

MINUTES OF THE TWELFTH MEETING

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

DATE: February 8, 2006
TIME: 1:00 p.m.
PLACE: Committee Room No. 1
Wauwatosa City Hall
7725 W. North Avenue
Wauwatosa, Wisconsin

Committee Members Present

Frederick J. Patrie, Chairman..... Director of Public Works, Kenosha County
Sandra K. Beaupre 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
Donna L. Brown..... Systems Planning Group Manager, Southeast Region,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Larry H. Bruss..... Regional Pollutant and Mobile Source Section Chief,
(Representing Kevin Kessler) Bureau of Air Management,
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
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
Jeffrey J. Mantes Commissioner of Public Works, City of Milwaukee
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
George A. Torres Director of Transportation and Public Works,
Department of Public Works, Milwaukee County
Wallace C. Thiel Village Administrator, Village of Hartland

Staff Members and Guests Present

Robert E. Beglinger Chief Transportation Engineer, SEWRPC
Douglas F. Dalton Urban Planning Manager,
Division of Transportation Investment Management,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Philip C. Evenson..... Executive Director, SEWRPC
David M. Jolicoeur..... Senior Engineer, SEWRPC
Ronald J. Rutkowski Transportation Planning Director,
Department of Public Works, Milwaukee County
Gretchen Schuldt..... CASH
Aileen I. Switzer Program Administration Supervisor, Southeast Region
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
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 JANUARY 11, 2006, MEETING

Chairman Patrie asked if there were any questions or comments on the minutes of the Advisory Committee's eleventh meeting held on January 11, 2006. There being no questions or comments, a motion to approve the minutes as written was made by Mr. Pesch, seconded by Mr. Lemens, and carried unanimously by the Committee.

REVIEW OF PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF ADDITIONAL SECTION 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 an additional section of Chapter VIII, "Regional Transportation Plan Development and Evaluation." During Mr. Yunker's review, the following questions were raised and comments made by Committee members:

1. Mr. Bruss asked about the last sentence of the first paragraph under the heading of *Consistency with Planned Regional Land Use Pattern* on page 69. Mr. Yunker responded that the area of the Region along and close to Lake Michigan is at a disadvantage with respect to accessibility to jobs as there are no jobs in Lake Michigan.
2. Mr. Bruss asked about the concept of accessibility and asked if just using travel time would be a better measure. Mr. Grisa and Mr. Yunker responded that the accessibility measure considers both travel time as well as the importance of that travel time through the number of jobs that are reached in that travel time.
3. Mr. Pesch asked about construction costs in Table 9 for the arterial street and highway system under a No-Build Plan. Mr. Yunker responded that those construction costs represent an estimate of the necessary resurfacing and reconstruction costs which would be required to preserve the existing arterial street and highway system.
4. Mr. Grisa asked if the cost presented in Table 9 were in terms of year 2005 or year 2006 dollars. Mr. Yunker responded that they were in year 2005 dollars.
5. Mr. Lemens noted that with respect to Maps 17 and 26, there are two hospitals along STH 50 in the City of Kenosha. Mr. Yunker responded that the maps would be corrected in the final report.
6. Mr. Bruss noted that the first sentence of the last paragraph on page 84 begins to describe the ability of the different plan alternatives to meet accessibility standards and asked if a table could be included which identified each standard. Mr. Yunker responded that each standard is identified in Chapter VII and that each Map in Chapter VIII displaying areas of the Region meeting a specific standard also identifies the specific standard.
7. With respect to Tables 12 and 13, Mr. Bruss asked whether the major retail center in northwest Milwaukee County should be identified as the Northridge Shopping Center. Mr. Mantes responded that the shopping center should be identified as Granville Station.

8. Mr. Pesch asked how the urbanized area boundary is defined. Mr. Yunker responded that the urbanized areas are defined by the U.S. Census Bureau based upon population density. He added that the Commission then works with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation and the communities in each urbanized area of the Region to define an adjusted (expanded) urbanized area boundary to include commercial and industrial areas which are part of the urbanized area, but are not included in the U.S. Census Bureau definition of the urbanized area. Mr. Yunker also noted that the urbanized area boundaries shown in Maps 24 through 35 have been further adjusted (expanded) to correspond with traffic analysis zone boundaries.
9. Mr. Bruss and Ms. McCutcheon noted that the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WisDNR) had some suggested text edits regarding WisDNR Land Legacy Places and would be transmitting those edits to the Commission staff following the meeting.

[Secretary's Note: The Commission staff has received language from the WisDNR regarding Land Legacy Places and will incorporate that language into the final report.]

10. With respect to Table 16, Mr. Bennett asked if the term dislocation should be changed to relocation. Mr. Yunker responded that the intent was to provide an estimate of the number of residential units and commercial and industrial buildings that may need to be acquired for expanded transportation right-of-ways, and agreed that the term relocation should be used.
11. With respect to Table 17, Mr. Patrie asked why ammonia emissions are forecast to increase over 2001 levels under each plan alternative. Mr. Yunker responded that the Commission staff had asked the WisDNR about this and they indicated that newer catalytic converters were designed to significantly reduce certain emissions – such as nitrogen oxides – but provide no to minimal reduction in ammonia emission rates. Mr. Bruss added that some selected diesel engines also require the injection of ammonia into the cylinders during operation, and that this results in ammonia emissions.
12. Mr. Grisa asked if it would be possible to add historic emissions data to Table 17. Mr. Yunker responded that historic information is provided for volatile organic compound and nitrogen oxide emissions and the Commission staff would attempt to provide additional historic emissions data in the final report.
13. With respect to Table 18, Mr. Grisa asked if it would be possible to identify the improvement in crash experience which may be expected as they specifically relate to the whether or not the recommendation is made to widen 19 miles of freeway in the City of Milwaukee. Mr. Yunker responded that the Commission staff would attempt to prepare a discussion of the potential safety impacts.

[Secretary's Note: The traffic safety discussion on page 2 would be revised as follows:

Traffic Safety

The widening of IH 94 and IH 43 from six to eight lanes as part of freeway reconstruction will provide traffic safety improvement by accommodating more traffic on freeways rather than surface arterials, and by reducing freeway traffic congestion. About 10 percent more traffic will be carried on these 19 miles of freeway rather than on surface arterials, if these 19 miles of freeway are widened from six to eight lanes. The crash rates for surface arterials are about three times higher than those for – freeways for total crashes and for fatalities and injuries. Also, if these freeways are widened from six to eight lanes, 12 of the 19 miles may be expected to operate at severe rather than extreme traffic congestion and experience a significantly lower – 50 percent lower – traffic crash rates. The 50

percent reduction in traffic crash rates would be a result of reduced rear-end accidents. Rear-end accident rates are five to 15 times higher on congested freeways as compared to uncongested freeways, with the most extremely congested freeways experiencing the highest rear-end crash rates.]

14. With respect to Table 17, Mr. Thiel asked if the acceptable levels of each pollutant could be added along the bottom. Mr. Yunker responded that the WisDNR is responsible for the preparation of a State Implementation Plan (SIP) for attaining ozone air quality standards, and that this plan identifies levels, or budgets, for volatile organic compounds and nitrogen oxides to which the regional transportation plan must be determined to conform, that is, not exceed. He added that those budgets would be added to the table. Mr. Bruss stated that the WisDNR is in the process of preparing a new State Implementation Plan for the 8-hour ozone standard and that they are probably about 18 months away from estimates of planned budget levels and attributing a portion of that budget to transportation pollutants.

[Secretary's Note: The budgets in the State Implementation Plan for the previous 1-hour ozone standard, and which serve as interim budgets for the 8-hour ozone standard are 32.2 tons of volatile organic compounds on a hot summer weekday and 71.4 tons of nitrogen oxides on a hot summer weekday in the year 2007. Projected emission levels for the year 2007 and future years to the year 2035 must be determined to not exceed these budget levels for the regional transportation plan to conform to the State Implementation Plan.]

15. Ms. Brown noted that the Wisconsin Department of Transportation was still reviewing this chapter and may provide comments to Commission staff at a later date.

There being no further discussion, a motion to approve the additional section of the preliminary draft chapter was made by Mr. Feller, seconded by Mr. Mantes, and carried unanimously by the Committee.

REVIEW OF PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF APPENDIX C, "EVALUATION OF THE IMPACTS OF THE YEAR 2035 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN TSM PLUS HIGHWAY ALTERNATIVE ON MINORITY AND LOW-INCOME POPULATIONS IN SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN" 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 an Appendix C, "Evaluation of the Impacts of the Year 2035 Regional Transportation Plan TSM Plus Highway Alternative on Minority and Low-Income Populations in Southeastern Wisconsin." Mr. Yunker noted that this appendix would ultimately be prepared for the preliminary recommended, and final recommended regional transportation plan. During Mr. Yunker's review, the following questions were raised and comments made by Committee members:

1. Mr. Bruss asked if a map showing concentrations of persons of all minorities within southeastern Wisconsin could be included near the beginning of the Appendix. Mr. Yunker responded that the Commission staff would add this map in the final report.
2. Mr. Lemens asked about the definition of other minorities. Mr. Evenson responded that the U.S. Census Bureau has a write-in space on the census form in which persons can identify themselves as of "some other race." He added that this includes persons of mixed race. Mr. Yunker added that Commission staff would report in the minutes the U.S. Census Bureau definition of other minority.

[Secretary's Note: The U.S. Census Bureau identifies "some other race" based upon a write-in area on the census form. The "some other race" category is defined by the U.S. Census Bureau as *write-in entries such as multiracial, mixed, interracial, or a Hispanic/Latino group (for example, Mexican, Puerto Rican, or Cuban.)*]

3. Mr. Bruss noted that the first sentence of the first full paragraph under the heading *Potential Adverse Impacts* on page C-2 indicated that residing in proximity to an arterial street or highway proposed to be widened was perceived as having potential adverse effects. He requested that the word perceived be removed from the sentence. Mr. Pesch objected to removing the term. Mr. Yunker responded that the Commission staff would examine the text and attempt to propose new text.

[Secretary's Note: The first sentence will be replaced with the following sentence: "Automobile and truck traffic on arterial streets and highways emit air pollutants and noise."]

4. Mr. Thiel noted that with respect to residing adjacent to freeways, it is not a phenomenon limited to families in poverty. He noted that within his community he doubted a family in poverty would be able to afford a residential property near the freeway.
5. Mr. Bruss suggested that a brief summary be added to the beginning of the Appendix. Mr. Yunker responded that Commission staff would add a summary in the introduction to the appendix in the final report.

There being no further discussion, a motion to approve the preliminary draft Appendix C was made by Mr. Lampark, seconded by Mr. Lemens, and carried unanimously by the Committee.

REVIEW OF PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF APPENDIX D, "EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION OF FREEWAY INTERCHANGES" 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 Appendix D, "Evaluation and Recommendation of Freeway Interchanges." During Mr. Yunker's review, the following questions were raised and comments made by Committee members:

1. Mr. Grisa noted that the first page of the Appendix recommends that no new half interchanges be constructed, but Map 7 shows two new half interchanges along the long proposed freeway extension of USH 12 in Walworth County. Mr. Yunker responded that staff would need to review this long proposed freeway extension.

[Secretary's Note: The Commission staff recommends that the two half interchanges with CTH H and CTH A be replaced with a full interchange with CTH A.]

2. Ms. Brown noted that the Wisconsin Department of Transportation was still reviewing this Appendix and may be providing comments to the Commission staff within two weeks.
3. Mr. Grisa asked if the construction costs were in year 2005 dollars. Mr. Yunker responded that they were.
4. With respect to the 27th Street interchange, Mr. Lampark asked that the references to CTH G be removed. Mr. Yunker stated the correction would be made in the final report.

5. Mr. Pesch noted the proposed development in Washington County at the STH 145 interchange with USH 45, and asked the Commission staff to review the proposed improvement of STH 145 between USH 41 and USH 45 attendant to the proposed development. Mr. Yunker responded that the Commission staff would review the issue with Washington County and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation. Mr. Lemens requested that the Commission staff review the potential need for additional lanes on CTH K west of IH 94 in Kenosha County due to planned development.
6. Mr. Lampark asked that the Commission staff conduct an analysis of a new interchange at CTH C and IH 94. Mr. Yunker and Ms. Brown noted that this segment is in preliminary engineering and that the Wisconsin Department of Transportation is now examining this proposal. He added that an interchange at CTH K and IH 94 in Kenosha County is also being examined in preliminary engineering. He stated the proximity of these proposed interchanges to existing interchanges would probably require the use of collector-distributor roads which connect a split interchange. He stated that the plan maps for Racine and Kenosha Counties will include notes that recommend that preliminary engineering for the reconstruction of IH 94 consider the provision of an interchange with CTH C in Racine County and CTH K in Kenosha County.

There being no further discussion, a motion to approve the additional section of the preliminary draft chapter was made by Mr. Feller, seconded by Mr. Mantes, and carried by the Committee on a vote of 18 ayes to 0 nays with Mr. Kappel abstaining from the vote.

REVIEW OF PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF APPENDIX E, "EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVE FREEWAY SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS" 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 Appendix E, "Evaluation of Alternative Freeway System Improvements." During Mr. Yunker's review, the following questions were raised and comments made by Committee members:

1. Mr. Torres indicated that the text of the first page of Appendix E should be clarified to indicate that Milwaukee County does have an official position regarding the 19 miles of freeway widening proposed in the City of Milwaukee. He noted that the executive branch of Milwaukee County vetoed the legislative branch resolution opposing 19 miles of freeway widening in the City of Milwaukee. He stated that with the legislative branch failing to override the executive veto, Milwaukee County's official position is in favor of widening those 19 miles of freeway within the City of Milwaukee. Mr. Evenson questioned whether the actions of the Milwaukee County Board and Executive resulted in any official position, the Commission staff being of the opinion that any "official" position of the County should be concurred by both the executive and legislative branches of County government. Mr. Mantes stated that the City of Milwaukee's position of opposition to the widening of those 19 miles has not changed. Mr. Yunker explained the Commission staff's recommendation regarding these 19 miles of freeway for the final freeway system reconstruction plan and noted that these 19 miles of proposed freeway widening are likely to be the most controversial portion of both a preliminary and final recommended plan.
2. Mr. Grisa asked if the Commission would prepare a table which indicated the freeway study advisory committee votes and Milwaukee County's position. Mr. Pesch asked that all county government positions on this issue be included in the proposed table. Mr. Yunker responded that the Commission staff would prepare such a table.

[Secretary's Note: A table outlining the votes regarding the widening of 127 miles of freeways in southeastern Wisconsin has been included with these minutes as Attachment A.]

3. Mr. Mantes noted that with respect to IH 94, between the state line and the Mitchell Interchange, the freeway reconstruction study estimated that 72 potential properties in the City of Milwaukee may need to be acquired. He indicated that this would have an estimated reduction in tax base in the City of Milwaukee of about \$15 million. Ms. Brown responded that the Wisconsin Department of Transportation preliminary engineering study which has just been initiated will determine whether any property acquisitions will be required. Mr. Yunker added that the 72 residences cited by Mr. Mantes were estimated to be required for design and design-related safety improvements, not additional lanes.
4. Mr. Mantes indicated the City of Milwaukee's agreement with the Commission staff's final freeway system plan recommendation regarding these 19 miles of widening on freeways in the City, specifically, that these 19 miles of freeway widening not be included in the final plan, but rather be addressed as an alternative as the Wisconsin Department of Transportation conducts preliminary engineering and environmental assessments attendant to the reconstruction of these 19 miles of freeway. Should the final recommendation from the preliminary engineering and environmental assessment include the widening of some or all of these 19 miles of freeway from six to eight traffic lanes, the regional transportation plan would be amended by the Commission at that time. Mr. Grisa suggested that the potential improvements should be identified and recommended in the plans, so that residents are not surprised should the lanes be constructed in the future. Mr. McComb noted that the regional transportation plan does not mandate construction projects, and that final decisions are made in preliminary engineering. He stated that the plan should identify the improvements necessary to address identified needs and deficiencies.

There was no further discussion on the preliminary draft of Appendix E.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Yunker suggested that the Committee set another meeting date prior to March 8th. He stated that at this meeting the Committee would continue discussion and attempt to reach consensus on the widening of these 19 miles of freeway; review and consider two freeway options suggested for analysis by Committee members – a new freeway connecting IH 43 and USH 45 near the Milwaukee County-Ozaukee County line and new freeway connecting IH 94 in Kenosha or Racine County with IH 94 in western Waukesha County; and consider recommending a preliminary plan for the Commission staff to take to public hearing. After some discussion, the Committee set its next meeting on March 1, 2006 at 9:30 a.m. The twelfth meeting of the Advisory Committee on Regional Transportation Planning was adjourned at 3:15 p.m. on a motion by Mr. Grisa, seconded by Mr. Bennett, and carried unanimously by the Committee.

Signed

Kenneth R. Yunker
Recording Secretary

Attachment A

VOTES REGARDING THE PROPOSED FREEWAY SYSTEM RECONSTRUCTION PLAN

Regional Freeway System Reconstruction Study	For	Against
Technical Subcommittee (preliminary plan)	8	3
Advisory Committee (preliminary plan)	18	2
Advisory Committee (final plan) ¹	15	8
County Board Action		
Kenosha County ²	25	0
Milwaukee County ³	10	15
Ozaukee County ⁴	24	3
Racine County ⁵	20	0
Walworth County ⁶	24	0
Washington County ⁷	27	1
Waukesha County ⁸	29	3

¹ The elected officials who were members of the Advisory Committee voted 10 for and 4 against on the final plan. Regarding including the 19 miles of freeway widening in the City of Milwaukee in the final plan, the Advisory Committee vote was 14 to 9 (elected officials vote was 9 to 5) to include the widening in the final plan.

² Kenosha County Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 46 – September, 2002.

³ Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors Resolution 02-275 – February, 2003. The Milwaukee County Executive vetoed Resolution 02-275 on March 20, 2003. The Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors failed to override the veto on a vote of 16 to 9. (The Milwaukee County Board voted 15 to 10 on February 20, 2003, to oppose the widening of the 19 miles of freeway in the City of Milwaukee.)

⁴ Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 02-19 – August, 2002.

⁵ Racine County Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 2002-65 – July, 2002.

⁶ Walworth County Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 39-08/02 – August, 2002.

⁷ Washington County Board of Supervisors 2002 Resolution 12 – June, 2002.

⁸ Waukesha County Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 157-3 – June, 2002.

Source: SEWRPC.

DMJ/dmj
02/10/06
#115727