


**OBJECTIONS TO CURRENT REPORT TO THE DODGE COUNTY
DRAINAGE BOARD REGARDING THE CREATION OF AND ASSESSMENT
OF PROPERTIES IN DRAINAGE DISTRICT NO. 88
IN DODGE COUNTY, WISCONSIN**


Ryan Kittell, as an officer of Kit-Tell, Inc., and agent for Lorraine Kittell, and Randy Woock make the following objections:

1. Landowner's property is being taken without adequate compensation or benefit from the Drainage District.
2. It is inequitable to divide benefits in the District by soil type, and this is evidenced from aerial maps in the report.
3. The proposed report and assessment treats landowners' lands differently with some landowners' soil types receiving an allocated benefit and some not.
4. The Drainage District's outlet at the Giese property is not adequate or defensible.
5. The proposal to bury a non-perforated pipe on the "north" leg of the District, instead of a grass waterway with tile underneath, is not in compliance with the agreement with Giese.
6. The culvert on Butternut Road is approximately one-half the size of what the engineer, Daniel Prunuske, indicates is needed for the District and effectively throttles the water back on to the Kittell property. The Butternut Road culvert should be lowered.
7. A grass waterway that runs from the east side of Butternut Road to the Marion Barsch drainage ditch lacks sufficient depth to place a 15 inch tile from the drainage ditch upstream to Butternut Road. This would necessitate the lowering of Marion Barsch's ditch, the widening of the waterway, and possibly both.
8. The drainage ditch between the Woock and Ganske properties to the east of Marion Barsch's land is too shallow to allow any of the property owners to tile their properties. It is flat and does not have an adequate pitch to allow tiling.
9. Because this ditch is shallow, it will fill up faster.
10. In order to be consistent, there should be changes to the grass waterway on the DCAPCI property.
11. It has taken nine months to determine the benefits to the property owners, which should have been determined in 30 days, leaving only one year to get the work done pursuant to the terms of the original Giese agreement.
12. Is the engineer bonded and/or insured to correct these defects and stand behind the work needed to complete the Drainage District?

SUMMARY: We feel that to correct all of these objections would make the project cost prohibitive and the district should be dissolved.

DATED: October 25, 2012.



Ryan Kittell


Randy Woock