

Meeting Summary

Waukesha West Bypass Advisory Group

Workshop 6

Retzer Nature Center,
November 9, 2012
4:00 pm to 6:00 pm

General

The sixth Advisory Group workshop for the Waukesha Bypass was held on Monday October 29, 2012 from 4:00 pm to 6:00 pm at the Retzer Nature Center in Waukesha County. Buddy Desai of CH2M HILL, facilitated the meeting. Approximately 11 members of the Advisory Group and 10 members of the community at-large were present at the meeting.

Advisory Group Members Present at the Meeting

Joe Banske	Perry Lindquist	Bob Johnson
Mike Thompson	Suzanne Kelly	Chris Hiebert
Jerry Gutjahr	Steve Schmuki	David Bahl, Jr.

Technical Resources Present at the Meeting

Waukesha County – Gary Evans
WisDOT – Doug Cain, Ben Eruchalu
CH2M HILL – Buddy Desai, Charlie Webb, Dan Dupies
Kapur – Kurt Farrenkopf

Meeting Agenda

4:00 Convene the Meeting
4:05 Recap of CSS Advisory Group Meetings 1 through 5
4:15 Study Findings and Recent Developments
4:40 Draft EIS
4:50 Next Steps
5:00 Preferred Alternative Discussion
6:00 Adjourn

Materials Available at the Meeting

Materials available for discussion at the meeting, in addition to the agenda, included a handout with the Waukesha Bypass Alternatives Evaluation Matrix. Exhibits included plots with the project alternatives that remain under consideration.

Also used in the meeting was a PowerPoint presentation covering the CSS meeting recap, Study Findings and Recent Developments, Draft EIS, and Next Steps.

Introductions

The meeting was convened by Gary Evans of Waukesha County. Gary welcomed the group and thanked them for their participation. Buddy Desai, CH2M HILL, then began the formal portion of the Advisory Group meeting.

Recap of CSS Advisory Group Meetings 1 through 5

Buddy Desai utilized the PowerPoint to review the purpose and results of the first five CSS Advisory Group meetings.

- CSS Meeting #1: March 2010 – Issues & Goals
- CSS Meeting #2: May 2010 – Rating of Key Issues
- CSS Meeting #3: June 2010 – Feedback on Initial Range of Corridors
- CSS Meeting #4: September 2010 – Initial Alternatives Evaluation
- CSS Meeting #5: January 2011 – Refined Alternatives Rating

Study Findings and Recent Developments

Dan Dupies and Charlie Webb, both with CH2M HILL, reviewed the recent study findings and developments. Updates were provided for the following study areas:

- Wetland delineations
- Herptile survey
 - State threatened Blanding's turtle
 - State threatened Butler's garter snake
- Recommended ecopassages
- Golf Course East alignment
 - Eliminated from further consideration due to the magnitude and significance of other environmental impacts
- Road Safety Audit findings
 - No-Build is the least safe
 - 4-lane alternatives safer than 2-lane alternatives
 - Pebble Creek Alternatives 42% lower crash rate than No-Build Alternative
 - Sunset-to-County X Alternative 34% lower crash rate than No-Build Alternative

Draft EIS

Charlie Webb provided an update on the approval of the Draft EIS for the project. A summary of issues surrounding the Draft EIS is as follows:

- Approved by WisDOT on October 16th and the Federal Highway Administration on October 19th
- Public comment period October 26th to December 10th
- Provide comments via:
 - westbypass@waukeshacounty.gov
 - Gary Evans, 515 W Moreland Blvd, Waukesha, WI 53188
- Public Hearing November 13th 4-8 pm
 - Waukesha North High School auditorium
 - Written or oral testimony
 - Oral testimony in public or one-on-one with a court reporter

- Draft EIS available at:
 - waukeshabypass.org
 - Waukesha and Pewaukee libraries
 - Waukesha Town Hall, City of Waukesha DPW, Waukesha County DPW, WisDOT office on Barstow

Next Steps

The next steps in the project were defined as the following:

- Identify a preferred alternative
- Prepare Final EIS
 - Identifies preferred alternative
 - More detailed mitigation plans
 - Addresses comments on the Draft EIS
 - Documents input received during comment period
 - March/April 2013
- Record of Decision (approved by Federal Highway Administration)
 - Final federal approval to move into design and begin acquiring real estate

Preferred Alternative Discussion

The alternatives still under consideration were reviewed using the large plots that were prepared by the study team.

Charlie Webb described the following decision-making process that will be used to identify the preferred alternative:

- Advisory group input
- Public hearing/public comment period input
- Resource agency comments on Draft EIS
- Town Board, City Council, County Board resolutions in November/December
- WisDOT & FHWA agreement
- Timeframe – after comment period closes on December 10th
- Notify participating and cooperating agencies and seek their concurrence
 - Including DNR, EPA, FWS, Corps of Engineers, City of Pewaukee

The Advisory Group was provided a copy of the Waukesha Bypass Alternatives Evaluation Matrix. This evaluation matrix shows the alternatives remaining under consideration, including the No-Build alternative, Purpose and Need Elements, CSS Advisory Group Goals and Objectives, Evaluation Criteria, and the Standard to which each criterion should be measured. The Advisory Group members were asked to fill out the evaluation matrix at the meeting or to take it home to fill it out. All evaluation matrices should be sent to the study team by November 9th.

Questions & Discussion

The following questions and discussion took place between the study team and the Advisory Group:

Steve Schmuki – Why is the No-Build Alternative a “do nothing” alternative rather than it having a small improvement component?

Charlie Webb – the No-Build Alternative is the baseline against which the Build Alternatives are compared. In addition to the 4-lane Build Alternatives presented tonight, we have evaluated smaller footprint Build Alternatives such as the improved two-lane alternative that correct more deficiencies than the No-Build Alternative, but have a smaller footprint than the 4-lane alternatives.

Jim White – Can you provide an explanation of what the Sunset-to-County X Alternative would look like?

Charlie Webb – The Sunset-to-County X Alternative was explained the alternatives exhibit used in the meeting.

Bob Johnson – What type of traffic control is proposed at the Badger Lane/Sunset intersection?

Charlie Webb – With the Sunset-to-County X Alternative there is a median opening at the intersection, but Badger Lane would remain stop controlled.

Bob Johnson – Noted that one semi going to or leaving from Cooper Power Systems uses the intersection every minute. He also noted that the 100 buses that enter or leave the bus yard daily also use the intersection.

Perry Lindquist – Asked whether the wetland impact on the Sunset-to-County X Alternative included the impacts beneath the Sunset Bridge.

Charlie Webb – Yes. The study team noted that because there could be a function or value impact to a shaded wetland, we are counting it as an impact.

Perry went on to note that he is concerned about the depth of cuts with the Pebble Creek Alternatives south of Sunset in a primary environmental corridor. He wondered that if instead of a 25-32 foot cut into the slope, the roadway could rest on top of the slope south of Sunset and then cross over Sunset Drive either with no connection or ramps on the Christoph property.

Kurt Farrenkopf noted that the slope is so steep in that area that while cuts are required on the west side of the road, fill will be required on the east side of the road.

Dave Bahl – Asked whether the bridge over Pebble Creek at County X would be improved.

Charlie Webb – Yes, and also note that the Sunset Bridge expansion would not occur with the Pebble Creek Alternatives.

Chris Hiebert – Asked how bikes would be accommodated.

Charlie Webb – Noted that the location of the extended bike path on the east side of the Build Alternative from Summit to a connection with the Glacial Drumlin Trail. It was also pointed out that there would be sidewalk on the west side of the project from the north terminus to Kame Terrace subdivision south of Madison Street. There will also be throughout the project, regardless of the alternative selected south of the Wisconsin & Southern Railroad, an 8-foot-wide paved shoulder to accommodate bicyclists.

Joe Banske – Asked about the wetland impact totals in the matrix that was handed out. He wanted to confirm that the wetland impacts noted under each alternative did not include any impacts for the other alternative.

Charlie Webb – Responded that Joe’s understanding was correct.

Joe also asked if the Sunset-to-County X wetland impacts take into account that existing Sunset Drive has already filled some of the wetlands under the Sunset-to-County X Alternative footprint.

Charlie responded that only new wetland impacts were calculated.

Perry Lindquist – Asked whether the new R/W amounts in the matrix included the stormwater detention facilities that are proposed.

Charlie Webb – Responded that no, the new R/W acreage in the matrix accounts only for the approximately 200-foot-wide corridor between the north and south termini.

Adjournment

Buddy concluded the meeting by reminding the Advisory Group of the upcoming Public Hearing. He also noted that this would most likely be the final Advisory Group meeting and the Public Hearing will be the final “public” setting to provide input to the study team. The Final EIS will have a 30-day comment period; however that comment period will not include a public meeting/hearing. He thanked everyone for their time and thoughtful comments and consideration on this very important project.