

**FACTOR SHEETS – AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS**

The Environmental Matrix of the Basic Sheets lists specific environmental factors or issues that were investigated for this Environmental Impact Statement. There are individual Factor Sheets that correspond with specific environmental factors identified on the Matrix. The Factor Sheets are used to provide detailed information on environmental factors and issues that may be substantial and that require a more in-depth discussion than is possible to provide in the comments portion of the Evaluation Matrix on page 61.

If there is no substantial impact to a specific environmental factor, a Factor Sheet was not completed, rather described in the comment section of the Environmental Matrix.

Calculations of the potential impacts were based on a study corridor width of 400 feet for the 4-lane alternatives, 200 feet for Alternative 3, which would remain a two-lane highway and the proposed right-of-way width on existing US 14 for portions of Alternative 2b that are within the urban area of Fort Atkinson. This is so that each alternative is compared fairly and to determine the maximum impacts that could occur. It is highly likely that for impacted areas, minimization would actually occur as roadway design is refined on a selected alternative.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**Factor Sheets – Affected Environment and Environmental Conditions ..... 101**

- A. Socio-economic Factors ..... 103
  - 1. General Economics Impact Evaluation Factor Sheet ..... 103
  - 2. Community or Residential Impact Evaluation Factor Sheet ..... 107
  - 3. Economic Development and Business Impact Evaluation Factor Sheet ..... 121
  - 4. Agricultural Impact Evaluation Factor Sheet ..... 129
  - 5. Environmental Justice Evaluation Factor Sheet ..... 139
- B. Natural Environment Factors ..... 145
  - 1. Wetlands Impact Evaluation Factor Sheet ..... 145
  - 2. Streams and Floodplains Impact Evaluation Factor Sheet ..... 155
  - 3. Upland Habitat Impact Evaluation Factor Sheet ..... 161
- C. Physical Environment Factors ..... 165
  - 1. Air Quality Impact Evaluation Factor Sheet ..... 165
  - 2. Construction Stage Sound Quality Impact Evaluation Factor Sheet ..... 167
  - 3. Traffic Noise Impact Evaluation Factor Sheet ..... 169
  - 4. Hazardous Substances or Underground Storage Tanks (UST's) Factor Sheet ..... 177
  - 5. Energy Requirements ..... 179
- D. Cultural Environment Factors ..... 181
  - 1. Historic Structures/Buildings Impact Evaluation Factor Sheet ..... 181
  - 2. Archaeological Sites Impact Evaluation Factor Sheet ..... 193
  - 3. Aesthetics Factor Sheet ..... 197

## A. SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS

### 1. General Economics Impact Evaluation Factor Sheet

**1) Describe, briefly, the existing economic characteristics of the area around the project. This could include type(s) of farming, retail or wholesale businesses, manufacturing, tourism, or other elements contributing to the area's economy and potentially affected by the project.**

Economic data show that the study area has a healthy and growing economy, which will ultimately translate into increased demands on the transportation system. Elements contributing to the area's economy are farming in the rural areas and retail, wholesale and manufacturing businesses existing primarily within the City of Fort Atkinson. Tourism also contributes to the area's economy.

Economic data are presented in Purpose and Need on page 20.

**2) Discuss the economic advantages and disadvantages of the proposed action. Indicate how the project would affect the characteristics described in item 1 above.**

#### No Action and Alternative 1a

##### Advantages

Traffic would continue to flow through the downtown, giving exposure to downtown businesses.

The City of Fort Atkinson would continue to receive state aids for maintenance of a state trunk highway.

The lack of new construction cost to the State compares favorably against the build alternatives.

For Alternative 1a, improved geometrics would improve safety and so reduce the potential for crashes. A reduction in crashes would reduce associated economic impacts due to loss of life, injuries and property damage.

##### Disadvantages

Large semi-trucks and non-local traffic would continue to use Main Street. The local Chamber of Commerce has indicated that this type of traffic is not pedestrian friendly and may discourage shoppers from coming downtown.

Main Street Parking would be maintained as is. On-street parking would continue to be narrow at a typical 7 to 8 feet wide.

The City would not have the planned highway access to their business park on the south side of Fort Atkinson as they have planned.

As a Corridors 2020 connector highway and as part of the National Highway System, the roadway does not currently serve regional traffic effectively, including freight traffic that carries goods to markets. Freight haulers must slow down and negotiate their way through the City. This inefficiency has a negative impact on the general economics of the state since goods cannot be transported as easily as they can on a route with more constant speeds and fewer operational conflicts created in downtown Fort Atkinson.

#### Alternative 2b

##### Advantages

Traffic would continue to flow through the downtown, giving exposure to downtown businesses.

Main Street Parking could be preserved and automobile access to that parking could be improved. There is room under this alternative to allow parking lanes wider than the existing 7 to 8 feet.

The estimated project cost at \$29.8 million would be lower than the estimated project cost of a bypass on new alignment which ranges from \$45.1 to \$50.5 million.

Improved geometrics would improve safety and so reduce the potential for crashes. A reduction in crashes would reduce associated economic impacts due to loss of life, injuries and property damage.

**Disadvantages**

Large semi trucks and non-local traffic would continue to use Main Street. The local Chamber of Commerce has indicated that this type of traffic is not pedestrian friendly and may discourage shoppers from coming downtown.

Better traffic flow may increase speeding, which would impair the customer friendly atmosphere that the city seeks.

The one-way pair makes it difficult to travel to and from a specific location without having to drive into the residential neighborhoods. This is complicated by the presence of the Rock River which cuts across at a diagonal. This would create conflicts with residential neighborhoods by introducing additional detouring traffic. It could also discourage shoppers if it is difficult to get to a parking space at the front door of the establishment they want to visit.

The City would not have the planned highway access to their business park on the south side of Fort Atkinson.

**Alternative 3****Advantages**

The cost to the state is less than building a bypass. This would not eliminate the need to upgrade the existing route because it would continue to be a state highway (WIS 89) and would need improvements if traffic reaches the projected volumes of 10,300 vehicles per day in 2030. The estimated project cost of Alternative 3 is \$23.9 million while the bypass alternatives range from \$45.1 to \$50.5 million.

**Disadvantages**

The traffic assessment indicates that Alternative 3 would be ineffective in terms of providing a direct and well utilized US Highway route. See Table 9 on page 46 and Figure 20 through Figure 24, beginning on page 47, showing the estimated traffic numbers and projections. Traffic would not be diverted from existing US 12 to CTH N as well as with Alternatives 7 and 7a. The traffic mix of regional and local traffic would continue in downtown Fort Atkinson and would potentially affect the City's economy as stated in City of Fort Atkinson Resolution. See Resolutions in Appendix F.

The City would not have the planned highway access to their business park on the south side of Fort Atkinson.

**Alternative 7 and 7a****Advantages**

A bypass could positively impact employment opportunities in the city of Fort Atkinson by opening new areas for commercial or service-sector growth. This opportunity for development can be positive for a community if it is planned growth.

The City's industrial districts in the Robert L. Klement Business Park and along Janesville Avenue would be served by easy-on easy-off access to the US Highway System. This improved access could result in increased development potential and make it an attractive selling point to businesses looking to locate in the City's south side manufacturing district and eventually increase the local tax base. See Figure 9 on page 22 for a map of land uses and Figure 25 on page 98 for a map of the business park.

The Chamber of Commerce cited in a resolution that the Highway 26 bypass enhanced the customer friendly atmosphere of downtown. A reduction in heavy truck traffic and the overall reduction in traffic congestion downtown would likely be beneficial in increasing the desired customer friendly atmosphere. The city of Fort Atkinson states that this could further support the public/private investment in building renovation and river walk development in downtown Fort Atkinson.

Improved regional mobility would provide more efficient movements of goods through the region, reducing fuel consumption and travel times.

Improved geometrics would improve safety and so reduce the potential for crashes. A reduction in crashes would reduce associated economic impacts due to loss of life, injuries and property damage.

**Disadvantages**

A bypass could create new competition in the retail market because additional commercial development could be influenced to locate at the interchanges to take advantage of the drive-by traffic on the bypass. The City's Master Plan indicates a need for additional commercial development to serve projected population increases.

Tax revenues from taxable real property would be lost as the property is transferred from private to public ownership, thereby reducing the Town of Koshkonong tax base.

This route requires the most new construction of all the alternatives, and would remove the greatest acreage of farmland out of production.

A bypass may cause a reduction in property values for those areas that are less accessible such as farm buildings separated from cropped land.

At estimated project costs of \$50.5 million for Alternative 7 and \$45.1 million for Alternative 7a, these are the most expensive alternatives.

Residential property values of some homes could be negatively affected by noise and diminished aesthetics because of the proximity of the bypass to existing homes.

With Alternative 7, 8 farms would be severed and 6 farms would be severed with Alternative 7a. This would cause economic hardships to those individual farmers or corporations.

**3) In general, will the proposed action increase or decrease the potential for economic development in the area influenced by the project.**

**Alternatives 1, 1a and 2b**

In general, these alternatives could affect the potential for economic development in downtown Fort Atkinson as discussed in Question 2, above. The advantages and disadvantages include impacts related to traffic volumes and mix in the downtown business area. These alternatives do not eliminate trucks from the local streets, which would make traffic patterns safer for shopping pedestrians, thereby encouraging economic development downtown. These alternatives would not provide an increase in development potential for the Fort Atkinson business park that the bypass alternatives would because the business park would not have the easy access to a bypass as envisioned by the business park planners.

**Alternative 3**

In general, Alternative 3 would not have an effect on the potential to affect economic development much more than the no build alternative (Alternative 1) because it ineffectively diverts traffic. There are no indications that by simply re-signing the route as US 12, motorists and freight transporters would choose to use it over the existing route.

**Alternatives 7 and 7a**

A WisDOT research project of bypassed communities shows that bypasses in Wisconsin, of cities comparable in size to Fort Atkinson, do not have detrimental effects on economic development.<sup>18</sup> That study found that over the long term, traffic on the old routes are close to or higher than pre-bypass counts, indicating continued economic activity in those communities. Another finding was that little retail flight has occurred in bypassed communities.

According to WisDOT research, other Wisconsin communities that have been bypassed view their bypasses as beneficial overall. Primarily, there is better overall traffic flow and congestion relief. The elimination of trucks and seasonal traffic from local streets made traffic patterns safer and more predictable in the community. Individual users benefit from improved travel times, transportation cost and increased safety. This can translate into economic savings to truckers by reducing their shipping costs. This can further translate into lower product costs and business expansion.<sup>19</sup>

In general, the City of Fort Atkinson could benefit from a bypass because of the improvements it would cause in easing the transportation of goods manufactured in the City's industrial districts. Eliminating truck traffic from the downtown area could make the central business district more attractive to pedestrians and shoppers, both locals and tourists.

<sup>18</sup> *The Economic Impacts of Highway Bypasses on Communities*. Wisconsin Department of Transportation. February 1998.

<sup>19</sup> Glen E. Weisbrod and James Beckwith (1992) *measuring Economic Development Benefits for Highway Decision-making: The Wisconsin Case* [online] Available from <http://www.edrgroup.com/pages/pdf/Wisconsin29.pdf> (accessed September 2004).

Another study suggests that “The wide range of highway bypass studies carried out around the country provide a generally consistent story. They indicate that highway bypasses are seldom either devastating or the savior of a community business district. The locational shift in traffic can cause some existing businesses to turn over or relocate, but net economic impacts on the broader community are usually relatively small (positive or negative). Communities and business districts that have a strong identity as a destination for visitors or for local shoppers (such as Stillwater) are the ones that are most likely to be strengthened due to the reduction in traffic delays through their centers. However, there is a broad perception that adequate signage to the bypassed business center is an important need (and concern) for ensuring its continued success.”<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Dennis Leong, Wisconsin Department of Transportation and Glen Weisbrod, Economic Development Research Group. (July 1999) *Summary of Highway Bypass Studies* [online] Available from <http://www.edrgroup.com/pages/pdf/Town-Bypass-Case-Studies.pdf> (accessed September 2004)

**2. Community or Residential Impact Evaluation Factor Sheet**

1) Give a brief description of the community or neighborhood affected by the proposed action.

**COMMUNITY & NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTERISTICS**

Jefferson and Rock Counties are located in Southeast Wisconsin, between the cities of Milwaukee and Madison. The majority of land is dedicated to agricultural and open space uses. In the study area, the only incorporated city is the City of Fort Atkinson. The area is rich in historic and archaeological resources, as well as natural resources including high quality wetland complexes, forested woodlands and open agricultural cropland and dairy operations. The study area has manufacturing and commercial businesses, primarily within the City of Fort Atkinson. Fort Atkinson is considered a “manufacturing center” in the State’s highway plans.

After Watertown, Fort Atkinson is the second largest municipality in Jefferson County and is considered a “trade center” for the State of Wisconsin. See also the Economic Development and Business Impact Factor Sheet. The City is a typical Midwestern small city with a typical historic development pattern of a central business district surrounded by traditional residential neighborhoods interspersed with churches and schools. Newer development occurs as the city has grown outward, mainly toward the northwest and southwest. Many residential houses have been converted to commercial uses as the central business district pushes out along the US 12 corridor. Industrial development has been directed toward the southwest and west of the city as shown on their Master Plan. Land use designations are indicated on Figure 9 page 22.

The main groups that have expressed interest in the project include the rural residents from the Towns of Koshkonong, Lima and Milton and the urban residents from the City of Fort Atkinson. The Town of Koshkonong sustains both agricultural uses and low density (large lot) residential development. The agricultural uses are mainly family farming operations although there are some large dairy operations within the township, including Pond Dairy, LLC, which would be affected by Alternatives 7 and 7a. Rural residential development has been limited mainly to the extra-territorial area of the City of Fort Atkinson where there are numerous scattered ranchette-type residential uses. The Towns of Milton and Lima in Rock County, where Alternative 3 is located, are primarily agricultural areas, with some scattered rural residential uses, home occupations, hobby farms, and commercial uses. Agricultural uses include large and small dairy operations as well as open cropland.

**DEMOGRAPHICS:**

Table 12 through Table 17 present demographic data from the 2000 US Census and from the Wisconsin Department of Administration’s Demographic Service Center.

The Town of Koshkonong’s population being greater than the Rock County Towns shows that its proximity to an urban area (Fort Atkinson) influences their residential growth. The Town of Lima and Milton are more traditional farming communities that are not yet experiencing growth pressures from the municipalities that lie within them. Koshkonong has its rural areas, but it also has quite a bit of residential land use.

**Table 12: Populations, Households and Families (number)**

Community/neighborhood name	Community population	Households	Families
Fort Atkinson, Wisconsin	11,621	4,760	3,070
Town of Koshkonong, Wisconsin	3,395	1,249	965
Jefferson County, Wisconsin	74,021	28,205	19,894
Town of Milton	2,844	1,061	813
Town of Lima	1,312	472	367
Rock County, Wisconsin	152,307	58,617	40,403

Table 13 shows that the City of Fort Atkinson is aging compared to the rest of the study area. The Towns appear to have the highest number of those in their peak earning years from age 35 to 54.

**Table 13: Populations by Age (percent)**

Community/neighborhood name	0-17	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Fort Atkinson, Wisconsin	24.2	8.6	14.4	16.4	13.5	8.3	14.5
Town of Koshkonong, Wisconsin	25.3	6.5	9.8	18.0	18.1	11.3	11.1
Jefferson County, Wisconsin	25.2	8.5	13.6	16.8	14.1	9.2	12.6
Town of Milton	26.3	7.1	10.5	19.3	18.0	10.1	8.8
Town of Lima	25.9	7.3	11.7	18.1	15.3	10.4	11.2
Rock County, Wisconsin	26.5	8.6	13.5	16.3	13.6	8.8	12.7

Fort Atkinson does not have a large minority population, but it has a higher percentage of minorities than the surrounding townships.

Table 14 shows the census breakdown of minorities in each community.

**Table 14: Populations by Race (number)**

Community/neighborhood name	White Alone	Black Alone	American Indian Alone	Asian Alone	Pacific Islander Alone	Other Race Alone	Two or more races
Fort Atkinson	11,167	40	34	70	1	217	92
Town of Koshkonong	3,324	1	10	6	0	18	36
Jefferson County	71,309	210	249	333	14	1,220	686
Town of Milton	2,789	5	5	9	0	12	24
Town of Lima	1,212	7	3	0	4	60	26
Rock County	138,610	7,048	422	1,191	61	2,691	2,284

As shown in the following table, the median household income in 1999 of the various affected communities compare favorably with the State as a whole with the median income in Fort Atkinson being nearly the same as the State as a whole. The Towns of Lima and Milton had the highest income level in the study area.

**Table 15: Median Household Income in 1999**

Community/neighborhood name	Median Household Income in 1999 (Dollars)
Fort Atkinson	43,807
Town of Koshkonong	60,000
Jefferson County	46,901
Town of Milton	60,151
Town of Lima	48,913
Rock County	45,517
Wisconsin State	43,791

Cars are by far the preferred means of transportation to work as indicated in Table 16 on page 79. This is expected since the area is not metropolitan, where you would expect to see the use of public transportation. There is no city bus service or rail service in Fort Atkinson.

Table 17 on page 79 shows that Fort Atkinson and Koshkonong have the smallest commute, likely due to the close proximity to the major employers within Fort Atkinson. Lima and Milton have longer commutes; they are further removed from an urban area.

**Table 16: Commuting – Means of Transportation to Work for Workers 16 Years and Over**

	Jefferson County	Rock County	Town of Koshkonong	Town of Lima	Town of Milton	City of Fort Atkinson
Total	39,264	75,033	1,826	692	1,544	6,196
Car, truck, or van	35,809	69,953	1,731	616	1,414	5,727
Drove alone	31,679	62,385	1,520	495	1,260	5,092
Carpooled	4,130	7,568	211	121	154	635
Public transportation:	317	558	6	5	5	71
Bus or trolley bus	149	509	0	2	5	23
Streetcar or trolley car	5	0	0	0	0	3
Subway or elevated	0	0	0	0	0	0
Railroad	12	15	0	0	0	0
Ferryboat	0	6	0	0	0	0
Taxicab	151	28	6	3	0	45
Motorcycle	40	26	0	0	0	0
Bicycle	131	135	0	0	0	35
Walked	1,412	2,018	42	18	42	193
Other means	152	300	0	5	7	28
Worked at home	1,403	2,043	47	48	76	142

Source: 2000 US Census

**Table 17: Travel Time to Work by Means of Transportation to Work for Workers 16 Years and Over Who Did Not Work at Home**

	Jefferson County	Rock County	Town of Koshkonong	Town of Lima	Town of Milton	City of Fort Atkinson
Total:	37,861	72,990	1,779	644	1,468	6,054
Less than 30 minutes:	27,561	56,857	1,448	487	1,012	5,034
30 to 44 minutes:	5,779	9,233	136	110	240	533
45 to 59 minutes:	2,712	3,905	69	30	105	290
60 or more minutes:	1,809	2,995	126	17	111	197

Source: 2000 US Census

**2) Identify and discuss the existing modes of transportation and their traffic within the community or neighborhood**

Along US 12, the primary mode of transportation is personal vehicles (cars, motorcycles, small trucks) and commercial freight such as semi-trucks. School buses, taxis, bicycling and walking are other modes of transportation used. There is no mass transit operation in Fort Atkinson. The Jefferson County Glacial River Trail follows alongside WIS 26 west and southwest of Fort Atkinson. The City of Fort Atkinson has scheduled to construct a recreation/commuter bike trail in the City of Fort Atkinson on an abandoned Union Pacific Railroad corridor. This trail would have a connection to the Glacial River Trail.

US 12 traffic volumes in the Fort Atkinson area range from 9,000 vehicles per day (vpd) on Madison Avenue to 15,000 vpd along the Main Street Bridge. Details of the traffic volumes and traffic factors are contained in Table 9 on page 46.

**3) Identify and discuss the probable changes resulting from the proposed action to the modes of transportation and their traffic within the community or neighborhood.**

**Alternative 1 and 1a** Traffic projections show that traffic congestion would continue to increase as indicated in Figure 20 on page 47. Projected traffic volumes along US 12 in the Fort Atkinson area range from 11,500 vehicles per day on Whitewater Ave, south of CTH M to 21,200 vehicles per day along the Robert Street Bridge in the year 2030. Trucks make up between 3 and 9 percent of the average daily traffic. Truck traffic is further affected without the minimum 12 foot lane that is typically required on a long truck route. It results in difficulties in maneuvering and thus a reduction in operational capacity as traffic flow is interrupted while trucks take time to maneuver the turns.

Parallel parking in general results in a reduction in capacity on typical streets, especially during peak traffic times. In areas of high turnover, interruptions in traffic flow on adjacent lanes occur as parkers pull in and out of the parking spaces. This is especially a problem in Fort Atkinson on Main Street as the parking lanes are minimal at 7 to 8 feet in width.

**Alternative 2b** Alternative 2b would affect modes of transportation within the community in that traffic would be redirected as a one-way pair that is separated by three to four blocks, with the Rock River bisecting it generally from east to west. Circulation within the city would be changed as local traffic would need to make more maneuvers to get around downtown and so new traffic would be introduced into the adjacent neighborhoods. Projected traffic volumes along US 12 in the Fort Atkinson area range from 11,600 vehicles per day on Whitewater Ave, south of CTH M to 18,400 vehicles per day along the Robert Street Bridge in the year 2030.

Traffic would be more evenly distributed between Main Street and Robert Street whereas current conditions show a greater number of trips being carried by Robert Street than by Main Street (See Table 9 on page 46).

**Alternative 3** See Figure 22 on page 49, which shows that average daily traffic numbers on CTH N would be minimally different from the No Action alternative (6,200 vs. 7,800 in the year 2030). There would be similar reductions on existing US 12 as shown in the figure.

**Alternatives 7 and 7a** As traffic congestion and traffic mix improves in downtown Fort Atkinson Chamber of Commerce officials are hopeful that the pedestrian and bicycle traffic would have the opportunity to increase as the perception of safety increases. Traffic downtown would decrease as shown in Figure 23 and Figure 24 on pages 50 - 51. These alternatives would introduce a new access controlled freeway into an area that currently does not have substantial amounts of traffic.

**4) Briefly discuss the proposed action's effect(s) on existing and planned land use in the community or neighborhood.**

See Appendix D for a Secondary and Cumulative Impacts Report that details potential changes to land use in the surrounding area.

**Alternative 1, 1a, 2b**

The City has planned and is developing their business park to have access to a future bypass and with these alternatives, their plans would not be realized.

**Alternative 3**

Alternative 3 is expected to have minimal secondary land use impacts. It is an existing route, no new interchanges are proposed and traffic is expected to increase from 6,200 ADT to 7,800 ADT. Existing land use is primarily agricultural and it is anticipated that it would continue to develop as it otherwise would, since the increase in traffic would not be great and since no interchanges are planned as a part of this project. Impact would occur to those residences and businesses adjacent to the highway when the right of way is widened.

**Alternatives 7 and 7a**

Alternative 7 would direct future growth and development to the southwest and as an indirect effect could encourage more rapid development and expansion of the industrial park because of the new access and rerouting of Business 26 through the business park on Commerce Parkway. The lands south of Fort Atkinson are planned for residential and industrial growth as indicated on the land use plans in Figure 9 on page 22. For Alternative 7, the lands converted to right of way would take away from the amount of land available for future residential growth. The local communities have indicated that it would be important to contain development north of any potential bypass to encourage compact and contiguous development. The urban service area extends outside of the boundary created by Alternative 7 and so development would likely jump the boundary created by the Alternative 7 alignment. Alternative 7a extends the boundary further south and so may stimulate residential development farther south. The Town's land use policies and decisions will have a greater impact on how far south land is developed with Alternative 7a. Industrial expansion is planned south of the Alternative 7 boundary and better fits the alignment of Alternative 7a. Both bypass alternatives will impact agricultural land uses by converting agricultural lands, severing farms and acquiring farm buildings. Secondary impacts to land use are discussed in more detail in the Secondary and Cumulative Impacts Report in Appendix D.

**5) Address any changes to emergency services or other public services during and after construction of the proposed project.**

**Alternative 1**

The response time would increase as the traffic and congestion increase. Traffic safety issues would continue to affect all vehicular traffic, including emergency service vehicles.

**Alternative 1a**

It is not expected that aside from slightly improving congestion, that the changes would significantly help a responding emergency vehicle.

**Alternative 2b**

Coordination with emergency services during construction would be minimal since this alternative would consist primarily of repainting lines on the roadways and resigning the route. Construction activities would need to be coordinated with emergency service providers to ensure the maintenance of access.

Response time could increase as emergency service routes would need to change due to the one-way pair and the resulting limited choices in travel routes to any given destination downtown.

**Alternative 3, 7 and 7a**

During construction, WisDOT would coordinate with emergency service providers to ensure access. Access would be maintained to rural properties. Service response time should decrease in some instances due to better traffic flow.

**6) Describe any physical or access changes and their effects to lot frontages, driveways, or sidewalks. This could include effects on side slopes or driveways (steeper or flatter) reduced terraces, tree removal, vision corners, sidewalk removal, etc.**

**Alternative 1**

No physical changes in access are proposed. As congestion increases, ease of entering the highway from driveways would degrade.

**Table 18: Access Changes**

Parcel Number	Site Addresses	Access Changes
<b>Alternative 1a</b>		
226-0514-0411-026 226-0514-0411-025 226-0514-0322-027 226-0514-0322-028 226-0514-0411-028	245 N. Main St. 225 N. Main St. 244 N. Main St. 310 N. Main St. 2 Madison Ave.	Properties at the intersection of Madison Avenue and North Main Street. Potential to implement access management and to possibly reduce driveways.
226-0514-1022-019	1012 Whitewater Ave.	East Rockwell & Whitewater Avenue access management and possibly reduce driveway access.
226-0514-0333-040	923 Whitewater Ave.	Realignment of Bark River Road & Rockwell to form a 4-leg intersection could potentially change access from Whitewater to Bark River Road.
<b>Alternative 2b</b>		
2331-000	N1086 US 12	Remove 2 access points on US 12 (Access provided on Carnes Rd.
1044-001	N1706 US 12	Remove 1 access point
1043-022	N1732 US 12	Consolidate 2 access points into 1
1031-005	N1857 US 12	Consolidate 2 access points into 1
1031-003	N1873 US 12	Consolidate 2 access points into 1
1031-001	N1895 US 12	Consolidate 2 access points into 1
1022-019	1012 Whitewater Ave	Consolidate 2 access points into 1
<b>Alternative 3</b>		
6-11-25 6-11-70 6-11-70.1 6-11-71.A 6-11-71.B 6-11-71.C 6-11-72.1 6-11-72.1A	11529 E CTH N No address (Jones) 11318 E CTH N 11142 E CTH N 11124 E CTH N 11142 E CTH N 11046 E CTH N 11045 E CTH N	2 existing APs– 1 proposed AP Consolidate 4 access points and install frontage road on the south side of CTH N to access all indicated properties with one access point on US 12.
6-11-62	10240 E CTH N	Consolidate 4 access points into 1
6-11-30.1 6-11-30.2 6-11-30.3	9805 E CTH N 9803 E CTH N 9817 E CTH N	Consolidate 3 access points into 1
6-11-65	10918 N CTH KK	Remove access point on CTH N (Access provided on CTH KK).
6-11-38	No address (Lauer)	Consolidate 3 access points into 1
6-11-46.2	8129 E CTH N	Remove 2 access points on US 12 (Access provided on Vickerman Road
6-11-48.2	8015 E CTH N	Consolidate 2 access points into 1
6-11-48.1 6-11-49A	7911 E CTH N 7819 E CTH N	Consolidate 2 access point into 1 using a frontage road
6-13-93.1 6-13-94.1 6-13-94.2A 6-13-94.2B	7327 E CTH N 7227 E CTH N 7237 E CTH N 7227 E CTH N	Consolidate 4 access points on US 12 into one backage road.
6-13-95.1	7119 E CTH N	Remove access point on US 12 (Access provided on Bryant Road
6-13-98	6936 CTH N	Consolidate 2 access points into 1
<b>Alternative 7</b>		
3613-000 3613-001 3624-001	N260 US 12 N273 US 12 N380 US 12	Provide frontage Road
3622-000	N 380 US 12	Cul-de-sac Buckingham and provide access via Buckingham
3623-000 3624-000 3623-001	No address (Winn) No address (Winn) N 416 US 12	Cul-de-sac Twinkling Star Road Affects Oak Clay Road Parcels and other Twinkling Star Parcels

Parcel Number	Site Addresses	Access Changes
3511-001	N 431 Twinkling Star Rd.	
3511-000 2644-000 Other Parcels on Hoge Road	N 491 US 12	Cul-de-sac Hoge Road. Provide a connection to Creamery Road between parcels 2634-000 and 2643-000
2641-000	N 640 US 12	Remove 1 farm access and provide access from Cheesebroro Road.
2331-000	N1086 US 12	Remove 2 access points on US 12 (Access provided on Carnes Rd.
<b>Alternative 7a</b>		
3613-000 3613-001 3624-001	N260 US 12 N273 US 12 N380 US 12	Provide frontage Road
3622-000	N 380 US 12	Cul-de-sac Buckingham and provide access via Buckingham
3623-000 3624-000 3623-001 3511-001	No address (Winn) No address (Winn) N 416 US 12 N 431 Twinkling Star Rd.	Cul-de-sac Twinkling Star Road Affects Oak Clay Road Parcels and other Twinkling Star Parcels
2742-000	W5850 Creamery Rd.	Consolidate 2 access points into 1
2821-000	N815 McIntyre Rd.	Consolidate 2 access points into 1

**7) Indicate whether a community/neighborhood facility will be affected by the proposed action and indicate what effect(s) this will have, overall, on the community/neighborhood. Also include and identify any minority population or low-income population that may be affected by the proposed action.**

**Alternative 1 and 1a**

In general, access to and from community/neighborhood facilities along the route are expected to be affected by increased traffic which can increase the difficulty of entering and leaving the sites. No minority or low-income populations are expected to be affected disproportionately by the proposed action.

**Alternative 2b**

For Alternative 2b, access to the Senior Center on Robert Street would change because Alternative 2b would eliminate access to the site for northbound traffic on Robert Street. Visitors would only be able to enter and exit the property from a southbound perspective with a right-turn. This elimination of the dual choice of turning movements may be safer because it would be easier to exit the site with the traffic coming from only one direction instead of two. This effect would be the same for Barrie Park on Robert Street.

There is a licensed Community Based Residential Facility (CBRF) located at N1366 US 12. Records indicate that the facility is licensed for up to 6 disabled individuals. Relocation assistance would be available for the facility as a business to assist them in relocating. The occupants would be considered separate tenant displacees depending on the nature of their disabilities and so they may need to be provided special services.

**Alternatives 2b and 7**

The Town of Koshkonong Town Hall is located within the study corridor of Alternatives 2b and 7 and may require relocation depending upon final design. The Town uses the Town Hall for administrative functions and as a community meeting-place. The Town would not be entitled to the replacement business assistance.

**Alternatives 2b, 7 and 7a**

Within the study corridor, five of fourteen owner-occupied mobile homes would need to be relocated from the Wolf mobile home park on Twinkling Star Road near the southern end of Alternatives 2b, 7 and 7a. This is likely a lower income neighborhood with some larger families where additional assistance may be needed to find replacement units.

**Alternative 3**

No public facilities would be directly affected by Alternative 3. Impacts noted above to the Town Hall, CBRF, and

mobile home park could be similarly affected with the upgrades to WIS 89 that would still be required to handle the future traffic projected for that route under the Alternative 3 scenario.

8) Place an "X" in the appropriate box below if one of the populations indicated would be *disproportionately* affected by the proposal. Give a brief description of the community/neighborhood and population affected by the proposed action. Include demographic characteristics of those affected by the proposal. For the populations shown below, The Orders issued by the U.S. Department of Transportation and its implementing agencies to satisfy the requirements of Executive Order 12898 require an evaluation to determine whether a minority and/or low income population would experience a disproportionately high and adverse effect. If any of the populations shown below are affected, the Environmental Justice Factor Sheet, along with the remaining items on this worksheet will need to be completed to satisfy Environmental Justice requirements

- a)  NO Disabled population is not affected  
 YES Disabled population is affected – See Environmental Justice Factor Sheet
- b)  NO Elderly population is not affected  
 YES Elderly are affected - See Environmental Justice Factor Sheet
- c)  NO Minority populations are not affected  
 YES Minority populations are affected - See Environmental Justice Factor Sheet
- d)  No Low-income populations are not affected  
 Yes Low income populations are affected - See Environmental Justice Factor Sheet

9) Identify and discuss, in general terms, factors that residents have indicated to be important or controversial.

#### Alternative 1 and 1a

Residents living along Robert Street and Whitewater Avenue have indicated problems with existing noise, speed, and difficulties getting out of their driveways because of traffic volume. Downtown, it is difficult for parked cars to open their doors on the driver's side.

#### Alternative 2b

Residents living along Robert Street and Whitewater Avenue have indicated existing noise, speed, and difficulties getting out of their driveways because of traffic speed and volume problems. Business access along Main Street is hindered because of traffic volume and narrow parking lane widths.

#### Alternative 3

Individuals from the towns of Milton and Lima have indicated concern about Alternative 3 because they feel it would negatively impact their quality of life in terms of noise, increased traffic, loss of farmland and loss of tax revenue to the town as land is taken off the tax rolls. Some felt it does not meet the purpose and need in that it is far away from the City of Fort Atkinson and so would be ineffective, while others felt that it would encourage too much traffic on CTH N, which would affect safety.

Residents of the town of Koshkonong have indicated that this route is practical, would save the state a lot of money and would eliminate the higher negative impacts of a bypass on new right of way on their township.

#### Alternative 7 and 7a

The town of Koshkonong has indicated concern that it would lose tax base through the conversion of private land to state right-of-way. In addition they cite a concern with the loss of productive farmland and impacts to dairy farms, as well as a concern for the loss of rural character.

The City of Fort Atkinson and the Fort Atkinson Industrial Development Corporation have cited concerns that without the Alternative 7 or 7a bypass, their business park development would be impacted. The infrastructure to the business park has been partially constructed including the roadways, which were designed to provide access to the park from the south. This southern access was planned to be from a bypass. See a map of the business park in Figure 25 on page 98.

10) Indicate the number and type of any residential buildings that would be removed because of the proposed action.

**Table 19: Residential Impacts**

Type of Occupied Residential Buildings to be Acquired	Alternative 2b	Alternative 3	Alternative 7	Alternative 7a
	Number of Occupied Buildings to be Acquired			
Single Family Dwellings	24	13	26	19
Apartment Buildings	1	0	0	0
Community Based Residential Facility	1	0	0	0
Condominiums	0	0	0	0
Duplexes	0	0	0	0
Mobile homes (in mobile home parks)	5	0	5	5
Mixed Use (Saxes Restaurant, Rural Insurance)	2	0	1	1

**Alternate 2b, 7 & 7a**

The single family dwelling located at N419 US 12, near southern end of route, is located on dairy farm operation.

**Alternative 2b & 7**

The single family dwelling located at N1086 US 12 at the southeast corner of US 12 and Carnes Road is located on a dairy farm operation.

**Alternate 7a**

The single family dwelling located at N1236 Groeler Road is located on a dairy farm operation. In this case all of the farm buildings may need to be acquired. This property is owned by Pond Hill Dairy, LLC and is part of their extensive dairy operation. The residence is occupied by the farm manager and the farm buildings are used for cattle.

**Alternative 3**

The single family dwellings located at 6441 E County Road E and 8929 E County Road E are located on a dairy farm operation. The residence at 8929 appears to be tenant occupied at this time.

In the owner occupied cases, it may be necessary to replace the residence on the farm site, the replacement housing payment would need to be computed based on reasonable cost for new construction of a functionally equivalent dwelling at the site. The project schedule would need to take into consideration the time required new construction. In the tenant occupied situation, the tenant may be eligible for a farm rent supplement payment as they may need to relocate to another farm where the residence is adjacent to the farm buildings.

The farm at 10240 E. CTH N straddles CTH N and the structures on both sides of CTH N are affected. Both a single family home and farm buildings are within the 200 foot study corridor. They would potentially need to be acquired in which case the owner would be eligible for both a residential and farm replacement payment and services.

**Alternative 2b**

Regarding the licensed Community Based Residential Facility (CBRF) located at N1366 US 12, records indicate that the facility is licensed for up to 6 disabled individuals. Special services may need to be provided in assisting these individuals, if the business owner has difficulty in replacing with a similar replacement property that would accommodate the same number of occupants or chooses to not continue in business. Providing sufficient time for

finding replacement units or for the approval process for the construction or purchase of a replacement should be provided. If Alternative 2b is selected as the preferred alternative, further coordination with the residents and business owner would be required.

**Alternative 2b, 7 and 7a**

Within the study corridor, five of fourteen owner-occupied mobile homes would need to be relocated from the Wolf mobile home park on Twinkling Star Road near the southern end of Alternatives 2b, 7 and 7a. This is a lower income neighborhood with some larger families where additional assistance may be needed to find replacement units. There is no room for expansion of the mobile home park on the property. It would be unlikely that the mobile homes could be moved to a new park because existing parks typically have a limit on how old the unit can be. The units in question were manufactured between 1972 and 1989. If the units cannot be moved, they would need to be purchased by the state, in which case the owner occupants may be eligible for both a tenant rent differential payment and replacement housing payment.

**11) Estimate the number of households that would be displaced from the occupied residential buildings identified in item 10, above.**

Total Number of households to be relocated is indicated in Table 19 on page 85. Note that the numbers indicated here may be greater than the number shown in Table 19 because one occupied apartment building may have more than one household.

**Table 20: Characteristics of Displaced Households**

Household Characteristic	Alternative 2b	Alternative 3	Alternative 7	Alternative 7a
	Number of Households			
<i>By Ownership</i>				
Owner-occupied	23	12	26	19
Rented quarters	18	2	6	6
<i>By number of bedrooms</i>				
1 bedroom	6	0	1	0
2 bedrooms	9	1	2	3
3 bedrooms	23	10	23	5
4 or more bedrooms	3	3	5	10
<i>By type and price range</i>				
Single-family – Owner Occupied				
\$ 50,000 - \$ 99,999	2	1	3	0
\$ 100,000 - \$149,999	4	5	8	8
\$ 150,000 - \$199,999	9	4	9	5
\$ 200,000 - \$249,999	3	1	0	1
\$ 250,000 - \$299,999	0	0	0	0

Household Characteristic	Alternative 2b	Alternative 3	Alternative 7	Alternative 7a
	Number of Households			
\$ 300,000+	0	1	1	0
Mobile Home - Owner Occupied				
\$ 5,000 - \$ 9,999	2	0	2	2
\$ 10,000 - \$15,999	1	0	1	1
\$ 15,000 - \$19,999	1	0	1	1
\$ 20,000 - \$24,999	0	0	0	0
\$ 25,000 - \$29,999	1	0	1	1
\$ 30,000 +	0	0	0	0

12) Describe the relocation potential in the community.

**Table 21: Relocation Potential in Community**

Household Characteristic	Number of Comparable Households Available
<i>By Location</i>	
City of Fort Atkinson	56
Town of Koshkonong	14
Town of Lima	10
Town of Milton	36
<i>By number of bedrooms</i>	
1 bedroom	1
2 bedrooms	21
3 bedrooms	53
4 or more bedrooms	41
<i>By type and price range</i>	
Single-family – Owner Occupied	
\$ 50,000 - \$ 99,999	8
\$ 100,000 - \$149,999	42

Household Characteristic	Number of Comparable Households Available
\$ 150,000 - \$199,999	31
\$ 200,000 - \$249,999	14
\$ 250,000 - \$299,999	10
\$ 300,000+	11
Mobile Home - Owner Occupied	
\$ 5,000 - \$ 9,999	0
\$ 10,000 - \$15,999	0
\$ 15,000 - \$19,999	0
\$ 20,000 - \$24,999	2
\$ 25,000 - \$29,999	2
\$ 30,000 +	4
Single-family/Mobile Home – Tenant Occupied	
\$ 600- \$699	1
\$ 700- \$799	3
\$ 800- \$899	5
\$ 900- \$999	0
\$ 1000+	1
Multi-family/Mixed	
\$400-\$499	3
\$500-\$599	7
\$600-\$699	7
\$700-\$799	2
\$800+	1
Duplexes	
\$ 500- \$599	3
\$ 600- \$699	3
\$ 700 - \$799	2

Household Characteristic	Number of Comparable Households Available
\$ 800- \$899	0
\$ 900- \$999	0
\$ 1000+	0

**13) Identify all the sources of information used to obtain the data in item 12.**

Multiple Listing Services  
 Milton Courier  
 Daily Jefferson County Union

**14) Describe how relocation assistance will be provided in compliance with the WisDOT Relocation Manual or FHWA regulation 49 CFR Part 24**

The assessment of relocation impacts created by a transportation project is mandated by federal and state statutes. Eminent domain is the power of the state to take private property for public use. State statute 32.05 sets forth the procedures for the acquisition and condemnation of property for streets, highways, airports, mass transit facilities and other projects. Section 32.05(8) of the statutes specifies that occupants cannot be removed from a property until a relocation site has been made available. The intent of these statutes is to see that persons displaced by any public project are fairly compensated by payment for the property required and have a place to relocate.

An updated Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan will be prepared for the preferred alternative when one is selected. Preliminary information has been collected and is presented in this DEIS.

Before an agency can start any property acquisition activities for a project, all displacees would be interviewed by a relocation agent to determine the specific needs the individuals, businesses, farms, and nonprofits being displaced by the project. The agency, must, by law, prepare a relocation acquisition stage plan that addresses the specific concerns and how the agency will meet the needs of the displacees.

The agency will prepare the computations to determine a relocation replacement housing payment based on a comparable decent, safe and sanitary housing (DSS). DSS requires the replacement housing fits the relocatees' needs of the displacees, cost within ability to pay, and an adequate number of rooms and area. Units must be structurally sound and provide adequate utility services and be equal to or better than the unit to be acquired.

Residential and business tenants will be assigned a relocation agent who will assist relocatees in finding a comparable building that meets their needs. Relocation entitlements available include reimbursement of moving costs for all individuals with personal property located on the acquired properties. Individuals displaced for a residential unit may be eligible to receive replacement housing assistance. The amount of assistance available to a displacee is determined for 1) a tenant-occupied unit, by computing the difference between the current rent plus utilities and the rent plus utilities over 48 month period for an available comparable, and generally are capped out at \$8,000 and 2) an owner occupied unit is computed based on the difference between the acquisition price and the adjusted listing price of a comparable available replacement unit and is generally capped at \$25,000. If required, these caps may be exceeded in the case of last resort housing. As described earlier, these routes may take the residence associated with dairy farm operations, as the home needs to be in close proximity to the dairy buildings, it may be necessary to consider construction of a functionally equivalent structure on the remainder land.

Businesses, farms and non profits are eligible for necessary moving costs for its personal property and may be eligible for a reestablishment payment up to \$10,000, and a business replacement payment up to \$50,000 for an owner occupied unit and \$30,000 for a tenant occupied unit. The replacement assistance is computed in the same manner as the replacement housing and rent supplement payments for residences. These caps are not exceeded.

Several potential displaced properties are in a mixed used unit or have buildings that will need to be carved-out prior to computing a replacement payment.

Displacees need to file claims with supporting documentation in order to receive their relocation assistance entitlements.

FHWA is in the process of approving rule changes to regulation 49 CFR Part 24, that should be passed prior to this project which will need to be taken in to consideration for the preferred alternative when estimating the potential real estate and relocation costs associated with the project.

Under the current regulations, displaced landowners would be compensated for the fair market value of their acquired property. To determine the fair market value, WisDOT would hire or employ a qualified appraiser who would prepare an appraisal and the owner would be given an offer based on this appraisal. If the owner disagrees with the appraisal, they may find another qualified appraiser at the reasonable expense of WisDOT. The offer would then be negotiated based on the two appraisals. Displaced landowners would be provided with pamphlets on eminent domain and relocation benefits.

If an agreement cannot be reached, WisDOT would give the owner a “jurisdictional offer” and if this offer is rejected by the owner WisDOT may make an “award of compensation”, which allows WisDOT to begin condemnation proceedings. The landowner may appeal this to the County Condemnation Commission or directly to the circuit court. If the landowner succeeds in their appeal, WisDOT would pay legal fees as well as the difference in valuation. Any determination provided the displacee, would be adjusted to reflect the negotiated or awarded settlement for the acquisition of the property.

**15) Identify any difficulties or unusual conditions for relocating households displaced by the proposed action**

Relocations are necessary with each of the 4 build alternatives. The primary impact will be the relocation of families displaced from the acquired dwellings. Preliminary indications are that there should be an adequate supply of available housing in the project area. No problems are foreseen in providing any of these individuals or families with relocation options. Should special relocation advisory services be required or an unusual problem arises, WisDOT would have relocation personnel to provide the necessary services.

**16) Indicate whether Special Relocation Assistance Service will be needed? Describe any special services or housing programs needed to remedy identified difficulties or unusual conditions noted in item #14 above.**

**Alternatives 2b, 7 and 7a**

Wright’s mobile home park near the intersection of Twinkling Star Road and US 12 in southern Jefferson County could require relocation of up to 5 mobile home owners who are tenants in the mobile home park. The mobile homes cannot be relocated or realigned in the current park as there is no available land on site for the owner to create replacement lots. There are no other mobile home parks located within the Town of Koshkonong and no lands zoned for such uses. Lands would need to be rezoned to accommodate a new mobile home park. If space would be available at one of the mobile home parks located in the surrounding area, the park may not accept the home due to the age and condition of the units which were constructed between 1972 and 1989. These occupants may be eligible for a moving expense payment to relocate their unit to another park and a rent supplement payment. If the unit cannot be relocated, the owner would be eligible for a replacement housing payment which would be the difference between the acquisition price of their mobile home and the price of purchase of a replacement mobile home. If the unit is in another mobile home park, they may be eligible for a rent supplement payment if the rent at new park is greater than that at the current park. Discussions with individuals in the park indicated that one of the units has a large family and that they have limited income, which could require additional services.

**Alternatives 2b**

The licensed Community Based Residential Facility (CBRF) business located at N1366 US 12 may require special services. Records indicate that the facility is licensed for up to 6 disabled individuals. If the CBRF cannot be replaced, special services may need to be provided in assisting these individuals in finding space in comparable units and assistance.

**17) Describe any additional measures which would be used to minimize adverse effects or provide benefits to those relocated, those remaining, or to community facilities affected.**

No additional measures were identified.

**3. Economic Development and Business Impact Evaluation Factor Sheet**

**1) Describe the economic development or existing business areas affected by the proposed action.**

**No Action and Alternatives 1a and 2b**

These alternatives can be expected to affect two of the City’s existing business areas:

The Downtown District of the City of Fort Atkinson is the historical central business district along Main Street. As described in the City’s Master Plan, the downtown has remained the primary shopping district for the city and the location of most of the primary governmental and cultural institutions. The City is making improvements to a riverwalk, parks and a bicycle trail downtown as planned in their Master Plan. It is a goal of the City to maintain downtown Fort Atkinson as the commercial center for the community, with an emphasis on specialty retail, services, and government and institutional uses.

Whitewater Avenue (US 12 on the south side of Fort Atkinson) supports many commercial uses. Commercial land use is planned here from Rockwell Avenue, south to CTH M. The City plans to develop this area as an attractive, peripheral commercial district. It is their plan to consolidate driveway and roadway access along this route.

**Alternative 3**

There are no business districts along CTH N between Whitewater and WIS 26.

**Alternatives 7/7a**

These alternatives are in the countryside and the main businesses are farms and dairies.

**2) Identify and discuss the existing modes of transportation and their traffic within the economic development or existing business area.**

Personal vehicles are the most common of the existing modes of transportation within the study area. Biking is also encouraged as the city has purchased the rail corridor that runs through the central business district for a bike trail. Likewise, the City continues to improve the Riverwalk to encourage pedestrian use in the downtown central business district. Fort Atkinson does not have a public transit system.

Semi-truck traffic is common along the existing route as it is a long truck route. Based upon data gathered in the origin-destination studies for the needs assessment, approximately one third of the traffic is estimated to be regional traffic.

**3) Place an “X” in the appropriate box below if one of the populations indicated would be *disproportionately* affected by the proposal. Give a brief description of the community/neighborhood and population affected by the proposed action. Include demographic characteristics of those affected by the proposal. For the populations shown below, The Orders issued by the U.S. Department of Transportation and its implementing agencies to satisfy the requirements of Executive Order 12898 require an evaluation to determine whether a minority and/or low income population would experience a disproportionately high and adverse effect. If any of the populations shown below are affected, the Environmental Justice Factor Sheet, along with the remaining items on this worksheet will need to be completed to satisfy Environmental Justice requirements**

- a)  NO Disabled population is not affected  
 YES Disabled population is affected – See Environmental Justice Factor Sheet
- b)  NO Elderly population is not affected  
 YES Elderly are affected - See Environmental Justice Factor Sheet
- c)  NO Minority populations are not affected  
 YES Minority populations are affected - See Environmental Justice Factor Sheet
- d)  No Low-income populations are not affected  
 Yes Low income populations are affected - See Environmental Justice Factor Sheet

**4) Identify and discuss effects on the economic development potential and existing businesses that are dependent upon the transportation facility for continued economic viability.**

- The proposed project will have no effect on a transportation-dependent business or industry.
- The proposed action will change the conditions for a business that is dependent upon the transportation facility. Identify effects, including effects that may occur during construction.

**No Action and Alternative 1a**

With the projected increase in traffic congestion, the City expects that its economic viability will be negatively affected by decreased access and mobility.

**Alternative 2b**

At the City of Fort Atkinson expert interview meeting, participants stated that for these reasons, Alternative 2b would be in conflict with their plans for the downtown, which is to create a pleasant, pedestrian friendly environment where people are encouraged to stop and spend time in the downtown area. The change to a one-way pair could cause problems with vehicle access to businesses as they would only have right-in, right-out access where currently they can enter from either direction in most cases. This may require some vehicles to extend their trips to reach their destination from the proper direction. Semi-truck access to loading docks may be an issue that should be studied further if this alternative is selected as the preferred alternative.

**Alternative 3**

This alternative would not likely substantially change existing conditions. The Robert L. Klement Business Park on the south side of Fort Atkinson would not realize any of the benefits of the bypass alternatives.

**Alternative 7 and 7a**

The City of Fort Atkinson’s Robert L. Klement Business Park would have a new access point. Business 26 would be relocated to Commerce Parkway, through the park. This would improve visibility of the park and could attract more businesses to locate there. Currently about 95 acres of the 140-acre park are vacant. Of the vacant area, 45 acres has infrastructure. See Figure 25 on page 98 for the plat of the Business Park.

The Downtown District of Fort Atkinson would have less heavy vehicle traffic, improving the atmosphere and making it more conducive to local pedestrian and vehicular traffic. It is expected that 66% of the regional traffic could be diverted using one of the bypass alternatives.

**Alternative 7 and 7a**

The bypass alternatives will improve access to the Robert L. Klement business park.

**5) Estimate the number of businesses and jobs that would be created or displaced because of the project.**

**Table 22: Number of Businesses and Jobs that would be Created or Displaced<sup>21</sup>**

Type of Business	Number of Businesses Displaced	Number of Jobs Displaced
<b>Alternative 2b</b>		
Retail	1	0
Service	3	7-17
Wholesale	0	0
Manufacturing	0	0

<sup>21</sup> WisDOT. ReferenceUSA (Version 2004.11), from the Library Division of infoUSA.

Type of Business	Number of Businesses Displaced	Number of Jobs Displaced
Farm	1	To be determined*
<i>TOTAL ALT 2b</i>	5?	7 to >17
<b>Alternative 3</b>		
Retail	0	0
Service	1	To be determined*
Wholesale	0	0
Manufacturing	0	0
Farm	2	To be determined*
<i>TOTAL ALT 3</i>	3	To be determined*
<b>Alternative 7</b>		
Retail	0	0
Service	1	5-9
Wholesale	0	0
Manufacturing	0	0
Farm	1	To be determined*
<i>TOTAL ALT 7</i>	2	5 to >9
<b>Alternative 7a</b>		
Retail	0	0
Service	1	7-17
Wholesale	0	0
Manufacturing	0	0
Farm	2	To be determined*
<i>TOTAL ALT 7a</i>	3	7 to >17

\* At this stage, the study did not include interviews of the local businesses and farms for numbers that would be displaced. Data was found for some of the establishments and those are reported above.  
See Question 12(b) below.

Job creation from highway projects is an unsettled topic. One DOT study calculates through an input/output model, that each billion dollars of highway spending by the federal government will lead to employment benefits totaling 47,576 person-years. Using this formula would create the following jobs in person years:

**Table 23: Jobs Created**

Alternative	Jobs Created (in person years)
2b	1,370
3	785
7	2,127
7a	1,913

Input/Output models are inherently limited and arguments can be made that government funding not be spent on highway projects would go toward other projects that would in turn create jobs, nullifying the net impact on the economy of a road building project.

It is not anticipated that any businesses would be created as a direct result of any of the alternatives.

**6) Identify any special characteristics of the created or displaced businesses or their employees.**

Detailed study of the employee make-up of each displaced business would be completed for the Relocation Study on the selected preferred alternative. It is not expected the businesses noted above that could potentially be displaced would exclusively or specifically employ a number of disabled, elderly, minority or low-income groups.

**7) Is Special Relocation Assistance Needed?**

See Question 10, below.

**8) Describe the business relocation potential in the community.**

Farms and businesses are more difficult to relocate than residences. Finding available comparable farm/commercial properties for the businesses/farms described in Question 10 would be difficult and new construction may be the only option.

**9) Describe how relocation assistance will be provided in compliance with the WisDOT Relocation Manual or FHWA Regulation 49 CFR Part 24.**

Wisconsin’s relocation law and regulations can be found in Sections 32.185 – 32.27, Wisconsin Statutes Ch. COMM 202, Wisconsin Administrative Code. A brochure is available from WisDOT describing relocation rights of business, farm and nonprofit organizations.

The assessment of relocation impacts created by a transportation project is mandated by federal and state statutes. Eminent domain is the power of the state to take private property for public use. State statute 32.05 sets forth the procedures for the acquisition and condemnation of property for streets, highways, airports, mass transit facilities and other projects. Section 32.05(8) of the statutes specifies that occupants cannot be removed from a property until a relocation site has been made available. The intent of these statutes is to see that persons displaced by any public project are fairly compensated by payment for the property required and have a place to relocate.

A formal Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan will be prepared for the preferred alternative when one is selected. Preliminary information has been collected and is presented in this DEIS.

**10) Identify any difficulties for relocating a business displaced by the proposed action and describe any special services needed to remedy identified unusual conditions.**

Farms and businesses are usually more difficult to relocate than residences. Finding available comparable farm/commercial properties can be difficult and new construction may be the only option. For this project, aside from the business and farms described below, it is not anticipated that there would be any unusual requirements for businesses or farms that would prevent their successful relocation. There are currently several farm operations and restaurants listed for sale in the surrounding area. This project would not however be built for

several years. In the future, finding replacement farms may be more difficult if current development trends continue. More land will likely be developed into non-farm uses, decreasing the amount of farmland available.

**Alternative 7a - Pond Hill Dairy LLC**

Pond Hill Dairy currently has approximately 700 cows, 500 heifers and employs approximately 12 individuals on approximately 1,200 acres. The alignment of Alternative 7a may require the acquisition of all the structures, including a residence, at its farm on Groeler Road, where they house dry cows. The acquisition of these structures does not appear to put Pond Farm Dairy out of business as it has another residence, farm structures and its milking operation located on land it owns south of the 7a alignment on Poeppel Road. The residence on Groeler Road is currently occupied by the farm’s manager. It is not known whether Pond Hill Dairy will need to replace the residence and other farm buildings and structures to be acquired. They may be able to relocate to other facilities it owns, or may elect to replace the structures to be acquired on the remainder lands. The manager may be eligible for a rent supplemental payment in addition to residential moving expenses, depending how his relocation is handled by his employer. The project schedule should consider time that may be required for Pond Hill Dairy to reconstruct the structures on its remaining land.

**Alternative 2b - Cedar Hill CBRF LLC**

A replacement location would need to be remodeled or built to meet the requirements of the CBRF and be located sufficient distance from other comparable facilities to obtain the necessary zoning permits. The project would need to provide sufficient time for the zoning approval, new construction or modification of an existing parcel for the CBRF. Replacement of the facility is the best relocation option for the current occupants. If the owner chooses not to replace the facility, additional time would be required to find suitable replacement locations for its handicapped tenant occupants.

As long there is sufficient time for new construction and obtaining of required permits, it is not anticipated that there would be any unusual requirements for any of the businesses or farms that would prevent their successful relocation. There are currently several farm operations and restaurants listed for sale in the surrounding area. There is replacement commercial space for sale and for rent in the area suitable for the ones to be displaced. This project is not planned for several years, the steady growth of the area will continue to provide additional replacement options for the commercial space, and the same growth may make finding comparable replacement farms more difficult as the current farms are converted to other land uses.

**11) Describe any additional measures which would be used to minimize adverse effects or provide benefits to those relocated, those remaining, or to community facilities affected.**

No additional measures other than those mentioned herein, have been identified at this time.

**12) Generally describe both the beneficial and adverse effects accruing to:**

**a) The area’s economic development potential or existing business area caused by the proposed action. Include any factors identified by business people that they feel are important or controversial.**

**No Action and Alternative 1a**

**Beneficial**

Keeping the highway as is may maintain the level of potential customers currently using US 12.

**Adverse**

Taking no action would not address the identified congestion and safety problems that would hinder the pedestrian friendly atmosphere that the Chamber of Commerce has indicated as being an important factor in attracting shoppers to the central business district. As congestion increases, the benefits of this alternative would decrease accordingly.

**Alternative 3**

**Adverse**

Eight farms would lose buildings or farm residences with Alternative 3. Such loss can cause economic hardship to farmers and would impact the farm businesses. Alternative 3 does not have the severances that the bypass alternatives 7 and 7a do and so would not be as great an impact as those alternatives.

**Alternative 7 and 7a**

**Beneficial**

Alternatives 7 and 7a would both increase the viability of downtown Fort Atkinson by reducing traffic congestion and safety problems and so making a more attractive shopping district. Alternatives 7 and 7a would provide access to the city’s business park on Fort Atkinson’s southwest side.

**Adverse**

Eight farms would be severed by Alternative 7 and 6 by Alternative 7a. Alternative 7a is anticipated to have the greatest negative impact on farm business operations because it affects some very large dairy operations, especially the Hartwig and Pond Dairy LLC farms and others as indicated on the Agricultural Impact Factor Sheet.

Eight farms would lose buildings with Alternative 7 and 7 farms would lose buildings with Alternative 7a. Losing farm buildings can cause economic hardship to farms and would impact the farm businesses.

**b) The employment potential and existing employees in businesses affected by the proposal. Include, as appropriate, a discussion of effects accruing to minority populations or low-income populations.**

<b>Alternative 1 and 1a</b>	Not applicable. No businesses would be displaced.
<b>Alternative 2b</b>	Records show that Saxes Restaurant has 5 to 9 employees, Baker Glass, LLC has 1-4 employees, and Rural Insurance Office has 1-4 employees. The number of employees at Cedar Hill CBRF is unknown at this time.
<b>Alternative 3</b>	Saxes Restaurant has 5 to 9 employees
<b>Alternative 7</b>	Saxes Restaurant has 5 to 9 employees
<b>Alternative 7a</b>	Saxes Restaurant has 5 to 9 employees

Individual businesses were not interviewed for the Conceptual Stage Relocation Study and therefore racial and income level makeup of the various employees is unknown at this time.

Labor force participation rates are high in Jefferson County. In 2004 the unemployment rate has ranged from a high of 6.4 percent in February and a low of 4.2 in September (most recent data available for this report). The Jefferson County Workforce Profile of January 2004 indicates that among the top ten occupations with the most openings are food preparation and service, retail salespersons, cashiers, waiters and waitresses, registered nurses, and office clerks. These statistics indicate that based upon the types of business operations affected by the various alternatives, re-employment of people who might lose their positions, would not be exceptionally difficult.



**4. Agricultural Impact Evaluation Factor Sheet**

The Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Production (DATCP) has agreed that An Agricultural Impact Statement (AIS) should be prepared after the selection of a preferred alternative. The AIS will assess the potential environmental consequences of the preferred alternative on the nearby farm operations. In accordance with standard AIS procedure, copies of the completed AIS will be sent to all farm operators in the project corridor. Appendix G has been reserved for the AIS.

In accordance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act, a Farmland Conversion Impact Rating Form (AD-1006) has been completed for each alternative and is presented in Appendix H. The impact rating evaluates the proposed conversion of farmland to highway uses.

**Table 24: Type of Land Acquired from Farm Operations**

Type of Land Acquired from Farm Operations:	Alt 1	Alt 1a	Alt 2b	Alt 3	Alt 7	Alt 7a
Agriculture acres	0	0	88	83	257	239
Woodland acres	0	0	11	0	19	23
Land of undetermined or other use (e.g., wetlands, residential, transportation, etc.) acres	0	0	62	11	75	32
<b>TOTAL ACRES</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>294</b>

Source: Jefferson County

**Table 25: Number of Farms That Would Be Impacted**

Number of farm operations:	Alt 1	Alt 1a	Alt 2b	Alt 3	Alt 7	Alt 7a
from which land would be acquired	0	0	17	37	20	20
that would be severed	0	0	0	0	8	6
that would lose buildings	0	0	1	2	1	2
that would require relocation of the residence	0	0	1	2	1	2

Source: HNTB Corporation

**2) Identify and describe the effects to farm operations because of land lost due to the project.**

The Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection indicates that generally, farmers who lose land due to projects such as the proposed one may have difficulty finding comparable land for the following reasons:

- Other farmers will also be in the market, increasing demand.
- The overall supply of farmland will decrease due to right-of-way acquisitions.
- The productive potential of available farmland may be less than the farmland taken.
- Travel distances to available farmland may be prohibitive.

Impacts to existing farms would mainly involve the loss of land adjacent to the existing US 12. This would occur when the road is widened. On the new alignments of Alternatives 7 and 7a, farm severances would occur.

**Alternative 1 and 1a**

There would be no loss of farm land due to Alternatives 1 and 1a.

**Alternative 2b**

This alternative does not involve any drainage districts, but is likely to affect farmland with drainage tiling or grassed waterways. From a field review, it appears that the Kriedeman and Stade farms may be drain tiled. DATCP states

that approximately 54% of the soils along this alternative between Twinkling Star Road and Fort Atkinson are prime; approximately 27% are prime where drained.

### Alternative 3

Impacts to existing farms would mainly involve the loss of land adjacent to the existing County N. This would occur when land is purchased for the future acquisition of right of way for clear zones and widening. The roadway would remain on alignment, so the separation of farm operations is not indicated.

This alternative would affect Drainage District #5 in Rock County; the drainage district covers 1,720 acres. DATCP states that approximately 62% of the soils along this alternative between US 12 and WIS 26 are prime; approximately 15% are prime where drained.

### Alternative 7

Twenty farms would be impacted and/or severed by the construction of this alternative. Impacts to farming operations would involve the land lost to the roadway construction, as well as the potential separation of farming operations.

This alternative does not involve any drainage districts, but is likely to affect farmland with drainage tiling or grassed waterways. From a field review it appears that the Kriedeman, Stoller and Majesz farms are drain tiled. DATCP states that approximately 50% of the soils along this alternative between US 12 and WIS 26 are prime; approximately 19% are prime where drained.

### Alternative 7a

Approximately 20 farms would be impacted and/or severed by the construction of this alternative. Impacts to farming operations would involve the land lost to the roadway construction, as well as the potential separation of farming operations.

This alternative does not involve any drainage districts, but is likely to affect farmland with drainage tiling or grassed waterways. DATCP states that approximately 73% of the soils along this alternative between US 12 and WIS 26 are prime; approximately 4% are prime where drained.

The town of Koshkonong has expressed concerns that a bypass would impact large dairy and cattle businesses in their community and that they would lose acreage from the proposed bypass alignments 7 and 7a, particularly at the Highway 26 interchange. It should be noted that the proposed interchange at Highway 26 is already within the urban service area as shown in the *Jefferson County Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Plan*.

## 3) Describe changes in access to farm operations caused by proposed action.

Access changes to farm operations would occur where medians are installed in the 4-lane roadway and median openings are not provided. Access changes would occur as indicated in Table 18 on page 82. DATCP indicates that when access to farms is altered, the resulting access plan may lead to farmers traveling longer distances or using side roads, resulting in greater time spent and increased cost in farming the parcels.

### Alternative 3

One farm (parcel 6-13-89, Hanlon) at the west end of the corridor would have access altered in that a median would be added where the roadway splits into a divided highway at the interchange approaches, giving the farm right-in, right-out access only.

### Alternative 7

Access to farm operations would be altered due to this alternative. This alternative would be an access controlled 4-lane roadway along the bypass portion and access controlled 4-lane roadway from the US 12 Whitewater bypass to the Alternative 7 bypass; therefore, access concession would be necessary for those farms and farm owners affected by the construction. Possible modifications to field entrances would be made during a future engineering design phase.

### Alternative 7a

Access to farm operations would likely be altered due to this alternative. This alternative would be a limited-access

4-lane roadway; therefore, access concession would be necessary for those farms and farm owners affected by the construction. Possible modifications to field entrances would be made during a future engineering design phase.

At the expert interview meeting conducted for the secondary and cumulative impacts study, a town official mentioned that the dairy and cattle operations located on the western side of the town provide manure for the crop producers on the eastern side of town. The Town of Koshkonong mentioned that alignment 7a would sever east-west connections through the town and disrupt manure management practices. Furthermore, the bypass, particularly alignment 7a would diminish efficiencies for agricultural businesses as traffic circulation in multiple directions would be cut off except at the interchanges.

**4) Indicate whether a farm operation will be severed because of the project and describe the severance (include area of original farm and the size of any remnant parcels).**

#### **Alternatives 1, 1a, 2b and 3**

No farms would be severed because of these alternatives.

#### **Alternative 7 and 7a**

This study identified 8 farms that would potentially be severed by Alternative 7 and 12 farms on Alternative 7a. Table 26 on page 102 shows the areas owned and farmed by particular property owners. Acreages do not indicate the exact amount cropped, rather the total acreage of contiguously owned properties that appear to be farmed together from examination of aerial photography. The estimated acreage may contain non-cultivated areas. The identified landowners have not yet been consulted regarding the following acreages. More detailed acreages would need to be determined in the Agricultural Impact Statement to be prepared for the preferred alternative.

**Table 26: Farm Severances**

Property Owner	Parcel ID Number(s)	Area of original parcels	Area of remnant parcels
<b>Alternative 7</b>			
Marcia A. Stade Trust	016-0514-2323-000 016-0514-2322-000	67 acres	6 acres 5 acres <u>18 acres</u> Total 29 acres
Minnie L. Kriedeman (John)	016-0514-1433-000 016-0514-1544-000 016-0514-1541-001	100 acres	70 acres 12 acres Total 82 acres
Theodore P Majesz Trust	016-0514-1513-004 016-0514-1432-000 016-0514-1541-000 016-0514-1542-000 016-0514-1543-000	119 acres	93 acres <u>13 acres</u> Total 106 acres
Russell H Ganzow	016-0514-1531-000 016-0514-1534-001	63 acres	12 acres 40 acres Total 52 acres
Bruce C. Tipton	016-0514-1532-000 016-0514-1533-000	60 acres	5 acres <u>44 acres</u> Total 49 acres
Erwin C. Poeppel Trust	016-0514-1641-000 016-0514-1644-000 016-0514-1643-000 016-0514-1643-000 016-0514-1642-000 016-0514-1634-000 016-0514-2121-000 016-0514-2122-000 016-0514-2123-000 016-0514-2124-003 016-0514-2124-000	349 acres	95 acres <u>201 acres</u> Total 296 acres
Helen M. Dettman	016-0514-2014-000 016-0514-2011-000	81 acres	38 acres <u>22 acres</u> Total 60 acres
Pond Hill Dairy LLC	016-0514-1743-000 016-0514-2012-000 016-0514-2013-000	96 acres	52 acres <u>15 acres</u> Total 67 acres
<b>Alternative 7a</b>			
Superior Env Serv Inc	016-0514-2642-000 016-0514-2641-001 016-0514-2643-000 016-0514-2644-000 016-0514-3521-001 016-0514-3521-002 016-0514-3523-000 016-0514-3524-000	239 acres	38 acres 44 acres 8 acres 120 acres <u>2 acres</u> Total 212 acres
Heritage Std Bk & Trust and James M. Bradley	016-0514-2631-000 016-0514-2634-001	45 acres	35 acres <u>6 acres</u> Total 41 acres
Michael T & Delia H Welch	016-0514-2633-000 016-0514-2632-000	81 acres	30 acres <u>38 acres</u> Total 68 acres
Edwin J. Rymut	016-0514-2732-000 016-0514-2733-003 016-0514-2734-000 016-0514-2743-001	95 acres	18 acres <u>58 acres</u> Total 76 acres

Property Owner	Parcel ID Number(s)	Area of original parcels	Area of remnant parcels
Joann C Steffen	016-0514-2841-000 016-0514-2844-001 016-0514-2843-000 016-0514-2842-001	87 acres	53 acres <u>19 acres</u> Total 72 acres
Lydia Eckart (Fogel Yvonne Trust)	016-0514-2722-001 016-0514-2814-000 016-0514-2813-000	106 acres	1 acre <u>96 acres</u> Total 97 acres
Jonathan P Hartwig	016-0514-2821-000 016-0514-2842-000 016-0514-2831-000 016-0514-2822-001 016-0514-2824-000 016-0514-2822-000	167 acres	114 acres 17 acres <u>11 acres</u> Total 130 acres
Robert L. McIntyre Jr	016-0514-2132-000 016-0514-2233-000 016-0514-2812-000 016-0514-2134-000 016-0514-2131-000 016-0514-2133-000 016-0514-2143-000 016-0514-2811-000 016-0514-2142-000	318 acres	19 acres 2 acres <u>267 acres</u> Total 288
Pond Hill Dairy LLC	016-0514-1743-000 016-0514-2012-000 016-0514-2013-000	97 acres	69 acres <u>2 acres</u> Total 71 acres
Pond Hill Dairy LLC	016-0514-2041-000 016-0514-2044-000 016-0514-2911-000 016-0514-2912-000 016-0514-2911-001 016-0514-2913-000 016-0514-2914-000	280 acres	249 acres 0.5 acres <u>15 acres</u> 264.5 acres
Erwin C. Poeppel	016-0514-1641-000 016-0514-1644-000 016-0514-1643-000 016-0514-1643-000 016-0514-1642-000 016-0514-1634-000 016-0514-2121-000 016-0514-2122-000 016-0514-2123-000 016-0514-2124-003 016-0514-2124-000	349 acres	4 acres <u>344 acres</u> 348 acres
Helen M. Dettman	016-0514-2014-000 016-0514-2011-000	81 acres	55 acres <u>15 acres</u> 70 acres

**5) Identify and describe effects generated by the acquisition or relocation of farm operation buildings, structures or improvements, e.g., barns, silos, stock watering ponds, irrigation wells, etc. As appropriate, address the location, type, condition and importance to the farm operation.**

The Conceptual Relocation Study in Appendix C would be updated to include additional details regarding structures and improvements of farms to be acquired, if any, for the preferred alternative. If a build alternative is chosen and after the route is designed, and prior to negotiations for farmland required for the project, the Department would prepare an Acquisition Stage Relocation Assistance Plan and would interview potentially displaced occupants of the farm operations to determine the details of the type, condition and importance of displaced farm improvements.

#### **No Action, Alternative 1a**

No farmland acquisition or relocations would be associated with these alternatives.

#### **Alternative 2b**

Alternative 2b would require the acquisition or relocation of buildings, structures or improvements that could be used for farm operations from 6 properties. At this time only 4 appear to be active farm operations, at least two of which appear to be dairy operations. The buildings, structures and other improvements being acquired from a farm may create a total displacement of the farm operation. In order to minimize the disruptive effect to dairy operations, replacement assistance would consider construction of new residences associated with these dairy operations on the remainder of their land. There are farms available for sale in the area, but if the area develops further and farmland is converted to other uses, available farms may be more limited and construction on the remainder site may need to be considered as a replacement option.

#### **Alternative 3**

Alternative 3 would require the acquisition or relocation of farm operation buildings, structures or improvements from 6 properties. For three of the farms, the residence is the only major structure that would need to be acquired. Two of these residences are associated with dairy operations. In order to minimize the disruptive effect to the dairy operations, replacement assistance should consider construction of new residences on the remainder land near the farm operation.

#### **Alternative 7**

Buildings, structures or improvements that could be used for farm operations would be acquired from 7 properties on Alternative 7.

Alternative 7 would require the acquisition of residences associated with dairy operations. In order to minimize the disruptive effect to the dairy operations, replacement assistance would consider construction of new residences on the remainder land near the farm operation.

#### **Alternative 7a**

Buildings, structures or improvements that could be used for farm operations would be acquired from 5 properties on Alternative 7a.

Alternative 7 would require the acquisition of residences associated with dairy operations. In order to minimize the disruptive effect to the dairy operations, replacement assistance would consider construction of new residences on the remainder land near the farm operation.

Alternative 7a would require the acquisition of the residence and farm improvements for Pond Hill Dairy, LLC's northern farm on Groeler Road. The acquisition of this farm would not be expected to put Pond Hill Dairy, LLC out of business. It is understood that this residence is occupied by the farm manager and the farm facilities there house dry cows. In 2004, Pond Hill Dairy had approximately 700 cows, 500 heifers and employed approximately 12 individuals. To relocate that portion of the operation from that location would disrupt the farm operations. Access between the southerly and northerly acreage would be affected by this alignment.

**6) Describe effects caused by the elimination or relocation of a cattle/equipment pass or crossing. Attach plans, sketches, or other graphics as needed to clearly illustrate existing and proposed location of any cattle/equipment pass or crossing:**

At this stage, no cattle crossings have been identified in the project area. On Alternative 7a, the Hartwig farm buildings are separated from the majority of their tillable land. One solution could be to create an equipment pass to cross the highway corridor and provide the farmer with access to the fields.

**7) Describe the effects generated by the obliteration of the old roadway.**

**No Action, 1a and 3**

No roadways would be obliterated.

**Alternative 2b**

Roadways along Alternative 2b that would be obliterated where intersections have been realigned include Creamery Road, Cheesebroro Road, Carnes Road, Hackbarth Road, CTH M, and CTH K. See Figure 13 on page 39.

**Alternative 7**

Old roadway would be obliterated where intersections are realigned at Buckingham and Twinkling Star Roads, Hoge, Creamery and Cheesebroro Roads, as well as US 12 at the new interchange south of Fort Atkinson. The rebuilt South Fort Interchange at WIS 26 and Alternative 7 bypass would require obliteration of existing roads. See Figure 18 on page 44.

**Alternative 7a**

Old roadway would be obliterated where intersections are realigned at Buckingham and Twinkling Star Roads, Hoge and Creamery Roads, Poeppel Road and roadway within the South Fort WIS 26 interchange. See Figure 19 on page 45.

**8) Identify and describe any proposed changes in the land use or secondary development that will affect farm operations that relate to the development of this project.**

Land use in the vicinity of US 12 would remain relatively constant as agricultural and residential. Increased capacity of US 12 may potentially result in increased development in the vicinity of the corridor, especially in areas near the City of Fort Atkinson. Such potential future development could lead to the conversion of agricultural lands to other non-agricultural uses. Conversion would be under the control of the local community and their implementation of zoning and land use planning regulations.

**Alternative 2b**

DATCP indicates that Alternative 2b would have the potential secondary impact associated with radial expansion from two to four lanes of US 12. Generally, DATCP indicates that highway projects can create secondary impacts by encouraging residents to relocate further from their destinations (employment, schools, and commercial centers) because improved roads allow for more efficient travel. With an influx of urban residents, conflicts may arise over practices typically associated with farming – odors, noise, pesticide and herbicide use. Ultimately, these conflicts may cause some farmers to alter their practices, limit farming expansion, or quit farming altogether.

**Alternative 3**

Of the 4 proposed build alternatives; DATCP indicates that Alternative 3 is their most preferred for the following reasons:

- The alternative does not create an entirely new corridor.
- The alternative does not increase highway lane capacity, though the right-of-way width would be increased.
- Existing farm parcels are not fragmented and the alternative requires fewer farmland acres.
- The alternative is distant enough from Fort Atkinson that it would not have typical bypass impacts on land use.
- Land use in the vicinity of CTH N would remain relatively constant; i.e. agricultural and residential.

It should be noted that although there would be an interchange at the west end of the study corridor, it is to be constructed as a part of the separate WIS 26 highway project. Typically, the concern for over-development at interchanges is related to limited access routes where the interchanges provide sporadic access. Alternative 3 in and of itself would not further limit access along the existing County N route. Although WIS 26 is limited access to the north, the impacts at this interchange would be due to that project, not as a result of Alternative 3.

**Alternatives 7 and 7a**

Construction of this alternative may potentially result in increased development south of Fort Atkinson, leading to additional loss of farm land. DATCP states that this alternative would likely have substantial secondary impacts on farmland in southern Jefferson County. The alternative involves a partial bypass of Fort Atkinson and would need to be analyzed by DATCP in terms of its effects when combined with the already existing bypass of Fort Atkinson as well as the increase of the existing WIS 26 bypass scheduled for 2008. Additional secondary impacts may result from the capacity increase from two to four lanes into and out of Whitewater as it relates to recent development on Whitewater’s west side.

**9) Describe any other project-related effects identified by a farm operator or owner that may be adverse, beneficial or controversial.**

General comments received from farm owners and operators relate to their concern over the loss of field access and the potential loss of farm buildings at select locations.

**Alternative 3**

Concerns raised specific to Alternative 3 include the potential for increased traffic interfering with farm equipment moving from field to field and the loss of acreage to road right-of-way.

**10) Indicate whether minority population or low-income population farm owners, operators, or workers will be affected by the proposal. (Include migrant workers if appropriate.)**

No disproportionate effects will accrue to farm owners, operators or workers from minority populations or low-income populations

Yes - Discuss

**11) Describe measures to minimize adverse effects or enhance benefits.**

In final design, land acquisition would be minimized by designing the facility as close to the existing US 12 as design standards and site conditions will allow.

The study corridor of 200 to 400 feet wide is more than what final design would require so that there may be room to adjust the alignment to minimize impacts identified in the environmental impact study.

