



Dane County Drainage Board:

Paul Maly, Chairman • 5516 County Road N, Sun Prairie, WI 53590 • spdrainage@gmail.com

Nick Brattlie • 4231 Bannon Road, Marshall WI 53559 • nickdanedrainage@gmail.com

Bill Ringelstetter, Secretary • 2622 County Road V, Sun Prairie WI 53590 • Bill@ringelstetter.net

Kevin Trost, Atty. • 30 W Mifflin St, Suite 1001, Madison WI 53703 • 608-234-8054

Date: March 9, 2026

Location: Bristol Town Hall

The meeting was called to order at 4:01 pm by Chairman, Paul Maly, with all board members present.

The October 8, 2025 minutes meetings were approved with a change of Attn. Trost spelling error.

The February 27, 2025 business meeting was approved as written.

This first item of business public hearing and potential action on report on the Reassessment of Benefits for District #27. SIGMA started by explaining their report.

After the report, a property owner questioned why they are part of District #27 when their residential neighbor is not part of the district.

Next comment was made on how inequitable the commercial/manufacturing properties/parcels are being assessed of benefits.

There were a few property owners that were in attendance that wanted to get the board's commitment and plan for an updated benefits of assessment for future assessments.

A question came up regarding the Reassessment of Benefits Report and the five parcels that were not part of the database, but part of the interactive map.

It was brought to our attention that a meeting is planned for next week about expanding the Dane County Airport. Attorney Trost will reach out to Dane County and City Madison.

The last item of the public hearing was the reading of an objection of the Reassessment of Benefits. Only the February 26th, 2026 objection was read from Bill and Jill Calkins. There was other email correspondence from the Calkins. They will be included in the minutes.

Ringelstetter moved to accept the Reassessment of Benefits, 2nd by Brattlie motion carried.

Ringelstetter moved to reaffirm the past assessment of District #27, 2nd by Brattlie, motion carried.

Last item of business was public comment.

It was mentioned to have some business meetings with commercial properties that are in the district on a new way for Assessment of Benefits.

Ringelstetter moved to adjourn at 5:28 pm

Written Objection – March 9, 2026 Reassessment (Drainage District 27)

From Jill Calkins <jillcalkins0625@gmail.com>

Date Fri 2/13/2026 7:08 AM

To Paul Maly <spdrainage@gmail.com>; Bill Ringelstetter <bill@ringelstetter.net>; Nick Brattlie <nickdanedrainage@gmail.com>; Kevin D. Trost <ktrost@trostllc.com>

Cc Bill Calkins <calkinsc3@gmail.com>; Carlos Pabellon <pabellon.carlos@danecounty.gov>; adam.gallagher@countyofdane.com <adam.gallagher@countyofdane.com>; countyclerk@countyofdane.com <countyclerk@countyofdane.com>

Members of the Board,

Re: Parcel 0810-211-0917-0 (4102 Westerfield Lane)

Pursuant to the March 9, 2026 notice, this correspondence constitutes a written objection to the extent the Board intends to reconsider or reaffirm a prior assessment based upon the reassessment report dated December 31, 2025, which was provided after that date.

The original assessment was issued, funds were collected, and work was performed prior to preparation of the reassessment report. A subsequently prepared report cannot retroactively confer statutory authority or cure procedural defects existing at the time the assessment was imposed.

Under Wisconsin Statutes Chapter 88, assessments must be grounded in a lawful determination of benefit. A post-dated reassessment cannot supply the prerequisite benefit determination required at the time an assessment is levied.

I further object to reliance upon the reassessment report absent documentation demonstrating lawful authorization, engagement, and funding of the engineer.

In addition, I object to the reassessment insofar as the report fails to demonstrate, through parcel-specific findings, a specific, documented, and measurable drainage benefit to my parcel. Demonstrated benefit to assessed lands is a statutory prerequisite to any lawful assessment or expenditure under Chapter 88.

Further, in light of Resolution No. 36,166 (October 2, 1980), which authorized petition pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 88.83(4) to transfer jurisdiction of the portion of District 27 lying within the City of Madison, I request clarification as to whether a court order effectuating such transfer was entered and, if so, the jurisdictional basis upon which the Board asserts authority to reassess parcels located within city limits.

All objections to jurisdiction, legality, sufficiency of the report, procedural compliance, and the equity of any assessment are expressly preserved.

This correspondence is submitted to ensure the record reflects that the underlying assessment, benefit determinations, and jurisdictional basis remain formally contested.

Please include this correspondence in the official record of the March 9, 2026 reassessment proceeding and retain it in the District's correspondence file associated with this matter.

Jill Calkins
Bill Calkins

Re: Written Objection – March 9, 2026 Reassessment (Drainage District 27)

From Jill Calkins <jillcalkins0625@gmail.com>

Date Sat 2/14/2026 12:36 PM

To Paul Maly <spdrainage@gmail.com>; Bill Ringelstetter <bill@ringelstetter.net>; Nick Brattlie <nickdanedrainage@gmail.com>; Kevin D. Trost <ktrost@trostllc.com>

Cc Bill Calkins <calkinsc3@gmail.com>; Carlos Pabellon <Pabellon.Carlos@danecounty.gov>; adam.gallagher@countyofdane.com <adam.gallagher@countyofdane.com>; countyclerk@countyofdane.com <countyclerk@countyofdane.com>

Members of the Board,

This is a brief follow-up to my prior written objection submitted in advance of the March 9, 2026 proceeding, solely to ensure clarity of the record.

For clarity of the record, please indicate the specific Board action and statutory authority the Board contends would authorize any disbursement of District funds related to the work at issue, including the form of authorization that would appear in the Board's official record (e.g., an allowed claim reflected in the minutes, a formal order, or other written authorization supporting payment).

A reassessment report, standing alone, is not a payment instrument and does not itself constitute authorization for disbursement or ratification of prior expenditures.

For the avoidance of doubt, this objection extends to any reliance on the December 31, 2025 reassessment report as a basis for future disbursements absent separate lawful authorization under Chapter 88.

This clarification is provided to ensure the record reflects that any disbursement of district funds must rest upon independent lawful authorization reflected in the Board's official record, and that reliance on the reassessment report as a basis for disbursement remains expressly contested.

Please include this clarification in the official record of the March 9 proceeding and the District's correspondence file.

Jill Calkins
Bill Calkins

> On Feb 13, 2026, at 7:08 AM, Jill Calkins <jillcalkins0625@gmail.com> wrote:

>

> Members of the Board,

>

> Re: Parcel 0810-211-0917-0 (4102 Westerfield Lane)

>

> Pursuant to the March 9, 2026 notice, this correspondence constitutes a written objection to the extent

Written Objections – Drainage District No. 27 (March 9 Hearing)

From Jill Calkins <jillcalkins0625@gmail.com>

Date Sat 3/7/2026 11:35 AM

To Paul Maly <spdrainage@gmail.com>; Bill Ringelstetter <bill@ringelstetter.net>; Nick Brattlie <nickdanedrainage@gmail.com>

Cc Kevin D. Trost <ktrost@trostllc.com>; adam.gallagher@countyofdane.com <adam.gallagher@countyofdane.com>; Carlos Pabellon <pabellon.carlos@danecounty.gov>

Members of the Board,

For clarity of the administrative record in advance of the March 9 hearing, please treat my prior correspondence regarding Drainage District No. 27 as written objections to the jurisdiction of the Board and to the sufficiency and legality of the report and assessment referenced in the meeting notice.

Those objections include, but are not limited to, questions concerning the statutory authority for the assessment, the underlying project cost and scope, and the authorization basis for payments and reimbursements associated with the District 27 work.

This message is submitted solely to ensure that those objections are clearly reflected in the written record prior to the hearing referenced in the Board's notice.

Sincerely,

Jill Calkins



Outlook

Supplemental Written Objection – District 27 Reassessment Timeline (March 9 Hearing)

From Jill Calkins <jillcalkins0625@gmail.com>

Date Sun 3/8/2026 10:35 AM

To Kevin D. Trost <ktrost@trostllc.com>; Paul Maly <spdrainage@gmail.com>; Bill Ringelstetter <bill@ringelstetter.net>; Nick Brattlie <nickdanedrainage@gmail.com>

Cc adam.gallagher@countyofdane.com <adam.gallagher@countyofdane.com>; Carlos Pabellon <pabellon.carlos@danecounty.gov>

Members of the Board,

This correspondence is submitted as a supplemental written objection in advance of the March 9, 2026 public hearing concerning the Reassessment of Benefits report for Dane County Farm Drainage District No. 27. It is intended to clarify the administrative record in light of the Board's own published meeting minutes.

Based on publicly available Board records and the posted reassessment report, the sequence of events for District 27 is reflected as follows:

District 27 Timeline Based on Board Records

1. October 8, 2024 – The Board voted to assess District 27 in the amount of \$40,000 for maintenance and repair work.
2. Early 2025 – Work associated with the district was performed.
3. March 27, 2025 Board Minutes – The minutes state that “work has been completed and is ongoing” in District 27.
4. December 31, 2025 – The Sigma Group prepared the “Reassessment of Benefits” report currently posted on the District website.
5. March 9, 2026 – The Board has scheduled a public hearing to consider the Reassessment of Benefits report and to reconsider or reaffirm the past assessment.

Given this sequence reflected in the Board's own records, the work referenced in the March 27, 2025 minutes predates the preparation of the Reassessment of Benefits report dated December 31, 2025.

This sequence raises a question regarding whether the reassessment report was prepared after the work referenced in the Board's minutes rather than serving as the engineering basis for the original assessment.

Accordingly, I respectfully request clarification as to how a reassessment report prepared on December 31, 2025 is being relied upon to support or justify work that the Board's own minutes indicate had already been completed or was ongoing earlier in 2025.

This question is submitted as an objection concerning the sufficiency and legality of the reassessment report and the assessment referenced in the public hearing notice.

This supplemental objection is intended to accompany and reinforce my prior written objections dated February 13, 2026 and subsequent correspondence already submitted for inclusion in the administrative record.

Please include this correspondence in the official record of the March 9, 2026 proceeding and retain it within the District's correspondence file associated with this matter.

Respectfully,

Jill Calkins

Bill Calkins



Nick Brattlie <nickdanedrainage@gmail.com>

Written Objection / Comment for Record – District 27 Reassessment of Benefits Hearing (March 9, 2026)

1 message

Jill Calkins <jillcalkins0625@gmail.com>

Mon, Mar 9, 2026 at 2:22 PM

To: Paul Maly <spdrenage@gmail.com>, Bill Ringelstetter <bill@ringelstetter.net>, Nick Brattlie <nickdanedrainage@gmail.com>, "Kevin D. Trost" <ktrost@trostllc.com>

Cc: Carlos Pabellon <pabellon.carlos@danecounty.gov>, adam.gallagher@countyofdane.com

Members of the Board,

I am submitting the following written objection/comment regarding the "Reassessment of Benefits" report for Dane County Farm Drainage District No. 27 prepared by Sigma Group and dated December 31, 2025. Please include this comment in the official record for the March 9, 2026 hearing.

While reviewing the report, I noticed several statements concerning the parcel inventory and assessment methodology that appear relevant to the reassessment.

The report notes that when the historic drainage district maps were compared with current parcel mapping, discrepancies were identified regarding parcel boundaries and parcel identification within the district. The report also indicates that certain parcels were not assigned an assessment and that some lands outside the district may receive benefit from the drainage system but were not assessed.

Because Chapter 88 assessments are intended to be based on benefit to the land being assessed, I would appreciate clarification regarding how these parcel discrepancies and exclusions were addressed in preparing the reassessment roll.

I respectfully request that this written objection/comment be included in the official record for the District 27 reassessment hearing.

Sincerely,

Jill Calkins
4m

March 8, 2026

District #27 Meeting

Name:

Chuck Bollig

District #8

Tom Shannon

District 27

Heather Shannon

u u

Dave + Beckii Martin

D 27

Stephen McKenzie

PRACHI MEHENDALE

N/A

Judy Underwood

#27

Chery Her

27