

## Lamers, Brandon - DOT

---

**From:** Berens, Jeff - DOT  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 24, 2019 11:33 AM  
**To:** Matt Schuenke  
**Cc:** Grimes, Jennifer - DOT; Brown, Joel R - DOT; Petersen, Joan; DOT DTSD US 51 Stoughton to McFarland EA; Brad Czebotar; Jim Hessling; 'brian@tcengineers.net'; Lamers, Brandon - DOT  
**Subject:** RE: 5845-06-03 US 51 Stoughton to McFarland Corridor Study - Village of McFarland  
**Attachments:** US 51 - Village of McFarland 20190924.pdf

Matt,

Attached are responses to the bulleted questions posed in the email below. Once you've had a chance to review the responses we can setup a meeting(s) to discuss these issues/concerns in more detail. WisDOT looks forward to working with the village of McFarland as the study continues. As for your question regarding the public comment period, the public comment period after a public meeting is typically 30 days, however WisDOT will accept comments at any time during the study. Thank you.

Jeff Berens, P.E.  
Major Studies Project Manager  
WisDOT SW Region - Madison Office  
(608) 245-2656

---

**From:** Matt Schuenke <Matt.Schuenke@mcfarland.wi.us>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 09, 2019 11:08 AM  
**To:** Berens, Jeff - DOT <Jeff.Berens@dot.wi.gov>  
**Cc:** Grimes, Jennifer - DOT <Jennifer.Grimes@dot.wi.gov>; Brown, Joel R - DOT <Joel.Brown@dot.wi.gov>; Petersen, Joan <Joan.Petersen@strand.com>; DOT DTSD US 51 Stoughton to McFarland EA <DOTDTSDUS51StoughtontoMcFarlandEA@dot.wi.gov>; Brad Czebotar <Brad.Czebotar@mcfarland.wi.us>; Jim Hessling <Jim.Hessling@mcfarland.wi.us>; 'brian@tcengineers.net' <brian@tcengineers.net>  
**Subject:** RE: 5845-06-03 US 51 Stoughton to McFarland Corridor Study - Village of McFarland

Jeff,

Thank you for hosting the recent meetings. Having not been part of this before, it was helpful to see what previous progress had been made and what next steps are planned. We look forward to the public comment period coming up next month. When will this be confirmed?

That being said, as Staff representing the interests of the Village of McFarland we have several concerns that we want to see are accounted for in some fashion in the Environmental Assessment. I realize some of these issues require far more detail to resolve than can be determined at this time. However, it is imperative the Environmental Assessment include these issues to some extent in order for them to be considered as part of the final design. This is a summary of the issues we've raised internally thus far, some of which are things I wrote on the plans when the meeting was held. I apologize for the length but again, it's a large project and at the outset wanted to make sure we could put down everything we were thinking.

- Will a State/Municipal Agreement be required? If so, what will the proposed terms be? To what extent do the costs cover the work that is planned (i.e. – cost sharing)?

- Are there allowances as to what used to be called Community Sensitive Solutions? This would have been a program that formerly provided funds on a small percentage basis to the locals for streetscaping and/or related amenities.
- Outside of this project but on the same highway and as part of a different study, the Village would like to see additional turn lanes added on Terminal Drive and US 51. This would be a second left hand turn lane for traffic turning left off of Terminal in order to head north on US 51. I realize this is probably just a confirmation that you'll include the note in that study and understand its not necessarily inclusive in this study.
- The ingress and egress from the Highway onto Siggelkow will be a significant local discussion. We will need to discuss more the alternatives for traffic flow beyond just roundabouts. There are a lot of vehicles, large vehicles, coming through there at pretty decent numbers. I understand there are multiple options here and want to make sure all are on the table within the EA going forward.
- Siggelkow was repaved and in some areas reconstructed underneath the highway in 2018. This should have been the fiscal responsibility of WisDOT but it declined. This will need to be accounted for with the cost sharing for this project based on the funds we expended for WisDOT's responsibility.
- We are going to want to discuss potential pedestrian enhancements at certain key crossings within this corridor. Areas where we have had issues that have no treatments presently. We would want to make sure all options remain available in this discussion to maximize the ability to create safe crossings.
- Can you confirm to what level this project is being planned for? My understanding is that it is a complete urban reconstruction that would require sidewalks on both sides of the street including the complete removal and replacement of existing pavement.
- Sidewalks are going to be necessary for this project both from the standpoint of pedestrian relief created by the congestion of the highway and possibly as you said for bicycles given the constraints about painting the bike lanes on the road. But as I understand it there is a new policy about not paying for sidewalks. The Village is not agreeable to this as you might imagine and will require more discussion on this point.
- I also don't understand why you can't paint bike lanes on the road. I understand the condemnation powers lost but if you are not condemning for anything, not sure how that relates.
- To what extent has stormwater management been included in the planning thus far? What sorts of plans are in place for the highway to collect and convey its own stormwater? Any consideration for treatment?
- We would need to evaluate McFarland Utilities in the area. We have mostly crossings but would want to see what if any work is needed in association or in advance of this project. Also, MMSD should be consulted as they have a main line in the State right of way running from about Yahara Drive to the north project limits.
- The Village remains opposed to the current speed. This was brought to the attention to WisDOT a few years ago which lead to a meeting but no formal action to address it. This plan and project should better regulate speed through the Village.
- At some point we will want to discuss medians and how they interact with this project as well as what they are constructed with. I see them planned as grass now but would want to consider as hardscape as well through the EA.
- Street lighting would need to be considered as well. We began a designed concept on Farwell through that project last year and would likely want to continue that. We understand that could be cost shared but want to make sure it is also consistent through the corridor.
- Any thoughts yet on detours and/or constructing staging?
- We will need to talk further about access to Yahara Drive being limited through this project. We are not agreeable to limiting this access as its shown here.
- We talked a little bit about the bridge over the Yahara River. I would like to see more detail as its available on what is planned with this replacement. I know the County Parks has been consulted and again concur the opening needs to be wider to better regulate flow.

- I mentioned also that Farwell was repaved significantly in 2018 and was paid for by the Village. We would want to limit the impact on this work given what went into that project since its shown in the plans going deeper into the block than we were anticipating.
- At some point we should discuss the large retaining wall on Highway 51 across from Babcock Park. Also discuss new retaining walls that might be proposed (I think one was mentioned).

Are we able to setup a regular schedule for meetings going forward? If you are planning to complete this Environmental Assessment within the next year, it would seem to me we should be meeting more frequently to confer on these issues. Look forward to hearing back from you, let us know if you have any questions.

Thanks,  
Matt

---

**From:** Berens, Jeff - DOT <[Jeff.Berens@dot.wi.gov](mailto:Jeff.Berens@dot.wi.gov)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, July 31, 2019 11:18 AM

**To:** Brad Czebotar <[Brad.Czebotar@mcfarland.wi.us](mailto:Brad.Czebotar@mcfarland.wi.us)>

**Cc:** Matt Schuenke <[Matt.Schuenke@mcfarland.wi.us](mailto:Matt.Schuenke@mcfarland.wi.us)>; Grimes, Jennifer - DOT <[Jennifer.Grimes@dot.wi.gov](mailto:Jennifer.Grimes@dot.wi.gov)>; Brown, Joel R - DOT <[Joel.Brown@dot.wi.gov](mailto:Joel.Brown@dot.wi.gov)>; Petersen, Joan <[Joan.Petersen@strand.com](mailto:Joan.Petersen@strand.com)>; DOT DTSD US 51 Stoughton to McFarland EA <[DOTDTSDUS51StoughtonttoMcFarlandEA@dot.wi.gov](mailto:DOTDTSDUS51StoughtonttoMcFarlandEA@dot.wi.gov)>

**Subject:** 5845-06-03 US 51 Stoughton to McFarland Corridor Study - Village of McFarland

Mr. Czebotar,

The attached letter is to inform you that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) have recently resumed the US 51 Stoughton to McFarland corridor study after an approximate 3-year hiatus. We look forward to working with you as the study moves forward.

Sincerely,

Jeff Berens, P.E.  
Major Studies Project Manager  
WisDOT SW Region - Madison Office  
(608) 245-2656

## Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by **Mimecast Ltd**, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a **safer** and **more useful** place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more [Click Here](#).

Village of McFarland Comments  
Received September 9, 2019

- 1) Will a State/Municipal Agreement be required? If so, what will the proposed terms be? To what extent do the costs cover the work that is planned (i.e. – cost sharing)?

A State Municipal Financial Agreement (SMFA) may be required as part of a future project, depending on what items included in the project need to be funded in whole or part by the Village. This could include items such as sidewalk, municipality owned utilities, and continuous lighting. Preparation of a SMFA would be completed after the study/planning phase of the project.

Items requiring cost participation will be discussed with the municipality, and a signed agreement in place, before being added to projects.

- 2) Are there allowances as to what used to be called Community Sensitive Solutions? This would have been a program that formerly provided funds on a small percentage basis to the locals for streetscaping and/or related amenities.

No, there are no allowances available for Community Sensitive Solutions.

BACKGROUND: The adoption of 2015 Wisconsin Act 55 (referred to herein as Act 55) eliminated state funding for community sensitive solutions, which were aesthetic and community elements that were included in projects to promote local acceptance. Specifically, s. 85.0205(1m), Wis. Stats., prevents the use of improvement funds on elements of a highway improvement project that are determined to be primarily related to the aesthetic preferences of communities adjacent to the improvement project. These aesthetic preferences are sometimes referred to as community sensitive solutions (CSS) or community sensitive design (CSD).

- 3) Outside of this project but on the same highway and as part of a different study, the Village would like to see additional turn lanes added on Terminal Drive and US 51. This would be a second left hand turn lane for traffic turning left off of Terminal in order to head north on US 51. I realize this is probably just a confirmation that you'll include the note in that study and understand its not necessarily inclusive in this study.

The Village's request to add additional turn lanes at the US 51/Terminal Drive intersection will be forwarded on to the US 51 Stoughton Road study team.

- 4) The ingress and egress from the Highway onto Siggelkow will be a significant local discussion. We will need to discuss more the alternatives for traffic flow beyond just roundabouts. There are a lot of vehicles, large vehicles, coming through there at pretty decent numbers. I understand there are multiple options here and want to make sure all are on the table within the EA going forward.

As you mentioned, a specific type of intersection control for the Siggelkow ramp terminals has not been identified. WisDOT values any input the Village may have regarding the options in this area and looks forward to discussing those options in more detail.

- 5) Siggelkow was repaved and in some areas reconstructed underneath the highway in 2018. This should have been the fiscal responsibility of WisDOT but it declined. This will need to be accounted for with the cost sharing for this project based on the funds we expended for WisDOT's responsibility.

The WisDOT Highway Maintenance Manual, Chapter 2, Section 15 (Maintenance at Interchanges), states that when the department initiates an improvement project which includes that portion of the local road between ramp termini at an interchange, the responsibility for financing, designing, and constructing the entire project rests with the state. When a local unit of government initiates such a project, similar responsibilities for that portion of the roadway between ramp termini will generally be borne by that unit of government, subject to overall review by the state to insure continued operational efficiency at the interchange.

- 6) We are going to want to discuss potential pedestrian enhancements at certain key crossings within this corridor. Areas where we have had issues that have no treatments presently. We would want to make sure all options remain available in this discussion to maximize the ability to create safe crossings.

WisDOT looks forward to discussing any potential pedestrian enhancement requests the Village may have.

- 7) Can you confirm to what level this project is being planned for? My understanding is that it is a complete urban reconstruction that would require sidewalks on both sides of the street including the complete removal and replacement of existing pavement.

During the study phase, the project will be designed to around 30 percent to complete the environmental document. The design includes a full urban reconstruction and sidewalks are proposed on the west side of US 51 from Exchange Street to Larson Beach Road and on the east side of US 51 from Babcock Park to Larson Beach Road. Sidewalk is not required as part of the reconstruction of the roadway.

- 8) Sidewalks are going to be necessary for this project both from the standpoint of pedestrian relief created by the congestion of the highway and possibly as you said for bicycles given the constraints about painting the bike lanes on the road. But as I understand it there is a new policy about not paying for sidewalks. The Village is not agreeable to this as you might imagine and will require more discussion on this point.

WisDOT's current policy is that in areas where sidewalk does not currently exist the municipality will pay 100% of the cost for installation.

- 9) I also don't understand why you can't paint bike lanes on the road. I understand the condemnation powers lost but if you are not condemning for anything, not sure how that relates.

After the passage of Act 59, bike lanes were removed through the urban area of McFarland and the proposed cross-section was reduced accordingly. The bike lanes were removed because including them in the cross section increased the amount of right-of-way needed along US 51 in the area. WisDOT is currently in the environmental (NEPA) process for the project. The Uniform Relocation Act does not allow WisDOT to start the Real Estate process of acquiring property prior to the completion of the NEPA process. Based on this, WisDOT policy is to not include bike lanes or multi-use paths where their installation would require right-of-way.

- 10) To what extent has stormwater management been included in the planning thus far? What sorts of plans are in place for the highway to collect and convey its own stormwater? Any consideration for treatment?

The project will only be designed to 30 percent to complete the environmental document. There has been no stormwater management design completed at this stage. During final design, the reconstruction will meet applicable state regulations and post construction stormwater management requirements in developing stormwater and drainage design. Stormwater drainage standards that are outlined in the FDM will be followed as roadway design advances. The project will also review any existing flooding or drainage concerns within the roadway corridor.

- 11) We would need to evaluate McFarland Utilities in the area. We have mostly crossings but would want to see what if any work is needed in association or in advance of this project. Also, MMSD should be consulted as they have a main line in the State right of way running from about Yahara Drive to the north project limits.

WisDOT would coordinate with the Village to attempt to incorporate any utility work needed into the construction project. MMSD will be contacted.

- 12) The Village remains opposed to the current speed. This was brought to the attention to WisDOT a few years ago which lead to a meeting but no formal action to address it. This plan and project should better regulate speed through the Village.

The speed limit would not be changed as part of the construction process. The Village can request a speed study in the area after construction is completed. The results of the speed study would dictate whether or not the speed limit is changed.

- 13) At some point we will want to discuss medians and how they interact with this project as well as what they are constructed with. I see them planned as grass now but would want to consider as hardscape as well through the EA.

The medians shown on the public meeting exhibits are colored green, but there is currently no planned treatment. Typically, during final design WisDOT will work with the local municipalities to determine the best treatment in the medians.

- 14) Street lighting would need to be considered as well. We began a designed concept on Farwell through that project last year and would likely want to continue that. We understand that could be cost shared but want to make sure it is also consistent through the corridor.

Typically, street lighting will be discussed with the local municipalities during final design.

- 15) Any thoughts yet on detours and/or constructing staging?

The project would most likely be constructed using staging in the village of McFarland. There are areas along US 51 that could be constructed under detour. This would be determined later in the design process.

- 16) We will need to talk further about access to Yahara Drive being limited through this project. We are not agreeable to limiting this access as its shown here.

WisDOT looks forward to discussing the Alternative H design with the Village. The right in/right out access is shown for access management purposes and to improve safety. There are alternative routes to access US 51 at Burma Road for residents.

- 17) We talked a little bit about the bridge over the Yahara River. I would like to see more detail as its available on what is planned with this replacement. I know the County Parks has been consulted and again concur the opening needs to be wider to better regulate flow.

The current structure is 63 feet long and the replacement will match the existing dam opening. At this point WisDOT could provide a planning level plan/profile sheet, however bridge details would not be designed until after the study is completed.

- 18) I mentioned also that Farwell was repaved significantly in 2018 and was paid for by the Village. We would want to limit the impact on this work given what went into that project since its shown in the plans going deeper into the block than we were anticipating.

The limits on Farwell Street are dictated by the WisDOT Facility Development Manual (FDM). There are two proposed left turn lanes from southbound US 51 onto Farwell Street. There is a required tangent length before these lanes can merge together. The current limits shown meet the FDM guidance for merging these two left turn lanes into the existing lane on Farwell Street.

- 19) At some point we should discuss the large retaining wall on Highway 51 across from Babcock Park. Also discuss new retaining walls that might be proposed (I think one was mentioned).

There are numerous retaining walls in Babcock Park. There is also a retaining wall between the Yahara River and Yahara Drive on the east side of the roadway. There are no proposed improvements to the large retaining wall on the east side of US 51 between Yahara Drive and Burma Road.