

## **Janesville Road Public Information Meeting 3/11/2008 Comments**

Total 72 Comment Sheets

Option 1A – 15 Comment Sheets

Option 1B – 42 Comment Sheets

Option 2 – 11 Comment Sheets

No Choice – 5 Comment Sheets

## Option 1A

### Please discuss why you chose this alternative?

- No store and go lights! All stop sign and lights in Muskego should be roundabouts ALL! Also this plan will not effect any homes.
- Utilizing the existing ROW seems to be the most financially feasible for the City. Especially given the timeframe in which decisions need to be made. Option #1A is the most appropriate if we truly want to encourage something new and distinct in Muskego. At least having roundabouts at Lannon and Parkland is a must.
- I like Janesville Road being the main road thru town
- We need roundabouts, lets keep traffic flowing and join the 21<sup>st</sup> century.
- I like 1A but with only 2 roundabouts at parkland and Lannon. It helps define the entry to this downtown area.
- Cost to City for right of way is eliminated, minimum land lost, simplifies path through city
- It would promote traffic in the business district.
- I like the straight-through feature with roundabouts but 2 not 3. It would add to the beauty with some landscaping.
- I like this traffic flow
- Better access to both sides of Janesville – better for businesses
- Feel roundabouts will keep traffic moving and would be aesthetically pleasing.
- I think roundabouts help traffic flow and would allow for better ingress and egress for a developing “mid town district”
- Love the continuous flow of traffic with roundabouts. Additionally by rerouting Pick N Save mall entrances both north and south sides of the road to their adjacent roads (Lannon and Parkland)all interests are achieved.
- I have concerns about developer cooperation under plan #2. I think a businesses along Janesville would create a more vibrant downtown area.
- Keep Janesville Road using existing right of way to keep the downtown area “centered” using bypass makes downtown lopsided. Either use one roundabout in the middle or two on ends, but not three.

### Please discuss why you didn't choose the other alternative?

- On plan 2 the roadway will be over a filled in wetland and cost to much and will make home owners mad.
- The timeframe for this project seems unfeasible. Further, condemnation may need to be used which will take too long to possible come to a conclusion that doesn't even work given WI law. The cost of this alternative doesn't seem to outweigh the benefits as well. The cost to purchase the property and also to pay for the above and beyond road costs to the County won't get paid back by future development in a reasonable time. A developer will tell you that they could develop the

- property either way creating the same land uses with the same value I imagine.
- Why spend unnecessary \$. The downtown “district” created by the bypass is silly for a grocery store (main anchor) and a tree farm that the City has no control over – or would have to spend a lot of \$ to acquire. Locals would be displaced.
  - Cost of right of way – cost land, Internal roadways could be developed in either case pedestrian bridge or underpass can be used for connection of both sides of Janesville.
  - It would promote traffic on Woods Road during rush hour
  - The “2” alternative would cost too much without much benefit, although a city center might be nice.
  - People might avoid this and use Woods Road instead.
  - Concern that people would short cut anyway
  - I believe a bypass option would take away from the needed traffic flow for the businesses in the heart of the mid town district to flourish.
  - Lights will significantly reduce flow of traffic and will not give our downtown aesthetic appeal. In fact, 3 lights may deter people from visiting downtown. A bypass would also be detrimental to business on south side of Janesville.
  - Developer cooperation required for successful use of bypass. I also have concerns about procurement of land for option #2.
  - Loses the “integrity” of downtown Muskego. Area does not seem large enough for mixed use plus a bypass will infringe on nearby residents.

**What are your thoughts, and reasons for/against, on using roundabouts to slow traffic, improve safety, and provide a unique sense of place in the downtown of Muskego?**

- Good idea all intersection in Muskego should be roundabouts.
- Need to encourage something unique in the downtown and roundabouts will do this while slowing down traffic and by providing a safer area for vehicles and pedestrians. New Berlin’s roundabouts are a bad example and I’m sure the County can engineer roundabouts better.
- I like the idea of turnabouts they take sometime to get used to – they work in Europe (my husband travels there) I like not having to stop. I like having to yield and go it keeps traffic moving. The design is important and EDUCATION of the country bumpkins is important. Change is always hard.
- I think they can be a good idea, as long as there are not too many in one small area. I feel they slow traffic, make any accidents less deadly and provide a sense of place.
- I prefer the roundabouts in 1A. Once people get used to using them it would prevent accidents.
- I like them.

- I like roundabouts. I use the one on Moorland and the traffic is starting to flow through this now that people are getting used to it.
- I actually like them. They work once everyone gets over the “newness” and understands yield doesn’t mean stop.
- Like them, but wouldn’t want 3 in this small area.
- I like the way roundabouts move traffic and I think they would help create a unique downtown.
- For all noted reason (affective means to slow traffic, improve safety as well as enhance aesthetic appeal. I really like roundabouts. Additionally, once residents become more used to them, I believe they will appreciate them even more.
- I like the movement of traffic possible with the use of a roundabout, but I have concerns about pedestrian traffic if roundabouts are used.
- Like the sue of roundabouts to keep traffic flowing. However, be sure to have ped x-ings anticipating more pedestrians.

#### **Other comments and/or suggestions:**

- The area marked potential City Center has a wetland problem. There is wetland on the north end that was filled in. No permit was issued for that work. DNR did not ok it. It should be restored and a park built around it. The land along the roadway might be buildable but a nice park would be nice. There should be no parking on Janesville Road and no driveway entry. If driveways are needed only right in and right turn out. No cross traffic.
- Use Option #1A with roundabouts at least at the Lannon and parkland intersections. Continue to promote development in that area with or without parkland Mall owner going forward. This new road will be here for fifty more years and we have one chance. Since we have one chance also make sure sidewalks are found on both side of the street throughout the entire route!
- Signals are expensive and require maintenance they can go out they have gone out at Lannon and Janesville many times. This is even slower way to clear traffic. Traffic has definitely increased on Janesville in 22 years I have lived here.
- I think we need to help do something unique for this area. This plan will be in place for rest of our life times and we need to thin about the future development of our downtown area. Lets create something special while we have the chance now. We do not want to look back and regret our choices now.
- It may be easier to develop a town center on moorland like Bayshore than attempt to do it on Janesville. You need a curb land in the residential area so cars can egress the driveways.
- Reduce speed to 30 mph
- Same as option 1A except eliminate entrance to Pick N Save off Janesville. Instead use entrances off Lannon and Parkland.

## Option 1B

### Please discuss why you chose this alternative?

- It is the main thoroughfare of the City and from a fire/rescue perspective I want to have quick access and response times. Also, I do not like roundabouts.
- This option is the most economical and has the least impact on existing businesses as well as the least disruption during construction.
- It would provide the necessary capacity for Janesville Road at a lower cost and require less ROW acquisition.
- Less likelihood of roundabouts
- Minimal change – roundabouts cause huge confusion. Please don't install roundabouts. They cause trouble. I'd rather have a four way stop.
- Less traffic impact
- We don't want or need any roundabouts
- Less interruption of private and business property. Traffic does not warrant the roundabouts. Loss of homes and business bring less tax revenue.
- Keep the present businesses in tack with no removal of buildings along Janesville Road
- This is most conservative – no new land disturbance for traffic easiest to navigate – fastest for emergency vehicles
- Forget roundabouts. They're jerky stop and start people don't know how to use them and you have to take extra precaution looking both ways constantly back and forth to get thru.
- Not 1A. Keep it simple – straight line.
- Cost
- 1B only – less cost, will buy less properties
- Least cost and as of this point this has been no agreement as to the status of our "tree farm" so to make road plans around something that has not been finalized makes no sense to me!!
- Most cost effective to the Muskego taxpayers and change from the arterial hwy Muskego tax payers pay for. The city will be responsible for cost from the curb back.
- Future planning use of space can be maximized less impact to traffic would give clean flow into that area
- 1B- Access to businesses more appropriate, this community is not favorable to another mall with time consuming reaching all stores and businesses
- I wish to minimize City cost. A straight thoroughfare is better to move about the City
- No roundabouts go with Waukesha County plan.
- I'd like to see any consideration of "any" roundabouts scrapped. They may be quaint, but this is Muskego WI not a small city in France. They cause unnecessary confusion in drivers and are more dangerous than any

upside. Traffic lights and stop signs which people are used to will be far better method of traffic control. I like 1 B because it is the most ideal proposal. Boulevards are esthetically better and if floral groupings are planed they add to how an area looks. Emergency vehicles can get around safer when they don't have to deviate from a straight line. Sensors can recognize a strobe light and move an emergency vehicle faster. I cannot stress enough how strongly I feel about roundabouts. The Roundabout on moorland road is always a topic of discussion in my group of friends and neighbors. It is not a concern of these proposlas but you can learn from residents opinions concerning these roundabouts.

PEOPLE HATE THEM. LISTEN TO THE PEOPLE! Don't say "people will get used to them." Why must we get used to something.

- I think it will be less of an expense to the City and County. Plus I don't think it would be fair to the people living behind there that they will all of a sudden be on a main street.
- Synchronize the stop lights! I find Moorland road very frustrating when you have to stop for a light 100 feet ahead. I was asked traffic flow during rush hour in Phoenix and suburbs of Detroit.
- I like the layout and ease of traffic. NO ROUNDABOUTS
- A pre existing roadway, which only needs to be widened.
- I prefer to leave Janesville Road a straight through road + 1B. We do not need any roundabouts much less 3 in that short distance
- Road we have now is fine. We do not have to spend a lot of money just because we can.
- Straightforward and less cost. Stay with the lights and forget the roundabouts. I've done my own mini survey and nobody wants them.
- I'm looking at cost as one factor. It would seem to be fiscally more manageable to go straight through the center (no roundabouts at all) and just have stop signs or lights (but not too many). I also prefer to use the center lane as a turn lane (no median). A comment was made by one of the County Planners at the meeting that medians could be engineered to begin with and then removed if necessary. That line of reasoning is lost on me and is a waste of money. Would it not be more efficient and cost effective to decide to add medians if necessary in the future rather than pay for their installment at the onset, and then find out they need to be removed at increased cost after the fact? In the latter scenario, the road would not have to be widened as the median could be placed in the common center turn lane. National Ave between 124<sup>th</sup> St. and Calhoun Road in New Berlin is a perfect example of this type of construction. It is very serviceable, providing reasonable traffic flow and allows for ingress and egress from any business along the road (without being impeded by medians). It was constructed a number of years ago and has proved itself to be compatible with traffic and business flows. It also allows for a decent speed limit. I would seriously caution trying to glamorize the road rather than make it "driver friendly" as this was the same mistake, which was made when Mitchell Street on the south side of Milwaukee was revamped.

The street businesses saw a marked reduction in customer volume causing many stores to close, and eventually, the street had to be returned to its former front. However, it was too late, and now Mitchell Street has lost many stores because the recovery of the original street design came too late. Another example of a similar insidious thought process with the same unfortunate result as Mitchell Street was the attempt that took place a number of years ago to make Greenfield Ave in West Allis between 70<sup>th</sup> and 76<sup>th</sup> Street a pedestrian friendly street with main street appeal. That premise failed miserably, again, costing the city many businesses. We just don't have that much pedestrian movement currently, and I don't see any data related to your "Main Street Appeal" comments indicating that turning Janesville Road into a traditional main street will generate more pedestrian traffic, which if it's too difficult to navigate the road will not flourish either. Pedestrians should certainly be safe, and I would want the road to look good, but all of this should not be done at the expense of thoroughfares. People will become irritated and decide to avoid the area as I have already done at the roundabout on Moorland Road. I'd rather have a root canal than go through that area again in rush hour traffic. Taking the pedestrian issue out of the discussion, I challenge that this "fashionable new road with medians and roundabouts would increase business volume with cars wither. There are many businesses that have already left the strip malls in the area. Examples of this are Piggly Wiggly et al on Janesville Road, the strip mall on Racine and Janesville that only recently was finally finished after many years of standing like a Anastzi ruin, which still does not have full occupancy at this time. Unless people have a reason and means to get to a certain store, they will more than likely go someplace that offers more variety of inventory of options in store types with ease of transportation as a plus. Having said that, I am not in favor of bringing any type of super store of mall types to Muskego.

- Reconstruct using Option : "1B Only"!
- No roundabouts! It is already difficult to get on Janesville from Parkland. Roundabouts would make it worse.
- No roundabouts. I will still be waiting for traffic on Janesville.
- I believe the roundabouts would slow traffic to a stand still in the rush hour. I think emergency vehicles could get trapped or would have to try to maneuver around stopped vehicles because of flashing lights the drivers would see.
- I feel that option 1B is the best because of the lighted intersections. If we were to go with option #2 it is my understanding that Muskego would have to pay more. The lighted intersections are much safer because of the speed limit. If we were to put the roundabouts what would the speed limit be then? The limit is currently 35 would it drop to 25?? Keep the traffic flow even.

- It would be the most cost effective! Again no roundabouts!! A bypass is “stupid” for such a short distance and not practical. Bypass works for large cities with big downtown areas. But not for Muskego.
- We are for a 4-lane road with 1 turning lane to right and a shared 1 turning lane to the left. Also stop n go lights and NO roundabouts!
- I’m more for Main Street Muskego – while I can handle driving roundabouts I witness “the mess” on Moorland daily, with the cross section of people we have (young and old) in Muskego – I think main street is the way to go or yes bypass as an alternate, but us street stop lights not roundabouts.
- The bypass would be too close to the apartments. Keep it simple – keep the road straight.
- A thru street in Muskego access to the “future: downtown of Muskego! – But No No roundabouts. Divided boulevard with center left turn lanes a must. Curb parking and sidewalks also necessary. Let’s make “downtown: “customer friendly” or the customer will go elsewhere!

#### **Please discuss why you didn’t choose the other alternative?**

- Do not like roundabouts, also #2 is not needed.
- The other options ie. 1A would require the roundabouts to be big enough to accommodate truck (semis) traffic and would be confusing to use. The other option 2 would cost Muskego to much with the purchase of land plus the cost of removal of the peat soil to make roadbed to say nothing about the post office removal.
- I do not care for roundabouts and I think the entire Parkland Mall site is needed for potential redevelopment
- Roundabouts
- Why move the road and add more curves?
- Town Center development not happening
- The by pass would be a waste of resources. It would also penalize the businesses it’s passing.
- We don’t want or need any roundabouts.
- We are trying to entice people to use the services and products and slowing down. Traffic with the roundabouts is a hassle
- I’m afraid of turnabouts and it’s control sings without traffic control lights
- There should not be a winding route through a downtown because it will deter patronization of area businesses and confuse travelers or visitors.
- Straight line is shorter than a curve around to get to the other side and to much condemnation of others land. Roundabouts are confusing.
- Why add distance and intersections when a straight line will do? Some ideas may look great on paper, but not practical in the real world.
- Would have to move post office and other buildings
- Costs for 1A & 2

- Higher cost/adds to commute time thru town. People don't know how to drive through them (roundabouts)
- The community doesn't want
- Waste valuable land by keeping a version of current road and adding more traffic lanes behind development
- Malls are of the past. Specialize in specialty shops would be a reason to avoid going there patronizing would not be easy access. Roundabouts would be avoided by using the straight small narrow lanes of east and west on L.
- Slows traffic patters for no real benefit besides some local businesses.
- Costly use personal property
- Just develop our downtown so we have an area we can be proud of and get people to come and visit and shop.
- Roundabouts. No Roundabouts! NO 1A
- I live close to Janesville on Lannon, north of Janesville adjacent to the Parkland property. I do not want traffic diverted closer to my property. It would also cost more money to develop and build. More noise and congestion coming form a close Janesville Road.
- Don't like the idea. We don't need a green space closing the existing Janesville Road. We need business along this stretch of road. We need stores in Muskego – not grass.
- Bypassing one block is not worth the effort. It also would change the area greatly. The result would not be worth it.
- Cost and inconvenience, negative impact on project
- Expense, design and unproven ability to meet objectives.
- We think the traffic circles are a very over used option. The new one by the ridge theater is very dangerous because the radius is so small semis cut across both lanes.
- It would be the most cost effective! Again no roundabouts!! A bypass is "stupid" for such a short distance and not practical. Bypass works for large cities with big downtown areas. But not for Muskego.
- Option #2 would discourage travel into and through Muskego, would cost far to much for land acquisition and building demolition, and remove very valuable private land from the city tax roll.
- Inconvenient and probably more expensive
- We need lighted intersections
- I think this could possibly look the best with a bypass but the Parkland Development would be reduced in size and I also believe it would be the most costly.
- I do not think that the roundabouts would make the road any safer. It would just confuse people. Also, the "bypass" would not improve the original situation, Janesville Road. It would cost Muskego more because the county would not pay for that. That was my understanding according to a rep by Muskego.

- Putting in roundabouts or a center city commercial area based on roundabouts is a mistake. I'm not against change or development. I want more business to go to in Muskego – not deal with delays in roundabouts trying to get to a shopping district – put roundabouts in and I'll find a roundabout way of shopping somewhere else.

**What are your thoughts, and reasons for/against, on using roundabouts to slow traffic, improve safety, and provide a unique sense of place in the downtown of Muskego?**

- Do not care for them also. Fire/Rescue slowed down with them.
- I think roundabouts are just today's fad not a solution to traffic problems. In order for roundabouts to work they need to be big enough for truck traffic to stay in the inner lane so as not to crowd out cars in the outer lane. I've driven on these in New Jersey and contrary to popular belief they can be confusing and dangerous.
- As I stated before I do not care for roundabouts and I don't know if I believe the stated "advantages". They also require quite a bit of additional ROW.
- I lived in Boston, MA 50 years ago and I didn't like them then and I don't like them now.
- I don't think they are safe. They are very confusing and do nothing more than a 4 way stop would do.
- Do not like roundabouts. Safety concern
- Roundabouts are an accident waiting to happen. They interfere with traffic flow. I'm very much against any roundabouts. They're a reason not to use a road.
- People do not like roundabouts – they don't know how to drive in them. What's wrong with lights?
- The roundabout on Moorland seems senseless and cause confusion as to who yields.
- I'm afraid of turnabouts and it's control signs without traffic control lights.
- Roundabouts use too much land, street/highway land is polluted with oil, brake dust, crash debris, refuse thrown from car windows, salt and other contaminants. We should keep these tainted parcels as minimal as possible.
- Roundabout on Moorland is irritating. We look for alternative routes.
- First, the question is leading. What percentage increase over signalized intersections (Parkland & Lannon ) would be seen for slowing traffic and improving safety. We have had more close calls at the roundabout on moorland Road in the months its been open then the 10+ years prior. Roundabouts do not make a place unique.
- Will be safer and slow down traffic?
- Costs – against roundabouts

- Roundabouts slow things down for sure! It takes long enough to go from one end of town to the other now. Why exacerbate this problem. I also don't understand the fixation with the down town concept. Down towns died 30 years ago!! Did I miss something??
- To be properly used the size (diameter) needs to be increased to address semi-trailers and snow removal
- Don't want them.
- I drive for a living it causes confusion and is a burden for large vehicles roundabouts are not large enough in the US to handle the traffic. I have driven in Ireland, Scotland and England
- Keeping our Janesville Road with the theme of living in Muskego, fresh air, green scenery, less condos. Unique in keeping its history of warmth and not city coldness.
- Roundabouts on Janesville should increase traffic on Woods Road immediately. I won't go through one of those small roundabouts they are planning and will help organize the opposition. I've already bought a few web domain names and have a broadcasting background. Since they have this questions, I know I won't be alone.
- Does not make any sense
- I don't believe roundabouts will do any of the above. They are confusing therefore dangerous. They slow traffic but will cause road rage among drivers who are behind another confused driver. "Unique sense of place" belongs with "quaint". Quaint is okay in Europe – not Muskego – not worth the expense.
- I don't like the idea of roundabouts. With more traffic lights in place that will slow down the traffic. Yes, accidents are less severe, but what is the back up with traffic when they do occur.
- No roundabouts! They do not improve safety traffic gets frustrated with people that don't know how to use them. Semis can't get around the 1 lane, there are backups during busy times.
- Insufficient – less safe – inexperienced drivers in roundabouts. They slow traffic, people don't know hoe to use them. Stoplights are more efficient. Our English Waukesha DOT guy can keep his roundabouts in England.
- Against roundabouts. If a beautiful downtown Muskego is the objective, a straight drive through with traffic lights. The traffic lights would allow for street parking and downtown store fronts on the roadway. (similar to downtown Waukesha).
- What downtown??? We don't need to slow traffic and I don't' think roundabouts will improve safety. They are an accident waiting to happen.
- The speed limit is now just about right. Why slow it down?
- Roundabouts are not for Americans and it will take to many years to accept and start your plan off on a negative note with the public. It Is not safer you have more small accidents and with the cost of gas more people will be using motorcycles and scooters. A small fender bender can be fatal to someone on a motorcycle or scooter and a helmet will not save them. Se criteria and disclaimer for DOT approved helmets.

- Roads are meant to move traffic at a reasonable speed. Roundabouts slow traffic down unnecessarily, I have not seen any reliable safety data references provided by the city (or anyone else) at this point. Europe may have roundabouts but roads are not as wide, and vehicles are smaller. I think if you make this road so complicated for navigation, you increase the probability of having the opposite effect and deter traffic dramatically.
- We don't want Muskego to look like Mt. Horeb. There are 5 traffic circles in less than 1 1/2 miles coming into the village from hwy-151 it looks trashy!
- I don't think roundabouts improve safety at all. Lights are needed at the intersections.
- Dangerous traffic to slow and lighted intersection are safer and easier for people to understand
- I have a great dislike for the roundabouts I have used. Discourteous drivers do not yield when they are supposed to. I also think that because I live in the Parkland subdivision it will even be harder than it is now to get into the traffic flow. I favor stoplights.
- The roundabouts only positive is that it would provide a "unique sense of place in the downtown of Muskego. I do not feel that it would improve safety only make it worse. How would the pedestrians cross? My first thought is that they would go around but straight through, this could be fatal and very irresponsible on Muskego's outlook for citizens. The round about would work best on a side road, single lane not a 4-5 lane road with 35-40 mph. Take for instance the roundabouts on Grange Ave. Works great! Single lane road, slow traffic and keeps it moving. Now look at Moorland Road, two lanes higher speed limit. I have personally witnessed at least 4-5 vehicles going the wrong way! I do not feel that having the 2 lanes and a parking lane is the best option. If there are still going to have businesses and residents on the road it only makes sense! What if you lived there and had a child having a b-day party. Where is your family going to park? When Country Trader was still in business I seen a few times where people were using the driving lane as a parking lane. Very dangerous! Therefore I do feel that the parking lane is a practical idea. Please read the attached article from the Daily Reporter (Monday March 17<sup>th</sup> Volume 110, Number 54) I feel that this article – letter to the editor sums it up perfectly regarding the roundabouts.
- Roundabouts are expensive, confusing and annoying. Why would you want to slow traffic? You have lights to do that. The roundabout on Moorland is a joke.
- I don't want roundabouts. I see how semi's, busses and cars/trucks go over their line when maneuvering around circle. I also don't want to be known as the "roundabout city"! I'm also against the roundabout discussion for Kelsey & Racine. The drunks are already at a disadvantage.
- Regarding slowing traffic – other options are available such as the pavement used at Janesville Road and Tess Corners Road. Reducing the speed limit from 35mph to 30 mph through downtown could also be

considered. Regarding improving safety – Roundabouts are confusing because drivers have to watch for cars and pedestrians from multiple directions at the same time while maintaining lane position through the curve. Drivers in a line approaching a traffic light can see the light change from green to yellow some distance away and can begin braking in anticipation of the stop. Drivers in a line approaching a roundabout cannot see if the lead driver has spotted a pedestrian and therefore cannot anticipate whether the lead driver might stop. This is dangerous to persons in vehicles and to the pedestrians. When the north side of Janesville Road is developed, traffic signals will provide the safest way for pedestrians to cross. Roundabouts are also much more difficult for large vehicles and vehicles pulling trailers to navigate without straying from their lane and crowding the other lane. Regarding providing a unique sense of place – street lighting, signage, paving surfaces, pedestrian walkways, landscaping and other architectural elements can create a very positive sense of place. Consider the village mall in downtown Greendale for example. Most people from outside Muskego don't know the Janesville Road intersection at Tess Corners road is part of Muskego. Repeating the paving surface and crosswalks used there at the three intersections in downtown Muskego would provide a much-needed consistency and connection between the downtown and the Tess Corners area. Instead of creating a unique sense of place in downtown Muskego, roundabouts would create a unique sense of a place to avoid.

- They truly slow traffic down, but have you ever navigated on in a semi? They will deliver to your commercial district during rush hour and weekends at time the northbound Moorland Road roundabout can back up or stop traffic back to Grange Ave. I now I've been parked in the mess. Muskego has always to me had a main street feel. Why change that?
- I am totally against the roundabouts. Many people are confused as to who should yield to traffic. I have been rear-ended by another vehicle in the roundabout on Moorland Road. Foresee many problems. I feel the stop lights are the way to go. It's been working the 20 plus years we've lived in Muskego and will continue to do so if left in place.
- Roundabouts are fine at neighborhood intersections but not on a busy street – get serious. A thru street with stoplights will slow traffic – roundabouts will make it a race track.

### **Other Comments and/or suggestions**

- I would like to see a multi use path for golf carts. People could use them to go shopping and save gas. Muskego could be on the leading edge of this type of alternative transportation. We could subsidize by collecting fees \$25-\$30 per cart to pay for up keep etc.
- I think the planning body should stop trying to make Muskego into some quaint village and put its efforts into making the owner of the old Parkland Mall understand that the land is not as valuable as he thinks. To relocate the road & talk of city centers etc only encourages him to

hold the City captive to his whims. I think this City Administration should be looking to the Janesville Road project in terms of the cost to City and County taxpayers not as another attempt at developing the Parkland Mall site. Face facts you already have the south side of Janesville committee to a strip mall, a grocery store and 2 banks. What kind of City Center could you hope to build on the north side? Save the County and City taxpayers their money and build the road as in Option 1B.

- I hope the “wall “ consideration along the Parkland Mall site is dead. It is a ridicules proposal not to mention its cost and maintenance - graffiti would also be a continuous problem. I would think the property owner would object and may be awarded access damages.
- Emergency vehicles can more rapidly move thru an intersection with lights them roundabouts.
- Downtown businesses should be practical “Cape Cod” shops or the like would only be a temporary fad look at Greendale.
- Use what the County is suggesting. It works now it'll work in the future.
- I can see residents going east to Hales Corners with less traffic flow interruption and shops there. Boulevards seem an unnecessary decoration eating up road space.
- I like plan 1B the best. We do need improved traffic flow but a roadway should not be a “feature” lets improve the downtown with landscaping, design guide and peripheral features. Also, please drop the “wall” idea. It makes no sense to devote resources to a construction project that will be temporary at best. If we want the Christmas tree farm to look better we can make a design guide that all AG (farmers) can comply to or urge Art Dyer to do an adult planting along his peripheral. Perhaps a “farm” fence or other decorative border that is easier on the eyes and less intrusive than a wall.
- The idea of “theme” sections through the corridor (nautical, cape cod, eclectic) is not good. Pick one style and go with it. If not the City would be like a theme park. Add option 1A and we would have a theme with a 3 ring circus. Don't even think of putting a wall up. “Unique” for this development wouldn't be a correct word. I assume the group has looked at downtown Delafield as an example. It's a real treat to be in a roundabout with a semi or bus. Just the other day I had the opportunity to spend some time in the Moorland road roundabout with a double trail semi – wonderful.
- I suggest thanking the task force for their ideas and eliminate the group
- Understand taxpayers pay for this ---listen to them.
- To make a shopping district use as much f the land north of Janesville Road and create your downtown store fronts in there. Use parking structures to allow for more development.
- Placing of south side (old section) with businesses like the Leon Custard. The few of Little Muskego should/would be easy access off Janesville, viewing the lake like the old Dandelion park had been. This

is needed to make Muskego a place to want to go. Not see all these condos – give impression of sleep quarters and lot “living”.

- ROUNDABOUTS are already keeping Muskego out of New Berlin. Why did we map through Moorland to begin with and then put up a wall?
- Straight road with left turn lanes.
- “Unique sense of place” can be accomplished with a boulevard system with floral arrangements such as those found in Wauwatosa, Whitefish Bay and some parts of Milw. Such as on Capitol Drive between Hwy 100 and the east side of Milwaukee.
- NO ROUNDABOUTS! I have to drive thru the Moorland 143 ones all they need was to synchronize the stoplights!! My sister lived in London for a number of years. She said they don’t help congestion, there were terrible backups during rush hour. No roundabouts!! Manage traffic by keeping it moving!
- Sidewalks and bike paths would be nice. Green areas also. Eclectic shops, Starbucks, Panera, unique gift shops
- I would prefer streetlights at the intersection of Lannon and Parkland. Having a paved curb with sidewalks. Pedestrian traffic could walk from storefront to storefront and enjoy the downtown area.
- I prefer option 1B
- Option 1B is what we have now and it seems the right option.
- I really don’t see that roundabouts would give “uniqueness” for downtown Muskego except to create annoyance to drivers creating a place to avoid rather than use. You used the correct adjective in your “Community Character” description, and that is “NOVELTY”. What happens with the “novelty” wears off, and people become really annoyed with this construction? Do we redo the road again? At what cost, and who will pay for it? As far as sidewalks are concerned, I would prefer walks to be constructed as far away from the road as possible, and have only one parkway between the road and side walk. This would provide a greater margin of safety for pedestrians from traffic, and also provide a larger area for snow storage from the road without impeding the sidewalk. I would not want street parking provided on the roadway. That would just produce more congestion with people popping in/out of their cars especially in poor weather (snow, ice, etc). Providing customer parking should be the purview of each business just as it is now. I do not wish to subsidize expenses any further than I already am (including anything to do with TIF districting). Reading the description of your Community Character makes me think it was written by an interior designer. You’ve got to be kidding: “Maintain potential to house sculpture, interesting horticultural design or other landscape features”! Who’s going to pay for these illustrious affectations? The county has already said that they will not pay for these items. Of course the city would raise taxes or not do the maintenance at all. Maybe the city should contract with Art Dwyer to

plant some of hi new brown trees in those areas! At the next meeting, please provide a landscaper that is interested in discussing options for design instead of trying to sell his designs. His plans were not diverse nor optimal for the project proposals. By the way, had I not read JS Online, I wouldn't have known about the meeting at the school, since the notice for the meeting came two days after the meeting occurred. Please send out the meeting announcements so we received at least a week prior to having a meeting.

- Just reconstruct the old part like the way it was done from Moorland east to Hales Corners. Add sidewalks and crosswalks as required.
- We are completely opposed to any and all roundabouts in Muskego and neighboring communities. They are aggravating, irritating, dangerous, cause more accidents than stop-n-go light intersections. We are grossly concerned about emergency vehicles getting through quickly to attend and help people in emergency situations; other vehicles have no place to move over for large vehicles to get through especially those on a mission of help. Semi trucks, busses, snowplows, and any other longer vehicles trying to get through would need both lanes. What if there was fender bender or someone had a flat tire, or a more serious accident? Where would traffic go? One can't drive around because here isn't a shoulder for the broken down vehicle to move over and out of the way. That would back traffic up with no where to go and with Muskego only having two (2) main roads into the city using roundabouts will only add to killing the town and making it a user "unfriendly" place to travel. How will the snowplows be efficient with plowing? It will take longer time and much more maneuvering to clear the area verses a straight road. Have there been comparisons done with other communities on cost of maintaining roundabouts; both summer plantings and winter removals? With energy conservation a major concern for all and water crises all over the nation, fountains should not even be considered. In addition, Milwaukee and Waukesha Counties are now nearing concerns with their water table levels. Motorcycles are put in more danger if there are any loose particles on the pavement not to mention poor visibility by other vehicles. When driving through a roundabout, the driver doesn't have time to look at what stores or shops are in the area because they have to concentrate on the congested traffic surrounding them and maintain their lane, not crossing over into the other lane as many drivers do. New comers/visitors to the city would have to know in advance which lane they need before entering the roundabout only adds frustration for traveling unfamiliar roads. One of the comments we have heard regarding the roundabouts is "to slow traffic down". Well then leave the highway as it exist don't widen it. People will go out of their way to avoid roundabouts. They will find other routes such as College Avenue and Woods Road, which are not built to handle more traffic. We thought the purpose of widening the highway was t

move traffic along more smoothly due to the increase of building both residential and commercial. We feel a better solution would be placing a stop-n-go at Parkland Drive and Janesville as there is a lot of traffic going in and out of the Post Office, Pick N Save, and the Library. You could then reduce accidents at Pick N Save and Block Buster by closing off the entrances onto Janesville Road allowing traffic to flow quicker and safer through this section. People prefer to travel in straight lines verses roundabouts and bypasses especially when most of our traffic is the daily worker who just wants to get to work and back home quickly and safely each day. We don't see a bypass as helping when we look around and see so many empty shops in the malls along Janesville Road an Racine Ave. The Janesville Road area entering Muskego from New Berlin, in front of Pick N Save, and at Racine Avenue by Sentry and Parkland Mall, it was never full. These each have and had ample parking and walkway; what makes you think calling it a bypass will make it work any differently? What about the homes surrounding this bypass area? Will they lose their homes/apartments? Is there going to be more lighting? Will the cleaners, the post office, etc. Have to be moved? Who is going to pay for all this? Surely it is not fair to the taxpayers to take on all these burdens. We are very concerned with the widening of Janesville Road to both residential and commercial that it will KILL the quaint small town atmosphere as has happened to the TESS CORNERS area. The businesses have been forced out due to lack of parking space availability and without our businesses and easy access to their facility, we have no town, nothing to draw people to our area, and if we don't have interesting or needed services, we won't have the traffic; therefore, we don't need to change the existing highway. Widening the highway will disrupt many family and friends (neighbors) with devaluing our property and homes an in many cases totally removing our homes. If widening of roadways need to occur, Racine Avenue is long overdue all the way from Waukesha through New Berlin out to Wind Lake. This is a direct access from the freeway "straight" to the industrial park and for residence and businesses throughout Muskego. We further are against medians, which would only cause more headaches for everyone and take away additional space that already we are in short supply. The two-way left turn lane is a much better option. We all know concrete is much more expensive than asphalt, but which one will hold up to the heavy traffic of semis, heavy loaded equipment vehicles, buses, etc. and cost less in the long run? My guess would be concrete. As to the sidewalks we prefer to have them on one (1) side; mainly on the SOUTH side of Janesville in front of the apartments using a minimum width of six (6) foot to eight (8) foot maximum. With more people residing in the apartments than the homes on the North side of Janesville common sense would tell you who would probably use the sidewalks more. In addition, the tenants are not property

owners and would therefore not be losing land that the sidewalk requires. Most of the homeowners are in the elderly range and sidewalks less than six (6) feet would be an additional burden for them to maintain. With regard to planters between the roadway curbs and the sidewalks we think three (3) to four (4) feet would be sufficient and allow proper incline to driveway entrances so as not to cause vehicles to bottom out when entering and exiting their property. This brings us to the question; will Janesville Road be lowered back to what it originally was to accommodate water runoff? Our property can't handle any more water to drain back to our home. Presently we have Janesville Road property owner's sump pumps pumping to our backyards which end in our yard flooding our property every spring, fall and winter. We further feel it would be advantageous for all tax paying citizens of Muskego to be able to have a chance to voice their opinions of the use of this main access to the city we call home. A few more dates for others to attend, or another larger public meeting or a public VOTE would be fair. There were many people we spoke to that weren't even aware of the open-house on March 11<sup>th</sup>. We are a land of democracy; a government for the people, by the people, lets keep it that way. As to "unique sense of place" for roundabouts they are a European design for which we are Americans and can think for ourselves and don't need to follow or copy their ways. We broke away from Europe to create and live a different style, we don't need to imitate other cities, communities, or countries.

- I would like to see a sidewalk/ bike path wide enough to share. Also street lights to reflect on the sidewalks. If they are only on 1 side then a crossing button should be installed by the stop and go light. I'm okay with stop n go lights at Lannon and Parkland Drive. I don't believe we should have parking on Janesville Road nor curbs. I do believe we should have ramps at the end of sidewalks/bike path intersections or wheel chair and stroller accessibility. Planters with flowers or shrubs would be okay no to grass on trees. That would require a lot of upkeep. Also, no to brick paving, though it looks pretty, it's hard for anyone in a wheelchair or it's bumpy with a stroller. Waste containers along the path are okay.
- Every car entering a roundabout must brake (use energy) and slow to 15 mph or less, negotiate the curve then accelerate again when exiting, using more energy and generating pollution. Has a study been conducted on the fuel required for the average vehicle to use a roundabout, or the pollution generated? Traditional traffic signals using timers and sensors can provide a very efficient flow of traffic with cars spending very little time idling. In this era of conserving fuel and reducing pollution, these should be important considerations. Roundabouts would also require much more land acquisition and demolition of existing buildings. This not only costs money at the

outset but costs money forever due to property being taken off the tax rolls.

- I love living in Muskego. And would hate to see the small town character of Muskego go away. If the roundabouts are installed traffic will slow or stop. What happens when people stop for emergency vehicles or a semi can't get through because of traffic is this what Muskego planners want. Listening to many people at the high school meeting and watching the patterns of people driving into/out of or through Muskego as I do every day. You notice that Muskego in many ways is a bedroom community with a main street feel. In listening to people talk to others at the high school meeting
  1. People are worried about the 4 lane highway in the residential area between Racine Ave and Pioneer – loss of front yards, trees, etc.
  2. Do not want parking on Janesville Road anywhere!!!
  3. People I listen to/overheard didn't want the roundabouts – including truck drivers who live and work in Muskego and some elderly people, let alone a lot of others.
  4. Does the owner of the tree farm approve of the bypass?
  5. We have more than enough strip malls – both occupied and also empty
  6. Muskego is a bedroom community in many ways – what is going to come to Muskego to anchor residents to shop in Muskego – the square foot cost in the strip mall doesn't support anchor stores now! What coming here for me to shop here?
  7. I fully agree Janesville Road needs to be improved – but don't believe roundabouts are the answer to make me shop Muskego. Thankfully there is still Woods Road.
- NO ROUNDABOUTS!!
- If “downtown” is to become the center of activity – make it friendly and inviting – retail is necessary – not just a grocery store and post office – be aggressive – go after business – and – not just one “big box” store. I am a new resident in Muskego (3 years). I like suburban living. I think a downtown area is essential to any city. Also I think it should have diverse business not just one or two big “box stores”. Downtown should be inviting and customer friendly. Small businesses, coffee shops, restaurants, etc. You do need a major draw but it should be supported with an abundance of small business. If the “forest land” is used for one box store – it will be “so long” to the friendly downtown! But first let's get the street done – and do it right – no race track, no roundabouts. Make it friendly.

## Option 2

### Please discuss why you chose this alternative?

- More Development. More opportunities to define our downtown
- Provides larger contiguous tract for development. Moves CTH-L closer to lakes, which opens up opportunity.
- I like the idea of opening up the City Center
- Creates opportunity for town center/destination. Can create traffic to slow down to utilize businesses. Sets Muskego apart from other communities
- I like 1A but with only 2 roundabouts at parkland and Lannon. It helps define the entry to this downtown area.
- Enables a true city center to develop safely for pedestrian traffic and visually pleasing.
- The “bypass” makes sense. Traffic on Janesville will shift traffic to Woods
- Like the idea of making a nice downtown area possible like Cedarburg.
- I like the idea of not having a major arterial bisection the commercial development. People wouldn’t have to drive a car to go from north side to south side of the area.
- No roundabouts
- It depends on plans for the area. If a “town center’ were developed it would be best to with Plan 2 so more area would be available without through traffic. Don’t like the idea of 3 (three) roundabouts as close as in 1A.
- The concept of having the business center not separated by a major road is appealing. It would have the feeling of some of the large shopping centers and would likely attract more shoppers to Muskego and more large businesses as well as providing the local people with a cohesive

shopping centers. It would be nice to do all the shopping without crossing the highway.

**Please discuss why you didn't choose the other alternative?**

- Option 1 or 1A wouldn't be bad, but option 2 would totally make a new change.
- Much of the same suburban development
- It seems to be too costly to add all of this extra area. Also, there ends up being less usable land for development
- 1B would create a strip mall look, not attractive to us, 1A dislike roundabouts.
- Otherwise we like choice #1B. We are scared of roundabouts because of the troubles with the New Berlin one.
- 1A Second best choice but would make waling the area difficult. B Least desirable, least imaginative, no pluses
- no roundabouts, too costly, not traffic, uses too much land
- Until I've traveled on the completed roundabout intersection in New Berlin I withhold my opinion. That one seems too small for such a high traffic corridor.
- The shopping area is split; major stores less likely to locate here. Not as pleasant or convenient to the shoppers. It would have the conventional small town look.

**What are your thoughts, and reasons for/against, on using roundabouts to slow traffic, improve safety, and provide a unique sense of place in the downtown of Muskego?**

- Open to roundabouts
- I have no problems with roundabouts, but using too many would almost make it a carnival ride.
- New concept that requires getting used to. Like that is safer than traffic signal intersection. Like that is move traffic smoothly. Like that is can create traffic calming for benefit of businesses.
- I think the roundabouts on Moorland actually slow traffic and create a safety hazard. I've experienced this using the road.
- People don't seem to be able to use roundabouts the one on Moorland is way to scary to me.
- Totally against! Over sold as being safe. Frequently lead to severity in accidents. Quit being posers and just design a decent road.
- I like roundabouts
- Side walks are good
- Has possibilities. How would people driving through like it?
- A major plus for roundabouts is their low cost to maintain with respect to traffic lights. Roundabouts do slow traffic, but also keep it constantly moving. The overall time from end to end through Muskego will likely not

be much different between lights and circles. One will be constant moving. One will be stop and go with build-ups at the lights.

- 

### **Other Comments and/or suggestions**

- I heard that one idea was to make one large circle to the north and further south. That would be a bit much.
- Many committees later and much input from citizens that a destination/town center is strongly desired. More difficult to create with traditional road plan/design.
- We like the idea of a downtown. We like the idea of bike paths and sidewalks that are taken care of (snow removal).
- Quit conducting social experiments with our lives.
- Save existing businesses, build apartment rentals in tree farm
- I'm happy that something is being done. Keep up the good work. Do whatever you can to help improve Muskego's identity.
- The offset concept should still have a 2 lane road going east and west through it with 2 stop signs (not lights) along the way and a low speed limit (20mph) to allow for pedestrian safety and convenience. Large trucks should not be allowed to go straight through. Using traffic lights at the Lannon Drive and parkland Drive intersections with the offset approach would destroy the traffic flow generated by traffic circles at the east and west ends of the City Center.

### **No Choice Selected**

#### **Please discuss why you chose this alternative?**

- I got here late, but bottom line please no roundabouts!!
- I like #2 for a more central downtown area
- Both options can work but no roundabouts

#### **Please discuss why you didn't choose the other alternative?**

- Because it's just stupid. Let the county do their job. Our taxes are high enough if Muskego has too much money to spend maybe there should be a change at the top.

#### **What are your thoughts, and reasons for/against, on using roundabouts to slow traffic, improve safety, and provide a unique sense of place in the downtown of Muskego?**

- I'm against roundabouts, strong and memorable identity yes we would be a laughing stock of Wisconsin. Designers/ developers planner should look at Moorland and either rethink or go back to school. It would slow traffic mainly because of congestion by accidents and back ups due to road blockage.
- My main concern about the roundabouts is the safety of the students and drivers of school buses. I understand about slowing traffic, but are they big enough for the 39 foot buses and semi trucks.
- The circles are too small. We have electric lights to control traffic.
- No roundabouts. Yes to sidewalks and bike paths.

**Other Comments and/or suggestions**

- How will the #2 option handle handicap parking.