



## Final Meeting Notes Wisconsin Dells Parkway (US 12) Public Advisory Group Workshop #1 WisDOT Project I.D. 6145-01-01

Client: Wisconsin Department of Transportation  
 Client Location: 3550 Mormon Coulee Road  
 Meeting Date: September 6, 2012  
 Meeting Location: Village of Lake Delton, Administration Building / 50 Wisconsin Dells Parkway South  
 Meeting Time: 12:30 PM

<b>PAG Members in Attendance:</b>			
Adam Makowski	Doran Carrell	Mark Nykaza	Steve Pine
Bill Pettit	Gene Dalhoff	Mike Rynearson	Tom Deihl
Cathy Bleser	Griff Westerman	Nick Laskaris	Tom Dorner
Chris Tollaksen	Kay Mackesey	Robert W. Steinweg	
<b>PAG Facilitators in Attendance</b>			
Andre Ost	Ian Winger	Mark Lenters	Scott Cramer
Anne Wallace	Jeremy Krachey	Mary Beth Pettit	Shana Mogensen
<b>PAG Members Not Able to Attend:</b>			
Dee Pettack	Gregg Borucki	Mike Obois	Stephen Muchow
<b>New Members Identified Following PAG #1 (Will Receive a Copy of the Meeting Notes)</b>			
Gary Hansen	Jason Field	Mark Hamm	Romy Snyder

**Purpose:** The Wisconsin Dells Parkway Public Advisory Group (PAG) was put together to assist the design team in the study of various alternatives for the reconstruction of the US 12 corridor between Monroe Street (STH 23) and Broadway (STH 13) in the Village of Lake Delton and the Village of Wisconsin Dells. The corridor study is being performed in accordance with the NEPA (National Environmental Protection Act) Process and considers public involvement a critical component to the success of every project. This meeting will serve as the kick-off meeting to a series of workshops that will span the 3 year preliminary study period. 5-8 workshops are planned at this time. The focus of Workshop #1 includes the following items:

1. Introduce the study team
2. Describe the study purpose
3. Provide background information on the study area
4. Obtain your input on transportation deficiencies in the study area

**Workbooks:** Each member of the PAG received a workbook for use during Workshop #1 and future Workshops for the project. The workbooks include the following information:

1. PAG Workshop Schedule
2. US 12 (Wisconsin Dells Parkway) Study Schedule
3. Workshop #1 Materials:
  - a. A printout of the PPT Presentation
  - b. Existing Condition & Constraints Map
  - c. Crash Assessment 2005 – 2009
  - d. Graphics of typical sections for discussion and study purposes
4. Planning Toolbox Information

- a. Toolbox Content Summary
- b. Various Pamphlets and Brochures
- c. Executive Summary of the US 12 Roadway Safety Audit (January 2012)
- d. Wisconsin Dells Parkway Public Involvement Plan – DRAFT (September 5, 2012).

### Summary of Discussion Items

### Action Items

#### Introductions:

The meeting began with introductions of all members of the PAG as well as the WisDOT representatives and GRAEF design team.

#### Session #1:

- Session #1 was designed to provide the members with an understanding of the study process and role of the PAG. A Microsoft PPT presentation was given by the design team to provide background on the following items.
  1. Overview of 2011 Resurfacing Project
  2. Study Purpose \ NEPA Process
  3. PAG: Creation & Role
  4. Existing Corridor Review
    - i. Features
    - ii. Crash Assessment
    - iii. Traffic
- Nick Laskaris asked if the design team WisDOT had already made up their minds as to the best solution for the corridor and wanted to express support for the concept of one-way roadways that complement each other. Mary Beth emphasized to the members of the group that all alternatives are currently on the table. The team is just beginning to study alternatives.
- Mary Beth indicated that Strand Associates did complete a study in February 2011 that evaluated five alternatives including a no build option; a four-lane median option; a four-lane with a two-way-left-turn lane option; and a number of options that considered one-way pairs with various cross street connections. The purpose of this safety study was to begin to identify potential alternatives to assist with funding for the study. All options will be further considered during this study.

#### Session #2: Value Exercise

Session #2 involved the members of the PAG breaking into small groups to participate in a Value Exercise. The exercise followed the following outline:

- Break into four groups
- Elect a spokesperson
- Brainstorm on the transportation issues in the corridor
  1. What are the problems along the existing corridor (list at least 5)?
  2. What are the priorities for a long term solution (list at least 3)?
- Have your spokesperson present it
- The meeting facilitator will clarify and assist with questions
- After all groups have reported, everyone will be given 4 dots to vote for their preferred issues for question #1 and 4 dots for their preferred issues related to question #2

- Your group will have twenty minutes to brainstorm on each question.

**Question #1: What are the problems along the existing corridor?**

- Group #1

1. Lack of Pedestrian Crossways – pedestrians cross in traffic
2. Too many driveways
3. Lack of left turn lanes
4. Difficulty accommodating bicycle traffic
5. Lack of pavement marking
6. Confusing signing at intersections
7. No alternate route signing
8. Existing speed limit is too low in the winter time
9. Confusing to drive different speeds depending on the time of year
10. Drivers are distracted by roadside elements including signs, buildings, fixtures
11. Event traffic congests the roadway
12. Bad weather causes mass exodus of visitors to the roadway
13. Profile of roadway combined with multiple driveways is dangerous (specifically in front of Atlantis)
14. Not enough taxis at bar time \ many people are walking home
15. Bikes & pedestrians share narrow walk.
16. Cyclists don't pay attention
17. Keeping sidewalk clear in the winter, existing terrace is too narrow for snow storage – pedestrians end up walking in the roadway
18. Visitors not aware of US traffic rules.
19. Lack of pedestrian refuge areas (safety islands)
20. Lack of roadway lighting
21. Wildlife collisions a concern, particularly in the fall
22. Aesthetic and safety concern of power lines
23. Cross street signage / no address reference locations
24. No benches, plantings, or water fountains

- Group #2

1. Getting traffic to the venues
2. Traffic congestion
3. Turning movement conflicts; rear end collisions
4. No left turn lanes
5. Pedestrian safety; sidewalk too narrow; not enough safe crossings
6. Driveway spacing too close
7. Cyclists ride on the sidewalk
8. Cyclists ride in the roadway
9. Cyclists do not follow rules of the road
10. Narrow roadway width for multiple types of users
11. Distracted drivers
12. Poor Wayfinding
13. Lack of lighting
14. Overhead utilities (aesthetic and safety concern)
15. Aesthetics lacking along the corridor

- Group #3

1. Pedestrian Safety; not enough crossings and cross walks
2. Lack of left turn lanes
3. Pedestrian and cyclists not following the rules of the road
4. Lack of designated bicycle lanes
5. Lack of storm water treatment; urban area results in a lot of impermeable surface

6. Entrance and exits are very busy during the start and end of each day
  7. Difficult to move traffic around emergency scenes
  8. Lack of taxi \ bus pull-outs \ stopping points along the corridor
  9. Pedestrian use streets when sidewalks are full of snow
  10. Stopping in travel lane due to lack of signs prohibiting this action
  11. Pedestrian crossing near the Ducks, near the student housing location
- Group #4
    1. Too many driveways
    2. No deceleration lanes
    3. No bike paths
    4. No clear marking (signs, wayfinding, pavement marking)
    5. Lack of safe pedestrian crossing areas
    6. Old motels are housing summer employees, increases pedestrian\bike activity along the corridor
    7. No control for Left turn Movements
    8. Poor lighting at night
    9. Narrow sidewalks, steep slopes at existing driveways
    10. Limited public right-of-way
    11. Traffic bottle necks at specific locations
    12. Vertical curve issues at one location
    13. No education for summer employees for bicycle use in the area
    14. Lack of snow storage due to small terraces.

**Question #2: What are the priorities for a long term solution?**

- Group #1
  1. Benches\parking\kiosks\rest rooms \ public art \ decorative lighting \ banners
  2. Eclectic mix of Businesses – some w\parking lots, some boutiques
  3. Pedestrian Friendly Walkways
  4. Underpass \ Overpasses that are ADA Compliant
  5. Wayfinding \ Color Coding of Geographic Locations
  6. No Roundabouts
  7. Roundabout in front of Mt. Olympus
  8. More Signals
  9. Bike Lanes
  10. Frontage Roads \ Fewer Driveways \ 45° driveway entry\exit
  11. Zoning Changes
  12. Shuttle for Workers (Private \ Public)
  13. Alternative Transportation (Private \ Public)
  14. Continued large scale development with a mix of small scale businesses which would include attractions \ retail \ accommodation (lodging)
  15. Designated turn lanes
  16. Median w\designated U-turn locations
  17. Protect Wildlife \ Deer Crossings
  18. Accommodations of pullouts \ shuttle stops
  19. Ability to handle traffic around emergency incidents
- Group #2
  1. Parkway aesthetics are needed
  2. One-way Northbound along existing 12 with loops connecting to SB roadway
  3. Five lanes with a two-way-left-turn-lane (TWLTL)
  4. Complete street should include bike lane
  5. Two-way bike boulevard
  6. Shuttle bus & lane

- 7. Distinct streetscape
- 8. Wayfinding
- 9. Clara Avenue remains two-way
- Group #3
  - 1. Bikes off the Road – Develop an Alternate Route
  - 2. Alternative Modes of Transportation for Students\Workers
  - 3. Maintain Business Viability \ Access
  - 4. Use Interstate as 12 Bypass for thru traffic to focus Business Traffic on Existing 12
  - 5. Multiple Stop Locations for Mass Transit
  - 6. Consistent Locations: Wayfinding Signs and\or Numbered Stop Lights
  - 7. Pedestrian Overpass \ Tunnels
  - 8. Improved Street Lighting \ Lights on both sides in the Village of Lake Delton
  - 9. More Greenery Along Corridor
  - 10. Off-Corridor Stormwater Facilities \ Detention Areas
  - 11. Promote Mass Transit between Businesses
- Group #4
  - 1. Bypass Options w\Connector Roads to Strip
  - 2. One ways pairs
  - 3. Overhead Pedestrian Crossings
  - 4. Median w\Planting on Barrier to Reduce Crossing at Odd Locations
  - 5. Adding Turn Lanes & On Street Bike Lane
  - 6. Added Intersections
  - 7. Zoning Along Clara Avenue to allow Development
  - 8. Mass Transit Options \ Park & Ride
  - 9. Alternate Access Points for High Traffic Areas
  - 10. Retrofit Existing Roadway with Paths \ Ped & Bike Accommodations

**Summary of Value Exercise**

Following each of the small break-out sessions, the groups shared their thoughts with the other groups and like items were combined to establish the following lists in response to each question. Each individual was then given 8 colored dots. Members were asked to place 4 dots of the top 4 priority items for each question. The following is a summary of the survey:

Identification of Existing Problems along the Corridor	No. of Stickers
Traffic congestion (special event traffic / start and end of workday)	12
Pedestrian crossings/ pedestrian islands/ narrow walks	10
Too many driveways/ spacing concerns	8
Lack of curb appeal (overhead lines, no benches, no waterfront)	8
Lack of designated bike lanes	7
Lack of way finding/ cross street signage/ alternate route signage	4
Narrow existing right of way	2
Foreign population of workers; lack of rules of the road	2
Distracted drivers	2
Lack of lighting	1
Safety of power poles	1
Lots of impervious surface/concern for quality	1
Snow storage/ pedestrian facilities in winter	1

No left turns in median	1
No acc/dec lanes at high traffic generators	0
Speed limit - too low winter/ too high summer	0
Weather (thunderstorm)	0
Profile/ sight distance/ steepness of driveway (geometric deficiencies)	0

Objectives/Vision of the Future Corridor	No. of Stickers
One way couplets/ pairs with multiple cross roads	10
Bike lanes	9
Buried utilities	9
Streetscape, greenway, planting, bio-swales, benches, restrooms, public art	8
Promote mass transit between businesses	5
Overhead pedestrian crossings	4
Overhead signage	4
More signals	4
Add acceleration/ deceleration lanes	3
Wayfinding signs/ number stop lights	2
Bypass with connections to the strip	1
No roundabouts	1
Zoning changes	1
Parking lots/ park and rides	1
Alternate access for high traffic areas	1
Alternate bike routes	1
Wider sidewalks	0
Roundabouts	0
Frontage roads/ fewer driveways	0
Lighting (roadway)	0
Retrofit for future expansion	0

**Session #3: Transportation Planning 101**

Session #3 was designed to provide the members with an understanding of the basic transportation planning principals that will be important as we study the corridor as a group.

- Mark Lenters presented the session that focused on the following items:
  1. Corridor Studies & Objectives
  2. Roadway Classifications
  3. Measures of Performance
  4. Typical Section Development
  5. Access Management
  6. Intersection Control
- Mark referred to many of the brochures included in the Member Workshop in the planning toolbox. Members are encouraged to review these documents prior to the next PAG meeting.

**Next Steps: PAG Workshop #2**

- Mary Beth indicated that Workshop #2 is intended to focus on the following concepts:
  1. Establish Evaluation Screening and Criteria based on Objectives defined during this meeting.
  2. Allow members to begin to create\study alternatives using transportation planning concepts through a design charette.
- Members had completed the availability request form that was sent out ahead of the meeting and it was determined that the highest number of members could make the morning of Wednesday, October 10<sup>th</sup>.
- Mary Beth encouraged members to further consider the following between now and the next meeting:
  1. Think about other locations that may have had similar concerns and how did they solve these concerns.
  2. Review the information contained in the planning toolbox. Consider how the concepts may be used to create alternatives\solutions for the Wisconsin Dells Parkway.
- Mary Beth asked all members to consider the community and identify any individuals that would bring particular value to this group and provide information to the design team so that we may contact them to determine interest in joining the committee. It is important to identify any additional members prior to Workshop #2 as all workshops build on what has occurred during prior sessions.
- Mary Beth will provide a form to PAG attendees as a means to provide feedback on PAG Workshop #1.

*Review information included in the Planning Toolbox Portion of the PAG Workbooks.*

*Mary Beth will follow-up with a Electronic Invite to Workshop #2 to be held on Wednesday, October 10<sup>th</sup> in the morning.*

*Members to submit additional PAG names to Mary Beth so they may be included in the invitation to Workshop #2.*

*Mary Beth to solicit feedback from members on effectiveness of Workshop #1*

**Summary of Action Items:**

**GRAEF (Consultant Team)**

- 1) *Mary Beth will follow-up with a Electronic Invite to Workshop #2 to be held on Wednesday, October 10<sup>th</sup> in the morning.*
- 2) *Mary Beth to solicit feedback from members on effectiveness of Workshop #1*

**PAG Members**

- 1) *Review information included in the Planning Toolbox Portion of the PAG Workbooks.*
- 2) *Members to consider individuals in the community who may bring value to the PAG. Submit names to Mary Beth so that she may perform outreach to them prior to Workshop #2.*

If you have any questions regarding the contents of these minutes, please contact me directly at (414) 266-9175.

Respectfully Submitted by,



Mary Beth Pettit, P.E.  
Consultant Team Project Manager