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I-94: South Corridor Study
Racine and Kenosha Counties
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Project ID# 1032-07-05

I. INTRODUCTION

The Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) has prepared this agricultural impact statement (AIS) in accordance with §32.035, Wisconsin Statutes. The AIS is an informational and advisory document that describes and analyzes the potential effects of the project on farm operations and agricultural resources, but cannot stop a project.

The DATCP is required to prepare an AIS when the actual or potential exercise of eminent domain powers involves an acquisition of interest in more than 5 acres of land from any farm operation. The DATCP may choose to prepare an AIS if an acquisition of less than 5 acres will have a significant impact on a farm operation. Significant impacts could include the acquisition of buildings, the acquisition of land used to grow high-value crops, or the severance of land. The DATCP should be notified of any projects affecting farmland regardless of whether the proposing agency intends to use its condemnation authority in the acquisition of project lands. The proposing agency may not negotiate with or make a jurisdictional offer to a landowner until 30 days after the AIS is published.

The DATCP is not involved in determining whether or not eminent domain powers will be used or the amount of compensation to be paid for the acquisition of any property. The AIS reflects the general objectives of the DATCP in its recognition of the importance of conserving important agricultural resources and maintaining a healthy rural economy.

Sources of information used to prepare this statement include: Wisconsin 1997 Agricultural Statistics and other yearly issues; the 1992 Census of Agriculture; the Racine County Farmland Preservation Plan; the Kenosha County Farmland Preservation Plan; the Soil Survey of Kenosha and Racine Counties; the Wisconsin Department of Transportation; and the owners and operators of the affected farmland.

---

1The term farm operation includes all owned and rented parcels of land; buildings and equipment; livestock; and personnel used by an individual, partnership, or corporation under single management to produce agricultural commodities.
II. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) proposes to reconstruct twelve interchanges along a 22-mile segment of Interstate Highway (IH) 94 between the State Trunk Highway (STH) 165 and County Trunk Highway (CTH) “Q” intersection in Kenosha County and the 27th Street intersection in Racine County. Refer to the Project Sketch on this page. The proposed project will require the fee-simple² acquisition of 125.2 acres of farmland from 30 farmland owners. Since the project has not been funded yet, the schedules for acquisition and construction have not been determined.

The plans developed for this project will serve as a blueprint to guide development over a 25-year planning period through 2020 and to preserve the necessary right-of-way for future transportation use. The project will include reconfiguring some interchanges, widening and reconstructing crossroads and ramp terminals, separating frontage roads from interchange ramps, adding some traffic control improvements, and improving access. Crossroad widths will increase at six interchanges, but only in the immediate vicinity of the interchanges. Relocated frontage roads will require approximately 100 feet of additional right-of-way.

The interchanges with IH 94 that will be upgraded are: CTH “C”; STH 50; STH 158; CTH “S” & STH 142; CTH “I”; CTH “K”; STH 11; STH 20; CTH “K” in Racine County; CTH “G” 7-Mile Road; and 27th Street.

²A fee-simple acquisition means that the buyer purchases exclusive rights to the property. This is in contrast to an easement where a buyer purchases partial rights to property.
Existing Highway

In Kenosha and Racine Counties, IH 94 is a north-south, limited access freeway\(^3\) that serves through traffic between Wisconsin and Illinois as well as between communities in southeastern Wisconsin. Within the project limits, IH 94 is a six-lane highway with an average right-of-way width of 425 feet. East-west access to the highway occurs at 13 interchanges within the study area.

Project Need

According to WisDOT, the need for developing long-range interchange improvement plans is twofold. First, WisDOT needs to meet planned development and increasing transportation demand along the IH 94 corridor. Second, WisDOT needs to address existing safety, physical, access control, and capacity problems with the design and condition of the intersections. Specifically, WisDOT wants to separate the IH 94 entrance and exit ramps from the frontage roads.

Alternatives

Several alternative alignments were developed for each interchange. WisDOT evaluated each alternative and selected a preferred alternative based on cost, safety, environmental impacts, and local government and community input.

III. AGRICULTURAL SETTING

Agricultural Productivity\(^4\)

In 1993, agriculture generated cash receipts of over $27.1 million in Kenosha County consisting of $14.2 million in livestock and related sales and $12.9 million in crops. In 1996, Kenosha County ranked twelfth out of Wisconsin’s 72 counties in the production of soybeans and seventeenth in winter wheat. Fifteen years earlier, it ranked fourth in all wheat and fifth in soybeans.

---

\(^3\)A freeway is a divided arterial highway for through traffic with full control of access that generally has grade separations at intersections. An arterial highway is a principal roadway providing high speed, high volume travel between major points in both urban and rural areas.

In 1993, Racine County generated agricultural cash receipts of over $50.1 million. They consisted of $18.0 million in livestock and related sales and $32.1 million in crops. In 1996, Racine County ranked fifth out of all of Wisconsin’s counties in the production of winter wheat and seventh in soybeans. In 1981, it ranked first in the production of all wheat and third in soybeans.

**Land Area in Farms**

Kenosha and Racine Counties are classified as urban counties. Urban counties are defined as having an average of 100 or more residents per square mile. According to the 1992 Census of Agriculture, Kenosha County has 92,761 acres of land in farms,\(^5\) which represents 53.3 percent of the total land area. Racine County has 133,197 acres of farmland, which represents 61.8 percent of the total land area in the county. They compare to average values of 205,055 acres of land in farms or 61.1 percent of the land area among all urban Wisconsin counties and 220,800 acres or 45.6 percent of land area among all Wisconsin counties. Refer to Chart 1 for a graphic comparison of the percentage of land in farms in Kenosha and Racine Counties, urban counties, and all Wisconsin counties.

**Number and Size of Farms**

As is the case in the rest of Wisconsin, there are fewer farm operations in Kenosha and Racine Counties today than fifteen years ago. From 1981 to 1996, the number of Kenosha County farms dropped from 570 to 520, an 8.8 percent loss. The number of Racine County farms dropped from 790 to 750 during the same period. This is a 5.1 percent decline. In comparison, the number of farm operations statewide dropped from 93,000 to 79,000, a decline of 15.1 percent. Refer to Chart 2 for a graphic depiction of the decline in the number of farm operations in Kenosha and Racine Counties.

\(^5\)Land in farms consists primarily of agricultural land used for crops, pasture, or grazing. It also includes woodland and wasteland not actually under cultivation or used for pasture or grazing, providing it was part of the farm operator’s total operation.
During the same period, the amount of Kenosha County land in farms also declined from 114,200 to 109,000 acres, a loss of 4.6 percent. In Racine County, the amount of land in farms declined slightly from 146,000 to 143,000 acres, which represents a 2.1 percent loss. Statewide, the amount of land in farms fell from 18.6 million to 16.8 million acres, a 9.7 percent loss. Refer to Chart 3 for a graphic representation of the change in the amount of Kenosha and Racine County land in farms.

In Kenosha County, the average size of a farm decreased from 200.4 to 192 acres and in Racine County, the average size of a farm rose from 184.8 to 191 acres. In Wisconsin as a whole, the average size of farms rose from 200 to 213 acres from 1981 to 1996. Refer to chart 4 for a graphic comparison of the change in the average size of farms in Kenosha and Racine Counties and Wisconsin.
Size Distribution of Farms

Table 1 shows the percentage of farms in each size category for Kenosha and Racine Counties, urban counties, and all Wisconsin counties. Proportionately, Kenosha and Racine Counties have more very small farms (less than 50 acres) and very large farms (more than 500 acres) compared to the averages for urban counties and all Wisconsin counties.

Table 1
Percent of Farms per Size Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Range in Acres</th>
<th>0-49</th>
<th>50-179</th>
<th>180-500</th>
<th>more than 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Kenosha County Farms</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Racine County Farms</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Farms Among Urban Counties</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Farms among All Wisconsin Counties</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Farmland Taxes and Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1994/95 Dollars per Acre of Farmland</th>
<th>Average Taxes</th>
<th>Average Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha County</td>
<td>$31.59</td>
<td>$1,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine County</td>
<td>34.85</td>
<td>1,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Counties</td>
<td>25.91</td>
<td>1,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Counties</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Property Taxes and Values

Table 2 lists the average property taxes and values per acre of farmland in Kenosha and Racine Counties, urban counties, and all Wisconsin counties. In 1994/95, average property taxes on Kenosha County farmland were 21.9 percent higher than the average for urban counties and 101.1 percent higher than the average for all Wisconsin counties. The average taxes on Racine County farmland were 34.5 percent higher than the average for urban counties and 121.8 percent higher than the average for all Wisconsin counties.

On average, the value of farmland in Kenosha County was 50.9 percent higher than the average for all urban counties and 155.7 percent higher than the average for all Wisconsin counties. The value of Racine County farmland was 44.7 percent higher than the average for urban counties.

---


7Wisconsin Department of Revenue, Division of Research and Analysis, Bureau of Local Fiscal Policy.
and 145.2 percent higher than the average for all Wisconsin counties. These values do not include land sold for nonfarm purposes.

Soils

Most of the soils along IH 94 within the project limits are included in the Varna-Elliott-Ashkum soil association. The highway passes through about 1 1/4 miles of the Hebron-Montgomery-Aztalan soil association from south of CTH “C” to north of the Des Plaines River. The highway also passes through two areas of the Morley-Beecher-Ashkum soil association. It passes through a little over a mile of this association just south of the Kenosha/Racine County line. The other area of this association is located between CTH “K” in Racine County and the northern project limits.

The Varna-Elliott-Ashkum association has well drained to poorly drained, nearly level and gently sloping soils that have a silty clay loam to clay subsoil. This association formed in thin loess and the underlying clay loam or silty clay loam glacial till on ridges and knobs. The soils in this association are well suited to crops and have high natural fertility.

The Hebron-Montgomery-Aztalan association has well drained to poorly drained, nearly level to rolling soils that have a loam to silty clay subsoil. They are underlain by clayey to loamy lacustrine and outwash material on hills, knobs, and lake plains. These soils are highly suitable for farming. Erosion is a hazard on the Hebron soils and improved drainage is needed in the Montgomery and Aztalan soils.

The Morley-Beecher-Ashkum association has well drained to poorly drained, nearly level and gently sloping soils that have a silty clay or silty clay loam subsoil. They formed in thin loess and the underlying clay loam or silty clay loam glacial till on ridges and knobs. These soils have high natural fertility and are well suited to crops.

The following table lists the individual soils that will be affected by the proposed project. The soils that will be affected by each interchange are listed in the Agricultural Impacts on pages 9 through 17. All of the affected soils except Morley silt loam with 6 to 12 percent slopes-eroded are prime. Refer to Appendix V for a definition of prime farmland.

---

*Soil Survey of Kenosha and Racine Counties, USDA Soil Conservation Service in cooperation with the University of Wisconsin, Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, Soils Department, and Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station, December, 1970, p. 3.*
Table 3
Affected Soils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Soil Name</th>
<th>Percent Slope</th>
<th>Capability Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AtA</td>
<td>Ashkum silty clay loam</td>
<td>0 to 3</td>
<td>IIw-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AzA</td>
<td>Aztalan loam</td>
<td>0 to 2</td>
<td>IIw-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AzB</td>
<td>Aztalan loam</td>
<td>2 to 6</td>
<td>IIw-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BcA</td>
<td>Beecher silt loam</td>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td>IIw-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BlA</td>
<td>Blount silt loam</td>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td>IIw-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EtA</td>
<td>Elliott silty clay loam</td>
<td>0 to 2</td>
<td>IIw-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EtB</td>
<td>Elliott silty clay loam</td>
<td>2 to 6</td>
<td>IIw-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HeB2</td>
<td>Hebron loam</td>
<td>2 to 6-eroded</td>
<td>IIe-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MeB</td>
<td>Markham silt loam</td>
<td>2 to 6</td>
<td>IIe-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MeB2</td>
<td>Markham silt loam</td>
<td>2 to 6-eroded</td>
<td>IIe-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgA</td>
<td>Martinton silt loam</td>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td>IIw-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MzdB</td>
<td>Morley silt loam</td>
<td>2 to 6</td>
<td>IIe-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MzdB2</td>
<td>Morley silt loam</td>
<td>2 to 6-eroded</td>
<td>IIe-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MzdC2</td>
<td>Morley silt loam</td>
<td>6 to 12-eroded</td>
<td>IIIe-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ShB</td>
<td>Saylesville silt loam</td>
<td>2 to 6</td>
<td>IIe-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm</td>
<td>Sebewa silt loam</td>
<td>0 to 2</td>
<td>IIw-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VaB</td>
<td>Varna silt loam</td>
<td>2 to 6</td>
<td>IIe-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZuB</td>
<td>Zurich silt loam</td>
<td>2 to 6</td>
<td>IIe-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to Appendix V for descriptions of capability units.*
Farmland Preservation

The Kenosha and Racine County Farmland Preservation Plans were certified in 1982. The plans identify farmland preservation areas in the counties and provide tax credit eligibility to farmers who wish to participate in the Farmland Preservation Program. The purposes of the program are to encourage local governments to develop farmland preservation policies through land use planning and zoning, provide tax relief in the form of tax credits to eligible farmers, and to conserve soil and water resources. The tax credit is provided to owners of farmland protected by a preservation agreement or an exclusive agricultural zoning ordinance.

The towns of Bristol, Paris, and Somers and the village of Pleasant Prairie in Kenosha County have adopted the County’s exclusive agricultural zoning ordinance. Therefore, eligible farmland owners in these areas can receive 100 percent of the available tax credit. The towns of Yorkville, Mt. Pleasant, Raymond, and Caledonia in Racine County have not adopted any exclusive agricultural zoning ordinances. Eligible farmland owners in these towns can only participate in the program if they have signed farmland preservation agreements. Since Racine County is an urban county (having an average of 100 or more residents per square mile), farmland owners must have signed agreements between July 1, 1988 and June 30, 1991 in order to participate in the program. If they have valid agreements, they can receive 80% of the available tax credit.

Farmland owners whose land will be affected by a public project and who participate in the Farmland Preservation program are not required to pay back any of the tax credits they have received through the program. Likewise, farmers who have land enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Program that will be acquired for the project, won’t have to pay any penalties since the acquisitions are for a public project. The loss of any farmland enrolled in the federal government’s Production Flexibility program could affect a farmer’s base acreage resulting in lower revenue from the program. The Production Flexibility program is a seven-year transition from various “Feed Grain” programs to the free market.

IV. AGRICULTURAL IMPACTS

An Agricultural Impact Statement (AIS) is required by law when 5 or more acres from any farm operation will be acquired for a public project. Thirty days after the publication date of the AIS, the purchasing agency may begin negotiating with the affected farmland owners. Each interchange and its effects on farmland are discussed individually. Each of the four boxes in the tables for the intersections represents the quadrants of the interchange. The affected farmland owners are listed in the box which represents the quadrant of the interchange where their affected property is located. For example, if farmland in the northeast quadrant of an interchange will be affected, the farmland owner’s name and the affected acreage will be listed in the upper right-hand box of the table. The affected soils are also listed in each box. Refer to Table 3 for more
information about each soil. No farm buildings or cattle passes are expected to be included in any of the acquisitions of farmland for the proposed project. There will be access control along the crossroads between the relocated frontage roads. New access to future development will only be permitted on the relocated frontage roads.

**CTH “C”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northwest of CTH “C”</th>
<th>Northeast of CTH “C”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southwest of CTH “C”</strong></td>
<td><strong>Southeast of CTH “C”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soils: ZuB &amp; AzA</td>
<td>soils: ZuB &amp; Sm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Matthews et al</td>
<td>C-94 Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>original parcel size 50 acres</td>
<td>original parcel size 101 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed acquisition 4.2 acres</td>
<td>proposed acquisition 5.6 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed severance 0.8 of an acre</td>
<td>proposed severance 4.1 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STH 50**

The reconstruction of this interchange will be completed in two phases. Phase I will include the construction of an access road, median access control along STH 50, capacity increase of STH 50 to six lanes, reconstruction of bridges over STH 50, and signals at new access road; and phase II will be the construction of a split-diamond interchange. The existing west frontage road in the southwest quadrant will be removed after the new west frontage road is constructed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northwest of STH 50</th>
<th>Northeast of STH 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southwest of STH 50</strong></td>
<td><strong>Southeast of STH 50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soils: BcA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-94 Partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>original parcel size 86 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed acquisition 3.2 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed severance 13 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I-94 Partners rents 29.3 acres of cropland to Dale Nelson. The partners indicated that there are drainage tiles on this land but they don’t know their exact location.
### STH 158

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northwest of STH 158</th>
<th>Northeast of STH 158</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>soils: MzdB, EtB, &amp; MeB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John &amp; Anna Werr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>original parcel size 200 acres</td>
<td>proposed acquisition 2.7 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest of STH 158</td>
<td>Southeast of STH 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soils: MzdB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Keane, &amp; S&amp;A Cohen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>original parcel size 42 acres</td>
<td>proposed acquisition 1.5 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed severance 2.6 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Keane and Cohen parcel is farmed by Marvin and Keith Drissel. The Drissels farm two other parcels adjacent to the IH 94 interchange with STH 142 and CTH “S” and their farm operation is discussed under that interchange. WisDOT has indicated that access will be provided to the severed parcels.

### STH 142/CTH “S”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northwest of STH 142/CTH “S”</th>
<th>Northeast of STH 142/CTH “S”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>soils: VaB, EtA, &amp; MeB</td>
<td>soils: VaB, EtA, &amp; MeB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Mauer</td>
<td>Gene Speca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>original parcel size 49 acres</td>
<td>original parcel size 47 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed acquisition 7.1 acres</td>
<td>proposed acquisition 10.0 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed severances 0.8 and 0.7 acres</td>
<td>proposed severances 0.7 and 12.5 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwesr of STH 142/CTH “S”</td>
<td>Southeast of STH 142/CTH “S”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soils: VaB, EtA, &amp; AtA</td>
<td>soils: VaB, EtA, &amp; AtA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mario Ventura, Sr.</td>
<td>Sandra Schiller &amp; Theil Cohen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>original parcel size 7 acres</td>
<td>original parcel size 15 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed acquisition 1.4 acres</td>
<td>proposed acquisition 4.0 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed severance 2.9 acres</td>
<td>proposed severance 5 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome &amp; LaVerne Drissel</td>
<td>Samuel Cohen et. al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>original parcel size 121 acres</td>
<td>original parcel size 114 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed acquisition 3.7 acres</td>
<td>proposed acquisition 1.0 acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Charles Mauer is concerned that the new frontage road will affect the septic system for the house on this property and that the closeness of the road to the house will make the house less livable. He also stated that all of the tile lines on this parcel will be affected. He said that drainage problems already exist on this parcel due to residential development and previous highway construction. He is concerned that the severed parcels will be too small to be taxed as farmland and will be taxed at a higher rate as residential property.

Jerome and LaVerne Drissel did not express any concerns about the proposed project's effects on their property. Ms. Schiller and Mr. Cohen are mainly concerned about the effects this project will have on access to their property. Both of these parcels as well as the George Keane and S&A Cohen parcel are rented to Melvin and Keith Drissel. In an average year, Marvin and Keith Drissel grow 250 acres of corn, 250 acres of soybeans, 100 acres of hay, and 75 acres of wheat. They also run a 55-cow dairy operation with 40 replacement dairy animals. Marvin Drissel indicated that the changes to the intersections will increase the travel distances between the parcels of land he farms.

**CTH “E”**

A U-turn in the median will be provided for residential use only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northwest of CTH “E”</th>
<th>Northeast of CTH “E”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>soils: EtB &amp; MeB2</td>
<td>soils: MeB2, MeB, MzdB2, AtA, &amp; EtA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha Co. Land Venture (Thomas Gould)</td>
<td>Arlo &amp; Jeanne Funk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>original parcel size 168 acres</td>
<td>original parcel size 90 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed acquisition 5.6 acres</td>
<td>proposed acquisition 5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed severance 6 acres</td>
<td>proposed severance 7 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southwest of CTH “E”</th>
<th>Southeast of CTH “E”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>soils: MeB, MeB2, &amp; EtB</td>
<td>soils: MeB &amp; EtA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrico &amp; Ginetta Mosconi</td>
<td>Robert &amp; Elaine Fliess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>original parcel size 147 acres</td>
<td>original parcel size 112 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed acquisition 6.4 acres</td>
<td>proposed acquisition 5.1 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed severances 2.8 and 1.1 acres</td>
<td>proposed severances 2.6 and 8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yosef &amp; Valentine Hakimi</td>
<td>Yosef &amp; Valentine Hakimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>original parcel size 71 acres</td>
<td>original parcel size 71 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed acquisition 2.7 acres</td>
<td>proposed acquisition 2.7 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed severance 3 acres</td>
<td>proposed severance 3 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Kenosha County Land Venture owns 170 acres of cropland that is rented to John Gorton. Mr. Gould indicated that he does not have enough information about the final design of the interchange to identify the impacts this project will have on his farmland.

Arlo and Jean Funk own 80 acres of land that is rented out for farming. The renters vary from year to year. There are grassed waterways on this property that will be affected by the proposed project. The Funks are concerned that the severed parcel will be too small to be of value to them.

Enrico and Ginetta Mosconi rent 145 acres of their farmland to Robert and JoAnne Funk. The Funks will also be affected by the changes to the STH 11/IH 94 interchange. The Mosconis indicated that the proposed project will affect drainage and fences on their property. They are most concerned about the marketability of their property and access to it after construction is completed.

Robert Fliess indicated that he is very opposed to the proposed project. He said that very few people use the existing frontage road and its pavement is in very poor condition. In addition, he does not want to lose any farmland. The proposed acquisition combined with the severances represent a loss of 14.7 percent of this parcel.

**CTH “KR”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northwest of CTH “KR”</th>
<th>Northeast of CTH “KR”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frank Holmes Estate (Shirley Poisl)</td>
<td>original parcel size 51 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>original parcel size 165 acres</td>
<td>proposed acquisition 3.2 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed acquisition 6.1 acres</td>
<td>proposed severance 3.2 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southwest of CTH “KR”</th>
<th>Southeast of CTH “KR”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>soils: ShB, EtB, &amp; HeB2</td>
<td>soils: ShB, EtB, &amp; AtA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas &amp; Catherine Coughlin</td>
<td>Ervin &amp; Theresa Koser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>original parcel size 56 acres</td>
<td>original parcel size 56 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed acquisition 2.7 acres</td>
<td>proposed acquisition 2.5 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed severance 0.7 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thomas and Catherine Coughlin rent 31 acres of land from Dolores Safransky. The combined total of land that will be acquired from these two parcels for the project is 5.9 acres. Ms. Safransky indicated that the affected parcel is tiled and she is concerned that the proposed project will affect the trees along the existing frontage road. Mr. Coughlin indicated that there are also drainage tiles on his land. He is very concerned that damage to his tiles will not only impair
drainage on his adjacent fields but could also impede the flow of water in a larger area that includes other cropland that he owns. He indicated that the irregularly shaped fields will be created by interchange construction. These fields more difficult to farm. Refer to the sections entitled “Farm Drainage” and “Severances” for additional information.

### STH 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northwest of STH 11</th>
<th>Northeast of STH 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>soils: EtB</td>
<td>soils: VaB, EtB, &amp; AtA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Benben</td>
<td>Robert &amp; JoAnne Funk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>original parcel size 35 acres</td>
<td>original parcel size 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed acquisition 3.9 acres</td>
<td>proposed acquisition 4.7 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed severance 7 acres</td>
<td>proposed severance 12 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southwest of STH 11</th>
<th>Southeast of STH 11</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Robert and JoAnne Funk rent land from Enrico and Ginetta Mosconi that will be affected by the reconstruction of the CTH “E” interchange.

### STH 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northwest of STH 20</th>
<th>Northeast of STH 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>soils: MeB, EtB, &amp; AtA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Kuiper Trustee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>original parcel size 116 acres</td>
<td>original parcel size 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed acquisition 2.5 acres</td>
<td>proposed acquisition 2.9 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southwest of STH 20</th>
<th>Southeast of STH 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CTH “K”

A U-turn will be provided in the median for residential traffic only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northwest of CTH “K”</th>
<th>Northeast of CTH “K”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sekao Inc.</td>
<td>Charles Kuiper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>original parcel size 125 acres</td>
<td>original parcel size 226 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed acquisition 4.0 acres</td>
<td>proposed acquisition 3.2 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed severance 14 acres</td>
<td>proposed severance 1.3 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southwest of CTH “K”</th>
<th>Southeast of CTH “K”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>soils: MeB2, AtA, &amp; MzdB</td>
<td>soils: MzdB &amp; BcA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert &amp; Audrey Hagemann</td>
<td>Charles Kuiper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>original parcel size 72 acres</td>
<td>proposed acquisition 0.7 of an acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed acquisition 3.0 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed severance 2.8 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sekao, Inc. owns 124 acres of land consisting of 90 acres of cropland, 10 acres of pasture, 10 acres of woodland, 9 acres of wetland, and 5 acres for the buildings and parking lot. The farmland is rented out. Glenn Oakes, the owner of Sekao, Inc., is concerned that the proposed project will go through the parking lot and affect the access to his property.

Charles Kuiper owns about 1,500 acres of land and rents additional farmland including some from Seven Mile Fair, Inc. The parcel of the Seven Mile Fair property northwest of CTH “G” will also be affected by this project. Mr. Kuiper indicated that the parcel of land that he owns has drainage tiles. Fences on this parcel will also be affected.

Gilbert and Audrey Hagemann indicated that the proposed project will affect the main drainage tile line as well as the feeder tile lines on their property. They are very concerned that the proposed project will divert additional runoff water onto their farm.
**CTH “G”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Northwest of CTH “G”</strong></th>
<th><strong>Northeast of CTH “G”</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seven Mile Fair Inc.</td>
<td>T. and C. Thelen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>original parcel size 196 acres</td>
<td>original parcel size 18 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed acquisition 6.6 acres</td>
<td>proposed severance 0.3 of an acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed severance 6.1 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Southwest of CTH “G”</strong></th>
<th><strong>Southeast of CTH “G”</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Thelen et al</td>
<td>P. Michael Fabinski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>original parcel size 35 acres</td>
<td>original parcel size 69 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed acquisition 6.1 acres</td>
<td>proposed acquisition 3.4 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed severance 4.1 acres</td>
<td>proposed severance 0.3 of an acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Seven Mile Fair, Inc. property is farmed by the Kuiper Farms. There is a grass waterway on this parcel, which flows east from the Raymond Heights subdivision to the west frontage road. Access will also be affected on this property since it will be severed into two parcels.

P. Michael Fabinski rents 62 acres of farmland to Scott Fredrickson. Mr. Fabinski did not express any concerns about the proposed project’s effects on his property.

**7-Mile Road**

No farmland will be affected by the changes to this intersection. However, Seven Mile Fair, Inc. owns land northwest of this intersection that will be affected by the project in addition to their farmland northwest of the CTH “G” intersection.

**27th Street**

No farmland will be affected by the changes to this interchange.

**Loss of Farmland**

There are eight farmland owners who will lose more than 5 acres as a result of the proposed project. They are: C-94 Partnership (5.6 acres), Charles Mauer (7.1 acres), Kenosha County Land Venture (5.6 acres), Arlo and Jean Funk (5.5 acres), Robert and Elaine Fliess (5.1 acres), Enrico and Ginetta Mosconi (6.4 acres), the Frank Holmes Estate (6.1 acres), Seven Mile Fair, Inc. (6.6 acres), and Edward Thelen et al (6.1 acres). In addition, the acquisition of farmland...
from five parcels is greater than 10 percent of the existing parcel size. These affected farmland
owners are: Charles Mauer (14.5%), Mario Ventura (20%), Sandra Schiller and Theil Cohen
(26.7%), Michael Benben, Inc. (11.1%), and Edward Thelen et al (17.4%).

According to the *Wisconsin 1997 Agricultural Statistics*, the average size of farms in Kenosha
County is 192 acres. The acquisition of 64.9 acres of Kenosha County farmland for the proposed
project is the equivalent of the loss of 33.8 percent of an average Kenosha County farm. In
Racine County, the average size of farms is 191 acres and the acquisition of 50.3 acres of Racine
County farmland is the equivalent of 26.3 percent of an average farm.

**Severances**

Acquisitions that sever farmland frequently create irregularly-shaped fields, making equipment
usage awkward and production more costly. This increased cost is due in part to the additional
time, fuel, and equipment wear associated with moving and turning equipment in corners of
fields that are not square or along sides of fields that are not straight. Nonproductive time and
labor costs associated with the frequent working of these fields may reduce the possibility of
generating profits on these parcels. In addition, when fields are made smaller, an increased
proportion of waste land is created along the edges and in narrow corners of the fields reducing
their productive capacity. Compensation for the reduction in the value of parcels that are small
and/or irregularly shaped will be addressed in the appraisal of each affected parcel.

Severed parcels that are too small for agricultural or other uses may be designated uneconomic
remnants by WisDOT. WisDOT may offer to purchase any uneconomic remnants.

**Access**

Landowners will continue to have access to frontage roads and side roads. Some changes to
intersections may cause some farmers to have to drive their farm equipment farther between
parcels of land that they farm. Lengthening routes traveled between farm parcels increases the
amount of time that farmers spend on the road, fuel for the equipment, and equipment wear.
These increased costs can reduce the profits that farmers can generate from these parcels. In
addition, increased travel time can increase safety risks to farmers and the traveling public due to
conflicts between slow moving farm equipment and faster moving vehicles.

**Farm Drainage**

Gilbert and Audrey Hagemann; Charles Mauer; Enrico and Ginetta Mosconi; Ken Gobble (Seven
Mile Fair, Inc.); I-94 Partners; Charles Kuiper, Thomas Coughlin, and Dolores Safransky all
expressed concerns about the project's effects on the drainage of their property.
There are four drainage districts in the vicinity of the proposed project. There are two in Kenosha County: the Dutch Gap Drainage District Number 5 and the Pike Creek Drainage District. The two in Racine County are the Hoads Creek Drainage District and the Yorkville Raymond Drainage District. The two closest drainage districts are sketched on the following maps.

Proper field drainage is vital to a successful farm operation. Highway construction can disrupt improvements such as culvert pipes, drainage tiles, grassed waterways, and drainage ditches, which regulate the drainage of farm fields. If drainage is impaired, water can settle in fields and cause substantial damage, such as harming or killing crops and other vegetation, concentrating mineral salts, flooding farm buildings, or causing hoof rot and other diseases that affect livestock. In addition, where salt is used on road surfaces, runoff water can increase the content of salt in nearby soils.
Section 88.87 of the *Wisconsin Statutes* requires highways to be built with adequate ditches, culverts, and other facilities to prevent obstruction of drainage, protect property owners from damage to lands caused by unreasonable diversion or retention of surface water, and maintain, as nearly as possible, the original drainage flow patterns. Refer to Appendix IV for the statutes pertaining to drainage rights. Landowners whose property is damaged by improper construction or maintenance of highways and highway drainage structures may file a claim with the appropriate agency within three years after the damage occurs.

**Fencing and Other Improvements**

Fencing will be affected on the Charles Kuiper and Enrico and Ginetta Mosconi property.

Compensation for fencing and other improvements will be included in the appraisal. In addition, if fencing or other improvements are damaged outside of the right-of-way, the owner will receive damages, or the improvement will be repaired or replaced to a condition equal to or better than that existing before the damage was done.

**Appraisal Process**

WisDOT will provide a full narrative appraisal of the affected property to the landowners. This will be the basis for their jurisdictional offer. Landowners have the right to obtain their own appraisal of their property. They will be compensated for the cost of this appraisal if the following conditions are met:

1. The appraisal must be submitted to WisDOT within 60 days after the landowner receives WisDOT’s full narrative appraisal.

2. The appraisal fee must be reasonable.

3. The appraisal must be a full narrative report.

**V. RECOMMENDATIONS**

The DATCP recommends the following as ways to mitigate the potential adverse impacts associated with the proposed project:

1. WisDOT should consult with farmers to ensure that access points are provided in safe and efficient locations for farming operations.
2. In order to adequately address possible drainage problems, which may occur as a result of the project, DATCP recommends that WisDOT representatives discuss construction plans with representatives of the Racine and Kenosha County Land Conservation Departments and the Department of Natural Resources in the early stages of planning. WisDOT should also discuss drainage with all of the affected landowners. Landowners with drainage tiles or grassed waterways should provide WisDOT with as much information about the locations of these structures as possible, so their concerns about drainage can be addressed.

3. The county conservationists should be consulted to ensure that construction proceeds in a manner that minimizes crop damage, soil compaction, and soil erosion.

4. All farmland owners and operators should be given advance notice of acquisitions and construction schedules so that farm activities can be adjusted accordingly. To the extent feasible, the timing of the acquisitions and construction should be coordinated with farm operators to minimize crop damage and disruption of farm operations.

5. WisDOT will consider compensating farmers who will have to travel longer distances between parcels of their land if the highway project caused the farmer to travel a greater distance to the parcel due to splitting of the parcel.
APPENDIX

The information provided in this section summarizes some of the statutes associated with the acquisition of farmland for public projects. It serves as a reference and should not be considered an exhaustive summary of the statutes or your rights. It is not a substitute for legal advice. In the event of any conflict between the information summarized below and the statutes, the statutes are controlling.
Appendix I: Agricultural Impact Statements

The Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) is required to prepare an Agricultural Impact Statement (AIS) whenever five or more acres of land from at least one farm operation will be acquired for a public project if the agency acquiring the land has the authority to use eminent domain for the acquisition(s). The DATCP has the option to prepare an AIS for projects affecting less than five acres of each farmland owner's property. An AIS would be prepared in such a case if the proposed project would have significant effects on a farm operation. The agency proposing the acquisition(s) is required to provide the DATCP with the details of the project and acquisition(s). After receiving the needed information, DATCP has 60 days to analyze the project's effects on farm operations, make recommendations about it and publish the AIS. DATCP will provide copies of the AIS to various state and local officials, local media and libraries, and any other individual or group who requests a copy. Thirty days after the date of publication, the proposing agency may begin negotiating with the landowner(s) for the property.

Section 32.035 of the Wisconsin Statutes: Agricultural impact statement.

(1) Definitions. In this section:
(a) "Department" means department of agriculture, trade and consumer protection.
(b) "Farm operation" means any activity conducted solely or primarily for the production of one or more agricultural commodities resulting from an agricultural use, as defined in s. 91.01 (1), for sale and home use, and customarily producing the commodities in sufficient quantity to be capable of contributing materially to the operator's support.

(2) EXCEPTION. This section shall not apply if an environmental impact statement under s. 1.11 is prepared for the proposed project and if the department submits the information required under this section as part of such statement or if the condemnation is for an easement for the purpose of constructing or operating an electric transmission line, except a high voltage transmission line as defined in s. 196.491(1)(f).

(3) PROCEDURE. The condemnor shall notify the department of any project involving the actual or potential exercise of the powers of eminent domain affecting a farm operation. If the condemnor is the department of natural resources, the notice required by this subsection shall be given at the time that permission of the senate and assembly committees on natural resources is sought under s. 23.09(2)(d) or 27.01(2)(a). To prepare an agricultural impact statement under this section, the department may require the condemnor to compile and submit information about an affected farm operation. The department shall charge the condemnor a fee approximating the actual cost of preparing the statement. The department may not publish the statement if the fee is not paid.

(4) IMPACT STATEMENT. (a) When an impact statement is required; permitted. The department shall prepare an agricultural impact statement for each project, except a project under
ch. 81 or a project located entirely within the boundaries of a city or village, if the project involves the actual or potential exercise of the powers of eminent domain and if any interest in more than 5 acres from any farm operation may be taken. The department may prepare an agricultural impact statement on a project located entirely within the boundaries of a city or village or involving any interest in 5 or fewer acres of any farm operation if the condemnation would have a significant effect on any farm operation as a whole.

(b) **Contents.** The agricultural impact statement shall include:

1. A list of the acreage and description of all land lost to agricultural production and all other land with reduced productive capacity, whether or not the land is taken.
2. The department's analyses, conclusions and recommendations concerning the agricultural impact of the project.

(c) **Preparation time; publication.** The department shall prepare the impact statement within 60 days of receiving the information requested from the condemnor under sub. (3). The department shall publish the statement upon receipt of the fee required under sub. (3).

(d) **Waiting period.** The condemnor may not negotiate with an owner or make a jurisdictional offer under this subchapter until 30 days after the impact statement is published.

(5) **PUBLICATION.** Upon completing the impact statement, the department shall distribute the impact statement to the following:

(a) The governor's office.
(b) The senate and assembly committees on agriculture and transportation.
(c) All local and regional units of government which have jurisdiction over the area affected by the project. The department shall request that each unit post the statement at the place normally used for public notice.
(d) Local and regional news media in the area affected.
(e) Public libraries in the area affected.
(f) Any individual, group, club or committee which has demonstrated an interest and has requested receipt of such information.
(g) The condemnor.
Appendix II: Eminent Domain

Fair compensation for a partial taking of property under eminent domain is the larger of two figures: (1) the fair market value of the acquired property or (2) the fair market value of the entire parcel before the acquisition minus the fair market value of the remaining parcel. Compensation will be paid for the land acquired, any improvements acquired (structures, fencing, etc.), loss of access, loss of a use of this property, damages resulting from severance of the property (including land and improvements), and increased travel distances.

In addition to other compensation, a condemnor is required to make a payment of $50,000 or less to any displaced farm or business owner who has owned the property for at least one year and who purchases a comparable replacement farm or business within two years of the acquisition. The amount of this payment would include any additional amount of money needed to equal the reasonable cost of a replacement farm or business, any increased interest or debt service charges, and closing costs. Displaced renters may also receive compensation if they rent or lease a comparable replacement farm or business within two years of the acquisition. If the displaced tenant rents or leases a comparable farm or business, the payment would include the amount needed to rent the replacement property for four years. This payment would not exceed $30,000. If the renter decides to purchase a comparable farm or business, the payment would be equal to the rental or lease of that property for four years plus closing fees.

If a project would displace any person, business, or farm operation, the condemnor must file and have approved a written relocation payment plan and a relocation assistance service plan with the Department of Industry, Labor and Human Relations. The condemnor must determine the relocation payment, assist displaced persons, businesses and farm operations to find comparable replacement properties, provide information about any government assistance to displaced persons, and coordinate the displacement with other project activities in a timely manner to avoid causing hardship.

Section 32.09 of the Wisconsin Statutes describes the compensation provided for property acquisition and certain damages:

(6) In the case of a partial taking of property other than an easement, the compensation to be paid by the condemnor shall be the greater of either the fair market value of the property taken as of the date of evaluation or the sum determined by deducting from the fair market value of the whole property immediately before the date of evaluation, the fair market value of the remainder immediately after the date of evaluation, assuming the completion of the public improvement and giving effect, without allowance of offset for general benefits, and without restriction because of enumeration but without duplication, to the following items of loss or damage to the property where shown to exist:
(a) Loss of land including improvements and fixtures actually taken.
(b) Deprivation or restriction of existing right of access to highway from abutting land, provided that nothing herein shall operate to restrict the power of the state or any of its subdivisions or any municipality to deprive or restrict such access without compensation under any duly authorized exercise of the police power.
(c) Loss of air rights.
(d) Loss of legal nonconforming use.
(e) Damages resulting from actual severance of land including damages resulting from severance of improvements or fixtures and proximity damage to improvements remaining on condemnee's land. In determining severance damages under this paragraph, the condemnor may consider damages which may arise during construction of the public improvement, including damages from noise, dirt, temporary interference with vehicular or pedestrian access to the property and limitations on use of the property. The condemnor may also consider costs of extra travel made necessary by the public improvement based on the increased distance after construction of the public improvement necessary to reach any point on the property from any other point on the property.
(f) Damages to property abutting on a highway right-of-way due to change of grade where accompanied by taking of land.
(g) Cost of fencing reasonably necessary to separate land taken from remainder of condemnee's land, less the amount allowed for fencing taken under par. (a), but no such damage shall be allowed where the public improvement includes fencing of right of way without cost to abutting lands.

Section 32.19 of the Wisconsin Statutes outlines payments to be made to displaced tenant-occupied businesses and farm operations.

(4m) BUSINESS OR FARM REPLACEMENT PAYMENT. (a) Owner-occupied business or farm operation. In addition to amounts otherwise authorized by this subchapter, the condemnor shall make a payment, not to exceed $50,000, to any owner displaced person who has owned and occupied the business operation, or owned the farm operation, for not less than one year prior to the initiation of negotiations for the acquisition of the real property on which the business or farm operation lies, and who actually purchases a comparable replacement business or farm operation for the acquired property within two years after the date the person vacates the acquired property or receives payment from the condemnor, whichever is later. An owner displaced person who has owned and occupied the business operation, or owned the farm operation, for not less than one year prior to the initiation of negotiations for the acquisition of the real property on which the business or farm operation lies may elect to receive the payment under par. (b) 1. in lieu of the payment under this paragraph, but the amount mof payment under par. (b) 1. to such an owner displaced person may not exceed the amount the owner displaced
person is eligible to receive under this paragraph. The additional payment under this paragraph shall include the following amounts:

1. The amount, if any, which when added to the acquisition cost of the property (other than any dwelling on the property) equals the reasonable cost of a comparable replacement business or farm operation for the acquired property, as determined by the condemnor.

2. The amount, if any, which will compensate such owner displaced person for any increased interest and other debt service costs which such person is required to pay for financing the acquisitions of any replacement property, if the property acquired was encumbered by a bona fide mortgage or land contract which was a valid lien on the property for at least one year prior to the initiation of negotiations for its acquisition. The amount under this subdivision shall be determined according to rules promulgated by the department of industry, labor and human relations.

3. Reasonable expenses incurred by the displaced person for evidence of title, recording fees and other closing costs incident to the purchase of the replacement property, but not including prepaid expenses.

(b) Tenant-occupied business or farm operation. In addition to amounts otherwise authorized by this subchapter, the condemnor shall make a payment to any tenant displaced person who has owned and occupied the business operation, or owned the farm operation, for not less than one year prior to initiation of negotiations for the acquisition of the real property on which the business or operation lies or, if displacement is not a direct result of acquisition, such other event as determined by the department of industry, labor, and human relations, and who actually rents or purchases a comparable replacement business or farm operation within 2 years after the date the person vacates the property. At the option of the tenant displaced person, such payment shall be either:

1. The amount, not to exceed $30,000, which is necessary to lease or rent a comparable replacement business or farm operation for a period of 4 years. The payment shall be computed by determining the average monthly rent paid for the property from which the person was displaced for the 12 months prior to the initiation of negotiations or, if displacement is not a direct result of acquisition, such other as determined by the department of industry, labor and human relations and the monthly rent of a comparable replacement business or farm operation and multiply the difference by 48; or

2. If the tenant displaced person elects to purchase a comparable replacement business or farm operation, the amount determined under subd. 1 plus expenses under par. (a) 3.

(5) EMINENT DOMAIN. Nothing in this section or ss. 32.25 to 32.27 shall be construed as creating in any condemnation proceedings brought under the power of eminent domain, any element of damages.

Section 32.25 of the Wisconsin Statutes delineates steps to be followed when displacing persons, businesses, and farm operations.
(1) Except as provided under sub. (3) and s. 85.09 (4m), no condemnor may proceed with any activity that may involve the displacement of persons, business concerns or farm operations until the condemnor has filed in writing a relocation payment plan and relocation assistance service plan and has had both plans approved in writing by the department of industry, labor and human relations.

(2) The relocation assistance service plan shall contain evidence that the condemnor has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to:

(a) Determine the cost of any relocation payments and services or the methods that are going to be used to determine such costs.

(b) Assist owners of displaced business concerns and farm operations in obtaining and becoming established in suitable business locations or replacement farms.

(c) Assist displace owners or renters in the location of comparable dwellings.

(d) Supply information concerning programs of federal, state and local governments which offer assistance to displaced persons and business concerns.

(e) Assist in minimizing hardships to displaced persons in adjusting to relocation.

(f) Secure, to the greatest extent practicable, the coordination of relocation activities with other project activities and other planned or proposed governmental actions in the community or nearby areas which may affect the implementation of the relocation program.

(g) Determine the approximate number of persons, farms or businesses that will be displaced and the availability of decent, safe and sanitary replacement housing.

(h) Assure that, within a reasonable time prior to displacement, there will be available, to the extent that may reasonably be accomplished, housing meeting the standards established by the department of industry, labor and human relations for decent, safe and sanitary dwellings. The housing, so far as practicable, shall be in areas not generally less desirable in regard to public utilities, public and commercial facilities and at rents or prices within the financial means of the families and individuals displaced and equal in number to the number of such displaced families or individuals and reasonably accessible to their places of employment.

(i) Assure that a person shall not be required to move from a dwelling unless the person has had a reasonable opportunity to relocate to a comparable dwelling.

(3)(a) Subsection (1) does not apply to any of the following activities engaged in by a condemnor:

1. Obtaining an appraisal of property.

2. Obtaining an option to purchase property, regardless of whether the option specifies the purchase price, if the property is not part of a program or project receiving federal financial assistance.
Appendix III: Access

WisDOT must reconstruct any entrance to property abutting a highway if there is a change in the highway alignment affecting that entrance. If a new highway severs property, WisDOT must provide an entrance to both parcels of land. The landowner is responsible for the maintenance of these access points after construction is completed.

WisDOT has the authority to limit the number of access points to and from rural segments of the state trunk system serving more than 2,000 vehicles per day. Access to a road or private property may be taken away if WisDOT determines a need for access control. A controlled-access highway is one where the entrance to and departure from the highway is limited. Access controls can be placed on a new or existing highway, and WisDOT can limit access by providing a grade separation, service roads or closing access to an intersecting road. Additional access to a controlled-access highway will not be provided without WisDOT's written permission. When a controlled-access highway severs a parcel, WisDOT may provide a crossover point for the owner to travel between the severed parcels. The access in these cases is removed when the parcels are no longer owned by the same party.

The following specifications and statutes cited address some of the impacts which could potentially occur during and after the proposed highway project. The statutes cited can be found in full in the following: Orlan L. Prestegard (ed.), Wisconsin Statutes, State of Wisconsin, 1985-86. WisDOT’s specifications can be found in Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction, State of Wisconsin, Department of Transportation, 1981. DATCP recommends that farmland owners concerned about access should consult these texts for further information.

Section 86.05 of the Wisconsin Statutes states that access shall be provided to land which abuts a highway:

"Whenever it is necessary, in making any highway improvement to cut or fill or otherwise grade the highway in front of any entrance to abutting premises, a suitable entrance to the premises shall be constructed as a part of the improvements, and if the premises are divided by the highway, then one such entrance shall be constructed on each side of the highway. Thereafter, each entrance shall be maintained by the owner of the premises. During the time the highway is under construction, the state, county, city, village or town shall not be responsible for any damage that may be sustained through the absence of an entrance to any such premises."

Section 84.25 of the Wisconsin Statutes describes access restrictions concerning a controlled-access highway:
(3) CONSTRUCTION; OTHER POWERS OF DEPARTMENT. In order to provide for the public safety, convenience and the general welfare, the department may use an existing highway or provide new and additional facilities for a controlled-access highway and so design the same and its appurtenances, and so regulate, restrict or prohibit access to or departure from it as the department deems necessary or desirable. The department may eliminate intersections at grade of controlled-access highways with existing highways or streets, by grade separation or service road, or by closing off such roads and streets at the right-of-way boundary line of such controlled-access highway and may divide and separate any controlled-access highway into separate roadways or lanes by raised curbs, dividing sections or other physical separations or by signs, markers, stripes or other suitable devices, and may execute any construction necessary in the development of a controlled-access highway including service roads or separation of grade structures.

(4) CONNECTIONS BY OTHER HIGHWAYS. After the establishment of any controlled-access highway, no street or highway or private driveway, shall be opened into or connected with any controlled-access highway without the previous consent and approval of the department in writing, which shall be given only if the public interest shall be served thereby and shall specify the terms and conditions on which such consent and approval is given.

(5) USE OF HIGHWAY. No person shall have any right of entrance upon or departure from or travel across any controlled-access highway, or to or from abutting lands except at places designated and provided for such purposes, and on such terms and conditions as may be specified from time to time by the department.

(6) ABUTTING OWNERS. After the designation of a controlled-access highway, the owners or occupants of abutting lands shall have no right or easement of access, by reason of the fact that their property abuts on the controlled-access highway or for other reason, except only the controlled right of access and of light, air or view.

(7) SPECIAL CROSSING PERMITS. Whenever property held under ownership is severed by a controlled-access highway, the department may permit a crossing at a designated location, to be used solely for travel between the severed parcels, and such use shall cease if such parcels pass into separate ownership.
Appendix IV: Drainage

Roads and railroad grades must be constructed and maintained so they do not impede the general flow of surface water in an unreasonable manner. Roads and railroad grades must be constructed with adequate ditches, culverts and other facilities to maintain a practical drainage pattern.

Section 88.87(2) of the Wisconsin Statutes describes regulations concerning rights of drainage:

(a) "Whenever any county, town, city, village, railroad company or the department of transportation has heretofore constructed and now maintains or hereafter constructs and maintains any highway or railroad grade in or across any marsh, lowland, natural depression, natural watercourse, natural or man-made channel or drainage course, it shall not impede the general flow of surface water or stream water in any unreasonable manner so as to cause either an unnecessary accumulation of waters flooding or water-soaking lowlands. All such highways and railroad grades shall be constructed with adequate ditches, culverts, and other facilities as may be feasible, consonant with sound engineering practices, to the end of maintaining as far as practicable the original flow lines of drainage. This paragraph does not apply to highways or railroad grades used to hold and retain water for cranberry or conservation management purposes.

(b) "Drainage rights and easements may be purchased or condemned by the public authority or railroad company having control of the highway or railroad grade to aid in the prevention of damage to property owners which might otherwise occur as a result of failure to comply with par. (a).

(c) "If a city, village, town, county, or railroad company or the department of transportation constructs and maintains a highway or railroad grade not in accordance with par. (a), any property owner damaged by the highway or railroad grade may, within 3 years after the alleged damage occurred, file a claim with the appropriate governmental agency or railroad company. The claim shall consist of a sworn statement of the alleged faulty construction and a legal description, sufficient to determine the location of the lands, of the lands alleged to have been damaged by flooding or water-soaking. Within 90 days after the filing of such claim, the governmental agency or railroad company shall either correct the cause of the water damage, acquire rights to use the land for drainage or overflow purposes, or deny the claim. If the agency or company denies the claim or fails to take any action within 90-days after the filing of the claim, the property owner may bring an action in inverse condemnation under ch. 32 or sue for such other relief, other than damages, as may be just and equitable."

WisDOT specification 205.3.2 further describes its policies concerning drainage:
"During construction, the roadway, ditches and channels shall be maintained in a well-drained condition at all times by keeping the excavation areas and embankments sloped to the approximate section of the ultimate earth grade. Blading or leveling operations will be required when placing embankments and during the process of excavation except when such excavation is in ledge rock or areas where leveling is not practical or necessary. If it is necessary, in the prosecution of the work, to interrupt existing surface drainage, sewers, or underdrainage, temporary drainage shall be provided until permanent drainage work is completed. The construction of all temporary drainage installations shall be considered as incidental to the construction of the work.

"Where Salvaged Topsoil is stored on the right-of-way during construction operations, it shall be so stockpiled to preclude interference with or obstruction of surface drainage.

"The contractor shall be responsible for and shall take all reasonable and necessary precautions to preserve and protect all existing tile drains, sewers, and other subsurface drains, or parts thereof, which in the judgment of the engineer may be continued in service without change. He shall repair at his own expense any and all damage to such facilities resulting from negligence or carelessness on the part of his operations."
Appendix V: General Criteria for the Classification of Important Farmlands

The following discussion summarizes the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service's written criteria for classifying farmlands, greater detail can be obtained from the Natural Resources Conservation Service office located at 6515 Watts Road, Suite 200, Madison, WI 53719-2726.

Prime Farmland

Prime farmland is land that has the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for producing food, feed, forage, fiber, and oilseed crops, and is also available for these uses (the land could be cropland, pastureland, rangeland, forest land, or other land, but not urban built-up land or water). It has the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to economically produce sustained high yields of crops when treated and managed, including water management, according to acceptable farming methods. In general, prime farmlands have an adequate and dependable water supply from precipitation or irrigation, a favorable temperature and growing season, acceptable acidity or alkalinity, acceptable salt and sodium content, and few or no rocks. They are permeable to water and air. Prime farmlands are not excessively erodible or saturated with water for a long period of time, and they either do not flood frequently or are protected from flooding.

Unique Farmland

Unique farmland is land other than prime farmland that is used for the production of specific high value food and fiber crops. It has the special combination of soil quality, location, growing season, and moisture supply needed to economically produce sustained high quality and/or high yields of a specific crop when treated and managed according to acceptable farming methods. Examples of such crops are citrus, tree nuts, olives, cranberries, fruit, and vegetables.

Additional Farmland of Statewide Importance

This is land, in addition to prime and unique farmland, that is of statewide importance for the production of food, feed, fiber, forage, and oilseed crops. Criteria for defining and delineating this land are to be determined by the appropriate state agency or agencies. Generally, additional farmlands of statewide importance include those that are nearly prime farmland and that economically produce high yields of crops when treated and managed according to acceptable farming methods. Some may produce as high a yield as prime farmlands if conditions are favorable. In some states, additional farmlands of statewide importance may include tracts of land that have been designated for agriculture by state law.
Additional Farmland of Local Importance

In some local areas there is concern for certain additional farmland for the production of food, feed, fiber, forage, and oilseed crops, even though these lands are not identified as having national or statewide importance. Where appropriate, these lands are to be identified by the local agency or agencies concerned. In places, additional farmlands of local importance may include tracts of land that have been designated for agriculture by local ordinance.
Appendix VI: NRCS Soil Capability Classes

The following discussion summarizes the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service's written criteria for land capability classification, greater detail can be obtained from the Natural Resources Conservation Service office located at 6515 Watts Road, Suite 200, Madison, WI 53719-2726.

Land suited to Cultivation and Other Uses:

Class I soils have few limitations that restrict their use.

Class II soils have some limitations that reduce the choice of plants or require moderate conservation practices.

Class III soils have severe limitations that reduce the choice of plants or require special conservation practices, or both.

Class IV soils have very severe limitations that restrict the choice of plants, require very careful management, or both.

Land Limited in Use—Generally Not Suited to Cultivation

Class V soils have little or no erosion hazard but have other limitations impractical to remove that limit their use largely to pasture, range, woodland, or wildlife food and cover.

Class VI soils have severe limitations that make them generally unsuited to cultivation and limit their use largely to pasture or range, woodland, or wildlife food and cover.

Class VII soils have very severe limitations that make them unsuited to cultivation and that restrict their use largely to grazing, woodland, or wildlife.

Class VIII soils and landforms have limitations that preclude their use for commercial plant production.

Soil Capability Subclasses

A subclass is a group of capability units within a class which has the dominant soil or climatic limitations for agricultural use. Capability Class I has no subclasses. There are four subclasses, designated by letter symbols and defined as follows:

Erosion susceptibility is the dominant problem or hazard. Both erosion susceptibility and past erosion damage are major soil factors for placement in this subclass.
Soil limitations within the rooting zone, such as shallowness of rooting zones, stones, low moisture-holding capacity, low fertility that is difficult to correct, and salinity or sodium, are dominant.

Excess water is the dominant hazard or limitation. Poor soil drainage, wetness, high water table, and overflow are the criteria for placing soils in this subclass.

Climate (temperature or lack of moisture) is the only major hazard or limitation.
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