, these parcels are used for seasonal housing and other recreational uses rather than for forestry or farming.

I. Rare Species & Natural Communities

The Town of Summit has four sections with occurrences of terrestrial plants, animals, and natural communities from common to critically endangered:

- Two sections with terrestrial occurrences
- Two sections with both terrestrial and aquatic occurrences

Wisconsin's biodiversity goals are to identify, protect and manage native plants, animals, and natural communities from the very common to critically endangered for present and future generations. Knowledge, appreciation, and stewardship of Wisconsin's native species and ecosystems are critical to their survival.

2. Agricultural Resources

A. Prime Farmland, cropland, livestock

According to the *Wisconsin Land Use Databook*, the Town of Summit is almost 58.1 percent agricultural. According to this document, 7.8 percent of the town's total land (36.9 square miles) is used for row crops, 37.8 percent is used for foraging, and 12.6 percent is grassland. The report also found that 38.6 percent of the town was in forest cover and 2.8 percent is wetlands.

In terms of farming trends, the town lost 2.4 percent of farmland acres on tax rolls between 1990 and 1997. According to the report there were 87 farms, 39 of which were dairy farms in 1997. Since then, although little land has gone out of agriculture, there has been consolidation of operations.

Prime farmland is one of several kinds of important farmland defined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and is of major importance in meeting the Nation's short and long-range needs for food and fiber. Prime Farmland is the land that is best suited to food, feed, forage, fiber, and oilseed crops. It may be cultivated land, pasture, woodland, or other land, but it is not urban land or water areas. Prime farmland produces the highest yields with minimal expenditures of energy and economic resources, and farming it results in the least damage to the environment. Adequate and dependable supplies of moisture from precipitation or irrigation are available. The temperature and growing season are favorable, and the level of acidity or alkalinity is acceptable. Prime farmlands have few or no rocks and are permeable to water and air. It is not excessively erodible or saturated with water for long periods and is not frequently flooded during the growing season. The land slope on these lands ranges mainly from 0 to 6 percent. The Town of Summit has 4,765.5 acres of prime farmland, which is 20.1 percent of the total land area of the town.

3. Cultural Resources

A. Brief community history

In 1854 the State of Wisconsin constructed a road connecting Mauston to Reedsberg, and passing through Summit. During the Civil War this road was used to bring iron ore mined in Ironston in Sauk County to the railroad in Mauston. Also in 1854 Jerome Potter settled in

the Town of Potter where he cleared the land, built a house and farm buildings and began farming. Climbing the Ironton Hill always posed a problem for travelers. There was a spring in the middle of the long hill and a large wooden tank was constructed to hold the cool spring water, and it became traditional for travelers to stop and water their horses, and themselves before continuing on.



Town Hall

The Sentinel post office opened in Summit in 1859, but closed in 1886. It reopened briefly in the 1890s. For most of the late nineteenth century representatives of Summit formed the core of a group of supervisors from the southern farming areas of the county who contended that the northern timber areas of the county were being under-assessed for their property taxes. The dispute was only resolved when most of the big timber in that part of the county was logged-off.

B. Historical buildings, archeological sites

There are no Buildings or sites on the National Register of Historic Places or on the Architectural History Inventory in the Town of Summit.

Lands in town that are adjacent to surface waters may have an abundance of cultural and archeological significance because they were often the location of Native American and early European settlements.

There are nine Century Farms in Summit:

- James Barrix on 136 acres in T14N R3E Sec 36 was settled in 1880.
- Ronald E & Darlene Daus on 249 acres in T14N R3E Sec 25 was settled in 1897.
- James & Karyl Demaske on 120 acres in T14N R3E Sec 4 was settled in 1895.
- Carl & Shirley Dogs on 179 acres in T14N R3E Sec 5 was settled in 1895.
- Lawrence Hagemann on 120 acres in T14N R3E Sec 5 was settled in 1880.
- Bernard & Diana Long on 72 acres in T14N R3E Sec 29 & 30 was settled in 1877.
- James & Sally Raese on 140 acres in T14N R3E Sec 18 was settled in 1868.
- Wayne & Lanita Sheil on 111 acres in T14N R3E Sec 26 & 35 was settled in 1893.
- Wayne Zietlow on 121 acres in T14N R3E R36 was settled in 1893

In celebration of Wisconsin's agricultural heritage, long time farm and homeowners are encouraged to register for Century Farm status. To qualify as a Century Farm the property must be proven to have been in continuous family ownership for the past 150 or 100 years.

4. Goals, Objectives & Policies

Goals

1. Encourage the protection of natural areas.
2. Protect economically productive areas, including farmland and forested areas.
3. Preserve cultural, historic and architectural sites.

Objectives

1. New development in the Town should not negatively impact natural resources.
2. Minimize impacts to the Town's natural resources from non-metallic mineral mining.
3. Encourage and support the preservation of natural open spaces that minimize flooding in lowland valleys.
4. Promote development that minimizes groundwater impacts from on-site septic systems and other sources.

Policies

1. New development should be discouraged from areas shown to be unsafe or unsuitable for development due to flood hazard, potential groundwater contamination, loss of farmland, highway access problems, incompatibility with neighboring uses, etc.
2. Discourage the draining or filling of wetlands.
3. Existing agricultural uses and buildings should be taken into consideration when locating new development to avoid conflicts
4. Preserve productive farmland for long-term agricultural uses.
5. Development proposals should be reviewed relative to the potential impacts to the historical and cultural resources of the Town.

5. Bibliography

Clark, Rose, "Reflections of the Town of Summit in Juneau County", Juneau County Star Times, 2007, Mauston

Juneau County Historical Society, Juneau County: The First 100 Years, 1988, New Past Press, Friendship, WI

Juneau County Land Conservation Department, Land & Water Resource Management Plan, 1999, Mauston

NCWRPC, Juneau County Outdoor Recreation Plan, 2002, Wausau

USDA – Soil Conservation Service, Soil Survey of Juneau County, Wisconsin, 1991, Washington DC

UW-Extension, Wisconsin Town Land Use Databook, 1998, Madison

III. HOUSING ELEMENT

1. Housing Stock

A. Total Housing Units

The housing stock in the Town of Summit is generally adequate for the needs of the community. The 1990 Census indicates that there were 248 housing units in the town. All but six of these units had complete plumbing facilities, and none lacked complete kitchen facilities. No units lacked plumbing or kitchen facilities by 2000. In 2000, there were 263 housing units in the town, an increase of 15 since 1990, a six percent increase. This compares to a 3.8 percent increase in population in the town and an eight percent increase in housing units for the county during the decade.

B. Year Built

The housing stock in Summit is older than the county's or the state's, comparable to the housing stock in Wonevok. More than half of buildings are more than 45 years old, higher than for either the county (36%) or the state (43.7%). Nearly eight percent were built in the 1940s or 1950s, well below levels for the county and state. Structures built in the 1960s and 1970s are higher than in Wonevok, and lower than the county and state percentages. Nearly thirty percent of housing units have been built since 1980, less than for the county but more than the state. The 1990s were a period of the growth, when fifty housing units were built.

Year built	Town of Summit		Town of Wonevok		Juneau County		State of Wisconsin	
Before 1939	101	38.4%	129	41.3%	2,842	23.0%	543,164	23.4%
1940-1959	20	7.6%	25	8%	1,610	13.0%	470,862	20.3%
1960-1979	68	25.8%	65	20.8%	3,633	29.4%	667,537	28.8%
After 1980	74	28.1%	93	29.8%	4,285	34.6%	639,581	27.5%
Total	263	100%	312	100%	12,370	100%	2,321,144	100%

Source: US Census Bureau & NCWRPC

C. Building Type

Single-family dwellings are the most common type of housing units in the town. At 217, they constitute 82.5 percent of the housing stock. Manufactured and mobile homes account for almost thirteen percent of housing units, lower than the percentage for the county (22.3%) and nearly triple the percentage for the state. The Census lumps the two together under the definition of “a housing unit that was originally constructed to be towed on its own chassis.”

Often described as “mobile homes” or “trailer homes”, manufactured housing has been subject to regulation by the Federal Government since the implementation of the “Manufactured Home Construction and Safety Standards” or “HUD-Code” in 1976.

Manufactured housing has evolved from the “travel trailer”, which is built primarily to be towed behind vehicles, they were lightweight and compact, generally metal clad, and intended to be moved repeatedly from place to place. Over time these structures became larger and often located permanently, either in a mobile-home park or on an individual lot.

The passage of the federal legislation mentioned above, which took effect June 15, 1976, established the preeminence of federal authority in the regulation of what have come to be known as manufactured housing. Under this legislation the federal government established standards and inspection mechanisms for all factory-built housing, and dictated that after its effective date all regulation of manufactured housing must conform to those standards. The inspection of the manufacturing process is meant to ensure the quality of housing built “on a chassis”. Since adoption of the HUD-Code a series of court rulings have reinforced the preeminence of the federal standards. In many rural areas manufactured housing is the best source of affordable housing.

D. Tenure

Owner occupancy is the overwhelming (87.3%) norm in the Town of Summit. This is fairly typical for a rural area, and exceeds the rate for the county (78.9%) and for the state (68.4%). There were only 30 renters in the town in 2000. Residents of Summit tend to move at slower rate than others in Juneau County. Approximately 27 percent of town residents have lived in the same home for more than twenty years, less than the Town of Woneuoc, but higher than the county and state.

Table 11 Housing Tenure by Jurisdiction, 2000

Tenure	Town of Summit		Town of Woneuoc		Juneau County		State of Wisconsin	
Over 30 years	31	13.4%	48	16.7%	1,053	10.9%	229,063	11.0%
21 to 30 years ago	32	13.8%	61	21.2%	1,189	12.3%	222,015	10.7%
11 to 20 years ago	42	18.1%	36	12.5%	1,701	17.5%	323,813	15.5%
10 years or less	127	54.7%	143	49.7%	5,753	59.3%	1,309,653	62.8%
Total	232	100%	288	100%	9,696	100%	2,084,544	100%

Source: US Census Bureau & NCWRPC

E. Value

Table 12 Median Value of Structures by Jurisdiction, 2000

Municipality	Median home value	% of state median value
Town of Summit	\$74,400	66.3%
Town of Woneuoc	\$74,000	65.9%
Town of Plymouth	\$91,400	81.5%
Juneau County	\$71,200	63.5%
State of Wisconsin	\$112,200	100%

Source: US Census Bureau & NCWRPC

Median home value in the Town of Summit is higher than the median value for the county, and slightly higher than the Town of Wonewoc, but lower than the Town of Plymouth. The indication from the Census are that 14.8 percent of homeowners, but no renters spend more than thirty percentage of their income on housing, compared to 17.1 percent of homeowners and 28.5 percent of renters in the county and seven percent of homeowners and 32.3 percent of renters for the state.



In recent years a number of new houses have been built that take advantage of the spectacular views available in Summit.

The National Low Income Housing Coalition assembles a yearly list of estimates of the income required to afford housing using this “cost-burden” standard for localities across the country. This report focuses on rental housing, but can be broadly applied to owner-occupied housing as well. The report calculates that for the state as a whole a full-time worker must earn \$11.63 an hour in order to be able to afford a two-bedroom apartment. For the non-metro areas of the state the comparable figure is \$8.93. In Juneau County a full time worker must earn \$8.40 per hour to afford the two-bedroom apartment. For a worker earning minimum wage this means working 65 hours every week to afford that apartment.

Although, housing prices rose across the country, they rose faster in non-metropolitan than in urban areas – 59 percent compared to 39 percent. The Median home value rose by 75 percent in Juneau County during the 1990s. Generally low wage rates, the tendency for banking overhead expenses and mortgage interest rates to be marginally higher in rural areas, and the increase in housing values all combine to make housing less affordable for rural, low-income residents.

F. Vacant/Seasonal

Of 262 housing units in the town 236 were occupied, while 26 (9.9%) were vacant. Eleven units, 4.2 percent, were identified as seasonal. This compares to 16.5 percent of housing units in the county being described as seasonal, and just over six percent for the state. The number of seasonal dwellings in the town has decreased by 27 since 1990. The number of vacant houses is down from 52 in 1990.

2. Housing Demand

A. Persons Per Household

Families are getting smaller and more people are living alone, so average household size has been going down for several decades. The most obvious effect of this trend is that demand for housing units is increasing faster than population. In the Town of Summit the average household size in 2000 was 2.64 persons per household. This compares to the average of 2.47 for Juneau County and the average of 2.5 for the state as a whole.

B. Projections

Population growth in the Town of Summit grew sharply (by 27.4%) during the 1970s then declined by 16.8 percent over the next ten years. Since then slow growth has taken place in the town. DOA projects that Summit will grow by 35 residents, or 5.3 percent, by 2025. At current household size this would lead to twelve new housing units in the town. In an estimate of the 2008 population of the town DOA says there are currently 683 residents, higher than the projection for 2010 by 30. If the twenty-year growth trend (1980-2000) is projected forward this would yield a decrease of 106 by 2025. This trend is probably misleading because of the spike in population during the 1970s. If the fifteen-year trend, from 1990 through the estimated 2005 population, is projected to 2025 it would yield an increase of 125, or twenty percent. This would mean 47 new housing units in the town.

	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
Dept. of Administration	623	620	653	660	664	658
Thirty-year growth rate	623	633	644	654	665	675
15-year trend (1990-2005)	623	660	680	701	726	748

Source: U.S. Census, DOA, NCWRPC

Based on the 2008 estimate of the population of Summit it seems clear that the DOA projections are low (the population is currently higher than the 2020 projected population peak). By projecting the thirty-year trend forward, bypassing the 1980 spike, yields an increase of 52 by 2025, an 8.3 percent growth rate.

3. Housing Programs

There are a number of programs available to local governments to aid those having trouble affording their housing needs. Based on the 2000 U.S. Census 14.7 percent of homeowners and 21.2 percent of renters spend more than thirty percent of their income on housing, the accepted standard for affordable housing. Below is a partial listing of programs available to localities:

- Section 502 Homeownership Direct Loan Program of the Rural Health Service (RHS) provides loans to help low-income households purchase and prepare sites or purchase, build, repair, renovate, or relocate homes.
- Section 502 Mutual Self-Help Housing Loans are designed to help very-low-income households construct their own homes. Targeted families include those who cannot buy affordable housing through conventional means. Participating families perform approximately 65 percent of the construction under qualified supervision.
- Section 504, the Very-Low-Income Housing Repair Program, provides loans and grants to low-income homeowners to repair, improve, or modernize their homes. Improvements must make the homes more safe and sanitary or remove health or safety hazards.
- Section 521 Rural Rental Assistance Program provides an additional subsidy for households with incomes too low to pay RHS-subsidized rents.
- Section 533 Rural Housing Preservation Grants are designed to assist sponsoring organizations in the repair or rehabilitation of low-income or very-low-income housing. Assistance is available for landlords or members of a cooperative.

The above programs are all available through USDA-RD to those who meet the income requirements. There are also programs through the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD):

- The HUD Self-Help Homeownership Opportunity Program finances land acquisition and site development associated with self-help housing for low-income families. Loans are made to the nonprofit sponsors of development projects and are interest-free. Portions of the loans are forgiven if promised units of housing are completed within a given period. These forgiven “grant conversion” funds may be used to subsidize future development projects.
- The HOME Investment Partnership Program aims to encourage the production and rehabilitation of affordable housing. HOME funds may be used for rental assistance, assistance to homebuyers, new construction, rehabilitation, or acquisition of rental housing.
- The Small Cities Development Block Grant (CDBG) program is the rural component of HUD’s Community Development Block Grant program, which is administered by state agencies. The state CDBG program provides assistance for the development of affordable housing and economic development efforts targeted to low- and moderate-income people.

The Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC), like HOME, aims to encourage the production and rehabilitation of affordable housing. It provides an incentive for private

entities to develop affordable housing. The credit reduces the federal taxes owed by an individual or corporation for an investment made in low-income rental housing. The amount of the tax deduction is tied to the proportion of low-income residents in the housing produced. The credit is paid out over 15 years to investors in the housing project. LIHTC provides funding for the construction of new buildings or the rehabilitation or conversion of existing structures. To qualify, a property must set aside a certain share of its units for low-income households.

4. Goals, Objectives & Policies

Goals

1. Allow adequate, affordable housing for all individuals consistent with the rural character of the community.
2. Discourage residential development in unsuitable areas.

Objectives

1. Ensure that local land use controls and permitting procedures do not discourage or prevent the provision of housing opportunities consistent with the rural character of the community.
2. Direct residential development away from existing agricultural uses and buildings to avoid conflicts.

Policies

1. Restrict the location of new development in areas that are shown to be unsuitable for specific uses due to septic limitations, flood hazard, groundwater pollution, highway access problems, etc.
2. The Town should work with landowners to encourage housing in accordance with this plan.

IV. TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

1. Background

The transportation system includes all modes of travel. The local transportation network is an important factor for the safe movement of people and goods, as well as to the physical development of the town. There is no transit, air, or water transportation service within the township. There are no water transportation facilities in the area. The Town of Summit transportation system includes all roadways.

A. Summary of Transportation Plans

1. Corridors 2020

Corridors 2020 was designed to enhance economic development and meet Wisconsin's mobility needs well into the future. The 3,200-mile state highway network is comprised of two main elements: a multilane backbone system and a two-lane connector system. All communities over 5,000 in population are to be linked by the backbone & connector systems.

This focus on highways was altered in 1991 with the passage of the federal Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA), which mandated that states take a multi-modal approach to transportation planning. Now, bicycle, transit, rail, air, and other modes of travel would make up the multi-modal plan. The Wisconsin Department of Transportation's (WisDOT) response to ISTEA was the two-year planning process in 1994 that created TransLinks 21.


2. TransLinks 21

WisDOT incorporated Corridors 2020 into TransLinks 21, and discussed the impacts of transportation policy decisions on land use. TransLinks 21 is a 25-year statewide multi-modal transportation plan that WisDOT completed in 1994. Within this needs-based plan are the following modal plans:

- State Highways Plan 2020
- Airport System Plan 2020
- Bicycle Transportation Plan 2020
- Wisconsin Pedestrian Policy Plan 2020
- Wisconsin Rail Issues and Opportunities Report
- No plans exists for transit or local roads.

None of the above modal plans have projects that conflict with the Town of Summit Comprehensive Plan.

3. Connections 2030



County Highway I

Connections 2030 will be a 25-year statewide multi-modal transportation plan that is policy-based. The policies will be tied to “tiers” of potential financing levels. One set of policy recommendations will focus on priorities that can be accomplished under current funding levels. Another will identify policy priorities that can be achieved if funding levels increase. Finally, WisDOT may also identify critical priorities that we must maintain if funding were to decrease over the planning horizon of the plan. This plan will not conflict with the Town of Summit Comprehensive Plan, because the policies are based upon the transportation needs outlined in TransLinks 21. There are no TransLinks 21 projects identified in Summit.

4. State Trails Network Plan

The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR) created this plan in 2001, to identify a statewide network of trails and to provide guidance to the DNR for land acquisition and development. Many existing trails are developed and operated in partnership with counties. By agreement the DNR acquires the corridor and the county government(s) develop, operate, and maintain the trail.

B. Inventory of Transportation Facilities

1. Roads

In the Town of Summit, roads play the key role in development by providing both access to land and serving to move people and goods through the area, by car, bicycle, and foot power.

The Town of Summit’s minor arterial is State Highways 58. CTH G and K are major collectors, and the remaining 56.6 miles of roads in the town are local.

The Town of Summit road network consists of roughly 6.9 miles of state highways, 12.3 miles of county highways, and 56.62 miles of local roads. WisDOT requires all local units of government to submit road condition rating data every two years as part of the Wisconsin Information System for Local Roads (WISLR). The Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating (PASER) program and WISLR are tools that local governments can use to manage pavements for improved decision making in budgeting and

Road Classifications

Principal Arterials – serve interstate and interregional trips. These routes generally serve urban areas with 5,000 people or more.

Minor Arterials – accommodate interregional and county-to-county traffic, often in conjunction with principal arterials.

Major Collectors – provide service to moderate sized communities and other county-level traffic.

Minor Collectors – take traffic from local roads and provide links to all remaining portions of smaller communities and connect to other higher function roads listed above.

Local Roads – provide direct access to residential, commercial, and industrial developments.

maintenance. Towns can use this information to develop better road budgets and keep track of roads that are in need of repair.

**Table 14: Annual Average Daily Traffic at Recorded Sites
Town of Wonevok 1980-2004**

	1980	1983	1989	1992	1998	2004	% Change 1980-2004
Site 1	860	830	920	1,200	1,200	1,700	97.6%
Site 2	790	720	800	880	870	---	10.1%*

Source: Wisconsin Highway Traffic Volume, Department of Transportation

Site 1: STH 58 north of CTH I

Site 2: STH 58 north of county line

* 1980-1998

Annual average daily traffic counts (AADT) are measured and calculated every three years by the Department of Transportation (DOT) for two areas of the town. Monitoring these counts provides a way to gauge how traffic volume is changing in Summit. Traffic levels in Summit don't follow a clear pattern. The greatest increase in traffic has been on STH 58 north of CTH I, where traffic has nearly doubled over the last twenty years. In 1980 traffic levels on 58 at the north end of the town were less than nine percent higher than at the south end of the town. By 1998, the last year a traffic count was done at both sites, traffic was 38 percent higher at the northern site. By 2004 traffic on STH 58 north of CTH I had increased by another 41.6 percent.

The interrelationships between land use and the road system makes it necessary for the development of each to be balanced with the other. Types and intensities of land-uses have a direct relationship to the traffic on roadways that serve those land-uses. Intensely developed land often generates high volumes of traffic. If this traffic is not planned for safety can be seriously impaired for both local and through traffic flows.

Traffic generated and attracted by any new land-use can increase congestion on the roadway system. Even without creating new access points, changes in land-uses can alter the capacity of the roadway. The new business may generate more car traffic, or farm implement traffic. Uncontrolled division of land tends to affect highways by increasing the amount of turning traffic into and out from intersecting driveways, therefore impairing safety and impeding traffic movements.

Wisconsin recognizes that a relationship between highway operations and the use of abutting lands exists. Under Chapter 233, the Department of Transportation (WisDOT) was given the authority to establish rules to review subdivision plats abutting or adjoining state trunk highways or connecting highways. Regulations enacted by the WisDOT establish the principles of subdivision review. They require new subdivisions to: (1) have internal street systems; (2) limit direct vehicular access to the highways from individual lots; (3) establish building setbacks; and (4) establish access patterns for remaining unplatted land. This rule has recently been suspended, but the four requirements are still useful in managing traffic flow.

The entire road system in the Town of Summit is also open by state law to pedestrian and bicycle travel, although some traffic volumes may make such travel unsafe.

Juneau County Road Improvement Plan

Annual road improvement plans are created and submitted to the County Board for approval.

2. Bicycling Opportunities

All roads in the Town of Summit are available for bicycle travel. Because of the nature of the topography within the town many roads are not well suited to bicycling. The Bicycle Federation of Wisconsin along with WisDOT have determined what the bicycling conditions are on all county and state highways. Although no formal bike trails exist within the town, Summit is nearby trails that pass through Wonewoc and LaValle.

3. Airports

Air Carrier/Air Cargo airports closest to Summit are the La Crosse Municipal Airport (LSE), and the Dane County Regional Airport (MSN) in Madison.

Transport/Corporate airports are intended to serve corporate jets, small passenger and cargo jet aircraft used in regional service and small airplanes (piston or turboprop) used in commuter air service. The only difference between a transport/corporate airport and a commercial airport is that the commercial airport has scheduled passenger service.

Utility airports are intended to serve virtually all small general aviation single and twin-engine aircraft, both piston and turboprop, with a maximum takeoff weight of 12,500 pounds or less. These aircraft typically seat from two to six people and are now commonly used for business and some charter flying as well as a wide variety of activities including recreational and sport flying, training, and crop dusting. There are several private landing strips in the town.

Three Castles Airpark (4D1) has two runways, is located one mile north-west of the Village of Wonewoc, and is open to the public. Runway #10 is 2740 x 90 feet, and has a turf surface. Runway #28 is 2740 x 90 feet, and also has a turf surface. This Basic Utility-A (BU-A) airport is designed to accommodate aircraft of less than 6,000 pounds gross weight, with approach speeds below 91 knots and wingspans of less than 49 feet. Such aircraft are typically single-engine piston, or ultralights.

4. Rail

The closest rail service is in the City of Mauston, the Canadian Pacific runs east-west, from Portage to Tomah, connecting Milwaukee and LaCrosse. There is regular freight service on both lines. Amtrak provides passenger rail service, which has stations in Tomah and Wisconsin Dells.

5. Bus/Transit

There are few transit systems near and within Juneau County. Shared ride taxi service is provided in Mauston. Intercity bus routes exist from Tomah to: Madison; Rockford, IL; & Milwaukee; and Tomah to Eau Claire; and Minneapolis, MN.

6. Transportation Facilities for Disabled

All residents of the county age 60 and over and all ages of handicapped persons are eligible to ride free. Trip priority is given to: 1. Medical trips; 2. Nutrition sites; & 3. Grocery shopping, beauty shop, and other types of trip requests.

There are no fixed routes. Volunteer drivers provide service with their own vehicles on a demand/response basis. Drivers are available Monday through Friday, and by special arrangement on weekends and evenings. The Juneau County Aging Unit has a small bus, and a van. The bus is utilized for wheelchair accessible transportation needs. The van is used four times a week for food delivery, and is available the remaining time for passenger transport. The van has running boards for better accessibility, but is not lift-equipped.



The Town of Summit maintains shop facilities along STH 58 where it stores road equipment and supplies.

7. Pedestrian Facilities

All roads are available for pedestrian travel.

2. Goals, Objectives & Policies

Goals

1. Encourage community designs that support a range of transportation choices.
2. Provide an efficient and economical transportation system that affords mobility, convenience and safety.

Objectives

1. Support and maintain a safe and efficient Town road system.
2. The Town should work with the County on any projects that affect the town.

Policies

1. Utilize WISLR application to inventory and rate the local roads.
2. Discourage land uses that generate heavy traffic volumes on local roads that have not been constructed or upgraded for such use.
3. Control roadway access along the existing Town road network to increase safety and preserve capacity.
4. Widen and improve existing roads before constructing new roads.

3. Bibliography


WDOT – Bureau of Planning, Corridors 2020, 1988, Madison, WI

WDOT – Bureau of Planning, TransLinks 21, 1994, Madison, WI



WDOT – Bureau of Planning, Connections 2030, *in process*, Madison, WI

WDNR – Bureau of Parks and Recreation, State Trails Network Plan, 2001, Madison, WI

Map 3 Utilities & Community Facilities Town of Summit Juneau County, Wisconsin



- Minor Civil Divisions
 - Cemeteries
 - Section Lines
 - Town Garage
 - Principal Arterial
 - Town Hall
 - Major Collector
 - Minor Collector
 - Summit Park
 - Minor Arterial
 - Local Roads
 - Water
- 500** Annual Average Daily Traffic Count, 2004



Source: WI DNR, NCWRPC, WI DOT 2004

This map is neither a legally recorded map nor a survey and is not intended to be used as one. This drawing is a compilation of records, information and data used for reference purposes only. NCWRPC is not responsible for any inaccuracies herein contained.



Prepared by:
**North Central
Wisconsin Regional
Planning Commission**

210 McClellan St., Suite 210, Wausau, WI 54403
715-849-5510 - staff@ncwrpc.org - www.ncwrpc.org

V. UTILITIES & COMMUNITY FACILITIES ELEMENT

As a primarily rural town relatively few utilities exist. There is no sanitary sewer, storm water systems, water supply, wastewater facilities, power plants, health care facilities, or libraries. The Town is split between the Wonewoc-Union Center School District, and the Mauston School District. The Town is in the Western Wisconsin Technical College District.

The Town is a member of three fire association: Mauston, LaValle and Wonewoc. Parts of the town call on the Mauston and LaValle departments, but the western part of the town is served by the Wonewoc Fire & Ambulance Association, which provides fire and ambulance service. There is a chief and twenty-three volunteers in that department and sixteen EMTs operate the ambulance. The Fire Association owns four fire engines, and one pick-up truck, all of which, including the ambulance are based at the Village of Wonewoc Fire Hall. The eastern sections of the town receive ambulance service from the ambulance association out of Mauston.



Summit Park

Community facilities include an historic Town Hall, and a shop housing a Town office, the equipment for road maintenance, as well as a garage adjacent where heavy equipment is stored. The Town owns the following road equipment: two dump trucks (International 2007, Peterbuilt, 2000), a front-end loader, with mower/brusher attachments (Case, 1990), a backhoe (Case, 1997), and a grader (1980s). The Town employs one full-time patrolman, a part-time patrolman, part-time dump man, and part-time mower.

The Town maintains Summit Park, across STH 58 from the town garage, a three-acre facility with a pavilion, picnic area, bathrooms, playground equipment, and baseball field. The Town is also responsible for maintaining three cemeteries.

Residents can bring their garbage to the County Landfill and there is a transfer station at the town garage that town residents can use for garbage disposal and recycling.

Electric service is provided by Oakdale Electric Co-op. Phone service in most of the town comes from LaValle Telephone, and Verizon. Limited DSL Internet lines are available depending on the distance through LaValle Telephone. Generally cell phone service is available throughout the town, mainly through US Cellular and Alltel. See the Transportation & Community Facilities Map 3.

2. Goals, Objectives & Policies

Goals

1. Continue to provide ambulance, volunteer fire and first responder services to residents.

Objectives

1. Consider the potential impacts of development proposals on groundwater quality and quantity.
2. Share equipment and services across Town boundaries, where possible.

Policies

1. Work with adjoining Towns, the County, the State, and individual landowners to maintain current water quality standards.
2. Encourage recycling by residents.

VI. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ELEMENT

1. Economic Base

A. Juneau County

In looking at the prospects for economic development in a rural community it is best to place it in a larger context. It is most useful to look first at Juneau County as a whole in assessing the prospects for economic development in the Town of Summit. In recent years there has been a good deal of change in the economy of Juneau County. Most significant has been the decline in manufacturing that has occurred throughout the nation as well as in the county. In order to reinvigorate the county's economic base diversification away from the traditional reliance on manufacturing will be required in order to better position the county to compete in a changing marketplace.

Many of the communities in Juneau County are located along the Interstate 90/94 Corridor making them something of a "midpoint" between the larger cities Madison and Eau Claire/La Crosse. Perhaps even more important is Juneau County's position between Chicago and Minneapolis. Manufacturers seeking to serve markets in these communities have historically found Juneau County's location to their liking. But this transportation linkage has not only impacted employers, but the ability of employees to commute as well.

Economic success often hinges on the characteristics of the population. These human resources are key to the diversification of the economy in Juneau County. A diversified community requires more employees and a wider variety of skills than a "one-industry focus" community. Furthermore, these workers must be adaptable to changes in the demand for labor and be capable of quickly retraining in new vocations to meet that demand. The county lags behind the state in educational attainment and the population is slightly older than the state as a whole. In spite of these factors, which could be considered handicaps to economic diversification, there has been steady growth in the total number of jobs within the county over the last twenty years.

Table 15: Labor Force and Unemployment Trends, Juneau County, 1980 to 2000

	1980	1990	2000	Change 80-00	State 2000
Labor Force	8,853	10,143	12,068	36.32%	26.77%
Employed	8,206	9,478	11,333	38.11%	29.34%
Unemployed	647	665	735	13.60%	-9.82%
Unemployment Rate	7.31%	6.56%	6.09%	-16.69%	-28.79%
Participation Rate	42.08%	46.85%	49.63%	17.94%	11.21%

Source: US Census

Despite progress in creation of new jobs and expanding the labor force from 1980 to 2000, the number of the unemployed is growing. Juneau County has a higher unemployment rate than the state's rate of 4.7 percent. Though total employment has increased over the last twenty years, employment has not increased in every industry sector of the economy. Table

16 provides an inventory of the types of industry in Juneau County and their respective numbers of employees and firms.¹

Table 16: Employees and Firms by Industry, Juneau County, 2000


Industry Name	Employees	Firms	Percentage of Total
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, and Hunting	842	658	7.43
Mining	10	2	0.09
Utilities	3	1	0.03
Construction	340	73	3.00
Manufacturing	2,671	47	23.57
Wholesale Trade	156	17	1.38
Retail Trade	1,116	99	9.85
Transportation and Warehousing	333	39	2.94
Information	69	11	0.61
Finance and Insurance	184	29	1.62
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	36	13	0.32
Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services	195	31	1.72
Management of Companies and Enterprises	16	5	0.14
Administrative and Support and Waste Management and Remediation Services	125	25	1.10
Educational Services	6	2	0.05
Health Care and Social Assistance	925	47	8.16
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation	96	15	0.85
Accommodation and Food Services	1,665	96	14.69
Other Services	350	77	3.09
Government, Schools, Public Administration	2,195	NA	19.37
Total	11,333	1,288	100

Source: US Census, County Business Patterns

Juneau County's largest source of employment is the manufacturing industry, followed by government, schools and public administration, then accommodation and food services, and retail trade. Industries showing a large number of firms are indicative of many small businesses or "one-person shops". Farming is, of course, the greatest share of one-operator businesses; construction, retail, and services show large shares of total firms as well. Figure 9 summarizes the allocation of workers in Juneau County by industry. It is clear that manufacturing comprises a substantial portion of Juneau County's employment.

¹ The number of employees in this table varies from the county numbers in Tables 18 and 19. The figures in Table 16 come from the Census Business Profile, which is collected directly from businesses. The other numbers are the result of individuals reporting their own occupation and industry, and are thus different from what businesses report.

Figure 9: Distribution of Employment by Industry Sector, Juneau County, 2000



Source: US Census

Areas of rapid employment growth in the US during the 1980 to 2000 period include: forestry, water transportation, transportation services, non-durable goods, building materials, hardware stores, garden supply, manufactured home dealers, home furniture & equipment stores, miscellaneous retail, security & commodity brokers, holding & investment offices, hotels, camps, lodging, business services, auto repair, miscellaneous repair shops, amusement & recreation, educational & social services, museums & art galleries, and legal services. Areas of employment decline during the same period include: leather products, membership organizations, insurance agents, brokers, eating and drinking places, general merchandise stores, apparel & other finished products made from fabric, and metal & coal mining.

How this employment mix will change over the coming years is dependent on a number of factors, but it seems likely that the dominance of manufacturing in the county will be reduced and services, health-related and knowledge-based employment will become more prominent.

B. Major Employers

As noted, manufacturing is still the largest single source of employment in Juneau County but a look at the largest employers in the county reveals how the profile of employment is changing. Of the eleven largest employers in the county only three are involved in manufacturing. Two are involved in health-care. The other six are some form of government enterprise. This is not to say that the trend in employment is toward more people working for the government.

Most people are employed by small business. It is significant that the third, fourth and fifth largest employment categories (as shown in Table 16) are occupations that involve a large

number of firms. Much of the job growth in the future is likely to be in these industries and in these kinds of small enterprises.

Table 17: Major Employers; Firms with 250 or More Employees, Juneau County, 2003

Employer Name	Industry
Hess Memorial Hospital	Health-care
Walker Stainless Equipment	Manufacturing
Sandridge Treatment Facility	Health-care
Mauston Public Schools	Education
County of Juneau	General Government
New Lisbon Correctional Institution	Prison
Parker Hannifin	Manufacturing
Necedah Public School	Education
Freudenburg (Farmer/Meillor)	Manufacturing
Wisconsin Dept. of Military Affairs	Volk Field
U.S. Department of Defense	Volk Field

Source: Department of Workforce Development

Growth in services, health-care and information technology will affect the shape of the Juneau County economy in the years to come. Perhaps the greatest single factor in the future of economic development in the county will be the I-90/94 corridor that passes through it. There is certainly potential within the warehousing and transportation sector due to this advantageous location. The position of the county halfway between Chicago and the Twin Cities places it literally at the center of an axis of high-tech growth. This offers great potential for development within the county.

C. Employment

The particulars of the labor force within the Town of Summit can be gleaned from the Census. The most notable fact is that most residents work outside of the town. Seventy-seven people work in the town, and 255 (76.8%) workers leave the town. Over thirty-four percent leave the county for their work. Almost nineteen percent of residents work at home. This compares to the City of Mauston where 45.6 percent of workers leave the city and 22.7 percent leave the county, and 1.8 percent work at home. In the Town of Wonewoc 78 percent leave the town and almost 42 percent of workers leave the county for their jobs.

Thirty-seven percent of workers, who do not work at home, commute between fifteen and thirty minutes to get to their jobs. Nearly thirty percent have a commute less than fifteen minutes and 28.5 percent travel between half an hour and an hour to get to work. Twelve workers travel for more than an hour to reach their jobs.

Table 18: Resident Occupation 2000

Occupation	Town of Summit		Town of Wonewoc		Juneau County		State of Wisconsin	
Management/professional	105	31.8%	101	26.8%	2,515	22.2%	857,205	31.3%
Service	38	11.5%	49	13%	2,034	17.9%	383,619	14%
Farming/forestry	14	4.2%	8	2.1%	179	1.6%	25,365	0.9%
Sales/office	65	19.7%	78	20.7%	2,494	22%	690,360	25.2%
Construction	26	7.9%	34	9%	1,110	9.8%	237,086	8.7%
Production/transportation	82	24.8%	107	28.4%	3,001	26.5%	540,930	19.8%
Total	330	100%	377	100%	11,333	100%	2,734,925	100%

Source: US Census Bureau & NCWRPC

Table 18, above, shows the occupation of workers in the Town of Summit and compares it with those in the Town of Wonewoc, Juneau County, and the state as a whole. The percentage of those in management or the professions is higher than Wonewoc, the county and the state. A smaller percentage of workers are in service jobs as in Wonewoc, the state or the county. The percentage of sales and office workers is lower than Wonewoc, the state or county. Construction workers are a lower percentage of the labor force than in Wonewoc, the state or county. Although the percentage of production and transport workers is above the level for the state it is lower than the level for the county or for Wonewoc.

Table 19: Industry by Jurisdiction, 2000

Industry	Town of Summit		Town of Wonewoc		Juneau County		State of Wisconsin	
Agriculture/forestry/mining	75	22.7%	51	13.5%	602	5.3%	75,418	2.8%
Construction	18	5.5%	27	7.2%	757	6.7%	161,625	5.9%
Manufacturing	76	23%	88	23.3%	2,789	24.6%	606,845	22.2%
Wholesale trade	5	1.5%	20	5.3%	258	2.3%	87,979	3.2%
Retail trade	43	13%	40	10.6%	1,423	12.6%	317,881	11.6%
Transport/warehouse/util.	12	3.6%	21	5.6%	623	5.5%	123,657	4.5%
Information	3	0.9%	2	0.5%	90	0.8%	60,142	2.2%
Finance/insur./real estate	7	2.1%	17	4.5%	379	3.3%	168,060	6.1%
Professional/management	13	3.9%	13	3.4%	393	3.5%	179,503	6.6%
Education/health/soc.serv	39	11.8%	63	16.7%	1,702	15%	548,111	20%
Arts/enter./accom/food	22	6.7%	18	4.8%	1,369	12.1%	198,528	7.3%
Other service	11	3.3%	7	1.9%	390	3.4%	111,028	4.1%
Public administration	6	1.8%	10	2.7%	558	4.9%	96,148	3.5%
Total	330	100%	377	100%	11,333	100%	2,734,925	100%

Source: US Census Bureau & NCWRPC

Manufacturing is the most common industry in which workers are involved. The percentage of workers in manufacturing is virtually identical to the level in Wonewoc, lower than the county and slightly higher than the state. As would be expected in a rural town employment

in agriculture and forestry is much higher than Wonevoc, four-times the level in the county and ten-times the level in the state. Retail trade occupies a slightly higher percentage of the workforce than the county, the state, and Wonevoc. The nearly twelve percent of workers in education, health-care and social service work is well below Wonevoc, the county and the state. Arts, entertainment, accommodation and food service workers are higher than in Wonevoc, lower than the state level, and just over half the level of the county. Professional and management jobs are similar to the rate for the county and Wonevoc, but well below the state. The percentage of workers involved in public administration is considerably below Wonevoc, the county and the state.

D. SWOT

Strengths:

- Rural setting – strong agricultural tradition
- Quality of Life
- Long-time residents
- Low cost of living
- Proximity to jobs, and the Interstate
- Outdoor recreation – close to Lakes
- Good schools
- Most Town roads paved
- No big developments

Weaknesses:

- Dangerous roads – difficult to maintain (hilly)
- Limited broadband service
- Pay scale and lack of opportunity – young people move
- Isolated for emergency services
- Services for elderly (difficult access)

E. Contaminated Sites

There is one contaminated site in the Town of Summit, an historic spill that took place at Pfaff and Daus Roads. The spill took place in 1993 and the site was remediated and closed by 1996. The area around the spill site continues in agricultural use.

2. Economic Development Programs

There are a number of economic development programs available to businesses and local governments in Juneau County. Following is a partial list of those programs.

Local:

The Juneau County Economic Development Corporation (JCEDC)

A non-profit organization that promotes the economic development of Juneau County, Wisconsin, and its respective cities, villages, and towns. JCEDC is comprised of area businesspersons, citizens, local government, utility company representatives, state agencies and elected officials, educational institutions and other organizations essential to the growth of Juneau County. JCEDC is prepared to serve the needs of new businesses coming to our area as well as assist existing companies.

Juneau County Development Zone

Juneau County was recently awarded designation as a Wisconsin Development Zone in association with Adams and Marquette Counties. Known as the JAM Zone (Juneau-Adams-Marquette), Juneau County qualifies for special state incentives available to businesses that locate or expand within the Zone. Development Zone Tax Incentives for businesses locating or expanding within Juneau County. A variety of credits are available.

Juneau County Revolving Loan Fund

A Wisconsin Department of Commerce Economic Development Grant was awarded to Juneau County in 1998. This grant enabled Juneau County to establish a revolving loan fund in order to assist local businesses

Regional:

North Central Wisconsin Development Corporation

The North Central Wisconsin Development Corporation (NCWDC) manages a revolving loan fund designed to address a gap in private capital markets for long-term, fixed-rate, low down payment, low interest financing. It is targeted at the timber and wood products industry, tourism and other manufacturing and service industries.

Western Wisconsin Technology Zone Tax Credits

Juneau County has been designated a Technology Zone by the Department of Commerce. The Technology Zone program brings \$5 million in income tax incentives for high-tech development to the area. The Western Wisconsin Technology Zone offers the potential for high-tech growth in knowledge-based and advanced manufacturing clusters, among others. The zone designation is designed to attract and retain skilled, high-paid workers to the area, foster regional partnerships between business and education to promote high-tech development, and to complement the area's recent regional branding project.

Northwest Wisconsin Manufacturing Outreach Center (NWMOC)

The Northwest Wisconsin Manufacturing Outreach Center provides operations assessments, technology training, and on-site assistance to help firms in western Wisconsin modernize and streamline manufacturing processes.

Alliant Energy

Alliant Energy is a regional utility company that provides technical and consultative economic development assistance to communities within its service area.

State:

Rural Economic Development Program

This program administrated by Wisconsin Department of Commerce provides grants and low interest loans for small business (less than 25 employees) start-ups or expansions in rural areas, such as Wonewoc. Funds may be used for "soft costs" only, such as planning, engineering, and marketing assistance.

Wisconsin Small Cities Program

The Wisconsin Department of Commerce provides federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds to eligible municipalities for approved housing and/or public facility improvements and for economic development projects. Economic Development grants provide loans to businesses for such things as: acquisition of real estate, buildings, or equipment; construction, expansion or remodeling; and working capital for inventory and direct labor.

University of Wisconsin Extension Office

The Center for Community Economic Development, University of Wisconsin Extension, creates, applies and transfers multidisciplinary knowledge to help people understand community change and identify opportunities.

The Wisconsin Innovation Service Center (WISC)

This non-profit organization is located at the University of Wisconsin at Whitewater and specializes in new product and invention assessments and market expansion opportunities for innovative manufacturers, technology businesses, and independent inventors.

Wisconsin Small Business Development Center (SBDC)

The UW SBDC is partially funded by the Small Business Administration and provides a variety of programs and training seminars to assist in the creation of small business in Wisconsin.

Other State Programs

Technology Development grants and loans; Customized Labor Training grants and loans; and Major Economic Development Project grants and loans.

Transportation Economic Assistance (TEA)

This program, administered by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation, provides immediate assistance and funding for the cost of transportation improvements necessary for major economic development projects.

Federal:

Economic Development Administration (EDA)

EDA offers a guaranteed loan program as well as public works grant program. These are administered through local units of government for the benefit of the local economy and, indirectly, private enterprise.

US Department of Agriculture – Rural Development (USDA – RD)

The USDA Rural Development program is committed to helping improve the economy and quality of life in all of rural America. Financial programs include support for such essential public facilities and services as water and sewer systems, housing, health clinics, emergency service facilities, and electric and telephone service. USDA-RD promotes economic development by supporting loans to businesses through banks and community-managed lending pools. The program also offers technical assistance and information to help agricultural and other cooperatives get started and improve the effectiveness of their member services.

Small Business Administration (SBA)

SBA provides business and industrial loan programs that will make or guarantee up to 90% of the principal and interest on loans to companies, individuals, or government entities for financing in rural areas. Wisconsin Business Development Finance Corporation acts as an agent for the U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA) programs that provide financing for fixed asset loans and for working capital.

3. Goals, Objectives & Policies

Goals

1. Encourage the expansion and stabilization of the current economic base.
2. Discourage commercial and industrial development in unsuitable areas.

Objectives

1. Encourage businesses that are compatible in a rural setting.

Policies

1. Accommodate home-based businesses that do not significantly increase noise, traffic, odors, lighting, or would otherwise negatively impact the surrounding areas.
2. Seek to minimize conflict between agricultural operations and nearby residential uses.

4. Bibliography

Department of Commerce, County Economic Profile: Juneau County, 2000, Madison

NCWRPC, Economic Diversification Study: Juneau County, Wisconsin, 2003, Wausau

Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development, Juneau County Workforce Profile, 2001, Madison

VII. LAND USE ELEMENT

1. Land Use

A. Background

The Town of Summit covers about 23,681 acres in Juneau County. The Town encompasses roughly one township. Summit is located on the northeastern edge of the Driftless Area, a part of the state that has never been glaciated.

B. Existing Land Use 2005

Knowing the existing land use patterns within a town is necessary to develop a desired future land use pattern. The Existing Land Use Map was developed using air photos from a countywide flight in 2003, with updates by local residents in 2009. Woodlands represent 49.4 percent of the area, and Agriculture occupies 38.5 percent of the land area of the town. Open Lands are nearly ten percent, and Commercial and Governmental are under one percent of the total each. Residential uses are 1.15 percent. See the Existing Land Use Map.

In general, woodlands are scattered through most of the town. Because of the deeply incised landscape agriculture tends to exist on hilltops and valley bottoms while woodlands occupy many of the steeper slopes.

Residential development tends to be widely scattered, distributed along the roadways. There were no existing or potential land use conflicts identified.

Land Use Type	Acres	Percent
Agriculture	9,126.9	38.5%
Commercial	3.8	0.0016%
Governmental	4.5	0.002%
Residential	274.2	1.15%
Transportation	368.9	1.5%
Open Lands	2,185	9.6%
Woodlands	11,695.4	49.4%
Water	22.5	0.095%
Total Acres	23,681	100%

Source: NCWRPC GIS


C. Future Land Use 2005-2025

The Future Land Use Plan Map (FLUP) represents the long-term land use recommendations for all lands in the town. Although the map is advisory and does not have the authority of zoning, it is intended to reflect community desires and serve as a guide for local officials to coordinate and manage future development of the town.

The Plan groups land uses that are compatible and separates conflicting uses. To create the Plan, nine basic future land use categories were created. Again, the classifications are not zoning districts and do not have the authority of zoning. However, the preferred land use map and classifications are intended for use as a guide when making land use decisions.

These land use classifications that are designed to be similar to those embodied in the Town's zoning ordinance. A future land use map drawn with the broad categories that can easily be translated into zoning districts. The vision that is embodied in the future land use map can act as a guide for whatever land use controls are implemented.



Map 4 Generalized Existing Land Use Town of Summit Juneau County, Wisconsin



- | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|
| Minor Civil Divisions | Commercial |
| Section Lines | Governmental |
| US Highways | Residential |
| State Highways | Open Lands |
| County Highways | Transportation |
| Local Roads | Water |
| Private Roads | Woodlands |
| Agriculture | |

Source: WI DNR, NCWRPC, 2008 Airphoto Interpretation

This map is neither a legally recorded map nor a survey and is not intended to be used as one. This drawing is a compilation of records, information and data used for reference purposes only. NCWRPC is not responsible for any inaccuracies herein contained.



Prepared by:

**North Central
Wisconsin Regional
Planning Commission**
 210 McClellan St., Suite 210, Wausau, WI 54403
 715-849-5510 - staff@ncwrpc.org - www.ncwrpc.org

D. Land Use Classifications

A general description of each land use classification follows:

1. Residential

Identifies areas recommended for residential development typically consisting of smaller lot sizes.

2. Rural Residential

Identifies areas that are recommended for less dense residential development, consisting of larger minimum lot sizes than the residential category. These areas will also allow a mixture of residential uses, and provide a good transition from more dense development to the rural countryside.

3. Commercial

Identifies areas recommended for commercial development, as well as existing commercial establishments located throughout the Town.

4. Industrial

Identifies areas recommended for industrial development.

5. Governmental/Public/Institutional

Identifies existing or planned governmental/public/institutional facilities within the Town, including recreational facilities.

6. Agricultural Areas

Identifies areas to be preserved for the purpose of general crop farming or the raising of livestock.

7. Forestry Areas

Identifies areas of large woodlands within the Town.

8. Transportation Corridors

Identifies the existing road network along with the recommendations for improved and safe traffic movement in the town, including airports and rail facilities.

9. Preservation & Open Space

Contains sensitive environmental areas, such as 100-year floodplains as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, DNR wetlands, steep slopes of 12

percent or greater, and open water. This could include endangered species habitat or other significant features or areas identified by the Town.

Using these categories the Planning Commission participated in a mapping exercise to identify the desired land use. Commission members were asked to indicate their thoughts on a map by drawing shapes or circles to place these different land uses on a map. Specifically, they used their broad knowledge of the town, the series of maps that were prepared as part of the planning process, and their interpretation of the current trends. The goal was to produce a generalized land use plan map to guide the town’s growth in the coming decades. The Year 2025 Land Use Plan Map represents the desired arrangement of preferred land uses for the future.

E. Future Land Use Plan Map Overview

The future land use plan map has identified approximately 14,300 acres of land for agriculture, 4,550 acres in forestry, 1,213 acres of land for preservation & open space, 3,019 acres for rural residential development, and 209 acres in commercial use. Of the total area of the township 22.5 acres are water. Because of the steeply incised topography of the town the FLUP addresses the predominant land use of an area. For example, an area shown completely as Agricultural may have deep, forested valleys and areas shown in Forestry may have scattered fields in flat areas.

The overwhelming majority of the town is designated for Agriculture, especially in the north and western section of the town. Areas of Preservation & Open Space follow the course of Crossman and West Branch Big Creeks. There are areas of Rural Residential along CTH G and I, and large are where STH 58 enters the hilly area of the Driftless Zone. There is a Commercial strip along STH 58 north of this area, toward Mauston.


Table 21: Land Use Projections

	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
Residential	274	281	290	298.5	306	310
Commercial	3.8	4.2	4.8	5.3	5.8	6.4


Source: U.S. Census, DOA, NCWRPC

The three thousand acres set aside for rural residential use in the Future Land Use Plan is more than enough, even considering the Town’s five-acre minimum lot size, to accommodate the likely demand for residential land, based on the twenty-years growth trend. Over two hundred acres of commercial development is envisioned in the town, far more than likely demand.

Map 5 Future Land Use Plan Town of Summit Juneau County, Wisconsin



- | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Minor Civil Divisions | Agricultural Areas |
| Section Lines | Commercial |
| US Highways | Forestry Areas |
| State Highways | Preservation & Open Space |
| County Highways | Rural Residential |
| Local Roads | Transportation |
| Private Roads | Water |



Source: WI DNR, NCWRPC
 This map is neither a legally recorded map nor a survey and is not intended to be used as one. This drawing is a compilation of records, information and data used for reference purposes only. NCWRPC is not responsible for any inaccuracies herein contained.

Prepared by:
 **North Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission**
 210 McClellan St., Suite 210, Wausau, WI 54403
 715-849-5510 - staff@ncwrpc.org - www.ncwrpc.org

The goal of this land use plan is to balance individual private property rights with the Town's need to protect property values community-wide, minimize the conflicts between land uses and keep the cost of local government as low as possible. An essential characteristic of any planning program is that it be ongoing and flexible. Periodic updates to the plan are needed to maintain that it is reflective of current trends.

2. Land Use Controls

A. Zoning/Subdivision

1. Town Land Use Ordinance

The Town of Summit adopted a Land Use Ordinance in 1997. This ordinance establishes the requirement for building permits, minimum lot size, road and driveway standards, nuisance and junkyard standards, and camper and mobile home regulations. The ordinance establishes a five-acre minimum lot size, and a 50-foot frontage requirement on a public road. There is a provision that certain kinds of buildings (business, commercial, industrial, and multi-family) require specific approval by the Town Board.

This special permit requirement constitutes something of a hybrid. Because it involves a review process more extensive for certain kinds of buildings, based on use, the ordinance mixes the function of building permit/subdivision regulations with the kind of land use regulation associated with zoning. The ordinance allows the Town Board "wide discretion in determining the size and area necessary to properly provide for the conduct of the proposed use," including waiving the minimum lot size and frontage requirements. The Town Board also "may grant" approval to a multi-family residential project if it "provides a reasonable area" for such use, a ten-acre minimum lot size applies to all multi-family structures.

What is not clear is whether the Town Board has the power to reject such applications, and if so what the criteria for such a rejection might be. In the case of commercial² uses the discretion is whether to allow a waiver of the five-acre minimum. Although this special permit may be intended as a method for giving the Town Board the ability to review site plans for certain kinds of uses before subdivision approval is granted, the lack of any clear criteria for what would constitute grounds for rejection puts the Town in a difficult position. Because the Board is given "wide discretion" on what constitutes "a reasonable area for the use" it is unclear what the basis for a denial of such a permit would be or even whether such a denial is within the power of the Board.

Among the documentation required to receive a building permit is an authorization to make "regular inspections...to verify compliance with this ordinance." It is not entirely clear that these inspections are to be related to the building permit and not a blanket authorization for inspections arising from other provisions of the ordinance.

² The actual ordinance language is, "Business, farm, commercial, and industrial" is here summarized under the title commercial for simplicity sake. In the same way "condominiums, apartments, or other multi-family units" are referred to simply as multi-family.

There is a provision requiring an 840 square foot minimum living space for any dwelling. This is a fairly standard method of restricting the spread of “single-wide” manufactured housing, and has generally been upheld by the courts. Another provision requires that any land whose “principal use as recreational property by organized groups” receive a permit for such use is somewhat ambiguous. It is unclear what constitutes a recreational use. It also begs the question whether an individual undertaking such a use would not be required to obtain a permit.

The Town Board is given the right to grant variances to the provisions of the ordinance, but no criteria for granting such variances is given. This risks the granting of such variances as being seen as arbitrary and capricious.

2. County Shoreline Jurisdiction

All water bodies in Summit are covered under the County’s shoreland zoning. Those zoning regulations apply only to areas within 300 feet of a stream or river, and within 1000 feet of a pond or lake.

B. County Subdivision Ordinance

The County administers a Road Access and Land Division ordinance, which requires minimum road frontage (40 feet) and a certified survey map for any newly created lot of less than fifteen acres. It also specifies road standards for any road that is to be accepted for dedication as part of any subdivision.

C. Managed Forest Tax Law

Owners of private timberlands can participate in deferred tax programs under Wisconsin tax laws. Voluntary participation in these programs requires that private landowners follow “sound forestry practices” as prescribed in a formal management plan or, as in the case of industrially owned lands, a management commitment. Lands in the Managed Forest Law (MFL) are committed to a management period of 25 or 50 years. Participants in the program have the right to keep some land closed to public use, but some is open to hunting, fishing, cross country skiing, hiking and sightseeing. Some activities not permitted under the law include motorized vehicles, permanent tree stands, picking berries or mushrooms and trapping. There are 1,314 acres of land in the Town of Summit that fall under the Managed Forest Tax Law.

3. Goals, Objectives & Policies

Goals

1. Balance individual property rights with community interests and goals.
2. Plan and develop land uses that create or preserve the rural community.
3. Encourage land uses, densities and regulations that promote efficient development patterns and relatively low municipal and utility costs.
4. Promote a quiet and peaceful community with open spaces and scenic landscape.

Objectives

1. Maintain orderly, planned growth which promotes the health, safety and general welfare of residents and makes efficient use of land, public services, facilities and tax dollars.
2. New development should not negatively impact the natural environment or existing properties.
3. Promote a mix of new land developments that are consistent with this plan.

Policies

1. Encourage land uses and building locations that minimize both the loss of productive farmland and the potential for conflicts between existing and proposed land uses.
2. Allow conservation easements and other tools to protect environmentally sensitive or unique resources.
3. Update existing land use regulations to be consistent with this plan.
4. Discourage conditions that threaten the health and safety of surrounding residences.

VIII. INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION ELEMENT

1. Background

Governmental relationships can best be described as “vertical” relationships, such as those between federal, state and local units (county/city/town) and are relatively well established in law. Unfortunately, there is little public policy in Wisconsin law that requires, horizontal governmental relationships such as town to town and municipality to county or town. The result is that towns, municipalities, and counties act more as adversaries than as partners.

Wisconsin Statute s.66.30, entitled "Intergovernmental Cooperation", does enable local governments to jointly do together whatever one can do alone. Typically, intergovernmental cooperation and coordination refers to the management and delivery of public services and facilities. It is also dependent upon a defined geographic area within which cooperation and coordination may be feasible. Often the area is a central city and its surrounding area, or several similar towns. It is a collection of local communities in which the citizens are interdependent in terms of their employment, residence, health, and medical care, education, recreation and culture, shopping and other experiences.

A variety of other factors, some long-standing and some of fairly recent origin, are combining to force citizens and local governments in both urban and rural area to confer, cooperate, and in some cases, to join together in a search for better ways to deliver public services in their respective areas. These factors include:

- population settlement patterns;
- local government structure, finance, and politics;
- high population mobility;
- economic and environmental interdependence; and
- high cost, capital-intensive functions.

Adjoining Units of Government

The Town of Summit is involved with several surrounding units of government. It belongs to three separate associations that provide fire fighting services, and first responders. Parts of the town call on the Mauston and LaValle departments, but the western part of the town is served by the Wonewoc Fire & Ambulance Association, which provides fire and ambulance service. Ambulance service in part of the town is also provided by the Mauston Ambulance Association.

The children in the Town attend schools in one of two districts: the Mauston School District or the Wonewoc-Union Center School District.

No existing or potential intergovernmental conflicts were identified.

2. Goals, Objectives & Policies

Goals

1. Encourage coordination & cooperation among nearby units of governments.

Objectives

1. Promote communication with other units of government, including adjoining Towns, the County, the State, and federal government.
2. Join together with other units of government to provide services in a more cost-effective manner.

Policies

1. Periodically review existing shared service agreements, and explore additional agreements.

IX. IMPLEMENTATION

Background

Implementation of this plan depends on the willingness of local officials, both Town and County, to use it as a guide when making decisions that affect growth and development in the Town. It is also important that local citizens and developers become aware of the plan.

The tools and techniques recommended to implement the comprehensive plan are as follows:

The Town Board should adopt the plan and use it as a guide in decisions that affect development in the Town. The Town's Plan Commission should become very knowledgeable of the plan and use it when making recommendations to the Town Board on development issues.

The Town should develop and adopt a town road ordinance concerning minimum acceptable road construction standards as well as a public roadway buffer strip.

The Town should encourage citizen awareness of the Town's comprehensive plan by making copies available and conducting public informational meetings.

Additional tools and approaches can be utilized by the Town to achieve the goals of the plan. These include but are certainly not limited to the following: fee simple land acquisition, easements (purchased or volunteered), deed restrictions, land dedication, and ordinances or programs regulating activities such as impact fees, land division, erosion control, mobile homes, etc.

An essential characteristic of any planning program is that it be ongoing and flexible. Periodic updating of the plan is necessary for continued refinement and course correction in the planning program to insure that it reflects the desires of the Town's citizens.

State law requires that a Comprehensive Plan be updated every ten years. The Town should re-examine the Plan, at least every five years, and determine if more complete review is required to bring it into line with changed conditions or altered priorities within the Town. Annual amendments to the Plan are one way of ensuring that changes in local conditions are reflected in the Plan. The release of information from the 2010 Census may provide a useful opportunity to update the data contained in the Plan and assess whether the vision and policies embodied in it are still appropriate to the Town's needs. Amendments to the Plan can be enacted as part of that process. In approving amendments to the Plan the same procedure should be followed as in adopting the Plan.

ATTACHMENT A
2000 CENSUS PROFILE

Table DP-1. Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000

Geographic area: Summit town, Juneau County, Wisconsin

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

Subject	Number	Percent	Subject	Number	Percent
Total population	623	100.0	HISPANIC OR LATINO AND RACE		
SEX AND AGE			Total population	623	100.0
Male.....	330	53.0	Hispanic or Latino (of any race).....	3	0.5
Female.....	293	47.0	Mexican.....	1	0.2
Under 5 years.....	30	4.8	Puerto Rican.....	-	-
5 to 9 years.....	49	7.9	Cuban.....	-	-
10 to 14 years.....	50	8.0	Other Hispanic or Latino.....	2	0.3
15 to 19 years.....	54	8.7	Not Hispanic or Latino.....	620	99.5
20 to 24 years.....	22	3.5	White alone.....	603	96.8
25 to 34 years.....	53	8.5	RELATIONSHIP		
35 to 44 years.....	110	17.7	Total population	623	100.0
45 to 54 years.....	102	16.4	In households.....	623	100.0
55 to 59 years.....	31	5.0	Householder.....	236	37.9
60 to 64 years.....	26	4.2	Spouse.....	155	24.9
65 to 74 years.....	68	10.9	Child.....	197	31.6
75 to 84 years.....	22	3.5	Own child under 18 years.....	163	26.2
85 years and over.....	6	1.0	Other relatives.....	15	2.4
Median age (years).....	39.5	(X)	Under 18 years.....	6	1.0
18 years and over.....	450	72.2	Nonrelatives.....	20	3.2
Male.....	239	38.4	Unmarried partner.....	6	1.0
Female.....	211	33.9	In group quarters.....	-	-
21 years and over.....	438	70.3	Institutionalized population.....	-	-
62 years and over.....	109	17.5	Noninstitutionalized population.....	-	-
65 years and over.....	96	15.4	HOUSEHOLD BY TYPE		
Male.....	55	8.8	Total households	236	100.0
Female.....	41	6.6	Family households (families).....	179	75.8
RACE			With own children under 18 years.....	81	34.3
One race.....	612	98.2	Married-couple family.....	155	65.7
White.....	605	97.1	With own children under 18 years.....	67	28.4
Black or African American.....	5	0.8	Female householder, no husband present.....	15	6.4
American Indian and Alaska Native.....	1	0.2	With own children under 18 years.....	9	3.8
Asian.....	1	0.2	Nonfamily households.....	57	24.2
Asian Indian.....	-	-	Householder living alone.....	49	20.8
Chinese.....	-	-	Householder 65 years and over.....	22	9.3
Filipino.....	-	-	Households with individuals under 18 years.....	87	36.9
Japanese.....	-	-	Households with individuals 65 years and over.....	69	29.2
Korean.....	-	-	Average household size.....	2.64	(X)
Vietnamese.....	-	-	Average family size.....	3.05	(X)
Other Asian ¹	1	0.2	HOUSING OCCUPANCY		
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander.....	-	-	Total housing units	262	100.0
Native Hawaiian.....	-	-	Occupied housing units.....	236	90.1
Guamanian or Chamorro.....	-	-	Vacant housing units.....	26	9.9
Samoan.....	-	-	For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use.....	11	4.2
Other Pacific Islander ²	-	-	Homeowner vacancy rate (percent).....	1.0	(X)
Some other race.....	-	-	Rental vacancy rate (percent).....	11.8	(X)
Two or more races.....	11	1.8	HOUSING TENURE		
Race alone or in combination with one or more other races: ³			Occupied housing units	236	100.0
White.....	615	98.7	Owner-occupied housing units.....	206	87.3
Black or African American.....	7	1.1	Renter-occupied housing units.....	30	12.7
American Indian and Alaska Native.....	6	1.0	Average household size of owner-occupied units.....	2.71	(X)
Asian.....	5	0.8	Average household size of renter-occupied units.....	2.17	(X)
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander.....	-	-			
Some other race.....	1	0.2			

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

¹ Other Asian alone, or two or more Asian categories.

² Other Pacific Islander alone, or two or more Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander categories.

³ In combination with one or more of the other races listed. The six numbers may add to more than the total population and the six percentages may add to more than 100 percent because individuals may report more than one race.

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

Table DP-2. Profile of Selected Social Characteristics: 2000

Geographic area: Summit town, Juneau County, Wisconsin

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

Subject	Number	Percent	Subject	Number	Percent
SCHOOL ENROLLMENT			NATIVITY AND PLACE OF BIRTH		
Population 3 years and over enrolled in school			Total population	650	100.0
Nursery school, preschool.....	4	2.1	Native.....	645	99.2
Kindergarten.....	11	5.9	Born in United States.....	645	99.2
Elementary school (grades 1-8).....	104	55.3	State of residence.....	559	86.0
High school (grades 9-12).....	54	28.7	Different state.....	86	13.2
College or graduate school.....	15	8.0	Born outside United States.....	-	-
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT			Foreign born.....	5	0.8
Population 25 years and over			Entered 1990 to March 2000.....	1	0.2
Less than 9th grade.....	35	8.3	Naturalized citizen.....	-	-
9th to 12th grade, no diploma.....	37	8.8	Not a citizen.....	5	0.8
High school graduate (includes equivalency).....	204	48.6	REGION OF BIRTH OF FOREIGN BORN		
Some college, no degree.....	85	20.2	Total (excluding born at sea)		
Associate degree.....	30	7.1	Europe.....	-	-
Bachelor's degree.....	16	3.8	Asia.....	1	20.0
Graduate or professional degree.....	13	3.1	Africa.....	-	-
Percent high school graduate or higher.....	82.9	(X)	Oceania.....	-	-
Percent bachelor's degree or higher.....	6.9	(X)	Latin America.....	-	-
MARITAL STATUS			Northern America.....	4	80.0
Population 15 years and over			LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME		
Never married.....	97	19.6	Population 5 years and over		
Now married, except separated.....	321	65.0	English only.....	616	100.0
Separated.....	9	1.8	Language other than English.....	597	96.9
Widowed.....	25	5.1	Speak English less than "very well".....	19	3.1
Female.....	15	3.0	Spanish.....	6	1.0
Divorced.....	42	8.5	Speak English less than "very well".....	9	1.5
Female.....	20	4.0	Other Indo-European languages.....	5	0.8
GRANDPARENTS AS CAREGIVERS			Speak English less than "very well".....	9	1.5
Grandparent living in household with one or more own grandchildren under 18 years			Asian and Pacific Island languages.....	1	0.2
Grandparent responsible for grandchildren.....	-	-	Speak English less than "very well".....	1	0.2
VETERAN STATUS			ANCESTRY (single or multiple)		
Civilian population 18 years and over			Total population		
Civilian veterans.....	54	12.0	Total ancestries reported	806	124.0
DISABILITY STATUS OF THE CIVILIAN NONINSTITUTIONALIZED POPULATION			Arab.....	-	-
Population 5 to 20 years			Czech ¹	39	6.0
With a disability.....	18	9.8	Danish.....	32	4.9
Population 21 to 64 years			Dutch.....	6	0.9
With a disability.....	54	15.3	English.....	83	12.8
Percent employed.....	61.1	(X)	French (except Basque) ¹	6	0.9
No disability.....	298	84.7	French Canadian ¹	3	0.5
Percent employed.....	87.6	(X)	German.....	322	49.5
Population 65 years and over			Greek.....	-	-
With a disability.....	24	30.8	Hungarian.....	6	0.9
RESIDENCE IN 1995			Irish ¹	91	14.0
Population 5 years and over			Italian.....	4	0.6
Same house in 1995.....	465	75.5	Lithuanian.....	-	-
Different house in the U.S. in 1995.....	150	24.4	Norwegian.....	43	6.6
Same county.....	103	16.7	Polish.....	43	6.6
Different county.....	47	7.6	Portuguese.....	-	-
Same state.....	43	7.0	Russian.....	11	1.7
Different state.....	4	0.6	Scotch-Irish.....	2	0.3
Elsewhere in 1995.....	1	0.2	Scottish.....	12	1.8
			Slovak.....	-	-
			Subsaharan African.....	-	-
			Swedish.....	8	1.2
			Swiss.....	4	0.6
			Ukrainian.....	-	-
			United States or American.....	56	8.6
			Welsh.....	2	0.3
			West Indian (excluding Hispanic groups).....	-	-
			Other ancestries.....	33	5.1

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

¹The data represent a combination of two ancestries shown separately in Summary File 3. Czech includes Czechoslovakian. French includes Alsatian. French Canadian includes Acadian/Cajun. Irish includes Celtic.

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

Table DP-4. Profile of Selected Housing Characteristics: 2000

Geographic area: Summit town, Juneau County, Wisconsin

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

Subject	Number	Percent	Subject	Number	Percent
Total housing units	263	100.0	OCCUPANTS PER ROOM		
UNITS IN STRUCTURE			Occupied housing units	232	100.0
1-unit, detached	217	82.5	1.00 or less	230	99.1
1-unit, attached	4	1.5	1.01 to 1.50	2	0.9
2 units	6	2.3	1.51 or more	-	-
3 or 4 units	2	0.8			
5 to 9 units	-	-	Specified owner-occupied units	61	100.0
10 to 19 units	-	-	VALUE		
20 or more units	-	-	Less than \$50,000	20	32.8
Mobile home	34	12.9	\$50,000 to \$99,999	24	39.3
Boat, RV, van, etc	-	-	\$100,000 to \$149,999	13	21.3
			\$150,000 to \$199,999	2	3.3
YEAR STRUCTURE BUILT			\$200,000 to \$299,999	2	3.3
1999 to March 2000	5	1.9	\$300,000 to \$499,999	-	-
1995 to 1998	23	8.7	\$500,000 to \$999,999	-	-
1990 to 1994	27	10.3	\$1,000,000 or more	-	-
1980 to 1989	19	7.2	Median (dollars)	74,400	(X)
1970 to 1979	43	16.3			
1960 to 1969	25	9.5	MORTGAGE STATUS AND SELECTED		
1940 to 1959	20	7.6	MONTHLY OWNER COSTS		
1939 or earlier	101	38.4	With a mortgage	37	60.7
			Less than \$300	2	3.3
ROOMS			\$300 to \$499	5	8.2
1 room	-	-	\$500 to \$699	9	14.8
2 rooms	5	1.9	\$700 to \$999	6	9.8
3 rooms	3	1.1	\$1,000 to \$1,499	11	18.0
4 rooms	35	13.3	\$1,500 to \$1,999	2	3.3
5 rooms	60	22.8	\$2,000 or more	2	3.3
6 rooms	52	19.8	Median (dollars)	742	(X)
7 rooms	48	18.3	Not mortgaged	24	39.3
8 rooms	38	14.4	Median (dollars)	250	(X)
9 or more rooms	22	8.4			
Median (rooms)	6.0	(X)	SELECTED MONTHLY OWNER COSTS		
			AS A PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD		
Occupied housing units	232	100.0	INCOME IN 1999		
YEAR HOUSEHOLDER MOVED INTO UNIT			Less than 15.0 percent	27	44.3
1999 to March 2000	17	7.3	15.0 to 19.9 percent	14	23.0
1995 to 1998	52	22.4	20.0 to 24.9 percent	7	11.5
1990 to 1994	58	25.0	25.0 to 29.9 percent	4	6.6
1980 to 1989	42	18.1	30.0 to 34.9 percent	-	-
1970 to 1979	32	13.8	35.0 percent or more	9	14.8
1969 or earlier	31	13.4	Not computed	-	-
VEHICLES AVAILABLE			Specified renter-occupied units	11	100.0
None	4	1.7	GROSS RENT		
1	52	22.4	Less than \$200	2	18.2
2	118	50.9	\$200 to \$299	3	27.3
3 or more	58	25.0	\$300 to \$499	2	18.2
			\$500 to \$749	2	18.2
HOUSE HEATING FUEL			\$750 to \$999	-	-
Utility gas	7	3.0	\$1,000 to \$1,499	-	-
Bottled, tank, or LP gas	118	50.9	\$1,500 or more	-	-
Electricity	16	6.9	No cash rent	2	18.2
Fuel oil, kerosene, etc	26	11.2	Median (dollars)	292	(X)
Coal or coke	-	-			
Wood	65	28.0	GROSS RENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF		
Solar energy	-	-	HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN 1999		
Other fuel	-	-	Less than 15.0 percent	4	36.4
No fuel used	-	-	15.0 to 19.9 percent	3	27.3
			20.0 to 24.9 percent	-	-
SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS			25.0 to 29.9 percent	2	18.2
Lacking complete plumbing facilities	-	-	30.0 to 34.9 percent	-	-
Lacking complete kitchen facilities	-	-	35.0 percent or more	-	-
No telephone service	5	2.2	Not computed	2	18.2

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

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

ATTACHMENT B
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN

Public Participation Plan

I. Background

The Town of Summit recognizes the need to engage the public in the planning process. This plan sets forth the techniques the county and its local units of government will use to meet the goal of public participation. Therefore, this Public Participation Plan forms the basic framework for achieving an interactive dialogue between citizens, local decision makers, staff, and the NCWRPC.

The creation of the Public Participation Plan is a task required in meeting the requirements of Wisconsin's Comprehensive Planning Legislation (1999 Wisconsin Act 9 and its technical revisions). The Town of Summit will comply with the Plan as appropriate to the situation. As the planning process develops, it should be expected that deviations from the plan may occur.

II. Objectives

The following is a list of objectives for public participation that the Town of Summit would like to achieve throughout the development and subsequent adoption of the Town of Summit Comprehensive Plan and local plans:

- That the residents of Town of Summit become fully aware of the importance of participating in the development of the Town of Summit Comprehensive Plan.
- That the public participation process be designed to engage all aspects of the Town.
- That the public have opportunities to provide their input (both formally and informally) to the Town, and its governing body.
- That the public have access to all technical information and any analyses performed throughout the planning process.
- That members of the Town have input from the broadest range of perspectives and interests in the community possible.
- That input is elicited through a variety of means (electronic, printed, and oral) in such a way that it may be carefully considered and responded to.
- That this process of public involvement strengthens the sense of community present in the Town of Summit.

The goal will be to inform, consult and involve the public and the communities served during each phase of the planning process. Hopefully, this will help balance the issues related to private property rights.

III. Techniques

The public participation plan for the comprehensive planning process will incorporate the following:

1. All meetings for the planning process will be open to the public and posted. A large open house will be held near the end of the process.
2. Periodic press releases to the media and local counties will occur to promote the open house meetings.
3. Periodic updates of the planning process will be included in the Town of Summit Newsletter, along with notices of any meetings or opportunities for public participation.
4. Via the NCWRPC NEWS newsletter all interested parties and adjoining governments will be informed of the planning process.
5. Planning meeting summaries and handouts will be maintained in the office and on the website www.ncwrpc.org.
6. All planning meetings will have comment sheets available. All website comments will be included in the record as well.

Throughout the plan process, the Town of Summit Planning Commission will meet to monitor the development of the plan.

RECEIVED

FEB 15 2010

NORTH CENTRAL WISCONSIN
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Town of Summit

RESOLUTION 09

For Adoption of a Public Participation Plan

WHEREAS, the Town of Summit is required to prepare and adopt a Comprehensive Plan as outlined in Wisconsin Statutes; and


WHEREAS, public participation is critical for the development of a sound plan; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary for the Town of Summit to approve a process to involve the public in the planning process; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town of Summit does approve and authorize the Public Participation Plan as presented.

ADOPTED on the 10 day of November, 2009.

ATTEST:



Tammy Miller, Clerk

The governing body of the Town of Summit has authorized this Resolution, dated today.

ATTEST:



Edwin Pfaff, Chair

ATTACHMENT C

NATURAL HERITAGE INVENTORY MAP

Juneau County

AQUATIC OCCURRENCES

Animal

Caspiy, Pandion haliaetus, 1982
 Bald Eagle, Haliaeetus leucoccephalus, 2002
 Black Tern, Chlidonias niger, 1999
 Weed Shiner, Notropis texanus, 1973
 Wood Turtle, Clemmys insculpta, 1988
 Prairie Shrew, Sorex araneus, 1986
 Least Bittern, Nidicolina leucorhoa, 1995
 Least Bittern, Nidicolina leucorhoa, 1995
 Sand Snipe, Ochropotus spithii, 1998
 Trumpeter Swan, Cygnus buccinator, 1999
 American Bittern, Botaurus lentiginosus, 1999
 Warrant Emerald, Somatochlora incurvata, 1998
 Ringed Turtle, Emydoidea blandingii, 2004
 Salamander Murrelet, Williamsia linneti, 2002
 Red-shouldered Hawk, Buteo lineatus, 1987
 Two-spotted Skipper, Euphyes bimaculata, 1998
 Western Sand Darter, Etheostoma caeruleum, 1973
 Louisiana Waterthrush, Seiurus motacilla, 1999
 Russet-tipped Clubtail, Stylurus plagiatus, 1995
 White-spangled Skimmer, Libellula cyanea, 1981
 Midwestern Fen Buckmoth, Hemileuca sp. 3, 1996
 Blanchard's Cricket Frog, Acris crepitans blanchardi, 1983
 A Predaceous Diving Beetle, Agabus bicolor, 2004
 Yellow-crowned Night-heron, Nyctanassa violacea, 1984
 Eastern Massasauga Rattlesnake, Sistrurus catenatus, 2005

Plants

Bog Fern, Thelypteris simulata, 1998
 Long Sedge, Carex folliculata, 1998
 Vasey Rush, Carex vaseyi, 1964
 Straw Sedge, Carex straminea, 1999
 Whip Nutsedge, Scirpus triglomerata, 1936
 Drooping Sedge, Carex prasina, 1993
 Grassleaf Rush, Juncus marginatus, 1969
 Water-purslane, Didiplis diandra, 1973
 Wolf Spikerush, Eleocharis wolffii, 1995
 Clustered Sedge, Carex cumulata, 1997
 Prickly Hornwort, Ceratophyllum echinatum, 1998
 Spotted Pondweed, Potamogeton pulcher, 1938
 Torrey's Bulrush, Scirpus torreyi, 1998
 Vasey's Pondweed, Potamogeton vaseyi, 1969
 Yellow Screwstem, Bartonina virginica, 1998
 Crossleaf Milkwort, Polygala cruciata, 1998
 Algae-like Pondweed, Potamogeton contervoides, 1975
 Engelmann's Spike-rush, Eleocharis engelmannii, 1967
 Water-thread Pondweed, Potamogeton diversifolius, 1997
 Virginia Water-milfoil, Myriophyllum farwellii, 1997
 Fatwill's Water-milfoil, Myriophyllum farwellii, 1997
 Slim-stem Sharp-reedgrass, Calamagrostis stricta, 1964
 Sudden-routed Bladderwort, Utricularia geminiscapa, 1998
 Sweetscented Indian-palmleaf, Scaevola suarvedensis, 1981
 Northern Yellow Lady's-slipper, Cypripedium parviflorum var. makasin, 1959

Natural Communities

Shrub-carr, Shrub-carr, 1982
 Alder Thicket, Alder thicket, 1981
 Emergent Marsh, Emergent marsh, 1979
 Central Poor Fen, Central poor fen, 1988
 Floodplain Forest, Floodplain forest, 2000
 Northern Wet Forest, Northern wet forest, 1982
 Northern Sedge Meadow, Northern sedge meadow, 1982
 Southern Sedge Meadow, Southern sedge meadow, 1981
 Tamarack (Poor) Swamp, Tamarack (poor) swamp, 1997
 Stream-Fast, Hard, Cold, Stream-fast, hard, cold, 1981
 Stream-Slow, Hard, Cold, Stream-slow, hard, cold, 1977
 Stream-Slow, Hard, Warm, Stream-slow, hard, warm, 1981
 White Pine-Red/Maple Swamp, White pine-red maple swamp, 1998
 Springs and Spring Runs, Hard, Springs and spring runs, hard, 1998
 Springs and Spring Runs, Soft, Springs and spring runs, soft, 1981

TERRESTRIAL OCCURRENCES

Animal



Kärner Blue, Lycaeides melissa samuelis, 2004
 Pigmy Shrew, Sorex hoyi, 1975
 Bird Roostery, Bird Roostery, 1986
 Prairie Vole, Microtus ochrogaster, 1974
 A Field Beetle, Calignus rufus, 1988
 A Tiger Beetle, Cicindela parvula tuberi, 1999
 Boreal Woodpecker, Boreocheilus, 2000
 Cerulean Warbler, Dendroica cerulea, 1989
 Northern Goshawk, Accipiter gentilis, 1997
 Regal Tattler, Spizella idalia, 1981
 Leonard's Skipper, Hesperia leonardus, 1982
 Loggerhead Shrike, Lanius ludovicianus, 2001
 Acaadian Flycatcher, Empidonax vireescens, 1992
 Persius Dusky Wing, Erynnis persius, 1980
 Little White Tiger Beetle, Cicindela lepida, 1998
 Western Slender Glass Lizard, Ophisaurus attenuatus, 2001
 Speckled Rangeland Grasshopper, Arphia conspersa, 1998

Plants

Musk-root, Adoxa moschatellina, 1980
 Mareleseed, Onosmodium molle, 1959
 Bushy Aster, Aster dumosus var. strictor, 1967
 Cliff Cudweed, Gnaphalium obtusilobum var. saxicola, 1999
 Fragrant Fern, Dryopteris fragrans var. remotuscula, 1995
 Rock Cudweed, Pulperzia porophylla, 1993
 Nodding Plover, Tympanuchus nitens, 1991
 Prairie Parsnip, Polytaenia nuttallii, 1990
 Woolly Milkweed, Asclepias lanuginosa, 1940
 Autumn Cone-root, Corallorrhiza odoratiza, 1991
 Pale Green Orchid, Platianthera flava var. herbicola, 1987
 Shadow Goldenrod, Solidago sciophila, 1985
 Roundstem Foxglove, Agalinis gairdneri, 1997
 Bird's-eye Primrose, Primula mistassinica, 1995
 Rocky Mountain Sedge, Carex backii, 1981
 Maidenhair Spleenwort, Asplenium trichomanes, 2000
 One-flowered Brodiaea, Orobanche uniflora, 1994
 Arrow-headed Rattle-box, Crotalaria sagittalis, 1973
 Yellow Evening Primrose, Calyophytum serrulatum, 1948
 Small-flowered Woody Bean, Strophostyles leiosperma, 1997

Natural Communities

Dry Cliff, Dry cliff, 2002
 Dry Prairie, Dry prairie, 1981
 Mesic Cliff, Mesic cliff, 1982, 1997
 Oak Barrens, Oak barrens, 1997
 Pine Barren, Pine barren, 1997
 Sand Barrens, Sand barrens, 1979
 Mesic Prairie, Mesic prairie, 1989
 Hemlock Relict, Hemlock relict, 1995
 Dry-mesic Prairie, Dry-mesic prairie, 1999
 Northern Dry Forest, Northern dry forest, 1988
 Southern Dry Forest, Southern dry forest, 1999
 Northern Mesic Forest, Northern mesic forest, 1981
 Southern Mesic Forest, Southern mesic forest, 1981
 Northern Dry-mesic Forest, Northern dry-mesic forest, 1987
 Southern Dry-mesic Forest, Southern dry-mesic forest, 2002
 Central Sands Pine-Oak Forest, Central sands pine-oak forest, 1998



This map represents the known occurrences of rare species and natural communities that have been recorded in the Wisconsin Natural Heritage Inventory (NHI). Colored sections indicate the presence of one or more occurrences within that section. Hatched townships indicate one or more occurrences reported only at the township level. The date following the names above notes the most recent year the occurrence was recorded in the county.

Map generated using NHI data from: 12/18/2006
 Copyright 2003, WDNR-Bureau of Endangered Resources
 This map may not be reproduced without prior written permission.



ENDANGERED RESOURCES