

**MEETING MINUTES**

Meeting Location: City of Beaver Dam,  
Municipal Building, Council  
Chambers

Project No.: 45-0314.00

Date/Time: July 18, 2016, 2:00pm – 4:00pm

Re: Local Officials Meeting #4

Attendees: See sign-in sheet

Project I.D. 1110-00-09  
USH 151 Freeway Conversion Study  
Columbus to Waupun  
Dodge County

Notes By: Dan Schrum

**I. Overview**

The Local Officials Meeting was held on Monday, July 18, 2016 at the City of Beaver Dam Municipal Building with project exhibits on display for officials to review. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce the Recommended Alternative that has been developed and to discuss this prior to holding the next public involvement meeting. A PowerPoint presentation was given at 2:15 pm. A print out of the presentation and a two-page FAQ were distributed along with comment forms. The presentation also gave a recap of the project purpose and need and the study's progress made since the last set of public meetings in 2014. See the sign-in sheet for a list of attendees. Individuals attending from the project study team included:

Ayres Associates

Matt Barr – Project Manager  
Dan Schrum – Design Engineer

TranSmart Technologies

Charles Wade – Planner

WisDOT

Mark Westerveld – WisDOT Project Manager  
Brandon Lamers – WisDOT Supervisor  
Colleen Hoesly – WisDOT Planner

**II. Presentation**

Mark Westerveld from the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) welcomed everyone to the meeting. Mark provided some background about the project and introduced presenters Matt Barr and Dan Schrum from Ayres Associates along with Chuck Wade from TranSmart. After introductions were completed, Matt began the presentation. The presentation lasted approximately 20 minutes and was split between Matt, Dan and Chuck (see slides for the presentation). The agenda of the presentation was as follows:

- Project Overview
- Review purpose and need of study
- Discuss official “mapping” process
- Discuss stakeholder concerns to date
- Summarize impacts of freeway conversion
- Discuss alternatives carried forward and the Recommended Alternative
- Gather input

### **III. Questions and Answers**

The meeting was then opened up to questions and a variety of topics were discussed as noted below.

1. Q: Will there be any acquisitions as part of the project?

A: There is no funding for the project. It is a planning study for mapping purposes. Once a map is prepared, WisDOT has the opportunity to review any improvements (60 days) property owners propose for their property to determine if they will purchase the area mapped or take no action. If no action, the improvement would be acquired as part of a future construction project.

2. Q: Is there a standard format for frontage roads? Do they become local, county, or state roads for maintenance and repair?

A: Frontage roads would tend to become local roads under the town jurisdiction. Ramps and state highway changes would remain under WisDOT and county highways would stay with the county. The final details would be determined prior to construction as part of maintenance agreements with the respective local authority. The town would have access control authority for new roads that would fall under their jurisdiction.

3. Q: Would new overpasses become the responsibility of the locals as well?

A: Similar to grade separated structures associated with other freeways on the DOT system, overpasses of US 151 would be maintained by the DOT.

4. Q: Do the locals take control of the corridor once the official map is created? (this question seems to be asking about mapped areas on private lands).

A: 84.295(10) results in an official map that identifies where future right-of-way is needed. Each property owner is notified and the maps are tied to property owner deeds. No action occurs unless (1) the property owner proposes to construct something within the identified area, or (2) A project is identified, funded and begins design/construction.

### **IV. One-on-One Discussions**

Some other discussions occurred during the open house sessions that were not part of the formal question and answer period.

#### **Mark Westerveld's Discussions**

Mark had a phone conversation with Dick Flynn (City of Waupun). They discussed the remaining access points between WIS 26 and WIS 49. They talked about the existing and future snowmobile crossings in the Waupun area and if our conversion will accommodate them. Dick said the reconstruction of the structures at WIS 49 in 2021 are supposed to address snowmobile, pedestrian and bicycle traffic. He asked that we make a commitment in our

environmental document to accommodate snowmobile crossings at WIS 49 and near the Wisconsin and Southern RR crossing. They also discussed the half diamond interchange at County M and the extension of COUNTY M to Oakwood Road.

Mark spoke with Tom Stobbins of Calamus Township. They discussed the preferred alternative in the County DE area and the impacts it will have relative to our other alternatives.

Mark spoke with Jeff Caine and Jeff Berres of Dodge County. They discussed the 84.295 process and the increasing volume of traffic along US 151.

### Matt Barr's Discussions

Brian Field, County Commissioner – He didn't have much to say about the concepts other than he agreed with the proposed interchange at County C.

Representative from Town of Chester (maybe Ron Hull?) – He said the NB off ramp at the STH 26 interchange seems too short. Seems like you have to make an abrupt stop at the end of that ramp before stopping. I told him this was reconstructed back in the mid 1990's when the road was converted to 4 lanes and maybe the standards were a little different at that time. He also asked if the access roads to the Hofman and Vesper properties off County M east of US 151 could be shifted closer to County M. They currently show a fair amount of impacts to farmland that the Town is trying to preserve. I mentioned we will work with property owners on the final locations of these but we can't get too close to County M otherwise the curves would get too sharp. We are also trying to maintain the 1,000' minimum distance between the ramp terminals and where an access ties into County M. He said he is glad to see we eliminated the entrance to the Hofman property off County M west of US 151 that cut through the Derksen property and impacted farmland on the Hofman property. I pointed out the access has been shifted to be closer to County M which was shown on the display, but it would affect less land than the previous concept. Colleen said the DOT met with Mr. Hofman to develop the location shown on the display. I also told him County M would connect into Oakwood Road which wasn't shown on the display. He mentioned that he thinks the Rens property off County C was sold a couple months ago.

### Dan Schrum's Discussions

Dan spoke with two gentlemen about the interchange at County S and ag access south of this interchange location. The two voiced their concern over the amount of traffic that currently crosses US 151 and with the location of the proposed interchange; they will have to go out of their way to cross US 151 in the future. The gentlemen voiced their opinion to consider an overpass from Bethel Road to Moriah Road across US 151. Dan mentioned the proximity of WIS 73 and the proposed County S interchange and the frontage road system connecting the two. An overpass would result in more agriculture right-of-way purchase and potential relocations.

Dan spoke with a gentleman about Cromheecke's landlocked parcels between County W and WIS 33 in Beaver Dam. Dan mentioned that Mark W. has had some discussions with this individual and access to his farm fields. Dan also mentioned that the Town of Beaver Dam has

some plans to develop this area and potentially add a connecting roadway between WIS 33 and County W east of US 151. There is concern over access to the parcels.

### Chuck Wade's Discussions

One gentleman said he would like to see a grade separated crossing of US 151 between Bethel Road and Moriah Road primarily for agricultural equipment accessing fields on both sides of US 151. The proposed frontage roads and interchanges between WIS 73 and County S are perceived to be too far away. Also discussed direct impacts to existing fields in the area to accommodate an overpass at this location.

### V. Written Comments

Comment sheets were also available at the meeting, which could be filled out or mailed to Ayres staff. No comment sheets were received.