Final Meeting Notes
Wisconsin Dells Parkway (US 12)
Public Advisory Group Workshop #3
WisDOT Project I.D. 6145-01-01

Client: Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Client Location: 3550 Mormon Coulee Road
Meeting Date: December 12, 2012
Meeting Location: Village of Lake Delton, Administration Building / 50 Wisconsin Dells Parkway South
Meeting Time: 1:00 PM

PAG Members in Attendance:			
Adam Makowski	Cathy Bleser	Doran Carrell	Stephen Muchow
Bill Pettit	Gregg Borucki	Mike Obois	Mark Nykaza
Tom Dorner	Griff Westerman	Nick Laskaris	Romy Snyder
Chris Tollaksen	Kay Mackesey	Robert W. Steinweg	Gene Dalhoff
PAG Facilitators in Attendance			
Andre Ost	Shana Mogensen	Mark Lenters	Julie Chapman
Scott Cramer	Jeremy Krachey	Mary Beth Pettit	
PAG Members Not Able to Attend:			
Dee Pettack	Steve Pine	Mark Hamm	Richard Cross
Tom Deihl	Gary Hansen	Mike Rynearson	Deborah Kowalke

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 City 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 was the 3rd meeting of a series of workshops that will span the 3 year preliminary study period. The focus of Workshop #3 includes the following items:

1. Review of NEPA Process and Value Assessment
2. Access Management Presentation
3. Review of Conceptual Design Alternatives including the following:
    a. Alternative 1: Four Lane Undivided
    b. Alternative 2: Four Lane Divided (Desirable Median)
    c. Alternative 3: Four Lane / TWLTL
    d. Alternative 4A & 4B: One-Way Couplets

Workbooks: Each member of the PAG received a handout to add to their workbook. The handout included the following information:

1. Meeting Agenda
2. Meeting Minutes from Workshop #2
3. Printout of PPT Presentation for PAG Meeting #3

Summary of Discussion Items

Action Items

The PAG members were divided into teams for the Workshop #3 exercises upon arrival.

Group #1 (Facilitator: Mary Beth Pettit & Shana Mogensen)

Griff Westerman	Robert W. Steinweg
Mike Obois	Bill Pettit
Romy Snyder	Gregg Borucki

Group #2 (Facilitators: Mark Lenters & Julie Chapman)

Doran Carrell	Nick Laskaris
Adam Makowski	

Group #3 (Facilitators: Andre Ost & Scott Cramer)

Kay Mackesey	Stephen Muchow
Chris Tollaksen	Cathy Bleser
Tom Dorner	Mark Nykaza
Gene Dalhoff	

Session #1: PPT Presentation

- A Microsoft PPT presentation was given by the design team that included the following items:
  1. Review of NEPA Process and the value prioritization determined from Workshop #2.
  2. Review of crash history along the project corridor and the roadway classification associated with it.
  3. Introduction to Access Management & Strategies for Design
     - Reduce the number of conflict points
     - Proper allocation of driveways
     - Eliminate driveways near intersections
     - Separating conflict points for all users
     - Proper driveway spacing
     - Relocate driveways to side street or backage road
     - Consolidate driveways for adjacent properties
     - Promote cross access between adjacent properties

Session #2: Review of Design Alternatives

Session #2 reviewed the alternatives that were studied. Two alternatives were dismissed by the design team:

- 2NB/1SB lanes on US 12 & 1NB/2SB lanes on Clara Avenue
  Reasons for dismissal:
  - The existing US 12 corridor cannot accommodate the SB travel demand with a single southbound lane. Given that traffic along the roadway is primarily traveling to destinations along the route, it is not logical to assume diversion will occur to provide for an acceptable level of service.
  - WisDOT will not fund and maintain two adjacent bidirectional roadways.
- 2NB lanes on US 12 & 1 NB/2SB lanes on Clara Avenue

Reasons for dismissal:

- US12 needs to accommodate traffic traveling in the north and south direction. This configuration would require both roadways to be signed as US 12: the existing corridor in the north direction and Clara Avenue in the southbound direction. This would result in 3 NB lanes and 2 SB lanes being signed as US 12 and would provide additional northbound capacity not required for the highway.
- Clara Avenue would serve as a bypass to the existing corridor which is currently accommodated by I-94.
- The alternative would be challenging to sign and difficult for visitors to follow.

Five alternatives were shown to the PAG that were designed based on access management principles that were outlined in the PPT presentation in Session #1. These alternatives include:

- Alternate 1: 4-Lane Undivided
- Alternate 2: 4-Lane Divided
- Alternate 3: 4-Lane with Two-Way-Left-Turn-Lane (TWLTL)
- Alternate 4A: One Way Couplet
  - North Connection located just south of Mt. Olympus
- Alternate 4B: One Way Couplet
  - North Connection located at CTH A

Design team to draw Alternate 4C.

Several PAG members asked for the design team to include another alternative that extends the one way couplet north connection to STH 13. This alternative will be drawn as Alternate 4C and presented at the public information meeting in January.

Comments from PAG members were recorded by the design team and are summarized below by group.

- Group #1:
  - Alternate 1 (Undivided) – The group members had mixed responses to this alternative identify the primary concern of access being shifted to side roads and backage roads vs. the main corridor. Members did feel that this alternative access was generally preferable to one-way concepts due to the fact that visitors continue to pass by properties from both directions.
  - Alternative 1 & Alternative 3 would require a different strategy to signing than the DOT currently allows in the public right-of-way. Without additional signing to indicate to visitors where access points are, these alternatives may not be acceptable.
  - Alternative 2 (Divided) is difficult to assess due to the fact that impacts along the roadway could result in significant impacts to parking and right-of-way, the group would be interested in more details on this alternative.
  - There is some concern that the backage roads shown in alternative #1 & #3 will be able to effectively handle the traffic circulation.
  - There is a general concern about promoting u-turns on this roadway,

attendees have concerns about the safety of this movement at various locations.

- Major traffic congestion created by major destinations (Mt. Olympus, Noah's Arc) need to be addressed differently than the primary aspects of the rest of the corridor.

- Group #2:
  - Alternate 2 (Divided) is gaining popularity due to its ability to provide refuge for crossing pedestrians, its aesthetic appeal, and its ability to restrict pedestrians from crossing at certain locations with the use of planters and decorative fencing.
  - Strategically placed u-turn opportunities and roundabouts at intersections would help vehicles access businesses that would be restricted by the median in Alternate 2 (Divided).
  - Both Noah's Ark and Mt. Olympus agree that in order to make for a safer corridor, their access needs to be removed from US 12 and relocated to Lake Avenue and CTH A respectively.
  - Both stakeholders felt that Alternate 3 (TWLTL) did not meet the purpose and need due to the highest amount of conflict points of all the shown alternatives and its nonrestrictive layout where pedestrians could still cross where they please throughout the corridor.
  - Both stakeholders preferred two-way traffic with limited access over one-way traffic with easy access. They felt that most businesses live by the traffic exposure.
  - Alternate 4A was not liked by all due to the design being half divided and half one way. They felt that motorists would become confused with a hybrid alternate such as this one. All members wanted to see another option that connected the one way couplet to STH 13.

  - Stakeholders felt that providing better guidance signing would improve the aesthetics of the corridor by eliminating the need for billboards and increase way-finding.
  - Mt. Olympus would like to see an internal roadway network as part of their development aspirations regardless of which alternative is chosen.

- Group #3:
  - Cathy Bleser was concerned with the environmental impacts for the one way pair at the south connection. NHI mapping data shows areas to be of interest in terms of vegetation and habitat that would be potentially impacted with the various options shown for the south connection. She

Design team to provide Cathy Bleser with shape files for the one-way pair alternates in order to evaluate its environmental impacts.

felt that connecting the SB traffic at Newsom Rd would be better in avoiding these environmental areas. She was also concerned about protecting Hulbert Creek at the north end of the project.

- Stephen Muchow was concerned with the additional maintenance for snow plowing for the one-way pairs. Chris Tollaksen was also concerned with the additional maintenance and plowing for the City with the addition of the public streets.
- Kay Mackesey was concerned with how the lighting was going to be addressed with each alternative. Lighting could be a cost share agreement between DOT and local municipalities. It will be up to Alliant Energies if the cables will remain aerial or if they would be buried. This coordination will take place after the alternative is determined.
- Chris Tollaksen thought that moving the McDonalds driveway and eliminating their left turn out may be a difficult fight, but agreed that the existing median opening was a safety concern.
- Tom Dorner was concerned with the location of the pedestrian crossings and if more crossings were going to be added at mid-block locations. He was informed that the design team would be analyzing the HAWK signals next summer to get a better understanding of pedestrian usage. Adjustments would then be made to each alternative according to the findings.

Session #3:

Session #3 was designed to inform the PAG of the upcoming events:

- Public Information Meeting #2 – January 22, 2013
- PAG Workshop #4: Evaluation of Alternatives – Spring 2013

Meeting Wrap Up:

Mary Beth asked if any PAG members would like to provide feedback on the public involvement process to date on the project or the alternatives being considered. The following comments were made:

- Robert Steinweg emphasized the importance of maintaining access to existing businesses along the Wisconsin Dells Parkway as part of the proposed improvement. He mentioned that many other areas that are important tourist destinations have been through the reconstruction process with success for the business community.
- Nick Laskaris indicated that he is also in favor of an option that allows bi-directional traffic on the existing corridor as he feels it represents the best option to meet all of the values and objectives defined for the project.

Next Steps: PAG Workshop #4

- Mary Beth indicated that Workshop #4 is intended to focus on the following concepts:
  - Evaluating each alternative on access/business impacts using the evaluation tools and available information.

Summary of Action Items:

GRAEF (Consultant Team)

1) *The Public Information Meeting is set for Tuesday, January 22nd from 4-7pm.*
2) *Design team to draw Alternate 4C: One way pair with north connection at STH 13*
3) *Design team to provide Cathy Bleser with shape files for the one-way pair alternates.*

PAG Members

1) *The Public Information Meeting is set for Tuesday, January 22nd from 4-7pm*
2) *Cathy Bleser to inform design team of her findings in regards to the environmental impacts of the one way pair alternatives.*

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

L:\Jobs2011\20110212\Project_Information\Public Involvement\Public Advisory Group\2012-1212 - Public Advisiory Group #3\2012_1212_US12_WDP_PAGWorkshop#3_MtgMinutes_FINAL.doc