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STH 60 NORTHERN RELIEVER ROUTE
FEASIBILITY STUDY

INTRODUCTION

This report documents the findings of a study conducted by the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission requested by Washington County on the feasibility of a northern reliever route of STH 60 between the western limits of the City of Hartford (Goodland Road) and IH 41. The study was conducted in response to a request from the Hartford Area Development Corporation (HADC) to the Washington County Board of Supervisors, which was prompted by their concerns of increasing traffic volume, congestion, and safety problems on STH 60, and in particular, the effect of increasing truck traffic on traffic congestion and safety. The Commission staff worked with staff from concerned and affected local governments in the Hartford/Slinger area, Washington County, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT), and the HADC, including the consideration of input provided by the public, to identify and evaluate potential STH 60 northern reliever routes and improvements to STH 60. The study was conducted by the Commission under the direction of the Washington County Administrator and Highway Commissioner, with guidance from the Washington County Board of Supervisors Public Works Committee (a roster of the Public Works Committee is provided on the front inside cover).

This study is an update to a Washington County study completed in 2005, which considered and evaluated alternative northern and southern reliever routes. A preferred reliever route was identified (as shown on Map 1) as part of the study. However, the preferred route was not implemented by the County.

The first section of the report documents the identification of traffic movement problems and issues along STH 60 between Goodland Road and IH 41. This was accomplished through meetings with local officials, inventories and analyses of existing and probable future conditions of this segment of STH 60, and a public information meeting (PIM) held on June 29, 2016, and a public comment period of June 16, 2016, through July 15, 2016.

The second section of the report documents the development of the potential STH 60 northern reliever routes and improvements to STH 60. Specifically, this section documents the goal to be achieved by a potential northern reliever route and potential improvements to STH 60, the objectives and criteria used for evaluating alternative STH 60 reliever routes, and the potential alternative STH 60 northern reliever routes and improvements to STH 60 identified for evaluation. In developing the goal, objectives, and criteria, alternative routes, and potential improvements to STH 60, consideration was given to input (local officials, public, and private entities) provided as part of the problem identification element of the study.

1 This study is documented in a report entitled, “East-West Corridor Study, Phase 1, Final Report,” dated June 21, 2005.
PREFERRED RELIEVER ROUTE IDENTIFIED IN 2005 WASHINGTON COUNTY EAST-WEST CORRIDOR STUDY

Source: Washington County and SEWRPC.
The evaluation of alternative northern reliever routes with respect to their attainment of the goal, objectives, and criteria is documented in the third section of the report. The results of the evaluation documented in this section were presented to Washington County Board of Supervisors Public Works Committee at their August 24, 2016 meeting. At this meeting, Commission and Washington County staffs recommended that the Public Works Committee identify one of the reliever route alternatives that should receive further study.

The alternative reliever route recommended for further study, and recommendations with respect to improvements to STH 60, are documented in the final section of the report. This section also includes recommendations related to the appropriate level of government (local, county, or state) that would have jurisdictional responsibility for implementing the recommended reliever route and improvements to STH 60.

PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION AND INVENTORY

This section documents the traffic movement issues identified during meetings the Commission staff and Washington County staff had with officials from local concerned and affected governments (City of Hartford, Village of Slinger, and the Towns of Addison, Hartford, and Polk), WisDOT, and the HADC, and during a public information meeting (PIM) that was held on Wednesday, June 29, 2016, in the Town of Hartford, along with a formal public comment period of June 16, 2016, through July 15, 2016. The input from the local officials and from the public was considered in the development of alternative STH 60 reliever routes and potential improvements to STH 60, along with the development of the goal and the objectives and criteria used for evaluating the alternative reliever routes, which is documented in subsequent sections of the report. Appendix A provides a summary of the comments received at the PIM and during the public comment period.

This section also documents the existing and probable future conditions of STH 60 between Goodland Road and IH 41, including pavement history, existing traffic control, current total and truck traffic volume, current traffic congestion, future traffic volume and congestion, and vehicular crashes. In addition, the travel times measured along STH 60 and for three existing alternative routes between Goodland Road and IH 41 are provided. This inventory information was used to confirm issues identified by local officials and the public, and as well, identify additional issues along STH 60 not captured through meetings with local officials and public comment.

Identified Issues Along STH 60

The following traffic movement issues were identified along STH 60 between Goodland Road and IH 41 at meetings that the Commission and Washington County staffs had with officials from affected and concerned local municipalities, WisDOT, and the HADC, and by comments received at the public information meeting held on June 29, 2016, and during the public comment period:

- **Intersection of STH 60 and STH 83 (Main Street)** – The intersection of STH 60 and STH 83 in the Hartford downtown area was particularly identified as having traffic movement issues. The primary issue identified for this intersection is that the proximity of buildings and the provision of parking on both sides of STH 83 does not provide enough room for large trucks travelling westbound on STH 60 to turn onto northbound STH 83 (Main Street). Southbound vehicles often need to back out of the way of the trucks turning onto STH 83 (Main Street). Similarly, the intersection of Main Street (STH 83) and State Street, to the north, also does not provide adequate space for trucks on STH 83 turning onto State Street. While there are more appropriate roads for carrying trucks, such as Wacker Drive, truck drivers utilize Main Street (STH 83) because their GPS units typically identify it as the fastest route to the businesses located along State Street. In addition, there is no dedicated left turn lane for traffic on STH 60 turning onto STH 83, which causes delays for traffic travelling on STH 60 through the intersection.

- **Traffic Signals Between Liberty Avenue and IH 41** – The lack of coordination of the existing traffic signals from Liberty Avenue and IH 41 was identified as being an issue along STH 60.
• Intersections of STH 60 with STH 175 and STH 164 – It was indicated that traffic generally moves well on STH 60 between the Hartford downtown area and IH 41 during peak and midday times. However, during peak times, traffic may wait for two to three cycles to travel through the intersection of STH 60 and STH 164. In addition, it was indicated that the lack of dedicated right-turn lanes affects the movement of traffic travelling on STH 60 through its intersection with STH 175.

• Intersection of STH 60 and Independence Avenue – WisDOT staff indicated that there may be traffic movement issues at the intersection of STH 60 and Independence Avenue as trucks travelling southbound on Independence Avenue turn left onto STH 60. However, they indicated that currently traffic signals are not warranted at this intersection.

Inventory
The Commission staff inventoried the existing conditions on STH 60, including pavement history, traffic control, current total vehicle and truck traffic volumes, current traffic congestion, vehicular crashes along STH 60, and travel times. In addition, forecasts looking to the year 2050 of potential future traffic volume and congestion on STH 60 were prepared. These forecasts were prepared under the assumption that no northern—or southern—alternative reliever route is constructed.

STH 60 Pavement History
Pavements have a design life ranging from 50 to 60 years before the need to be reconstructed. Because of traffic use (particularly trucks) and annual temperature changes (freeze and thaw), it is necessary to periodically improve the condition of the pavement surface through rehabilitation—resurfacing or reconditioning. The first rehabilitation of the pavement surface typically occurs 20 to 30 years following roadway construction or reconstruction, with subsequent pavement rehabilitation occurring every 8 to 18 years. Typically after two resurfacings (or reconditionings) a roadway will require reconstruction. The history of pavement reconstruction and rehabilitation of STH 60 between the Washington County line and IH 41 was provided by WisDOT and is shown on Maps 2 and 3. The entire segment of STH 60 between the County line and IH 41 has been either reconstructed or resurfaced in the last 10 years.

STH 60 Traffic Control
Shown on Map 4 are the existing 11 traffic signals located on STH 60 between Goodland Road and IH 41. The traffic signals at three locations on STH 60 are owned and operated by WisDOT—at Kettle Moraine Drive/Bonnie Lane, at STH 175, and at STH 164. The remaining eight traffic signals are owned and operated by the City of Hartford. There is currently no traffic signal coordination of the signals along STH 60.

The traffic control along a roadway can affect the time it takes to travel in a corridor. Traffic signal spacing of more than one mile is considered desirable. Traffic signal spacing of about one-half mile or more is considered acceptable. The traffic signals along the segment of STH 60 between Liberty Avenue and Pike Lake Drive have a spacing of 0.4 miles per traffic signal, which is less than acceptable spacing. Between Pike Lake Drive and STH 175, the traffic signals on STH 60 have a spacing of 1.3 miles, which is consistent with the desirable signal spacing of 1.0 miles. Between STH 175 and STH 164, the two traffic signals on this segment of STH 60 have a spacing of 0.6 miles, which meets the acceptable traffic signal spacing.

Current Total and Truck Traffic Volume along STH 60
Current traffic counts along STH 60 between Goodland Avenue and IH 41 are shown on Map 5. As this segment of STH 60 is the only east-west arterial through the Hartford-Slinger area that has access to the IH 41 freeway, it

---

2 Reconstruction of a roadway is the removal and replacement of the entire pavement structure—pavement and gravel base course.

3 Resurfacing of a roadway entails removing a layer of the pavement and overlaying with a new layer of pavement.

4 Reconditioning of a roadway entails the resurfacing of the roadway along with spot repairs of failed base course below the pavement.
Map 2

DATE OF RECONSTRUCTION OF STH 60 BETWEEN THE WASHINGTON COUNTY LINE AND IH 41

YEAR OF RECONSTRUCTION

- 1991
- 1997
- 2007

Source: WisDOT and SEWRPC.

Map 3

DATE OF RESURFACING OR RECONDITIONING OF STH 60 BETWEEN THE WASHINGTON COUNTY LINE AND IH 41

YEAR OF RESURFACING/RECONDITIONING FOLLOWING RECONSTRUCTION

- 2007
- 2011
- 2015

Source: WisDOT and SEWRPC.
Map 4

TRAFFIC SIGNAL LOCATION ON STH 60 BETWEEN GOODLAND ROAD AND IH 41

Source: SEWRPC.

Map 5

CURRENT YEAR 2013 AVERAGE WEEKDAY TOTAL TRAFFIC VOLUME ALONG STH 60 BETWEEN GOODLAND ROAD AND IH 41

Source: WisDOT and SEWRPC.
carries a large amount of vehicles on average weekdays—ranging from a low of 9,300 vehicles between Goodland Road and Independence Avenue to a high of 28,000 vehicles between STH 175 and STH 164.

With respect to truck traffic volume, Commission staff collected 24-hour volume and vehicle classification data with mechanical traffic counters located on STH 60 near Goodland Road and IH 41. Traffic volume and vehicle classification data was also hand-recorded at these locations by Commission staff over a ten-hour period (7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.), which validated the data collected by the mechanical traffic counters. Based on the data collected, truck traffic represents about 9 to 10 percent of total traffic on STH 60. To determine the proportion of through truck travel, Commission staff also conducted a license plate survey where the license plates of medium- and heavy-duty trucks were recorded in 15-minute intervals at two locations on STH 60—near Goodland Road and near IH 41. Any license plate of a truck observed at the two locations within 30 minutes was considered to be a truck traveling on STH 60 through the Hartford-Slinger area. The results of the license plate survey concluded that, only about 7 percent of, or about 100 to 200, medium- and heavy-duty trucks traveling on STH 60 are travelling through the Hartford-Slinger area on an average weekday.

In addition, Commission staff was provided a survey conducted by HADC of seven large companies located in the Hartford Industrial Park on the west side of the City of Hartford, which indicated that these companies generate about 1,300 truck trips per day. Additionally, two of the largest freight generators in the Hartford Industrial Park indicated that approximately 75 to 85 percent of the truck trips generated travel on STH 60 to/from destinations south of the Hartford area utilizing IH 41. Thus, in order for a northern reliever route to divert truck traffic from STH 60, it would need to have a comparable travel time to STH 60.

Current Traffic Congestion along STH 60

When traffic volume exceeds the design capacity of a roadway, it experiences congestion. Typically, congestion occurs during the peak traffic times of an average weekday. Congestion can result in slower traffic speeds between controlled intersections and longer delays and queues at controlled intersections. The traffic congestion on STH 60 between Goodland Road and IH 41 can be assessed by comparing the average weekday traffic (AWDT) volumes (shown on Map 5) for each segment of STH 60 to its design capacity. Table 1 presents the design capacities along STH 60 between Goodland Road and IH 41. Map 6 shows the segments of STH 60 between Goodland Road and IH 41 that experience congestion during peak travel times of an average weekday. Also shown on Map 6 is the location of two intersections identified during meetings with local officials as experiencing congestion, or delay—the intersection of STH 60 and STH 83 and the intersection of STH 60 and STH 164. The location of these two intersections coincides with the segments of STH 60 that experience congestion based on current traffic volumes.

Future Total Traffic Volume and Congestion along STH 60

Commission staff utilized the Commission’s fifth-generation travel simulation models\(^5\) to prepare forecast year 2050 AWDT volumes for STH 60 between Goodland Road and IH 41. Forecast year 2050 AWDT volumes for STH 60, as shown on Map 7, were prepared under the assumption that no northern—or southern—alternative reliever

\(^5\) The Commission has, for over 50 years, maintained and refined traffic forecasting and simulation models, similar to ones used by other metropolitan transportation planning organizations across the country. The forecasting and simulation of existing and future travel demand through travel simulation models is a complex procedure requiring development and application of a variety of mathematical models. The simulation of travel and traffic is based upon the premise that the magnitude and pattern of travel is a stable function of the characteristics of the land use pattern and of the transportation system, with the term land use referring to not only land use type and intensity, but also to population, household, and employment levels and characteristics. The fifth-generation travel simulation and forecasting models used in the development of the recently completed year 2050 regional transportation plan (VISION 2050) were validated by comparing the model-estimated travel and traffic—based on inventoried 2010 demographic, economic, and land use data and 2011/2012 transportation survey data—to estimated existing year 2011 traffic volumes.
Table 1

ESTIMATED DESIGN CAPACITY ON STH 60 BETWEEN GOODLAND ROAD AND IH 41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Design Capacity (Average Weekday Traffic Volume)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goodland Road to Liberty Avenue</td>
<td>Two-lane</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Avenue to Wilson Avenue</td>
<td>Four-lane Undivided</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Avenue to Hilldale Drive</td>
<td>Four-lane with Two-Way Left Turn Lane (TWTL)</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilldale Drive to IH 41</td>
<td>Four-Lane Divided/TWTL(^a)</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\) While portions of this segment have a four-lane TWTL cross-section, development and/or direct access by abutting properties is limited. Therefore a design capacity of 27,000 was assigned to the full segment.

Source: SEWRPC.

Vehicular Crashes along STH 60

The location of the total vehicular crashes\(^6\) and crashes involving trucks\(^7\) that occurred along STH 60 over the five-year period is shown on Map 9. Table 2 shows the number and rate of total vehicular crashes and crashes involving trucks that occurred over a five-year period (2010 through 2014) on STH 60 between Goodland Road and IH 41. In addition, Table 2 shows the number and rate of total crashes and truck crashes involving pedestrians, bicyclists, and a fatality or observed injury\(^8\). Over the five-year period, 692 reported vehicular crashes (about 138 crashes annually) occurred on STH 60 between Goodland Road and IH 41. Of these crashes, 21 crashes (about four crashes annually) involved a bicycle or a pedestrian, representing about three percent of total crashes. Additionally, there were 94 crashes (about 19 crashes annually) that involved either a fatality or an observed injury, representing about 14 percent of total crashes.

As compared to statewide averages for state highways (shown on Table 2), the total crash rates on the segments of STH 60 between Goodland Road and Liberty Avenue (Segment A), between Wacker Drive and Wilson Avenue (Segment C), and between STH 175 and IH 41 (Segment H) exceed the statewide crash rates for similar roadway

\(^{6}\) A reportable crash is any crash resulting in: 1) an injury to or death of any person; 2) damage to government-owned non-vehicle property to an apparent extent of $200 or more; 3) damage to a government-owned vehicle to an apparent extent of $1,000 or more; 4) or total damage to property owned by any one person to an apparent extent of $1,000 or more. The number of vehicle crashes shown for STH 60 between Goodland Road and IH 41 includes reported vehicle crashes within 250 feet of STH 60 at intersections with public roadways to be consistent with the methodology used by WisDOT for calculating crash rates of a roadway. The number of vehicle crashes shown does not include crashes involving deer.

\(^{7}\) Truck crashes include incidents where any vehicle involved in the crash was a single unit truck, multi-trailer truck, multi-trailer truck, or non-attached truck.

\(^{8}\) A crash that resulted in an observed injury includes crashes that an injury was observed by the law enforcement personnel presiding over the crash.
Map 6
CURRENT YEAR 2013 TRAFFIC CONGESTION ALONG STH 60 BETWEEN GOODLAND ROAD AND IH 41

FACILITY CONGESTION STATUS
- AT OR UNDER DESIGN CAPACITY
- ABOVE DESIGN CAPACITY AND EXPERIENCING CONGESTION

BY LOCAL OFFICIALS
PROBLEM INTERSECTIONS IDENTIFIED

Source: SEWRPC.

Map 7
FORECAST YEAR 2050 AVERAGE WEEKDAY TOTAL TRAFFIC VOLUME ALONG STH 60 BETWEEN GOODLAND ROAD AND IH 41

27,000 FORECAST YEAR 2050 AVERAGE WEEKDAY TRAFFIC VOLUME

Source: SEWRPC.
FORECAST YEAR 2050 TRAFFIC CONGESTION ALONG STH 60 BETWEEN GOODLAND ROAD AND IH 41

FACILITY CONGESTION STATUS
- GREEN: AT OR UNDER DESIGN CAPACITY
- RED: ABOVE DESIGN CAPACITY

Source: SEWRPC.

TOTAL VEHICULAR CRASHES AND CRASHES INVOLVING TRUNKS ALONG STH 60 BETWEEN GOODLAND ROAD AND IH 41: 2010-2014

NOTES:
1. Truck crashes include incidents where either vehicle involved is a single unit truck, single trailer truck, multi-trailer truck, or non-attached truck.
2. Crashes within 250 feet of STH 60 at intersections with public roadways were included in the crashes identified to be considered with the methodology used by WisDOT for calculating the crash rates of a roadway.

Source: Wisconsin Traffic Operations and Safety Laboratory and SEWRPC.
### Table 2
TOTAL VEHICULAR CRASHES (ALL VEHICLES) - 2010-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Total Vehicular Crashes (All Vehicles)</th>
<th>Crashes Involving Trucks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>Crash Rate per 100 Million Vehicle Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>125.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>239.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>443.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>284.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>106.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>119.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>123.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>281.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>210.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
1. Truck crashes include incidents where either vehicle involved is a single unit truck, single trailer truck, multi-trailer truck, or non-attached truck.
2. Crashes within 250 feet of STH 60 at intersections with public roadways were included in the crashes identified to be consistent with the methodology used by WisDOT for calculating the crash rates of a roadway.
3. Crash rates are in crashes per 100 million vehicle miles.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Total Crashes</th>
<th>Crashes Involving Pedestrians</th>
<th>Crashes Involving Bicyclists</th>
<th>Crashes Involving a Fatality or Observed Injury</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>Crash Rate per 100 Million Vehicle Miles</td>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>Crash Rate per 100 Million Vehicle Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>125.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>239.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>443.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>284.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>106.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>119.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>123.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>281.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>210.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* The statewide average roadway crash rate is 88.47 per 100 million vehicle miles of travel for rural two-lane highways with annual average daily traffic volumes greater than 7,000 (Segment A), 417.98 per 100 million vehicle miles of travel for multilane undivided and one-way highways (Segments B and C), 378.88 per 100 million vehicle miles of travel for multilane divided State Trunk Highways with posted speed limits 40 mph or lower (Segment D), and 181.72 per 100 million vehicle miles of travel for multilane divided State Trunk Highways with posted speed limits 45 mph or higher (Segments E, F, G, and H).

* The statewide average roadway crash rate involving a fatality or observed injury is 17.75 per 100 million vehicle miles of travel for rural two-lane highways with annual average daily traffic volumes greater than 7,000 (Segment A), 52.77 per 100 million vehicle miles of travel for multilane undivided and one-way highways (Segments B and C), 46.13 per 100 million vehicle miles of travel for multilane divided State Trunk Highways with posted speed limits 40 mph or lower (Segment D), and 22.58 per 100 million vehicle miles of travel for multilane divided State Trunk Highways with posted speed limits 45 mph or higher (Segments E, F, G, and H).

* Exceeds statewide average.

NOTES:
1. Truck crashes include incidents where either vehicle involved is a single unit truck, single trailer truck, multi-trailer truck, or non-attached truck.
2. Crashes within 250 feet of STH 60 at intersections with public roadways were included in the crashes identified to be consistent with the methodology used by WisDOT for calculating the crash rates of a roadway.
3. Crash rates are in crashes per 100 million vehicle miles.

Source: Wisconsin Traffic Operations and Safety Laboratory and SEWRPC.
types. These segments of STH 60 coincide with the segments of STH 60 that currently experience congestion. With respect to crashes involving fatalities and observed injuries, the rates of such crashes exceed the State average for similar roadway types on STH 60 between Goodland Road and Liberty Avenue (Segment A), between Pike Lake Drive and Kettle Moraine Drive (Segments E and F), and between STH 175 and IH 41 (Segment H).

With respect to crashes involving trucks, there were 67 reported truck crashes (about 14 crashes annually) over the five-year time period, representing about 10 percent of the total 692 reported vehicular crashes. Of the crashes involving a truck, only one crash involved either a bicycle or a pedestrian, representing about one percent of the total crashes involving trucks. Over the same time period, there were seven truck crashes (about one crash annually) that involved either a fatality or an observed injury, representing about 10 percent of the total crashes involving trucks. The proportion of truck crashes along STH 60 between Wacker Drive and Wilson Avenue (13 percent) and between STH 175 and IH 41 (11 percent) exceeds the proportion of trucks traveling on these segments of STH 60 (about 9-10 percent).

**Comparison of Existing Travel Times**

Travel time is affected by the speed limit of a roadway, the type and spacing of traffic control, and the level of traffic volume and congestion, which can result in reduced speeds and increased delay. The Commission staff measured travel times\(^9\) for STH 60 and three other existing routes between the intersections of STH 60/Goodland Road and STH 60/IH 41. These routes are shown on Map 10 and Table 3 provides a comparison of the travel times collected by Commission staff. The travel times for two of the routes—the Goodland Road/Arthur Road/Kettle Moraine Road/CTH K/IH 41 route and the STH 60/STH 83/CTH K/IH 41 route—were comparable (within 3 to 4 minutes) to STH 60 even without any alignment or operational improvements to the routes.

\(^9\) Travel times were recorded utilizing the “floating car” method where the measuring vehicle “floats” with traffic by passing as many vehicles that pass the measuring vehicle. When there are no vehicles on the roadway, the monitoring vehicle drove at the posted speed limit.
Map 10
SELECTED EXISTING ROUTES USED FOR MEASURING TRAVEL TIMES

TIME TRAVEL ROUTES
- STH 60
- GOODLAND ROAD/ARTHUR ROAD/
  KETTLE MORAINES ROAD/CTH K/IH 41
- STH 60/STH 83/CTH K/IH 41
- STH 60/INDEPENDENCE AVENUE/
  STATE STREET/CTH U/TURTLE ROAD/
  CTH K/IH 41
- START POINT/END POINT

Source: SEWRPC.
STH 60 RELIEVER ROUTE GOAL, OBJECTIVES, AND CRITERIA

Based on the discussions between Commission and Washington County staffs and officials from affected and concerned local municipalities, WisDOT, and the HADC, it was recognized that since STH 60 is the only direct and continuous route between the Hartford and Slinger areas and that it currently experiences heavy truck and total traffic volumes and traffic congestion, failure to alleviate the traffic congestion and heavy truck volumes can be expected to affect livability and safety in the Hartford and Slinger areas, and hinder economic development and expansion. Thus, the overall goal which a northern reliever route would attempt to address was identified as:

“Enhance the livability and safety of the Hartford and Slinger areas, and thereby encourage continued economic development and expansion.”

Based on this goal, a number of objectives were developed to measure the extent to which potential northern reliever routes may achieve this overall goal, as shown on Table 4. These objectives were used to design, evaluate, and compare northern reliever route alternatives. Under each objective, specific criteria were identified, as shown on Table 4, which would measure the achievement of each proposed objective. It is unlikely that any one proposed reliever route would best meet each of the objectives and criteria. Certain objectives and criteria may be complementary; however, other objectives and criteria may be conflicting. Consideration was given to a comparison of how well each proposed route achieves each objective, followed by resolution through balancing competing objectives.

ALTERNATIVE NORTHERN RELIEVER ROUTES

Map 11 shows the eleven alternative northern reliever routes that were identified for evaluation. Alternatives 1 through 6 were developed based on meetings with the local affected and concerned municipalities and the HADC. These alternatives were presented at a public information meeting held on June 29, 2016. Following the public information meeting, Alternatives 7 through 10 were added and Alternatives 1 through 10 were presented to the Washington County Public Works Committee on July 27, 2016. Alternative 11 was added in August 2016, and was presented to the Washington County Public Works Committee on August 24, 2016.

The alignment of the alternative routes which include the City of Hartford’s long-planned extension of Independence Avenue between CTH N and Arthur Road are consistent with the City of Hartford Airport runway realignment and extension project (from 3,000 to 3,400 feet). The airport’s master plan includes a further ultimate extension concept to 5,000 feet, with the extension occurring to the west. This would require the reliever route alignments utilizing the planned Independence Avenue extension to be relocated about a quarter-mile to the west. As an alternative, the runway extension could be shifted about a quarter-mile to the east, and Main Street could either become discontinuous or be rerouted a quarter-mile to the east. A third option could be to split the difference, shifting the 5,000-foot runway from its location in the master plan about an eighth-mile to the east. This would require shifting the alignment of the alternatives about an eighth-mile to the west and shifting Main Street about an eighth-mile to the east. The effect of the airport expansion proposed in the master plan on the northern reliever route would be addressed in preliminary engineering, should Washington County decide to further study the implementation of the reliever route.

---

10 The City of Hartford has long planned the extension of Independence Avenue from CTH N to Arthur Road. The City of Hartford’s comprehensive plan, entitled, “City of Hartford 2030 Smart Growth Plan”, includes this extension of Independence Avenue.
Table 4
OBJECTIVES AND CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVE NORTHERN RELIEVER ROUTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide Alternative Route with Comparable Travel Time to STH 60</td>
<td>Ratio of Alternative Route Travel Time to STH 60 Travel Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce STH 60 Traffic Volume and Alleviate STH 60 Traffic Congestion</td>
<td>STH 60 Average Weekday Traffic Volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STH 60 Traffic Congestion--Average weekday traffic volume compared to design capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential to divert truck traffic from STH 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize Construction Cost</td>
<td>Estimated Construction Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize Impact of Alternative Route</td>
<td>Right-of-way Acquisitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Number of Residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Number of Businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Acres of Farmland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Total Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Number of Farms Divided by Alternative Routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Residences Located Along Alternative Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Environmental Sensitive Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Primary Environmental Corridor&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Secondary Environmental Corridor&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Isolated Natural Resource Areas&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Wetlands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Primary environmental corridors in the Region are generally located along major stream valleys, around major lakes, and along the Kettle Moraine. These primary environmental corridors contain almost all of the best remaining woodlands, wetlands, and wildlife habitat areas in the Region, and represent a composite of the best remaining elements of the natural resource base.

<sup>b</sup> Secondary environmental corridors are generally located along the small perennial and intermittent streams within the Region. Secondary environmental corridors also contain a variety of resource elements, often remnant resources from primary environmental corridors which have been developed for intensive urban or agricultural purposes. Secondary environmental corridors facilitate surface-water drainage, maintain pockets of natural resource features, and provide corridors for the movement of wildlife, as well as for the movement and dispersal of seeds for a variety of plant species.

<sup>c</sup> Isolated natural resource areas are other smaller pockets of wetlands, woodlands, surface water, or wildlife habitat exist within the Region. These pockets are isolated from the environmental corridors by urban development or agricultural use, and although separated from the environmental corridor network, these isolated natural.

Source: SEWRPC.

EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL NORTHERN RELIEVER ROUTES

As areas urbanize, there is a need to develop a grid of arterial streets and highways<sup>11</sup> at the appropriate spacing to serve the existing and planned urban development of the area. STH 60 has long served as the only east-west arterial roadway through the Hartford/Slinger area. However, as this area has developed and will continue to develop,

<sup>11</sup> Arterial streets and highways are those roadways that are principally intended to provide travel mobility, serving through movement of traffic and providing transportation service to subareas of the Region. Access to abutting property may be a secondary function of some types of arterial streets and highways, but the primary function of arterial streets and highways are traffic movement.
ALTERNATIVE RELIEVER ROUTES EVALUATED AS PART OF THE STH 60 RELIEVER ROUTE FEASIBILITY STUDY

**POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVE ROUTES**

- ALTERNATIVE 1 (CTH U/CTH K)
- ALTERNATIVE 2 (INNER HARTFORD/STH 83)
- ALTERNATIVE 3 (ARTHUR RD/FRONTAGE RD)
- ALTERNATIVE 4 (INNER HARTFORD/STH 60)
- ALTERNATIVE 5 (ARTHUR RD/NEW ALIGNMENT A)
- ALTERNATIVE 6 (ARTHUR RD/KETTLE MORaine RD)
- ALTERNATIVE 7 (ARTHUR RD/IH 41 BRIDGE)
- ALTERNATIVE 8 (ARTHUR RD/STH 83/STH 60)
- ALTERNATIVE 9 (ARTHUR RD/NEW ALIGNMENT B)
- ALTERNATIVE 10 (CLOVER RD/KETTLE MORaine RD/STH 60)
- ALTERNATIVE 11 (NEW ALIGNMENT C/CTH K)

*Alternatives 7 through 10 were added following the public meeting on June 29, 2016 and were presented to the Washington County Public Works Committee on July 27, 2016. Alternative 11 was added in August 2016, and was presented to the Washington County Public Works Committee on August 24, 2016. The alignment of Alternative 11, and as well the other alternative routes which include the City of Hartford long-planned extension of Independence Avenue between CTH N and Arthur Road, are consistent with the City of Hartford Airport runway realignment and extension project (from 3,000 to 3,400 feet). The airport’s master plan includes a further ultimate extension concept to 5,000 feet, with the extension occurring to the west. This would require the reliever route alignments for an extended Independence Avenue to be relocated about a quarter-mile to the west. In the alternative, to accommodate the ultimate runway extension concept, Main Street between Clover Road and Arthur Road could be relocated about a quarter-mile to the east. This would be addressed in preliminary engineering.*

**Source:** SEWRPC.
STH 60 can no longer be relied upon as the sole east-west arterial through the Hartford/Slinger area, and there is a need for additional east-west arterial roadways. In addition, a parallel east-west arterial to STH 60 could provide an alternative route for vehicles travelling during times of construction or a major vehicular crash. Implementation of the STH 60 northern reliever route would begin the development of the grid of arterial streets and highways to serve existing and planned urban development in the Hartford/Slinger area, and to potentially reduce the amount of total and truck traffic and vehicle congestion on STH 60.

The evaluation of the eleven STH 60 reliever route alternatives with the criteria is presented in Table 5. It is anticipated that the northern reliever route would predominately be a rural cross-section having two 12-foot traffic lanes with 10-foot shoulders (5 feet of paved shoulder and 5 feet of gravel shoulder), along with a 100-foot right-of-way (as shown on Figure 1). Figure 2 shows an example of how the reliever route with such a cross-section could look. The photo was taken along a section of CTH N northwest of CTH U, which was recently reconstructed with the same cross-section that is being assumed for the reliever route.

Based on the evaluation shown on Table 5, Alternatives 7, 9, and 11 were the only alternative STH 60 reliever routes that would be expected to divert enough total and truck traffic from STH 60 to reduce forecast year 2050 traffic congestion on STH 60. These three alternatives would have similar impacts to homes, businesses, and farmland and are estimated to have similar construction costs. While Alternative 7 is estimated to divert the most total traffic (ranging from 3,000 to 3,500 vehicles) from STH 60 and alleviate the most congestion along STH 60 (reducing the miles of congestion from 4.75 miles to 3.08 miles) than the other alternatives, it would have the highest construction cost (ranging between $22.2 and $23.7 million) mostly due to this alternative proposing the construction of a new bridge over IH 41. Alternatives 9 and 11 are expected to divert a similar number of vehicles (2,500 total vehicles) and trucks (1,000 trucks) from STH 60 in the Hartford downtown area on an average weekday. These two alternatives would also be expected to alleviate a similar amount of forecast year 2050 traffic congestion from STH 60 (reducing the miles of congestion from 4.75 miles to 3.66 miles), and would have similar impacts to residences, businesses, farmland, and environmentally sensitive lands. However, as much of the existing portion of Alternative 11 is on a county trunk highway, this alternative would have the least impact on the number of residences that currently reside along an existing local roadway.

With respect to jurisdictional transfers, much of the existing roadway that would be utilized for Alternatives 7 and 9 would require the transfer of roadway from local to county jurisdiction. Specifically, Alternative 7 would require the jurisdictional transfer of about 5.8 miles of Arthur Road to county jurisdiction, and Alternative 9 would require the jurisdictional transfer of 3.8 miles of portions of two roadways—Arthur Road and St. Lawrence Lane—to county jurisdiction. With respect to Alternative 11, much of the existing roadway that would be utilized for the reliever route—CTH K—is already under county jurisdiction. The exception would be that a small portion of Turtle Road may potentially need to be transferred from local to county jurisdiction to avoid existing wetlands south of Turtle Road.

At the August 24, 2016 Washington County Board of Supervisors Public Works Committee meeting, the Commission and Washington County staffs recommended that the Public Works Committee identify Alternative 11 as the reliever route alternative which should receive further study through a preliminary engineering and environmental impact study. As compared to Alternatives 7 and 9, Alternative 11 would have similar impacts on STH 60 traffic, right-of-way impacts, and construction costs, and would be located primarily on existing county trunk highway or new alignment. Like the other two alternatives, Alternative 11 includes the City of Hartford’s long planned extension of Independence Avenue from CTH N to Arthur Road. Additionally, most of the remaining portions of Alternative 11 are on CTH K. The proposed cross-section for the rural portions of the northern reliever route are consistent with how Washington County would likely reconstruct CTH K, regardless of whether it is utilized as part of the reliever route. The Public Works Committee indicated general agreement with this recommendation, and Commission and Washington County staffs were directed to prepare the study planning report with this recommendation for consideration at the subsequent Public Works Committee meeting held on September 28, 2016.
## Table 5
### EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVE STH 60 RELIEVER ROUTES (REVISED TO INCLUDE ALTERNATIVE 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Reliever Route&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Route Length Between STH 60/Goodland Road and STH 60/IH 41 (miles)</th>
<th>Travel Time Between STH 60/Goodland Road and STH 60/IH 41 Route Travel Time (minutes)</th>
<th>Ratio of Travel Time to STH 60</th>
<th>Change in Year 2050 Average Weekday Traffic Volume on STH 60&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Year 2050 Forecast STH 60 Traffic Congestion&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Percent of STH 60 Under Congestion</th>
<th>Number of Trucks Diverted from STH 60 Through Hartford Downtown</th>
<th>Right-of-way Acquisition</th>
<th>Number of Residences Located Along Alternatives</th>
<th>Residences Located Along an Existing Local Roadway</th>
<th>Residences Located Along an Existing County/State Trunk Highway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - CTH U/CTH K (red)</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-1,500 to -2,000</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>Number of Residences&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Inner Hartford/STH 83 (blue)</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Number of Businesses&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>21 to 22&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3 to 5 (including a church)&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Arthur Rd/Frontage Rd (green)</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-1,100 to -1,500</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Number of Farm Fields Divided By Alternative Routes</td>
<td>18 to 19&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1 (including a church)&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Inner Hartford/STH 60 (orange)</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Number of Residences&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0 to 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Arthur Rd/New Alignment A (black)</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-1,500 to -2,000</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>Number of Businesses&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Arthur Rd/Kettle Moraine Rd (purple)</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>-1,100 to -1,500</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Number of Farm Fields Divided By Alternative Routes</td>
<td>0 to 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Arthur Rd/IH 41 Bridge (Yellow)</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>-3,000 to -3,500</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Number of Residences&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4 to 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Arthur Rd/STH 83/STH 60 (pink)</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>-1,100 to -1,500</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Number of Residences&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>18 to 19&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1 (including a church)&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Arthur Rd/New Alignment B (light blue)</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-2,500</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Number of Businesses&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Clover Rd/Kettle Moraine Rd/STH 60 (light green)</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-3,500 to +2,000</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>Number of Farm Fields Divided By Alternative Routes</td>
<td>4 to 11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - New Alignment C/CTH K (light purple)</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-2,500</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Number of Residences&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Alternative Reliever Route: CTH U/CTH K (red), Inner Hartford/STH 83 (blue), Arthur Rd/Frontage Rd (green), Inner Hartford/STH 60 (orange), Arthur Rd/New Alignment A (black), Arthur Rd/Kettle Moraine Rd (purple), Arthur Rd/IH 41 Bridge (Yellow), Arthur Rd/STH 83/STH 60 (pink), Arthur Rd/New Alignment B (light blue), Clover Rd/Kettle Moraine Rd/STH 60 (light green), New Alignment C/CTH K (light purple).

<sup>b</sup>Year 2050 Traffic Congestion:
- 0: No traffic congestion
- 1: Slight traffic congestion
- 2: Moderate traffic congestion
- 3: Severe traffic congestion
- 4: Extreme traffic congestion

<sup>c</sup>Percent of STH 60 Under Congestion:
- 0: No STH 60 traffic congestion
- 1: Slight STH 60 traffic congestion
- 2: Moderate STH 60 traffic congestion
- 3: Severe STH 60 traffic congestion
- 4: Extreme STH 60 traffic congestion

<sup>d</sup>Right-of-way Acquisition:
- Number of Residences:
  - 1 to 3
  - 3 to 4
- Number of Businesses:
  - 0 to 3
  - 3 to 4
- Acres of Farmland:
  - 0 to 1
  - 1 to 3
- Total Acres:
  - 0 to 1
  - 1 to 3

<sup>e</sup>Number of Farm Fields Divided By Alternative Routes:
- 0 to 3
- 3 to 4

<sup>f</sup>Number of Residences Located Along an Existing Local Roadway:
- 0 to 3
- 3 to 4
### Table 5 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Reliever Route</th>
<th>Primary Environmental Corridor (Acres)</th>
<th>Secondary Environmental Corridor (Acres)</th>
<th>Isolated Natural Resource Areas (Acres)</th>
<th>Wetlands (Acres)</th>
<th>Construction ($)</th>
<th>Right-of-Way ($)</th>
<th>Total ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - CTH U/CTH K (red)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>$16.2</td>
<td>$1.2 to $1.7</td>
<td>$17.4 to $17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Inner Hartford/STH 83 (blue)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$6.0</td>
<td>$2.5 to $2.8</td>
<td>$8.5 to $8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Arthur Rd/ Frontage Rd (green)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>$18.5</td>
<td>$1.1 to $2.1</td>
<td>$19.6 to $20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Inner Hartford/STH 60 (orange)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
<td>$2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Arthur Rd/New Alignment A (black)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>$19.6</td>
<td>$0.8 to $1.5</td>
<td>$20.5 to $21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Arthur Rd/Kettle Moraine Rd (purple)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>$16.7</td>
<td>$0.8 to $1.8</td>
<td>$17.5 to $18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Arthur Rd/IH 41 Bridge (Yellow)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>$20.8</td>
<td>$1.4 to $2.9</td>
<td>$22.2 to $23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Arthur Rd/STH 83/STH 60 (pink)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$8.8</td>
<td>$0.3 to $0.8</td>
<td>$9.2 to $9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Arthur Rd/New Alignment B (light blue)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$21.1</td>
<td>$0.6 to $1.3</td>
<td>$21.8 to $22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Clover Rd/Kettle Moraine Rd/STH 60 (light green)</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>$15.2</td>
<td>$1.2 to $2.9</td>
<td>$16.4 to $18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - New Alignment C/CTH K (light purple)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>$18.5</td>
<td>$1.2 to $1.7</td>
<td>$19.7 to $20.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Alternatives 7 through 10 were added following the public meeting on June 29, 2016 and were presented to the Washington County Public Works Committee on July 27, 2016. Alternative 11 was added in August 2016, and was presented to the Washington County Public Works Committee on August 24, 2016.

The alignment of Alternative 11, and as well the other alternative routes which include the City of Hartford long-planned extension of Independence Avenue between CTH N and Arthur Road, are consistent with the City of Hartford Airport runway realignment and extension project (from 3,000 to 3,400 feet). The airport’s master plan includes a further ultimate extension concept to 5,000 feet, with the extension occurring to the west. This would require the reliever route alignments for an extended Independence Avenue to be relocated about a quarter-mile to the west. In the alternative, to accommodate the ultimate runway extension concept, Main Street between Clover Road and Arthur Road could be relocated about a quarter-mile to the east. This would be addressed in preliminary engineering.

*b The year 2050 forecast average weekday traffic volume on STH 60 is 18,000 to 23,000 vehicles between Independence Avenue and Wilson Avenue, 25,000 to 29,000 vehicles between Wilson Avenue and STH 175, and 31,000 to 34,000 between STH 175 and STH 164.

*c About 4.75 miles of the 9.20 miles of STH 60 between Goodland Road and IH 41, or about 52 percent, would be under congestion based on year 2050 average weekday traffic volumes without a STH 60 northern (or southern) reliever route.

*d The lower end of the range of the acquisition of residences and businesses would be located within the right-of-way of the alternative reliever route, and the upper end of the range includes residences and businesses located within 15 feet of the right-of-way of the alternative route.

*e Assumes aligning State Street with Union Street west of Main Street. Another option would be to align State Street with Union Street east of Main Street, which would potentially reduce the number of residences that would be acquired by one to four residences, eliminate the need to acquire a church, and would add the acquisition of a business.

*f Construction costs include costs for preliminary and final engineering.

*g The range of estimated right-of-way cost is a result of the range of residences and businesses estimated for each alternative reliever route.

Source: SEWRPC.

### POTENTIAL STH 60 IMPROVEMENTS

As indicated in the previous section, implementation of the STH 60 northern reliever route would begin the development of the grid of arterial streets and highways to serve existing and planned urban development in the Hartford/Slinger area, and to potentially reduce the amount of total and truck traffic and vehicle congestion on STH 60. However, it is not expected that implementation of a northern reliever route would eliminate all of the existing and forecast future congestion on this segment of STH 60.
The year 2050 regional transportation plan recommends that the portion of STH 60 between Independence Avenue and Liberty Avenue be widened from two to four traffic lanes to address existing and forecast future traffic congestion along that segment. However, addressing the existing and forecast future traffic congestion along STH 60 between Goodland Road and IH 41 by widening the roadway from four to six traffic lanes, along with providing adequate turn lanes at all intersections, would require significant acquisition of residences and businesses, particularly
within the Hartford downtown area. The cost of providing the six travel lanes, along with turn lanes, and property acquisition may be expected to far exceed the cost of beginning the development of the grid of arterials to serve the Hartford/Slinger areas by constructing a STH 60 northern reliever route.

A number of lower-cost traffic engineering measures were suggested by local and State officials and the public that could be implemented along STH 60 between Goodland Road and IH 41 for improving traffic movement within the corridor, including signal coordination, improving traffic flow at intersections, and increasing the speed limit in the downtown area. These traffic engineering measures would be expected to have limited impact on improving STH 60 traffic flow, and would not be a long-term solution, particularly as development and traffic increases along the STH 60 corridor in the future. The following is an evaluation of the various lower-cost traffic engineering measures that were suggested for improving traffic flow on STH 60 through the Hartford/Slinger area:

• **Signal Coordination** – Traffic signal coordination along STH 60 could be considered at the following locations with less than desirable signal spacing:
  – Seven traffic signals from Liberty Avenue to Pike Lake Drive
  – Two traffic signals from STH 175 to STH 164

It can be expected that during the times of the day that portions of STH 60 experience congestion, signal coordination may breakdown and not operate as desired. In any case, if traffic signal coordination were to permit a vehicle to effectively travel at the speed limit along STH 60 between Goodland Road and IH 41 without any stopping, the travel time is estimated to be about 13.5 minutes, which is about the same travel time that was observed along this segment of STH 60 during the midday period. Thus, traffic signal coordination may have the potential to reduce the variability of STH 60 travel times, but may not be expected to significantly improve travel time on STH 60.

• **Intersection Improvements** – The following intersection improvements could be considered to improve traffic flow movement in the STH 60 corridor:
  – Add right turn lanes on STH 60 at its intersection with STH 175 – Currently, there is a through/right lane, a through lane, and a dedicated left turn lane in both directions of STH 60 at its intersection with STH 175. Adding a dedicated right turn lane on STH 60 at this intersection would improve traffic flow through the intersection by potentially decreasing the queuing of traffic in the existing through/right lane.
  – Add additional lanes on STH 164/Lovers Lane at their intersection with STH 60 – Currently, there are no dedicated left turn lanes on STH 164 (to the south) and Lovers Lane (to the north) at their intersection with STH 60. Adding dedicated left turn lanes has the potential to reduce the queuing on STH 164 and Lovers Lane at the intersection for through and left turning vehicles; however, any impact on STH 60 operation would be expected to be minimal.

• **Increasing Speed Limits** – The speed limits along STH 60 between Independence Avenue and IH 41 are generally appropriate for the density of development and the number of driveways along STH 60, particularly between Wacker Drive and Wilson Avenue in the Hartford downtown area. As increasing the speed

---

12 The current speed limits along STH 60 are 55 miles per hour (mph) between Goodland Road and Independence Avenue, 35 mph to 45 mph between Independence Avenue and Wacker Drive, 25 mph to 30 mph between Wacker Drive and Sell Drive/Plaza Drive, 35 to 40 mph between Sell Drive/Plaza Drive and Pike Lake Road, and 45 mph to 50 mph between Pike Lake Road and IH 41.
limits higher than what is appropriate for the level of adjacent development and the number of driveways present may increase the number and severity of crashes along the STH 60 corridor, the number of segments of STH 60 for which an increase in the speed limit is possible may be limited.

• Installation of Signage in Hartford Downtown Area – Since, the Commission and Washington County staffs had met with officials from the City of Hartford in April of 2016, the City has installed signage along STH 60 near the Hartford downtown area directing trucks travelling to the industrial area along State Street to use Wacker Drive rather than Main Street (STH 83). As the signs were recently installed, it may be too early to determine their effectiveness of diverting trucks from STH 83 (Main Street). However, the City of Hartford and WisDOT could monitor over time whether the signage is effective in diverting trucks from utilizing STH 83 (Main Street). In addition to the signage already installed in the Hartford downtown area, signage could also be installed on State Street directing eastbound truck traffic to Wacker Drive.

• Providing a Traffic Signal at the Intersection of STH 60 and Independence Avenue – WisDOT staff indicated that southbound trucks on Independence Avenue turning onto eastbound STH 60 causes traffic movement issues at the intersection. However, it was also indicated that traffic signals are not warranted, based on the current traffic levels utilizing the intersection. The traffic at this intersection could be monitored over time, particularly if a northern reliever route is implemented, to determine whether traffic signals are warranted.

PREFERRED NORTHERN RELIEVER ROUTE

At its September 28, 2016, meeting, the Washington County Board of Supervisors Public Works Committee identified reliever route Alternative 11 for further study to acquire more detailed costs and impacts of this alternative, and requested Washington County staff to conduct initial preliminary engineering work for this route. On January 24, 2017, the results of the initial preliminary engineering work for Alternative 11 were presented at a joint meeting of the Washington County Board of Supervisors Executive and Public Works Committees.

Map 12 shows Alternative 11 as refined through the initial preliminary engineering work performed by the County. As part of the initial preliminary engineering, the route for Alternative 11 was refined to utilize more existing roadway and minimize the impacts to environmentally sensitive areas and farmland. Washington County staff worked, as well, with the City of Hartford to refine the portion of Alternative 11 that would serve as an extension of Independence Avenue between CTH N and Arthur Road. The route refinements were also designed to avoid the potential extension of the Hartford airport runway.13

Table 6 shows the impacts and updated project cost of the refined Alternative 11 from the more-detailed initial preliminary engineering. The refined alignment reduces the impacts to environmentally sensitive lands, but impacts to farmland remain about the same. Additionally, impacts to the existing buildings in the St. Lawrence area were avoided under the refined Alternative 11. However, the cost estimate attendant to the refined alignment is about 20 percent higher than the planning-level cost estimates developed as part of the Commission’s feasibility study. This was mainly due to Washington County wanting to ensure that sufficient costs were included for the accommodation of poor soils that likely exist along portions of the route expected to be on a new alignment.

---

13 The alignment for Alternative 11, developed as part of the Commission’s feasibility study, is consistent with the planned City of Hartford Airport runway realignment and western extension project (from 3,000 to 3,400 feet). The airport’s master plan includes a further ultimate western extension to 5,000 feet. This would require the Alternative 11 reliever route alignment for an extended Independence Avenue to be relocated about one quarter-mile further to the west relative to the original Alternative 11 alignment. With respect to the refined route for Alternative 11, Washington County, working with the City of Hartford, proposed an alignment for the extended Independence Avenue that would avoid a potential 4,000-foot ultimate runway, rather than the planned 5,000-foot ultimate runway length included in the airport’s master plan.
Map 12

REFINED ALIGNMENT OF ALTERNATIVE 11 BASED ON INITIAL PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING WORK CONDUCTED BY WASHINGTON COUNTY

STH 60 RELIEVER ROUTE

REFINED ALIGNMENT OF ALTERNATIVE 11 THROUGH INITIAL PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING WORK

Source: Washington County and SEWRPC.
### Table 6
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVE 11 RECOMMENDED AS PART OF THE STH 60 NORTHERN RELIEVER ROUTE FEASIBILITY STUDY AND THE MODIFIED ALIGNMENT OF ALTERNATIVE 11 BASED ON PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING WORK CONDUCTED BY WASHINGTON COUNTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Route Length Between STH 60/Goodland Road and STH 60/IH 41 (miles)</th>
<th>Travel Time Between STH 60/Goodland Road and STH 60/IH 41</th>
<th>Ratio of Travel Time to STH 60</th>
<th>Change in Year 2050 Average Weekday Traffic Volume on STH 60a</th>
<th>Year 2050 Forecast STH 60 Traffic Congestionb</th>
<th>Miles of STH 60 Under Congestion</th>
<th>Percent of STH 60 Under Congestion</th>
<th>Number of Trucks Diverted from STH 60 Through Hartford Downtown on an Average Weekday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 11 - Route Developed in Feasibility Study</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-2,500</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined Alternative 11 - Through Initial Preliminary Engineering Work</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>-2,500</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Right-of-way Acquisition</th>
<th>Residences Located Along Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Residencesc</td>
<td>Number of Businessesc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 11 - Route Developed in Feasibility Study</td>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined Alternative 11 - Through Initial Preliminary Engineering Work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Impacts to Environmentally Sensitive Lands</th>
<th>Estimated Cost ($ in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Environmental Corridor (Acres)</td>
<td>Secondary Environmental Corridor (Acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 11 - Route Developed in Feasibility Study</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined Alternative 11 - Through Initial Preliminary Engineering Work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

a The year 2050 forecast average weekday traffic volume on STH 60 is 18,000 to 23,000 vehicles between Independence Avenue and Wilson Avenue, 25,000 to 29,000 vehicles between Wilson Avenue and STH 175, and 31,000 to 34,000 vehicles between STH 175 to STH 164.

b About 4.75 miles of the 9.20 miles of STH 60 between Goodland Road and IH 41, or about 52 percent, would be congested based on forecast year 2050 average weekday traffic volumes without a STH 60 northern (or southern) reliever route.

c The lower end of the range includes residences and businesses that would be located within the right-of-way of the alternative reliever route, and the upper end of the range includes residences and businesses located within 15 feet of the right-of-way of the alternative route.

d These values may differ than the values developed as part of the initial preliminary engineering work conducted for Alternative 11, as the methods and assumptions used as part of that work slightly differed from those utilized as part this feasibility study.

Source: Washington County and SEWRPC
The refined route for Alternative 11 and the results of its evaluation were made available to the public, and a public information meeting was held on January 31, 2017. At a joint meeting of the Executive and Public Works Committees held on February 7, 2017, the Executive Committee, but not the Public Works Committee, recommended that the Washington County Board of Supervisors request that the Commission amend the Washington County jurisdictional highway system plan and VISION 2050—the adopted year 2050 regional land use and transportation plan—to replace the currently planned STH 60 reliever route utilizing Arthur Road, Kettle Moraine Drive, and CTH K with the refined Alternative 11 reliever route (shown on Map 12) utilizing CTH U, Turtle Road, and CTH K. At its meeting held on February 14, 2017, the Washington County Board of Supervisors decided to reject the proposed amendment to the County’s jurisdictional plan and VISION 2050, thus, retaining in both plans the planned STH 60 reliever route that utilizes Arthur Road, Kettle Moraine Road, and CTH K, consistent with the recommendations of the Washington County east-west corridor study completed in 2005.
Appendix A

SUMMARY OF RECORD OF PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE STH 60 NORTHERN RELIEVER ROUTE FEASIBILITY STUDY

A public information meeting (PIM) was held on Wednesday, June 29, 2016, in the Town of Hartford, along with a formal public comment period of June 16, 2016, through July 15, 2016, to gather information from the public regarding issues on STH 60 and to receive comment on alternative reliever routes and STH 60 improvements. The PIM was held in an open house format with boards displaying the inventory information on the STH 60 corridor (including pavement history, traffic control, existing total/truck traffic volumes, traffic congestion, forecast future year 2050 traffic volume and congestion, vehicle crashes, and travel times), the goal, objectives, and criteria identified for evaluating the alternative reliever routes (as shown on Table 4 of this report), and the six reliever routes that were identified prior to the PIM (Alternatives 1 through 6 shown on Map 11 of this report). The comments received at the PIM and during the comment period were considered by Commission staff and Washington County officials as alternative reliever routes and improvements were developed and evaluated and as a final recommendations were prepared.

This appendix presents in a series of exhibits:

- Comment received during the formal public comment period of June 16, 2016 through July 15, 2016:
  - Comments received via comment form during the June 29, 2016, public information meeting (Exhibit A-1)
  - Comments received via e-mail before the June 29, 2016, public information meeting (Exhibit A-2)
  - Comments received via email or U.S. mail after the June 29, 2016, public information meeting (Exhibit A-3)
  - Comments posted on an aerial map showing the alternative STH 60 reliever routes identified to date the June 29, 2016, public information meeting (Exhibit A-4)

- Material announcing the public information meeting (Exhibit B)

- Sign-in sheets from the June 29, 2016, public information meeting (Exhibit C)

- Information displayed at the June 29, 2016, public information meeting (Exhibit D)

The following is a summary of the public comments received via comment form and email during the public comment period and during the June 29, 2016, PIM at the Town of Hartford Hall.
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENT RECEIVED

A total of 64 persons provided comments regarding issues related to STH 60 between Goodland Road and IH 41. Comment was provided on forms available at the PIM on June 29, 2016, via electronic mail or U.S. mail, or through the Commission’s website.

Opposition to Alternatives
A total of 53 persons expressed opposition to a potential STH 60 northern reliever route. Of the people who opposed a reliever route, 13 persons specifically opposed the use of Arthur Road, and four persons specifically opposed the use of CTH K. Some of the comments made by those opposing to a STH 60 reliever route include the following:

- 13 persons indicated that they would support Reliever Route Alternative 4, a reliever route which would be located within the City of Hartford.
- One person indicated that they would support a route using Clover Road, Kettle Moraine Road, STH 60, and new alignment.
- Three persons suggested the use of Goodland Road as part of a STH 60 northern reliever route.
- One person indicated opposition to any alternative reliever route that utilized Kettle Moraine Road.
- Seven persons indicated a concern that farming equipment traffic would disrupt traffic on the reliever routes.

Support of Alternatives
A total of 11 persons indicated their support for a northern STH 60 reliever route. Of the people who supported a reliever route:

One person indicated that they particularly supported Reliever Route Alternative 1 and 2.

- One person indicated their support only for Reliever Route Alternative 3.
- Five persons indicated their support for only Reliever Route Alternative 1.
- One person indicated their support for any alternative reliever route using Arthur Road.
- One person indicated their support for an alternative reliever route using Arthur Road, a new bridge over IH 41, and STH 144.

Other Suggestions
In addition, a number of additional suggestions were made either at the PIM or during the public comment period:

- Eight persons suggested that a southern STH 60 reliever route be considered rather than a northern route.
- Nine persons suggested coordination of the traffic signals along STH 60.
- Two persons suggested the widening of STH 60 through the City of Hartford downtown area.
- Eight persons suggested prohibiting left turns from STH 60 onto STH 83.
- One person suggested rerouting STH 83 to utilize Wilson Avenue.
- One person suggested adding a right turn lane on westbound STH 60 to northbound STH 175.
- Three persons suggested the use of signage to encourage trucks to stay on STH 60 to the Hartford Industrial Park, rather than utilizing STH 83.
- One person suggested increasing the speed limit on STH 60 from 25 mph to 35 mph through the City of Hartford downtown area.
- One person suggested widening the STH 60/STH 83 Intersection.
- One person expressed concerns with the current amount of truck traffic on Arthur Road.
- One person suggested improving the STH 175/CTH K Intersection.
- One person suggested improving the STH 60/STH 164 Intersection.
Comments Submitted via Comment Form During June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting

Comment Form

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Name: HAROLD BUCK Date: June 29, 2016

Address: 1325 1st Ave. S. W. River Falls, WI

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

We really need a roundabout at the southern end of town. I have seen the city of River Falls give the STH a number of times, but the work doesn’t seem to get done, even at the southern end of town. Traffic has increased with the advent of the new Amazon warehouse. A roundabout at the southern end of town would be a great help in reducing congestion and increasing safety.

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:

I would like to see a roundabout at the southern end of town and an improvement to the bridge over the river. This would greatly reduce congestion and increase safety.

How did you learn about this meeting? Newsletter: Yes, Ad in Newspaper: Yes, Radio or TV: No, Website: No, Other (please specify):

Thank you!

Comment Form

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Name: DAVID THOMAS Date: June 29, 2016

Address: 123 Elm St. W. Woodbury, WI

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

The current intersection at the southern end of town is a major bottleneck and needs to be improved. Traffic congestion and delays are a constant problem. A roundabout would greatly reduce congestion and increase safety.

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:

A roundabout at the southern end of town would be a great improvement. It would reduce congestion and increase safety.

How did you learn about this meeting? Newsletter: Yes, Ad in Newspaper: Yes, Radio or TV: No, Website: No, Other (please specify):

Thank you!

Comment Form

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Name: JAMES JOHNSON Date: June 29, 2016

Address: 456 Main St. W. Woodbury, WI

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

The intersection at the southern end of town is a major bottleneck and needs to be improved. Traffic congestion and delays are a constant problem. A roundabout would greatly reduce congestion and increase safety.

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:

A roundabout at the southern end of town would be a great improvement. It would reduce congestion and increase safety.

How did you learn about this meeting? Newsletter: Yes, Ad in Newspaper: Yes, Radio or TV: No, Website: No, Other (please specify):

Thank you!
Comments Submitted via Comment Form During June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Comments submitted by [Redacted] on [Redacted]

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Comments submitted by [Redacted] on [Redacted]

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Comments submitted by [Redacted] on [Redacted]

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Comments submitted by [Redacted] on [Redacted]

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Comments submitted by [Redacted] on [Redacted]

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Comments submitted by [Redacted] on [Redacted]

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Comments submitted by [Redacted] on [Redacted]

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Comments submitted by [Redacted] on [Redacted]

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Comments submitted by [Redacted] on [Redacted]

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Comments submitted by [Redacted] on [Redacted]

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Comments submitted by [Redacted] on [Redacted]

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Comments submitted by [Redacted] on [Redacted]

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Comments submitted by [Redacted] on [Redacted]

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Comments submitted by [Redacted] on [Redacted]

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Comments submitted by [Redacted] on [Redacted]

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Comments submitted by [Redacted] on [Redacted]

Comment on Issues on STH 60:
Comments Submitted via Comment Form During June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting

STI 60 Northern Rerailer Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form
Name: 
Address: 

Comment on Issues on STI 60:

Comment on Alternative Rrerailer Routes and STI 60 Improvements:

How did you learn about this meeting? Newsletter, Internet, TV, Radio, Other (please specify): 

Thank you!

[Continued comments on back if more space is needed]
Exhibit A-1 (continued)

Comments Submitted via Comment Form During June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting

STI 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form
Name: Joshua Powell
Address: 1234 Main St, Anytown, USA

Comment on Issues on STI 60:

(continue comments on back if more space is needed)

How did you learn about this meeting? Newsletter: ___ Phone: ___ Ad in Newspaper: ___
Newspaper Article: ___ Radio or TV: ___ Website: ___ Other (please specify): ___

STI 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form
Name: Joshua Powell
Address: 1234 Main St, Anytown, USA

Comment on Issues on STI 60:

(continue comments on back if more space is needed)

How did you learn about this meeting? Newsletter: ___ Phone: ___ Ad in Newspaper: ___
Newspaper Article: ___ Radio or TV: ___ Website: ___ Other (please specify): ___

STI 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form
Name: Joshua Powell
Address: 1234 Main St, Anytown, USA

Comment on Issues on STI 60:

(continue comments on back if more space is needed)

How did you learn about this meeting? Newsletter: ___ Phone: ___ Ad in Newspaper: ___
Newspaper Article: ___ Radio or TV: ___ Website: ___ Other (please specify): ___
Comments Submitted via Comment Form During June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: David J. Grisham
Address: 2600 City Mil. Rd

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

This should be the city of Hartford position not the township. The city was very poor in planning when erecting an industrial park not thinking far enough ahead to the traffic issues. Continued use of the newly rebuilt Hwy 60 is the best option.

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:

People have moved out to the towns for a peaceful and secure way of life not to have to dodge traffic and live for their lives while trying to get to the mail box.

Thank you!

Comment Form

Name: John Shepheard
Address: 1427 Meade Rd

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

Recognize traffic pattern or light patterns, climate, left turn lane, right turn lane. Traffic should be to the town.

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:

Another route will not be a solution.

Thank you!

Comment Form

Name: Wes Heaving
Address: 13625 S. Calhoun Ln

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

Our property is on the corner of Arthur Rd. and Saint Lawrence St. We have a small horse farm and cannot afford to lose any more land. We also do not want the heavy traffic on Arthur Rd. with the noise and dirt and our animals being考核. the noise and dirt.

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:

There are too many homes on Arthur Rd. which are close to the road that will be affected. Please find another route.

Thank you!
Comments Submitted via Comment Form During June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form
Name: Tom McMahon
Address: 6534 Arthur Rd

Comment on Issues on STH 60:
I generally experience no problems with STH 60.

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:
I have very little information about the actual roads needed. The media, which attempts to make the roads needed, will cause a great deal of traffic to flow around the area, making access difficult. Traffic will be directed, making access difficult. I am concerned about the potential for increased property values in the area, which will affect the local economy.

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form
Name: John Smith
Address: 421 State St

Comment on Issues on STH 60:
The current route is beyond the limit of sustainable growth. Business expansion for the next 20 years cannot occur and is not supported by the current route.

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:
Preference is given to the northern route that is safe, efficient, and less disruptive to rural homes as cost-effective as possible.

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form
Name: Jeffrey M. Metz
Address: 625 Main St

Comment on Issues on STH 60:
This is a conservative community. Media reports available to everyone have made it clear that Brian Manufacturing is pushing this reliever route with the promise of economic growth. Some would claim this is "economic development." This is simply corporate welfare, and conservative are not for any type of welfare.

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:
Looking at the six proposed routes, only routes 2 and 1 make sense. Route 2 makes the most sense because the roadbed of STH 83 is already engineered for heavy truck traffic. Route 1 makes sense because it is direct from I-94 and stays on roads away from downtown which is the goal is to reduce the time of congestion. This would make the most sense.

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form
Name: Joe Wex
Address: 423 Main St

Comment on Issues on STH 60:
My 50 yard house is right in the middle of this new road. It will take many years to build and I have no idea what will happen. It will cause a great deal of noise and traffic. The amount of new homes will affect the local economy. There needs to be some way to control the growth in this area.

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:
I have a house in the area and there are many homes that would have to be in a group in order to get the road and should be allowed to build more homes. The amount of new homes would affect the local economy. There needs to be a way to control the growth in this area.

(continued on back of page if more space is needed)
Comments Submitted via Comment Form During June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form
Name: Horlick
Address: 3124 S 40th St

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

"The Horlick area needs a shopping center closer to the current one. The traffic on 40th Street is a major problem and it is becoming more dangerous each year. The intersection at 40th and STH 60 needs to be addressed to minimize accidents and improve safety."

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:

"Traffic on 40th Street is becoming increasingly congested. The construction of a new route that bypasses the current area would alleviate this issue."

Thank you!

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form
Name: E. Horlick
Address: 3124 S 40th St

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

"This is a city of Horlick. It is a bad city. The streets are not wide enough for the amount of traffic. The city needs to be expanded to accommodate the growth."

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:

"Route should stay high to the town to avoid congestion."

Thank you!
Comments Submitted via Comment Form During June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: Don M. Williams
Address: 3530 60th Ave. Dr.

Comment on Issues of STH 60:

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Date: 2/24/16

Comment on Issues of STH 60:

The relief route problem is a huge problem. It should stay as it is and be handled by the city.

Thank you!

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:

The relief route problem is a huge problem. It should stay as it is and be handled by the city.

Thank you!

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:

I believe that with light synchro-meshing traffic is a lot more smooth and with stop lights on the regular roads it is not as smooth as with theSynchro-Mesh and a smaller road with stop lights so far as they tell.

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:

The relief route problem is a huge problem. It should stay as it is and be handled by the city.

Thank you!

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:

The relief route problem is a huge problem. It should stay as it is and be handled by the city.

Thank you!

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:

The relief route problem is a huge problem. It should stay as it is and be handled by the city.

Thank you!

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:

The relief route problem is a huge problem. It should stay as it is and be handled by the city.

Thank you!

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:

The relief route problem is a huge problem. It should stay as it is and be handled by the city.

Thank you!

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:

The relief route problem is a huge problem. It should stay as it is and be handled by the city.

Thank you!

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:

The relief route problem is a huge problem. It should stay as it is and be handled by the city.

Thank you!

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:

The relief route problem is a huge problem. It should stay as it is and be handled by the city.

Thank you!

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:

The relief route problem is a huge problem. It should stay as it is and be handled by the city.

Thank you!
Comments Submitted via Comment Form During June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name:  Steve Wertz
Address:  241 E. 10th St., K
Hastings, NE 68935
Phone:  532-3027

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

I feel that the City of Hastings which industrial park & companies within should bear the
burden of that traffic, along with the newly reconfigured
4 lane Hwy 60.  And option 4 would be the
most logical & likely most economical route to utilize.

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:

Again - the City benefits financially from the businesses in the industrial park & should
ultimately accommodate the traffic.  I bought my
property in the quiet/rural village of St. Lawrence
so as not to be subjected to city industrial
traffic.  Option 4 still gives the city benefit
from truck traffic downtown & utilizes 4 lanes
on Hwy 60.

(continue comments on back if more space is needed)

How did you learn about this meeting?  Newsletter X  Flyer  Ad in Newspaper
Newspaper Article  Radio or TV  Website  Other (please specify):  Newsletter

Thank you!

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name:  W. F. E. Hedges
Address:  123 Main St.
Waconia, MN 55391
Phone:  555-5555

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

How may 60 discourage benefit for
Northern Route Atha 326.
A feasibility study needs to be
done, and the public has to
be involved.

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:

I like 

(continue comments on back if more space is needed)

How did you learn about this meeting?  Newsletter  Flyer  Ad in Newspaper
Newspaper Article  Radio or TV  Website  Other (please specify):  Newsletter

Thank you!
STH 69 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

**Comment Form**

**Name**: Bill Wade  
**Address**: 12345 Street  
**City**: Milwaukee  
**State**: WI  
**Zip**: 53201  
**Date**: 6-29-16

**Comment on Issues on STH 69**:  
"Making the connection between the two route highways is important to avoid congestion. The new route would help reduce traffic on the current route."  

**Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 69 Improvements**:  
"Making the connection between the two route highways is important to avoid congestion. The new route would help reduce traffic on the current route."  

**How did you learn about this meeting?**  
Newsletter ☐  Radio ☐  TV ☐  Newspaper ☐  Other (please specify)  
**Other**: (please specify)
Comments Submitted via Comment Form During June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: Juanita Scott  
Address: 5300 Main St. 
City: Oshkosh  
State: WI  
Zip: 54903  
Phone: 920-529-1234  
E-mail: Juanita.Scott@uwosh.org  
Fax: 920-529-1234

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

I am against any road built through this area. The roads are already a nightmare when it snows, and the traffic is always heavy. This new road will only make things worse. The entire area will be devastated. I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal.

Comment on Alternative Route and STH 60 Improvements:

I believe a new road is necessary. The current roads are insufficient and need immediate attention. A new road would be a significant improvement for the area.

How did you learn about this meeting?  
Newsletter  
Flyer  
Ad in Newspaper  
Newspaper Article  
Radio or TV  
Website  
Other (please specify):  
Thank you!

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: Mr. Smith  
Address: 123 Main St.  
City: Oshkosh  
State: WI  
Zip: 54901  
Phone: 920-529-1234  
E-mail: Mr.Smith@uwosh.org  
Fax: 920-529-1234

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

I live on the route and I have seen too many accidents. It is dangerous and needs to be addressed.

Comment on Alternative Route and STH 60 Improvements:

I support the idea of a new road. It will improve safety and reduce the number of accidents.

How did you learn about this meeting?  
Newsletter  
Ad in Newspaper  
Newspaper Article  
Radio or TV  
Website  
Other (please specify):  
Thank you!

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: John Doe  
Address: 456 Main St.  
City: Oshkosh  
State: WI  
Zip: 54902  
Phone: 920-529-1234  
E-mail: John.Doe@uwosh.org  
Fax: 920-529-1234

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

I am concerned about the impact on my property values. A new road could decrease my home's worth.

Comment on Alternative Route and STH 60 Improvements:

I understand the need for a new road, but I urge you to consider the environmental impact. Please ensure that the road is built in a sustainable manner.

How did you learn about this meeting?  
Newsletter  
Flyer  
Ad in Newspaper  
Newspaper Article  
Radio or TV  
Website  
Other (please specify):  
Thank you!
Comments Submitted via Comment Form During June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: Hope Kies
Address: 2611 Hillside Dr

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

I don't think it is needed. I think it is more of a waste!!! I think it will just be a waste of money that should not be spent.

Comment on Alternative Reliever Route and STH 60 Improvements:

Please consider an alternative route south toward Redemption/Ingersoll.

Thank you!

How did you learn about this meeting? Newsletter______ Flyer______ Ad in Newspaper______
Newspaper Article______ Radio or TV______ Website______ Other (please specify)______

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: John Miller
Address: 4640 My 175

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

I don't think it is needed. I think it is more of a waste!!!

Comment on Alternative Reliever Route and STH 60 Improvements:

Please consider an alternative route south toward Redemption/Ingersoll.

Thank you!

How did you learn about this meeting? Newsletter______ Flyer______ Ad in Newspaper______
Newspaper Article______ Radio or TV______ Website______ Other (please specify)______

Thank you!
Comments Submitted via Comment Form During June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: C. Ann Blank
Address: 4104 Maple Ave

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

I don't think it is so much a need, rather it's a want. Will we need 2000 kilos of tons around here? Maybe, or is there a 2000 block more. Is it going to be worth it? Before they go ahead.

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:

I would suggest we look to what's been the department down.

Thank you!

---

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: Judy Schilling
Address: 5765 S. St. Catherine Blvd

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

Too much noise, great! Great! Absolutely we need improvement.

Get all about green! Flower!

Support Yellow Route!

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:

We are not in favor of green brown! I am going to testify against but what about the brown route? The green route is considered a high traffic area. We show traffic for farm, truck, bus and hikers.

Support yellow route, please consider the brown route.

Thank you!

---

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: Daniel Fogey
Address: 157 Larch Rd

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

I would suggest we look to what's been the department down.

How did you learn about this meeting? Newsletter: Yes, Ad in Newspaper: No

Newspaper Article: Radio or TV: No, Website: Yes, Other (please specify):

Thank you!

---

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: Joe Martin
Address: 51 Marting Rd

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

I would suggest we look to what's been the department down.

How did you learn about this meeting? Newsletter: Yes, Ad in Newspaper: No

Newspaper Article: Radio or TV: No, Website: Yes, Other (please specify):

Thank you!
STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Date: 6-29-16
Comment:

Comment on issues with STH 60:
Make a cut from home, westbound on Hwy 60 to Co Rd 375. Patti Rowland
No left turn on Hwy 60 to P3.
No left turn to Co Rd 375
Co Rd 375 and P3

Comment on Alternative Reliever Routes and STH 60 Improvements:
IF you do the above, you don’t need a reliever.
Town Vote Not to any reliever out!

Sending comments on behalf of [Redacted]

How did you learn about the meeting? Newsletter [Redacted]
Newspaper Article [Redacted]
Website [Redacted]

Thank you!

Exhibit A-1 (continued)
Comments Submitted via Comment Form During June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting
Comments Submitted via Email Before June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting

Appended the city of Hartford thought this problem would fix itself when they installed those industrial parking lot lights and people have been complaining for years and no one would understand it is a problem. One easy way to lessen the problem for new is to high point about two feet you was in for a slight change is within and the other existing signs on the left there are some only one track on the school, the green light and its already changing. This is not enough. We think can run 24 on the same highway. People are complaining of the same lights from the HRA. We do not think we have a problem. The majority does not seem to be using the Hartford and it has no better.

First Name: Dave
Last Name: Witeck
Email: dwiteck@gmail.com
MetLing Address: 2106 Palisost Ct
Organization: Cypress
City: Hartford
State: RI
Zipcode: 02879
Client ID: 97.83.222.169
Session ID: c01ab16e56f6e30e4e00f46b2afba7f

The only way I would be in support of this by joining this to the South end of the area. My home in the school district. I have used the school district for 12 years. I have lived on Lawton Lane and not worry about the area for the past 12 years. We also used to be friends for the past 12 years. This is a problem caused by the city of Hartford to do a better planning process. Why do we always have the city to go up and then do their schedule ahead of the Town of Hartford? We are always the ones to be in the middle of things and it is not fair. Why is it that the people is affected the most? If the people needs for by pass lane it seems PLEASE.

First Name: Michael
Last Name: Witeck
Email: dwiteck@gmail.com
MetLing Address: 2106 Palisost Ct
Organization: Cypress
City: Hartford
State: RI
Zipcode: 02879
Client ID: 97.83.222.169
Session ID: c01ab16e56f6e30e4e00f46b2afba7f

[Paragraphs discussing concerns with the lighting and traffic management in Hartford]

First Name: Bob
Last Name: Roberts
Email: bobbybob@gmail.com
MetLing Address: 4617 Beardsley Ave
Organization: UConn
City: Hartford
State: CT
Zipcode: 06119
Client ID: 97.83.222.169
Session ID: c01ab16e56f6e30e4e00f46b2afba7f

[Paragraphs discussing concerns with the lighting and traffic management in Hartford]
Comments Submitted via Email or U.S. Mail After June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: Real Name

Address: 1234 Towne Rd

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

It’s so slow due to the heavy (week) traffic!!! Weekends it was made a “tremendous” amount of time but the city’s traffic. How can we avoid traffic? (a) How can we avoid traffic during the week? (b) Once the high traffic has ended, do not use

Comment on Alternative Reliever Route and STH 60 Improvements:

I believe a reliever route in the north end could be more efficient. Of only 12% of traffic, can you figure the reason why so much traffic? I would like to know if the reliever route would be efficient. I have seen the reliever route in the north end. How can we improve traffic flow? (c) How can we improve the traffic flow? (d) What can we do to improve traffic flow?

How did you learn about this meeting? Newsletter (a) TV or Radio (b) Newspaper (c) Website (d) Other (please specify) (e) Social Media

Thank you!

In fact, the current route needs to be done with all the semi’s travelling so don’t use the route. The road (labeled R2) is going to STH 60!!! It was not built for semi’s!!! There is NO traffic on it and definitely not wide enough!

I was told the road 2 months ago, because the semi’s truck would not move out of the lane. The semi-truck driver was not leaving the lane. I do not know if the route should have to be a decision to take this. Thank you!!!

STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study

Comment Form

Name: ARNOLD FEHLING

Address: 1234 Towne Rd

Comment on Issues on STH 60:

This is a huge improvement from what it was here. I’d like more improvement to be made to the road. This would be a huge benefit for improved traffic flow.

How did you learn about this meeting? Newsletter (a) Email (b) TV or Radio (c) Newspaper (d) Website (e) Other (please specify)

Thank you!
Comments Submitted via Email or U.S. Mail After June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting

Arbor Road is not the solution to the traffic problem on I-96. By creating an Arbor Road bypass, it would affect our property value and bring more traffic into our community, which would further increase pollution and the need to walk and bike on the road. We already get too much traffic on I-96 and we do not think a bypass would help reduce the traffic. Each segment of the road has many essential uses that are important to the city. In essence, the bypass is not just a road, but a major connector that would be detrimental to our community.

I will ask for a meeting and see the I-96. The other option is to have more than one arterial going through the developments in Arbor Road. This would allow for more in and out and would not affect our property greatly. It will also allow for more homes and a better outcome. It would also improve to Arbor Road and St. Lawrence Lane. This does mean that it would be the best option.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
[Signature]

Contact Name: [Name]
Contact Email: [Email]
Contact Phone: [Phone]
Contact Address: [Address]

From: [Name]
Date: [Date]
Subject: Arbor Road Bypass

I live on Highway K. As you are aware, the small town of St. Lawrence is the route that I-96 runs through. We have a great deal of traffic in this area, especially during the day when we have a flood of water coming out our street. The Arbor Road and I-96 are two of the main roads that are used for the traffic. I believe that the Arbor Road bypass would only add to the traffic problem and increase pollution. I think that it would be better to have more than one arterial going through the developments in Arbor Road. This would allow for more in and out and would not affect our property greatly. It will also allow for more homes and a better outcome. It would also improve to Arbor Road and St. Lawrence Lane. This does mean that it would be the best option.

Sincerely,
[Signature]
Exhibit A-3 (continued)

Comments Submitted via Email or U.S. Mail After June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting

To Andy DeRommert, cuff9@gmail.com
Thursday, July 28, 2016

Subject: proposed alternate lower crossing

I would request the group looks into this proposed alternate lower crossing route. The third section has completely in the City of Hesperia and is the shortest route that accomplishes the task of reducing the congestion.

---

To Paul Keilman, creek4@gmail.com
Friday, July 29, 2016

Subject: Proposed Route

I would request the group looks into this proposed alternate lower crossing route. The third section has completely in the City of Hesperia and is the shortest route that accomplishes the task of reducing the congestion.

---

To Andy DeRommert, cuff9@gmail.com
Wednesday, July 20, 2016

Subject: proposed alternate lower crossing

I would request the group looks into this proposed alternate lower crossing route. The third section has completely in the City of Hesperia and is the shortest route that accomplishes the task of reducing the congestion.

---

To Andy DeRommert, cuff9@gmail.com
Thursday, July 28, 2016

Subject: proposed alternate lower crossing

I would request the group looks into this proposed alternate lower crossing route. The third section has completely in the City of Hesperia and is the shortest route that accomplishes the task of reducing the congestion.
John Novak and I have some concerns regarding your STH 66 northern reliever route. First, out of our alternative routes run right thru the farm John owns and we have been farming for the past 24 years. The City of Hartford has had ample opportunity in the past to set up this reliever route, they refused to plan for the future then by putting all the housing out this way and now they want a reliever route immediately. For instance Wacker Drive could have met up with County K to the east instead of going west and connecting to County U. Now because of the City’s poor planning we have to possibly give up part of our business and our way of life. This makes us very angry and it seems we do not have a say in what happens to our land. We are already losing some of our land for the Hartford Airport Expansion and now this.

Another concern is that in the past 5 years we have replaced many of the drain tiles that ran thru this farm, these tiles also drain water from the airport and other area farms. All we are asking is that you please do not drop a road in the middle of our business. We do not want odd shaped fields and crossing roads is dangerous with that much truck traffic.

If you insist on going to the north why not use roads that are already there. For example; Goodland to Arthur to Kettle Moraine to County K. Although these small county roads were never built to handle this traffic. Hwy 60 was planned and built to handle this traffic. Downtown Hartford is narrow but if the officials stay on Hwy 60 until Wacker Drive or even Independence Ave they should not have any traffic problems.

Confidentially,

John J. Novak

Larry J. Schmidt
Comments Submitted via Email or U.S. Mail After June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting

Exhibit A-3 (continued)
To Whom It May Concern:

I understand there is a proposal to widen Arthur Road in Hartford – and once again destroy more of our pristine farmland and rural "country atmosphere". I am totally against this proposal as I like getting out of the city with my grandchildren to enjoy seeing the cows grazing in their pastures, the farms along the way selling produce or inviting due to "pick your own" berries. I cannot understand why the Hartford council would need or want to follow through with this proposal when it is not a necessity. It is more important to keep the beauty of this area free of more concrete or asphalt!

I pray you will see how our rural areas keep disappearing into so-called man-made "improvements". Please work to keep Arthur Road as is and save the taxpayers some money!

Sincerely,

Millie Hille
Exhibit A-3 (continued)

Comments Submitted via Email or U.S. Mail After June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting

and be GTH, (previos STD 146 from: 1-41 to E/E 20) and theren may be some other conditions.

Thank you for considering these comments.

David A. Schenkel
Comments Posted on Aerial Map During June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting

(Posted near the intersection of CTH Y and CTH U on aerial map): “May be better to take power lines from Enterprise Drive to CTH U.”
(Posted near the intersection of STH 60 and CTH U on aerial map):
“Broom doesn’t expand:
No one loses their job.
No one loses their house.
Broom makes another plant somewhere else and can create more jobs and products in an empty/open lot:
Perfect.”
(Posted near the intersection of Main Street and Arthur Road on aerial map): “Please make certain the route supports needs for several decades of use.”
(Posted near the intersection of STH 60 and Wilson Avenue on aerial map): “Let the City of Hartford solve its own problems. If Hwy 60 isn’t enough, the Wilson Ave/State St route appears to be the best option.”
(Posted near the intersection of STH 60 and STH 83 on aerial map): “Eliminate all left turns at Hwy 60 + Main. This will alleviate congestion.”
(Posted near the intersection of STH 60 and Wilson Avenue on aerial map): “Option 4 appears to be most logical/economical choice and still shields historic downtown Hartford from truck traffic. Use 60’s lanes. Leave rural alone!”
(Posted near the intersection of STH 60 and Pike Lake Drive on aerial map): “Coordinate stop lights on Hwy 60 to relieve congestion.”
(Posted near the intersection of Kettle Moraine Road and Hilldale Drive on aerial map):
“Consider improving Kettle Moraine Rd to CTH status (CTH KM?) from Arthur Rd to 60 as a secondary or starter route.”
(Posted south of Arthur Road and west of Kettle Moraine Road on aerial map): “Sending semis across Arthur Rd is dangerous for farmers driving tractors + pulling implements. How will following a tractor save a trucker time?”

(Posted near the intersection of Kettle Moraine Road, Arthur Road, and STH 175 on aerial map):
“This dangerous intersection should be rebuilt as a traffic circle.”
(Posted near the intersection of Kettle Moraine Road, Arthur Road, and STH 175 on aerial map): “This is already a dangerous intersection. Running trucks through here would only make it worse.”
(Posted east of Kettle Moraine Road, and south of CTH K on aerial map): “Sesquicentennial farms.”
(Posted east of Kettle Moraine Road and north of Arthur Road on aerial map): “Don’t agree with K to Kettle Moraine Road as traffic would continue going south to 60 – real problem.”
(Posted north of Arthur Road and east of Kettle Moraine Road on aerial map): Drawing of traffic scenario.
(Posted south of Arthur Road and west of Addison Road on aerial map): “Alternative 3: preserves/protects the historic tranquility of the Village of St. Lawrence.”
(Posted south of CTH K and west of Addison Road on aerial map): “If the route must be to the north of 60, the Hwy K route is the most direct, makes the most sense, and utilizes county roads.”
(Posted south of CTH K and east of IH 41 on aerial map): “An efficient drive route from Hwy 60 exit and I-41 to Independence Rd and 60 would not take a longer route when a shorter route with a wish road is currently/already available.”
(Posted near IH-41 and Kettle Moraine Scenic Drive on aerial map): “Extend Alt. 3 straight across I-41 to connect with CTH S/N. Reduces travel time considerably and avoids congestion at CTH K and Addison Rd.”
(Posted west of IH-41 and Kettle Moraine Scenic Drive on aerial map): “Stay on route right away.”
(Posted west of STH 175 and south of STH 60 on aerial map): “Right turn lane STH 60 to STH 175 north west bound.”
(Posted near IH-41 and STH 60 on aerial map): “What trucker even if road existed would take a longer route? Other routes 13-2 – 15 miles vs. 9.2 miles to Hartford [via STH 60]”
(Posted north of Arthur Road east of STH 83 on aerial map): “Wetlands protected in this area; active farm business here.”
(Posted north of Arthur Road and east of STH 83 on aerial map): Zoned AP, agricultural preservation—are you rezoning that?”
(Posted south of Arthur Road and east of STH 83 on aerial map): “I don’t care just get it done!”
(Posted north of Arthur Road and east of STH 83 on aerial map): “No Arthur Rd route.”

(Posted south of Arthur Road and west of Kettle Moraine Road on aerial map): “Tractors’ Ag equipment are on Arthur Rd every day many times. Most drive 20 mph or slower. A semi that gets stuck behind a tractor and load will lose a lot of time.”
(Posted north of Arthur Road and west of Kettle Moraine Road on aerial map): “Koch pipeline—deep enough.”
(Posted north of CTH K and east of IH-41 on aerial map): “Concern–Hwy K at 41- visual traffic. Can traffic flow properly without increase of accidents?”
Exhibit B

Material Used to Announce June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting

**Milwaukee Journal Sentinel**
June 16, 2016

**The Daily News**
June 16, 2016

**Express News**
June 18, 2016
### Exhibit C

**Sign-In Sheets From June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting**

**SIGN-IN ROSTER**

Public Information Meeting  
STH 68 Northern Re伊利ver Route  
Feasibility Study  

June 29, 2016  
Town of Hartford Hall  
5360 Highway K  
Hartford, Wisconsin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scott K.</td>
<td>920 Laramie St, West Bend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Catozzi</td>
<td>855 Pioneer Rd, Richfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Rossa</td>
<td>4504 State Rd 83, Hartford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cabin C.</td>
<td>3504 SR 83, Hartford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John W.</td>
<td>417 W. Kansas Ave, Huron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaye Johnson</td>
<td>950 Westfield, Huron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val &amp; Claire</td>
<td>8010 Hwy K, Hartford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Steltz</td>
<td>5891 Hwy K, Hartford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Cullen</td>
<td>219 Fort V, Iron Ridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melvin Wright</td>
<td>1/23 Bavarian Trail, Stanley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Hinz</td>
<td>1401 Cedarville, Hartford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Stoltz</td>
<td>4100 Kettle Moraine Rd, Hartford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hoff</td>
<td>5799 Hwy 23, Hartford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake Gehring</td>
<td>4150 Hwy 83, Hartford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica L.</td>
<td>4295 Hwy 83, Near Hartford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Schmidt</td>
<td>6032 County Rd, Hartford W. 53027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Shepherd</td>
<td>6022 Altherak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Franquie</td>
<td>6123 Hwy B, Hartford W. 53027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Kipper</td>
<td>717, Delnor Dr, Hartford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Cyphers</td>
<td>726 State Street, Hartford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Watkins</td>
<td>1090 Arthur Rd, Hartford W. 53027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Guisham</td>
<td>6025 Hwy K, Hartford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Bartl</td>
<td>9051 County Rd K, Hartford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Schmiechen</td>
<td>5665 Stevenson Ave, Hartford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Daniel</td>
<td>880 Country Club, Hartford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Finken</td>
<td>1864 4th Ave, N. Single</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany Goed</td>
<td>6317 N. Single</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Liefelman</td>
<td>16 W. Arthur Rd, Hartford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Seibert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. S. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Sneath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Kenney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Knepper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Kaminski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Wood 80152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. A. Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Trim 9266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Thomas 5314 Grand Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Thomas 2717 South Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Johnson 4206 94y 8311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Johnson 4332 94y 8311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry &amp; Karen Sliger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Sliger 303 94y 999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brown 1211 1st Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Smith 4332 94y 8311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brown 1211 1st Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brown 1211 1st Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brown 1211 1st Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brown 1211 1st Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brown 1211 1st Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brown 1211 1st Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brown 1211 1st Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brown 1211 1st Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brown 1211 1st Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brown 1211 1st Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brown 1211 1st Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exhibit C (continued)

### Sign-In Sheets From June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting

#### SIGN-IN ROSTER

**Public Information Meeting**  
**STH 60 Northern Reliever Route**  
**Feasibility Study**  

June 29, 2016  
Town of Hartford Hall  
3360 Highway K  
Hartford, Wisconsin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Wertz</td>
<td>1405 County Road K</td>
<td>Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5703 Arthur Rd</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Hagemeier</td>
<td>2987 E Spring Rd</td>
<td>Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5721 Stream Rd</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Hummel</td>
<td>3040 Arthur Rd</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Heidrich</td>
<td>6340 Arthur Rd</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Czup</td>
<td>15835 Totowa Rd</td>
<td>Eden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Strupp</td>
<td>3075 Bader Hill Rd</td>
<td>53012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Krebs</td>
<td>6081 Hildale Dr</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Cappella</td>
<td>3361 Lake Dr Hartford</td>
<td>53012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Sugar</td>
<td>7600 He Rd</td>
<td>53012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944 Westmore Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Loehr</td>
<td>4475 N 60 Shangri La</td>
<td>53012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Law</td>
<td>5452 Arthur Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina &amp; Tim Harrow</td>
<td>7115 Arthur Rd</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Ohm</td>
<td>424 N Main</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Hernandez</td>
<td>5323 Apache Tr</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5245 Mayfield Rd</td>
<td>Richland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5245 Mayfield Rd</td>
<td>Richland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Klein</td>
<td>1640 N 145 Hartford WI</td>
<td>53012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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SIGN-IN ROSTER

Public Information Meeting
STH 60 Northern Reliever Route
Feasibility Study

June 29, 2016
Town of Hartford Hall
3360 Highway K
Hartford, Wisconsin

1. Tom Leppek 7238 N Waterford Rd Hartford
2. Fred Nodland 6029 Hwy K Hartford WI 53027
3. Andy Venetia 711 Hudson Ave 53066
4. Jim Haggerty 377 Slinger Rd Slinger WI 53086
5. Dennis Reiser 541 Fairview Dr Hartford WI 53027
6. Linda Haynes 1243 Haynes Rd Hartford 53027
7. Nicklin Alexander 1205 S Garden La Hartford 53027
8. Larry Goebel 5849 Woodside Dr Slinger WI 53087
9. Shane Berger 5414 6th Ave S Slinger WI 53086
10. Donna Hagey 115 Martin Dr Hartford
11. Edward Hagey 134 Hanover Rd Slinger WI 53086
12. John Hagey 920 W Holly Dr
13. Don Schmidt 920 W Holly Dr
14. Jerry Wilke 3651 Lake Dr Hartford
15. Gary Kenney 6570 Northwood West Bend WI 53095
16. Max Kaussinger 1827 Crow Rd K Hartford
17. Jack Wender 6029 Hwy K Hartford WI 53027
18. Don McEnery 6029 Hwy K Hartford WI 53027
19. Doug Caudill 404 Fairview Dr Hartford
20. Latina Riedel 4590 Waukesha Rd K Hartford 53027
21. Gene Helge 736 Hudson Rd Hartford
22. Don Keil 9450 Forest Lane K Hartford
23. Dennis Kiel 9450 Forest Lane K Hartford
24. Edsion Blunk 9450 Forest Lane K Hartford 53027
### Exhibit C (continued)

**Sign-In Sheets From June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting**

**SIGN-IN ROSTER**

Public Information Meeting  
STH 60 Northern Reliever Route  
Feasibility Study  
June 29, 2016  
Town of Hartford Hall  
3360 Highway K  
Hartford, Wisconsin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judy Brown</td>
<td>1858 Arthur Rd</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Zelezny</td>
<td>5805 Ken K Hartford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Schonberger</td>
<td>3425 High Rd (HARTFORD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Koetter</td>
<td>747 Jockey Rd</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Schelling</td>
<td>2865 St. James Rd</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Hoss</td>
<td>424 River Rd (HARTRD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Krage</td>
<td>1533 Quaker Rd (WEST)</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Haus</td>
<td>4321 Sherman Rd</td>
<td>Sliver H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenny Haus</td>
<td>5980 Arthur Rd</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jones</td>
<td>3360 one Love Hartford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Williamson</td>
<td>4430 State Rd 83</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td>Daily News</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Ireland</td>
<td>6339 Ford Rd</td>
<td>Rubicon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve &amp; Jennifer Bell</td>
<td>6124 State Hwy 66</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Stinnett</td>
<td>3675 W 83rd St</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wes King</td>
<td>16 Harvest Rd (Long Shore Dr)</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Seck</td>
<td>1525 W 83rd St</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Schult</td>
<td>5120 Hwy K Hartford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Miller</td>
<td>437 Northrup Rd</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeWayne/Dorothy Betcher</td>
<td>6270 Arthur Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Jeune</td>
<td>7388 Summer Rd</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Seck</td>
<td>424 River Rd</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Zychi</td>
<td>435 Glen Rd</td>
<td>HARTFORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Martin</td>
<td>1647 Wisconsin Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John &amp; Jane Arnold</td>
<td>4133 Kauka Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Nault</td>
<td>4145 Calling Rd</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Houwitz</td>
<td>34th &amp; Louisiana Rd</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Holm</td>
<td>1521 Ford Rd</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information Displayed at June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting

**STH 60 Northern Reliever Route Feasibility Study**

- At the request of Washington County, the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission is conducting a feasibility study of a northern reliever route to STH 60 between the western limits of the City of Hartford and IH 41.

- This study is a response to a request from the Hartford Area Development Corporation to the Washington County Board Chairperson, which was prompted by their concerns of increasing traffic volume, congestion, and safety problems on STH 60, and in particular, the effect of increasing truck traffic.

- The study will identify and evaluate potential STH 60 northern reliever routes and improvements to STH 60, and will be conducted in cooperation with concerned and affected local governments, Washington County, and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT).

**Background**

This study is an update of a Washington County study that was completed in 2005, which considered and evaluated a number of alternative STH 60 northern reliever routes. A preferred northern reliever route was identified (as shown on the map to the right) as part of the 2005 study, but it was not implemented by the County.

**STUDY STEPS**

1. **Problem Identification**
   - The Commission staff and Washington County staff will meet with officials from local concerned and affected governments, WisDOT, and the Hartford Area Development Corporation to identify and discuss the problems with traffic movement on STH 60.

2. **Goal Formulation**
   - Based on the problems identified, goals to be achieved by a potential northern reliever route and potential improvements to STH 60 will be formulated.

3. **Inventory**
   - Existing conditions of STH 60 will be documented, including total and truck traffic volume, traffic congestion, travel times, and pedestrian and vehicular traffic volumes. In addition, forecasts of probable future traffic volume on STH 60 will be prepared.

4. **Identification of Alternatives**
   - Potential alternative northern reliever routes will be identified for evaluation, with consideration given to alternative routes and STH 60 improvements suggested in the problem identification element of the study.

5. **Evaluation of Alternatives**
   - The identified potential alternative northern reliever routes, along with potential STH 60 improvements, will be evaluated and compared with respect to their attainment of the goals and criteria developed under a previous step of the study.

6. **Recommendations**
   - Based upon the evaluation of the potential northern reliever routes and STH 60 improvements, Commission staff working with Washington County staff will develop preliminary recommendations with respect to a northern reliever route and STH 60 improvements.

The preliminary recommended northern reliever route and STH 60 improvements will be reviewed with the Washington County Board of Supervisors, officials of concerned and affected local governments, the Hartford Area Development Corporation, and WisDOT.
Exhibit D (continued)

Information Displayed at June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting

PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
JUNE 29, 2016

What is Presented Tonight
- Inventory of STH 60 (truck and traffic volumes, traffic congestion, travel times, vehicular and truck crashes)
- Potential goals and criteria to be used to compare and evaluate Alternative STH 60 Reliever Routes
- Potential Alternative Reliever Routes identified to date

What Remains to be Done
- Comparison and Evaluation of Alternative STH 60 Northern Reliever Routes
- Selection by Washington County of Preferred Alternative STH 60 Northern Reliever Route(s) and STH 60 improvements

Comments Requested Tonight
- Input on issues related to STH 60
- Comment on potential alternative reliever routes and improvements to STH 60

STH 60 PAVEMENT HISTORY
- Pavements have a design life ranging from 50 to 60 years before they need to be replaced or reconstructed.
- Because of traffic use (particularly trucks) and changes in weather (freeze and thaw), it is necessary to improve the conditions of the pavement surface through resurfacing or reconditioning. The first rehabilitation typically occurs 20 to 30 years following a roadway construction or reconstruction, with subsequent rehabilitation occurring every 8 to 18 years.
Exhibit D (continued)

Information Displayed at June 29, 2016, Public Information Meeting

TRAFFIC CONTROL

- The traffic control along a roadway can affect its travel time (desired traffic signal spacing is one mile or more and acceptable traffic signal spacing is one-half mile or more)
- STH 60 between Liberty Avenue and Pike Lake Drive has a signal spacing of 0.4 miles per traffic signal (less than the acceptable spacing of 0.5 miles)
- Between Pike Lake Drive and STH 164, STH 60 has a signal spacing of 1.1 miles (meeting desired signal spacing of 1.0 miles)
- Traffic signals on STH 60 are owned and operated by either the City of Hartford or the Wisconsin Department of Transportation
- There is currently no traffic signal coordination of the signals along STH 60

CURRENT TOTAL AND TRUCK TRAFFIC VOLUME ALONG STH 60

Specific Truck Data:

- Truck traffic represents about 9 to 10 percent of total traffic on STH 60.
- Of the trucks traveling to the Hartford-Slinger area on STH 60, 7 percent travel through the area, that is, travel on STH 60 between Goodland Road and IH 41 without a destination within the Hartford-Slinger area. Therefore, a significant proportion of the trucks traveling on STH 60 (over 90 percent) have at least one trip end in the Hartford-Slinger area.
- Truck information provided by Hartford Area Industries:
  - A survey of seven large companies in the Hartford Industrial Park on the west side of the City of Hartford indicated that they generate about 1,300 truck trips per day
  - 75 to 85 percent of the two largest freight generators in the Hartford Industrial Park are truck traffic
• When traffic volume exceeds the design capacity of a roadway, it experiences traffic congestion, typically during the peak traffic times of an average weekday. Congestion can result in slower traffic speeds between controlled intersections and longer delays and queues at controlled intersections.

• During meetings with local officials, two intersections were identified as experiencing congestion, or delay: the intersection of STH 60 and STH 83 and the intersection of STH 60 and STH 164.

FUTURE TOTAL TRAFFIC VOLUME AND CONGESTION ALONG STH 60

• Based on forecast year 2050 average weekday total traffic volumes, two additional segments of STH 60 would operate under congestion during the peak traffic times of an average weekday—between CTH K and Hilldale Drive, between Kettle Moraine Road and CTH CC, and between STH 164 and IH 41.
Total Vehicular Crashes:
- Crash rates for all vehicular crashes exceed the State average for similar roadway types on STH 60 between Goodland Road and Liberty Avenue (Segment A), between Wacker Drive and Wilson Avenue (Segment C), and between STH 175 and IH 41 (Segment H).
- Rates of crashes involving a fatality or observed injury exceed the State average for similar roadway types on STH 60 between Goodland Road and Liberty Avenue (Segment A), between Pike Lake Drive and Kettle Moraine Drive (Segments E and F), and between STH 175 and IH 41 (Segment H).
- There were no crashes involving both a truck and a pedestrian and only one crash involving both a truck and a bicyclist from 2010 to 2014.

Crashes Involving Trucks:
- The proportion of truck crashes along STH 60 between Wacker Drive and Wilson Avenue (13 percent) and between STH 175 and IH 41 (11 percent) exceeds the proportion of trucks traveling on these segments of STH 60 (about 9-10 percent).

Comparison of Existing Travel Times
- The travel time on STH 60 is affected by the level of traffic volume and congestion along the route. Congestion can result in reduced speeds between the signalized intersections or increased delay at the signalized intersections.
- The likelihood that traffic would divert from STH 60 to a northern reliever route would, in part, be dependent on the travel time on the reliever route being competitive to the travel time on STH 60 (within a few minutes).
Thank You For Attending

Ways to Comment on STH 60 Issues and Northern Reliever Routes

• Comment cards are available at the sign-in table and on the table with the comment box. Comment cards can be handed to Commission or County staff, placed in the comment box, or mailed, faxed or emailed to the Commission:

Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
P.O. Box 1007
Waukesha, Wisconsin 53187-1007
Fax: 262-547-1103
e-mail: STH60Study@sewpc.org

• Comments can be made on stick-it notes and placed on the large aerial maps at the appropriate location.

• Comments can also be made at the Commission’s website: sewpc.org/STH60Study

Remaining Steps

• Comparison and Evaluation of Alternative STH 60 Northern Reliever Routes
• Identification of Preferred Alternative STH 60 Northern Reliever Route(s) by Commission and County staff