

## Meeting Summary

### Waukesha West Bypass Advisory Group

#### Workshop 2

Retzer Nature Center,  
May 6, 2010  
4:00 pm to 6:00 pm

#### **General**

The second Advisory Group workshop for the Waukesha Bypass was held on Thursday, May 6, 2010 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 15 members of the Advisory Group and 8 members of the community at-large were present at the meeting. The Daily Reporter was also present.

#### **Advisory Group Members Present at the Meeting**

|               |                 |                |
|---------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Joe Banske    | Perry Lindquist | Dale Pfeiffle  |
| Paul Day      | Bruce Massman   | Steve Schmuki  |
| Jerry Gutjahr | Mike Murphy     | Megan Spreager |
| Chris Hiebert | Jeff Panosian   | Mark Stigler   |
| Bob Johnson   | Carlos Pena     | Jim White      |

#### **Advisory Group Members Not Present at the Meeting**

|                 |                  |               |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------|
| Suzanne Kelly   | Jennifer Becker  | Ken Westlake  |
| David Bahl, Jr. | Maureen Millmann | Bob Tallinger |

#### **Technical Resources Present at the Meeting**

Waukesha County – Gary Evans, Allison Bussler  
WisDOT – Doug Cain  
CH2M HILL – Buddy Desai, Charlie Webb, Brad Heimlich, Dave Rodebaugh  
Kapur – Kurt Farrenkopf

#### **Meeting Agenda**

- 4:00 Convene the Meeting
  - Welcome, introductory comments, introductions (Buddy Desai, CH2M HILL)
  - Agenda Review (Buddy Desai, CH2M HILL)
- 4:10 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Primer (Charlie Webb, CH2M HILL)
- 4:30 Recap of major issues related to the West Waukesha Bypass (Buddy Desai, CH2M HILL)
- 4:40 Rating of Key Project Issues (Buddy Desai, CH2M HILL)
- 5:30 Adjourn

#### **Materials Available at the Meeting**

Materials available for discussion at the meeting, in addition to the agenda, included a handout with the weighting exercise goals, exhibits that included the Advisory Group's statement of issues facing west Waukesha, ideas about future transportation in West Waukesha, and a list of summarized goals that resulted from Workshop #1 exercises.

## Introductions

The meeting was convened by Buddy Desai, CH2M HILL. Buddy welcomed the group and introduced the consultant team and county staff. Once introductions were complete, Buddy thanked the Advisory Group members for participating in the meeting and committing to be involved in the upcoming Advisory Group meetings.

## National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Primer

Charlie Webb, Consultant Project Manager, CH2M HILL, gave a PowerPoint presentation about NEPA. The NEPA Primer was used to provide more information to the Advisory Group about the federal law governing environmental review of projects that utilize federal funds.

Comments and Questions:

*Question:* Jim White asked how the environmental impact statement schedule mesh with the CSS schedule?

*Response:* Charlie Webb responded that the CSS schedule and the EIS schedule share similar milestone dates. The CSS work will be used to prepare the purpose and need statement and will also be used in the development and initial screening of the range of alternatives.

*Question:* Jim White asked if copies of the draft EIS would be provided to the Advisory Group?

*Response:* Buddy noted that a copy of the draft EIS could be made available electronically to the Advisory Group and will be posted to the project's web site.

## Recap of Workshop #1

Buddy provided a recap of Workshop #1. Buddy presented an exhibit listing the transportation issues facing west Waukesha as provided by the Advisory Group, including:

- Congestion
- Accommodate growth
- Safety – Sunset/St. Paul
- Safety – Bike/Pedestrian
- No useful road connections
- Speed
- Outdated geometrics (sharp curves/steep curves)
- Traffic control
- Access control/driveways

Buddy also presented an exhibit listing what the Advisory Group stated they would like to see as part of any future transportation improvements in west Waukesha, including:

- Protect conservancy
- Bike/pedestrian accommodations
- Enhance environmental corridor
- Lighting – safety, light pollution, aesthetics
- Mobility
- Access
- Sound abatement
- Safety/speed
- Limit agricultural impacts
- Address sharp curves and steep hills

Comments and Questions:

*Comment:* Joe Banske asked that the study team consider the Pebble Creek Management Plan during the environmental study and carefully consider the impacts of a road on groundwater in the area of Pebble Creek.

*Response:* Buddy indicated that the EIS team will certainly do so and consider all other available resource information also when gathering data and analyzing impacts.

## Weighting Exercise

### Individual Weighting

Buddy introduced the weighting exercise that would be used by the group to help determine the priorities of the projects goals the Advisory Group identified in Workshop #1. Each Advisory Group member was given a note card with the numbers 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 written on them. He asked the group to take about 5 minutes to review the various goals and then to assign a value of 1 to 5, five being the highest, to the goals. He noted that each number could only be used once. The goals were listed on the exhibit and in the meeting handout. The goals included:

- A. Accommodate bikes/pedestrians
- B. Protect the natural environment
- C. Address sharp curves and steep hills/safety/intersections
- D. Improve access and mobility
- E. Protect the human environment

Note cards were used to record the individual's priority rating. The total points assigned to each goal were tallied and presented to the Advisory Group. They were as follows:

|  |    |
|--|----|
| A. Accommodate bikes/pedestrians                             | 29 |
| B. Protect the natural environment                           | 54 |
| C. Address sharp curves and steep hills/safety/intersections | 57 |
| D. Improve access and mobility                               | 49 |
| E. Protect the human environment                             | 36 |

### Group Weighting

Buddy then asked the Advisory Group to break up into five groups of three members each. He then stated that in this exercise, the group would need to discuss the goals and develop a consensus ranking of the importance/weighting of each goal. Each group was given a note card with the numbers 1 through 5 written on them. Again, each group was asked to assign a number only once per goal. The results of the exercise were as follows:

|  |    |
|--|----|
| A. Accommodate bikes/pedestrians                             | 8  |
| B. Protect the natural environment                           | 20 |
| C. Address sharp curves and steep hills/safety/intersections | 17 |
| D. Improve access and mobility                               | 16 |
| E. Protect the human environment                             | 14 |

The purpose of the exercise was to help the County and the consultants identify which of the goals were of greatest importance and which were important, but may not carry as much weight. Buddy explained that the numerical weights were "means to an end" and not the "end" itself. The total number of points a goal received is less important than the fact that one or two goals are considerably more important than some others. In the end, the team will work towards achieving all of the goals noted.

Buddy added that the group exercise also brings to light the trade-offs that this, and every other project that has multiple goals and desires, must contend with. Some members of the Advisory Group noted that it was more challenging to develop a consensus on how to weight the goals. They acknowledged that while all of the goals are important, getting everyone to concur on the

rankings took considerable additional effort when working in a group than when they were simply providing a personal weighting of the goals.

Buddy finished by explaining that the weighting of the goals is also important in decision-making when an alternative might impact two goals that the Advisory Group had identified. As an example he noted that if including wide sidewalks and/or adding a bike lane at a certain location would result in impacts to a wetland, the weighting provided by the Advisory Group would help provide direction on which goal to accommodate.

## **Purpose and Need**

Dave Rodebaugh provided an overview of the data that had been gathered by the study team related to crashes, traffic forecasts and existing roadway deficiencies.. Crash data indicates that the crash rate on County TT south of Summit Avenue is above the statewide average for county trunk highways. The crash rate on Sunset Drive between County T and County X is also above the statewide average for county trunk highways.

The traffic forecast for the year 2035, provided by SEWRPC, estimates that traffic volumes on County TT would range from 13,000 vehicles per day near Sunset Drive to 20,000 vehicles per day near I-94. In general, Waukesha County and WisDOT consider widening to four lanes when traffic volumes approach 13,000-14,000 vehicles per day.

Design deficiencies such as sharp turns or steep hills are common on County TT south of Summit Avenue. Travel lanes are narrower (10 to 11 feet wide) and there are little to no shoulders on County TT south of Summit Avenue. North of Summit Avenue, there are few design deficiencies on County TT.

A question was raised by Jeff Panosian about how the traffic forecasts were developed. Chris Hiebert, SEWRPC and a member of the Advisory Group, provided an overview of how they are developed.

## **Adjournment**

Buddy concluded the meeting by noting that the first public meeting will be on May 18<sup>th</sup> at Waukesha West High School and that workshop #3 would be in mid to late June. He added that information about the meeting and the date of the meeting will be forwarded, via newsletter and newspaper ads as well as the web site, in the near future.