

9. Comments and Coordination Following Draft EIS Availability and Public Hearing.....	9-1
Public Involvement	9-1
Summary of Oral and Written Comments.....	9-2
Agency and Local Official Comments.....	9-2
Frequently Asked Questions and Comments	9-5
Preferred Alternative Announcement.....	9-8
Project Advisory Committee.....	9-8
Public Information Meeting.....	9-8

Exhibits

9-1	Summary of Public Comments
-----	----------------------------

Tables

9-1	Agency and Local Official Comments.....	9-3
-----	---	-----

SECTION 9

COMMENTS AND COORDINATION FOLLOWING DRAFT EIS AVAILABILITY AND PUBLIC HEARING

This section discusses community involvement activities and coordination with state and federal review agencies and other interest groups following availability of the Draft EIS including the public hearing. The public involvement process was open to all residents and population groups in the study area.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The public hearing was held at Kettle Moraine High School (cafeteria) in Wales, WI from 4 p.m. to 8 p.m. on Thursday, November 20, 2003. One hundred thirty-six people attended. The public hearing format was open house, and representatives from WisDOT and the consultant team were available to review project alternatives, answer questions, and explain procedures for providing testimony. Two formats were available for providing testimony – oral presentations to a court reporter and written comment forms at the hearing. The comment forms could also be mailed in after the public hearing. All forms of testimony were given equal consideration.

The notice announcing the public hearing and availability of the Draft EIS was published in the *Lake Country Reporter* on October 23 and November 6, 2003; in the *Kettle Moraine Index* on October 23 and November 6, 2003; and in the *Mukwonago Chief* on October 29, 2003. In addition, the notice was sent to the project's mailing list (abutting property owners and all who signed in at past public meetings) which includes about 1,100 individuals.

Exhibits at the public hearing included:

- Statements about the project's Proposed Action and Key Objectives
- Existing and future deficiencies (traffic projections, crash analysis, existing roadway photos)
- Location Map showing roadway sections
- Alternatives and Impacts table
- Before and after photo renderings of roadway
- 1" = 200' scale aerials with proposed right-of-way for widening and Alternative D; reproduced directly from Draft EIS
- Draft EIS's available for review

A handout was provided that included a Location Map, procedures for providing oral and written testimony, information about upcoming activities and contacts, summary of project purpose and need, alternatives retained for detailed study, public involvement and agency coordination efforts, an impact table, and a comment form.

SUMMARY OF ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMENTS

During the public hearing and public comment period, seventy one (71) people provided written or oral comments. Of the 71 comments:

- 34 people opposed widening the highway in general (29 of these people specifically opposed a 4-lane alternative or Alternative D in Genesee Depot)
- 26 people expressed general concerns about a wider road being closer to homes, environmental impacts, construction schedule/details, and cost
- 7 people opposed Alternative D
- 4 people supported a 4-lane alternative for the corridor

Overall, the comments opposed to and in favor of the project were consistent with comments the study team had heard throughout activities leading to the Draft EIS. Project supporters cite growing traffic volumes and existing safety issues, especially at intersections, as reasons to improve WIS 83. An area of agreement between project supporters and project opponents is the need to improve problem intersections and enforce posted speed limits.

Many who oppose the project believe that widening WIS 83 will encourage faster vehicle speeds and more traffic. Many people expressed concern that a multi-lane facility will eliminate the rural character of the corridor. Specifically, those opposed to 4 lanes in Genesee Depot do not want to lose the small town charm that residents have come to enjoy. Noise, air, wetland, and wildlife impacts are also of concern to project opponents. A number of people mentioned that 4-lane improvements would cause problems for children along the corridor, especially near schools. Others opposing the expansion of WIS 83 expressed concern about an increase in urban sprawl with a disruption to natural habitat, scenic beauty, and additional stress on groundwater supplies.

Many people opposed to widening the highway in Genesee Depot support constructing an improved 2-lane highway, eliminating parking from one side of the road, and reducing the speed limit near Magee Elementary School.

Exhibit 9-1 is a summary of oral testimony and written comments received during the public comment period. All testimony received during the public comment period is available at the WisDOT District 2 office, 141 NW Barstow, Waukesha, Wisconsin.

AGENCY AND LOCAL OFFICIAL COMMENTS

Comments on the Draft EIS were received from state and federal review agencies and local governments. In addition, state/federal review agencies and local officials provided input on the preferred alternative based on continued coordination for purposes of the Final EIS. Table 9-1 summarizes these comments. Appendix D contains agency correspondence along with responses, as applicable. The vertical line and circled numbers on agency letters correspond to comment responses following each letter.

**TABLE 9-1
Agency and Local Official Comments**

Agency	Key Issues/Comments
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	<p>December 4, 2003—letter noting previous concurrence in project purpose and need and range of alternatives considered in the Draft EIS. Requested the following information be included in the Final EIS: potential impact to high quality trout habitat/streams and mitigation; special consideration for Scuppernong Creek headwaters-natural bottom crossing and wetland impacts; commitment to re-evaluate Blanding’s Turtle habitat if Alternative D is selected; additional wetland information including value, function, and compensation plan; and air quality and project conformity with the SIP. Supports stormwater management plan for Scuppernong Creek identified in the Draft EIS (see Appendix D, page D-1).</p> <p>April 21, 2004—letter noting previous concurrence in project purpose and need and range of alternatives considered in Draft EIS. Provided concurrence in preferred alternative. Reiterated inclusions for Final EIS including more detailed mitigation plans/descriptions of wetlands and high quality trout streams and air quality conformity with the SIP (see Appendix D, page D-2).</p>
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	<p>December 5, 2003—electronic mail memo requesting additional information on wetlands including functions, values, and impacts for each alternative; requested minor Draft EIS text and table modifications (see Appendix D, page D-3).</p> <p>April 29, 2004—letter concurring in preferred alternative (see Appendix D, page D-4).</p> <p>August 26, 2005—letter concurring with the treatment for the existing Bark River wetland mitigation site (see Appendix D, page D-5).</p>
State Historical Society of Wisconsin (SHS)	<p>November 7, 2003—letter noting comments on archaeological investigations would be provided upon receiving the archaeological investigation report. Noted that information on potential impacts to Ten Chimneys and the millrace in the Woolen Mill Historic District should be included in Final EIS (see Appendix D, page D-6).</p> <p>December 15, 2003—signed Section 106 Form indicating concurrence in results of the archaeological/historical investigations (see Appendix D, page D-7).</p> <p>September 21, 2004— signed Section 106 Form indicating concurrence in results of the additional archaeological investigations (see Appendix D, page D-8).</p> <p>May 5, 2005—signed Memorandum of Agreement on historical and archaeological issues between FHWA and SHS (see Appendix D, page D-9).</p>
Waukesha County Department of Parks and Land Use	<p>November 25, 2003—letter reiterating preference for a combined grade-separated crossing of the Lake Country Trail/Ice Age Trail. Also requested a paved trail from Golf Road to County KE (see Appendix D, page D-10).</p> <p>May 28, 2004—letter requesting reconsideration for a combined grade-separated crossing of the Lake Country Trail/Ice Age Trail (see Appendix D, page D-11).</p> <p>November 8, 2004—meeting with IAPTF representatives, NPS, and Waukesha County Parks and Land Use Department regarding trail crossing alternatives.</p>
Ice Age Park and Trail Foundation (IAPTF)	<p>December 2, 2003—follow up letter confirming preference for a combined grade-separated crossing for the Lake Country Trail/Ice Age Trail. Stated opinion that Section 4(f) and 6(f) is applicable to the parcel east of WIS 83 at Bark River (see Appendix D, page D-12).</p> <p>May 14, 2004—letter requesting reconsideration for a combined grade-separated crossing of the Lake Country Trail/Ice Age Trail (see Appendix D, page D-13).</p> <p>November 8, 2004—meeting with IAPTF representatives, NPS, and Waukesha County Parks and Land Use Department regarding trail crossing alternatives.</p>
U.S. Department of Commerce	<p>December 3, 2003—letter providing information on geodetic control monuments; requests notification if any monuments will be relocated (see Appendix D, page D-14).</p>

**TABLE 9-1
Agency and Local Official Comments**

Agency	Key Issues/Comments
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR)	<p>December 3, 2003—letter noting concerns about the following: impacts to waterways, especially cold-water communities and proposed crossing types; wetland impacts, especially ADID wetlands; stormwater management plans, especially near cold-water communities and wetland mitigation sites; magnitude of impacts associated with Alternative D; requested additional information on wetland mitigation sites, Special Concern Species, conservation plan for Threatened/Endangered Species, and that the farm access point to Lapham Peak State Park be maintained. Concurred in Ice Age Park and Trail Foundation preference for a combined and grade-separated Lake Country Trail/Ice Age Trail crossing (see Appendix D, page D-15).</p> <p>April 26, 2004—letter concurring in preferred alternative with the exception of rerouting the Lake Country/Ice Age Trail crossing to the signalized Golf Road intersection (see Appendix D, page D-16).</p> <p>May 7, 2004—letter providing additional input on threatened, endangered, and special concern species (see Appendix D, page D-17).</p> <p>June 27, 2005—letter concurring with the treatment for the existing Bark River wetland mitigation site (see Appendix D, page D-18).</p> <p>October 31, 2005—letter summarizing results of WDNR/WisDOT Conflict Resolution Meeting (see Appendix D, page D-19).</p>
Department of Health and Human Services, U.S. Public Health Service	December 3, 2003—letter noting that impacts were adequately addressed in Draft EIS and that mitigation measures should be adhered to. Requested copy of Final EIS (see Appendix D, page D-20).
Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Bureau of Aeronautics	October 27, 2003—e-mail stating that the WIS 83 project is far enough away from the Waukesha County airport (Crites Field) that it should pose no problems to the airport. Requested advanced notification if construction equipment will be used near any runway and noted the existence of height limitation requirements within 3 miles of airport property (see Appendix D, page D-21).
U.S. Department of Interior	December 15, 2003—letter noting historic properties potentially subject to Section 4(f) requirements and requesting more detailed maps in EIS to illustrate potential impacts to historic properties (see Appendix D, page D-22).
U.S. Department of Interior Fish and Wildlife Service	April 13, 2004—letter concurring in preferred alternative. Noted that critical habitat for threatened and endangered species should be reassessed if there is a time lag between plan completion and execution. Stated that wetland impacts should be minimized and mitigated and that wildlife movement under the highway should be encouraged (see Appendix D, page D-23).
U.S. Department of Interior National Park Service (NPS)	May 14, 2004—letter noting continued request for a combined, grade-separated crossing for the Lake Country and Ice Age Trails and expressing concern that an at-grade crossing rerouted to the signalized Golf Road intersection would not provide long term safety for trail users due to projected traffic increases in the County DR/Golf Road to Meadow Lane segment (see Appendix D, page D-24).
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	March 24, 2004—letter stating that Draft EIS provided excellent analysis of impacts and encouraged continued cooperation with SHS, U.S. Fish & Wildlife, and DNR (see Appendix D, page D-25).
Native American Interests--Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin, Ho-Chunk Nation	November 25, 2003—letter from WisDOT Archaeological Program Manager noting that the results of the Phase I and Phase II archaeological studies found there were no eligible sites in the project corridor (see Appendix D, page D-26).
City of Delafield	December 2, 2003—letter providing general concurrence with proposed actions through the Delafield City limits. Suggested that crash data be updated to reflect recent years and highway improvements; final plans should include utilities and access points; noted Draft EIS text corrections; expressed preference for high quality, low maintenance vegetation in medians; and detour routes. Noted that improvements through the City of Delafield should be completed as soon as possible (see Appendix D, page D-27).
Village of Wales	November 20, 2003—letter noting that landscaped medians soften the visual effect of the roadway and medians will provide shelter for turning vehicles. Requests provisions for retaining walls where slope grading severely impacts adjacent backyards (see Appendix D, page D-28).

TABLE 9-1
Agency and Local Official Comments

Agency	Key Issues/Comments
Town of Genesee	November 12, 2003—letter expressing opposition to any further road widening in Genesee Village and Genesee Depot, preference for no build alternative, and removal of parking on one side in Genesee Depot when warranted. Not in support of Alternative D due to magnitude of environmental and socioeconomic impacts (see Appendix D, page D-29).
Town of Mukwonago	November 19, 2003—letter stating preferences for traffic signals at CTH I and Sugden/Frog Alley Road, turning and passing lanes at Road X, median openings for farmers, sight distance improvements at Sugden/Frog Alley Road, no increase in posted speed limit, and consideration to lower the speed limit (see Appendix D, page D-30).

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

Following is a summary of and responses to the substantive social, economic, or environmental comments or issues identified during and following the Draft EIS comment period. Most issues are those having general community interest.

1. **Comment: Why is Highway 83 being studied?**

Response: WisDOT has identified 3 main reasons for studying the WIS 83 corridor; present average daily traffic volumes are high and planned development will increase future traffic, safety problems exist along the roadway, and preserving land needed for future transportation improvements is essential.

2. **Comment: Why are you showing alignments off of WIS 83 and why not stay on WIS 83?**

Response: The purpose of the study is to determine how to best meet the long-term transportation needs of the corridor. Major issues of safety and mobility have been addressed along with minimizing impacts to natural and cultural resources. In the Genesee Depot area, there are many natural and cultural resources along WIS 83, and the study team evaluated alternatives to minimize those impacts. Off-Alignment Alternatives have been evaluated to minimize the through Genesee Village and through Genesee Depot impacts. The Town of Genesee officials are also concerned about preserving the character of the Genesee Village and Genesee Depot areas.

3. **Comment: How were the Off-Alignment Alternatives chosen?**

Response: The alternatives were chosen based on their functionality as a state trunk highway while minimizing impacts to natural and cultural resources, residences, and businesses.

4. **Comment: Why were other Off-Alignment Alternatives (other than Alternative D) eliminated?**

Response: Alternative D was recommended for further evaluation because it had the least overall impacts compared to the other Off-Alignment Alternatives and through town alternative. It would also minimize displacements on the east-west leg of WIS 83 passing through Genesee Depot, minimize access points, and would avoid the right-angle turn.

Other Off-Alignment Alternatives were also considered early in the study such as using County E and County ZZ. These alternatives were not carried forward because they are too

far west to substantially reduce traffic on the existing WIS 83 route, are not consistent with the 2020 Regional Transportation System Plan for Southeastern Wisconsin or Waukesha County Plans, are not supported by local officials, and would be cost prohibitive due to their length.

5. Comment: Why is a 4-lane alternative through Genesee Village and Genesee Depot being considered when traffic projections do not warrant 4-lanes within 20 years?

Response: Safety is one of the key elements of the study, and as traffic increases so does the likelihood of more crashes. The study team has projected traffic to the year 2026 as part of the long-term transportation plan, and at this time, 4-lanes do not seem to be warranted from County X to County DE/E. However, the preferred alternative for WIS 83 in the County X to WIS 59 section is the 4-Lane Corridor Preservation Alternative and was selected for route continuity and for preserving a corridor in the event that traffic volumes warrant capacity expansion. The 2-lane alternative in Genesee Depot was selected to preserve the small town character of the community, and the 4-lane alternative was not supported by Town of Genesee officials and citizens due to the magnitude of impacts to adjacent homes, businesses, and historic properties.

6. Comment: How is public input taken into account?

Response: Throughout the Corridor Study, news releases have been published, notices have been mailed to those directly impacted by the alternatives, monthly Local Information Centers have been established, news articles have been published, a project website is online, a public meeting has been held, and a public hearing was held. The study team, local officials, and state/federal review agencies have taken all public comments into account during evaluation of the alternatives.

7. Comment: When is construction expected to start and which section will be first?

Response: A specific construction schedule has not been established, nor has funding been set in place. Because of emerging safety and traffic concerns, it seems likely that the Meadow Lane to WIS 16 segment could get constructed first, depending on funding and local cost share agreements. However, similar safety and traffic concerns exist from County DE/E to Hillside Drive, and secondly from County NN to County X. The earliest construction date for any full-length segment is 2009. WisDOT will consider splitting the segments shown in the EIS into smaller parts if warranted by need and if funding is available. A two-lane reconstruction from County NN to WIS 59 is planned within the four-lane corridor footprint in 2009 as an interim improvement.

8. Comment: Can the segment north of Chapman's Curve be widened more to the west instead of widening down the middle?

Response: After several residents in this area voiced their concerns with the road coming closer to their homes east of WIS 83 north of Chapman's Curve, the study team was able to shift the alignment about another 20 feet west which balanced the residential and wetland impacts. The future northbound lanes would generally be in about the same location as the existing pavement within 5 to 10 feet. This alignment shift was discussed with property owners on site and at local information centers including how the study team positively addressed their concerns and why a shift farther into the wetlands is not an environmentally sound option due to laws that protect wetlands. Additional detail could be developed in a future engineering phase after the study is completed.

9. Comment: Can a center turn lane be used in Wales instead of a wider grassed median?

Response: A raised grass median provides safe storage for turning vehicles and refuge for pedestrians and bicyclists. The median also provides shelter for vehicles crossing from side roads and driveways. Turns from side roads and driveways will be safer when executed in two maneuvers rather than one. The center turn lane only provides minimal refuge for pedestrians and bicyclists. Options for using a center turn lane in the short segment from Welsh Road to South Street may be evaluated in a future engineering phase after the study is completed.

10. Comment: How will impacts to adjacent properties with steep side slopes in Wales be addressed?

Response: Residents near Welsh Road and South Street voiced concerns about grading impacts on steep slopes and loss of trees. Discussions on site and at local information centers with affected residents included options to use small berms behind the curb and/or retaining walls to minimize grading impacts to trees and abutting backyards. Site specific details will be finalized in a future engineering phase after the study is completed.

11. Comment: Will median openings be provided for access to residences and businesses?

Response: Median opening locations will be determined in a future engineering phase after the study is completed and will be provided where feasible and safe according to WisDOT guidelines. Safety and access control issues limit the number of median openings allowed, so not every residence or business will have a median opening directly in front of their driveway.

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE ANNOUNCEMENT

On April 28, 2004, WisDOT met with members of the project advisory committee to present the preferred alternative and explain the process used in its selection. On April 29, 2004, WisDOT electronically mailed a project newsletter to state representatives and senators to explain the project's preferred alternative. The newsletter included information on features of the preferred alternative, upcoming project activities, and a general construction timeframe.

On April 30, 2004, a newsletter was mailed to everyone on the project's mailing list notifying them of the preferred alternative. The same day, a news release was published in the *Lake Country Reporter*, *Kettle Moraine Index*, and *Mukwonago Chief* newspapers that stated the preferred alternative.

PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The fifth and final PAC meeting was held on April 28, 2004 at the Genesee Town Hall in Genesee Depot. In addition to WisDOT and consultant study team members, the meeting was attended by local officials, representatives from FHWA, DNR, the Genesee Depot Neighborhood Alliance, and other interested citizens.

The purpose of the meeting was to report on study activities that occurred since the last PAC meeting including release of the Draft EIS, public hearing, and selection of a preferred alternative. Study team members reviewed the preferred alternative for each project section and facilitated group discussions. Photo renderings showing conceptual roadway layouts of the preferred alternative were available for review. Study team members also gave a preview of upcoming activities including Final EIS availability and functional plan development.

PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING

A public information meeting was held to discuss an interim two-lane reconstruction alternative from County NN to WIS 59 planned for 2009. The meeting was announced in the *Kettle Moraine Index*, and the *Mukwonago Chief*. It was also announced through a notice mailed to the entire project mailing list of property owners, local officials, and other interest groups.

The meeting was held on April 12, 2005, at Mukwonago Town Hall. About 80 people attended the open-house style meeting, which ran from 5 to 7 p.m. In general, most people agree there are existing safety problems between County NN and WIS 59, and the pavement is in poor condition. Many were encouraged that these deficiencies will be addressed with the interim two-lane reconstruct and that the long-term four-lane roadway would not be built until or if traffic volumes or additional safety concerns indicate the need.

Name/Address	Key Issues/Comments
Resident of Mukwonago	Opposed to 4-lane expansion from County NN to County X; prefers an improved 2-lane road with turn lanes added at intersections.
Resident of Waukesha	Opposed to 4-lane expansion and Alternative D in Genesee Depot. Concerned with speeding traffic and safety of children at Magee Elementary School.
Resident of North Prairie	Opposed to Alternative D; prefers 2-lane alternative and eliminating parking on 1 side of road in Genesee Depot.
Resident of Genesee Depot	Opposed to 4-lane alternative in Genesee Depot; prefers 2-lane reconstruct.
Resident of Wales	In favor of 2-lane alternative in Genesee; opposed to any alternate routes.
Resident of Mukwonago	Concerned with road coming closer to homes on east side of road; prefers alignment shift to west.
Resident of Genesee	Opposed to 4 lanes and Alternative D in Genesee Depot and prefers 2-lane alternative.
Resident of Waukesha	In favor of 2-lane alternative in Genesee Depot and 4-lane alternative everywhere else.
Resident of Wales	Prefers a center turn lane rather than median near Welsh and South Streets.
Resident of Delafield	Supports a 4-lane roadway. Concerned with road coming closer to home and noise.
Resident of Wales	Feels that South Street intersection should be lowered because of sight distance problems, a tunnel under STH 83 should be built at County G for bicycles and pedestrians, more speed enforcement is needed, and signals installed at Main Street.
Resident of Waukesha	Opposed to Alternative D; prefers no build or 2-lane reconstruct.
Residents of Genesee	Concerned with location of new road relative to their mound system and impacts to property.
Resident of Dousman	In favor of Alternative D and 4-lane alternative in remainder of corridor.
Resident of Mukwonago	In favor of 2-lane reconstruction from County X to County DE.
Resident of Pewaukee	In favor of no build in Town of Genesee; opposed to Alternative D.
Resident of Oconomowoc	Prefers no build in Genesee Depot.
Resident of North Prairie	Opposed to Alternative D and 4-lane expansion in Genesee Depot; in favor of parking on 1 side of street.
Resident of Waukesha	Prefers a no build in Genesee Depot and that environmental impacts should be minimized if expansion occurs. Feels that traffic will increase if road is expanded.
Resident of Waukesha	Opposed to any expansion or bypass in Genesee Depot. Feels that 2 lanes, the 90-degree turn, and heavy traffic are positive factors that force drivers to slow down.
Resident of Wales	Feels that money should go toward maintenance instead of new construction. Would like to see wider 2-lane roads to accommodate bicyclists. Feels that 4 lanes will encourage faster traffic – doesn't want that in Wales. Concerned with cemeteries.
Resident of Wales	Concerned with construction schedule; interested in which section will get built first.
Resident of Genesee Depot	Opposed to 4-lane alternative and Alternative D in Genesee Depot; prefers no build or 2-lane alternative.
Unknown	Opposed to Alternative D in Genesee Depot due to impacts to wildlife, especially Blanding's Turtle. Would like to see DOT collect more information on habitat use by threatened wildlife prior to finalizing any plans.

Name/Address	Key Issues/Comments
Resident of Eagle	Opposed to 4-lane alternative and Alternative D in Genesee Depot; prefers no build or 2-lane option in Genesee Depot. Feels bypass would hurt local business, environment, and town history. Feels that a wider road and increased speed will lead to more accidents.
Resident of Hartland	Would like to see proposed widening more to west to disrupt fewer properties and occupants on east side of road.
Residents of Mukwonago	Opposed to eastward expansion from Chapman Farm to Saxony Court and feels that property values and quality of life will be significantly diminished. Suggested text for Draft EIS and submitted map with westward alignment shift.
Resident of Sussex	In favor of widening the road to 4 lanes. Feels that congestion and multiple crossroads and driveways lead to dangerous conditions.
Resident of Genesee Depot	Opposed to 4-lane alternative and Alternative D in Genesee Depot; prefers a no build for Genesee and Genesee Depot. Feels that construction through the Depot will be destructive, reduce property values, and hurt local businesses.
Resident of Hartland	Opposed to road expansion. Concerned that configuration of 83/16 interchange and nearby proposed developments will generate enormous traffic problems. Concerned with future water table levels. Feels that signals near 83/16 would alleviate traffic problems.
Resident of Waukesha	Wants intersection at Depot Road maintained for Ten Chimneys access. Feels that Alternative D should be avoided; questions why eastern alignments were dismissed.
Resident of Mukwonago	Feels a no build from County X to County DE/E is only viable option and that WIS 59 intersection could be improved with left turn lanes/arrows. Feels that the 90-degree turn in Genesee Depot causes very little problems and that trucks negotiate with no difficulty.
Resident of Mukwonago	Feels a no build from County X to County DE/E is best idea and that widening from Walnut Street through the Depot would destroy both villages. Feels that Alternative D would destroy the Depot. Feels that 35 mph is too fast through town.
Resident of Waukesha	Opposed to any expansion of WIS 83 from County X to County DE/E. Prefers to improve existing road by expanding shoulders and repaving.
Resident of Genesee Depot	Feels that trucks get around the corner OK and that no accidents occur there. Feels that the corner is a good speed controller.
Resident of Hartland	Opposed to widening to 4 lanes; prefers limited improvements on and off WIS 83 including traffic signals. Feels that 4 lanes will cause faster driving and more problems.
Resident of Hartland	Wants a bike trail along WIS 83 in Hartland. Also would like landscaping/berming to minimize noise and lights.
Resident of Genesee Depot	Opposed to Alternative D. Wants Genesee Depot to remain as is.
Resident of Wales	Prefers a center two-way left turn lane from Welsh Road to US 18 in Wales to accommodate turning traffic.
Resident of Wales	Feels that the 4-lane and Alternative D through Genesee Depot would cause damage.
Resident of Mukwonago	Opposed to long term corridor preservation alternatives and off-alignment corridor preservation alternatives at Genesee or Genesee Depot; prefers a no build or 2-lane alternative from County X to County DE/E. Concerned about wetland and residential impacts, noise, air quality, and speed.

Name/Address	Key Issues/Comments
Resident of Genesee Depot	Feels that a 4-lane road would take away the following: walking to school/playground, ability to bike to town park, ability to walk to nature trail, ability to walk to stream for fishing, ability to camp out in own backyard. Feels that a way of life should be preserved for present and future kids.
Resident of Delafield	Opposed to selling some property for highway right-of-way. Concerned with wide right-of-way requirements and speed limits. Feels that a multi-use path would not get used in 45-mph areas.
Resident of Delafield	Concerned with losing trees along right-of-way line and excessive speed with a 4-lane highway. Questions the safety of a multi-use path to nearby I-94 area.
Residents of Genesee Depot	Opposed to Alternative D; don't want to destroy charm and beauty of Genesee Depot.
Resident of Mukwonago	Concerned with road coming closer to home, buried gas lines, and having a median opening for farming access. Wants traffic signals at County I before WIS 83 project.
Resident of Genesee Depot	Opposed to bridging over the waterway and destroying natural resources with Alternative D. Feels the corridor should be moved west.
Resident of Waukesha	Concerned that residents on WIS 83 are the only voices being heard and that other drivers are not being considered.
Residents of Genesee Depot	Opposed to Alternative D because of impacts to environment and historic areas. Submitted pictures and additional supporting exhibits.
Resident of Mukwonago	Opposed to long term corridor preservation and off-alignment alternatives in Genesee and Genesee Depot. Prefers a no build or 2-lane reconstruct from County X to County DE/E. Concerned with speeding, road maintenance, and drainage.
Residents of Genesee Depot	Opposed to 4-lanes and Alternative D in Genesee Depot. Other off-alignments should be re-examined. Concerned with speeding and would like to see a 4-way stop at County D.
Resident of Dousman	Opposed to Alternative D due to environmental impacts. Also opposed to any change in Hwy 83 through Genesee Depot.
Resident of Wales	Prefers a no build in Wales and would like to see traffic lights. If a 4-lane is needed, prefers a center turn lane and no multi-use path. Concerned with speeding and major loss of trees.
Residents of Genesee Depot	Feel that any off-alignment alternative should completely bypass Genesee Depot and that Alternative D is only half correct.
Resident of Eagle	Prefers that Genesee be left alone.
Resident of Wales	Prefers a two-way left turn lane for access to local business.
Resident of Wales	Prefers a center turn lane for access to local business and would like a traffic signal at Main Street.
Resident of Genesee Depot	Prefers a no build or at most, prohibit parking on one side of street in Genesee and Genesee Depot; would like to see a stop sign for southbound traffic at Depot Road.
Resident of Wales	Would like a median opening for access to property.
Resident of Waukesha	Opposed to the project; feels that speed bumps would help to slow traffic down.
Resident of Hartland	Prefers to maintain existing east right-of-way line and widen west.
Resident of Hartland	Would like a median opening for access to property; requested tax information relating to historic site status.
Resident of Genesee Depot	Prefers a no build in Genesee Depot.

Name/Address	Key Issues/Comments
Resident of Hartland	Concerned with noise, pollution, road runoff, and speed control after construction.
Resident of Delafield	Supports widening WIS 83. Prefers to relocate on current property, a driveway with reasonable slope, and a median opening.