

## Agency Coordination Summary

AGENCY	COORDINATION ACTIVITIES	COMMENTS
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources	An initial scoping packet, which included information on project location, scope, and purpose, was mailed to agencies in October 1994. In June 1995, a second packet was sent to agencies showing the preliminary range of interchange improvements. This packet also contained the project's draft purpose and need statement. The third agency packet, which described the recommended alternative at each interchange, was sent out in February 1996. Project team members also met with DNR twice to provide an update on project activities. The DNR was part of the study's Project Advisory Committee. The DNR Bureau of Endangered Resources provided information on state-listed threatened and endangered species. The DNR Bureau of Air Management provided information on air quality issues.	See DNR correspondence in Appendix B, page B-10, B-17, and B-18.
State Historical Society	The SHS received the three scoping packets discussed above, and reviewed the project's archaeological and historical investigation reports.	See SHS correspondence in Appendix B, pages B-19 and B-19A
Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection	The DATCP received the three scoping packets discussed above. They also received the Agricultural Impact Notice in May 1996.	See DATCP correspondence in Appendix B, page B-16.
WisDOT Bureau of Aeronautics	The Bureau of Aeronautics received the three scoping packets discussed above.	The Bureau of Aeronautics sent a letter in February 1996 with comments about potential impacts to the Kenosha Airport at STH 158. They stated that there would be no impact to Sylvania Airport (STH 11). See correspondence in Appendix B, page B-9.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	The COE received the three scoping packets discussed above. The COE also attended a project update meeting with DNR in July 1995. The COE was part of the study's Project Advisory Committee.	The COE commented on the fall 1994 and spring 1995 agency scoping packets. In February 1996, the COE indicated the interchange improvements that would likely require individual permits or Nationwide permits under the Clean Water Act. See correspondence in Appendix B, page B-1, B-4, B-7, B-8.
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	The EPA received the three scoping Packets discussed above.	No correspondence was received from the EPA.

AGENCY	COORDINATION ACTIVITIES	COMMENTS
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	The FWS received the three scoping packets discussed above, and they provided information about federally listed threatened and endangered species in the project corridor.	See FWS correspondence in Appendix B, page B-14.
USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service	The NRCS received the three scoping packets discussed above. The project team sent the Farmland Conversion Impact Rating sheets to NRCS in May 1996.	The NRCS provided information about farmed wetlands and hydric soils in the project area. See Appendix B, page B-27
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission	SEWRPC received the three scoping packets discussed above. The SEWRPC was part of the study's Project Advisory Committee.	See SEWRPC correspondence in Appendix B, page B-13.
Local Units of Government	Representatives from the seven towns in the project area, the Village of Pleasant Prairie, Racine and Kenosha Counties, and the Cities of Racine and Kenosha received the three scoping packets discussed above. The project team met with local units of government on a regular basis during the study. Representatives of these communities were also part of the study's Project Advisory Committee.	The Town of Mt. Pleasant passed a resolution in support of the project in March 1996. The Town of Bristol passed a resolution in July 1996. See Appendix B, page B-5 and page B-20.

## **Local Government Coordination and Public Involvement Activities**

### **Local Government Coordination**

A Project Advisory Committee (PAC) consisting of local officials from project-area communities, Racine and Kenosha Counties, and state agencies was formed to provide a link between the project-area communities and the study team. It also provides continuity between SEWRPC's land use and transportation plan for the corridor and the current study. Project advisory committee members are listed on the following page. PAC members also assisted the study team in early project scoping activities.

A series of four PAC meetings were held during the study. The first meeting was held on September 27, 1994, at the Kenosha County Center. Activities of the first meeting included the introduction of project staff and committee members, an overview of the project scope and schedule, a description of the PAC's role in the study, a discussion of cost sharing and jurisdictional transfer, an overview of the public involvement plan, and a description of work currently underway.

The second PAC meeting was held on May 11, 1995, at the Racine County Office Building. Activities included an update of progress since the first meeting, review of the preliminary interchange alternatives, review of the Public Information Meeting (PIM) No. 1, review of the study schedule, a discussion of corridor planning and programming issues, and a preview of the third PAC meeting. An open-house followed the meeting to allow attendees to review alternatives and provide comments.

The third PAC meeting was held on September 18, 1995, at the Kenosha County Center. The third PAC meeting included an open-house to allow review of the latest interchange alternatives, review of WisDOT's access management guidelines, discussion on cost sharing and jurisdictional transfer, discussion of WisDOT's park and ride lot study, a presentation on WisDOT's weigh station study, review of upcoming activities and schedule, and general discussion and questions.

The fourth PAC meeting was held on February 7, 1996, at the Kenosha County Center. The meeting included an open house to review the recommended interchange alternative concepts, an overview of the interchange concepts, an update of the weigh station study, and a discussion of upcoming project activities.

I-94 Corridor Study Project Advisory Committee

Racine County	Kenosha County	Agencies
Alan Jasperson, Town Chair Town of Raymond	August Zirbel, Jr., Town Chair Town of Paris	Kurt Bauer, Executive Director Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
Michael Kroes, Town Chair Town of Caledonia	David Holtze, Town Chair Town of Somers	Kenneth Yunker, Assistant Director Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
John R. Smith, Supervisor Town of Caledonia	Donald Weinke, Town Chair Town of Bristol	Jim Morrissey Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Grant Fuhrman, Commissioner Town of Yorkville Planning Commission	John Steinbrink, Village President Village of Pleasant Prairie	Dale Pfeiffle US Army Corps of Engineers
Thomas Melzer, Town Chair Town of Mt. Pleasant	Jean M. Werbie, Community Development Director Village of Pleasant Prairie	Jay Waldschmidt Bureau of Environment Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Patrick DeGrave, Town Administrator Town of Mt. Pleasant	Michael Pollocoff, Village Administrator Village of Pleasant Prairie	Don Struckmeyer Office of Design Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Carolyn Milkie, Village President Village of Sturtevant	Fred Patrie, Director Kenosha County Department of Public Works	Patrick Fleming Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Richard Jones, Commissioner of Public Works City of Racine	George Melcher, Director Kenosha County Department of Planning & Development	David Trowbridge Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Arnold Clement, Director Racine County Dept. of Planning & Development	Nick Arnold, City Administrator City of Kenosha	Sarah Peterson Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Cecil Mehring, County Engineer Racine County	Randy LeClaire, Traffic Engineer City of Kenosha	Richard Madrzak Federal Highway Administration
Glen Lampark, Director Racine County Department of Public Works		
James Smith, Mayor City of Racine		

Local Government Meetings were requested during the study by elected officials to discuss the corridor study and its alternatives and to address concerns of local officials and project-area residents. The table below list the meetings that were held with local governments.

**Local Government and Interest Group Meetings**

Interchange	Meeting Held	Dates
STH 165 (Kenosha Co.)	PAC Meeting No. 1 Local Government Group Meeting Village of Pleasant Prairie PAC Meeting No. 2 PAC Meeting No. 3 Pleasant Prairie Plan Comm. Representative Krueser	09/27/94 04/07/95 04/11/95 05/11/95 09/18/95 10/18/95 11/30/95
CTH C (Kenosha Co.)	PAC Meeting No. 1 Local Government Group Meeting Village of Pleasant Prairie PAC Meeting No. 2 Town of Bristol PAC Meeting No. 3 Pleasant Prairie Plan Comm. Representative Krueser Village of Pleasant Prairie	09/27/94 04/07/95 04/11/95 05/11/95 06/02/95 09/18/95 10/18/95 11/30/95 07/18/96
STH 50 (Kenosha Co.)	PAC Meeting No. 1 Local Government Group Meeting Village of Pleasant Prairie City of Kenosha PAC Meeting No. 2 Town of Bristol Town of Bristol/Business Interests Town of Bristol PAC Meeting No. 3 Pleasant Prairie Plan Comm. City of Kenosha Representative Krueser Town of Bristol/Business Interests Kenosha Engineering Dept. Village of Pleasant Prairie	09/27/94 04/07/95 04/11/95 05/01/95 05/11/95 06/02/95 06/14/95 09/07/95 09/18/95 10/18/95 10/31/95 11/30/95 02/02/96 03/21/96 07/18/96
STH 158 (Kenosha Co.)	PAC Meeting No. 1 Local Government Group Meeting City of Kenosha PAC Meeting No. 2 PAC Meeting No. 3 Representative Krueser City of Kenosha Town of Paris Representative Krueser	09/27/94 04/07/95 05/01/95 05/11/95 09/18/95 11/30/95 03/21/96 04/29/96 05/02/96

Interchange	Meeting Held	Dates
STH 142 (Kenosha Co.)	PAC Meeting No. 1 Local Government Group Meeting PAC Meeting No. 2 Town of Paris/Business Interests Town of Somers/Business Interests PAC Meeting No. 3 Town of Somers Plan Comm. Town of Somers/Business Interests Representative Krueser Representative Porter Town of Paris City of Kenosha Town of Paris Representative Krueser	09/27/94 04/07/95 05/11/95 07/19/95 07/19/95 09/18/95 09/25/95 10/12/95 11/30/95 12/07/95 04/29/96 03/21/96 04/29/96 05/02/96
CTH E (Kenosha Co.)	PAC Meeting No. 1 Local Government Group Meeting PAC Meeting No. 2 PAC Meeting No. 3 Town of Somers Plan Comm. Representative Krueser Town of Paris Representative Krueser	09/27/94 04/07/95 05/11/95 09/18/95 09/25/95 11/30/95 04/29/96 05/02/96
CTH KR (Kenosha Co. / Racine Co.)	PAC Meeting No. 1 Racine County Town of Yorkville Racine County DPW PAC Meeting No. 2 PAC Meeting No. 3 Town of Somers Plan Comm. Town of Yorkville Representative Krueser Town of Mt. Pleasant Town of Paris	09/27/94 04/13/95 04/18/95 04/20/95 05/11/95 09/18/95 09/25/95 11/27/95 11/30/95 04/18/96 04/29/96
STH 11 (Racine Co.)	PAC Meeting No. 1 Racine County Town of Yorkville Town of Mt. Pleasant Racine County DPW PAC Meeting No. 2 PAC Meeting No. 3 Town of Yorkville Town of Mt. Pleasant	09/27/94 04/13/95 04/18/95 04/20/95 04/20/95 05/11/95 09/18/95 11/27/95 04/18/96

Interchange	Meeting Held	Dates
STH 20 (Racine Co.)	PAC Meeting No. 1 Racine County Town of Yorkville Town of Mt. Pleasant Racine County DPW PAC Meeting No. 2 PAC Meeting No. 3 Town of Yorkville Senator Petak Senator Petak & Businesses Town of Mt. Pleasant	09/27/94 04/13/95 04/18/95 04/20/95 04/20/95 05/11/95 09/18/95 11/27/95 11/30/95 12/01/95 04/18/96
CTH K (Racine Co.)	PAC Meeting No. 1 Racine County Town of Raymond Racine County DPW Town of Caledonia PAC Meeting No. 2 Town of Raymond/Business Interests Business Interests/Property Owners PAC Meeting No. 3 Town of Raymond/Property Owners	09/27/94 04/13/95 04/18/95 04/20/95 05/01/95 05/11/95 07/19/95 08/23/95 09/18/95 10/12/95
CTH G (Racine Co.)	PAC Meeting No. 1 Racine County Town of Raymond Racine County DPW Town of Caledonia PAC Meeting No. 2 PAC Meeting No. 3 Town of Raymond/Property Owners	09/27/94 04/13/95 04/18/95 04/20/95 05/01/95 05/11/95 09/18/95 10/12/95
7 Mile Road (Racine Co.)	PAC Meeting No. 1 Racine County Town of Raymond Racine County DPW Town of Caledonia PAC Meeting No. 2 Town of Caledonia/7 Mile Road Property Owners Town of Caledonia/7 Mile Road Property Owners PAC Meeting No. 3	09/27/94 04/13/95 04/18/95 04/20/95 05/01/95 05/11/95 08/09/95 09/07/95 09/18/95
27th Street / USH 41 (Racine Co.)	PAC Meeting No. 1 Racine County Town of Raymond Racine County DPW PAC Meeting No. 2 PAC Meeting No. 3	09/27/94 04/13/95 04/18/95 04/20/95 05/11/95 09/18/95

## **Public Involvement**

### **Newsletters**

Four project newsletters were sent to about 800 property owners, local officials, agencies, and interest groups. These newsletters were sent in November 1994, May 1995, September 1995, and February 1996. Each newsletter included a project update, project summary, upcoming activities, study schedule, the location of information centers, a list of Project Advisory Committee members, project contacts, public information meeting announcements, and a "coupon" for interested parties to send in to have their names added to the mailing list.

### **Public Information Meetings**

The project team held three public information meetings (PIM) to gather public input and provide information regarding the study, including the range of alternatives for each interchange. The first PIM was held on May 23, 1995, in Racine County and May 24, 1995, in Kenosha County. Approximately 112 people attended the Racine County session, and about 60 people attended the Kenosha County session. Each of the sessions was an open-house from 4 to 8 p.m. The meetings were announced in the *Kenosha News*, *Racine Journal Times*, and the *Oak Creek Pictorial*. Newsletters announcing the meeting were sent to property owners, local officials, agencies, and interest groups.

Exhibits included a map of the I-94 study corridor; boards showing the study objectives, study schedule, existing and forecast traffic volumes, crash data, and metric/English equivalents; and aerial maps showing the preliminary range of interchange alternatives being considered. A handout was provided that contained a summary of the meeting purpose, corridor map, study objectives, schedule, project contacts, list of Project Advisory Committee members, and comment sheet.

Exhibits were arranged by interchange to facilitate an orderly overview and discussion. A take-home packet containing copies of the aerial maps showing the preliminary alternatives and a summary of key features was available for each interchange. Members of the study team recorded comments on aerial photo sheets and took summary notes. In addition, the public was encouraged to fill out comment sheets at the meeting, or send them in at a later date.

**Racine County Concerns.** At the CTH KR interchange, one of the main concerns was severance of an apple orchard with one of the frontage road alignments. Comments on the STH 11 interchange included concerns about truck operations and safety. Comments on the STH 20 interchange were mostly from businesses concerned about the effect of access changes on existing and future development. Concerns at the CTH K interchange included farmland severances and business access. Opinions about the closing of CTH G were mixed. Some people felt the interchange is not needed. Others were concerned that closure would increase truck traffic near residential development. At the 7 Mile Road interchange, many residents expressed concern about neighborhood impacts from one of the east frontage road alignments. There was also concern that the west frontage road alignment would sever farmland and the Kimmel Woods Natural Area.

**Kenosha County Concerns.** Concerns at the CTH C interchange centered around business and residential relocations. Business interests at the STH 50 interchange were concerned about

changes in access. Comments on the STH 158 interchange were mainly about future property access. Businesses at the STH 142 interchange were concerned about the effects of access changes and property acquisition. Others expressed concern about property severances. Comments on the CTH E interchange were mostly about the location of internal access roads. Several people stated closure of the CTH KR interchange was not a viable alternative. Other expressed concern about farmland severances.

The second PIM was held on September 27, 1995, in Racine County at Raymond Elementary School, and September 28, 1995, in Kenosha County at the Kenosha County Center. Approximately 75 people attended the Racine County session, and approximately 45 people attended the Kenosha County session. Each session was an open-house from 4 to 7 p.m. The meetings were announced in the *Racine Journal Times*, *Kenosha News*, and *Oak Creek Pictorial*, and in a project newsletter.

Display exhibits included a map of the I-94 study corridor; boards showing the study objectives, study schedule, existing and forecast traffic volumes, and crash data; aerial maps showing the latest interchange alternatives being considered, a schematic diagram showing typical interchange layout for separating frontage roads and ramps, and a set of "working" aerial maps for recording notes. A project handout was provided that contained a corridor map, summary of meeting objectives, background and project update information, key objectives of updating the I-94 interchanges, upcoming project activities, schedule, project contacts, list of Project Advisory Committee members, and a comment sheet.

Similar to the first PIM, displays were arranged by interchange to facilitate an orderly overview and discussion. A take-home packet was provided that contained copies of the aerial maps with alternatives; a summary of local government, interest group, and public meetings held to date and comments from those meetings; a summary of agency coordination to date, and a matrix comparing the latest alternatives to the No-Build alternative.

Racine County Concerns. A few property owners commented on the two alternatives for the CTH KR interchange. Both concepts for the STH 11 interchange showed closing Old STH 11 (58th Road) east and west of I-94. A few people noted reasons why Old STH 11 should be kept open. Of the two concepts for the STH 20 interchange, business interests preferred the one that would make the fewest changes to the existing interchange, which was recently reconstructed. At the CTH K interchange, businesses were concerned about closing direct access to CTH K between the ramps and frontage roads. Others expressed concern about property severances and the wide separation between the I-94 ramps and the frontage roads as shown on one of the two alternatives. Four concepts, including a closure option, were shown for the CTH G interchange. Several people opposed closure, and most preferred the layout with minimal separation between the ramps and frontage roads. There was concern about the effect of a possible new truck scale on the frontage road alignment and land use in the southwest quadrant.

At the 7 Mile Road interchange, several residents in the Hageman Road/Stanley Road neighborhood continued to express concern about the east frontage road alignment under both alternatives, and suggested that it be moved closer to I-94. Businesses expressed concern about closing direct access to the frontage roads or 7 Mile Road. Several people

suggested dropping the west frontage road alignment that looped behind the Auto Auction, and suggested that the study team work with 7 Mile Fair and Metro Auto Auction representatives to find a frontage road alignment between the two properties. Several people expressed concern about the frontage road alignment that would sever the Kimmel Woods Natural Area in the southwest quadrant. There were no particular comments or concerns about the 27th Street/USH 41 interchange.

**Kenosha County Concerns.** One person was concerned about the effect of widening CTH C because of adjacent electrical power lines and residences. Comments on the two alternatives for the STH 50 interchange focused mainly on changes in access and removing direct driveways to STH 50 on the west side of I-94. There were no particular comments on the two STH 158 alternatives. Businesses at the STH 142 interchange continued to express concern over closing direct access to STH 142 and CTH S between the ramps and frontage roads. At the CTH E interchange, comments on the two concepts included suggestions for following property lines with the frontage roads, and suggestions on internal circulation road locations. One person preferred closing CTH KR, while others preferred the concept that requires the acquisition of the least amount of land.

The third PIM was held on February 20, 1996, in Racine County at Raymond Elementary School, and on February 22, 1996, in Kenosha County at the Kenosha County Center. The purpose of the meeting was to present the study team's recommended alternative concept for each interchange. Approximately 50 people attended the Racine County session and 50 people attended the Kenosha County session. Each session was an open house from 4 to 7 p.m. The meetings were announced in the *Racine Journal Times*, *Kenosha News*, and the *Oak Creek Pictorial*, and in a project newsletter. A project handout and copies of the recommended interchange displays were provided.

**Racine County Concerns.** At the STH 11 interchange, a resident was concerned about keeping old STH 11 open to through traffic. Comments about the CTH K interchange included concerns about access to existing businesses and general approval of the proposed alternative. At CTH G, a farmer expressed concern about the impact the relocated frontage road would have on his livestock that would cross the road from the barn to the pasture. Several comments were received regarding 7 Mile Road, including impacts on existing businesses, amount of land to be taken, location of the relocated frontage roads, and access to residential properties.

**Kenosha County Concerns.** At CTH C, one resident asked to be relocated due to the proposed frontage road location. Concerns at STH 50 included access to commercial properties, cost of the improvements, and the proposed overpass. Comments on the STH 142 interchange were related to the impacts on business. At CTH E, residents were concerned about how the relocated frontage roads would impact their mound septic systems. Residents at CTH KR stated their preference for an alternative that would have fewer impacts on their property.

### ***Property Owner/Interest Group Meetings***

Meetings were held at the request of property owners and interest groups to discuss the proposed alternatives and their potential impacts on properties and businesses. The table below shows the meetings that were held between the study team, property owners, and

interest groups.

Property Owner, Interest Group, and Public Information Meetings

Interchange	Meeting Held	Dates
STH 165 (Kenosha Co.)	Public Information Meeting No. 1	05/24/95
	Public Information Meeting No. 2	09/28/95
	Public Information Meeting No. 3	02/22/96
CTH C (Kenosha Co.)	Public Information Meeting No. 1	05/24/95
	Public Information Meeting No. 2	09/28/95
	Property Owners	01/25/96
	Public Information Meeting No. 3	02/22/96
STH 50 (Kenosha Co.)	Public Information Meeting No. 1	05/24/95
	Woodman's Interest Group	09/26/95
	Public Information Meeting No. 2	09/28/95
	Brat Stop Business Interest	01/29/96
	Business Interest	01/31/96
	Individual Business	02/08/96
	Public Information Meeting No. 3	02/22/96
	Woodman's Development Interests	04/19/96
STH 158 (Kenosha Co.)	Public Information Meeting No. 1	05/24/95
	Public Information Meeting No. 2	09/28/95
	Public Information Meeting No. 3	02/22/96
STH 142 (Kenosha Co.)	Public Information Meeting No. 1	05/24/95
	Public Information Meeting No. 2	09/28/95
	Individual Business	10/31/95
	Individual Businesses (2)	11/02/95
	Individual Business	11/13/95
	Individual Property Owner	12/14/95
	Public Information Meeting No. 3	02/22/96
	Individual Businesses (2)	04/18/96
CTH E (Kenosha Co.)	Public Information Meeting No. 1	05/24/95
	Public Information Meeting No. 2	09/28/95
	Public Information Meeting No. 3	02/22/96
CTH KR (Kenosha / Racine County Line)	Public Information Meeting No. 1	05/23/95
	Apple Holler Business	07/26/95
	Public Information Meeting No. 2	09/27/95
	Public Information Meeting No. 3	02/22/96

**Property Owner, Interest Group, and Public Information Meetings**

<b>Interchange</b>	<b>Meeting Held</b>	<b>Dates</b>
STH 11 (Racine Co.)	Public Information Meeting No. 1	05/23/95
	Public Information Meeting No. 2	09/27/95
	Public Information Meeting No. 3	02/20/96
STH 20 (Racine Co.)	Public Information Meeting No. 1	05/23/95
	Business Interest Meeting	06/05/95
	Public Information Meeting No. 2	09/27/95
	Public Information Meeting No. 3	02/20/96
CTH K (Racine Co.)	Public Information Meeting No. 1	05/23/95
	Business Interests/Property Owners	08/23/95
	Public Information Meeting No. 2	09/27/95
	Racine Truck & Equipment	10/31/95
	Property Owners West Side	02/05/96
	Public Information Meeting No. 3	02/20/96
	Property Owners	02/05/96
	Property Owners	03/18/96
CTH G (Racine Co.)	Public Information Meeting No. 1	05/23/95
	Public Information Meeting No. 2	09/27/95
	Public Information Meeting No. 3	02/20/96
7 Mile Road (Racine Co.)	Public Information Meeting No. 1	05/23/95
	Neighborhood Meeting	09/07/96
	Public Information Meeting No. 2	09/27/95
	Business Interests	11/20/95
	Public Information Meeting No. 3	02/20/96
	Mobil Oil	04/18/96
	Property Owner (N/E quadrant)	04/29/96
	Property Owners (NW & SW quadrants)	05/16/96
27th Street / USH 41 (Racine Co.)	Public Information Meeting No. 1	05/23/95
	Public Information Meeting No. 2	09/27/95
	Public Information Meeting No. 3	02/20/96

The public involvement process was inclusive of all residents and population groups in the study area and did not exclude any persons because of income, race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, or handicap.