

# September 1, 2009 Public Information Meeting Comments Summary of Property Owners and Concerned Citizens

I.D. 5843-00-01  
CTH V  
STH 113 – CTH J  
Columbia County

Please provide us with any comments on issues you feel may affect the project or your property.

## COMMENTS

- My husband and I at one point agreed to giving up our driveway near the bridge IF we had stairs going down to our parking lot. I did not see any stairs on the plan at the meeting and if this does not change we will NOT allow that drive way to be closed off. Let me know if that was an oversight on your part or what happened there. I checked with our attorney and he said we would not have to give it up unless we volunteered.

Also, I cannot believe that you are still considering rerouting Hwy V down Shamrock. Apparently you do NOT listen to what the citizens that live here are telling you! This is OFF the table as far as we are concerned. MOVE ON! You will not be rerouting so start planning on the roadwork you will need to do to maintain the footprint of V that you have to work with. You are wasting all of our time with that even being in the mix.

Finally, we want the bridge raised higher than 6". We live on the bay. Cigar boats can already get under the bridge, speedboats can already get under the bridge, the ones you keep out are some pontoons. I think this needs to be discussed more to educate the people that are opposed to a higher bridge. They obviously don't understand what is going on. Being in the bait shop we watch 7 days a week all day long. Most of the people around here are only here on weekends and after 5PM. We are open at 6 AM and our home is here so we see it ALL day long.

- I am not a resident of Wisconsin, but I am a tourist in Okee for most of the summer every year. We come to Okee because of it's Rural feel. My husband has commented on how we feel as if we have stepped back in time to a calmer simpler era when we are there.

I have heard that there may be sidewalks, curb and gutter installed in the near future. I am voicing my opinion on the matter as a tourist to the area and a family that spends a fair amount of money in the restaurants, that we would be very disappointed to see that happen. We feel that curb and gutter would completely change the entire feel of the atmosphere of the area.

The simple point is Okee is now a part of Americana, a bastion of family values, peace, and comfort. We love spending our summers there because we feel safe, and we are able to show our son a bit of the America we grew up in. It would be a shame to lose this solid American town to unnecessary "progress". We love Okee and our family celebrates it's beauty and rural feel. Please don't take that away

- As a property owner on Red Cedar Dr., I have been following the controversy surrounding the proposed widening and improvement of CTH V with great interest. My family and I frequently walk along the stretch of Highway V from Red Cedar Dr. to the Okee bridge and it is not an easy walk. We need to be extremely alert to approaching traffic, since there is no designated walkway or shoulder area in which to walk. In addition, quite often the traffic going through that area is proceeding at a speed which is brisk and obviously dangerous for pedestrians who are sharing the road with those vehicles. My family and I applaud the proposed improvements which would make the road safer for all, including pedestrians and bicyclists. Since this stretch of highway is heavily populated with lake homes and heavily used, it should be hospitable to pedestrians. We will continue to follow the planning progress for this project and we hope we will soon be seeing a safe environment for our walks in this area.
- Eric-this is just to say that I thought the presentation to the Town of Lodi interested parties on Sept. 1 at the Lodi Town Hall was very well done and informative.

I support what you are doing and hope that the County etc. do the right things for the Highway V changes, which may not always be the most popular.

Anyway it was a good meeting and I think you and your team are on the right track. Thank you.

- I agree completely for the need for walking, biking room, and the need for safety. I cannot imagine any good reason to reroute V so it doesn't cross 113, if safety issues can be addressed in other ways.

If Okee is not rural now and I don't think curb would destroy this aspect. We are a recreational community and should function as one.

- #1 the bridge going up 6" is a waste of time! #2 DO NOT change the footprint of Hwy V; #3 Cul de Sac Shamrock & Old Sauk; #4 We DO NOT need a bike path!! Bikers bring NO money to our area; #5 DO NOT match up or realign Old Sauk & Shamrock. Two totally different groups use each of the roads. So that is so not necessary; #6 We really, really need handicapped fishery/water access by the bridge!
- The 113 – V is a must – the rest of the project seems unnecessary and invasive.

Prefer closing Shamrock & Old Sauk. We don't know of anyone complaining about parking on their lawns on the Friday p.m. Good natural drainage.

We were told several years ago that the bridge needed to be replaced – we think it needs to be.

- About the four corners at via Richards Rd. There has been three accidents this year so far. Two were killed in one accident five years ago. We definitely need flashing stop signs on those corners.
- Cut down the Hwy. 113 hill between Shamrock and "V". Then retain the existing crossing between 113 and "V".

- We are concerned about our small motel building, which we have plans to renovate into our business offices. Also loss of property in total. We are also concerned about the increase in traffic and speed going past our property as we have four young children. The noise level is especially bad during weekends and the better road will surely increase that – motorcycles are especially bad. We are also concerned about losing our large trees along the road on our property.
- My comments here follow questions I still have. They cover aspects of your team's presentations where I was un-persuaded where indicators your people mentioned seemed to point to very different conclusions, compared with your extensive plans.

1. At the intersection on Ryan Road, with curved lanes and one stop sign facing south only, the traffic has one more alternative than what you propose. Without week-long logs in the months of September, January and April, the team's proposal can not be justified, since it removes one of the alternatives now provided. Accident rate? Essentially nil, you said. This is construction overkill. People need much more solid evidence than the team project uses, to show that this part answers a real need.
2. I will ask John Pickle how he concluded as he did in his June 19 letter about the IBN part of the project. We had no public vote of which I'm aware. The closing off of two ingress points to 113 is more overkill. What is the reason?
3. When you covered *IBN* "need" in your own presentation, you did not persuade us that at that place the accident rate was significant; in fact, you quote data over long years that said it was NOT. Your "need" of it being a poor roadbed was verified and significant.

Your discussion ... or someone's... about standing water on V was persuasive. (Therefore, raised beds for railroads.) That is the one need clearly established by your team.

4. In the meantime, if you cut off T Shamrock and Old Sauk into cul-de-sacs, what need have you filled? Certainly you would make it more difficult for emergency vehicles to:
  - a. find their way
  - b. move with speed

As they serve the real needs of taxpayers. This is of vital concern to us all.

5. A second need your team demonstrated was the visibility now reduced by a rise on 113 south of the V intersection.

If you will satisfy real needs and not cause more threats to the daily lives of taxpayers, I conclude this part of your project should DRAIN the westbound V roadbed where it approaches 113, and lower the road rise on 113 just south of that intersection: PERIOD.

6. Your team member who discussed curbs and gutters along County Rd. Y near the schoolhouse, made one fatal mistake here in our boat country: he said not one word about where the water collected by gutters would go. You propose to take away people's front yards, which in sand country means removing natural swale filtering surface that has been working for hundreds of years.

We have now some years of solid evidence that curb and gutter water emptied into the reservoir or the bay is carrying effluent that builds up "weeds," so as to effectively destroy the main advantage for water's edge human activity in our region.

All over Wisconsin's water bodies, the same evidence is recorded.

So, don't do that. One example nearby is Demyneck Road, where the water's edge weed problem is worse every year. I suggest you need a survey of residents with boats, to know what you ought to plan for any change in water absorption or control on Y east and west of the schoolhouse.

7. If the bridge is good for 25 more years, as your team claimed, can it be made stronger without widening it? We have already the maximum of traffic we could ever have on the bridge off Summerville and Y, without any congestion at all? What is the reason for the extensive plan on it? We need to hear your reason.
- I attended the meeting on Sept. 1st, with my husband, Jim Schommer. Your team did an outstanding job of presenting all of the options for re-doing V, through Okee. My own opinion is that, it is 40 years too late to keep Okee Rural. Now it is important to keep Okee and all of its population and visitors safe. Continue your capable work.
  - Another thing, it was talked about the expense of "lining up the intersection of Old Sauk and Shamrock". If both are cul-de-sac, (as the townships want), what would the purpose of that be? There are 2 totally different groups of people using each road then. It would be completely a waste of dollars.
  - There may be high water table near the Old Sauk/STH 113 intersection (1-2' below the ground in some places) per adjacent property owner.
  - There may be a planned residential development/subdivision across from the Old Sauk/STH 113 intersection.
  - There is a lot of biking in Okee and we look forward to having bike accommodations.
  - There should be a reference on your exhibits where the aerial photo and mapping came from (i.e reference source)
  - There are rumors the railroad may shutdown due to quarry closing/running out of material.
  - We support staying on CTH V (no Shamrock reroute). Going down Shamrock is illogical.
  - There is contamination in the soil or groundwater at the Okee Store (former tanks).
  - A couple residents (contractor types, one lives on the lake) indicated ice stacking and damage caused by wind driven 2' thick ice slabs. Frequency is in the neighborhood of once every 2 to 4 years and the height can get 6' to 8' high! Waves can even splash onto the roadway at times. Concern is for the grassy slope we show on the causeway and the sidewalk slab. The slope will get torn up by the ice, and they felt the slab would be jeopardized as well. One owner has trees tipped over by ice slabs.

- To run Cty. V down Shamrock Road to Hwy 113 is a major mistake that we would have to live with for a very long time. It is very unsafe to have to turn onto 113 and go a half a mile and again slow down to turn back onto Cty. V. I don't care how many turn lanes you put in, there will still be accidents with that scenario. There is a farmer that lives just west of V, that farms a lot of land east of Okee, he may go across 113 ten to fifteen times in one day, and tractors do not go fast. That alone would be a major hazard on 113, where as going directly across 113 is much less of a hazard. Going straight across 113 is the only sensible route. I can live with the curb and gutters and it seems that the best route would be to buy only one property and use that option A2.
- We own property in Okee north of the bend in the road. We were informed of the plan to include parking on both sides of Hwy V bringing the sidewalk within 8 feet of our home and 4 feet of our entry to our home. We feel this is a severe over-reaction to a parking needed on a few Friday evenings during the summer months. We have owned this property for 20 years and this is the only time cars are parked in this area.

It appears that the only reason for this costly and invasive plan for parking is due to two restaurants having inadequate parking on some evenings. If this is plan is implemented we would lose valuable trees that provide our home with shade and add to the natural scenery of the lakeside community. Furthermore, the need to move power lines within a few feet of homes imposing on properties and adding possible safety risks seems costly for the value.

Has the township considered parking solutions on other properties nearby? Have the possibilities of injuries due to inadequately cared for walks in the winter months been weighed and were the liability falls? Most folks on the lake are not utilizing the property in these months, and care for the walks would be difficult if not impossible for people.

We ask for reconsideration of this plan and let Okee remain a tranquil community. The proposal of creating one long parking lot in place of our quaint lake front community is disappointing and the effects of this plan would permanently change the relaxing character of Okee.

- Thank you for the presentation on the Hwy V project. I thought everyone did a nice job explaining the proposal and the reasons for the work.

I live in Okee and walk or bike the streets everyday. I support any effort that will make this community safer for residents and tourists, and would make it more bike and pedestrian friendly. There is a huge need for wider roadways and a safe area for fishermen, bikes, pedestrians and parking around the causeway. This would feel like more of a cohesive community and more welcoming tourist destination if we had better walking and biking connections to all the areas of Okee. To this end, I think closing off the intersection at 113 and V would be a mistake. Diverting traffic to Old Sauk or Shamrock roads would change two neighborhoods into high traffic areas. Improving these intersections at V, possibly closing them off at 113, and increasing the visibility at V would be a more neighbor and exercise friendly option.

- Options:

A1 & A2 – no comments on this proposal except to the offer that if the speed limit on STH 113 is lowered the hill becomes less of an issue. I believe the speed limit is too high along this section of road.

B1 – The modifications made to the entrance of Heron Springs are minor so no issues with this proposal and is without purchase of land. I am assuming that B1 is completed with C1 so that traffic is not increased along Shamrock and the drawing as I read it has a sidewalk along Shamrock. If these assumptions are incorrect please let me know.

B2 – It is more costly than B1 without any apparent advantages but causing issues by unnecessarily increasing traffic safety concerns for these residences. Has the cost of purchasing this private road been included in the cost? The exhibit does not show the private property lines.

County V – I prefer the ditch and sidewalk over curb and gutter since walking to Okee is difficult now without taking away (by adding parking) the little bit of available shoulder. Otherwise a simple solution is to pave shoulder and paint line.

- Please do not route County V down Shamrock Road and back up Highway 113. I'm assuming this was originally proposed solely for the purpose of controlling costs. With the additional work completed this Summer, we now know the cost savings are not there and it makes the most sense to keep County V in current footprint.

Keeping County V on current route provides the following benefits:

- County V remains a straight simple road providing the most direct access to both sides of Highway 113.
- It preserves the neighborhood along Shamrock and creates the least amount of impact on property owners and neighborhoods.
- It preserves the Old Sauk Road neighborhood and does not impact wetlands.
- It is the safest option especially with the work that would be done on 113.
- It provides for one of the least expensive options (A2 – rental house only).
- It's a design that will serve the community and surrounding area well into the future, and will support future growth and travel needs.
- You have the opportunity to close two railroad crossings.
- You have community support for this design.

Rerouting County V down Shamrock creates the following issues:

- More property owners are impacted. Concerns exist around property values, setback requirements, speeds (especially off 113), safety, and water drainage.
- Traffic traveling through on County V will result in more traffic pulling out on 113, slower traffic on 113, and more traffic sitting on the highway to make left hand turns. New safety issues are created and they will become more prevalent as population grows.
- Increases traffic on Old Sauk Road, which creates new safety issue at 113 and railroad crossing. Improvements increase costs.
- The additional traffic on Old Sauk will result in higher road maintenance cost for West Point. The road is old and sits in a very wet area.
- Nobody likes detours and essentially this creates a permanent detour.
- Does not support "going green". Creates more carbon emissions.
- Highway 113 is a very dangerous roads for bicyclist, therefore, new safety issues are created for bicyclists (and walkers) traveling through on V. Gibraltar Rock has the potential to increase this type of activity in the area since it's now a State controlled and promoted park.

- Many, many people oppose this option. You received over 140 signatures and many e-mails opposing it. A viable alternative exists.

Eric, Kurt, and John, I do hope the decision is made and approved to keep County V in current footprint. You've done your due diligence, and I believe you have everything you need to make it happen. Logically it's the best solution and least disruptive to everyone (both now and in future). You all know that I'm very passionate about this part of project, please let me know what you need from me and the citizens to further support keeping County V in current footprint. Shamrock Road just doesn't make sense anymore. Thank you for all your work and consideration.

- I own a lot next to Mary See, which I plan to retire on and build. If the Cty V change goes through, I would consider changing them. Then the question is land value, which I am not sure what I'd have to do then.

Mary makes many great points and has done much more homework than I have. From a safety standpoint alone, I can't understand why this change is being considered. As a motorcyclist, I know left hand turns are very dangerous. I think the current traffic pattern is safer. You're routing a significant amount of traffic through a neighborhood. One that currently enjoys lake side views, biking, and foot traffic. It's like you got the development, and the tax revenue, and now you're changing the rules on us. Will tax rate decrease?

I am very disappointed with this proposal. Hopefully, you will make the right decision and stand up for us and the input you've been provided.

- No matter what improvements you plan on Hwy V I hope that you plan to fix the curve at the intersection with Ryan Rd. From the time the corn is 2 feet tall until it is harvested that intersection is very dangerous for the person heading west to turn off onto Ryan Road. Many of us use it every day, PLEASE try to fix that curve.
- **I agree with the following:**
  - Reconstructing of Hwy V because of the poor roadbed.
  - The improvement of the intersection of Hwy V and 113 by reducing the height of 113 by the recommended 15 feet.
  - The improvement of the intersection of Shamrock and 113.
  - The improvement of the intersection of Old Sauk and 113.
  - The improvement of the 3 railroad crossings.
  - The improvement of the line of sight to the east when exiting from the boat launch.

**I disagree with the following:**

- Any and all runoff of unfiltered rain water ( there are several methods to filter).
- This area receives several rainfalls of 4 to 6 inches each year.
- Using the area at Red Cedar and Hwy V as a retention area.
- The ground water is high enough to support the growth of cat tails (poor absorbtion).
- Along Hwy V from Summerville to Red Cedar turns uphill a few times. Does this mean pumping?