

TOWN OF LINCOLN

LAND USE PLAN

**Adopted February 1, 2005 by the
Town of Lincoln Board of Supervisors**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Town of Lincoln Board of Supervisors

Chairman	Clerk
Douglas Glaspie	Sandra Vaillancourt
Supervisors	Treasurer
Gerald Dybedal	Donald Bloomquist
Daniel Vaillancourt	

Town of Lincoln Land Use Planning Committee

Mark Dryer	Jeff Van Hooser
Judy Dybedal	Jack Wichita
Ted Galdi	Mary Wichita
Jean Hansen	Nancy Willett
E.J. Isaac	Ellie Williams
Teri Isaac	Roland Wolff
Tom Stout	Joe Zirn (Chairman)
Julie Vaillancourt	

Special Thanks

The Land Use Planning Committee thanks the Lincoln Board of Supervisors for their support for development of a Land Use Plan. The Committee also thanks the landowners and residents of the Town of Lincoln for completing the questionnaire and survey, which gave us guidance. Maps and GIS data layers were provided by Mr. David Lee and Ms. Holly Hemingway, Bayfield County Land Records Department.

The Committee also thanks the land use planning committees of Bayfield County and area Towns. We utilized their plans for ideas and guidance in developing our survey questions and for our plan outline and narrative.

About the Cover

The location of the Town of Lincoln in the county and the state is shown over a photograph of Lover's Lane. Photograph by Carol Seago.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PART I – INTRODUCTION	
Background	5
Why a land use plan?	5
History	6
PART II – PHYSICAL, NATURAL, AND CULTURAL RESOURCES	
Geography	9
Ecological Land Classifications	9
Forestlands	10
Agriculture	13
Soils	17
Minerals and Mining	17
Water Resources and Fish and Wildlife Habitats	18
Invasive Exotic Species	23
Unique Natural Areas, Historical Features and Rare Species	23
PART III – POPULATION, HOUSING, AND RECREATION	
Population	24
Housing	24
Recreation	27
PART IV – 2000 CENSUS RESULTS	
Population Demographics	27
Employment	27
Income	28
PART V – INFRASTRUCTURE	
Roads	28
Electrical Utilities	28
PART VI – EXISTING LAND COVER AND ZONING	
Land Cover	31
Zoning	31
PART VII – FUTURE LAND USE GUIDANCE	
Town of Lincoln Vision	37
Goals and Recommendations	37
Aesthetics	37
Forestlands	38
Agriculture	38
Water Quality	38

Fish and Wildlife Habitat	39
Air Quality	39
Transportation	39
Housing	40
Economic Development	40
Recreation	41
Proposed Future Land Use	41
PART VIII – IMPLEMENTATION	
Introduction	45
Recommended Committees	45
Available Implementation Tools	45
Purchases of Development Rights	45
Transfer of Development Rights	46
Acquisition	46
Conservation Easements	47
Land Trusts	47
LESA Farmland Preservation Tool	47
Best Management Practices	48
Conclusion	49
PART IX – BIBLIOGRAPHY	50
APPENDICES :	
A – Survey Data and Comments	51
B – Natural and Cultural/Historical Points of Interest	87
C – Wisconsin DNR Natural Heritage Inventory Sites	91
D– Land Type Associations in the Town of Lincoln	93

List of Figures

Figure 1. Original Forest Cover.	11
Figure 2. Forest Tax Law Programs.	15
Figure 3. Water Resources and Watershed Boundaries.	19
Figure 4. Habitable Structures.	25
Figure 5. Roads, Electrical Facilities and Gravel Pit Infrastructure.	29
Figure 6. Land Cover.	33
Figure 7. Zoning Districts.	35
Figure 8. Special Resource Management Areas and Sites	43
Figure 9. Natural and Cultural/Historical Points of Interest	85

PART I—INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

At the request of the Town Board, residents of the Town of Lincoln first gathered in the summer of 2001 to form a Committee to draft a land use plan. The Committee has met regularly since then.

As part of the 1999 state budget, the Wisconsin legislature passed a bill known as the Smart Growth Initiative that established certain requirements for local planning. The law 1) stated that beginning January 1, 2010, any program or action of a local unit of government that affects land use shall be consistent with that governmental unit's land use plan, 2) established procedures for adopting comprehensive plans, and 3) the legislation required communities to address nine key elements if they drafted comprehensive land use plans. These elements were:

1. Issues and Opportunities
2. Housing
3. Transportation
4. Utilities and Community Facilities
5. Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources
6. Economic Development
7. Land Use
8. Intergovernmental Cooperation
9. Implementation

Drawing upon issues raised in the land use plans of other towns in Bayfield County, and the specific interests of residents of the Town, the committee drafted the Town of Lincoln Land Use Planning Survey, which was sent to all Town taxpayers in March of 2002. Sixty two percent of the surveys were returned to the Committee. The detailed results of the survey are included as Appendix A. Using that survey, and specific input from its members, the Land Use Planning Committee drafted a plan for the Town of Lincoln to guide members of the Town Board and County Zoning officials in their decision-making. This plan contains background sections describing the recent history of the Town of Lincoln, its physical, natural and cultural resources, infrastructure, land use, geography, zoning, and recommendations related to land use goals. This plan may serve as the foundation for a future Comprehensive Plan.

WHY A LAND USE PLAN?

The job of maintaining, conserving and in some cases restoring the land legacy of the Town of Lincoln is a large task. Government agencies, elected officials, non-profit organizations, land owners and visitors all have roles in ensuring that future generations enjoy the scenic vistas and high quality of land, water, wildlife, and recreational opportunities that now exist in the Town of Lincoln.

There are many ways to protect our land and water resources. Some landowners, working by themselves, successfully balance their economic needs with a dedication to managing their property for conservation or recreation purposes. Others prefer to work with neighbors to manage a larger network of private lands. Some groups of citizens work cooperatively through their local units of government to protect important conservation or recreation lands. In other

situations private land trusts work with landowners to protect or restore lands through land or easement purchases and the provision of management advice for the accomplishment of specific goals. As part of this range of activities, the citizens of the Town of Lincoln can recommend a land use plan to guide their elected representatives on how the Town lands and waters should be used.

HISTORY

The first humans in the area were Native Americans. No long term camps are verified to have existed in the area. However, seasonal camps or stopping points were probable along early trails. A chapter by John Chapple in the book, *Namekagon Memories*, relates the story of Chief Namekagon and his silver mine. Chief Namekagon visited the William Johnson family farm in section 6 of Marengo township and then stopped at the Mattson farm in section 13/14 of Lincoln Township. Legend relates that he then had silver, which he used for trading in Ashland. The legendary mine has never been discovered and the story has become part of the town's folk history.

Before the first settlers, one of the earliest resources commercially harvested was timber. Lumber companies logged mixed hardwoods and white pine with an immigrant workforce hungry for land. Many had come from Europe where a poor man could not hope to own land unless he was the eldest son in the family. Some logging camps within the Town of Lincoln were Camp 8 in section 31, Camp 13 or Marengo in section 34, Camp 14 in section 25 and Camp 15 in section 21. After the timber was cut, the land was offered to homesteaders in 160 acre plots, which could be obtained by fulfilling land contracts. Among the earliest homesteaders in Lincoln were Norwegian immigrants Martin and Anna Moe. They received their homestead certificate in 1888, followed by their neighbors Tom and Ragnold Mattson in 1889. The Moe family established Moe Cemetery in section 14, where it remains today. The Bayfield Co. plat book of 1906 shows many of these early 160 acre homesteads still intact. During that period whole sections of land were owned by Wisconsin Central Railway and Willow River Lumber Company, among others. The plat book shows a "hay road" on what is now the north boundary of Lincoln, two trails and an "extensive peat (Bibon) swamp".

Early settlers were mainly European immigrants who relied heavily on their crops for subsistence. At a town meeting on April 18, 1918, the minutes note it was "moved and seconded that no work be done on roads during haying time, except such work as is absolutely necessary. Motion carried." The desire for productive tillable land for crops probably was behind the March 25, 1922 "motion made and seconded to sign the petition for drainage of Bibon Swamp." Evidently this proved to be either too large of a project or interest waned and the swamp remains today, an important fishery and ecosystem through which the White River flows. An 1860 map drawn by Chas. Whittlesey shows the Marengo River as Marangouin, an early French trader's word for mosquito.

The Birch lake post office was established on October 15, 1895 in the NE ¼ of section 22. Ole Gillingston sic (Ellingson) was the first postmaster. Postal service continued until it was transferred to Mason on March 31st 1913. At one time, there were five one-room community

schools established in different Town neighborhoods since travel at this time was by foot or by horse.

Pastor J.D. Nelsenius from Ashland gives one of the earliest written accounts on the difficulty of living in the area. An early letter of his stated: "Birch Lake is located about 20 miles from Ashland. At that time it was surrounded by an almost impenetrable forest. Those who first settled in this primitive place had to carry their groceries and other necessities on their backs from Ashland. At the time I made my first visit, July 2, 1889, a rough and often impassable road had been opened through the woods. This road extended only about 12 miles in a south-westerly direction from Ashland. I secured an old horse and a dilapidated wagon and set out for Birch Lake. The first three miles were not too bad and I made fairly good time, but after that I had to make my way over discarded logs, old stumps, and windfalls. Several times I had to unhitch the horse and pull the wagon over the worst places myself, then lead the horse across and hitch him to the wagon. Marshes and stump holes were filled with water from the recent heavy rains. About noon I had come to the Marengo River where the road came to an abrupt end. There I had to leave the wagon...I continued to visit Birch Lake quite regularly. In 1897, the Trinity Lutheran Church was organized, and a little later a Church was built."

Another interesting account of what early homestead life was like was written by Caroline Margaret (Chase) Bowers. She was born in 1893 in a log house near the banks of Marengo Lake where Jim and Carol Wilson now live in section 34. Her early life was like that of many immigrant families at the time, poor but living a life rich in experiences and adventures. Their lives were also very hard. Bowers wrote: "Summer was a lot of work for father and mother. There was a garden to put in, hay to cut, and shock which was done with a scythe and a wooden rake and pitchfork. The hay was loaded with a fork and hauled to the barn in the wagon, then pitched by hand into the hole in the barn loft where it was carried back to the farther side and packed in. Heavy work, but it had to be done if the cattle were to be fed during the long, cold winters. The wheat also had to be cut with a cradle and Mother bound it by hand...Corn was cut and bound in the same manner, but was left in the field to dry awhile after shocking. Large pumpkins were grown in the cornfield also. These were called cattle pumpkins and were hauled in and broken for the cattle to eat...My father was a trapper. Furs were what bought sugar, flour, coffee, tea and other staples we had to have besides what we raised.....They also bought the yarn mother used to knit our socks, caps and scarves, as well as a bolt of cloth and thread. Mother had no sewing machine or store from which to buy our clothes, so she was busy in winter sewing, making over old clothes, and making new ones from the bolt of outing flannel."

Lincoln Township was formed in 1909 when Judge JK Parish separated Lincoln (then Townships 45 and 46 North, Range 5 West) from what was then the Town of Pratt. The new town had 812 residents. The first election was held on April 6, 1909 at the schoolhouse in Section 33, T46N, R5W. The first town meeting was held in the rented old Modern Woodman Hall in Bibon on April 27th. Four years later, the Town of Kelly was formed from the north half of the town of Lincoln. After that legal separation, the boundaries of Lincoln were as they are today, T45N, R5W. In 1917-1918 the present town hall was built next to what was then the Swedish Lutheran Church known as the Birch Lake church today. In the election of November 5, 1912 women gained the right to vote in Wisconsin. Of the 95 male voters in Lincoln, 61 voted yes, 31 voted no, and 3 left no vote. Of the 95 votes cast for presidential electors, the Party

affiliation was Democrat-22, Prohibition-4, Republican-19, Social Democrat-19 and Independent-29.

The early township relied on local men to build and repair roads and bridges and maintain roads damaged by flooding. In April of 1914, road wages for a working man were \$1.75 per nine-hour day, or \$4.00 per day with a team of horses. By April 1920, the hourly wage for a man was 40 cents an hour, 70 cents for hour with a team. Although the workforce for roadwork was typically men, on May 7, 1921, a motion was passed by the town board to pay Mrs. Soffia Levin \$5.00 for road work.

In the early years a “poor fund” existed which was distributed by the town board. If people were experiencing hardship they could ask the town for assistance from this fund. In 1909 the fund for the year amounted to \$976. One payment made in December of 1910 was for a man whose wife died leaving five children aged seven months to 10 years. He was given funds for a housekeeper: \$15.00 a month for three months. This “poor fund” lasted into the 1930’s.

Even in these early years people were concerned about water quality. In April of 1912, the incoming town board was instructed to take such steps as necessary to stop the practice of dumping or flushing sewage or other refuse that contaminate the water into the White River at the village of Mason. In the early 1920’s, certificates for payment were given as bounties on wolves killed. They were likely seen as predators on livestock which early families could not afford to lose.

The 1940’s brought the telephone to the community, but it was not until the 1960s that private lines were available putting an end to the occasional practice of eavesdropping. Electricity also came to Lincoln in the 1940’s and contributed to the productivity of family farms. Dairy farming became popular and by 1949 there were 34 farms selling from 1 to 6 ten-gallon cans of milk daily to Sunnyside cheese factory located on County E.

During World War II pictures of young men in uniform were proudly displayed. Twenty men from Lincoln served in the U.S. Armed Forces, among them the seven Verville brothers, a record for the number of sons in any one branch of the service at one time. This was also a time when many young people left the farm for opportunities in larger cities like Chicago. Most never returned to the family farm.

In the spirit of the earlier five one-room school houses, the Penokee Mountain Cooperative School was established in 1981 by a group of parents. By the 1990’s the group outgrew their small building in Section 14 and now meet in the old Benoit school.

Today the original settlers with their European accents are gone. Some of their descendents still live in Lincoln, some only visit. New people have moved in adding to the diversity. In 2003, there are no producing dairy farms although small market farms are springing up in the area. The majority of the current residents are retired or work in nearby towns. But what does remain is what was always most valuable to the early settlers, the land and its resources.

PART II – PHYSICAL, NATURAL, AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

GEOGRAPHY

The Town of Lincoln is located in the lower third of Bayfield County along its eastern border, Township 45 North, Range 5 West (Cover). The Town enjoys the unique position of lying on the edge of two of Wisconsin's geographical provinces, the Northern Highland and the Lake Superior Lowland,¹ thereby creating within the town a diversity of topography and beautiful vistas. Driving south from Lake Superior, upon reaching the north-south roads traversing the Town of Lincoln, one begins a steady upward climb. One leaves the level plain left by Glacial Lake Duluth, crosses over the ancient beach line which forms the southern boundary of the Lake Superior Lowland and heads into the hills that become the western edge of the Penoque-Gogebic Iron Range. The Range is a rocky ridge about 80 miles long and from half a mile to one mile wide, comprised of some of the most ancient exposed rocks on the planet today. It now marks the northern boundary of the Northern Highland. The resistance of this ridge to eons of erosive action and the extraordinary scouring effects of the glaciers is a testament to the majestic mountain range that once covered most of northern Wisconsin.

ECOLOGICAL LAND CLASSIFICATIONS

The USDA-Forest Service in cooperation with federal and state partners (including the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources Division of Forestry) has developed the National Hierarchical Framework of Ecological Units. The purpose of this classification system is to distinguish land areas that differ from one another in ecological characteristics. A combination of factors, such as climate, geology, topography, soils, water and vegetation are known to control or influence biotic components and ecological processes. Together they provide a useful approximation of land use potential. The smallest land areas identified are known as ecological units. Specific geomorphologic features, soils and plant communities characterize each ecological unit. Future land use planning may well be based on ecological unit land classification.

The following chart and text explains the ecological unit hierarchy the Town of Lincoln lies within.

Domain: Humid Temperate	
Division: Warm Continental	
Province: Laurentian Mixed Forest	
Section: Southwest Lake Superior Clay Plain (SWLS) (SSU)	Section: Southern Superior Upland
Subsection: Superior-Ashland Clay Plain Range	Subsection: Gogebic/Penoque Iron
LTA: Ashland Lake Modified Till Plain Range	LTA: Penoque/Gogebic Iron
LTA: Bibon Marsh Spillway	LTA: Gurney/Ontonogan

¹ The five geographical provinces of Wisconsin were first described by Lawrence Martin in his book *The Physical Geography of Wisconsin* which was first published in 1916. In 1965 the University of Wisconsin Press published a reproduction of the second (1932) edition.

The Town of Lincoln's position within this nesting hierarchy begins with its placement with the continent-wide **Humid Temperate Domain**. Moving downward in progressively smaller parcels by spatial scale, the Town lies within the **Warm Continental Division**, The **Laurentian Mixed Forest Province** and two **Sections** called the **South West Lake Superior Clay Plain (SWLS)** and the **Southern Superior Upland (SSU)**.

Within the SWLS Section, the Town occupies the **Superior-Ashland Clay Plain Subsection**. Within that subsection there are two Land Type Associations (LTA) known as the **Ashland Lake Modified Till Plain Association** and the **Bibon Marsh Association**.

Within the SSU Section, we occupy the **Gogebic/Penokee Iron Range Subsection**. Within that subsection are two additional **LTA's** known as the **Penokee/Gogebic Iron Range** and the **Gurney/Ontonogan Spillway**. Further descriptions of these four LTA's can be found in Appendix D.

Visit the Web Page address www.dnr.wi.gov/org/land/forestry/look/ecolandclass/index.htm for more information on the four LTA's found within the Town of Lincoln.

FORESTLANDS

One is quickly impressed with the visual impact of a wide variety of forest habitats interspersed among the fields, hills and waterways in the Town of Lincoln. Forestlands are increasingly recognized as biologic, cultural, aesthetic and economic treasures. They provide the raw materials for the forest products industry, presently the second largest industry sector in the State of Wisconsin. Forests provide many recreational activities and are important for the tourist industry in our area. On an ecological level, forests purify and maintain the quality of water resources and provide habitat for a wide array of plant and animal species, including threatened and endangered species. They mitigate global warming and air pollution through carbon sequestration and oxygen production. Town of Lincoln residents have expressed a strong need to maintain forest lands.

Within the Town of Lincoln, a variety of forest habitat types² have evolved to fit the specific climate, topography and soils left by the most recent glaciations of approximately 10,000 years ago. Pre-European settlement saw mature forests covering the majority of the Town (Figure 1) with sugar maple, basswood, yellow birch and hemlock being the most common species. White pine, and to a lesser extent red pine, also grew where disturbance and local substrate were favorable. Swamp conifers, white cedar, black spruce and tamarack were the dominant lowland species. After European settlement and the ensuing Great Cutover of the late 1800's and early 1900's, subsequent forest fires and agricultural activities, the Town of Lincoln became a mosaic of forest and farm land. Today some of the more common species are sugar and red maple,

² A "habitat type: includes all sites, or areas, capable of producing similar mature plant communities.....The habitat type system is a method of site classification that uses the floristic composition of a plant community (understory species as well as trees) as an integrated indicator of those environmental factors that affect species reproduction, growth, competition, and therefore, community development.....The habitat type system is best suited for interpreting the ecological potential of various sites and the expected development of existing forest communities. (A Guide to Forest Communities and Habitat Types of Northern Wisconsin, 2nd edition ©2002 Dept. of Forest Ecology and Management, University of Wisconsin-Madison)

Figure 1
Town of Lincoln Original Forest Cover

quaking and big tooth aspen, white and yellow birch, black and white ash, basswood, American elm, cherry, hemlock, white and red pine, balsam fir, white and black spruce, tamarack, and white cedar

Approximately 24% of the total acreage in the Town of Lincoln is presently enrolled in Forest Crop or Managed Forest Law Programs. Forest stewardship plans for these Programs are approved by the Wisconsin DNR and can be written by the Wisconsin DNR or by private forestry consultants to the specifications of the Programs and individual landowners. These plans can include goals and objectives to improve wildlife habitat, maximize income from wood production, and enhance the visual quality of the woodlands. Utilization of forest stewardship plans can help landowners understand the working dynamics of the forest environment and help them to make choices that will perpetuate healthy forests. Forest lands managed under an approved management plan for Forest Crop or Managed Forest Law Programs are shown in Figure 2.

AGRICULTURE

Over the years, the role of agriculture in the Town of Lincoln has changed to reflect market conditions and the needs of the residents of the Town. One can characterize three fairly distinct periods for agriculture: the homestead/ logging period, the cash-crop period, and the current period.

During the homestead/logging period, the residents of the town concentrated on clearing the land either as part of organized logging operations or as necessary to fulfill the requirements for gaining title to the land under the terms of the Homestead Act. Because of the short growing season and available seeds, the primary focus was on subsistence agriculture with basic tools and small plots cultivated to feed family members. Most families kept small numbers of chickens for eggs, cows for milk and beef, and pigs for meat for use by family members. For most residents of the Town of Lincoln, farming was generally a secondary occupation.

By the 1920s, land coverage resembling that of today became established. According to a Land Cover Survey of Bayfield County (the field work and mapping having apparently been done in 1929) the areas that were cleared and capable of being used for agriculture closely resembled those of today. Land was cleared along what is now Four Corners Store Road, Altamont, and County Highway E in patterns similar to those of the year 2004. The land left in Forestry was also like that of today, except that the tree coverage was very sparse as a result of the logging that had taken place in the first two decades of the 20th century.

During this period which ran approximately from 1915 to 1940 one significant agricultural cash crop was potatoes. The better potatoes were shipped to market, those of lesser quality were fed to the livestock. Individual farms also grew hay, oats and silage for their own livestock. Small-scale dairy farming also became widespread with a typical farm having six or eight dairy cows which produced a marketable surplus of milk or cream. Other farms kept cattle for beef. There had been a cheese factory and general store on Snake Trail Road in the 1920s, and in 1933 the Sunnyside Cheese factory was established near the intersection of Four Corners Store Road and County Highway E. The cheese factory provided a major outlet for the milk production of farmers from the Town of Lincoln

Figure 2
Town of Lincoln Forest Tax Law Lands

and surrounding areas. The Sunnyside Cheese Factory remained in business until 1961. After this, dairy farming and its necessary support activities steadily declined. While farming did provide a major source of income for a number of residents of the Town of Lincoln during this period, for almost all workers it continued to be one of several sources.

Today, with the decline in cattle production in this part of the state, the major users of hay from the farms in the Town of Lincoln are no longer in business. At the present time, there are only a few small beef cattle farms in the town. The agricultural land in the Town is now mainly in corn or hay, or is uncultivated. Much of the uncultivated land is being cut to prevent the reversion of the land to forest. The land still actively in use is being worked almost entirely by farmers from other nearby towns.

While 41 percent of the Town of Lincoln is zoned agricultural, today according to the Bayfield County Zoning Ordinance, the actual amount of land being cultivated is much smaller than indicated by the zoning designation.

Although it is clear that the role of agriculture in 2004 is different than earlier, what is not clear is what effect the continuing change will have on future land use in the Town of Lincoln.

SOILS

The 1939 Bayfield County Soil Survey describes a wide range of soil associations (definitions) within the Town of Lincoln. Results of more recent soil surveys have not been mapped in a form that can be graphically displayed.

Soils in the north east corner consist predominantly of Rifle Peat (Ra) defined as black to brown fine textured woody peat surrounded by Bruce Associations (Bd) which are poorly drained stratified fine sand, silt and clay, and Otonagon-Pickford (Od) Associations which are fine textured sediments of former glacial lakes, predominantly red or reddish brown clay. At the present time, much of this land is still farmed, primarily producing corn and hay.

The north central and north east parts of Lincoln Township are predominantly Orienta-Ogemaw (Ok) or Superior-Ogemaw (Sm) soils. Both are sandy loams to fine sandy loams with areas of Ontonagon-Richford (Oe) clay and clay loams. This land today contains areas that have been reforested in the last 100 years and open areas are used to produce corn and silage.

The southern two thirds of the township consists predominantly of Gogebic Adolph (Ga, Gb, Gc, and Gd) soils. These are all loams and sandy loams on varying slopes with variable stone content, or Gogebic-Cloquet (Ge) another sandy loam association. The last major association, the Vilas Association (Va, Vb) consists of loamy sand and sand, and is scattered throughout the town. This land today is mostly forested with open areas lying fallow or producing forage crops.

The Marengo River valley itself is Alluvial (Ac) soil, which is generally too variable to classify.

MINERALS AND MINING

In addition to fur trading and missionary work, mineral exploration was a very early activity undertaken by Europeans in the region. A geologic map of the "Penokie" Range, part of which lies

within the present borders of the Town of Lincoln, was completed by Charles Whittlesey in 1860. The Longyear Drilling Company made exploratory core drillings in the 1950s or 1960s. In the early 1980s, another company did some seismic tests searching for oil in the region. Although it is unknown whether any mineral deposits or oil were discovered, no metallic mines or oil wells have ever been developed within the Town of Lincoln.

Shallow sand and gravel deposits in Lincoln spawned numerous open pits. Most of them have now been abandoned. At present, five such pits are operating under permit in the Town, and their locations are noted in Figure 5.

WATER RESOURCES AND FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITATS

Water areas or resources cover the third largest acreage in the Town of Lincoln; behind acreage of forest and agricultural lands. Such water resources include lakes, rivers and wetlands. They are displayed in Figure 3.

Watersheds: A watershed is the surface area or land that drains into a lake or river. Lands in the Town of Lincoln are within the Marengo River and White River watersheds, which are part of the Bad River Watershed. The Bad River flows into Lake Superior in Ashland County. As rainwater and melting snow run downhill, they carry sediment and other materials into our streams, lakes, wetlands and groundwater. Watersheds provide water in lakes and streams for their beauty, aquatic life and for recreation. Wildlife also requires healthy watersheds for food and shelter. Many land uses such as for dwellings, industry, roads, farming, recreation, mining, and forestry can affect the health of a watershed.

Wetlands: While historically regarded as wastelands by some landowners, wetlands are now widely recognized for their benefits to water quality and wildlife. The Town of Lincoln has a rich diversity of wetlands that play a critical role in environmental quality. Examples of wetlands include those along rivers and lakeshores, shallow-water marshes, wet meadows, bogs, beaver ponds, fens and shrub wetlands.

Compared to other ecosystems, wetlands have a high rate of biological productivity, allowing them to support an abundance of plant and animal life. Wetlands provide habitat for a great variety of birds, mammals, amphibians, reptiles, and invertebrates. For example, of Wisconsin's 370 species of resident birds, almost 40% live in, or extensively use, wetlands. About 1/3 of Wisconsin's endangered and threatened plants and animals depend on wetlands for some or all of their life cycles. Wetlands along lakes and rivers often provide critical spawning habitat and support the productivity of many fish species. In addition to these benefits, wetlands offer diverse recreational opportunities, such as waterfowl hunting, bird watching, canoeing, nature study, and trapping of aquatic furbearers. Large open wetlands also have an aesthetic appeal for many people, much like lakes and other water bodies.

The current rate of wetland loss from draining and filling has slowed dramatically with the institution of various incentives and regulations. Current regulations; however, do not offer the same level of protection to small isolated wetlands. Ditching of wetlands to drain them, excavation of wetlands to construct ponds, and the spread of invasive species such as purple loosestrife and reed canary grass, all contribute to their degradation.

Figure 3
Town of Lincoln Water Resources and Watershed Boundaries

The eastern end of the 10,000-acre geologically unique Bibon Swamp occurs within the Town of Lincoln. The Lake Superior Binational Program has identified the Bibon Swamp as a diverse habitat that contributes to the integrity of the Lake Superior Ecosystem.

Lakes and Rivers: Fostering good land use practices along our lakes, rivers, and streams is of utmost importance in protecting the Town of Lincoln's biological resources and providing satisfying outdoor recreation for residents and visitors.

Today the lakes and rivers in the Town of Lincoln are relatively healthy. There are currently no point source discharges in the Marengo River or Marengo Lake. Today the most troublesome pollution comes from over-land runoff (non point sources) and failing septic systems. Roads and other impervious surfaces prevent precipitation from slowly seeping into the ground. Instead, rain and snow are diverted to roadside ditches that drain directly into streams and lakes. As a result, these streams and rivers experience more widely fluctuating flows than prior to development. When impervious surfaces prevent groundwater from being replenished, the base flow of streams and rivers often drops. This can lead to a loss of habitat, increases in water temperature, and a decrease in water quality. Additional non-point source pollution occurs when property is developed without adequate shoreline buffers.

One of the most effective ways to reduce non-point pollution from entering our waters is to maintain permanently vegetated buffers along roads, streams, rivers, and lakes. Even relatively narrow buffers, if appropriately managed, have been shown to significantly reduce the amount of sediment, nitrogen and phosphorous from fertilizer, and other chemicals draining from farm fields, lawns, and construction sites. Maintaining the water quality of streams, rivers, and lakes (particularly Marengo Lake and the Marengo River) has a direct impact on fish and wildlife, and recreation.

The Town of Lincoln's lakes and rivers provide countless hours of enjoyment for residents and visitors alike. Without question, the quality and quantity of our water is one of our most valuable resources. Information available on the more prominent lakes in the Town of Lincoln is summarized below. Other lakes for which no fishery information is available are listed as points of interest in Appendix B.

Marengo River: The Marengo River is considered trout water by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR) except for where it flows through Marengo Lake. Prominent fish species present include native brook trout, white sucker and creek chub, and naturalized rainbow trout and brown trout. The river enters and leaves Marengo Lake in the Town of Lincoln and drains 217.5 square miles within the Bad River watershed. Due to rapid runoff from rather impervious soils, steep hills and rock outcroppings, the river experiences three-to-four-foot flood crests. Stream bottom types are predominantly muck and sand in the upper reaches, boulders and rubble in the middle sections, and sand again in the lower reaches. Sea lampreys are present in the Marengo River from above Marengo Lake to its confluence with the Bad River.

Marengo Lake: According to the Wisconsin DNR, Marengo Lake is a typical largemouth bass and panfish community, and supports an average sport fishery. It is 99 acres in size with a maximum depth of 26 feet. Fisheries surveys by the Wisconsin DNR were conducted in 1973, 1980 and 2001. In 1973, walleye were surveyed in small numbers. The lake was then stocked with walleye in 1974, 1975 and 1976. This effort was considered ineffective and stocking was discontinued. In all surveys to present, northern pike and largemouth bass were the dominant predator species sampled. The

dominant forage fish present was white sucker. Panfish present in the lake include bluegill, black crappie, pumpkinseed sunfish, rock bass, and yellow perch.

Birch Lake: Birch Lake (T45N R5W Sec. 22 SE NE) is 12.2 acres with a maximum depth of 55 feet. Thirty five percent of the lake has water depths of 20 feet or greater. Only 9% has water depths less than 3 feet. It is a landlocked seepage lake. The only record in the Wisconsin DNR fishery survey is from 1966 and indicates the lake is dominated by northern pike and panfish. The historic information also showed the presence of black crappie and white suckers. DNR records indicate no public access.

Indian Lake: Indian Lake (T45N R5W Sec. 23 SW) is approximately 26 acres with a maximum depth of 35 feet. Twenty percent of the lake has water depths of 20 feet or greater. Twelve percent of the lake has water depths less than 3 feet. It is a landlocked seepage lake. DNR information indicates that the lake is a northern pike, largemouth bass, bluegill fishery, with largemouth bass being cited as abundant. DNR records show stocking from 1934-1936 of walleye, bass, crappies and bluegills. Then from 1944-1946 largemouth bass were stocked. Since 1946 no stocking has occurred. DNR records indicate no public access.

Shorelines: Shorelines are important in maintaining a lake's health and the diversity of its aquatic biota. In their natural state, shorelines are commonly a mix of aquatic and wetland plants including sedges, bulrushes, or cattails, grading into shrubs and trees as one transcends to dry land. Trees often fall into the water and slowly decompose. Decaying vegetation supports a wide array of insects that in turn are fed on by fish, frogs, and other animals. Many lakes have a variety of substrates along their shores – gravel, sand, and silt – that provide places for fish and frogs to lay eggs and habitat for many insects such as mayflies and dragonflies. Together, this complex environment provides places for northern pike, bluegill, bass, and other fish to spawn, feed, and hide. Loons, ducks, geese, and other water birds nest along banks and feed on aquatic plants and the insects and fish they harbor. Wildlife such as frogs, otters, and mink spend most of their lives along shorelines.

Shorelines can be altered when cabins and houses are built too close to the water's edge. When property owners "fix up" the shoreline by removing down trees, cutting back shrubs, establishing grass lawns down to the water's edge, and create sand beaches they unintentionally destroy the very environment that drew them to lake front property in the first place. Without an adequate buffer of native aquatic plants, waves erode away the shore. Songbirds that had nested in shrubs and trees along the shore are replaced by geese, which are attracted to manicured lawns and leave behind substantial quantities of droppings. Sand dumped into the lakes can cover gravel spawning beds and silty areas that harbor all stages of insect life. The cumulative impact results in lower fish numbers, reduced water clarity, and an often dramatic loss in the biological diversity that the lake and its surroundings support.

In response to land use pressure, and in recognition of the conservation, recreation and aesthetic benefits of lakes, Bayfield County has adopted a shore land zoning ordinance that designates shoreline buffers for special zoning restrictions. Lake classification systems are also being established to help ensure that development and recreation levels are compatible with each lake's ability to support them. Although these efforts have resulted in some protection, considerable work lies ahead if remaining undeveloped and lightly developed lakes are to remain in their natural state. Future land protection measures that focus on maintaining and improving water quality and providing access to larger stretches of lake and river shoreline will likely be most popular and productive.

Ground Water. There is growing concern nationwide about the overall availability of good quality groundwater for municipal, industrial, agricultural, and domestic use and for adequate base flow to our lakes, rivers and wetlands. Groundwater problems have occurred naturally (from drought and bedrock structures that yield low volumes) and from human activities (excess withdrawal and land use activities limiting infiltration rates). When groundwater levels are lowered many problems arise. Wells often yield less water. Water quality can diminish as underground minerals such as arsenic, that were previously covered with water, are exposed to air and leach into aquifers. Nearby wells can dry up. The base flow of groundwater into streams, springs, lakes and wetlands can slow, cease, or even reverse course. As a result, not only can surface waters dry up, but also contaminants can more directly move into groundwater.

Although precipitation that falls throughout a watershed contributes to groundwater quantity and quality, certain areas supply a far greater percentage than others do. These “recharge areas” can be large or small and can occur many miles from where groundwater is removed for use or naturally discharged. Finding and mapping where groundwater recharge areas occur is important, particularly those recharge areas that are most significant in replenishing groundwater. Incorporating these recharge areas with other land protection objectives will likely prove increasingly significant in the future.

INVASIVE EXOTIC SPECIES

Invasive species are having an escalating impact on the ecology and recreational use of waters and wetlands. Many species of fish, plants and invertebrates have been purposely or unintentionally introduced to the area. As a result, the aquatic ecosystems of many of our inland waters have been transformed. Examples of some of the most problematic aquatic species that have moved into the Town of Lincoln include purple loosestrife and sea lamprey. A number of invasive species are currently found in Lake Superior and nearby inland waters -- including the spiny water flea, round goby, ruffe, white perch, Eurasian water milfoil, rusty crayfish, and zebra mussels -- and could invade Town of Lincoln waters. Every two to three years the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service applies lampricide, a pesticide called TFM that kills sea lamprey, to the Marengo River.

UNIQUE NATURAL AREAS, CULTURAL/HISTORICAL FEATURES, AND RARE SPECIES

The Town of Lincoln harbors a diverse mix of natural communities, features and native species. However, some species and natural communities have very limited distribution or only occur at small and scattered locations, and some unique features are one-of-a-kind. As a result, there will continue to be a need to find and protect those small pockets of unique elements, those that support rare species, those that harbor the highest quality examples of natural communities, and those that are uniquely special to residents and visitors to the Town of Lincoln. Examples include cedar-swamp wetlands, ground water seeps and upwellings, old growth forest, and the Marengo River. For species that depend on these natural communities, such as showy lady slipper, wood turtle, and gray wolf, the conversion of these habitats to other uses can result in a dramatic loss. See Appendix C for a complete listing of rare and unique plant and animal species known to occur in the Town of Lincoln and/or the Marengo River watershed. This list is compiled and maintained by the Wisconsin DNR’s Natural Heritage Inventory.

The rich cultural history of the Town of Lincoln is still preserved today in the historical remnants, photographs and historical accounts that were recorded from a variety of people and sources. See Appendix B for identification of cultural historical features and points of interest in the Town of

Lincoln. Further reading and information can be obtained from the book, *The Grand View Centennial and The Mason Historical Society*. Also, Gary Johnson, presently in Bayfield, but raised at the Sunnyside Cheese Factory, contributed clarifying information for Appendix B.

PART III – POPULATION, HOUSING, AND RECREATION

POPULATION

The Northwest Regional Planning Commission projects a small decrease in population from 293 people in 2000 to 288 in 2020. Total housing units are projected to increase from 191 in 2000 to 235 in 2020. Locations of habitable structures, both seasonal and occupied, are identified in Figure 4.

The following is a summary of the **population** and **population projections** in the Town of Lincoln:

Year	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000
Population	Approx 406	419	367	366	320	254	206	280	294	293

US Census Bureau

Population projections 2005-2020

Year	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	Projected change	Projected % change
Population	293	292	292	290	288	-5	-0.017

Northwest Regional Planning Commission projections

HOUSING

The following is a summary and projection of **housing units** in the Town of Lincoln:

Housing – Town of Lincoln – Census 2000

Total housing units	191
Total occupied housing units	118
Total seasonal housing units	64

Total housing units, 1980 – 2000 and projected total units 2005-2020

Year	1980	1990	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020
Units	150	178	191	204	214	224	235

Northwest Regional Planning Commission projections

Total occupied housing units 1980 – 2000 and projected occupied units 2005 - 2020

Year	1980	1990	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020
Units	91	115	118	128	135	142	148

Northwest Regional Planning Commission projections

Total seasonal housing units 1980 – 2000 and projected seasonal units 2005 – 2020

Year	1980	1990	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020
Units	36	53	64	72	79	86	93

Northwest Regional Planning Commission projections

Figure 4
Town of Lincoln Habitable Structures

RECREATION

Within the Town of Lincoln, on private property and on public waterways and Town roads, residents and visitors enjoy a wide range of recreational opportunities ranging from the silent sports of wildlife watching, fishing, hunting, hiking, horseback riding, canoeing, cross-country skiing and dog-sledding to motorized activities such as motor boating, snowmobiling and ATV riding. In addition all gain public access to many of the same recreational opportunities on surrounding Chequamegon National Forest property.

Balancing the needs of those user groups seeking quiet, experiences and the needs of those groups enjoying more motorized forms of recreation can create a tension which may require compromises on the part of both groups. As more people choose to recreate within the Town of Lincoln, partnering state and federal governmental agencies and organizations face an increasing challenge to preserve those qualities of our natural environment that draw recreational enthusiasts to this area in the first place.

PART IV- 2000 CENSUS RESULTS

POPULATION DEMOGRAPHICS

Town of Lincoln residents are represented by 151 males and 142 females. The average age is 42.5 years, with 22.9% under 18 years of age and 16.4% 65 years or older. Sixty-one percent of our residents are married. Our 293 residents live in 118 households; 31 of these are single person households with the remainder in multi-person households. The average household contains 2.48 persons. The average family size is 3.03 persons.

Eighty two percent of adults have completed high school. Of those, 41 percent have no formal education beyond high school, 25% attended college but did not get a degree, while 16 % have a bachelor's degree or higher education. Fifty-three of our residents were enrolled in school in the year 2000.

The Caucasian race is represented by 96.6% of the residents, 2.4% are African American, and 0.3% are of Asian descent. Most residents are U.S. born and most speak exclusively English. German is the largest heritage group with 29% claiming German ancestry, followed by Swedish (18%), Irish (13%), Norwegian (12%), French (11%), English (10%), Dutch (9%), and relatively small percentages (under 5%) of Polish, Czech, Welsh, Swiss, Slovak, Scottish, Hungarian, Danish, African, Native American, and others.

EMPLOYMENT

The Town of Lincoln has 151 residents in the labor force, which is 63% of the residents 16 years or older. Of the labor force, only 9, or 6%, were unemployed. The rest were employed, primarily in the census categories: production/transportation (26%), service (20%), sales/office (20%), construction/maintenance (16%), managerial/professional (12%), and agricultural (6%) occupations. By far the industry employing the largest number of our residents is manufacturing (23%), followed by construction (13%), education/health services (11%), agriculture/forestry (11%), retail trade (10%), and professional/scientific (7%). Smaller industrial representations (5% or less) include other services, arts/entertainment, public administration, information, utilities, and wholesale trade.

The majority of residents (68%) are private-sector hourly or salary workers, 19% are self employed individuals and 13% work for one of the various levels of government.

About 20% of the adult population over 18 years of age (47 of 232) are veterans.

Most residents commute to work either driving alone (70%) or in carpools (11%). Five percent walk. About 11% work at home. The average commute is 29 minutes long, suggesting that many residents spend an hour a day or more on the road for commuting.

INCOME

Census data on income are typically reported by household or family. Median household income was \$27,917. Less than one quarter (24%) had incomes of less than \$15,000 while about 5% had income of \$75,000 or more. Typically households fell into the more moderate-income categories of \$15,000-\$24,999 (19%), 25,000-\$34,999 (21%), or \$35,000-\$49,999 (21%).

Most residents' income is derived from direct labor. Seventy five percent of the households reported earnings from wages and salaries, with a mean of \$30,395. Forty three percent reported receiving social security income (mean of \$10,912), and supplemental security income (6%), public assistance (5%), and other retirement income (11%). In many households these income sources are mixed, with households having both earnings and social security income, or other combinations.

Full time year round male workers make more than full time year round female workers in the Town of Lincoln. The average male worker makes \$23,750 a year, while the average female worker makes \$18,250, a year or about 77% of men's earnings. This is close to the national average of about 74%, but significantly higher than the Northwestern Wisconsin (10 county area) average of about 62%.

PART V--INFRASTRUCTURE

ROADS

The 1906 Bayfield County plat book shows the layout of the two main roads we know today as Altamont and Four Corners Store Rd. From 1909 into the 1930's most of the men in the township worked on the roads and were paid for "grubbing" by the Town board.

Today there are 41 ½ miles of unpaved roads in the Town (Figure 5). There are three bridges over the Marengo River on the main roads, two of which have been recently replaced and widened. County Highway E forms the north border and is the only paved road in the Town of Lincoln.

The Town is responsible for road maintenance. Since 1961, a plat of the roads for public use, mail, and school bussing is filed every year with the state highway commission of Wisconsin in order to receive supplemental funding for road maintenance. Currently, the town employs a two-man crew and extra help on occasion for road maintenance with town-owned trucks, machinery and tools.

ELECTRICAL UTILITIES

Electricity was made available to all residents of the Town of Lincoln by 1950. The Town is currently supplied by two electrical entities, Xcel Energy and Bayfield Electric Cooperative. Xcel Energy serves customers primarily in the north and east parts of the Town, while Xcel customers

Figure 5
Town of Lincoln Roads, Electrical Facilities, and Gravel Pits

were originally supplied by Lake Superior District Power Company of Ashland and later Northern States Power Company. Bayfield Electric Cooperative of Iron River provides electricity primarily to the south and west parts of the Town. Figure 5 also shows the layout of the electrical grid in the Town.

In the early 1900s, a company called North Wisconsin Telephone offered telephone service out of Mason to a few homes along U.S. Highway 63, Bayfield County Highway E and what is now Four Corners Store Road. In August, 1952, a newly formed cooperative called the Chequamegon Telephone Cooperative bought out five independent telephone companies including the one in Mason. Since then, the Chequamegon Telephone Cooperative has been the only company providing phone-line service in the Town of Lincoln.

PART VI--EXISTING LAND COVER AND ZONING

LAND COVER

The predominant land covers in the Town of Lincoln in order of dominance are forest, which includes mixed deciduous and coniferous woods, and shrubland; agriculture, which includes cropland and glassland; and water areas, which includes lakes, rivers and wetlands (Figure 6).

ZONING

The Town of Lincoln acceded to the Bayfield County Zoning Ordinance in 1993. All areas are currently zoned within five zoning districts (Figure 7), but in many instances they may not reflect the current uses of the land. Over 90 percent of Lincoln Township was currently zoned either F-1 (Forestry 1) or A-1 (Agriculture 1). Land zoned forestry is concentrated in the central and southern areas of the town while that zoned agriculture is more evenly distributed through out the center of the Town and concentrated along Bayfield County Highway E. Overall, the area zoned Forestry is slightly larger than that zoned Agriculture. There are small areas zoned R-1 (Residential 1) surrounding Indian Lake, Marengo Lake and along the Marengo River. The Town has several small parcels zoned Commercial and no areas zoned Industrial.

Table 2. Town of Lincoln Current Zoning Districts

Zoning District	Acres	Percent of Town
(A-1) Agriculture	9,385	41.0%
(C-1) Commercial	19	0.1%
(F-1) Forestry	12,893	56.3%
(R-1) Residential	527	2.3%
(R-RB) Residential/Recreational Business	55	.02%
TOTAL	22,879	

Figure 6
Town of Lincoln Land Cover

Figure 7
Town of Lincoln Zoning Districts

PART VII—FUTURE LAND USE GUIDANCE

TOWN OF LINCOLN VISION

Survey results and comments support a vision that can best be characterized as a desire to wisely plan for future growth while maintaining a “rural character” by promoting stewardship on private lands and protecting valuable aesthetic, natural and cultural resources.

GOALS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Survey results are compiled and tabulated in Appendix A. The Land Use Planning Committee analyzed the results of the survey and developed the following goals and recommendations to reflect the opinions of those who responded to the survey. The strength of the wording in the goals and recommendations reflect the weight of the related survey response.

Copies of this land use plan will be provided to Town of Lincoln land owners who request a copy, the Bayfield County Board of Supervisors, the Bayfield County Zoning Committee, realtors and potential developers. This Plan was developed with the prospect that units of government, area citizens, businesses and developers will work with the Lincoln Board of Supervisors and Town of Lincoln land owners to achieve our Vision, Goals and Recommendations.

Aesthetics

Goal: Preserve and protect the scenic beauty of woodlands, open areas, vistas, farmsteads and water areas.

Recommendations:

- Identify and encourage preservation of existing scenic vistas.
- Retain tree canopy over Lover’s Lane road.
- Encourage planting or maintaining forest buffers or shrub screens that hide unsightly activities such as gravel pits, clear cuts and some commercial operations.
- Prohibit new high voltage transmission lines and gas pipelines.
- Prohibit placement of communication towers.
- Prohibit billboards and establish strict standards for business signage.
- Adopt standards for exterior lighting.
- Establish and enforce a noise ordinance.
- Explore establishing architectural design guidelines for structures.

Forestlands

Goal: Preserve forestlands in the Town of Lincoln for use by present and future generations.

Recommendations:

- Discourage parcelization and intensive residential development of lands zoned forestry.
- Encourage development of sustainable forest management plans and disseminate information on best practices.
- Maintain current map of forestlands under active management plans.
- Identify and map existing forest community types.
- Encourage implementation of Wisconsin Forest Management Guidelines-available from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.
- Encourage the formation of a Town-wide program of education activities to help ensure informed forest management plan decision-making.

Agriculture

Goal: Preserve productive agriculture land and open fields in the Town of Lincoln.

Recommendations:

- Support traditional family farming operations and activities including hobby farms and fruit orchards.
- Prohibit the development of large-scale factory farms.
- Protect farming operations from incompatible adjacent land use.
- Prevent isolated commercial and industrial uses in agricultural areas.
- Encourage participation in state farmland preservation programs.
- Explore feasibility of transfer or purchase of development rights.
- Support information and outreach programs to farmers and landowners to provide alternative farming activities.

Water Quality

Goal: Maintain the excellent quality of our surface and groundwater.

Recommendations:

- Prevent pollution by toxic chemicals, sediment, excessive nutrients and from other sources.
- Support implementation of best management practices and regulations that apply to logging and agricultural runoff.
- Encourage responsible use of pesticides.
- Encourage alternatives to lampricide (a pesticide) use in the Bad River Watershed for control of Sea Lamprey.
- Prohibit placement and operation of commercial sanitary and demolition waste landfills.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Goal: Preserve, protect and enhance habitats important for healthy fish and wildlife populations.

Recommendations:

- Preserve, protect and enhance the shorelines of the Town's lakes, rivers and tributaries.
- Allow limited single-family residential development that minimizes impacts on water quality, fish and wildlife habitat, and scenic beauty.
- Embrace county setback requirements and buffers around the Town's lakes, rivers and tributaries.
- Work to protect and preserve critical wildlife habitats, rare and unique species.

Air Quality

Goal: Maintain excellent air quality.

Recommendations:

- Examine methods to decrease smoke and dust pollution.
- Encourage enforcement of regulations controlling the burning of prohibited materials and garbage.

Transportation

Goal: Maintain the scenic views and improve the safety and efficiency of the Town's transportation system.

Recommendations:

- Continue the incremental improvement of the driving surfaces on existing Town roads.

- Minimize the development of new roadways through environmentally sensitive areas such as rivers, lakes and wetlands.
- Explore the feasibility of paving and/or dust control for the main roads.
- Protect historic, scenic, and cultural sites when constructing new or improving existing transportation facilities.
- Manage right-of-way vegetation in ways that: improve safety, maintain scenic views, control undesirable and exotic vegetation, reduce the use of herbicides and prevent erosion.
- Discourage development of airports or private landing strips.

Housing

Goal: Permit residential development compatible with the rural character of the Town.

Recommendations:

- Allow single-family residences (including duplexes) that are compatible with surrounding land uses.
- Discourage multi-family housing.
- Limit the expansion of R-1 residential zoning areas and maintain a minimum five-acre lot size for any new residential zoned land.
- Discourage development of lands zoned agriculture and forestland to parcels smaller than 40 acres.
- Strongly discourage the development of mobile home parks, condominiums and multi-family residential structures.
- Discourage planned unit developments and subdivisions.

Economic Development

Goal: Support economic activities compatible with the rural character of the Town of Lincoln.

Recommendations:

- Support small home-based businesses.
- Discourage commercial development.
- Direct the location and development of light industrial and commercial activities preferably to US Highway 63 and secondarily to County Highway E only.

- Prohibit the establishment of businesses that cause excessive noise, odor, traffic or light pollution.
- Prohibit heavy industrial development.
- Prohibit all mineral mining operations.
- Prohibit placement and operation of new commercial gravel pits and ensure implementation of required gravel pit reclamation plans for existing pits.

Recreation

Goal: Support a wide a range of silent sport activities.

Recommendations:

- Monitor the impact of recreational activities on Town properties.
- Assess the need for and/or revision of a Town ordinance to address conflict between motorized recreational use (personal watercraft, ATV's, snowmobiles) and non-motorized recreational use.
- Support development of silent sport trails.
- Prohibit commercial recreational development of go-cart, automobile, motocross tracks and convention centers.
- Discourage golf courses, resorts, shooting ranges, snowmobile/ATV race tracks.

PROPOSED FUTURE LAND USE

The designation of zoning districts is the primary tool that local units of government use to guide and determine appropriate land use. The current zoning districts in the Town of Lincoln were adopted when the Town acceded to the Bayfield County Zoning Ordinance in 1993. Today, based on citizen input through the Land Use Planning Survey responses and comments, the Lincoln Land Use Planning Committee recommends how lands in the Town of Lincoln should be used in the future to satisfy the Town's vision. In doing this, the Committee proposes that the Town Board recognize and follow Bayfield County's definitions and use expectations for these categories, but with the possibility of modifications, which the Town Board may specify.

The Committee also proposes that the Town Board recognize "*Special Resource Management Areas*". This classification is intended to give special consideration to significant features of natural and cultural heritage that together or individually give the Town of Lincoln its natural, undeveloped and rural character. Many of these features are listed in Appendices B and C. Specific locations are not always possible to identify, but when appropriate and possible, locations are noted in Figure 8. The Special Resource Management Area includes a minimum of 1,000 feet from waterways and wetlands. Special attention should be paid to these general and specific areas when allowing and performing activities that affect them. The proposed future land use map remains the same as current zoning, but with Special Resource Management Areas designated.

Figure 8
Town of Lincoln Special Resource Management Areas and Sites

PART VIII-IMPLEMENTATION

INTRODUCTION

This section of the Town of Lincoln Land Use plan is designed to provide a discussion of strategies for plan maintenance and revision and a detailed summary of available implementation tools.

The key purposes of the plan are to serve as an inventory of the town's resources and form a baseline in terms of land use. The plan also serves as an advisory document on which the town government can base its land use decisions in the future.

RECOMMENDED COMMITTEES

Planning/Special Resource Management Areas Committee

Following final plan adoption, the Town of Lincoln Land Use Planning Committee will no longer be responsible for plan development and oversight. Therefore, it is recommended that the Town should establish a permanent review committee, the Planning/Special Resource Management Areas Committee. The focus of this committee will be to interact with the public and other interested parties to further identify significant natural and cultural features, and to prioritize sites and features that meet the intent of a Special Resource Management Area, and to explore funding and administrative options to enhance and protect these areas. The committee would also be responsible for continued plan maintenance and periodic updating, and acting as an investigative body for the town board concerning zoning-related proposals.

Town Zoning Committee

The focus of this committee will be to investigate the present or future need for zoning at the township level in the Town of Lincoln.

Road Paving Committee

To allow Town citizens to make an informed decision on this issue at some future date, the focus of this committee will be to investigate the actual cost and possible funding sources for paving the main roads in the Town of Lincoln.

AVAILABLE IMPLEMENTATION TOOLS³

Purchases of Development Rights (PDR)

This technique is currently in use in some southern counties of Wisconsin and elsewhere in the United States and has proven to be effective for preserving farmland in areas adjacent to cities. The purchase of development rights is a *voluntary* protection technique that compensates landowners for limiting future development on their land. The programs are primarily used for retention of agricultural lands but the concept can be applied to all types of

³ This section draws heavily upon the March 2003 Bayfield County Land Use Plan.

land uses. Under a PDR program, an entity such as a town, county, or private conservation organization purchases the development rights to a designated piece of property. The land remains in private ownership and the landowner retains all the other rights and responsibilities associated with the property.

A PDR program works to insure that incompatible development will not take place; the PDR becomes part of the deed and keeps the land in its agricultural or natural state in perpetuity. An effective purchase of development rights program requires initial financial support and ongoing administration. In addition, the operation of the program requires the existence of a county review board to assess the lands of landowners requesting entry of their parcel into the PDR program.

Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)

The TDR program is a non-regulatory approach that allows the right to develop property to be transferred from one parcel (or zoning district) to another. Under a TDR program, development rights to a parcel of land are transferred from a “sending area” to another parcel referred to as the “receiving area.” Sending areas are typically those areas where development is discouraged or limited, and receiving areas are areas where growth and development are encouraged. Under some TDR programs, local government awards development rights to each parcel of developable land in the community or in selected districts on the basis of the land’s acreage or value. Landowners can then sell the development rights on the open market. The TDR or PDR tools could be considered as possible programs to preserve some of the remaining Bayfield County lakeshore from development. The TDR program has been widely implemented at the local level due to the fact that it requires no major financial by the local government.

Benefits of the TDR program include:

- The public benefits from the conservation easements, which protect and preserve natural features and wildlife habitat.
- Owners of sending area properties receive economic compensation for their properties where development would normally be precluded due to sensitive natural features or zoning restrictions.
- Owners of receiving area properties can increase their development density accommodating a greater number of uses or tenants.
- Little financial contribution on behalf of local government.

Acquisition

This type of land preservation tool involves the direct purchase of land for the purposes of preservation and protection. This tool should be used where other protective mechanisms fail to meet objectives, and/or in cases of the purchase of high priority land. Acquisition efforts should be coordinated with other local, state and national acquisition initiatives such as those of lake associations, environmental groups, the U.S. Forest Service, or the Wisconsin Department of Natural resources.

Conservation Easements

When a landowner sells his development rights, a legal document known as a conservation easement is drafted. The easement restricts the use of the land to agricultural use, open space or other desired uses in perpetuity. A conservation easement permanently limits residential, commercial, or industrial development to protect natural attributes or agricultural value. The conservation easement becomes part of the landowner's deed and remains on the deed even if the land is sold or passed through inheritance. This insures that development will not occur on the property.

The conservation easement does not automatically allow public access to the land; the land remains in the hands of the owner, as the only right to develop it has been purchased. All remaining rights of property ownership remain with the landowner including the right to transfer ownership, swap, deed, or sell the land.

One type of conservation easement, the Forest Legacy Program, was created by the 1990 federal Farm Bill. This program authorized the U.S. Department of Agriculture to acquire permanent conservation easements on private forestlands that are at risk of being converted to nonforest uses. The Forest Service may purchase easements only from willing landowners at fair market value. Priority is to be given to lands that can effectively be protected and managed, and which have important scenic, cultural, and recreational resources, fish and wildlife habitat, riparian areas, and other ecological values.

Landowners who participate in the Forest Legacy Program will be required to manage their property according to the terms of the easement that they have voluntarily sold. Forest management activities, including timber harvesting and recreational activities such as hunting, fishing, and hiking may be permitted as long as they are consistent with the purposes of the program.

Land Trusts

Land trusts are non-profit voluntary organizations that work with landowners to use a variety of tools to help them protect their land. Such organizations are formed with the purpose of protecting open space, scenic views, wildlife, etc., and use a variety of techniques to raise money for operating expenses and the acquisition of easements. Land trusts also provide monitoring and stewardship. In the United States, land trusts can hold conservation easements, which means that the organizations have the right to enforce the restrictions placed on the land.

LESA Farmland Preservation Tool

LESA is the acronym for land evaluation and site assessment tool, a program that assists in the evaluation of land based on its suitability for agricultural use and value for non-farm uses. This system, developed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service in 1981, has been routinely adopted and implemented for use by local government throughout the nation. The system involves a two-part process: the land evaluation component (LE), and the site assessment component (SA). The LE portion involves assessment of soil conditions

as they relate to the production of food and fiber products. Site assessment typically involves an analysis of the non-soil variables which affect the property's use, such as municipal services available, adjacent land uses, development suitability, compatibility with land use plans, and distance from populated areas. A point system is often used in order to quantify the variables of LE and SA components. Points are given based on whether or not the property meets the guidelines of the community and then totaled to achieve a composite score. A threshold score then determines whether the property would be an appropriate residential development area or whether the land should remain in agricultural use. Priority is to be given to lands that can effectively be protected and managed, land which have important scenic, cultural and recreational resources, fish and wildlife habitat, riparian areas and other ecological values. Landowners who participate in the Forest Legacy Program will be required to manage their property according to the terms of the easement they have voluntarily sold. Forest management practices, including timber harvesting and recreational activities such as hunting, fishing, and hiking may be permitted as long as they are consistent with the purposes of the program

Best Management Practices (BMP)

Best management practices describe voluntary procedures and activities aimed at protection of natural resources. Three types of best management practices are described below.

1. Shoreline Best Management Practices

Shoreline best management practices are a set of specific actions that landowners can take to help protect and preserve water quality. In many cases this means preserving the natural characteristics of shoreline property.

The shoreline best management practices handbook produced by the University of Minnesota-Extension Department (UM-EX) provides specific instructions for a large range of property types (e.g. Steep slopes, low vegetation, etc.)and issues pertaining to human use of shoreline (e.g. septic systems, gardens, landscaping, etc.)The information for these BMPs has been gathered from many different sources and is very thorough. Wisconsin does not have a specific set of shoreline BMPs, as it relies on forestry and construction BMPs to cover the shoreline area. As more information is gathered on the impact of human activity on shoreline, the BMPs may change accordingly. The shoreline BMPs outlined by UM-EX are meant to apply to all landowners on and near surface waters. It has been discovered that heavy land use by humans on, as well as around, shorelines can promote pollution of the water for human use and disrupt the natural habitation of the area.

The UM-EX Shoreline BMP contains 20 "Fact Sheets" which provide detailed instructions and diagrams.

More information concerning shoreline BMPs can be obtained from the University of Minnesota Extension Department or the Bayfield Land Conservation Department.

2. Construction Best Management Practices

The soil erosion rate in Wisconsin during construction is 10 to 100 times greater than the rate of erosion from agriculture. This erosion and the resulting sedimentation significantly degrade the quality of Wisconsin's surface waters.

Construction BMPs are a set of measures and practices gathered and organized by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources from numerous agencies throughout the country which are used to eliminate or drastically reduce the erosion and sedimentation brought about by construction and development.

In the Wisconsin Construction Site Best Management Practice Handbook, the principles of erosion and sediment control are described and details of seven specific subjects related to the prevention of erosion are explained.

Within each of these subjects there are subsections providing more information on specific types of problems and how to deal with them. The means to effectively implement each strategy are covered in depth in the handbook and often include diagrams and site specific directions.

More information concerning Construction BMPs is available from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources or the Bayfield County Land Conservation Department.

3. Forestry Best Management Practices

The goal of forestry BMPs in Wisconsin is to help loggers, landowners, and land managers be good stewards by protecting water quality during forest management activities. The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources guide titled Wisconsin's Forestry Best Management Practices for Water Quality, outlines in detail the procedures and practices recommended to attain this goal. These practices are voluntary in the sense that they are not legally binding but are strongly recommended by the DNR to insure clean and safe water in Wisconsin.

Wisconsin's Forestry Best Management Practices for Water Quality Field Manual and the Wisconsin Forest Management Guidelines are available online or in print form from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.

CONCLUSION

By preparing and adopting a Land Use Plan, residents of the Town of Lincoln have shown their willingness to examine the many possibilities for future change. With this plan, the Town can prepare to preserve its heritage and enhance the well-being of its inhabitants.

This land use plan is not a static or unchanging document, rather it serves as a "snapshot" of the town at the time of its completion and will require periodic review as conditions change in the future. The

members of the Land Use Planning Committee hope that this plan will contribute to the maintenance and preservation of the unique rural character of the Town of Lincoln.

PART IX--BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bowers, Caroline Margaret. My Yesterdays – As I Lived Them. Copy at Mason Historical Society.

Cleland, D.T.; Avers, P.E.; McNab, W.H.; Jensen, M.E.; Bailey, R.G., King, T.; Russell, W.E. 1997. *National Hierarchical Framework of Ecological Units*. Published in, Boyce, M.S.; Handy, A.K. ed. 1997. Ecosystem Management Applications for Sustainable Forest and Wildlife Resources. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT. pp. 181-200.

Grand View Centennial 1884-1984. Copy at Mason Historical Society.

Johnson, Emeroy, (1958) God Gave the Growth, the Story of the Lutheran Minnesota Conference 1876-1958. T.S. Denison & Company, Minneapolis. Chapter V copy at Mason Historical Society.

Logging Camps, list from Edwin Ekstrom's house found in 1998. Author unknown. Copy at Mason Historical Society.

Moertl, Frank. (Rev. ed. 1999) Wisconsin, Its Territorial and Statehood Post Offices; edited by James B Hale, James Maher and Greg Schmidt. Hartland WI: Wisconsin Postal History Society.

Meyer, Lilian M. (1975) Namakagon Memories. Country Print Shop, Hayward WI

Town of Lincoln, Town Board Minutes, 1909-1918, 1918-1930, Town of Lincoln.

Whittlesey, Chas. Map, December 1860. Geological Map of the Penokie Range. Ashland Co. Wis. Collection of Jean Hansen.

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. November 2002 - draft. Wisconsin Land Legacy Report.

State of Wisconsin, Bayfield County, Bayfield County Land Use Plan adopted March 25, 2003

APPENDIX A – SURVEY DATA AND COMMENTS

In an effort to obtain public input on issues affecting future growth and development in the Town of Lincoln, a Land Use Survey were sent to all property owners in March 2000. The results of this survey appear below. A total of 193 completed surveys was returned out of the 311 surveys distributed; a 62 percent overall return rate. Responses were tabulated in three categories: year-round residents, seasonal residents, and non-resident owners. Of the responses, 47 percent were year-round residents, 18 percent were seasonal residents, and 33 percent were non-resident owners. U.S. Census data for the year 2000 indicate that there were 118 year-round housing units and 64 seasonal housing units. Thus, the 92 surveys returned from year-round residents represented a 78 percent response rate from year-round residents; the 36 surveys from seasonal residents represented a 56 percent return rate from seasonal residents.

SURVEY TEXT

Please have **one** person from your residence take a few minutes to give us your household's opinion on a number of land use issues affecting the Town by completing this survey. This survey is entirely confidential and it is **not** necessary to sign your name. The survey consists of two parts. The first part attempts to identify general areas of concern to guide overall policy. The second part asks your responses to a number of specific questions that arise from those general areas of concern.

GRAND TOTAL FOR ALL RESPONDING

I. WHAT ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT GENERAL ISSUES FACING THE TOWN OF LINCOLN?

	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Not Important</u>			
	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Fostering economic development and job creation.	9(4%)	27 (14%)	56(29%)	22(11%)	67(35%)	12(6%)
Upgrading the Town's existing roads.	71(37%)	37(19%)	39(20%)	18(9%)	23(12%)	5(2%)
Protecting the rural character of the Town	117(60%)	45(23%)	11(5%)	5(2%)	4(2%)	9(4%)
Fostering recreational activities.	17(9%)	37(19%)	65(33%)	26(13%)	43(22%)	5(2%)
Protecting the environment.	130(67%)	36(18%)	18(9%)	3(1%)	2(1%)	4(2%)
Increasing Town services	10(5%)	27(14%)	65(33%)	38(20%)	43(25%)	9(4%)
Housing.	10(5%)	13(7%)	55(28%)	39(20%)	63(32%)	13(7%)
Preserving woodlands and encouraging forest management.	113(58%)	49(25%)	18(9%)	3(1%)	1(.5%)	9(4%)
Preserving farmland and agricultural activities	74(38%)	55(28%)	41(21%)	8(4%)	6(3%)	9(4%)
Attracting new residents	7(3%)	13(7%)	44(23%)	29(15%)	92(47%)	8(3%)

II. SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

RESPONDENT INFORMATION

1. Are you a Town of Lincoln: (check one)

92 Year-round resident

36 Seasonal resident

65 Non-resident property owner

2. How long have you owned property in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)

29(15%) Less than 5 years 82(42%) 5 to 20 years 82(42%) More than 20 years

AGRICULTURE and FORESTRY

3. Is preservation of farmland in the Town important? (check one)

146(76%) Yes 17(9%) No 25(13%) No opinion 5(2%) NA

What kind(s) of agricultural activities do you favor or oppose?

<u>167(89%)</u> Yes	<u>9(3%)</u> No	Traditional farming (beef, dairy, hay, etc.)	<u>17(9%)</u> NA
<u>84(44%)</u> Yes	<u>71(39%)</u> No	Truck farming	<u>38(19%)</u> NA
<u>153(79%)</u> Yes	<u>20(10%)</u> No	Alternative agriculture (herbs, flowers, etc.)	<u>20(10%)</u> NA
<u>155(80%)</u> Yes	<u>19(10%)</u> No	Hobby farms	<u>19(10%)</u> NA
<u>164(85%)</u> Yes	<u>10(4%)</u> No	Fruit Orchards	<u>19(10%)</u> NA
<u>23(12%)</u> Yes	<u>149(77%)</u> No	Factory farms (large cow, pig, poultry)	<u>21(10%)</u> NA
<u>165(85%)</u> Yes	<u>14(7%)</u> No	Tree Nursery	<u>14(7%)</u> NA
<u>143(74%)</u> Yes	<u>29(15%)</u> No	Greenhouses	<u>21(10%)</u> NA

4. For development purposes should agriculturally-zoned parcels in the Town that are 40 acres or less be allowed to be subdivided? (check one)

67(35%) Yes 98(51%) No 24(12%) No opinion 4(2%) NA

If yes, what should the minimum acreage be? (check one)

12(15%) Minimum of 20 acres 26(33%) Minimum of 10 acres
34(44%) Minimum of 5 acres 6(7%) Other size: ___ acres (please specify)

5. For development purposes should forestry-zoned parcels in the Town that are 40 acres or less be allowed to be subdivided? (check one)

59(30%) Yes 108(56%) No 23(12%) No opinion 3(2%) NA

If yes, what should the minimum acreage be? (check one)

12(19%) Minimum of 20 acres 16(26%) Minimum of 10 acres
29(47%) Minimum of 5 acres 5(6%) Other size: ___ acres (please specify)

TRANSPORTATION

6. Do you favor paving the main roads of the Town of Lincoln over time? (Four Corners Store Road, Altamont Road, Dybedal Road, Marengo Lake Road and Ashland-Bayfield County Line Road between County E and Midway Road) (check one)

95(49%) Yes 88(46%) No 9(4%) No opinion 1(.5%) NA

7. Would you favor a property tax increase levied by the town specifically for a road paving program? (The main roads, 17 miles, would get top priority) Any matching grants would accelerate the program chosen. (check one)

76(39%) Yes 103(53%) No 11(6%) No opinion 3(2%) NA

8. If yes, how much of an increase would you support? (Check an appropriate amount)

50(66%) \$5.00/thousand valuation increase would enable the town to prep and pave approximately 1 mile of road per year (example: \$5.00 x \$50,000.00 home/assessed value of property = \$250.00/year)
11(15%) \$10.00/thousand valuation increase would enable the town to prep and pave approximately 2 miles of road per year (example: \$10.00 x \$50,000.00 home/assessed value of property = \$500.00/year)
0(0%) \$15.00/thousand valuation (approximately 3 miles of road = \$750.00/year)
5(7%) \$20.00/thousand valuation (approximately 4 miles of road = \$1,000.00/year)
5(5%) Other \$2.00/thousand valuation (please specify)

9. Would you favor an airport or private landing strips in the Town? (check one)

14(7%) Yes 146(76%) No 30(16%) No opinion 3(1%) NA

HOUSING

10. Do you favor additional residential growth in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)

61(32%) Yes 91(47%) No 31(16%) No opinion 10(4%) NA

What kind(s) of growth would you like to see encouraged?

<u>113(58%)</u> Yes	<u>31(16%)</u> No	Single family residential	<u>49(25%)</u> NA
<u>20(10%)</u> Yes	<u>109(56%)</u> No	Multi-family residential, Duplexes	<u>64(34%)</u> NA
<u>10(4%)</u> Yes	<u>120(62%)</u> No	Multi-family residential, apartments	<u>63(34%)</u> NA
<u>15(8%)</u> Yes	<u>116(60%)</u> No	Condominiums	<u>62(32%)</u> NA
<u>42(22%)</u> Yes	<u>86(45%)</u> No	Senior housing	<u>65(34%)</u> NA
<u>28(15%)</u> Yes	<u>99(51%)</u> No	Low income housing	<u>66(34%)</u> NA
<u>24(12%)</u> Yes	<u>109(56%)</u> No	Mobile homes	<u>60(32%)</u> NA
<u>8(4%)</u> Yes	<u>122(63%)</u> No	Mobile home parks	<u>63(33%)</u> NA
<u>84(44%)</u> Yes	<u>53(27%)</u> No	Seasonal/recreational homes	<u>56(29%)</u> NA
<u>19(10%)</u> Yes	<u>105(54%)</u> No	Community Living Arrangements	<u>69(35%)</u> NA
<u>42(22%)</u> Yes	<u>87(45%)</u> No	Clustering or grouping of single family residences on a larger acreage with a common driveway link to a main road	<u>64(33%)</u> NA

11. Should there be a minimum lot size for residentially zoned land (R1) throughout the Town? (current county zoning is .75 acre for R1) (check one)

157(81%) Yes 8(4%) No 18(10%) No opinion 10(5%) NA

What should the minimum lot size be? (check one)

<u>67(35%)</u> Minimum of 5 acres	<u>20(10%)</u> Minimum of 2 acres
<u>8(4%)</u> Minimum of 1.5 acres	<u>23(12%)</u> Minimum of 1 acre
<u>18(9%)</u> Minimum of .75 acres	

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

12. Do you favor commercial development (for example, retail and wholesale stores, service businesses, etc.) in the Town? (check one)

72(37%) Yes 98(51%) No 19(10%) No opinion 4(2%) NA

13. Should commercial development be limited to certain areas to preserve the Town's rural character? (check one)

159(82%) Yes 13(7%) No 9(4%) No opinion 12(6%) NA

14. Where should commercial development occur in the Town? (check all that apply)

82(42%) Along Co. Hwy E? 132(68%) Along US Hwy 63?

15. What kind of business development pattern, if any, would you favor along the main roads in the Town of Lincoln? (Check one)

3(1%) Unlimited Strip development
69(36%) "Clustered" or high density development in small areas. (Businesses are grouped together and set back from the highway with a common driveway to the main road.)
70(36%) Low density development. (Single businesses on large lots)
20(10%) No opinion

16. Do you favor the development of home-based businesses (for example, childcare, bookkeeping, desktop publishing, making crafts, consulting, etc.) in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)

154(80%) Yes 19(9%) No 15(8%) No opinion 7(3%) NA

If yes, should there be limits on the numbers of non-household employees in the home-based business? (Current county zoning limits this to one person.)

<u>27(14%)</u> No limit	<u>7(4%)</u> 10-20 people	
<u>33(17%)</u> 6 to 10 people	<u>54(28%)</u> 2 to 5 people	<u>34(18%)</u> 1 person

17. Do you favor light industrial development (for example, electronic component assembly, furniture making, small appliance assembly, clothing, sewing, etc.) in the Town? (check one)
103(53%) Yes 66(34%) No 20(10%) No opinion

If yes, should there be limits on the numbers of employees in the business?

39(20%) No limit 5(3%) 21 to 50 people 7(4%) NA
23(12%) 11 to 20 people 25(13%) 5 to 10 people
12(6%) 1 to 4 people

18. If light industrial development were allowed should it be limited to certain areas to preserve the Town's rural character?

160(83%) Yes 17(9%) No 4(2%) No opinion 13(7%) NA

19. If light industrial development were allowed in the Town where should it occur? (check all that apply)

80(41%) Along Co. Hwy E? 139(72%) Along US Hwy 63?

20. Do you favor heavy industrial development (for example, paper mills or smelters) in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)

16(8%) Yes 171(89%) No 2(1%) No opinion 4(2%) NA

21. If heavy industrial development were allowed should it be limited to certain areas to preserve the Town's rural character? (check one)

148(77%) Yes 9(5%) No 5(2%) No opinion 31(16%) NA

22. If heavy industrial development were allowed in the Town where should it occur? (check all that apply)

50(26%) Along Co. Hwy E? 118(61%) Along US Hwy 63? 22(11%) NA

23. Do you favor commercial recreational development in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)

77(40%) Yes 74(38%) No 16(8%) No opinion 26(13%) NA

What kinds of commercial recreational development do you favor or oppose?

<u>58(30%)</u> Yes	<u>95(49%)</u> No	Golf courses	<u>40(21%)</u> NA
<u>83(43%)</u> Yes	<u>75(39%)</u> No	Campgrounds	<u>35(18%)</u> NA
<u>62(32%)</u> Yes	<u>91(47%)</u> No	Resorts	<u>40(21%)</u> NA
<u>101(52%)</u> Yes	<u>56(29%)</u> No	Riding Stables	<u>36(19%)</u> NA
<u>27(14%)</u> Yes	<u>127(66%)</u> No	Go Kart Tracks	<u>39(20%)</u> NA
<u>14(7%)</u> Yes	<u>142(74%)</u> No	Automobile Race Tracks	<u>37(19%)</u> NA
<u>60(31%)</u> Yes	<u>95(49%)</u> No	Shooting Ranges	<u>38(20%)</u> NA
<u>17(9%)</u> Yes	<u>140(73%)</u> No	Motocross Tracks	<u>36(18%)</u> NA
<u>32(17%)</u> Yes	<u>120(62%)</u> No	Convention Centers	<u>41(21%)</u> NA
<u>128(66%)</u> Yes	<u>33(17%)</u> No	Ski Trails	<u>32(17%)</u> NA
<u>127(66%)</u> Yes	<u>33(17%)</u> No	Biking Trails	<u>28(15%)</u> NA
<u>65(34%)</u> Yes	<u>97(50%)</u> No	Snowmobile/ATV Tracks	<u>31(16%)</u> NA

RECREATION

24. Do you favor keeping all Town roads open for ATV use? (check one)

96(50%) Yes 81(42%) No 14(7%) No opinion 2(1%) NA

25. Do you favor limiting access to certain Town roads for ATV use? (check one)

85(44%) Yes 82(42%) No 20(10%) No opinion 6(3%) NA

26. Do you favor keeping all Town roads open for snowmobile use? (check one)

90(47%) Yes 88(46%) No 14(7%) No opinion 1(.5%) NA

27. Do you favor limiting access to certain Town roads for snowmobile use? (check one)
87(45%) Yes 81(42%) No 19(10%) No opinion 6(3%) NA
28. Do you favor limiting ATV or snowmobile rallies in the Town? (check one)
114(59%) Yes 55(28%) No 19(10%) No opinion 5(2%) NA
29. Do you favor the public development of silent sports trails (ski, snowshoe, bicycle, horse) in the Town ? (check one)
122(63%) Yes 50(26%) No 17(9%) No opinion 4(2%) NA
30. Do you favor the public development of ATV trails in the Town ? (check one)
53(27%) Yes 128(66%) No 12(6%) No opinion
31. Do you favor the public development of snowmobile trails in the Town ? (check one)
60(31%) Yes 121(63%) No 12(6%) No opinion
32. Should the Town consider policies restricting the use of different types of powered watercraft on lakes and rivers, including personal watercraft (jet skis) and high-powered motorboats? (check one)
152(79%) Yes 22(11%) No 19(10%) No opinion

SHORELINE DEVELOPMENT

33. Do you favor development along the Marengo River and other creeks and streams in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
43(22%) Yes 129(67%) No 15(8%) No opinion 6(3%) NA

What type of development should be allowed along these waterways in the Town?

<u>89(46%)</u> Yes	<u>61(32%)</u> No	Single family dwellings/Residential	<u>43(22%)</u> NA
<u>7(3%)</u> Yes	<u>125(65%)</u> No	Multi family dwellings/Residential	<u>60(31%)</u> NA
<u>6(3%)</u> Yes	<u>129(67%)</u> No	Commercial (e.g., retail storefronts)	<u>58(30%)</u> NA
<u>30(16%)</u> Yes	<u>110(57%)</u> No	Commercial Recreational (e.g.,campground, canoe delivery or tubing)	<u>53(27%)</u> NA

34. Do you favor development along lake front property in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
67(34%) Yes 98(50%) No 25(13%) No opinion 7(3%) NA

35. What type of development should be allowed along lake front property in the Town?
109(56%) Yes 54(28%) No Single family dwellings/Residential 30(16%) NA
14(7%) Yes 127(66%) No Multi family dwellings/Residential 52(27%) NA
9(5%) Yes 132(68%) No Commercial (e.g., repair shops, dealerships, retail storefronts) 52(27%) NA
35(18%) Yes 110(57%) No Commercial Recreational (campground, boat rental) 34(18%) NA

ESTHETIC ISSUES

36. Do you feel it is important to preserve and protect the unique natural characteristics (large tracts of woodlands, wetlands, lakes, streams, rivers, scenic vistas) in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
178(92%) Yes 9(5%) No 3(1%) No opinion 3(1%) NA

Which characteristics of the Town are important to preserve for future years? (please specify)

37. Which of the following approaches would you favor?
144(75%) Yes 10(5%) No Preserving existing vistas 39(20%) NA
131(68%) Yes 15(8%) No Forest buffers 47(24%) NA
127(66%) Yes 23(12%) No Vegetative screening (planting shrubs & trees) 43(22%) NA

77(40%) Yes 59(31%) No Architectural design guidelines 57(29%) NA
106(55%) Yes 50(26%) No Special setback requirements 37(19%) NA

38. Do you favor retaining the tree canopy over Lover's Lane? (check one)
154(80%) Yes 13(7%) No 22(11%) No opinion 4(2%) NA

39. Do you favor the placement of billboards in the Town? (check one)
11(6%) Yes 163(84%) No 12(6%) No opinion 7(4%) NA

40. Should the Town of Lincoln set specific standards for advertising signs and billboards such as where they can be located, their size and maintenance requirements? (check one)
160(83%) Yes 9(5%) No 11(6%) No opinion 13(6%) NA

41. Do you favor limiting the siting and number of communication towers in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
142(74%) Yes 25(13%) No 19(10%) No opinion 7(4%) NA

42. Should the Town have a noise ordinance? (check one)
126(65%) Yes 38(20%) No 22(11%) No opinion 7(4%) NA

WATER and AIR QUALITY

43. Should the Town of Lincoln have an ordinance banning burn barrels? (check one)
38(20%) Yes 135(70%) No 20(10%) No opinion 3(1%) NA

44. Are you concerned with maintaining the quality of the ground and surface waters in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
180(93%) Yes 9(5%) No 1(.5%) No opinion 3(1%) NA

Would you support regulating the following to protect our ground and surface waters?

154(80%) Logging operations close to waterways
146(75%) Agricultural runoff
124(64%) Lampricide Use (current use is restricted to Marengo River)
146(76%) Pesticide Use
151(78%) Commercial demolition landfill
152(79%) Sanitary Landfill

OTHER ISSUES

46. Do you favor drilling, exploration and mining for gas, oil and minerals in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
38(20%) Yes 131(68%) No 19(10%) No opinion 5(2%) NA

47. Do you favor additional commercial sand and gravel pits operating in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
36(19%) Yes 123(64%) No 27(14%) No opinion 4(2%) NA

48. Would you favor the siting of a private or commercial demolition landfill for construction debris in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
35(18%) Yes 130(67%) No 19(10%) No opinion 8(4%) NA

49. Would you favor the siting of a commercial sanitary landfill for garbage in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
31(16%) Yes 137(71%) No 17(9%) No opinion 8(4%) NA

50. Do you favor utility development (for example, electrical high-power transmission lines, natural gas pipelines) in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
37(19%) Yes 127(66%) No 21(11%) No opinion 8(4%) NA

What types of utility development would you favor?

99(51%) Yes 59(31%) No Upgrading existing electrical high-power transmission lines 35(18%) NA
 35(18%) Yes 116(60%) No Placing additional electrical high power transmission lines 42(22%) NA
 51(26%) Yes 101(52%) No Placing natural gas pipelines 41(21%) NA

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

51. Do you have any other comments relating to **LAND USE AND PLANNING** issues in the Town of Lincoln that you wish to make? (please specify)see comments section.....

Would you be interested in picking up a copy of the final Land Use Plan for the Town of Lincoln? (This will help us determine the print run for the final plan.)

141(73%) Yes 35(18%) No

YEAR ROUND RESIDENTS

Please have one person from your residence take a few minutes to give us your household's opinion on a number of land use issues affecting the Town by completing this survey. This survey is entirely confidential and it is **not** necessary to sign your name. The survey consists of two parts. The first part attempts to identify general areas of concern to guide overall policy. The second part asks your responses to a number of specific questions that arise from those general areas of concern.

I. WHAT ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT GENERAL ISSUES FACING THE TOWN OF LINCOLN?

(Circle the number that applies)

WHAT ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT GENERAL ISSUES FACING THE TOWN OF LINCOLN?

Very Important Neutral Not Important

	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Fostering economic development and job creation.	4(5%)	13 (16%)	29(24%)	8(10%)	38(41%)	2(3%)
Upgrading the Town's existing roads.	48(52%)	16(18%)	12(13%)	7(8%)	7(8%)	2(2%)
Protecting the rural character of the Town	58(63%)	18(20%)	3(3%)	3(3%)	2(2%)	
Fostering recreational activities.	7(8%)	13(14%)	32(35%)	9(10%)	28(30%)	
Protecting the environment.	66(72%)	13(14%)	7(8%)	1(1%)	2(2%)	
Increasing Town services	7(8%)	18(20%)	27(29%)	16(17%)	20(22%)	
Housing.	7(8%)	6(6%)	20(22%)	18(20%)	33(36%)	
Preserving woodlands and encouraging forest management.	51(55%)	28(30%)	6(7%)	3(4%)	0(0%)	
Preserving farmland and agricultural activities	31(34%)	34(37%)	16(17%)	4(4%)	3(4%)	
Attracting new residents	4(4%)	6(7%)	23(25%)	13(14%)	41(45%)	

II. SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

RESPONDENT INFORMATION

1. Are you a Town of Lincoln: (check one)
 Year-round resident
 Seasonal resident
 Non-resident property owner

2. How long have you owned property in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
10(11%) Less than 5 years 39(42%) 5 to 20 years 43(47%) More than 20 years

AGRICULTURE and FORESTRY

3. Is preservation of farmland in the Town important? (check one)
72(78%) Yes 9(10%) No 9(10%) No opinion 2(2%) NA

What kind(s) of agricultural activities do you favor or oppose?

<u>83(90%)</u> Yes	<u>5(6%)</u> No	Traditional farming (beef, dairy, hay, etc.)	<u>4(4%)</u> NA
<u>47(51%)</u> Yes	<u>3(34%)</u> No	Truck farming	<u>14(15%)</u> NA
<u>78(85%)</u> Yes	<u>8(9%)</u> No	Alternative agriculture (herbs, flowers, etc.)	<u>6(6%)</u> NA
<u>82(89%)</u> Yes	<u>5(6%)</u> No	Hobby farms	<u>5(5%)</u> NA
<u>82(89%)</u> Yes	<u>4(4%)</u> No	Fruit Orchards	<u>6(9%)</u> NA
<u>15(16%)</u> Yes	<u>69(75%)</u> No	Factory farms (large cow, pig, poultry)	<u>8(9%)</u> NA
<u>77(84%)</u> Yes	<u>9(10%)</u> No	Tree Nursery	<u>6(6%)</u> NA
<u>72(78%)</u> Yes	<u>15(16%)</u> No	Greenhouses	<u>21(10%)</u> NA

4. For development purposes should agriculturally-zoned parcels in the Town that are 40 acres or less be allowed to be subdivided? (check one)
35(38%) Yes 49(53%) No 8(9%) No opinion 0(0%) NA

If yes, what should the minimum acreage be? (check one)

<u>8(20%)</u> Minimum of 20 acres	<u>12(29%)</u> Minimum of 10 acres	<u>1(2%)</u> Minimum of 3 acres
<u>17(42%)</u> Minimum of 5 acres	<u>3(7%)</u> Minimum of 40 acres	

5. For development purposes should forestry-zoned parcels in the Town that are 40 acres or less be allowed to be subdivided? (check one)

<u>29(32%)</u> Yes	<u>50(54%)</u> No	<u>10(11%)</u> No opinion	<u>3(3%)</u> NA
--------------------	-------------------	---------------------------	-----------------

If yes, what should the minimum acreage be? (check one)

<u>6(19%)</u> Minimum of 20 acres	<u>10(32%)</u> Minimum of 10 acres	<u>1(3%)</u> Minimum of 3 acres
<u>12(39%)</u> Minimum of 5 acres	<u>2(7%)</u> Minimum of 40 acres	

TRANSPORTATION

6. Do you favor paving the main roads of the Town of Lincoln over time? (Four Corners Store Road, Altamont Road, Dybedal Road, Marengo Lake Road and Ashland-Bayfield County Line Road between County E and Midway Road) (check one)
48(52%) Yes 43(47%) No 0(0%) No opinion 1(1%) NA

7. Would you favor a property tax increase levied by the town specifically for a road paving program? (The main roads, 17 miles, would get top priority) Any matching grants would accelerate the program chosen. (check one)

<u>40(44%)</u> Yes	<u>48(52%)</u> No	<u>3(3%)</u> No opinion	<u>1(1%)</u> NA
--------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	-----------------

8. If yes, how much of an increase would you support? (Check an appropriate amount)

<u>27(74%)</u>	\$5.00/thousand valuation increase would enable the town to prep and pave approximately 1 mile of road per year (example: \$5.00 x \$50,000.00 home/assessed value of property = \$250.00/year)
<u>3(8%)</u>	\$10.00/thousand valuation increase would enable the town to prep and pave approximately 2 miles of road per year (example: \$10.00 x \$50,000.00 home/assessed value of property = \$500.00/year)
<u>0(0%)</u>	\$15.00/thousand valuation (approximately 3 miles of road = \$750.00/year)
<u>3(8%)</u>	\$20.00/thousand valuation (approximately 4 miles of road = \$1,000.00/year)
<u>2(5%)</u>	\$2.50/thousand valuation
<u>2(5%)</u>	\$2.00/thousand valuation

9. Would you favor an airport or private landing strips in the Town? (check one)
5(5%) Yes 74(81%) No 11(12%) No opinion 2(2%) NA

HOUSING

10. Do you favor additional residential growth in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
32(35%) Yes 43(47%) No 11(12%) No opinion 6(6%) NA

What kind(s) of growth would you like to see encouraged?

<u>55(69%)</u> Yes	<u>12(13%)</u> No	Single family residential	<u>25(27%)</u> NA
<u>8(9%)</u> Yes	<u>52(57%)</u> No	Multi-family residential, Duplexes	<u>32(34%)</u> NA
<u>3(3%)</u> Yes	<u>57(62%)</u> No	Multi-family residential, apartments	<u>32(35%)</u> NA
<u>6(7%)</u> Yes	<u>56(61%)</u> No	Condominiums	<u>30(32%)</u> NA
<u>19(21%)</u> Yes	<u>41(45%)</u> No	Senior housing	<u>32(34%)</u> NA
<u>12(13%)</u> Yes	<u>46(50%)</u> No	Low income housing	<u>34(37%)</u> NA
<u>13(14%)</u> Yes	<u>47(51%)</u> No	Mobile homes	<u>32(35%)</u> NA
<u>2(2%)</u> Yes	<u>58(63%)</u> No	Mobile home parks	<u>32(35%)</u> NA
<u>37(40%)</u> Yes	<u>25(27%)</u> No	Seasonal/recreational homes	<u>30(33%)</u> NA
<u>9(10%)</u> Yes	<u>51(55%)</u> No	Community Living Arrangements	<u>32(35%)</u> NA
<u>20(22%)</u> Yes	<u>41(45%)</u> No	Clustering or grouping of single family residences on a larger acreage with a common driveway link to a main road	<u>31(33%)</u> NA
_____ Yes	_____ No	Other	Home business on same acreage

11. Should there be a minimum lot size for residentially zoned land (R1) throughout the Town? (current county zoning is .75 acre for R1) (check one)
80(81%) Yes 3(3%) No 4(4%) No opinion 5(6%) NA

What should the minimum lot size be? (check one)

<u>42(63%)</u> Minimum of 5 acres	<u>8(12%)</u> Minimum of 2 acres	<u>5(7%)</u> 10 Acres
<u>5(7%)</u> Minimum of 1.5 acres	<u>8(12%)</u> Minimum of 1 acre	<u>7(10%)</u> 20 Acres
<u>4(6%)</u> Minimum of .75 acres		<u>2(3%)</u> 40 Acres

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

12. Do you favor commercial development (for example, retail and wholesale stores, service businesses, etc.) in the Town? (check one)
34(37%) Yes 49(53%) No 8(9%) No opinion 1(1%) NA

13. Should commercial development be limited to certain areas to preserve the Town's rural character? (check one)
77(84%) Yes 6(7%) No 4(4%) No opinion 5(5%) NA

14. Where should commercial development occur in the Town? (check all that apply)
46 (39%) Along Co. Hwy E? 60(50%) Along US Hwy 63?

Other:

Nowhere	10(8%)
Indian Lake	1(1%)
Anywhere	1(1%)
Only paved roads	1(1%)

15. What kind of business development pattern, if any, would you favor along the main roads in the Town of Lincoln? (Check one)
1(1%) Unlimited Strip development
25(30%) "Clustered" or high density development in small areas. (Businesses are grouped together and set back from the highway with a common driveway to the main road.)

36(44%) Low density development. (Single businesses on large lots)

11(13%) Other

10(12%) No opinion

16. Do you favor the development of home-based businesses (for example, childcare, bookkeeping, desktop publishing, making crafts, consulting, etc.) in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)

80(87%) Yes 7(8%) No 5(5%) No opinion 1(1%) NA

If yes, should there be limits on the numbers of non-household employees in the home-based business? (Current county zoning limits this to one person.)

14(17%) No limit 4(5%) 10-20 people

11(14%) 6 to 10 people 31(38%) 2 to 5 people

20(25%) 1 person 1(1%) Other (please specify)

17. Do you favor light industrial development (for example, electronic component assembly, furniture making, small appliance assembly, clothing, sewing, etc.) in the Town? (check one)

52(57%) Yes 30(33%) No 8(9%) No opinion

If yes, should there be limits on the numbers of employees in the business?

20(37%) No limit 4(7%) 21 to 50 people 1(1%) greater than 100

8(15%) 11 to 20 people 12(22%) 5 to 10 people 7(4%) NA

7(13%) 1 to 4 people 1(1%) as needed

18. If light industrial development were allowed should it be limited to certain areas to preserve the Town's rural character?

77(84%) Yes 7(8%) No 3(3%) No opinion 5(5%) NA

19. If light industrial development were allowed in the Town where should it occur? (check all that apply)

48(40%) Along Co. Hwy E? 66(55%) Along US Hwy 63?

6(4%) Other (nowhere, Town Garage, anywhere)

20. Do you favor heavy industrial development (for example, paper mills or smelters) in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)

4(4%) Yes 87(95%) No 1(1%) No opinion

21. If heavy industrial development were allowed should it be limited to certain areas to preserve the Town's rural character? (check one)

72(78%) Yes 3(3%) No 3(3%) No opinion 14(16%) NA

22. If heavy industrial development were allowed in the Town where should it occur? (check all that apply)

32(33%) Along Co. Hwy E? 56(58%) Along US Hwy 63?

8(9%) Other

23. Do you favor commercial recreational development in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)

37(40%) Yes 35(38%) No 5(6%) No opinion 15(16%) NA

What kinds of commercial recreational development do you favor or oppose?

23(25%) Yes 47(51%) No Golf courses 22(24%) NA

41(45%) Yes 33(36%) No Campgrounds 18(19%) NA

25(27%) Yes 47(51%) No Resorts 20(22%) NA

50(54%) Yes 24(26%) No Riding Stables 18(20%) NA

13(14%) Yes 60(65%) No Go Kart Tracks 19(21%) NA

4(4%) Yes 70(76%) No Automobile Race Tracks 18(20%) NA

28(30%) Yes 45(49%) No Shooting Ranges 19(21%) NA

8(9%) Yes 66(72%) No Motocross Tracks 18(19%) NA

10(11%) Yes 61(66%) No Convention Centers 21(23%) NA

<u>62(67%)</u> Yes	<u>13(14%)</u> No	Ski Trails	<u>17(19%)</u> NA
<u>60(65%)</u> Yes	<u>15(16%)</u> No	Biking Trails	<u>17(19%)</u> NA
<u>30(33%)</u> Yes	<u>46(50%)</u> No	Snowmobile/ATV Tracks	<u>16(17%)</u> NA
_____ Yes	_____ No	Other	<u>Nonmotorized (2), Quiet & Low Polluting (1)</u> (please specify)

RECREATION

24. Do you favor keeping all Town roads open for ATV use? (check one)
46(50%) Yes 44(48%) No 2(2%) No opinion
25. Do you favor limiting access to certain Town roads for ATV use? (check one)
40(43%) Yes 44(48%) No 8(9%) No opinion
26. Do you favor keeping all Town roads open for snowmobile use? (check one)
45(49%) Yes 44(48%) No 3(3%) No opinion
27. Do you favor limiting access to certain Town roads for snowmobile use? (check one)
43(47%) Yes 41(45%) No 8(8%) No opinion
28. Do you favor limiting ATV or snowmobile rallies in the Town? (check one)
60(65%) Yes 26(28%) No 6(7%) No opinion
29. Do you favor the public development of silent sports trails (ski, snowshoe, bicycle, horse) in the Town ? (check one)
62(67%) Yes 24(26%) No 6(7%) No opinion
30. Do you favor the public development of ATV trails in the Town ? (check one)
28(30%) Yes 62(67%) No 2(3%) No opinion
31. Do you favor the public development of snowmobile trails in the Town ? (check one)
30(33%) Yes 60(65%) No 2(2%) No opinion
32. Should the Town consider policies restricting the use of different types of powered watercraft on lakes and rivers, including personal watercraft (jet skis) and high-powered motorboats? (check one)
74(80%) Yes 12(13%) No 6(7%) No opinion

SHORELINE DEVELOPMENT

33. Do you favor development along the Marengo River and other creeks and streams in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
20(22%) Yes 63(68%) No 7(8%) No opinion 2(2%) NA
- What type of development should be allowed along these waterways in the Town?
- | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--|-------------------|
| <u>40(43%)</u> Yes | <u>30(33%)</u> No | Single family dwellings/Residential | <u>22(24%)</u> NA |
| <u>3(3%)</u> Yes | <u>58(63%)</u> No | Multi family dwellings/Residential | <u>31(34%)</u> NA |
| <u>1(1%)</u> Yes | <u>62(67%)</u> No | Commercial (e.g., retail storefronts) | <u>29(32%)</u> NA |
| <u>11(12%)</u> Yes | <u>53(58%)</u> No | Commercial Recreational (e.g., campground, canoe delivery or tubing) | <u>28(30%)</u> NA |
34. Do you favor development along lake front property in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
30(33%) Yes 49(53%) No 12(13%) No opinion 1(1%) NA

35. What type of development should be allowed along lake front property in the Town?
- | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|---|-------------------|
| <u>53(58%)</u> Yes | <u>24(26%)</u> No | Single family dwellings/Residential | <u>15(16%)</u> NA |
| <u>6(7%)</u> Yes | <u>58(63%)</u> No | Multi family dwellings/Residential | <u>28(30%)</u> NA |
| <u>3(3%)</u> Yes | <u>61(66%)</u> No | Commercial (e.g., repair shops,
dealerships, retail storefronts) | <u>28(31%)</u> NA |
| <u>12(13%)</u> Yes | <u>54(59%)</u> No | Commercial Recreational (campground,
boat rental) | <u>26(28%)</u> NA |

ESTHETIC ISSUES

36. Do you feel it is important to preserve and protect the unique natural characteristics (large tracts of woodlands, wetlands, lakes, streams, rivers, scenic vistas) in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
- | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| <u>80(87%)</u> Yes | <u>7(8%)</u> No | <u>3(3%)</u> No opinion | <u>2(2%)</u> NA |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|

Which characteristics of the Town are important to preserve for future years? (please specify)

37. Which of the following approaches would you favor?
- | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--|-------------------|
| <u>64(70%)</u> Yes | <u>5(5%)</u> No | Preserving existing vistas | <u>23(25%)</u> NA |
| <u>60(65%)</u> Yes | <u>6(7%)</u> No | Forest buffers | <u>26(28%)</u> NA |
| <u>58(63%)</u> Yes | <u>10(11%)</u> No | Vegetative screening (planting shrubs & trees) | <u>24(26%)</u> NA |
| <u>34(37%)</u> Yes | <u>27(29%)</u> No | Architectural design guidelines | <u>31(34%)</u> NA |
| <u>55(60%)</u> Yes | <u>13(14%)</u> No | Special setback requirements | <u>24(26%)</u> NA |

38. Do you favor retaining the tree canopy over Lover's Lane? (check one)
- | | | | |
|--------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| <u>73(79%)</u> Yes | <u>9(10%)</u> No | <u>9(10%)</u> No opinion | <u>1(1%)</u> NA |
|--------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|

39. Do you favor the placement of billboards in the Town? (check one)
- | | | | |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| <u>7(8%)</u> Yes | <u>79(86%)</u> No | <u>4(4%)</u> No opinion | <u>2(2%)</u> NA |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|

40. Should the Town of Lincoln set specific standards for advertising signs and billboards such as where they can be located, their size and maintenance requirements? (check one)
- | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| <u>77(84%)</u> Yes | <u>3(3%)</u> No | <u>7(8%)</u> No opinion | <u>5(5%)</u> NA |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|

41. Do you favor limiting the siting and number of communication towers in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
- | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| <u>72(78%)</u> Yes | <u>8(9%)</u> No | <u>8(9%)</u> No opinion | <u>4(4%)</u> NA |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|

42. Should the Town have a noise ordinance? (check one)
- | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| <u>59(64%)</u> Yes | <u>18(20%)</u> No | <u>10(11%)</u> No opinion | <u>5(5%)</u> NA |
|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|

WATER and AIR QUALITY

43. Should the Town of Lincoln have an ordinance banning burn barrels? (check one)
- | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| <u>21(21%)</u> Yes | <u>75(75%)</u> No | <u>3(3%)</u> No opinion | <u>1(1%)</u> NA |
|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|

44. Are you concerned with maintaining the quality of the ground and surface waters in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
- | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| <u>83(91%)</u> Yes | <u>5(5%)</u> No | <u>1(1%)</u> No opinion | <u>3(3%)</u> NA |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|

Would you support regulating the following to protect our ground and surface waters?

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| <u>72(79%)</u> | Logging operations close to waterways |
| <u>66(73%)</u> | Agricultural runoff |
| <u>59(65%)</u> | Lampricide Use (current use is restricted to Marengo River) |
| <u>68(75%)</u> | Pesticide Use |
| <u>71(78%)</u> | Commercial demolition landfill |
| <u>73(80%)</u> | Sanitary Landfill |

Increasing Town services	0(0%)	3(8%)	10(28%)	10(28%)	12(33%)	
Housing.	0(0%)	2(6%)	8(22%)	8(22%)	18(50%)	
Preserving woodlands and encouraging forest management.	26(72%)	6(17%)	2(6%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	
Preserving farmland and agricultural activities	18(50%)	7(19%)	8(22%)	2(6%)	1(3%)	
Attracting new residents	0(0%)	2(6%)	5(14%)	5(14%)	24(66%)	

II. SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

RESPONDENT INFORMATION

1. Are you a Town of Lincoln: (check one)

- Year-round resident
 Seasonal resident
 Non-resident property owner

2. How long have you owned property in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)

- 7(19%) Less than 5 years 17(45%) 5 to 20 years 13(36%) More than 20 years

AGRICULTURE and FORESTRY

3. Is preservation of farmland in the Town important? (check one)

- 26(72%) Yes 3(8%) No 5(14%) No opinion 2(6%) NA

What kind(s) of agricultural activities do you favor or oppose?

- | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--|------------------|
| <u>32(89%)</u> Yes | <u>1(3%)</u> No | Traditional farming (beef, dairy, hay, etc.) | <u>3(8%)</u> NA |
| <u>15(42%)</u> Yes | <u>12(35%)</u> No | Truck farming | <u>9(25%)</u> NA |
| <u>26(72%)</u> Yes | <u>6(17%)</u> No | Alternative agriculture (herbs, flowers, etc.) | <u>4(11%)</u> NA |
| <u>26(72%)</u> Yes | <u>4(11%)</u> No | Hobby farms | <u>6(17%)</u> NA |
| <u>30(83%)</u> Yes | <u>3(9%)</u> No | Fruit Orchards | <u>3(8%)</u> NA |
| <u>1(3%)</u> Yes | <u>28(78%)</u> No | Factory farms (large cow, pig, poultry) | <u>7(19%)</u> NA |
| <u>34(94%)</u> Yes | <u>1(3%)</u> No | Tree Nursery | <u>1(3%)</u> NA |
| <u>23(64%)</u> Yes | <u>8(22%)</u> No | Greenhouses | <u>5(14%)</u> NA |

4. For development purposes should agriculturally-zoned parcels in the Town that are 40 acres or less be allowed to be subdivided? (check one)

- 4(11%) Yes 26(72%) No 5(14%) No opinion 1(3%) NA

If yes, what should the minimum acreage be? (check one)

- 0(0%) Minimum of 20 acres 1(17%) Minimum of 10 acres
4(67%) Minimum of 5 acres 1(17%) Other size: 2 acres (please specify)

5. For development purposes should forestry-zoned parcels in the Town that are 40 acres or less be allowed to be subdivided? (check one)

- 3(8%) Yes 29(81%) No 4(11%) No opinion

If yes, what should the minimum acreage be? (check one)

- 0(0%) Minimum of 20 acres 1(25%) Minimum of 10 acres
2(50%) Minimum of 5 acres 1(25%) Other size: 2 acres (please specify)

TRANSPORTATION

6. Do you favor paving the main roads of the Town of Lincoln over time? (Four Corners Store Road, Altamont Road, Dybedal Road, Marengo Lake Road and Ashland-Bayfield County Line Road between County E and Midway Road) (check one)

- 16(44%) Yes 19(53%) No 1(3%) No opinion

7. Would you favor a property tax increase levied by the town specifically for a road paving program? (The main roads, 17 miles, would get top priority) Any matching grants would accelerate the program chosen. (check one)

12(33%) Yes 23(64%) No 1(3%) No opinion 3(2%) NA

8. If yes, how much of an increase would you support? (Check an appropriate amount)

6(55%) \$5.00/thousand valuation increase would enable the town to prep and pave approximately 1 mile of road per year (example: \$5.00 x \$50,000.00 home/assessed value of property = \$250.00/year)

3(27%) \$10.00/thousand valuation increase would enable the town to prep and pave approximately 2 miles of road per year (example: \$10.00 x \$50,000.00 home/assessed value of property = \$500.00/year)

0(0%) \$15.00/thousand valuation (approximately 3 miles of road = \$750.00/year)

1(9%) \$20.00/thousand valuation (approximately 4 miles of road = \$1,000.00/year)

1(9%) Other \$1.00/thousand valuation (please specify)

9. Would you favor an airport or private landing strips in the Town? (check one)

14(7%) Yes 146(76%) No 30(16%) No opinion 3(1%) NA

HOUSING

10. Do you favor additional residential growth in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)

2(6%) Yes 26(72%) No 6(17%) No opinion 2(5%) NA

What kind(s) of growth would you like to see encouraged?

18(50%) Yes 8(22%) No Single family residential 10(28%) NA

1(3%) Yes 23(64%) No Multi-family residential, Duplexes 12(33%) NA

0(0%) Yes 24(67%) No Multi-family residential, apartments 12(33%) NA

0(0%) Yes 24(67%) No Condominiums 12(33%) NA

4(11%) Yes 18(50%) No Senior housing 13(36%) NA

3(8%) Yes 21(59%)No Low income housing 12(33%) NA

3(8%) Yes 22(61%) No Mobile homes 12(31%) NA

0(0%) Yes 25(69%) No Mobile home parks 11(31%) NA

16(44%) Yes 9(25%) No Seasonal/recreational homes 12(31%) NA

0(0%) Yes 23(64%) No Community Living Arrangements 12(36%) NA

3(8%) Yes 22(61%)No Clustering or grouping of single family residences on a larger acreage with a common driveway link to a main road 11(31%) NA

_____ Yes 1 No Other: None _____ (please specify)

11. Should there be a minimum lot size for residentially zoned land (R1) throughout the Town?

(current county zoning is .75 acre for R1) (check one)

31(86%) Yes 0(0%) No 3(8%) No opinion 2(6%) NA

What should the minimum lot size be? (check one)

12(38%) Minimum of 5 acres 4(13%) Minimum of 2 acres 2(6%) Minimum of 10 acres

2(6%) Minimum of 1.5 acres 3(8%) Minimum of 1 acres 3(9%) Minimum of 20 acres

4(13%) Minimum of .75 acres 1(3%) Minimum of 3 acres 1(3%) Minimum of 30 acres

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

12. Do you favor commercial development (for example, retail and wholesale stores, service businesses, etc.) in the Town? (check one)

9(25%) Yes 24(58%) No 5(14%) No opinion 1(3%) NA

13. Should commercial development be limited to certain areas to preserve the Town's rural character? (check one)

30(83%) Yes 0(0%) No 1(3%) No opinion 4(14%) NA

14. Where should commercial development occur in the Town? (check all that apply)
11(24%) Along Co. Hwy E? 25(53%) Along US Hwy 63? 8(17%) NA
3(6%) Other Nowhere (please specify)
15. What kind of business development pattern, if any, would you favor along the main roads in the Town of Lincoln? (Check one)
0(0%) Unlimited Strip development
12(32%) "Clustered" or high density development in small areas. (Businesses are grouped together and set back from the highway with a common driveway to the main road.)
14(38%) Low density development. (Single businesses on large lots)
5(14%) Other 4(11%) none, 1(3%) convenience store (please specify)
1(3%) No opinion
5(13%) NA
16. Do you favor the development of home-based businesses (for example, childcare, bookkeeping, desktop publishing, making crafts, consulting, etc.) in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
28(78%) Yes 3(8%) No 3(8%) No opinion 2(6%) NA
- If yes, should there be limits on the numbers of non-household employees in the home-based business? (Current county zoning limits this to one person.)
2(7%) No limit 0(0%) 10-20 people
9(33%) 6 to 10 people 14(47%) 2 to 5 people
5(16%) 1 person _____ Other (please specify)
17. Do you favor light industrial development (for example, electronic component assembly, furniture making, small appliance assembly, clothing, sewing, etc.) in the Town? (check one)
16(44%) Yes 16(44%) No 3(12%) No opinion
- If yes, should there be limits on the numbers of employees in the business?
5(24%) No limit 0(0%) 21 to 50 people 3(14%) NA
4(19%) 11 to 20 people 8(38%) 5 to 10 people
1(5%) 1 to 4 people _____ Other (please specify)
18. If light industrial development were allowed should it be limited to certain areas to preserve the Town's rural character?
32(89%) Yes 1(3%) No 0(0%) No opinion 3(8%) NA
19. If light industrial development were allowed in the Town where should it occur? (check all that apply)
9(20%) Along Co. Hwy E? 26(59%) Along US Hwy 63? 6(14%) NA
3(7%) Other Home base 1(2%), none 2(5%) (please specify)
20. Do you favor heavy industrial development (for example, paper mills or smelters) in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
1(3%) Yes 34(89%) No 2(5%) No opinion 1(3%) NA
21. If heavy industrial development were allowed should it be limited to certain areas to preserve the Town's rural character? (check one)
28(78%) Yes 1(3%) No 0(0%) No opinion 7(19%) NA
22. If heavy industrial development were allowed in the Town where should it occur? (check all that apply)
3(8%) Along Co. Hwy E? 22(58%) Along US Hwy 63? 9(23%) NA
_____ Other 4(11%) nowhere (please specify)
23. Do you favor commercial recreational development in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
9(25%) Yes 19(53%) No 3(8%) No opinion 5(14%) NA

What kinds of commercial recreational development do you favor or oppose?

<u>10(28%)</u> Yes	<u>18(50%)</u> No	Golf courses	<u>8(22%)</u> NA
<u>9(25%)</u> Yes	<u>18(50%)</u> No	Campgrounds	<u>9(25%)</u> NA
<u>9(25%)</u> Yes	<u>18(50%)</u> No	Resorts	<u>9(25%)</u> NA
<u>15(42%)</u> Yes	<u>13(36%)</u> No	Riding Stables	<u>8(22%)</u> NA
<u>2(6%)</u> Yes	<u>25(69%)</u> No	Go Kart Tracks	<u>9(25%)</u> NA
<u>0(0%)</u> Yes	<u>27(75%)</u> No	Automobile Race Tracks	<u>9(25%)</u> NA
<u>6(17%)</u> Yes	<u>20(55%)</u> No	Shooting Ranges	<u>10(28%)</u> NA
<u>0(0%)</u> Yes	<u>28(78%)</u> No	Motocross Tracks	<u>9(22%)</u> NA
<u>3(8%)</u> Yes	<u>24(67%)</u> No	Convention Centers	<u>9(25%)</u> NA
<u>23(64%)</u> Yes	<u>7(19%)</u> No	Ski Trails	<u>6(17%)</u> NA
<u>24(66%)</u> Yes	<u>6(17%)</u> No	Biking Trails	<u>6(17%)</u> NA
<u>10(28%)</u> Yes	<u>20(56%)</u> No	Snowmobile/ATV Tracks	<u>6(16%)</u> NA
<u>1(3%)</u> Yes	_____ No	Other <u> Fishing </u> (please specify)	

RECREATION

24. Do you favor keeping all Town roads open for ATV use? (check one)
17(47%) Yes 18(50%) No 0(0%) No opinion 1(3%) NA
25. Do you favor limiting access to certain Town roads for ATV use? (check one)
19(53%) Yes 14(39%) No 0(0%) No opinion 3(8%) NA
26. Do you favor keeping all Town roads open for snowmobile use? (check one)
14(39%) Yes 21(58%) No 1(3%) No opinion 0(0%) NA
27. Do you favor limiting access to certain Town roads for snowmobile use? (check one)
21(58%) Yes 12(33%) No 0(0%) No opinion 3(9%) NA
28. Do you favor limiting ATV or snowmobile rallies in the Town? (check one)
23(64%) Yes 9(25%) No 3(8%) No opinion 1(3%) NA
29. Do you favor the public development of silent sports trails (ski, snowshoe, bicycle, horse) in the Town ? (check one)
23(64%) Yes 11(30%) No 1(3%) No opinion 1(3%) NA
30. Do you favor the public development of ATV trails in the Town ? (check one)
6(17%) Yes 28(78%) No 2(5%) No opinion
31. Do you favor the public development of snowmobile trails in the Town ? (check one)
8(22%) Yes 27(75%) No 1(3%) No opinion
32. Should the Town consider policies restricting the use of different types of powered watercraft on lakes and rivers, including personal watercraft (jet skis) and high-powered motorboats? (check one)
32(89%) Yes 0(0%) No 4(11%) No opinion

SHORELINE DEVELOPMENT

33. Do you favor development along the Marengo River and other creeks and streams in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
9(25%) Yes 25(69%) No 2(6%) No opinion

What type of development should be allowed along these waterways in the Town?

<u>19(53%)</u> Yes	<u>11(31%)</u> No	Single family dwellings/Residential	<u>6(16%)</u> NA
<u>3(8%)</u> Yes	<u>24(67%)</u> No	Multi family dwellings/Residential	<u>9(25%)</u> NA
<u>2(6%)</u> Yes	<u>25(69%)</u> No	Commercial (e.g., retail storefronts)	<u>9(25%)</u> NA

6(17%) Yes 22(61%) No Commercial Recreational (e.g.,camp ground,
canoe delivery or tubing) 8(22%) NA

34. Do you favor development along lake front property in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)

11(31%) Yes 21(58%) No 4(11%) No opinion

35. What type of development should be allowed along lake front property in the Town?

<u>19(53%)</u> Yes	<u>10(28%)</u> No	Single family dwellings/Residential	<u>9(19%)</u> NA
<u>3(8%)</u> Yes	<u>23(64%)</u> No	Multi family dwellings/Residential	<u>10(28%)</u> NA
<u>1(3%)</u> Yes	<u>26(72%)</u> No	Commercial (e.g., repair shops, dealerships, retail storefronts)	<u>9(25%)</u> NA
<u>5(14%)</u> Yes	<u>22(61%)</u> No	Commercial Recreational (campground, boat rental)	<u>9(25%)</u> NA

ESTHETIC ISSUES

36. Do you feel it is important to preserve and protect the unique natural characteristics (large tracts of woodlands, wetlands, lakes, streams, rivers, scenic vistas) in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)

36(100%) Yes 0(0%) No 0(0%) No opinion 0(0%) NA

Which characteristics of the Town are important to preserve for future years? (please specify)

37. Which of the following approaches would you favor?

<u>29(81%)</u> Yes	<u>2(6%)</u> No	Preserving existing vistas	<u>5(13%)</u> NA
<u>28(78%)</u> Yes	<u>2(6%)</u> No	Forest buffers	<u>6(16%)</u> NA
<u>27(75%)</u> Yes	<u>3(8%)</u> No	Vegetative screening (planting shrubs & trees)	<u>6(17%)</u> NA
<u>12(33%)</u> Yes	<u>14(39%)</u> No	Architectural design guidelines	<u>10(28%)</u> NA
<u>18(50%)</u> Yes	<u>10(28%)</u> No	Special setback requirements	<u>8(2%)</u> NA
<u>3(8%)</u> Yes	_____ No	Other _____ (please specify)	

38. Do you favor retaining the tree canopy over Lover's Lane? (check one)

34(94%) Yes 1(3%) No 1(3%) No opinion

39. Do you favor the placement of billboards in the Town? (check one)

1(3%) Yes 33(92%) No 2(15%) No opinion

40. Should the Town of Lincoln set specific standards for advertising signs and billboards such as where they can be located, their size and maintenance requirements? (check one)

32(89%) Yes 1(3%) No 1(3%) No opinion 2(5%) NA

41. Do you favor limiting the siting and number of communication towers in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)

32(89%) Yes 3(8%) No 1(3%) No opinion

42. Should the Town have a noise ordinance? (check one)

33(92%) Yes 3(8%) No 0(0%) No opinion

WATER and AIR QUALITY

43. Should the Town of Lincoln have an ordinance banning burn barrels? (check one)

4(11%) Yes 19(53%) No 12(33%) No opinion 1(3%) NA

44. Are you concerned with maintaining the quality of the ground and surface waters in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)

36(100%) Yes 0(0%) No 0(0%) No opinion

Would you support regulating the following to protect our ground and surface waters?

- 32(17%) Logging operations close to waterways
- 31(16%) Agricultural runoff
- 25(13%) Lampricide Use (current use is restricted to Marengo River)
- 33(17%) Pesticide Use
- 32(17%) Commercial demolition landfill
- 33(17%) Sanitary Landfill
- 4(3%) Other Gravel pit 2(1%), DNR controls 1(1%), Check septic 1(1%) (please specify)

OTHER ISSUES

- 46. Do you favor drilling, exploration and mining for gas, oil and minerals in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
2(6%) Yes 30(33%) No 3(11%) No opinion

- 47. Do you favor additional commercial sand and gravel pits operating in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
1(3%) Yes 30(83%) No 3(8%) No opinion 2(6%) NA

- 48. Would you favor the siting of a private or commercial demolition landfill for construction debris in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
5(14%) Yes 26(72%) No 4(11%) No opinion

- 49. Would you favor the siting of a commercial sanitary landfill for garbage in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
4(11%) Yes 27(75%) No 3(8%) No opinion 2(6%) NA

- 50. Do you favor utility development (for example, electrical high-power transmission lines, natural gas pipelines) in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
5(14%) Yes 28(78%) No 0(0%) No opinion 2(8%) NA

What types of utility development would you favor?

- | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|---|------------------|
| <u>18(50%)</u> Yes | <u>14(39%)</u> No | Upgrading existing electrical high-power transmission lines | <u>4(11%)</u> NA |
| <u>3(8%)</u> Yes | <u>28(78%)</u> No | Placing additional electrical high power transmission lines | <u>5(14%)</u> NA |
| <u>7(19%)</u> Yes | <u>24(67%)</u> No | Placing natural gas pipelines | <u>5(14%)</u> NA |

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

- 51. Do you have any other comments relating to **LAND USE AND PLANNING** issues in the Town of Lincoln that you wish to make? (please specify)see comments section....

Would you be interested in picking up a copy of the final Land Use Plan for the Town of Lincoln? (This will help us determine the print run for the final plan.)

- 30(97%) Yes 1(3%) No

NON RESIDENT PROPERTY OWNER

Please have **one** person from your residence take a few minutes to give us your household's opinion on a number of land use issues affecting the Town by completing this survey. This survey is entirely confidential and it is **not** necessary to sign your name. The survey consists of two parts. The first part attempts to identify general areas of concern to guide overall policy. The second part asks your responses to a number of specific questions that arise from those general areas of concern.

I. WHAT ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT GENERAL ISSUES FACING THE TOWN OF LINCOLN?

	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Not Important</u>			
	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Fostering economic development and job creation.	5(8%)	9(14%)	25(58%)	7(11%)	16(25%)	3(4%)
Upgrading the Town's existing roads.	12(18%)	16(25%)	20(31%)	8(12%)	6(9%)	3(5%)
Protecting the rural character of the Town	33(52%)	20(31%)	7(11%)	1(2%)	1(2%)	2(2%)
Fostering recreational activities.	8(12%)	14(22%)	23(35%)	12(18%)	6(9%)	3(4%)
Protecting the environment.	34(52%)	18(28%)	10(15%)	2(3%)	0(0%)	3(2%)
Increasing Town services	3(5%)	6(9%)	28(43%)	12(18%)	11(17%)	5(8%)
Housing.	3(5%)	5(8%)	27(42%)	13(20%)	12(18%)	5(9%)
Preserving woodlands and encouraging forest management.	36(55%)	15(23%)	10(15%)	0(0%)	1(2%)	2(5%)
Preserving farmland and agricultural activities	25(38%)	14(22%)	17(26%)	2(3%)	2(3%)	4(8%)
Attracting new residents	3(5%)	5(8%)	16(24%)	11(17%)	27(41%)	3(5%)

II. SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

RESPONDENT INFORMATION

1. Are you a Town of Lincoln: (check one)

- Year-round resident
 Seasonal resident
 Non-resident property owner

2. How long have you owned property in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)

12(18%) Less than 5 years 27(42%) 5 to 20 years 26(40%) More than 20 years

AGRICULTURE and FORESTRY

3. Is preservation of farmland in the Town important? (check one)

48(74%) Yes 5(8%) No 11(17%) No opinion 1(1%) NA

What kind(s) of agricultural activities do you favor or oppose?

52(80%) Yes 3(5%) No Traditional farming (beef, dairy, hay, etc.) 7(15%) NA
22(34%) Yes 28(43%) No Truck farming 10(23%) NA
49(75%) Yes 6(9%) No Alternative agriculture (herbs, flowers, etc.) 7(16%) NA
47(72%) Yes 10(15%) No Hobby farms 6(13%) NA
52(80%) Yes 3(5%) No Fruit Orchards 7(15%) NA
7(11%) Yes 52(80%) No Factory farms (large cow, pig, poultry) 5(9%) NA
54(83%) Yes 4(6%) No Tree Nursery 5(11%) NA
48(74%) Yes 6(9%) No Greenhouses 7(16%) NA

4. For development purposes should agriculturally-zoned parcels in the Town that are 40 acres or less be allowed to be subdivided? (check one)

28(43%) Yes 23(35%) No 11(17%) No opinion 2(5%) NA

If yes, what should the minimum acreage be? (check one)

4(9%) Minimum of 20 acres 13(30%) Minimum of 10 acres 12(28%) NA
13(30%) Minimum of 5 acres 1(2%) Other size: 1/2 acres

5. For development purposes should forestry-zoned parcels in the Town that are 40 acres or less be allowed to be subdivided? (check one)

27(42%) Yes 29(45%) No 9(13%) No opinion

If yes, what should the minimum acreage be? (check one)

6(14%) Minimum of 20 acres 5(12%) Minimum of 10 acres 15(36%) NA
15(36%) Minimum of 5 acres 1(2%) Other size: 1/2 acres (please specify)

TRANSPORTATION

6. Do you favor paving the main roads of the Town of Lincoln over time? (Four Corners Store Road, Altamont Road, Dybedal Road, Marengo Lake Road and Ashland-Bayfield County Line Road between County E and Midway Road) (check one)

31(48%) Yes 26(40%) No 9(12%) No opinion 1(2%) NA

7. Would you favor a property tax increase levied by the town specifically for a road paving program? (The main roads, 17 miles, would get top priority) Any matching grants would accelerate the program chosen. (check one)

24(37%) Yes 32(48%) No 7(11%) No opinion 2(3%) NA

8. If yes, how much of an increase would you support? (Check an appropriate amount)

17(65%) \$5.00/thousand valuation increase would enable the town to prep and pave approximately 1 mile of road per year (example: \$5.00 x \$50,000.00 home/assessed value of property = \$250.00/year)

5(19%) \$10.00/thousand valuation increase would enable the town to prep and pave approximately 2 miles of road per year (example: \$10.00 x \$50,000.00 home/assessed value of property = \$500.00/year)

0(0%) \$15.00/thousand valuation (approximately 3 miles of road = \$750.00/year)

1(4%) \$20.00/thousand valuation (approximately 4 miles of road = \$1,000.00/year)

0(0%) Other \$2.00/thousand valuation (please specify)

3(12%) NA

9. Would you favor an airport or private landing strips in the Town? (check one)

8(12%) Yes 42(65%) No 14(22%) No opinion 1(1%) NA

HOUSING

10. Do you favor additional residential growth in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)

27(42%) Yes 22(34%) No 14(22%) No opinion 1(1%) NA

What kind(s) of growth would you like to see encouraged?

40(62%) Yes 11(17%) No Single family residential 10(21%) NA

11(17%) Yes 34(52%) No Multi-family residential, Duplexes 14(31%) NA

7(11%) Yes 39(60%) No Multi-family residential, apartments 14(29%) NA

9(14%) Yes 36(55%) No Condominiums 15(31%) NA

19(29%) Yes 27(42%) No Senior housing 14(28%) NA

13(20%) Yes 32(48%) No Low income housing 15(31%) NA

8(12%) Yes 40(62%) No Mobile homes 14(26%) NA

6(9%) Yes 39(60%) No Mobile home parks 14(31%) NA

31(48%) Yes 19(29%) No Seasonal/recreational homes 11(23%) NA

10(15%) Yes 31(48%) No Community Living Arrangements 17(37%) NA

19(29%) Yes 24(37%) No Clustering or grouping of single family residences on a larger acreage with a common driveway link to a main road 14(34%) NA

11. Should there be a minimum lot size for residentially zoned land (R1) throughout the Town? (current county zoning is .75 acre for R1) (check one)

46(71%) Yes 5(8%) No 11(17%) No opinion 2(4%) NA

What should the minimum lot size be? (check one)

<u>13(25%)</u> Minimum of 5 acres	<u>8(16%)</u> Minimum of 2 acres	<u>1(2%)</u> Minimum of 15 acres
<u>1(2%)</u> Minimum of 1.5 acres	<u>12(24%)</u> Minimum of 1 acres	<u>1(2%)</u> Minimum of 20 acres
<u>10(20%)</u> Minimum of .75 acres	<u>2(4%)</u> Minimum of .5 acres	<u>3(5%)</u> Minimum of 40 acres

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

12. Do you favor commercial development (for example, retail and wholesale stores, service businesses, etc.) in the Town? (check one)

29(45%) Yes 28(43%) No 6(9%) No opinion 2(3%) NA

13. Should commercial development be limited to certain areas to preserve the Town's rural character? (check one)

52(80%) Yes 7(11%) No 4(6%) No opinion 2(3%) NA

14. Where should commercial development occur in the Town? (check all that apply)

25(33%) Along Co. Hwy E? 47(63%) Along US Hwy 63?
3(4%) Other _____ (please specify)

15. What kind of business development pattern, if any, would you favor along the main roads in the Town of Lincoln? (Check one)

2(3%) Unlimited Strip development
32(47%) "Clustered" or high density development in small areas. (Businesses are grouped together and set back from the highway with a common driveway to the main road.)
20(29%) Low density development. (Single businesses on large lots)
2(3%) Other _____ (please specify)
8(12%) No opinion
4(6%) NA

16. Do you favor the development of home-based businesses (for example, childcare, bookkeeping, desktop publishing, making crafts, consulting, etc.) in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)

42(71%) Yes 9(14%) No 7(11%) No opinion 4(4%) NA

If yes, should there be limits on the numbers of non-household employees in the home-based business? (Current county zoning limits this to one person.)

11(24%) No limit 3(7%) 10-20 people
13(29%) 6 to 10 people 9(20%) 2 to 5 people
9(20%) 1 person _____ Other (please specify)

17. Do you favor light industrial development (for example, electronic component assembly, furniture making, small appliance assembly, clothing, sewing, etc.) in the Town? (check one)

35(54%) Yes 20(31%) No 8(12%) No opinion

If yes, should there be limits on the numbers of employees in the business?

14(39%) No limit 1(3%) 21 to 50 people
11(31%) 11 to 20 people 5(14%) 5 to 10 people
4(10%) 1 to 4 people 1(2%) Other: One person

18. If light industrial development were allowed should it be limited to certain areas to preserve the Town's rural character?

57(78%) Yes 9(14%) No 1(1%) No opinion 5(7%) NA

19. If light industrial development were allowed in the Town where should it occur? (check all that apply)

23(28%) Along Co. Hwy E? 47(57%) Along US Hwy 63? 8(10%) NA
4(5%) Other _____

20. Do you favor heavy industrial development (for example, paper mills or smelters) in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
11(17%) Yes 50(77%) No 1(1%) No opinion 2(5%) NA
21. If heavy industrial development were allowed should it be limited to certain areas to preserve the Town's rural character? (check one)
48(74%) Yes 5(8%) No 2(3%) No opinion 10(15%) NA
22. If heavy industrial development were allowed in the Town where should it occur? (check all that apply)
15(22%) Along Co. Hwy E? 40(59%) Along US Hwy 63? 13(19%) NA
23. Do you favor commercial recreational development in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
31(48%) Yes 20(31%) No 8(12%) No opinion 6(9%) NA

What kinds of commercial recreational development do you favor or oppose?

<u>25(39%)</u> Yes	<u>30(46%)</u> No	Golf courses	<u>6(15%)</u> NA
<u>33(51%)</u> Yes	<u>34(37%)</u> No	Campgrounds	<u>5(12%)</u> NA
<u>28(43%)</u> Yes	<u>26(40%)</u> No	Resorts	<u>7(17%)</u> NA
<u>36(55%)</u> Yes	<u>19(29%)</u> No	Riding Stables	<u>7(16%)</u> NA
<u>12(18%)</u> Yes	<u>42(65%)</u> No	Go Kart Tracks	<u>8(17%)</u> NA
<u>10(15%)</u> Yes	<u>45(69%)</u> No	Automobile Race Tracks	<u>7(16%)</u> NA
<u>26(40%)</u> Yes	<u>30(46%)</u> No	Shooting Ranges	<u>6(14%)</u> NA
<u>9(14%)</u> Yes	<u>46(71%)</u> No	Motocross Tracks	<u>8(15%)</u> NA
<u>19(29%)</u> Yes	<u>35(54%)</u> No	Convention Centers	<u>7(17%)</u> NA
<u>43(66%)</u> Yes	<u>13(20%)</u> No	Ski Trails	<u>6(14%)</u> NA
<u>43(66%)</u> Yes	<u>14(22%)</u> No	Biking Trails	<u>6(12%)</u> NA
<u>25(38%)</u> Yes	<u>31(48%)</u> No	Snowmobile/ATV Tracks	<u>5(14%)</u> NA

RECREATION

24. Do you favor keeping all Town roads open for ATV use? (check one)
33(51%) Yes 19(29%) No 12(18%) No opinion 2(2%) NA
25. Do you favor limiting access to certain Town roads for ATV use? (check one)
26(40%) Yes 24(37%) No 12(18%) No opinion 3(5%) NA
26. Do you favor keeping all Town roads open for snowmobile use? (check one)
31(48%) Yes 23(35%) No 10(15%) No opinion 2(2%) NA
27. Do you favor limiting access to certain Town roads for snowmobile use? (check one)
23(35%) Yes 28(43%) No 11(17%) No opinion 4(5%) NA
28. Do you favor limiting ATV or snowmobile rallies in the Town? (check one)
31(48%) Yes 20(31%) No 10(15%) No opinion 3(6%) NA
29. Do you favor the public development of silent sports trails (ski, snowshoe, bicycle, horse) in the Town ? (check one)
37(57%) Yes 15(23%) No 10(15%) No opinion 4(5%) NA
30. Do you favor the public development of ATV trails in the Town ? (check one)
19(29%) Yes 38(59%) No 9(12%) No opinion 1(1%) NA
31. Do you favor the public development of snowmobile trails in the Town ? (check one)
22(34%) Yes 34(52%) No 9(14%) No opinion 1(1%) NA

32. Should the Town consider policies restricting the use of different types of powered watercraft on lakes and rivers, including personal watercraft (jet skis) and high-powered motorboats? (check one)
- 46(71%) Yes 10(15%) No 9(14%) No opinion 2(2%) NA

SHORELINE DEVELOPMENT

33. Do you favor development along the Marengo River and other creeks and streams in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
- 14(22%) Yes 41(63%) No 6(9%) No opinion 4(6%) NA

What type of development should be allowed along these waterways in the Town?

- | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|---|-------------------|
| <u>30(46%)</u> Yes | <u>20(31%)</u> No | Single family dwellings/Residential | <u>8(23%)</u> NA |
| <u>1(2%)</u> Yes | <u>43(66%)</u> No | Multi family dwellings/Residential | <u>13(38%)</u> NA |
| <u>3(5%)</u> Yes | <u>42(65%)</u> No | Commercial (e.g., retail storefronts) | <u>12(30%)</u> NA |
| <u>13(20%)</u> Yes | <u>35(54%)</u> No | Commercial Recreational (e.g.,campground, canoe delivery or tubing) | <u>10(26%)</u> NA |

34. Do you favor development along lake front property in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
- 26(40%) Yes 28(43%) No 9(14%) No opinion 2(3%) NA

35. What type of development should be allowed along lake front property in the Town?
- | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--|------------------|
| <u>37(57%)</u> Yes | <u>20(31%)</u> No | Single family dwellings/Residential | <u>9(12%)</u> NA |
| <u>5(8%)</u> Yes | <u>46(71%)</u> No | Multi family dwellings/Residential | <u>8(23%)</u> NA |
| <u>5(8%)</u> Yes | <u>45(69%)</u> No | Commercial (e.g., repair shops, dealerships, retail storefronts) | <u>8(22%)</u> NA |
| <u>18(28%)</u> Yes | <u>34(52%)</u> No | Commercial Recreational (campground, boat rental) | <u>5(20%)</u> NA |
| <u> 2</u> Yes | <u> </u> No | Other _____(please specify) | |

ESTHETIC ISSUES

36. Do you feel it is important to preserve and protect the unique natural characteristics (large tracts of woodlands, wetlands, lakes, streams, rivers, scenic vistas) in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)
- 62(95%) Yes 2(3%) No 0(0%) No opinion 1(2%) NA

Which characteristics of the Town are important to preserve for future years? (please specify)

37. Which of the following approaches would you favor?
- | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--|-------------------|
| <u>51(78%)</u> Yes | <u>3(5%)</u> No | Preserving existing vistas | <u>8(17%)</u> NA |
| <u>43(66%)</u> Yes | <u>7(11%)</u> No | Forest buffers | <u>10(23%)</u> NA |
| <u>42(65%)</u> Yes | <u>10(15%)</u> No | Vegetative screening (planting shrubs & trees) | <u>8(20%)</u> NA |
| <u>31(48%)</u> Yes | <u>18(28%)</u> No | Architectural design guidelines | <u>10(24%)</u> NA |
| <u>33(51%)</u> Yes | <u>13(20%)</u> No | Special setback requirements | <u>11(28%)</u> NA |
| <u> </u> Yes | <u> </u> No | Other _____(please specify) | |

38. Do you favor retaining the tree canopy over Lover's Lane? (check one)
- 47(72%) Yes 3(5%) No 13(20%) No opinion 2(3%) NA

39. Do you favor the placement of billboards in the Town? (check one)
- 3(5%) Yes 51(78%) No 6(9%) No opinion 3(8%) NA

40. Should the Town of Lincoln set specific standards for advertising signs and billboards such as where they can be located, their size and maintenance requirements? (check one)
- 51(78%) Yes 5(8%) No 3(5%) No opinion 5(9%) NA

41. Do you favor limiting the siting and number of communication towers in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)

38(58%) Yes 14(22%) No 10(15%) No opinion 2(5%) NA

42. Should the Town have a noise ordinance? (check one)

34(52%) Yes 17(26%) No 12(19%) No opinion 2(3%) NA

WATER and AIR QUALITY

43. Should the Town of Lincoln have an ordinance banning burn barrels? (check one)

13(20%) Yes 41(63%) No 10(15%) No opinion 1(2%) NA

44. Are you concerned with maintaining the quality of the ground and surface waters in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)

67(94%) Yes 4(6%) No 1(1%) No opinion

Would you support regulating the following to protect our ground and surface waters?

50(76%) Logging operations close to waterways
49(75%) Agricultural runoff
40(62%) Lampricide Use (current use is restricted to Marengo River)
45(69%) Pesticide Use
48(74%) Commercial demolition landfill
46(71%) Sanitary Landfill

OTHER ISSUES

46. Do you favor drilling, exploration and mining for gas, oil and minerals in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)

17(26%) Yes 36(55%) No 9(14%) No opinion 2(5%) NA

47. Do you favor additional commercial sand and gravel pits operating in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)

21(37%) Yes 28(43%) No 14(20%) No opinion 1(1%) NA

48. Would you favor the siting of a private or commercial demolition landfill for construction debris in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)

14(22%) Yes 34(52%) No 10(15%) No opinion 2(11%) NA

49. Would you favor the siting of a commercial sanitary landfill for garbage in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)

14(22%) Yes 41(63%) No 9(9%) No opinion 1(6%) NA

50. Do you favor utility development (for example, electrical high-power transmission lines, natural gas pipelines) in the Town of Lincoln? (check one)

18(28%) Yes 32(48%) No 12(18%) No opinion 5(5%) NA

What types of utility development would you favor?

36(55%) Yes 17(26%) No Upgrading existing electrical high-power transmission lines 8(19%) NA
19(29%) Yes 34(52%) No Placing additional electrical high power transmission lines 8(19%) NA
28(43%) Yes 26(40%) No Placing natural gas pipelines 7(17%) NA

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

51. Do you have any other comments relating to **LAND USE AND PLANNING** issues in the Town of Lincoln that you wish to make? (please specify).... See comments section....

Would you be interested in picking up a copy of the final Land Use Plan for the Town of Lincoln?

34(52%) Yes 22(34%) No

APPENDIX A CONTINUED - SURVEY COMMENTS ON ESTHETIC ISSUE'S

Question # 36 Which characteristics of the Town are important to preserve for future years?

All mentioned above

No subdivision of large natural plots

Maintain the pristine nature of the town, at least as much as possible

Clean water, air, forests, wildlife.

Woodlands, lakes, streams.

All of the above mentioned areas. (It terrifies me to hear of development in the township.)

Agriculture, forests, streams & lakes, rural flavor.

Lakes and other waterways, large tracts of woodlands, preserve forest and farm feel of town. Low density regardless of the type of development.

All of above; small town atmosphere; nature-indigenous surroundings

Keeping big tracts of woodlands from being sold in pieces. The town should lower the tax on a person who doesn't develop his vacant property (woodland) & increase it to the developer. Everybody whines when landowners sell large parcels into small pieces, yet the town doesn't give these owners of property (large tracts) any type of break on the tax bill for keeping these unique parcels.

Quietness and we have enough gravel pits. Stop the destruction of the whole town with pits.

All of the above

Dirt roads as they are. Great town services as they are! Wild & wet lands

Let it remain as natural as possible. Keep out developments and use of its natural resources. Mother Nature is begging you to leave her country alone. Mankind is always an intruder and Needs to be unnoticed rather than intrusive. Actually, dwellings in the middle of 40 acres are bad because it is too expensive to cater to their needs and too invasive.

Forest, view of the river/creeks, open space.

Woods, lakes, wetlands, streams, rivers, scenic vista's

Streams -wetlands

Wildlife, pristine atmosphere of some of the last truly beautiful, untouched and un-spoiled wood lands in the state

Waterways

Woodlands, wetlands, waterways, bridges.

We like the natural aspect of the area and would prefer that it stays that way, as much as possible.

Wetlands, woodlands, lakes, rivers, streams, any and all.

All of the above

It's rural character, green areas, and carefully controlled development.

All of the characteristics listed above combine to create the wonderful environment around the town and I feel they all should be preserved

Woodlands- especially mature ones. Lakes, streams, & waterfront. Open space..

Its isolation & beautiful natural surroundings. It's unique now because it's quiet & away from things. We could change it, and then it would be just like the rest, Hayward, Minoqua, or WI. Dells. Its beautiful as is and we should preserve it now. WI is losing communities like the town of Lincoln every year. That's what makes Lincoln as great as it is! Let's keep it this way!

Undeveloped shore line. Quiet, rural character, areas of woods--- canopy over tree tunnel! Gravel roads

Keep township wooded & natural

Woodlands, streams, lakes

Don't change the rural setting- leave as is.

The peace and quiet and no more pits left from gravel pits.

However woodlands need management activity to provide economic activity & healthy forest conditions.

Lakes, streams, rivers. Not allowing private or commercial purchases of all the land surrounding lakes so the public or residents of the town can't use nor have access to the waters.

Above

Good hunting lands, commercial forests

Quiet, rural, woodland settings.

Woods-lakes-streams

Woodlands, lakes, streams

All of the above

The town should embrace recreational use of land. Hunting, fishing, etc. The town should recognize its recreational paradise and encourage resorts, Inns, etc.

Alcohol permits should be available to those who wish to operate business in the township!

Ease of access should be limited-

Lover's Lane, Snake trail

All the above

It is my opinion that such economic activities such as logging & mining should be permitted. However, the companies that develop these sites should be responsible for making the land esthetically pleasing after operations have ceased. Such as gravel pits.

Rural atmosphere, public land for hunting & fishing

Not allow low income or assisted housing.

It is important to retain natural areas dispersed throughout the town in the forms of parks where various types of recreation can be allowed.

All of the above: I would gladly pay higher taxes to avoid destructive development.

Large tracts of wilderness

All listed

The Northwoods natural beauty, the remote rural setting, the unpaved roads, trees and forests, mature forests, natural shorelines, the quiet wild places for animals and plants.

Unpaved dirt roads. Woodlands

You can not preserve esthetic character of the town and continue to raise taxes. Land must be utilized to return at least the taxes to the property owner.

Quiet & peaceful with out too many township politicians worrying about things that don't concern them

Some woodlands can be selective cut depending on A certain amount of scenic preservation

Wildland areas, forests; water front areas, rural nature

Low population, no artificial lights, only the beautiful natural sounds, wild lands, forests, wetlands

Lakes, streams, rivers

Our rural country setting- quiet and natural.

Rural character. Maintain quiet peaceful area.

People under Agriculture and Forestry zoning should be doing that. Not just getting A tax break. People on Agriculture Zoning should farm some

Preserve the rural, undeveloped quality of the Town's forests & lands, lakes, air, and water. Reduce noise pollution. Silence will be sought in the years ahead.

Woodlands, wetlands, lakes, streams, rivers, scenic vistas

Lakes, river's protection

Quietness & safety. Road frontage attractiveness. Decently maintained developed areas. Limited pollution of environment by ALL.

All of the above! That's why we live here in the country instead of in town.

Lovers Lane- Timbered Land

All the above

Morgan Falls (Old Baldey) Saint Peter's Dome

Wetlands, large tracts of old growth timber, unspoiled land along streams and lakes, some agriculture land.

Keep the country in the country – Keep town in town

All of above

The above mentioned. Instead of development - industrial or otherwise to improve (?) the town, Why can't we maintain what we currently have? Use this to our advantage.

Trees. I hate how they have been hacked back so far from the road. They have not been neatly trimmed. It looks dreadful.

Woodlands, wetland, lakes, rivers, streams & scenic vistas

Wetlands, woodlands, lakes, streams, rivers & scenic vistas

Wilderness

Woodlands -etc- all listed in #36. Keep dirt roads as much as possible, restrict commercial development (Four Corners Store Bar complex OK – but keep to that) Monitor snowmobile & ATV use – keep off property where residents don't want them!

All of its current characteristics

There is still a certain 'WILDERNESS' character to this area in large part due to large tracts of forests and fields and lakeshores and riversides not built upon. Once we allow smaller and smaller fragmentation of these parcels to occur, and this is inevitable, this character will be lost and so will what makes this area unique and attractive to us.

Large undeveloped areas. Large tracts of woodlands. Small family Farms. Quiet, semi-wild feeling of the area. Town roads are fine as they are: no need to pave or widen

Woodlands, lakes, streams & rivers.

Rural living- which does not include multi- building homesteads- Keep dirt roads.

Lovers Lane, Moe Cemetery, Birch Lake Church, Town Hall, Marengo River bottoms & cliffs a.k.a. "Little Siberia", the Snake Trail.

Remaining farmland, any areas which have extra special watershed importance. Mature stands of timber.

Undeveloped Marengo R. valley, rural character, scenic vistas, quiet

The natural & clean environment. This would include a control on sound and light as well as other type of pollutions.

Woodlands

Lakes, streams, rivers

The present wooded areas.

Wetlands, scenic vistas

The rural charm. Limited recreational activities & family farming.

Streams -Lakes (Public Access)

Rough gravel roads.

The Quiet. Fresh air. Clean Water.

Woodland, sparse population, natural shorelines, well maintained gravel roads, neighbor lines, clean air and water, darkness at night.

Large tracts of woodlands and wetlands, lakes, rivers, scenic views, hiking trails.

No Billboards

To keep the rural area as is. Don't cut trees down.

Forests, fields, rivers, lakes & dirt roads: people should build in such a way as to blend in with the natural habitat/surroundings of Lincoln: garnish displays of wealth should be avoided

Undeveloped spaces. Lack of air, water, noise and light pollution. I like to see the stars. Brainerd, MN. is considering regulating them.

Not to clear-cut the wood's.

Lover's Lane. All the lakes and rivers and streams. Country Roads. (Keep a tree barrier) Birch Lake Church except for the fake flowers. Moe Cemetery (no fake flowers). Town Hall, especially pews. All the log homes and / or historical dwellings. Save old barns left instead of recreating them.

APPENDIX A CONTINUED - GENERAL COMMENTS

Question # 51 Do you have any other comments relating to LAND USE AND PLANNING issues in the Town of Lincoln that you wish to make?

No subdividing of large plots for residential, commercial development. I feel 30 acres for future residential/ recreational development should be the minimal plot allotment, unless already plotted smaller

From my answers to the questions in this survey it should be obvious that I'm opposed to the exploitation of one of the last pristine areas in the state. At the present rate of development & destruction of woodlands, water & wildlife habitat there will be little left for future generations to enjoy unless serious steps are taken to protect them. Wise decisions for land management made now will be of utmost benefit to the local economy in the future.

The most valuable resource Lincoln Township has is found in its unique natural beauty. Limiting or restricting or not allowing various types of development will preserve the qualities most valuable to the majority of the township residents.

We oppose group homes, maternity homes, drug rehab homes, outreach centers, foster homes, adoption centers, and any other group home facilities that would further burden the already strained City and County services.

Protect and preserve the natural beauty of the township. Common sense regulation for quality of life issues i.e. noise, water, and air pollution. Density of development otherwise doesn't over regulate.

Please, please let's pave at least some of our roads. 4 Corners would be an excellent start!

State and Federal laws should be considered and used as guidelines. Ordinances should be thought out. Town government has a tendency to become a vehicle for personal gain and / or vendetta. DON'T ALLOW THIS TO HAPPEN! Consider what other towns in the area.

We pay taxes on our land but are really borrowing it from the future. Thank you for sending out this survey.

See bottom of previous page. Keep up the good planning work! Lincoln Township is a very special, unspoiled place that means a lot to us.

Interested In programs aimed at developing public appreciation for the value of Wisconsin's woodlands and their importance in the economy and future generations and the overall long-term welfare of the entire state. Foster and encourage wise use & management of timber, wild life habitat, and recreation.

I would like to kick Zoning to Hell out of our town. So far it has stopped nothing that the people don't want. I obey the laws of our land. I have served my Country proudly. I make sure my taxes are paid. With this said and done I always realized a security... a special sense of freedom in this township. Since this cancerous Zoning has reared it's ugly head with a biased set of unpopular do's and don'ts and fines if you don't comply - I do believe our freedoms are headed down

the crapper. I don't think we need the SS troops back again. Hell, who am I kidding—the commies have it better than us now. Get rid of the Zoning forever!

Possible restrictive covenant's concerning residential "Eyesores" that are viewable ONLY from passing roadways - Not to interfere with A person's daily business or personal activities.

Generally speaking, I do not favor any additional development of the area. Obviously, I represent the older generation. But it is our generation, which has kept it a beautiful place to visit. A part of the world as Mother Nature formed and continues to form it.

Have Lincoln the way it was farm and forest long ago.

Protect existing condition at all practical costs

Septic system choices for properties with limited acreage. i.e. Fill for Conventional System etc.

Growth cannot be stopped completely; hopefully the growth in Lincoln will be handled wisely.

The Town has a unique opportunity to preserve and protect the environment, woodlands and wildlife of the area. Vanishing forests and pollution have gone too far. Reverse the trend of over development and protect the unique character of the area.

Most of my answers indicate that I prefer to keep Lincoln as it is rather than promoting lots of growth & development. My greatest fear is that over time Lincoln will become the next Hayward or even Minocqua. Both of those towns have lost their original charm and are plagued with over development & over crowding. I would prefer to avoid that!

Thank you for putting together this survey!

It is a quiet serene area- we are opposed to making significant commercial changes which would increase disrupting the scenery, noise, etc. & oppose a move for major development to attract lots of people

To keep people informed about the issues by mail and meetings. To let the people of the community to vote on issues.

Maintain the area as is. Need to have town meetings on various issues.

We are non-resident forestland owners & therefore we are not answering many questions that need resident's view & understanding of the Town.

Favor the plan for housing unwed, pregnant mothers. Think this is a wonderful idea.

There's too much regulation in this country already. The existing Zoning ordinances are enough to keep a proper balance.

How about a regulation on junk cars, trucks, tractor, etc? Do we have one now?

We should be cautious of development, but not be a dictatorship. I am Town Chair at home, & some development is good for the economy, without harming the environment. Don't let the tree-huggers & do-gooder's get too big of a toehold. If I own my land, I should be able to use it as I want so long as it doesn't damage water quality etc.

Prefer less regulation in general. However, damage can be done to Town of Lincoln if people who do not care about the nature of the place can run rough over the land.

Direct all forms of development and use toward preserving water quality, scenic vistas, and the rural character of the town.

This is a well-put together survey. Thank you for seeking the land owners opinion.

If you want to keep the taxes down and keep the wildlife & rural atmosphere forget about all this. Its ideas such as this will end up costing the Town lots of money. Development will not reduce taxes. From experienced Board member of the Village of Slinger

I don't feel you need to increase property taxes for paved roads. Our taxes have doubled for the last 3 years. There is no need to keep assessing property every single year. Where is all the money going? All the streets should be paved by now! I have seen nothing new or done for 5 years. And plowing the streets and sand/salt for ice is a complete joke.

Attempt to avoid Spot Zoning.

Since the late 60's, more than 3 generations of Graves families have been coming back "home" to this beautiful area for hunting, fishing, and get together's. Confronting issues like whether to pave Altamont R., Four Corners Rd, Marengo Lake Rd. and whether or not to leave the trees over Lovers Lane are very important to me. I hope you make it your mission to keep these rural roads as they are for as long as another 3 generations can enjoy them!

This survey is working at cross-purposes. You can not increase taxes and preserve woodlands etc. Increasing property taxes only accelerates the fragmentation of land. Most of the ideas presented in this survey are unworkable either due to economics or the unacceptable restriction of property rights. All property issues should be A joint effort between owner/county/neighbor with discretion.

I am a non-resident landowner. My concerns are environmental but weighed sensibly with the growth & economic needs of the Town of Lincoln.

I found my little piece of heaven after living in 3 countries and 7 states. I want to thank all those people who helped with this survey. More than enough development on this poor Earth. Keep it simple & natural! "The Earth does not belong to us, we belong to the Earth."

The questions on paving are presented in such a way that the committee will obtain the answer they want. What about building into present budget for road improvement like other towns are doing? There is not that option in this survey.

Regulations and enforcement of non-operable vehicles. How many can be in the yard, for what length of time? Restrictions put in place prohibiting hauling in OLD trailers to be used for hunting shacks, or whatever. For instance the one recently put on land next to _____. JUNKY!

Hire someone to write grants for Roads etc. Also checkout monies from state and fed.'s and other government dollars, make them pay!

The land & water has to be equal with people needs cause if it goes so do our future generations

It's nice the roads are open for ATV & snowmobile use, but people seem to think that includes County E & use it as such. * I can't see blacktopping the dirt roads, - the way the dump trucks drive crazy & beat the hell out of them, it doesn't seem to make sense. (Others drive crazy too!)- Especially between bars) * Semis are speeding down County E & throwing their Jake Brakes on to quick slow down for the sharp corner at all times of the day & night- there should be time of day use restrictions on this. Jake Brakes are not intended for this use & they are LOUD! Also lots of engine revving & racing around going on all times of day and night.

Road paving- if possible to even do- we need to have as much grant assistance as possible! #48 Private landfills for a small amount of debris for a one-time use would be okay.

An ordinance for light pollution i.e. Shading mercury vapor (outside) lights to direct the light downward not out & up.

If I wanted to live in town I would have bought A place in town.

Thanks to this committee for all of the hard work. I hope as a community we recognize the beauty of surroundings and move cautiously regarding land/ water use issues. Preservation of our environment should take precedence over commercial and economic growth. As a species mankind has already created too many environmental disasters.

Why don't we find help with solar and wind power development?

If mobile homes are permitted, they should be required to have a peaked roof within 6 months after entrance. Otherwise they should utilize a mobile home park in a surrounding area (Ashland-Cable-etc.) The peaked roof requirement would not only improve appearance but would also ensure permanence.

Hope that this is an ongoing endeavor- perhaps with a new survey every 5-10 years. Believe we need a permanent land use planning commission in our town and the ability to make our own Zoning ordinances that can be enforced. Preserving our precious ground and surface waters should be a number one priority such that every land use decision we make takes THIS ISSUE into consideration. Would like to see existing roads upgraded- better sloping, better base, better ditches etc, but not necessarily paved. We can afford to maintain gravel but not sure, at this time, that we can afford to maintain paved roads.

None

I favor most development if it's done on a scale that is still in balance with nature. I want the residents to have many choices & for new people who love the area to be welcomed. I just don't want the area to be open for anybody to do anything without concern of the environment.

Some limits as to the number of "junked vehicles" on land. They are unsightly and destroy the "landscape" just as much, if not more, than logging. I believe that elsewhere in the state a fence is required to "hide" the view. I think completed, tabulated results should be available for distribution at town meeting to reduce costs of mailing.

Avoid being too restrictive less you stifle development. The town needs more tax base, as single family residents do.

Dogs should not be allowed to run free.

Road improvement is absolutely of top priority. Anxious to maintain the rural character of the town.

Joe- I hope this plan will help preserve the Township the way we were given it 20+ years ago!

I feel a road tax in the form of higher property taxes will only force current landowners to further fragment their properties, as they become unable to pay the bills. I propose a toll booth manned by a troll to collect tolls from non-residents entering our Shangri-La.

Thanks for the survey.

Before any action is taken there needs to be 2-3 meetings and the people should be able to vote in November elections on issues.

Please, I would like to try to keep the Power Company from putting any more of those huge, ugly transmission lines in the town.

Any development that increases property taxes should be discouraged.

I think Land Use Committee have done a nice job.

We need control over zoning issues in our town. Both of us in the household are represented by these answers.

Thank you very much for your efforts. You are doing a great job. This township is very special and we hope it can stem the tide of development. Please let us know if you need some help

We will favor this under one condition. We want Marengo River Rd. fixed, it is very bad. On April 26, 02 we came up to our property & we had to use 4 Wheel Drive to get in & out. And a couple of more trips through it will be impossible, it is so bad. Two-wheel drive will never make it. Suggestion, dig out all your soft spots down to good ground & put in good fill gravel. Road's need to be graded more often. We have people that drive anywhere from 100 to 250 miles on our road.

How can I get involved w/ the plan & the town?

I commend you for sending out this questionnaire! Great idea. I just hope the residents of Lincoln feel the way I do. It is special now because we have not tampered with it too much. We should keep it that way! People are here in Lincoln for reasons why we shouldn't let it get more populated, commercialized & built up. I support existing ATV routes & on roads, however cutting new trails would be a fringe on the wonderful forestlands Lincoln has to offer. Keep all roads open for ATV's! But let's not construct any more highways in the woods for people to run on! Thank You!

A year or two ago The Town of Grand View sent us a similar questionnaire and I filled it out and so did many of my friends. We all lost. As the subdivides and land developers moved in and literally destroyed the shorelines and the lakes in our area. The rich now play with their jet skis and speedboats. The shorelines where many of our animals and birds lived and reproduced have been permanently destroyed. Not one living soul would save this important habitat. When I received my Tax notice on the property, I almost fell off the chair and I immediately knew The Town of Lincoln is going down. We were going to build a small house, but I have to do some serious thinking. It sounds like The town of Lincoln is on its way to becoming just another place full of concrete. The questionnaire is very contradictory and much of it should not be answered. On the other hand those who want massive land development, noise and pollution must have a smile from ear to ear. Wisconsin is just about finished for those who have any love for the land.

We need policies but we can't stop everything.

I would like to see the Town of Lincoln be an exception to the "short sighted development mode" that so many municipalities have practiced. I strongly urge you to enact all possible means and ways to limit further development in the town that would change the quiet, rural and natural spot that is today. My concern about Development is that it brings growth, which in turn brings more Development, and so it goes..... That is what we have here in Southeastern WI. We are losing the natural places of our world so fast here...and most people don't like that, yet once it starts no one makes new choices to limit what money and development have changed. Developers ready to offer municipalities larger tax bases, seems to be the innocent start of what I feel can be "the end of what we now enjoy". In regards to road paving, I feel that paving of the roads would be an invitation to development of the wrong kind. It would be actually "paving the way" for developers to the town. I searched most of the state, for a quiet place to vacation & eventually retire, prior to selecting my property in the Town of Lincoln. One thing stood out to me, that is; paved road areas invited more development of what I think is the wrong kind; go-kart tracks, amusement parks, airports, golf courses, shopping malls, residential subdivisions (on a large scale), etc. I like the gravel roads! I would also encourage all efforts to include Renewable Energy into our area. One item that comes to mind would be Wind Generator Farms. These would be a way for us to give something back to society, while easing the burden on nature as well. Quiet areas for "no motor vehicles" and silent sports would be a big focus for me. I really enjoy places like the North Country Trail, Morgan Falls, etc. In conclusion, I would like to see the Town adopt a Comprehensive Land Use Plan that would give the Village powers more control over future land use & limit development. Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion about land use in the town. P.S. Is there anything that I can do to get involved?

Figure 9

Town of Lincoln-Natural and Cultural Historical Points of Interest

APPENDIX B--NATURAL AND CULTURAL HISTORICAL POINTS OF INTEREST

The great era of logging in northern Wisconsin began around 1870, right after the railroad laid track through the area. The Hines Lumber Co. built what is claimed to be the largest sawmill in the state, on the White River in Mason. This mill sawed approximately 500,000 feet of pine lumber every twenty-four hours, with two separate crews each working a ten-hour shift. Logging camps were generally located so that an area of about one mile in all directions could be worked from the camp. Below, each camp is assigned an identity number, usually in sequence according to when it was built.

- 1) **Camp 8.** This camp was on the main line of the Superior and Southeastern Rail Road. It was a car camp, which usually consisted of two rows of box-car type structures on side track rails with connecting platform walks between the cars. Most camps had several bunk cars, a cook car and a dining car.
- 2) **Camp 13.** Also known as Camp Marengo, as superstition discouraged the use of this number. Operation was in about the year 1909. The camp burned and only the root cellar remains visible.
- 3) **Camp 14.** The Camp was in operation from about 1910-1914. This was where the Rail Road line ended. The tracks were torn up in 1915
- 4) **Camp 15.** This camp was in operation about 1914, with Nels Swanson as the camp foreman.

In the late 1800s, and early 1900s, separate areas of the Town formed their own little communities with each building a school. It was a long walk for most no matter where you lived. In 1944, the Town of Lincoln joined the Town of Grand View School District.

- 5) **The Marengo Lake School.** This was first located on Morgan Creek. Students from the Marengo Lake and Birch Lake area attended this school. After a few years, it was moved one half mile north, placing it just east across the road from Birch Lake Church. The children attended classes in the Town Hall temporarily while their school building was being relocated. It closed in 1936-37. It later became part of the Town Garage.
- 6) **The Penokee Mountain Cooperative School.** This school was founded in 1981, built on the Thomason property, near the Moe Cemetery.
- 7) **Mattson School.** Perhaps the oldest of the schools. Martin Moe helped Tom Mattson build the school located on the Tom Mattson homestead, during the 1870's. It closed in 1937-38.
- 8) **Unseth School.** This school was built on the Unseth property, and was in operation for about 20 years. It closed in 1914-15.
- 9) **Dybedal School.** This school was also named after one of the early settlers. Students from the northwest area of the Town attended here. It closed in 1937-38.

- 10) **Swanson School.** Also known as the Matchen School, it was located on the Nels Swanson property. It closed about 1914-1915.
- 11) **Simmons Lake.** This lake was originally called Joe Anderson Lake because in 1899 he received the Government Land Grant for the property. Then in 1954 Paul Simmons purchased the property and somehow the new name has stayed.
- 12) **Thorsen Lake.** T.H. Thorsen came to the Town of Lincoln between the years 1917 and 1920. He bought the land that was known as the Ellingson Lake property. He was a big wholesale butter and egg man from Chicago Ill. It would take Mr. Thorsen three to four days to drive up here every Spring in his 1917 Model T.
- 13) **Olson Lake.** Hans Olson came from Norway to the Town of Lincoln in the early 1880's. He homesteaded 160 acres and built a house that still stands today in good condition.
- 14) **Indian Lake.** T. Mattson, M. Moe and A. Levine were early settlers that homesteaded neighboring lands. Chief Namakagon would often stop to visit on his route from Ashland to Lake Namakagon. After his visit, he would routinely camp out at what they called "Indian Lake".
- 15) **Birch Lake.** This lake got its name from the early settlers because of the reflection of the Birch trees on the water.
- 16) **Birch Lake Church.** On Feb. 11, 1899, a decision was made to build the church. The first service was held on June 30, 1901. Martin Arhenius, who had a homestead in this part of Lincoln, donated the land. In 1923 women had voting rights in the church and it was decided to build a steeple. The bell that remains there today is from The Green Mountain School.
- 17) **Moland Church.** On Thanksgiving Day, 1901 the Moland congregation decided to have a church built. The first service was held on Oct. 5, 1902.
- 18) **Our Saviors Church.** This church was built in 1986-1987. Lowell and Sue Bourbeau donated the land.
- 19) **Moe Cemetery.** Martin Moe was purported to be the first settler in the Birch Lake area. He was granted ownership of this quarter section from The U.S. Government on March 6, 1888. The first documented record of burial is from July of 1889.
- 20) **Birch Lake Cemetery.** On Jan. 22, 1901, it was decided to stake out this cemetery. Martin Arhenius donated the land.
- 21) **Moland Cemetery.** This cemetery was initially started in the year 1898 when Andrew Johnson donated some of his homestead for a church and a cemetery. Several additional land donations followed from the Jacob Yderstand family, Grace Weiss and son Charles, and Mr. Collinge.
- 22) **Altamont Rd.** The name Altamont refers to a geographical spot known as a "siding" for the loading of saw logs and railroad ties onto the cars of the Duluth South Shore Rail Road. The name Altamont is said to be of French origin meaning "high hill."

- 23) **Bibon Tavern.** Originally established sometime before 1936 by Hans Hawkinson, it had several owners and renters. It was during Richard Nelson's ownership that the lumber from The Green Mountain School was purchased from Gust Welin for the addition of a dance hall and an extension on the house. Bud Upedhal had also been a previous owner, but later became the Bayfield County Sheriff and gave the drivers license exam in the parking lot during the early to mid 50's. Another owner, Mr. Faucett, had the nickname of Leaky. The last purchase was around 1965 by Harold Wickman. Jean Wickman said "it closed in 1994, and a lot of beautiful people had walked through the door."
- 24) **Nelson Implement.** This is a father-and-son business that started in 1958 by Don and Richard Nelson Sr. Don's specialty is knowing all of his customers personally and helping them accordingly.
- 25) **Bibon Swamp.** The Bibon Swamp (or Marsh), through which the White River flows, is an ecological refuge protecting many diverse species. Bibon Swamp Road, also known as Old 63, was originally built with the help of Ed Ellingson and his two teams of horses. Bibon was first known as Forest City.
- 26) **Sears House.** This is a mail-order house from The Sears Roebuck catalogue. It was delivered in sections on a train from Chicago to the Grandview Depot in 1918. The apple orchard was sent along as a gift for making the purchase from Sears. Its destination was printed on the rafters and is still clearly visible today.
- 27) **The Bitneys.** This is a hilly area named after the first family that settled there. It quickly became a farming community with some of the men working as loggers also.
- 28) **30 Road.** This was a logging road through the east side of the Bitneys that ended in Section 30, near Thorsen lake, previously known as Ellingson Lake.
- 29) **7-Mile Hill.** This hill got its name from the earlier settlers that were loggers. It was a marker point of seven miles to the lumber mill in Mason. This hill was a noted challenge to be able to go down with a full load of logs being pulled by a team of horses.
- 30) **Old Pine Hill.** This name came about from the homestead family name of Opine. Years later it was recognized as Old Pine Hill.
- 31) **U.S. Mail Horse Barn.** This was a small horse barn just west of the Town Hall that was built for the Mason Post Office. This was a halfway point on the mail route, and a horse exchange would take place here. The first horse would be put into the barn, with the second horse finishing the route. In the summertime, the mail was delivered by horse and buggy, in the winter a horse and sleigh were used. Someone was hired to maintain the barn and bring water and feed to the horse.
- 32) **Town Hall.** The original building is still utilized today in the same manner as it was when first established. Monthly Town Board meetings, voting and special meetings still take place here. Oral history claims that it is the old Swanson School that was relocated around the time of 1916-1918.
- 33) **Town Garage.** This is where the town keeps and repairs all of its machinery for maintaining the roads.

- 34) **Indian Lake Tavern.** Fritz and Angeline Swanson built a home and dance hall here that became a popular place. Fritz was an accomplished musician furnishing most of the music.
- 35) **Birch Lake Post Office.** Mail was delivered to this post office from Sanborn by horse and buggy three days a week. It was established in 1895 and ceased operation in 1913.
- 36) **Lil Bit of Sweden.** Walter Levine and his sister Ruth had this dance hall built. The walls only went halfway up. It was a lively place that served only beer. Music of all types was played here.
- 37) **Snake Trail.** This is a road that was well traveled by some during the prohibition period. It led to a "still" just across the Township line, where moonshine was being made and shipped to Chicago on the railroad. Remnants of an old barrel are all that remains.
- 38) **Marengo Island Dance Hall.** The Dance Hall was built on the island during the years 1909-1910. It didn't have a roof at first, but a passing rain didn't seem to be bothersome. Kegs of beer were floated to the island across the water. There was a floating bridge connecting the mainland to the island. This bridge swayed when you walked across it, and many times people would fall into the water. When there were several people crossing the bridge at the same time, it would sag under the water, getting their feet wet. This was quite a popular place.
- 39) **Marengo River.** A map drawn by Chas. Whittlesey in 1860 shows the Marengo River as Marangouin, an early French trader's word for mosquito. In June, 1946, there was a lengthy rainfall that caused the river to rise up over its banks. Roads were washed out and travel was minimal for several days until it slowly began to recede. The washout can still be seen today in several places along the river's path.
- 40) **Little Siberia.** This area acquired its name from the early settlers that were trappers. It wasn't so much the terrain of steep cliffs as it was the very cold temperatures at the bottom by the river.
- 41) **Lovers Lane.** A scenic lane with an overhanging canopy that is beautiful in all seasons. The canopy consists mostly of Hard Maple and Sugar Maple.
- 42) **Sunnyside Cheese Factory.** Built in 1933 by Richard Martens, who immigrated from Germany in 1929. His wife said that she liked the sound of the name "Sunnyside," and so it was. It is said that this was the first cheese factory in northern Wisconsin to install a pasteurizer and sell pasteurized cheese. It closed in 1961. In 1962, Richard Squires purchased the property and established his well-drilling business.
- 43) **4-Corners Store.** Built in 1939 by Joe and Violet Berweger. The store included a butcher shop, a walk-in cooler, a freezer with 100 lockers for rent and a warehouse. They sold licenses for hunting, fishing and burn permits. It is now owned and operated by Dave and Maryellen Zepczyk as The 4-Corners Saloon.

RESOURCES- Information gathered here came from a variety of people and sources. Further reading and information can be obtained from the book "The Grand View Centennial" and the Mason Historical Society. Also, Gary Johnson, presently in Bayfield, but raised at the Sunnyside Cheese Factory, contributed clarifying information.

APPENDIX C – WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES NATURAL HERITAGE INVENTORY SITES

Wisconsin DNR’s Natural Heritage Inventory Database indicates that the following endangered, threatened or special concern species and/or their communities are known to occur in the Town of Lincoln and the Marengo River watershed. The specific location(s) of these species and features is not provided to protect against harm.

State Rank Key:

- SC/M - fully protected by federal and state laws under Migratory Bird Treaty Act
- SC/N - no laws regulating protection
- SC/FL - federally protected as endangered or threatened, but not so designated by WiDNR
- SC - special concern
- THR - state threatened
- END – endangered

Wisconsin DNR Natural Heritage Inventory Species List for Marengo River Watershed with Town of Lincoln Records Noted by Asterisk.

Group	Scientific name	Common name	State rank
BEETLE	OREODYTES SCITULUS	A PREDACEOUS DIVING BEETLE	SC/N
BEETLE	SANFILIPPODYTES PSEUDOVILIS	A PREDACEOUS DIVING BEETLE	SC/N
BIRD	COCCOTHAUSTES VESPERTINUS	EVENING GROSBEAK	SC/M
BIRD	EMPIDONAX FLAVIVENTRIS	YELLOW -BELLIED FLYCATCHER	SC/M
BIRD	OPORORNIS AGILIS	CONNECTICUT WARBLER	SC/M
BIRD	PERISOREUS CANADENSIS	GRAY JAY	SC/M
BIRD	VERMIVORA PEREGRINA	TENNESSEE WARBLER	SC/M
BIRD	FALCO COLUMBARIUS*	MERLIN	SC/M
BIRD	HALIAEETUS LEUCOCEPHALUS	BALD EAGLE	SC/FL
BUTTERFLY	BOLORIA EUNOMIA	BOG FRITILLARY	SC/N
BUTTERFLY	LYCAENA EPIXANTHE	BOG COPPER	SC/N
COMMUNITY	BOREAL FOREST	BOREAL FOREST	NA
COMMUNITY	GREAT LAKES BEACH	GREAT LAKES BEACH	NA
COMMUNITY	MOIST CLIFF	MOIST CLIFF	NA
COMMUNITY	NORTHERN DRY-MESIC FOREST	NORTHERN DRY-MESIC FOREST	NA
COMMUNITY	NORTHERN SEDGE MEADOW	NORTHERN SEDGE MEADOW	NA
COMMUNITY	NORTHERN WET FOREST	NORTHERN WET FOREST	NA
COMMUNITY	POOR FEN	POOR FEN	NA
COMMUNITY	TAMARACK SWAMP	TAMARACK SWAMP	NA
DRAGONFLY	CORDULEGASTER OBLIQUA	ARROWHEAD SPIKETAIL	SC/N
DRAGONFLY	SOMATOCHLORA KENNEDY*	KENNEDY’S EMERALD	SC/N
DRAGONFLY	OPHIOMOPHUS CAROLUS*	RIFFLE SNAKETAIL	SC/N
PLANT	DESCHAMPSIA FLEXUOSA*	CRINKLED HAIRGRASS	SC
PLANT	LYCOPODIUM SELAGO	FIR CLUBMOSS	SC
PLANT	OSMORHIZA CHILENSIS	CHILEAN SWEET CICELY	SC
PLANT	STREPTOPUS AMPLEXIFOLIUS	WHITE MANDARIN	SC
PLANT	VACCINIUM VITIS-IDAEA SSP MINUS	MOUNTAIN CRANBERRY	END
PLANT	ARETHUSA BULBOSA	SWAMP -PINK	SC
PLANT	CALLITRICHE HERMAPHRODITICA	AUTUMNAL WATER-STARWORT	SC
PLANT	CAREX CAPILLARIS	HAIR-LIKE SEDGE	SC

PLANT	CAREX LIVIDA VAR RADICAULIS	LIVID SEDGE	SC
PLANT	CAREX TENUIFLORA	SPARSE-FLOWERED SEDGE	SC
PLANT	ELEOCHARIS ROBBINSII	ROBBINS SPIKERUSH	SC
PLANT	EPILOBIUM PALUSTRE	MARSH WILLOW -HERB	SC
PLANT	EPILOBIUM STRICTUM	DOWNY WILLOW -HERB	SC
PLANT	EQUISETUM PALUSTRE	MARSH HORSETAIL	SC
PLANT	RHYNCHOSPORA FUSCA	BROWN BEAKRUSH	SC
PLANT	PETASITES SAGITTATUS*	ARROW-LEAVED SWEET-COLTSFOOT	THR
REPTILE	CLEMMYS INSCULPTA*	WOOD TURTLE	THR

Appendix D – LAND TYPE ASSOCIATIONS IN THE TOWN OF LINCOLN

Ashland Lake-Modified Till Plain

The characteristic landform pattern is undulating modified lacustrine moraine with deep v-shaped ravines. Bedrock type is carbonates found between 100 and 50 feet of the land surface. Soils associations include Badriver-Odanah-Sanborg-Portwing-Herbster and Rubicon-Sultz which are somewhat poorly drained, well drained and moderately well drained clayey soils with a clay loam or silt loam over calcareous clay till or loamy/sandy lacustrine. Bedrock is between 100 feet and 50 feet of the land surface. Common forest cover types on clay are dominated by aspen and balsam fir intermixed with red maple, white birch and white spruce. Common forest types on sand are dominated by red maple, aspen and balsam fir with white birch and white spruce common associates and sugar maple, black ash, red oak, white pine and red pine present in some stands.

Bibon Marsh

The characteristic landform is nearly level swamp with outwash plains and alluvial plains common. Bedrock type is carbonates found between 100 and 50 feet of the land surface. Soil associations include Lupton-Tawas-Vilas-Dechamps which are predominantly very poorly drained nonacid organic soils, along with excessively drained sandy soils with a loamy sand surface over non-calcareous sand outwash and somewhat poorly drained loamy/sandy alluvial soils. Common habitat type is forested lowland.

Gurney/Ontonagon Spillway

The characteristic landform pattern is undulating outwash as a result of glacial meltwater depositions and lake plain with old beaches and dunes common. Bedrock type is igneous, metamorphic and volcanic rock usually found deeper than 100 feet from land surface. Soil associations include Vilas-Cublake-Annalake-Rousseau which are excessively drained and moderately well drained sandy and loamy soils with a loamy sand or fine sandy loam surface over non-calcareous sand outwash or loamy/sandy lacustrine. Common forest types on dryer soils are dominated by pine (jack, red, white) and aspen interspersed with red oak and red maple. Common forest types on dryer soils are dominated by aspen and balsam fir.

Penokee/Gogebic Iron Range

The characteristic landform is hilly bedrock-controlled moraine. Bedrock type is igneous, metamorphic and volcanic rock which can be found between 50 feet and 5 feet of the land surface. Soil associations include Saronia-Gogebic-Metonga and Lupton-Tawas which can be described as well drained loamy soils with a sandy loam surface over non-calcareous sandy loam till (some over igneous/metamorphic bedrock). Most major northern Wisconsin tree species can be found here. Common associates are red oak, red maple, basswood, white ash, yellow birch and hemlock.