## 8. Land Use

Land use is central to the process of comprehensive planning and begins with an assessment of existing conditions. Evaluating land use entails broadly classifying how land is presently used. Each type of land use has its own characteristics that can determine compatibility, location, and preference relative to other land uses. Land use analysis then proceeds by assessing the community development impacts of land ownership patterns, land management programs, and the market forces that drive development. Mapping data are essential to the process of analyzing existing development patterns, and will serve as the framework for formulating how land will be used in the future.

The land use element of the comprehensive planning process is typically the most interesting and emotionally charged to local residents and landowners. This is largely due to the fact that land use and private property rights are often directly intertwined with land use management and regulation. Land use regulations, topography, community infrastructure, private market demands, ownership patterns, and resource management all contribute to the character of the community as it is
 known today.

A primary function of the Land Use element is to help assess the development pattern and how it potentially impacts future land use. This analysis is intended to provide perspective as to how the components of land use relate to each other, and to help build the foundation for discovering methods of land use management that are compatible and desirable for Burnett County's long term development pattern.

### 8.1 Existing Land Use

Figure 8-1, Table 8-1, Table 8-2 provide a summary of land use classifications based on the Department of Revenue 2007 assessment statements and data from the county's geographic information system data. The most dominate land use category is Forest/Open Space with over 400,000 acres or about $71.7 \%$ of the total land area. The second highest land use classification is agricultural property followed by residential lands at $7.4 \%$. Commercial and manufacturing property only makes up 0.8 and $0.2 \%$ of the real estate in Burnett County respectively. Burnett

County can be characterized as having a predominantly rural landscape with the highest variety and densities of developed land use occurring in and around its villages. Passive land uses including agriculture, woodlots, and recreational lands account for about $80 \%$ of the county. Within the passive land uses that characterize the rural landscape, agriculture for crop production comprises nearly $11.1 \%$ of the land area, while over $71 \%$ of the county is forested. This distribution of wooded and open areas is cited by many county residents as a component of the "rural character" that defines Burnett County and makes it a desirable place to live. Intensive land uses including all forms of developed land use-residential, commercial, and industrial-account for $7.9 \%$ of the county. The majority of developed land is composed of the various forms of residential land use including (one and two-family) residential, multi-family residential, and mobile home parks, which together account for 41,580 acres. Non-residential developed land, such as commercial and industrial uses, account for another 2,571 acres of the county. Water occupies $7.7 \%$ of Burnett County including nearly 42,931 acres of both permanent and seasonal lakes, ponds, rivers, and streams. Transportation features account for $1.4 \%$ of the landscape and include road, trail, and railroad rights-of-way, public and private airports, and Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) owned lands. Map 8-1 shows Existing Land Use in the County.

Figure 8-1
Existing Land Use, Burnett County, 2008


Source: Burnett County, Wisconsin Department of Revenue (2007 Statement of Assessments as Reported on or Before 3-04-08), and Foth.

* Please note that Park and Recreation and Government land uses are only indicated for the incorporated villages.

Table 8-1
2008 Existing Land Use Inventory Summary, Burnett County

| Land Use Classifica | Acres | Percent of <br> Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Residential | 42,520 | $6.5 \%$ |
| Commercial | 2,346 | $0.4 \%$ |
| Industrial | 536 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Agricultural | 62,055 | $14.3 \%$ |
| Forest / Open Space | 401,970 | $69.3 \%$ |
| Tribal Land | 1,029 | $0.2 \%$ |
| Parks and Recreatior | 109 | $0.02 \%$ |
| Government | 629 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Surface Water | 43,022 | $7.6 \%$ |
| Roads | 8,334 | $1.5 \%$ |
| Total | 562,551 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0} \%$ |

Source: Burnett County, Wisconsin Department of Revenue (2007 Statement of Assessments as Reported on or Before 3-04-08), and Foth.

* Please note that Park and Recreation and Government land uses are only indicated for the incorporated villages.


## Table 8-2

## 2008 Existing Land Use Inventory by Town and Village, Burnett County

|  | Residential | Commercial | Industrial | Agricultural | Forest/ Open Space | Tribal Land | Surface <br> Water | Roads | Parks and Recreation | Government | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T. Anderson | 1,231 | 9 | 0 | 2,828 | 34,910 | 0 | 1,424 | 473 | 0 | 0 | 40,875 |
| T. Blaine | 885 | 18 | 0 | 1,782 | 40,848 | 0 | 1,225 | 318 | 0 | 0 | 45,076 |
| T. Daniels | 1,381 | 239 | 6 | 4,368 | 15,012 | 0 | 1,527 | 357 | 0 | 0 | 22,891 |
| T. Dewey | 676 | 39 | 0 | 9,509 | 12,329 | 86 | 557 | 367 | 0 | 0 | 23,563 |
| T. Grantsburg | 2,990 | 132 | 12 | 3,771 | 15,320 | 0 | 413 | 407 | 0 | 0 | 23,045 |
| T. Jackson | 2,115 | 70 | 0 | 360 | 15,141 | 0 | 4,127 | 459 | 0 | 0 | 22,273 |
| T. La Follette | 967 | 37 | 0 | 1,662 | 20,047 | 310 | 1,602 | 330 | 0 | 0 | 24,955 |
| T. Lincoln | 1,322 | 12 | 120 | 979 | 19,479 | 0 | 349 | 254 | 0 | 0 | 22,515 |
| T. Meenon | 3,860 | 183 | 10 | 2,060 | 13,640 | 2 | 1,013 | 470 | 0 | 0 | 21,238 |
| T. Oakland | 3,711 | 322 | 78 | 984 | 10,975 | 0 | 4,579 | 396 | 0 | 0 | 21,045 |
| T. Roosevelt | 409 | 146 | 0 | 4,000 | 17,330 | 0 | 499 | 205 | 0 | 0 | 22,589 |
| T. Rusk | 1,354 | 46 | 0 | 3,392 | 15,545 | 124 | 1,451 | 330 | 0 | 0 | 22,241 |
| T. Sand Lake | 1,914 | 39 | 0 | 1,453 | 16,941 | 135 | 2,374 | 291 | 0 | 0 | 23,147 |
| T. Scott | 2,545 | 210 | 12 | 1,961 | 12,301 | 0 | 4,517 | 331 | 0 | 0 | 21,877 |
| T. Siren | 2,344 | 244 | 2 | 2,044 | 14,435 | 222 | 3,261 | 444 | 0 | 0 | 22,996 |
| T. Swiss | 4,216 | 172 | 0 | 1,626 | 29,812 | 149 | 2,140 | 669 | 0 | 0 | 38,783 |
| T. Trade Lake | 1,875 | 41 | 0 | 8,718 | 9,525 | 0 | 2,132 | 429 | 0 | 0 | 22,721 |
| T. Union | 2,000 | 87 | 0 | 284 | 19,436 | 0 | 2,197 | 281 | 0 | 0 | 24,284 |
| T. Webb Lake | 2,995 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 16,535 | 0 | 3,124 | 443 | 0 | 0 | 23,170 |
| T. West Marshland | 1,382 | 0 | 0 | 599 | 41,005 | 0 | 3,227 | 456 | 0 | 0 | 46,669 |
| T. Wood River | 1,408 | 30 | 183 | 9,453 | 10,152 | 0 | 1,193 | 392 | 0 | 0 | 22,811 |
| V. Grantsburg | 440 | 70 | 57 | 222 | 534 | 0 | 50 | 91 | 52 | 413 | 1,929 |
| V. Siren | 257 | 78 | 39 | 0 | 180 | 0 | 13 | 76 | 43 | 53 | 739 |
| V. Webster | 244 | 51 | 17 | 0 | 538 | 0 | 29 | 65 | 13 | 163 | 1,120 |
| Total | 42,521 | 2,347 | 536 | 62,055 | 401,971 | 1,028 | 43,023 | 8,334 | 108 | 629 | 562,551 |

Source: Burnett County, Wisconsin Department of Revenue (2007 Statement of Assessments as Reported on or Before 3-04-08), and Foth.
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## Land Use Comparison: 1997-2008

Burnett County developed a land use plan in 1998. Land uses in each town and village, according to their respective property real estate assessment category were provided in that plan. To conduct a comparison, land use acres in 1998 were compared to 2008 land uses to illustrate the categories witnessing the most change.

This inventory has been updated with land use acreages based on the Wisconsin Department of Revenue 2007 Statement of Assessments. This allows for a comparison of acreage changes for Burnett County land uses.

Figure 8-2

## Existing Land Use, Burnett County, 1997



Source: Burnett County; Wisconsin Department of Revenue Statement of Assessments, 1997; and Foth

## Table 8-3

Net Changes in Land Use, Burnett County, 1997-2008

|  | 1997 |  | 2008 |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | Acres Percent of Total | Acres | Percent of <br> Total |  |
| Land Use Classification | 35,622 | $6.3 \%$ | 42,580 | $7.4 \%$ |
| Residential | 1,815 | $0.3 \%$ | 2,148 | $0.4 \%$ |
| Commercial | 423 | $0.1 \%$ | 423 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Industrial | 79,982 | $14.2 \%$ | 61,833 | $11.0 \%$ |
| Agricultural | 388,861 | $69.1 \%$ | 400,719 | $71.2 \%$ |
| Forest / Open Space | 1,029 | $0.2 \%$ | 1,029 | $0.2 \%$ |
| Tribal Land | 42,931 | $7.6 \%$ | 42,931 | $7.6 \%$ |
| Surface Water | 8,102 | $1.4 \%$ | 8,102 | $1.4 \%$ |
| Roads | 562,551 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ | 562,551 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  |

Source: Burnett County; Wisconsin Department of Revenue Statement of Assessments, 1997; and Foth Infrastructure \& Environment, LLC

Table 8-4
Residential Land Use Changes in Acres by Town and Village, Burnett County, 1997-2008

|  | Residential Land Use Changes |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1 9 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | \% Change |
| T. Anderson | 1,688 | 1,231 | $-27.1 \%$ |
| T. Blaine | 459 | 885 | $92.8 \%$ |
| T.Daniels | 1,188 | 1,381 | $16.2 \%$ |
| T. Dewey | 433 | 676 | $56.1 \%$ |
| T. Grantsburg | 2,926 | 2,990 | $2.2 \%$ |
| T. Jackson | 2,032 | 2,115 | $4.1 \%$ |
| T. La Follette | 718 | 967 | $34.7 \%$ |
| T. Lincoln | 244 | 1,322 | $441.8 \%$ |
| T. Meenon | 3,581 | 3,860 | $7.8 \%$ |
| T. Oakland | 3,249 | 3,711 | $14.2 \%$ |
| T. Roosevelt | 266 | 409 | $53.8 \%$ |
| T. Rusk | 1,235 | 1,354 | $9.6 \%$ |
| T. Sand Lake | 1,507 | 1,914 | $27.0 \%$ |
| T. Scott | 2,271 | 2,545 | $12.1 \%$ |
| T. Siren | 1,868 | 2,344 | $25.5 \%$ |
| T. Swiss | 4,033 | 4,216 | $4.5 \%$ |
| T. Trade Lake | 1,499 | 1,875 | $25.1 \%$ |
| T. Union | 1,824 | 2,000 | $9.6 \%$ |
| T. Webb Lake | 2,790 | 2,995 | $7.3 \%$ |
| T. West Marshland | 696 | 1,382 | $98.6 \%$ |
| T. Wood River | 1,115 | 1,408 | $26.3 \%$ |
| V. Grantsburg | 306 | 440 | $43.8 \%$ |
| V. Siren | 225 | 257 | $14.2 \%$ |
| V. Webster | 224 | 392 | $75.0 \%$ |
| Total | 36,377 | 42,521 | $16.9 \%$ |

Source: Burnett County Land Use Plan, 1998 and Wisconsin Department of Revenue Statement of Assessments, 2007.

According to Table 8-3 and 8-4, Burnett County has witnessed significant land use changes that have resulted in substantially more real estate acres being categorized as residential. From 1997 to 2008, the residential lands in Burnett County increased by an additional 16.4 percent or nearly 6,000 acres. The largest rate of residential land use growth was seen in the Town of Lincoln which added over 1,100 acres, or a percentage increase of over $440 \%$. West Marshland nearly doubled its residential acreage again from 1997 to 2008. The Town of Anderson was the only community to decrease it residential property during the 1997-2008 time frame.

The increase in residential land use may be tied to the decrease in agricultural land use during the 17 year time frame. From 1997 to 2008, only the Towns of Blaine, Jackson, and Scott increased their agricultural land use. As Table 8-5 illustrates, Burnett County witnessed more than 18,000 real estate acres be reclassified into another land use category in the ten years from 1997 to 2008.

Table 8-5
Agricultural Land Use Changes in Acres, Burnett County, 1997-2008

|  | Agricultural Land Use Changes <br> 1997 | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | \% Change |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| T. Anderson | 4,672 | 2,828 | $-39.5 \%$ |
| T. Blaine | 931 | 1,782 | $91.4 \%$ |
| T.Daniels | 5,344 | 4,368 | $-18.3 \%$ |
| T. Dewey | 12,752 | 9,509 | $-25.4 \%$ |
| T. Grantsburg | 4,372 | 3,771 | $-13.7 \%$ |
| T. Jackson | 281 | 360 | $28.1 \%$ |
| T. La Follette | 2,253 | 1,662 | $-26.2 \%$ |
| T. Lincoln | 1,255 | 979 | $-22.0 \%$ |
| T. Meenon | 2,897 | 2,060 | $-28.9 \%$ |
| T. Oakland | 1,373 | 984 | $-28.3 \%$ |
| T. Roosevelt | 6,058 | 4,000 | $-34.0 \%$ |
| T. Rusk | 3,767 | 3,392 | $-10.0 \%$ |
| T. Sand Lake | 2,845 | 1,453 | $-48.9 \%$ |
| T. Scott | 1,714 | 1,961 | $14.4 \%$ |
| T. Siren | 3,071 | 2,044 | $-33.4 \%$ |
| T. Swiss | 2,191 | 1,626 | $-25.8 \%$ |
| T. Trade Lake | 10,103 | 8,718 | $-13.7 \%$ |
| T. Union | 530 | 284 | $-46.4 \%$ |
| T. Webb Lake | 22 | 0 | $-100.0 \%$ |
| T. West Marshland | 950 | 599 | $-36.9 \%$ |
| T. Wood River | 12,601 | 9,453 | $-25.0 \%$ |
| V. Grantsburg | 271 | 222 | $-18.1 \%$ |
| V. Siren | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| V. Webster | 7 | 0 | $-100.0 \%$ |
| Total | 80,260 | 62,055 | $-22.7 \%$ |

Source: Burnett County Land Use Plan, 1998 and Wisconsin Department of Revenue Statement of Assessments, 2007.

As Table 8-6 illustrates, manufacturing land acreage has decreased by over 18\% from 1997 to 2008 while commercial land use has increased by nearly 17\%; however, these two land uses have never made up more than $1 \%$ of the total land uses. As a result, these changes represent very small alterations to the overall landscape of Burnett County.

Table 8-6
Commercial \& Industrial Land Use Changes in Acres, Burnett County, 1997-2008

| Commercial Land Use Changes |  |  |  | Industrial Land Use Changes |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1997 | 2008 | \% Change | 1997 | 2008 | \% Change |
| T. Anderson | 27 | 9 | -66.7\% | - | 0 | N/A |
| T. Blaine | 13 | 18 | 38.5\% | - | 0 | N/A |
| T.Daniels | 42 | 239 | 469.0\% | 6 | 6 | 0.0\% |
| T. Dewey | 22 | 39 | 77.3\% | - | 0 | N/A |
| T. Grantsburg | 118 | 132 | 11.9\% | 12 | 12 | 0.0\% |
| T. Jackson | 129 | 70 | -45.7\% | - | 0 | N/A |
| T. La Follette | 56 | 37 | -33.9\% | - | 0 | N/A |
| T. Lincoln | 5 | 12 | 140.0\% | 120 | 120 | 0.0\% |
| T. Meenon | 160 | 183 | 14.4\% | 10 | 10 | 0.0\% |
| T. Oakland | 303 | 322 | 6.3\% | 78 | 78 | 0.0\% |
| T. Roosevelt | 61 | 146 | 139.3\% | - | 0 | N/A |
| T. Rusk | 34 | 46 | 35.3\% | - | 0 | N/A |
| T. Sand Lake | 57 | 39 | -31.6\% | - | 0 | N/A |
| T. Scott | 197 | 210 | 6.6\% | 12 | 12 | 0.0\% |
| T. Siren | 311 | 244 | -21.5\% | 2 | 2 | 0.0\% |
| T. Swiss | 88 | 172 | 95.5\% | - | 0 | N/A |
| T. Trade Lake | 46 | 41 | -10.9\% | - | 0 | N/A |
| T. Union | 23 | 87 | 278.3\% | - | 0 | N/A |
| T. Webb Lake | 87 | 72 | -17.2\% | - | 0 | N/A |
| T. West Marshland | 1 | 0 | -100.0\% | - | 0 | N/A |
| T. Wood River | 35 | 30 | -14.3\% | 183 | 183 | 0.0\% |
| V. Grantsburg | 39 | 70 | 79.5\% | 23 | 57 | 147.8\% |
| V. Siren | 79 | 78 | -1.3\% | 20 | 39 | 95.0\% |
| V. Webster | 75 | 51 | -32.0\% | 191 | 17 | -91.1\% |
| Burnett County | 2,008 | 2,347 | 16.9\% | 657 | 536 | -18.4\% |

Source: Burnett County Land Use Plan, 1998 and Wisconsin Department of Revenue Statement of Assessments, 2007.

## Land Use Changes

Some of the land use classifications changed between 1997 and 2008. In 1997 (as shown in the 1998 Burnett County Land Use Plan) property for each town and village was classified as residential, commercial, manufacturing, agricultural, swamp/ waste, forest, other, woodland tax or exempt. The current Department of Revenue assessment statements no longer use the swamp/ waste category and do not include woodland tax and other exempt properties. Rather, the 2007 statement of assessments include the agricultural forest and undeveloped land use classifications. These definitional changes somewhat impair comparisons across the decade. However, the primary categories of residential, commercial, manufacturing, agricultural and forest appear to be relatively unchanged. For the purposes of a meaningful comparison, some 1997 land use categories were revised to be compatible with 2008 land use categories. Even though some
classification inconsistencies exist, broad changes in general land use are still illustrated. For example, the large decrease in agriculture land from 1997 to 2008 is likely accounted for in the increase in residential acreage in 28. It also appears that the addition of the "agricultural forest" category in 2008 could be responsible for the decrease in the acreage associated with "forest" land use category in 1997.

Figure 8-3 below illustrates land use changes in Burnett County for these major categories.
Figure 8-3
Changes in Land Use, Burnett County, 1997-2008


Source: Burnett County Land Use Plan, 1998 and Wisconsin Department of Revenue Statement of Assessments, 2007.

### 8.2 Development Patterns

## Residential

Residential land use is the predominant form of existing development and is dispersed throughout Burnett County. The highest densities of residential land use are found in the county's villages as supported by the availability of public sewer, water, and other utilities and services. The villages also provide the greatest variety of residential land use where the majority of multi-family homes, elder care facilities, and other group quarters are present. The highest concentrations of rural residential development can be found surrounding the lakes and rivers in the county and to a lesser extent along the road network. See Map 8-2, Structure Locations, for a graphic representation. The black dots on the map represent the location of structures (the vast majority of which are residential).

There are large areas of Burnett County that remain untouched by residential land use. Large wetland, floodplains, and forested areas preclude residential land use. Certain areas of the county lack any substantial amount of residential development. This includes forested portions of the Towns of West Marshland, Anderson, Blaine, and Union.

## Commercial and Industrial

Commercial and industrial uses represent a relatively small but important part of the Burnett County landscape. From a positive standpoint, these land uses generate jobs, wages, property tax base, and other economic benefits. From the negative standpoint, these uses are often a source of land use conflict due to noise, odors, traffic congestion, and the like. Commercial and industrial areas may be viewed as eyesores or a loss of community identity if they are not thoughtfully designed. Commercial and industrial development proposals often lead to community conflict through the use of controversial implementation tools such as tax increment financing or annexation.

The distribution of commercial and industrial land uses in Burnett County generally follows some logical patterns. The villages' downtown areas generally include commercial uses, and some also include industrial uses.

Industrial development is often steered to targeted areas through the establishment of industrial parks or business parks. These areas account for concentrations of commercial and industrial land use that are not necessarily in downtown areas or along major transportation routes. Active industrial parks are located in Grantsburg, Siren, and Webster as shown on Мар 6-1.

Commercial and industrial uses are also found scattered throughout the rural areas of the county, generally within unincorporated communities along arterial or collector roads.

## Land Use Terms Defined

Both housing density and minimum lot size are key terms in dealing with land use. However, the two terms are often confused.

Minimum Lot Size: The minimum amount of land required to build a structure

- Often measured in square feet or acres

Housing Density: The number of dwelling units per unit of land area

- For example: one home per 10 acres (a common rural housing density), or 5 homes per acre (a common urban housing density)

Example: 160 acres developed under 20 acre minimum lot size. 8 homes. Uniform lot sizes.


Example: 160 acres developed under one unit per 20 acres density. 8 homes. Various lot sizes. 99 acres remaining in green space.
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## Agriculture

Agricultural land use is found throughout Burnett County to some degree. Communities that do not have any land classified as agricultural according to the 2007 DOR Statement of Assessments are the Town of Webb Lake and the Villages of Siren and Webster. There are, however, some distinct regional differences in the concentration of agricultural land use, and Map 5-2 in the Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources chapter, identify the primary reason for these differences. There is a direct correlation between the occurrence of prime farmland and the location of the agricultural activity. Agriculture is most prevalent in the southwestern and southeastern portions of the county due to the presence of prime agricultural soils. Towns with the greatest acreage of agricultural land include Grantsburg, Wood River, Trade Lake, Anderson, Roosevelt, Daniels, Rusk and Dewey.

## Forests

Forest lands contribute the most significant portion to the county's total land use at 71.7\%. Woodlots are dispersed throughout Burnett County, but concentrated forest areas are also present. Approximately $75 \%$ of the county's forested area is considered productive forest land, with the primary product being pulp wood. The largest concentrations of land that are used in the timber industry are the Towns of Blaine, Swiss and Anderson. Smaller woodland tracts that are not productive forests are often highly valued for recreational purposes, in addition to residential development. Woodlots have rapidly grown in value and now sell for higher prices per acre than agricultural lands, due to both value assessment and market demands.

### 8.3 Land and Resource Management

Land and resource management is comprised of several components that significantly affect land use. The type of land ownership (public, private, land trust, etc.) has a direct impact on how property is managed and how lands may be used in the future. Public ownership of land in Burnett County consists of municipal, county, and state owned lands. As land management takes place under both private and public ownership, resource management programs may prescribe certain requirements and limitations that affect how lands may be used in the future. Voluntary land and resource management protection programs with significant utilization on private lands in Burnett County include Managed Forest Land (MFL) and Forest Crop Land (FCL).

Understanding land ownership and management patterns provides a link to a host of voluntary and non-regulatory plan implementation tools. Valued community features and resources can be protected for future generations not only through regulatory approaches like zoning and land division ordinances, but also through public ownership or programs like MFL and FCL. Burnett County will be best positioned to achieve its desired future when land use, land management, and land regulation are working in concert. Map 8-3 Land Ownership and Management, is designed to facilitate this analysis by displaying the location of public lands and lands enrolled in forest management programs.

## Managed Forest Land (MFL)

MFL enrollments are significant to planning for future land use, as these lands are dedicated to a long term forest management plan for contract periods of 25 or 50 years. Depending on the date of enrollment, this time frame may extend beyond the time horizon of the comprehensive plan in many locations. Significant characteristics of the MFL program include a minimum enrollment size of 10 acres, a prohibition on the construction of homes, and the requirement of a timber harvest at some point during the life of the contract. MFL enrollments may either be open or closed to public access at the option of the land owner. For more information on the details of this program administered by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR), refer to the Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources element.

Table 8-7 displays the acreage of lands enrolled in MFL and a similar program, Forest Crop Land (FCL), for each town in Burnett County. FCL has objectives and land use planning implications that are similar to MFL, but is an older program and is being phased out and replaced by MFL.

Lands enrolled in forest management programs are scattered throughout the towns in Burnett County. Approximately $61 \%$ of the lands enrolled in the MFL and FCL programs are closed to public access with the largest concentrations located in the Towns of Wood River, Roosevelt, Jackson, La Follette, and Scott.

The largest tracts of open MLF are found in the Towns of Wood River, Roosevelt, Lincoln, and Webb Lake. Other open parcels are scattered throughout the county. All FCL enrollments are open to public access, and the largest remaining areas of FCL are found in the Town of Jackson.

About 12,307 acres of land are enrolled in a forest management program. This equates to over two percent of the land area in Burnett County.

## Public Lands

Public lands including parks, public open spaces, recreational areas, and natural resource management areas, are significant to land use planning. The public lands themselves are not available to accommodate development and may influence the land market of the surrounding areas. Lands within close proximity of public lands are generally desirable for development, as their access to these public resources is enhanced by their location. In contrast, lands within close proximity of existing public lands may also be desirable for acquisition as additional public resource land. For example, the WDNR sets long range plans for the expansion of certain state fish and game areas. As lands become available for purchase, properties that are adjacent or very close to existing public lands are most attractive for WDNR acquisition. This dynamic becomes important as communities set priorities and plan for the areas surrounding lands currently under public ownership.

Municipal, county, state, and federally owned lands are located throughout Burnett County. Table 8.7 shows the acreages in each town that are owned by the county, state, tribal, or federal government. The largest share of municipal and county owned lands is represented by the Burnett County Forest and county and community parks. State owned lands include the

Governor Knowles State Forest, 12 state natural areas, and 10 state wildlife areas located in Burnett County, including both fishery and wildlife areas. Federally owned lands in Burnett County include the St. Croix National Scenic Riverway, which is a unit of the National Park System. Refer to the Utilities and Community Facilities element for additional information on parks, open space, and recreational areas. Refer to the Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources element for additional information on state natural areas.

Table 8-7
Land Ownership, Burnett County, January 1, 2008

|  | County Lands | Federal Lands | State Land | Tribal Lands | Private Managed Forest Crop Land and Forest Land | Total | Land Not Under State, Federal, County, Tribal or Private Agricultural Ownership and Management |  | Total Town Acreage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anderson | 14,206.5 | 254.3 | 12,170.1 | 0.0 | 387.7 | 27,018.6 | 13,856.1 | 34\% | 40,874.7 |
| Blaine | 32,985.1 | 1,560.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 627.0 | 35,173.0 | 9,903.2 | 22\% | 45,076.2 |
| Daniels | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1,935.5 | 0.0 | 141.0 | 2,076.5 | 20,814.3 | 91\% | 22,890.8 |
| Dewey | 0.0 | 0.0 | 394.4 | 86.1 | 355.7 | 836.2 | 22,726.7 | 96\% | 23,562.9 |
| Grantsburg | 0.2 | 620.0 | 6,131.4 | 0.0 | 367.8 | 7,119.4 | 17,855.4 | 71\% | 24,974.8 |
| Jackson | 2,690.4 | 0.0 | 1,604.8 | 0.0 | 733.0 | 5,028.2 | 17,245.1 | 77\% | 22,273.3 |
| La Follette | 0.0 | 313.7 | 281.5 | 310.3 | 933.5 | 1,839.0 | 23,116.4 | 93\% | 24,955.3 |
| Lincoln | 3,572.6 | 0.0 | 4,345.0 | 0.0 | 1,074.0 | 8,991.6 | 13,523.3 | 60\% | 22,514.9 |
| Meenon | 772.3 | 0.0 | 730.0 | 2.2 | 455.2 | 1,959.7 | 20,398.0 | 91\% | 22,357.7 |
| Oakland | 0.4 | 0.0 | 829.1 | 0.0 | 412.9 | 1,242.4 | 19,803.0 | 94\% | 21,045.4 |
| Roosevelt | 3,824.0 | 0.0 | 2,468.6 | 0.0 | 1,016.2 | 7,308.7 | 15,279.8 | 68\% | 22,588.6 |
| Rusk | 5,868.7 | 122.8 | 0.0 | 124.1 | 209.0 | 6,324.6 | 15,917.0 | 72\% | 22,241.6 |
| Sand Lake | 5,531.1 | 176.5 | 81.1 | 134.9 | 618.1 | 6,541.7 | 16,604.9 | 72\% | 23,146.6 |
| Scott | 0.1 | 0.0 | 232.5 | 0.0 | 703.2 | 935.7 | 20,940.9 | 96\% | 21,876.7 |
| Siren | 148.7 | 217.5 | 349.5 | 222.3 | 407.8 | 1,345.7 | 22,388.0 | 94\% | 23,733.7 |
| Swiss | 18,838.7 | 1,423.7 | 5,182.9 | 148.7 | 360.0 | 25,953.9 | 12,829.2 | 33\% | 38,783.1 |
| Trade Lake | 84.9 | 0.0 | 19.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 104.6 | 22,616.3 | 100\% | 22,720.8 |
| Union | 9,574.8 | 579.3 | 5,975.8 | 0.0 | 362.4 | 16,492.3 | 7,792.0 | 32\% | 24,284.2 |
| Webb Lake | 9,401.3 | 598.2 | 39.6 | 0.0 | 1,030.5 | 11,069.6 | 12,100.3 | 52\% | 23,169.9 |
| West Marshland | 5,186.1 | 311.7 | 30,789.7 | 0.0 | 2,111.8 | 38,399.3 | 8,269.2 | 18\% | 46,668.6 |
| Wood River | 0.0 | 0.0 | 900.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 900.2 | 21,910.8 | 96\% | 22,810.9 |
| Grand Total | 111,469.8 | 6,178.5 | 74,461.3 | 1,028.5 | 12,306.8 | 206,660.9 | 355,889.7 | 63\% | 562,550.6 |

Source: Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Managed Forest Law 2008 Master Listing \& Forest Crop Law 2008 Master Listing

## Land Trusts

A land trust is a private, community-based, non-profit organization established to protect land and water resources for public benefit. An estimated 9 million acres of land are currently protected by more than 1,500 land trusts nationwide. Wetlands, farms, wildlife habitat, forests, urban gardens and parks, ranches, coastlines, watersheds, trails, and river corridors are among the areas safeguarded by land trust organizations. Land trusts can be local, regional, or statewide
in focus and are funded largely through membership dues and donations. They vary in size from small land trusts operated by volunteers to organizations with professional staffs that own and manage thousands of acres. Some land trusts do not own land, but monitor development restrictions they helped put in place.

Lands owned or managed by land trusts are significant to comprehensive planning as they are no longer available to accommodate development. Land trusts protect lands generally by purchasing property outright, by receiving gifted lands, or by purchasing the development rights of a property through the use of conservation easements. Both outright purchase and the use of easements are generally permanent or very long term with respect to time frame, extending beyond the time horizon of the comprehensive planning process. Valued features of the natural landscape may be identified by communities as preferred locations for land trust activity or for other voluntary land management tools. Lands owned or managed by land trusts may or may not be open to the public at the option of the trust and the land owner.

Burnett County is one of eighteen counties that is a member of the Western Wisconsin Land Trust (WWLT) that actively serves the west central and northwestern region of Wisconsin. WWLT has succeeded in conserving over 20,000 acres of farms and natural areas in this region. Table 8-8 details the WWLT properties that are currently active that are located in Burnett County. Currently seven properties are being protected through the use of conservation easements for a total of nearly 627 acres.

## Table 8-8 WWLT Projects in Burnett County

| Conserved Land <br> Size (acres) | Conservation Tool |
| ---: | :--- |
| 8.6 | Conservation Easement |
| 27.5 | Conservation Easement |
| 64.8 | Conservation Easement |
| 80 | Conservation Easement |
| 80 | Conservation Easement |
| 116 | Conservation Easement |
| 250 | Conservation Easement |
| $\mathbf{6 2 6 . 9}$ | Total |

Source: Western Wisconsin Land Trust, September 2008 Note: For confidentiality reasons the name or location of the conserved property was not disseminated by the WWLT.
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Map 8-3 Land Ownership and Management
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### 8.4 Land Supply, Demand, and Price Trends

There are many potential indicators that may be utilized to measure the supply, demand, and price trends of land. The following analysis is intended to provide a variety of view points from respected sources. These sources do not provide data that are precisely comparable, primarily due to differing methods and time periods of data gathering. Nor will any single source provide the complete picture of land supply, demand, and price trends, but rather, each will provide some additional insight into this dynamic aspect of planning for future land use.

## Land Supply

Burnett County as a whole has a substantial supply of land. According to Table 8-9, lands that are currently undeveloped (agriculture, woodlots, and other open land) account for $85.2 \%$ of the county. The availability of land for development varies by community, and a substantial difference exists between the land supply of cities and villages and the land supply of towns. All of Burnett County's villages contain undeveloped lands, but their availability for development is impacted by the presence of wetlands, floodplains, steep slopes, bedrock geology, or other natural limitations, or the presence of active farming operations, mineral extraction, or other long term resource based land uses. For some villages, these factors may severely limit their land supply. For this reason, villages may need to look to extraterritorial areas to accommodate future growth.

## Land Demand and Price Trends

## Equalized Valuation

Changes in the equalized value of real property provide insight into land price trends. Equalized values are based on the full market value of all taxable property in the state, except for agricultural land. In order to provide property tax relief for farmers, the value of agricultural land is determined by its value for agricultural uses rather than for its possible development value, which is termed a "use value" system, rather than one based on full market value.

## Table 8-9

Equalized Valuation, Burnett County, 2004-2008

| Year |  | Residential |  | Commercial |  | nufacturing |  | Aricultural |  | developed |  | Ag Forest |  | Forest |  | Other* |  | tal Real Estate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2004 | \$ | 1,865,364,500 | \$ | 90,974,500 | \$ | 10,225,200 | \$ | 6,923,800 | \$ | 13,156,200 | \$ | 559,400 | \$ | 227,191,000 | \$ | 28,294,100 | \$ | 2,242,688,700 |
| 2005 | \$ | 2,066,504,600 | \$ | 95,492,100 | \$ | 11,539,500 | \$ | 6,690,900 | \$ | 16,225,500 | \$ | 9,983,800 | \$ | 235,120,900 | \$ | 26,910,100 | \$ | 2,468,467,400 |
| 2006 | \$ | 2,275,429,400 | \$ | 100,567,800 | \$ | 11,970,400 | \$ | 7,243,600 | \$ | 17,449,400 | \$ | 25,260,200 | \$ | 235,822,700 | \$ | 29,270,600 | \$ | 2,703,014,100 |
| 2007 | \$ | 2,439,566,200 | \$ | 103,373,500 | \$ | 11,914,000 | \$ | 7,543,900 | \$ | 19,853,600 | \$ | 19,979,500 | \$ | 269,314,700 | \$ | 30,023,300 | \$ | 2,901,568,700 |
| 2008 | \$ | 2,445,174,200 | \$ | 106,292,700 | \$ | 12,056,100 | \$ | 7,935,200 | \$ | 19,929,300 | \$ | 21,447,900 | \$ | 275,190,800 | \$ | 30,724,600 | \$ | 2,918,750,800 |

*Includes swamp, waste, and other land.
Source: Wisconsin Department of Revenue, Statement of Changes in Equalized Value by Class and Item, 20042008.

The total equalized value of real estate in Burnett County has increased by 30.2\% from 2004 to 2008. This nearly paralleled the $31.7 \%$ increase in equalized real estate value for the State of Wisconsin during the same time period.

## Agricultural and Forest Land Sales

The Wisconsin Agricultural Statistics Service maintains information on agricultural and forest land sales for every county in the state. Tables 8-10 and 8-11 present this information for Burnett County.

Table 8-10
Agricultural Land Sales, Burnett County, 2003-2007

|  |  |  |  |  |  | \# Change <br> \% Change |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |  |
| $2003-2007$ | $2003-2007$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Wisconsin Agricultural Statistics Service, 2003-2007.
As of 2007, the sale of agricultural lands in Burnett County showed declining trends with respect to the number of transactions and the total amount of land sold. However, agricultural commodity pricing began to recover in late 2003 and has continued to improve. Commodity pricing has dropped since March 2009 along with other consumer market prices. The agricultural financial service community anticipated that optimism over farm commodity markets would lead to increasing farm demand for land, both for rent and for purchase. It is likely that this is taking place in Burnett County and that the trends shown in Table 8-10 have started to reverse. In contrast, the price per acre of agricultural land sales trend has shown steady increases at $19.6 \%$ for all agricultural lands. Over the last five years in Burnett County, two years (2005 and 2007) experienced no agricultural land being sold and converted to other uses such as residential development. In 2006, however, a single 60 acre transaction was made that yield a price of over $\$ 2,700$ per acre, approximately a $42 \%$ increase from the average price witnessed in 2003.

Table 8-11
Forest Land Sales, Burnett County, 2000-01 \& 2005-2007

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Source: Wisconsin Agricultural Statistics Service, 2000-2007.
The last update by the Wisconsin Agricultural Statistics Service (at the time this report was written) on forest land sales was conducted in 2007. From 2002 to 2004, no data was collected on forest lands sales because of a lack of requests according to the Wisconsin Agricultural Statistics Services. However, data request began to increase in late 2004 and the Department decided to resume collecting and aggregating the forest land sales data for 2005 to the present.

Between 2000 and 2007, the number of forest land transactions has decrease each year the data is available. The average price per acre shows a significant increase with few exceptions. The increase in the price per acre of forest lands sold was striking. For all transactions, there was a reported $116 \%$ increase. Lands sold for continuing forest use more than doubled in price with a $121 \%$ increase. These trends experienced between 2000 and 2007 were expected to continue to the present, and this expectation is supported by the $21 \%$ increase in equalized valuation of forest lands between 2004 and 2008 as shown in Table 8-9.

## Wisconsin Realtors Association Information

The Wisconsin Realtors Association (WRA) is one of the largest trade associations in the state and represents over 12,000 realtors statewide who are involved in virtually all aspects of the sale, purchase, exchange, or lease of real estate in Wisconsin. The primary purpose of the WRA is to further the quality of the real estate industry in Wisconsin by promoting the competent practice and professionalism of realtors. In addition, the association represents its membership in legislative efforts to keep housing affordable in Wisconsin and protect the private property rights of citizens throughout the state. The WRA also provides information on property sales.

The WRA provides data on home sales and their median sale prices. There are a few instances where the data was not reported as marked in the chart below. In general, the number of home sales has decreased over the last eight years while the median sale price has increased. If assumed that the sales follow the same trend as the first half of 2008, there will be approximately 190 home sales at a median sale price of about $\$ 173,300$. The increasing median sales price
indicates raising property values in Burnett County. The slowing number of home sales point to a downturn in the local real estate market comparable with the recent national trend.

Table 8-12
WRA Residential Sales Data, Burnett County, 2001-2008

|  | $2001^{*}$ | $2002^{* *}$ | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Home Sales | 407 | 98 | 197 | 236 | 259 | 253 | 214 | 193 |
| Median Sale Price | $\$ 96,000$ | $\$ 140,000$ | $\$ 141,800$ | $\$ 134,500$ | $\$ 154,300$ | $\$ 138,200$ | $\$ 168,000$ | $\$ 150,000$ |

Note: * means data form Quarter 1 is not available
Note: ** means data from Quarter 1 and 2 is not available
Source: Wisconsin Realtors Association, Housing Statistics for Burnett County.
Table 8-13
Plat Reviews, Burnett County Towns, 1998-2007

|  | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | $\begin{gathered} 10 \text { - year } \\ \text { total } \end{gathered}$ | 10 - year average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T. Anderson | 8 | 8 | 6 | 15 | 9 | 11 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 75 | 7.5 |
| T. Blaine | 4 | 7 | 8 | 2 | 9 | 6 | 11 | 7 | 11 | 4 | 69 | 6.9 |
| T. Daniels | 9 | 16 | 13 | 23 | 13 | 15 | 10 | 14 | 5 | 12 | 130 | 13 |
| T. Dewey | 14 | 17 | 13 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 101 | 10.1 |
| T. Grantsburg | 15 | 18 | 22 | 17 | 17 | 15 | 28 | 17 | 7 | 10 | 166 | 16.6 |
| T. Jackson | 36 | 38 | 46 | 44 | 16 | 31 | 54 | 34 | 43 | 21 | 363 | 36.3 |
| T. La Follette | 12 | 20 | 13 | 20 | 15 | 13 | 20 | 8 | 6 | 11 | 138 | 13.8 |
| T. Lincoln | 3 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 47 | 4.7 |
| T. Meenon | 22 | 33 | 39 | 26 | 36 | 26 | 20 | 22 | 20 | 19 | 263 | 26.3 |
| T. Oakland | 43 | 44 | 39 | 33 | 42 | 37 | 36 | 22 | 26 | 33 | 355 | 35.5 |
| T. Roosevelt | 1 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 40 | 4 |
| T. Rusk | 13 | 14 | 14 | 11 | 10 | 15 | 6 | 13 | 6 | 4 | 106 | 10.6 |
| T. Sand Lake | 15 | 16 | 11 | 17 | 18 | 13 | 11 | 10 | 14 | 7 | 132 | 13.2 |
| T. Scott | 35 | 37 | 27 | 17 | 32 | 29 | 43 | 20 | 26 | 13 | 279 | 27.9 |
| T. Siren | 37 | 28 | 20 | 38 | 26 | 26 | 25 | 16 | 27 | 13 | 256 | 25.6 |
| T. Swiss | 20 | 36 | 35 | 28 | 34 | 27 | 23 | 24 | 12 | 30 | 269 | 26.9 |
| T. Trade Lake | 21 | 18 | 28 | 12 | 17 | 19 | 26 | 21 | 14 | 14 | 190 | 19 |
| T. Union | 9 | 14 | 17 | 16 | 17 | 15 | 15 | 12 | 11 | 8 | 134 | 13.4 |
| T. Webb Lake | 22 | 35 | 35 | 24 | 29 | 29 | 17 | 22 | 24 | 20 | 257 | 25.7 |
| T. West Marshland | 5 | 7 | 10 | 8 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 67 | 6.7 |
| T. Wood River | 23 | 19 | 18 | 18 | 15 | 17 | 16 | 17 | 0 | 11 | 154 | 15.4 |
| V. Grantsburg |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | N/A |
| V. Siren |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | N/A |
| V. Webster |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | N/A |
| Burnett County | 367 | 435 | 427 | 384 | 381 | 379 | 392 | 301 | 274 | 251 | 3,591 | 359.1 |

Source: Burnett County Planning Office, Villages of Grantsburg, Siren, and Webster.

## Outhouse Permits

According to Burnett County, when a home does not have running water, outhouses are allowed to suffice for a sanitary system. Thus, Burnett County keeps a separate count of the amount of outhouse permits that are issued each year. Table 8-14 illustrates that Burnett County has issued 185 outhouse permits from 1998 to 2007. The Towns of Swiss, Webb Lake, and Oakland have averaged approximately two new outhouse permits each year.

Table 8-14
Permits for New Outhouses, Burnett County Towns, 1998-2007

|  | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \text { - year } \\ & \text { total } \end{aligned}$ | 10 - year average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T. Anderson | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0.7 |
| T. Blaine | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 0.9 |
| T. Daniels | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0.4 |
| T. Dewey | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0.4 |
| T. Grantsburg | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.2 |
| T. Jackson | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0.7 |
| T. La Follette | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0.3 |
| T. Lincoln | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0.3 |
| T. Meenon | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 1.2 |
| T. Oakland | 0 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 1.9 |
| T. Roosevelt | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 0.9 |
| T. Rusk | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 0.9 |
| T. Sand Lake | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0.6 |
| T. Scott | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 1.1 |
| T. Siren | 1 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 14 | 1.4 |
| T. Swiss | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 23 | 2.3 |
| T. Trade Lake | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 1.1 |
| T. Union | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 0.9 |
| T. Webb Lake | 5 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 2 |
| T. West Marshland | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0.3 |
| T. Wood River | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| V. Grantsburg |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | N/A |
| V. Siren |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | N/A |
| V. Webster |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | N/A |
| Burnett County | 17 | 24 | 24 | 23 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 17 | 12 | 17 | 185 | 18.5 |

Source: Burnett County Planning Office, Villages of Grantsburg, Siren, and Webster.

## Building Permit Activity for New Home Construction

Possibly one of the best indicators for land demand and development in the county is building permits. Table 8-15 details building permit activity for new home construction in the county from 1997 to 2007. The Town of Oakland has witnessed the highest average number of building permits for new homes with over 26 per year. Burnett County as a whole has averaged issuing over 211 building permits per year from 1998 to 2007 for new home construction. In 1999 Burnett County totaled 282 building permits, while in 2007 a combined total of 137 permits were issued in the county.

Table 8-15
Building Permit Activity for New Home Construction (New Homes Added), Burnett County, 1998-2007

|  | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 10 - year total | 10 - year average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T. Anderson | 3 | 8 | 8 | 14 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 73 | 7.3 |
| T. Blaine | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 28 | 2.8 |
| T. Daniels | 4 | 4 | 4 | 15 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 44 | 4.4 |
| T. Dewey | 5 | 12 | 12 | 18 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 14 | 88 | 8.8 |
| T. Grantsburg | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 39 | 3.9 |
| T. Jackson | 16 | 23 | 22 | 12 | 16 | 17 | 24 | 14 | 17 | 15 | 176 | 17.6 |
| T. La Follette | 9 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 45 | 4.5 |
| T. Lincoln | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0.3 |
| T. Meenon | 6 | 15 | 9 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 11 | 79 | 7.9 |
| T. Oakland | 27 | 41 | 21 | 36 | 30 | 22 | 27 | 21 | 17 | 20 | 262 | 26.2 |
| T. Roosevelt | 4 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 31 | 3.1 |
| T. Rusk | 5 | 9 | 6 | 12 | 9 | 17 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 5 | 79 | 7.9 |
| T. Sand Lake | 10 | 11 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 67 | 6.7 |
| T. Scott | 21 | 22 | 24 | 12 | 19 | 2 | 24 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 164 | 16.4 |
| T. Siren | 27 | 17 | 15 | 31 | 23 | 18 | 20 | 13 | 12 | 8 | 184 | 18.4 |
| T. Swiss | 19 | 27 | 25 | 22 | 26 | 20 | 17 | 14 | 11 | 2 | 183 | 18.3 |
| T. Trade Lake | 10 | 21 | 17 | 7 | 10 | 8 | 15 | 13 | 5 | 7 | 113 | 11.3 |
| T. Union | 10 | 19 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 11 | 19 | 11 | 8 | 4 | 119 | 11.9 |
| T. Webb Lake | 10 | 27 | 24 | 15 | 15 | 16 | 22 | 13 | 10 | 4 | 156 | 15.6 |
| T. West Marshlanc | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0.3 |
| T. Wood River | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 26 | 2.6 |
| V. Grantsburg | 8 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 3 | 10 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 58 | 5.8 |
| V. Siren | 5 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 11 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 50 | 5 |
| V. Webster | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 41 | 4.1 |
| Burnett County | 208 | 282 | 240 | 249 | 225 | 207 | 235 | 175 | 153 | 137 | 2,111 | 211.1 |

Note: Not included in the numbers are 31 new home building permits that were issued in 2001, that previously existed but were destroyed by a tornado.
Source: Burnett County Planning Office, Villages of Grantsburg, Siren, and Webster.

## Land Use Demand Projections

The following tables display estimates for the total acreage that will be utilized by residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural, and forest/open space land uses for five year increments through 2030. These future land use demand estimates are largely dependent on population projections and should only be utilized for planning purposes in combination with other indicators of land use demand.

The residential acreage projection shown in table 8-14 is based on the population projections from the WDOA and a linear population projection based on past Census data (refer to the Population and Housing element for more information on population projections). Together, these two projections provide a range of possibility for each community and the county as a whole.

The residential calculations use the population projections as the starting point. Housing unit projections are then made in five year increments based on population projections and the 2008 ratio of population to total housing units (to account for seasonal population. Total residential acreage based on assessment data (2008) is compared to the total housing units (2008) in each community to determine the average land area per residential unit. The average land area (this number is 3.1 acres per residential unit in the county) is then multiplied by the housing unit projections to determine the projected residential acreage from 2010 to 2030. These numbers are averaged here for simplicity. See Appendix LU for a detailed breakdown of the residential housing unit and acreage projections for each participating community. Table 8-16 shows the incremental projections for residential housing units and acreage based on the alternate population projection methods.

Projected demand for commercial/industrial land use assumes that the ratio of the county's current population to current land area in each use will remain constant in the future. In other words, each person will require the same amount of land for each particular land use as they do today. Based on historic trends, demand for new commercial land is expected to grow by about $1 \%$ each decade. By 2030, Burnett County will likely add 867 acres of commercial and industrial. Most of this demand is expected to be clustered around the existing commercial and industrial nodes in the Villages.

Projected agricultural and forest/open space land use acreages are calculated based on the assumption that they will decrease over time. These uses are converted to accommodate new development. Land projected for residential, commercial, and industrial uses was subtracted from agricultural and forest/open space based on the 2008 proportion of each. In 2008, it is estimated that there were 61,833 acres of agricultural and 400,719 acres of forest/open space - a ratio of approximately $1: 6.5$. Therefore, projected decreases in these categories followed the same ratio between 2010 to 2030.

Table 8-16
Projected Land Use Demand (Acreage), 2010-2030

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ <br> Current <br> Estimate | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ <br> Projections | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ <br> Projections | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ <br> Projections | $\mathbf{2 0 2 5}$ <br> Projections | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ <br> Projections | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 - 2 0 3 0}$ <br> Change |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Residential | 42,520 | 43,410 | 45,492 | 47,472 | 49,228 | 50,722 | 8,202 | $19 \%$ |
| Commercial | 2,148 | 2,395 | 2,510 | 2,619 | 2,716 | 2,798 | 650 | $30 \%$ |
| Industrial | 423 | 548 | 574 | 599 | 621 | 640 | 217 | $0 \%$ |
| Agricultural | 61,833 | 61,821 | 61,523 | 61,240 | 60,989 | 60,776 | $-1,057$ | $-2 \%$ |
| Forest/ Open Space | 400,719 | 399,529 | 397,604 | 395,773 | 394,148 | 392,766 | $-7,953$ | $-2 \%$ |
| Other (Roads and Surface |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Water) | 51,032 | 51,032 | 51,032 | 51,032 | 51,032 | 51,032 | 0 | $0 \%$ |

Source: Burnett County; Wisconsin Department of Revenue Statement of Assessments, 1997; and Foth

Table 8-17
Alternate Projections for Residential Development, 2010-2030

|  | 2008 |  | 2010 |  | 2015 |  | 2020 |  | 2025 |  | 2030 |  | Total Increase in Residential Acres | Total <br> Residential Acres by 2030 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Housing Units | Total Residential Acres | Additional <br> Housing Units | Additional Acres | Additional <br> Housing Units | Additional Acres | Additional <br> Housing Units | Additional Acres | Additional Housing Units | Additional Acres | Additional <br> Housing Units | Additional Acres |  |  |
| WisDOA Estimate | 13,711 | 42,520 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Li near Projection |  |  | 251 | 777 | 536 | 1,661 | 470 | 1,456 | 325 | 1,007 | 156 | 483 | 5,385 | 47,905 |
| WisDOA-based Projection |  |  | 323 | 1,001 | 807 | 2,503 | 807 | 2,503 | 807 | 2,503 | 807 | 2,503 | 11,014 | 53,534 |

Source: Burnett County; Wisconsin Department of Revenue Statement of Assessments, 1997; and Foth
If land use in Burnett County continues along the same trends that exist today, several features of these projections become important.

- Residential Land Use: If land use follows the above projections, then an additional 5,385 to 10,014 acres (see Appendix LU) or an average of 8,202 acres will be needed to accommodate residential development on a countywide scale, as the percentage of residential development in the county increases from $8.5 \%$ to about $9.5 \%$ of the total land area. The acreage figure is calculated, presuming that lots sizes will average 3.1 acres per unit. Using WDOA population projection to calculate residential demand yields the greatest projected demand for housing, while projections based on past Census population data yield a smaller projected increase in demand. Consideration should also be given to the following:
- The average amount of land used for each new residential unit will not necessarily be 3.1 acre for Burnett County in the future. Plan policy and regulation can greatly affect this number. For instance, lot clustering and conservation subdivisions produce relatively smaller lots, and preserve open space.
- Household size is decreasing. Fewer people occupy each housing unit than did in the past, therefore, more land is being consumed to accommodate the population.
- More population growth is taking place in the towns than in the cities and villages than did in the past. Since 1980, the majority of Burnett County’s population has resided in the rural towns, and this trend is likely to continue. Towns lack the utilities to support higher housing densities, so residential growth is likely to include more low density housing on larger lots than if it were accommodated on smaller lots in cities or villages
- It is expected that Burnett County will continue to be a destination for people seeking second homes.

Residential land use accounts for the vast majority of existing development, and this is projected to continue as the largest share of projected growth. As a result, the single biggest factor that can impact land use demand in Burnett County is rural residential lot size. The projected demand changes substantially with small adjustments to this assumption. This is an important point to consider as growth management strategies and tools are explored, especially lot size and development density policies.

- Commercial/Industrial Land Use: These uses represent the smallest share of projected land demand in terms of developed uses. In fact, acreage for commercial and industrial is not expected to exceed 2,798 acres, which represents a $30 \%$ increase from 2008 to 2030. This is not unusual. By using the ratio of population to land use, projected demand for commercial and industrial land use (as well as institutional land use) is biased toward the existing density for this type of development. Most existing commercial and industrial development is located in cities and villages at relatively high density. As a result, projected demand reflects a proportionately smaller land area. Since most new commercial and industrial growth is likely to take place in cities and villages, this bias toward higher density supports the results of the projection.
- Agricultural and Forest/Open Space Land Use: Looking at historic trends, it can be extrapolated that approximately 1,000 agricultural acres will be converted to other uses. It is also possible that this projected loss of agriculture land is overestimated based on trends in the agricultural market segment. Most likely a majority of land use conversions will happen within the forest and open space category based on simple math (majority of land use area will experience a majority of land use conversions) and rural development trends. No matter the theory applied, there are strong connections between projected agricultural and forested land use and residential demand, and the projection for residential demand is very volatile.


### 8.5 Land Use Trends and Outlook

The following land use trends are likely to be experienced in Burnett County over the next 20 to 25 years. The following statements are based on recent trends that are expected to continue well into the future, the opinions of Burnett County and municipal staff that deal with these issues, and the opinions of other Burnett County citizens who are leaders in these areas. The trend statements are organized to demonstrate that changes in land use are connected to the other planning elements.

## Housing, Population, and Land Use

- According to the WDOA projections, the Burnett County population will continue to grow at a rate similar, but slightly slower rate to the state of Wisconsin as a whole.
- The number of persons per household will continue to decrease requiring more housing units and more land to accommodate the county's growing population.
- The number of housing units in Burnett County will continue to grow at a rate slightly slower than the State of Wisconsin as a whole.
- The county's rural areas, especially not yet developed waterfronts will be desired as sites for subdivisions and new housing construction.


## Transportation and Land Use

- Burnett County villages and nearby town arterials will continue to be targeted for commercial and industrial development.
- More intense commercial and industrial activity will likely be attracted to the Villages since they are well-served infrastructure and have concentrated populations.


## Utilities, Community Facilities, and Land Use

- County and local government administration of land use regulations will improve in response to a growing population and the need to provide services at a lower cost and higher level of efficiency.
- The availability of urban services and utilities will continue to draw growth to the areas surrounding the Villages of Grantsburg, Siren and Webster.
- High quality community services such as schools and emergency services will continue to make Burnett County a desirable place to live and attract new growth.


## Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Land Use

- The sale of forested, open, and agricultural lands for conversion to private recreational use will continue.
- Agriculture will maintain a strong presence in Burnett County. There will likely be a decreasing number of total farms, but increasing numbers of large farms.
- The demand for agricultural land needed to grow feed crops and spread livestock waste will increase as farm size increases, competing with other demands for rural lands.
- Productive land uses like forestry and grazing will increase in order to take advantage of property tax breaks.
- Cash cropping and specialty farming will increase.
- Nonmetallic mines sites will continue to be developed to meet demands for sand, gravel, and other resources.


## Economic Development and Land Use

- Businesses and industry that support the existing manufacturing base will be attracted to the county and region.
- Agriculturally based or related businesses and industry will continue to be attracted to the county.
- Residential and commercial highway corridor development will continue in order to accommodate those who commute to employment centers in surrounding counties.
- The local and regional availability of jobs with competitive wages will continue to make Burnett County a desirable place to live and attract new growth.


## Overall Development Patterns

The following trends are from the perspective of the county as a whole and broad regional division of the county. Trends within individual communities may vary, and the implementation of comprehensive plans may have a significant impact on whether these trends are realized. Statements concerning the expected rates of growth are not intended to reduce or elevate the importance of planning for any part of Burnett County over another. Regardless of the rate of expected growth, all parts of Burnett County will experience growth and change over the next 20 to 25 years. Each community will need to adopt land use management strategies that address the challenges that are likely to accompany the locally relevant types, densities, and rates of growth.

- The combination of high quality services and plentiful natural resources will continue to draw a steady rate of growth to Burnett County. In particular, the area will attract retirees and others looking for second homes.
- The presence of agriculture will decrease as the land becomes more valuable for more intense development. However, southeastern and southwestern Burnett County will continue to have a stable agricultural land base due to the strong presence of agricultural resources and infrastructure.
- Commercial and industrial activity is not expected to increase dramatically. Most development will be attracted to the villages.


### 8.6 Land Use Plans and Programs Currently in Use

The following plans and programs are currently available for use in Burnett County with regard to land use.

Burnett County Land and Water Resources Plan

## State Programs

## Wisconsin Land Information Program

The Wisconsin Land Information Program is a voluntary, statewide program that provides financial support to local governments for land records modernization efforts. All 72 Wisconsin counties voluntarily participate in the program. The Wisconsin Land Information Board oversees the program's policies. The Board's statutory authority includes preparing guidelines to coordinate the modernization of land records and land information systems; implementing a grant program for local governmental units; approval of countywide plans for land records modernization; serving as the clearinghouse for access to land information; and providing
technical assistance and advice to state agencies and local governmental units with land information responsibilities.

## Regional Programs

## Northwest Regional Planning Commission

The Northwest Regional Planning Commission (NWRPC) is the oldest planning commission in the state of Wisconsin. It offers land use planning resources, zoning assistance, economic development strategies, grant program assistance, environmental planning resources, and transportation planning assistance to counties in the northwestern part of the state. The following counties are served by NWRPC: Ashland, Bayfield, Burnett, Douglas, Iron, Price, Rusk, Sawyer, Taylor, and Washburn.

The State of the St. Croix Basin
The State of the St. Croix Basin is a resource management plan published by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources in 2002.

## County Programs and Plans

## Burnett County Zoning Office

The Burnett County Zoning Office oversees community planning and administers zoning and subdivision regulations. Furthermore, it administers and regulates state mandated shoreland requirements, floodplain regulations, wetland regulations and sanitary code regulations.

## Burnett County Land Information System

The Burnett County Land Information System provides citizens, agencies and businesses with property and parcel information, reports and statistics, and geographic data related to the county.

## Burnett County Land and Water Conservation Department

The Burnett County Land and Water Conservation Department provides leadership in executing programs that conserve land and water resources. The department developed the Burnett County Land and Water Resources Plan, which was adopted in 2004 and applied through 2008. The plan assessed the natural resources, including water, land, soil and species, planned for the future of theses resources, and recommended implementation strategies.

## Burnett County Forest Comprehensive Land Use Plan

This comprehensive plan for forest land outlines plans to preserve the forest for future recreation, education and economic uses. The plan is to be administered between 2006 and 2020.

## 1998 Burnett County Land Use Plan

The 1998 Burnett County Land Use Plan included planning strategies and recommendations for the natural environment (including soils, wildlife, water, floodplains, forests and wetlands), and the built environment (including housing, transportation, recreational trails and airports). Additionally, the plan identified existing land use conditions at the time and made recommendations for implementation strategies.

## Local Plans

## Village of Siren Comprehensive Plan

This plan was adopted in August of 2004 and addresses the smart growth elements of housing, transportation, utilities and community facilities, agriculture and natural resources, economic development, land use and intergovernmental cooperation. It also makes recommendations for implementing the plan.

## Village of Grantsburg Comprehensive Plan

The Village of Grantsburg adopted this plan in 1999. It addresses the elements of smart growth comprehensive plans and makes recommendations for implementation.

## Town of Blaine Comprehensive Plan

The Town of Blaine adopted this comprehensive plan in 2005 in accordance with Wisconsin's Smart Growth legislation. Blaine partnered with the Town of Swiss to secure grants and assistance in developing this plan.

## Town of Swiss Comprehensive Plan

The Town of Swiss adopted this comprehensive plan in 2005 to address the elements of smart growth. The town coordinated with the Town of Blaine to secure grants and assistance in developing this plan.

## Town of Grantsburg Comprehensive Plan

The Town of Grantsburg adopted this plan in 2005. It addresses the elements of smart growth and makes recommendations for implementation strategies.
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## Appendix LU
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The following table shows the residential housing unit and acreage projections for the participating communities and the county. The housing unit/acreage projections are based on both the population projections from the WDOA and a inear population projection based on past Census data. Together, these two projections provide a range of possibility for each community and the county as a whole. These numbers can also be averaged for simplicity.

The calculations use the population projections as the starting point. Housing unit projections are then made in 5 -year increments based on population projections and the 2008 ratio of population to total housing units (to account for seasonal population. Total residential acreage based on assessment data (2008) is compared to the total housing units (2008) in each community to determine the average land area per residential unit. The average land area is then multiplied by the housing unit projections to determine the projected residential acreage from 2010 to 2030.

## Table A-LU-1

Residential Acreage Projections 2010-2030, Burnett County

|  |  | Historical Population Data |  |  | Population Projections |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Resiemeral |  | $\underbrace{\text { ate }}_{\substack{\text { Housing } \\ \text { Unis }}}$ |  |  | $\substack{\text { Housing } \\ \text { Uuits }}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\underbrace{}_{\substack{\text { Housing } \\ \text { Uuis }}}$ |  |  | $\underbrace{\text { ate }}_{\substack{\text { Housing } \\ \text { Units }}}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ${ }_{\substack{\text { Cenus } \\ 1909}}^{10}$ | Censo | Estinate | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { Full-Time } \\ \text { Estimate } \\ 2008 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { Seasonal } \\ \text { Estimate } \\ 2008 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r\|} \hline \text { Total } \\ \text { Estimate } \\ 2008 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { Residential } \\ \text { Acres } \\ 2008 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Residential <br> Acres <br> Per Unit | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { Full-Time } \\ \text { Projection } \\ 2010 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Seasonal } \\ \text { Projection } \\ 2010 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { Full-Time } \\ \text { Projection } \\ 2015 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Seasonal } \\ \text { Projection } \\ 2015 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { Full-Time } \\ \text { Projection } \\ 2020 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Seasonal } \\ \text { Projection } \\ 2020 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { Full-Time } \\ \text { Projection } \\ 2025 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { Full-Time } \\ \text { Projection } \\ 2030 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { Seasonal } \\ \text { Projection } \\ 2030 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| T. Andesom |  |  |  | ${ }_{402}^{40}$ | ${ }_{413}^{423}$ | ${ }_{41}^{44}$ | ${ }_{468}^{468}$ | ${ }_{496}^{477}$ | ${ }^{485}$ | ${ }_{166}^{166}$ | ${ }_{120}^{120}$ | ${ }_{266}^{286}$ | ${ }_{1}^{1,31}$ | ${ }_{4} 3$ | ${ }_{171}^{175}$ | ${ }_{123}^{126}$ | ${ }_{29}^{39}$ | ${ }_{182}^{183}$ | ${ }_{131}^{132}$ | ${ }_{315}^{316}$ | ${ }_{193}^{191}$ | ${ }_{139}^{138}$ | ${ }_{333}^{323}$ | ${ }_{205}^{197}$ | ${ }_{148}^{142}$ | ${ }_{352}^{33}$ | ${ }_{216}^{201}$ | ${ }_{\substack{145 \\ 156}}$ | ${ }_{37}^{36}$ | $\underset{37}{257}$ | 20.9 |
| ${ }^{\text {T. Domeies }}$ |  |  |  | ${ }_{713}^{713}$ | ${ }_{723}^{770}$ | ${ }_{\substack{722 \\ 746}}$ | ${ }_{7}^{775}$ | ${ }_{794}^{741}$ | cis |  | ${ }_{\substack{159 \\ 159}}$ | ${ }_{459}^{459}$ | 1,381 | ${ }^{3} .0$ | ${ }_{304}^{297}$ | ${ }_{162}^{158}$ | ${ }_{465}^{455}$ | $\underset{\substack{303 \\ 314}}{ }$ | ${ }_{1}^{161}$ | ${ }_{485}^{465}$ | ${ }_{324}^{309}$ | ${ }_{172}^{164}$ | ${ }_{436}^{473}$ | ${ }_{34}^{311}$ | ${ }_{178}^{166}$ | ${ }_{517}^{477}$ | ${ }_{34}^{311}$ | ${ }_{1}^{165} 1$ | ${ }_{56}^{476}$ | ¢ | 3.0 |
| T. Devey |  | ${ }^{482}$ |  | ${ }_{605}^{605}$ | ${ }_{615}^{617}$ | ${ }_{6}^{637}$ | ${ }_{664}^{654}$ | ${ }_{688}^{665}$ | ${ }_{7}^{669}$ | ${ }_{224}^{224}$ | $\xrightarrow{101} 101$ | ${ }_{325}^{325}$ | 676 | 2.1 | ${ }_{228}^{229}$ | ${ }_{102}^{103}$ | ${ }_{330}^{331}$ | ${ }_{237}^{238}$ | ${ }_{\text {l106 }}^{106}$ | ${ }_{3,5}^{32}$ | ${ }_{246}^{242}$ | ${ }_{111}^{109}$ | ${ }_{351}^{350}$ | ${ }_{25}^{246}$ | ${ }_{115}^{111}$ | 350 | ${ }_{264}^{278}$ | ${ }_{111}^{111}$ | $\underset{385}{359}$ | ${ }_{120}^{12}$ | ${ }_{10,58}^{10.68}$ |
| ${ }_{\text {T. Jackon }}$ |  |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{880 \\ 880}}$ | ${ }^{899}$ | ${ }_{995}^{962}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {len }}^{1.1083}$ | $\underbrace{\substack{1,24 \\ 1,24}}$ | ${ }_{391}^{391}$ | ${ }_{771}^{771}$ | $\substack{1,1,6 c^{1}, 161}$ | 2,115 | ${ }^{1.8}$ | $\substack{408 \\ 408}_{40}$ | ${ }_{805}^{797}$ |  | $\underbrace{}_{\substack{366 \\ 368}}$ |  | ${ }_{\substack{1,095 \\ 1,05}}^{1,29}$ | ${ }_{496}^{49}$ | $\substack{921 \\ 978}_{\text {92, }}$ | (1,388 | ${ }_{\substack{49 \\ 590}}^{40}$ | (1004 | (1, | $\underbrace{}_{\substack{511 \\ 584}}$ | ${ }_{\substack{1,007 \\ 1,150}}^{\substack{19}}$ | (1, | cion | ${ }^{30.785}$ |
| T. Oadand |  | ${ }^{480}$ |  | ${ }_{895}^{895}$ | ${ }_{926}^{945}$ | ${ }_{\substack{1,021 \\ 1,003}}$ | $\xrightarrow{\text { li,092 }} 1$ | ${ }_{\text {l }}^{1,150}$ | $\underbrace{1,129}_{1,1,23}$ | ${ }_{434}^{434}$ | ${ }_{767}^{767}$ | $\left.\begin{aligned} & 1,201 \\ & 1,201 \end{aligned} \right\rvert\,$ | 3,711 | ${ }^{3} 1$ | ${ }_{49}^{459}$ | ${ }_{793}^{899}$ | (1,28 | ${ }_{456}^{464}$ | $\substack{819 \\ 804}_{\substack{\text { g }}}$ | $\underbrace{1,2,88}_{1}$ | ${ }_{524}^{530}$ | ${ }_{925}^{935}$ | c, | ${ }_{\substack{551 \\ 561}}^{5}$ | ${ }_{990}^{995}$ | 1,593 | $\underset{\substack{50 \\ 599}}{\substack{\text { che }}}$ | ${ }_{\substack{1,023 \\ i, 066}}^{\substack{\text { a }}}$ | ${ }_{\text {l }}^{\substack{1,605 \\ 1,65}}$ | ${ }_{\text {l }}^{1,200}$ | ${ }_{\substack{3 \\ 3788 \\ \hline 8.8 \\ \hline}}$ |
| T. Snan Late |  | 439 |  | ${ }_{560}^{56}$ | ${ }_{501}^{595}$ | ¢ ${ }_{604}^{604}$ | ${ }_{\text {ck }}^{\substack{62}}$ | (631 | (188 | ${ }_{216}^{216}$ | ${ }_{238}^{238}$ | $\underset{\substack{454 \\ 454}}{\substack{\text { cis }}}$ | 1.914 | 4.2 | ${ }_{22}^{223}$ | ${ }_{24}^{245}$ | ${ }_{465}^{465}$ | - 293 | ${ }_{\substack{328 \\ 328}}^{3}$ | ${ }_{\substack{615 \\ 627}}$ | ${ }_{248}^{237}$ | ${ }_{272}^{260}$ | ${ }_{520}^{492}$ | ${ }_{261}^{241}$ | ${ }_{287}^{265}$ | ${ }_{\substack{506 \\ 548}}$ | ${ }_{274}^{22}$ | ${ }_{\substack{266 \\ 301}}$ | ${ }_{\substack{500 \\ 555}}$ | ${ }_{510}^{226}$ | ${ }_{26,6}^{11,8}$ |
| T. Sien |  | 910 |  | ${ }_{920}^{920}$ | ${ }_{\text {988 }}^{989}$ | ${ }_{\text {¢888 }}^{\text {988 }}$ | ${ }_{\substack{874 \\ 1.037}}$ | $\underbrace{\text { a }}_{\substack{\text { 860 } \\ 1.066}}$ | ${ }_{\substack{\text { a } \\ 1.138}}$ | ${ }_{\substack{398 \\ 398}}$ | ${ }_{357}^{357}$ | ${ }_{755}^{755}$ | 23.34 | ${ }_{3}$. | ${ }_{\substack{384 \\ 407}}$ | ${ }_{365}^{34}$ | $\xrightarrow[729]{771}$ | ${ }_{48}^{337}$ | ${ }_{\substack{302 \\ 384}}$ | ${ }_{811}^{631}$ | ${ }_{49}^{378}$ | ${ }_{403}^{339}$ | (181 | ${ }_{70}^{372}$ | ${ }_{421}^{334}$ | 706 | ${ }_{49}^{362}$ | ${ }_{4}^{325}$ | ${ }_{\substack{683 \\ 93 \\ \hline 1}}$ | ${ }_{546}^{21}$ | ${ }_{23,3}^{-9.0}$ |
| T. Trate Late |  |  |  | 970 | ${ }_{\substack{998 \\ 989}}^{98}$ | ${ }_{\substack{971 \\ 1,025}}$ |  | (1,199 | - | ${ }_{411}^{411}$ | - 291 | $\xrightarrow{702}$ | ${ }_{1}^{1,775}$ | 27 | ${ }_{418}^{40}$ | ${ }_{296}^{298}$ | ${ }_{713}^{686}$ | ${ }_{434}^{411}$ | - | $\underset{748}{793}$ | ${ }_{451}^{419}$ | ${ }_{319}^{297}$ | $\xrightarrow{770}$ | ${ }_{4}^{423}$ | ${ }_{\substack{300 \\ 331}}$ | $\xrightarrow{798}$ | ${ }_{484}^{423}$ | (300 | cor | ${ }_{\substack{56 \\ 323 \\ \hline}}$ | ${ }^{12.75}$ |
| T. Unon |  | ${ }^{221}$ | ${ }^{35}$ | ${ }_{36}^{34}$ | ${ }_{\substack{361 \\ 356}}$ | ${ }_{\substack{377 \\ 383}}$ | ${ }_{3}^{392}$ | ${ }_{4}^{402}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4061 \\ & 461 \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{169}^{169}$ | ${ }_{248}^{248}$ | ${ }_{417}^{417}$ | 2,000 | ${ }^{4.8}$ | ${ }_{174}^{176}$ | $\underset{255}{258}$ | ${ }_{425}^{43}$ | ${ }_{187}^{189}$ | ${ }_{274}^{270}$ | ${ }_{456}^{456}$ | ${ }_{199}^{191}$ | 281 <br> 283 | ${ }_{492}^{472}$ | ${ }_{212}^{196}$ | ${ }_{311}^{288}$ | ${ }_{4}^{484} 5$ | ${ }_{225}^{199}$ | $\begin{gathered} 292 \\ 330 \end{gathered}$ | ${ }_{595}^{495}$ | $\underbrace{}_{\substack{358 \\ 668}}$ | cine |
| T. Webb Late |  | 200 |  | ${ }_{421}^{421}$ | ${ }_{487}^{488}$ | 485 | $\underset{\substack{518 \\ 514}}{ }$ | 545 | ( 56 | ${ }_{217}^{217}$ | ${ }_{635}^{635}$ | ${ }_{\text {a }}^{82}$ | 2.95 | ${ }_{3} 5$ | ${ }_{225}^{221}$ | ${ }_{658}^{675}$ |  | ${ }_{245}^{250}$ | ${ }_{717}^{731}$ | ¢ | ${ }_{265}^{267}$ | ${ }_{776}^{771}$ | (1,048 | $\underset{\substack{281 \\ 285}}{ }$ | ${ }_{884}^{822}$ | (1, | ${ }_{305}^{292}$ | $\underbrace{}_{\substack{\text { gis } \\ \text { g3 }}}$ |  | ${ }_{\substack{1,032 \\ 1,219}}^{\substack{19}}$ | ${ }^{34.8}$ |
| T. Wood River |  | ${ }^{948}$ |  | $\xrightarrow[\substack{1,03 \\ 1,02}]{1}$ | ${ }_{\substack{1,966 \\ 1,040}}^{1}$ | $\underbrace{\text { lit }}_{\substack{1,066 \\ 1.061}}$ |  | $\xrightarrow{\substack{1,91 \\ 1,1,02}}$ | ${ }_{\text {l }}^{1,1,128}$ | ${ }_{397}^{397}$ | ${ }_{\substack{183 \\ 183}}$ | ${ }_{57}^{57}$ | ${ }_{1}^{1,068}$ | 2.4 | ${ }_{400}^{402}$ | ${ }_{184}^{195}$ | ${ }_{\substack{58 \\ 584}}^{50}$ | ${ }_{408}^{40}$ | ${ }_{\substack{189 \\ 188}}$ | ${ }_{596}^{599}$ | ${ }_{416}^{417}$ | ${ }_{192}^{192}$ | ${ }_{609}^{609}$ | ${ }_{424}^{420}$ | ${ }_{195}^{193}$ | ${ }_{619}^{613}$ | ${ }_{43}^{418}$ | ${ }_{199}^{192}$ | ${ }_{630}^{660}$ | ${ }_{123}^{75}$ |  |
| V.Gransturg |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {l }}^{1,4,600}$ | ${ }_{\substack{1,463 \\ 1,488}}^{\text {a }}$ | ${ }_{\substack{1,504 \\ 1,588}}$ | $\underset{\substack{1,544 \\ 1,627}}{ }$ | $\underbrace{}_{\substack{1.567 \\ 1.697}}$ | ${ }^{1 ., 767}$ | ${ }_{629}^{629}$ | ${ }_{28}^{28}$ | $\underset{\substack{65 \\ 657}}{65}$ | 440 | 0.7 | ${ }_{641}^{631}$ | ${ }_{28}^{28}$ | ${ }_{670}^{69}$ | ${ }_{6}^{648}$ | ${ }_{30}^{29}$ | 701 | ${ }_{701}^{666}$ | ${ }_{31}^{29}$ | ${ }_{735}^{695}$ | ${ }_{\substack{675 \\ 732}}$ | ${ }_{32}^{30}$ | $\xrightarrow[\substack{795 \\ 764}]{ }$ | ${ }_{762}^{67}$ | $\begin{array}{r}30 \\ 34 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | ${ }_{795}^{799}$ | 35 ${ }_{92}^{35}$ |  |
| v.Webser | Census WDOA Linear |  |  | ${ }_{685}^{685}$ | ${ }_{\substack{682 \\ 695}}$ | ${ }_{791}^{691}$ | ${ }_{7}^{69}$ | ${ }_{\substack{69 \\ 767}}$ | $\xrightarrow{\substack{69 \\ 99}}$ | ${ }_{317}^{317}$ | ${ }_{26}^{26}$ | $\underset{\substack{343 \\ 34}}{ }$ | 24 | 0.7 | ${ }_{\substack{316 \\ 322}}$ | ${ }_{27}^{26}$ | ${ }_{3}^{34} 8$ | ${ }_{\substack{320 \\ 33}}$ | ${ }_{28}^{26}$ | ${ }_{3}^{366}$ | ${ }_{34}^{324}$ | ${ }_{28}^{27}$ | ${ }_{32}^{350}$ | ${ }_{35}^{324}$ | ${ }_{29}^{27}$ | ${ }_{\substack{350 \\ 384}}$ | $\substack{320 \\ 366}_{\substack{20}}$ | ${ }_{30}^{27}$ | ${ }_{36}^{34}$ | ${ }_{38}^{28}$ |  |
| Bumet Cominy | Census |  |  |  |  | $\underbrace{17,754}_{1} 1$ | $\substack{18,39 \\ 1,1,164}$ | ${ }_{\text {l }}^{18} \mathbf{1 8 , 2 7}$ |  | $\underbrace{}_{\substack{7,206 \\ 7.206}}$ | $\substack{6.505 \\ 6.505}_{\text {c, }}$ | con | 12,520 | ${ }_{3.1}$ | ${ }_{\substack{7,388 \\ i, 3 / 6}}$ | $\underbrace{\text { c. }}_{\substack{6.658 \\ 6.65}}$ |  |  | $\underbrace{\text { c, }}_{\substack{6,978 \\ 7,04}}$ |  | ${ }_{\substack{7,8,25 \\ 8,25}}^{\text {a }}$ | ${ }_{\substack{7,104 \\ i, 24}}^{\substack{\text { a }}}$ |  | $\underbrace{\text { a }}_{\substack{8,0,67 \\ 8.69}}$ | ${ }_{\text {l }}^{\substack{7,2,55 \\ 7,07}}$ |  | (i.119 | ${ }_{\substack{7,199 \\ 8.19}}^{\text {¢ }}$ | (15,48) | (1,366 |  |
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[^0]:    Source: Burnett County Land Use Plan, 1998 and Wisconsin Department of Revenue Statement of Assessments, 2007

