

Context Sensitive Solutions Workshop #4

The fourth Context Sensitive Solutions Advisory Group Workshop for the West Waukesha Bypass was held on September 15, 2010 from 4:00 pm to 6:00 pm in the Waukesha West High School Media Center, 3301 Saylesville Road, Waukesha. Buddy Desai, CH2M HILL, facilitated the meeting. Consultant staff at the meeting included Charlie Webb, Project Manager, Dan Dupies, Dave Rodebaugh (CH2M HILL), Kurt Farrenkopf (Kapur). Waukesha County was represented by Allison Bussler, Director of Public Works and Gary Evans, Engineering Services Manager. Fifteen members of the Advisory Group and approximately 60 members of the community-at-large attended the workshop.

Advisory Group Members Present at the Workshop

David Bahl, Jr.	Perry Lindquist	Dale Pfeiffle
Joe Banske	Bruce Massman	Steve Schmuki
Paul Day	Maureen Millmann	Jim White
Jerry Gutjahr	Mike Murphy	Chris Hiebert
Suzanne Kelly	Jeff Panosian	

Advisory Group Members Not Present at the Workshop

Jennifer Becker
Mike Stigler
Bob Johnson

Materials Available at the Meeting

- Alternatives Analysis Presentation
- Map of the alternatives
- Traffic Forecast Exhibits
- Impact Summary Tables for North and South Alignments

Introductions

Buddy opened the meeting by welcoming the Advisory Group to the workshop and proceeded to introduce the technical staff present at the meeting. Buddy recapped the first three CSS workshops and briefly explained what the 4th workshop would entail. Following his opening remarks, Buddy introduced Charlie Webb who began a PowerPoint presentation on the project's purpose and need statement and provided an overview of the alternatives and the analysis that the study team had conducted on the various alternatives.

Advisory Group Exercise

After Charlie finished the presentation, Buddy introduced the workshop exercise for the Advisory Group. This exercise involved utilizing an evaluation matrix to help facilitate their evaluation of the alternatives. He explained the purpose of the matrix and the methodology that they would use to evaluate the alternatives. Buddy reminded the group that their evaluations would not result in a decision on which alternative should be selected, but would provide the county with a recommendation on which alternative(s) they support and which should be eliminated from further consideration. Buddy asked the Advisory Group to spend some time to assess the information presented and then complete the matrices prior to the end of the workshop. He

added that members of the group could take the evaluation matrix home so that they could spend more time analyzing the information but requested that if they do so, they send their completed matrices to Charlie Webb within a few days after the workshop. The advisory group was given 30 to 45 minutes to complete the evaluation matrix.

At the completion of the exercise, Buddy asked the group if they had any comments that they would like to share regarding the alternatives that they were asked to evaluate. The following comments were made by the advisory group:

Jerry Gutjahr – T is not a viable alternative. He assumes that the new road would have stop lights.

Jim White – No Comments

Bruce Massman – T is not a viable alternative. He has concerns about starting all over with the SS alternatives.

Paul Day – T is not an option for the City of Waukesha. Paul said he likes the feel of SS as a true bypass, but doesn't think that it would draw enough traffic away from the TT corridor.

Joe Banske – Joe would like to see the team explore different types of improvements on TT, not just four lanes or nothing. He doesn't see any problems on TT being that would be solved by constructing a four lane road.

Jeff Panosian – Wondered about the Section 4(f) issues. Does hitting Retzer Nature Center eliminate the SS alternatives? Likes SS because it has fewer displacements but intuitively feels like the traffic on SS would come from TT and would be higher than shown. Parks are a big thing for him because it eliminates so many alternatives.

Maureen Millman – No comment

Meagan Spraege – Sees SS as a true bypass. Does not think T is a viable alternative.

Dave Bahl – T is not a viable alternative and he does not favor the SS alternative.

Steve Schmuki – No build is still an option, but how does a person evaluate that against the matrix. Prefers the T1X alternative but wants to think more about the evaluation.

Chris Hiebert – The traffic forecast model shows the need for four lanes in the TT corridor. The SS alternatives will not negate that need. The T corridor is essentially a No Build Alternative.

Perry Lindquist – An alternative that goes between the Pebble Creek and the Golf Course East alternative would be a good location for a southern alignment even if it results in more residential displacements.

Dale Pfeiffer – No comments at this time.

Following the Advisory Group's comments, Buddy explained the next steps in the study, including another CSS advisory group meeting in October or November.

Buddy concluded the meeting by thanking the Advisory Group and the community at large for their time and efforts.