

MINUTES OF THE SIXTH MEETING

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON REGIONAL
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING**

DATE: April 6, 2005
TIME: 1:00 p.m.
PLACE: Commission Offices
W239 N1812 Rockwood Drive
Waukesha, WI

Committee Members Present

Frederick J. Patrie, Chairman..... Director of Public Works, Kenosha County
Sandra K. Beaufre Director, Bureau of Planning,
Division of Transportation Investment Management,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
John M. Bennett City Engineer, City of Franklin
Daniel A. Boehm Manager of Research and Planning,
(Representing Kenneth J. Warren) Milwaukee County Transit System
Allison M. Bussler Chief of Staff, Waukesha County Executive's Office
Paul A. Feller Director of Public Works, City of Waukesha
Thomas M. Grisa Director of Public Works, City of Brookfield
Richard M. Jones Commissioner of Public Works, City of Racine
William A. Kappel Director of Public Works, City of Wauwatosa
Glenn M. Lampark Director of Public Works, Racine County
Michael M. Lemens Director of Engineering, City of Kenosha
Michael K. Lynett Village Engineer/Commissioner of Public Works,
Village of Fox Point
Dwight E. McComb Planning and Program Development Engineer,
Federal Highway Administration,
U.S. Dept. of Transportation
Gloria L. McCutcheon Southeast Regional Director,
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Kenneth M. Pesch Highway Commissioner, Washington County
Jeffrey S. Polenske City Engineer, City of Milwaukee
Ronald J. Rutkowski Transportation Planning Director,
(Representing George A. Torres) Department of Parks and Public Infrastructure,
Milwaukee County
Aileen I. Switzer Planning Supervisor, District 2,
(Representing Donna L. Brown) Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Wallace C. Thiel Village Administrator, Village of Hartland

Staff Members and Guests Present

Robert Anderson Transportation Planning and Corridor Supervisor,
District 2, Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Albert A. Beck Principal Planner, SEWRPC
Robert E. Beglinger Chief Transportation Engineer, SEWRPC
Christopher T. Hiebert Senior Engineer, SEWRPC
Patrick A. Pittenger Senior Planner, SEWRPC
Kenneth R. Yunker Deputy Director, SEWRPC

WELCOME AND ROLL CALL

Chairman Patrie welcomed all of those in attendance and indicated that roll call would be accomplished through a sign-in roster circulated by Commission staff.

CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 2, 2005, MEETING

Chairman Patrie asked if there were any questions or comments on the minutes of the Advisory Committee's fifth meeting held on March 2, 2005. Mr. Feller pointed out that the minutes of March 2, 2005, indicated that the minutes of November 10, 2005, were considered at the March meeting, but the minutes of the January 5, 2005, meeting were actually considered at the March meeting. Mr. Yunker stated that the minutes of the March 2, 2005, meeting would be revised to reflect Mr. Feller's comment. Mr. Yunker pointed out that additional text for Chapter VI documenting how well the Commission's travel simulation models have performed over time was attached to the meeting minutes. Mr. Yunker noted that this additional text and the associated table had been prepared in response to a Committee member's suggestion at the previous meeting, and demonstrate that the forecasts provided by the Commission's travel simulation models have generally proven to be very accurate. There being no further questions or comments, a motion to approve the minutes was made by Mr. Feller, seconded by Mr. Lampark, and carried unanimously by the Committee.

REVIEW OF PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF INITIAL SECTIONS OF CHAPTER VIII, "REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION," OF SEWRPC PLANNING REPORT NO. 49, "A REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN FOR SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN: 2035"

Chairman Patrie asked Mr. Yunker to lead the Committee through a review of the preliminary draft of initial sections of Chapter VIII, "Regional Transportation Plan Development and Evaluation." During Mr. Yunker's review of the chapter, the following questions were raised and comments made by Committee members:

1. Mr. Yunker stated that there was a typographical error in Table 8-1 which presented transportation system demand measures potentially applicable to the Southeastern Wisconsin Region, that would be corrected by Commission staff and reported in the minutes of this meeting.

[Secretary's Note: The last sentence under the heading of "Probability of Implementation" of the demand management measurement "Flexitime and compressed work week" in Table 8-1 on page 7c, has been removed. The sentence was revised and reinserted as the last sentence under the heading of "Probability of Implementation" of the demand management measurement of "Trip-reduction ordinance." The sentence has been revised to read as follows: "The failure of employer trip reduction programs to be implemented as part of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (CAAA) is an indication of the lack of support for this type of measure."]

2. With respect to the provision of High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) queue bypass lanes at metered freeway on-ramps, Mr. Grisa asked if the intent was to provide ramp meters and HOV bypass lanes at all ramps in the Region. Mr. Yunker stated that metering of ramps currently exists throughout the metropolitan Milwaukee area. He added that it may be expected that it will be proposed that ramp meters be expanded throughout the Region during the planning period for the year 2035 regional transportation plan. It is proposed that HOV bypass lanes be provided at all

metered on-ramps, recognizing that there may be locations where restricted right-of-way may make the provision of HOV bypass lanes infeasible.

3. While discussing HOV bypass lanes at ramp meters, Mr. McComb pointed out that the preliminary sections of this chapter did not contain any discussion of mainline freeway HOV lanes. He stated that while he was not advocating the provision of such facilities, he believed that provision of such facilities should be addressed during the preparation of the new plan. Mr. Yunker stated that freeway HOV lanes will be addressed under the public transit and/or arterial street and highway elements of the plan. He added that while it may be possible to add one standard freeway lane in each direction largely within the existing freeway right-of-way, the provision of a separate two-lane HOV facility may require the acquisition of additional right-of-way. Mr. Yunker added that HOV lanes proposed during the East-West Corridor Study had received very little support, and as a result, the Marquette Interchange is being reconstructed without provision for HOV lanes, and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation has not pursued further freeway corridor studies considering freeway HOV lanes. Mr. Rutkowski concurred with the lack of support for provision of HOV freeway lanes

Mr. Grisa noted that the text did not include a discussion of reversible express lanes, and asked if they would be addressed in this chapter. Mr. Yunker indicated that like HOV lanes, express lanes may be expected to require the acquisition of additional right-of-way due to the need to physically separate the express lanes from the existing freeway lanes. He added that this could be expected to be addressed in a later section of this chapter presenting the arterial street and highway system element of the plan.

4. Responding to a question from Mr. Feller, Mr. Rutkowski and Mr. Polenske indicated that transit priority signal systems are compatible with existing emergency vehicle preemption signal systems. Mr. Yunker stated that the text of the chapter would be revised to reflect the coordination of the different types of signal systems.

[Secretary's Note: The following text has been added after the fifth sentence of the first full paragraph on page 12: "Traffic signal controllers that provide preemption systems for emergency vehicles, railroad operations, or bridge opening operations, can also provide for transit vehicle priority. Transit vehicle priority must be subordinate to all traffic signal preemption, with the activation of emergency vehicle, railroad operation, or bridge opening operation traffic signal preemption system terminating the operation of transit vehicle priority, or preventing the activation of transit vehicle priority."]

Also, the sixth and seventh sentences of the first full paragraph on page 12 are proposed to be revised as follows: "While the functionality to accommodate both preemption systems and transit vehicle priority systems is typically built into state-of-the-art traffic signal controllers, implementation of transit vehicle priority systems would require the installation of the appropriate communications hardware on the transit vehicle and the traffic signal controller. Older traffic signal controllers may need new or upgraded software, or, in some instances, the controllers may need to be upgraded or replaced to accommodate both preemption systems and transit vehicle priority systems."]

5. With respect to the provision of discount transit pass programs, Mr. Rutkowski noted that while Milwaukee County currently offers a quarterly pass program for passes subsidized by employers, only a weekly pass program is currently offered to the general public. He asked that the text be

revised to indicate this information. Mr. Yunker stated that the text would be revised to reflect Mr. Rutkowski's comment. Additionally, the text will be revised to reflect the fact that the Kenosha Transit System also offers an adult monthly pass to the general public.

[Secretary's Note: The second full paragraph on page 13 has been revised to read as follows: "A variety of discount pass programs are currently offered by four of the Region's public transit operators—the Kenosha Transit System, the Milwaukee County Transit System, the Racine Belle Urban System, and the Waukesha Metro Transit System—including quarterly, monthly, or weekly passes. In addition to the student passes offered by each of the four transit systems, the Milwaukee County Transit System currently offers weekly passes to the general public and quarterly passes to employees of employers participating in the employee pass program. The Kenosha Transit System, the Belle Urban System, and the Waukesha Metro System currently offer monthly passes to adults. The Kenosha Transit System also currently offers monthly passes to elderly and disabled persons, and Racine's Belle Urban System also currently offers monthly passes to disabled persons.

This proposed quarterly, monthly, or weekly pass program would allow employers to offer their employees discounted passes. Under this proposed measure, the employer and the transit operator would negotiate an agreement in which they both subsidize a portion of the monthly or weekly pass. This proposed travel demand management measure may be expected to achieve a reduction in vehicle-trips and vehicle-miles of travel by reducing the cost of public transit for employees."]

Mr. Lemens asked if it is possible that the demand for service generated by subsidized transit passes could exceed the capacity of the Milwaukee County Transit System. Mr. Yunker stated that he did not foresee any difficulties as the Milwaukee County Transit System has experience in providing sufficient service to meet expected demand. More specifically, he pointed out that the Milwaukee County Transit System has successfully operated the UPASS program which provides "free" transit use for University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee students.

6. Regarding the expansion of existing vanpool programs, Mr. Boehm pointed out that the current vanpool program within the Milwaukee area is designed so that it does not compete with existing bus service, specifically, one end of each vanpool trip must be outside the transit service area. He suggested that the text be revised to clarify that vanpool programs should not compete directly with existing fixed-route services.

[Secretary's note: The fourth sentence of the last paragraph on page 13 has been revised as follows: "This proposed travel demand management measure would expand the existing vanpool program to include Walworth County."]

7. Chairman Patrie noted that it may be difficult to implement and administer the cash-out of employee paid parking travel demand management measure. Employees may be expected to resist paying for something which had previously been made available to them at no charge, and there will a need to monitor parking to ensure that employees who do not purchase parking are not using the available parking spaces.

Mr. Yunker pointed out that there will be a need to also address employees who may need parking only occasionally for medical appointments, and other purposes. Mr. Yunker indicated

that additional text would be added to this section of the chapter noting there are numerous potential difficulties associated with this travel demand measure that may result in limited implementation.

[Secretary's Note: The following text has been added after the fifth sentence of the second full paragraph on page 14: "There are a number of potential issues associated with this potential travel demand measure that may result in low levels of voluntary implementation by employers. These issues include charging employees for something which had previously been provided at no cost; monitoring to ensure that only those who purchase parking are using the available parking; and the need to provide parking for employees who elect to participate in the cash out option, but then require a space occasionally."]

8. During the discussion of user fees to pay the costs of construction, maintenance, and operation of street and highway facilities and services, Mr. Grisa suggested that a statement be added to the text indicating that the expenditure of transportation user fees should be restricted to transportation purposes. Mr. Yunker stated that text would be added to this section of the chapter to reflect this comment.

[Secretary's Note: The following text has been added following the first partial sentence at the top of page 15: "It will be important, however, that these transportation user fees be limited to funding transportation purposes only."]

9. During the discussion of detailed site-specific neighborhood and major activity center land use plans on page 16, Mr. Boehm noted that the land use site design transportation demand management measure discussed on page 9 was reintroduced on page 16, but the concept of growth management was not similarly reintroduced. He suggested that more detail similar to that previously set forth earlier in this chapter under the heading of "land use measures" be inserted in this section. Mr. Yunker agreed that additional text reiterating the desirability of implementing growth management practices should be included in this section of the text and indicated that changes would be reflected in the minutes of this meeting.

[Secretary's Note: The following text has been added preceding the first full paragraph on page 16 with a heading of "Implementation of Regional Land Use Plan": Achieving full implementation of the adopted regional land use plan will assist in managing travel demand by directing growth to existing urban centers—particularly the central cities of Milwaukee, Racine, and Kenosha—as infill and redevelopment, and to planned urban growth areas adjacent to these urban centers, and having development occur predominantly at medium and high densities."]

10. During the discussion of the bicycle and pedestrian element of the plan, Mr. Bennett questioned whether bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and in particular the network of off-street paths, truly represent an alternate mode of travel as they are generally used for recreational travel and are not maintained in the winter, and thus only seasonal use is feasible. Mr. Polenske disagreed, stating that many off-street paths are an alternate mode for daily utilitarian travel. Mr. Lemens stated that some Kenosha off-street paths are maintained year around, and Mr. Polenske added that on-street bicycle facilities are maintained in the winter. Mr. Theil stated that the bicycle and pedestrian facility network is an integral part of the overall transportation system. Mr. Grisa agreed that the bicycle and pedestrian facilities are an integral part of the overall transportation system, but

indicated that travel survey data indicate only a small portion of total weekday travel is made by bicycle. Mr. Polenske stated that he perceived bicycle travel is increasing. Mr. Yunker stated that the Commission staff would attempt to capture the essence of the Committee's discussions on this matter, and include additional text for inclusion in the chapter in the minutes of this meeting.

[Secretary's Note: The following text has been added after the third sentence of the second full paragraph on page 16: "Although some existing off-street bicycle and pedestrian facilities are not currently maintained year around thereby limiting those facilities to seasonal use only, as a whole, the system of on-street and off-street bicycle and pedestrian facilities serve as an alternate mode of travel and are an integral part of the Region's multimodal, comprehensive transportation system."]

11. Mr. Thiel noted that in the bicycle accommodations section, the text states that the unit of government responsible for a particular surface arterial street or highway should also have responsibility for the construction and maintenance of the associated bicycle and pedestrian facility. He noted, however, that many municipalities currently require that private entities developing properties construct and maintain such facilities. He suggested that this practice be acknowledged in both the regional transportation plan and the regional land use plan. Mr. Grisa added that the City of Brookfield often requires private developers to construct bicycle and pedestrian facilities, with the City responsible for maintenance. Mr. Yunker stated that the text would be revised to reflect the Committee members' comments, with changes reported in the minutes of this meeting.

Mr. Anderson suggested that the text describing the Wisconsin Department of Transportation's role regarding bicycle and pedestrian facilities within the right-of-way of State trunk highways and connecting streets should indicate that the Department should "encourage" such facilities, not "assume responsibility for" such facilities. He added that current Wisconsin Department of Transportation policy requires local financial participation for such facilities as well as agreement by the local municipality to maintain the facility. This policy reflects the Department's position that bicycle and pedestrian facilities, even when constructed adjacent to a state trunk highway, serve only intra-neighborhood and intra-municipal trips which should be the responsibility of the local municipality. Ms. Beaupre pointed out that on-street bicycle facilities are maintained by the Department as part of the roadway, however. Mr. Yunker noted that the intent of the text was to propose that bicycle facilities should be considered an integral part of an arterial street and highway.

[Secretary's Note: The last paragraph on page 17 has been revised to read as follows: "Bicycle and pedestrian facilities should be considered an integral part of an arterial street and highway, and should be considered for provision at the time an arterial street or highway is constructed, reconstructed, or resurfaced. The unit of government or governmental agency, including the Wisconsin Department of Transportation, responsible for constructing and maintaining the surface arterial street and highway should also have responsibility for constructing and maintaining the associated bicycle or pedestrian facility. This responsibility may be fulfilled by entering into construction, operations, and/or maintenance agreements with another unit of government or with private entities, but not by requiring another level of government to fund the construction and maintenance of the facility. The current practice of the Wisconsin Department of Transportation is to encourage development of bicycle and pedestrian facilities within the right-of-way of State trunk highways and connecting streets, but the Department does

require the local unit of government to fund the construction of such facilities and to agree to maintain the facility. This practice does not recognize the bicycle and pedestrian facility as an integral part of a state trunk highway.”]

12. Regarding the evaluation of alternatives and the priority of need for accommodation of bicycles on surface arterial streets or highways by implementing agencies discussed on page 18, Mr. Polenske noted that bicycle level of service can be a useful tool for this evaluation, and suggested that it be mentioned in this section of the chapter. Mr. Yunker responded that the text will be revised to propose use of bicycle level of service, with the revisions reported in the minutes of this meeting.

[Secretary’s Note: The third full paragraph on page 18 will be modified as follows: “The Regional Planning Commission will prepare, following the completion of the year 2035 plan, an assessment of the priority of need for bicycle accommodation on each segment of the surface arterial street and highway system considering bicycle level of service including factors of traffic volume, composition, speed, and congestion.

Also, the second sentence of the first full paragraph on page 18 is proposed to be modified as follows: “Factors to be considered during the detailed evaluation include bicycle level of service; the availability of right-of-way; the number and type of structures and vegetation that may need to be removed or relocated to provide the bicycle facility; the effects on environmentally sensitive areas, including wetlands; the cost of providing the bicycle facility on a specific street or highway in relation to providing the bicycle-related improvement on a parallel street or off-street corridor; and the quality of the alternative locations and the likelihood that bicyclists would use those alternatives, including the potential for a recommended off-street bicycle path to serve as an alternative location.”]

There being no further discussion, a motion to approve the preliminary draft of initial portions of Chapter VIII, “Regional Transportation Plan Development and Evaluation” as amended was made by Mr. Lampark, seconded by Mr. Lemens, and carried unanimously by the Committee.

Chairman Patrie asked Mr. Yunker to review for the Committee the preliminary draft of Appendix B, “Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Element Facility Standards and Design Guidelines,” of SEWRPC Planning Report No. 49, “A *Regional Transportation System Plan for Southeastern Wisconsin: 2035.*” During Mr. Yunker’s review of the appendix, the following questions were raised and comments made by Committee members:

1. Mr. Yunker stated that text indicating that the bicycle level of service could be used as a tool to help guide decisions regarding the provision of bicycle facilities would be added to the appendix.

[Secretary’s Note: The following text has been added after the second sentence of the last full paragraph on page 3 of appendix B: “Bicycle level of service should be used to evaluate the type of bicycle facility to be provided.”]

2. Mr. Yunker stated that the fourth numbered sentence on page 1 would be deleted from the appendix for the final study report, with the following numbered sentences renumbered as appropriate.

3. Ms. Beaupre indicated that she would provide the comments of the Wisconsin Department of Transportation staff regarding technical aspects of Appendix B to Commission staff. Mr. Yunker stated that Commission staff would review the comments provided by Ms. Beaupre, and respond to those comments as appropriate in the minutes of this meeting.

[Secretary's Note: The following changes are proposed to be made to Appendix B:

The last sentence in the fifth full paragraph on page 16 of Appendix B is proposed to be revised as follows: "Sidewalks along land access streets should be a minimum of five feet in width in all areas of residential development". Also, the last paragraph on page 16, is proposed to be revised as follows: "An unobstructed sidewalk width of no less than four feet should be provided. The Americans with Disabilities Act requires that passing areas at least five feet in width and five feet in length be provided at intervals of no more 200 feet where sidewalks are less than five feet in width".

The first two sentences of the third full paragraph on page 6 are proposed to be revised as follows: "Recent changes in State law facilitate the maneuvers of bicyclists turning left from a bicycle lane and motorists turning right from the left of the bicycle lane by allowing motorists to enter the bike lane to turn right, and allowing the bicyclist to turn left from the appropriate traffic lane. This revision makes these maneuvers consistent with generally accepted rules of the road."

The first sentence of the second full paragraph on page 9 is proposed to be revised as follows: "A barrier should be provided wherever a bicycle path intersects a roadway and less restrictive measures such as signing and enforcement have failed to prevent unauthorized motor-vehicle use of the path."

The first two sentences at the top of page 23 are proposed to be revised as follows: "Off-street paths intended to accommodate bicycle travel should be developed in accordance with the most recent edition of the AASHTO Bicycle Guide and the WisDOT *Wisconsin Bicycle Facility Design Handbook*. Facilities that do not meet these guidelines should be signed as recreational trails rather than as bicycle paths."]

There being no further discussion, a motion to approve the preliminary draft of Appendix B, "Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Element Facility Standards and Design Guidelines," as amended was made by Mr. Feller, seconded by Mr. Jones, and carried unanimously by the Committee.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Yunker stated that the Advisory Committee's next meeting was scheduled for May 4, 2005. He stated that Commission staff would determine if sufficient materials would be ready for Advisory Committee review at a May 4th meeting. He indicated that the materials under development for the Advisory Committee's next meeting include additional sections of Chapter VIII that will address transportation systems operations and public transit. He stated that Commission staff would contact Advisory Committee members about two weeks prior to the meeting to inform them if the May 4 meeting would be held. He indicated that if the May 4 meeting were cancelled, the Advisory Committee's next meeting would be held on June 1, 2005, as previously scheduled.

Chairman Patrie asked when the Commission would be sending out letters to reconvene the Jurisdictional Highway Planning Committees. Mr. Yunker responded that letters would go out to the Jurisdictional Highway Planning Committees in April or May.

The sixth meeting of the Advisory Committee on Regional Transportation Planning was adjourned at 2:30 p.m. on a motion by Mr. Feller, seconded by Mr. Thiel, and carried unanimously by the Committee.

Signed

Kenneth R. Yunker
Recording Secretary