

MINUTES OF THE SIXTH MEETING

SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGIONAL
FREEWAY SYSTEM ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DATE: July 26, 2001
TIME: 3:30 p.m.
PLACE: Tommy G. Thompson Youth Center
Banquet Room 2
Wisconsin State Fair Park
640 South 84th Street
West Allis, WI 53214

Committee Members Present

William R. Drew Vice Chairman, SEWRPC
Chairman
Peter W. Beitzel..... Vice President, International Trade,
(representing Tim Sheehy) Transportation, and Business Development,
Metropolitan Milwaukee Association of Commerce
Kathryn C. Bloomberg Mayor, City of Brookfield
James T. Dwyer Chairperson,
Waukesha County Board of Supervisors
Theresa M. Estness Mayor, City of Wauwatosa
Leslie J. Fafard Director, District 2,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
William K. Fung Wisconsin Division Administrator,
Federal Highway Administration,
U.S. Department of Transportation
Robert L. Kufrin City Administrator, City of Oak Creek
(representing Dale J. Richards)
Kenneth J. Leonard Director, Bureau of Planning,
Division of Transportation Investment Management,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Gloria L. McCutcheon Southeast Regional Director,
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Thomas L. Millonzi Organizer, Teamsters Local 200
(representing Frank Busalacchi)
Allen L. Morrison Chairperson,
Walworth County Board of Supervisors
David A. Novak Director,
(representing F. Thomas Ament) Milwaukee County Department of Public Works
Karen O. Ordians Chairman,
Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors
Frederick J. Patrie Director,
(representing Allen K. Kehl) Kenosha County Department of Public Works
Betty A. Pearson Executive Vice President,
West Bend Chamber of Commerce

Kenneth M. Pesch.....Highway Commissioner,
(representing Kenneth F. Miller) Washington County
Jeffery Polenske City Engineer, City of Milwaukee
(representing John O. Norquist)
Katherine L. Smith Chairperson,
Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors
Marcus Smith Legislative Assistant,
(representing Marvin E. Pratt) City of Milwaukee Common Council
Gustav W. Wirth, Jr..... Commissioner, SEWRPC
(representing Thomas H. Buestrin)

Staff Members and Guests Present

Linda Cutler..... Executive Director,
Milwaukee Regional Medical Center
Philip C. EvensonExecutive Director, SEWRPC
Edward J. Friede..... Systems Planning Manager, District 2,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Patrick E. Hawley.....Traffic Section Director, HNTB
Christopher T. Hiebert..... Senior Engineer, SEWRPC
Terry A. Horst Senior Transportation Design Engineer, HNTB
John Neville..... Reporter, Ozaukee County News Graphic
Patrick A. Pittenger Senior Planner, SEWRPC
Larry Sandler..... Reporter, Milwaukee Journal Sentinel
Doug Senso..... Project Manager, Parsons Transportation Group
Brian Swenson..... Vice President, HNTB
Michael C. ThompsonEnvironmental Analysis and Review Supervisor,
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Rosemary Wehnes..... Organizer, Sierra Club
Thomas WontorekCity Administrator, City of Wauwatosa
Kenneth R. Yunker..... Assistant Director, SEWRPC

WELCOME AND ROLL CALL

Chairman Drew welcomed all members present and indicated that roll call would be accomplished with a sign-in sheet being circulated by Commission staff.

CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JUNE 21, 2001, MEETING

Chairman Drew asked if there were any questions or comments on the [minutes of the Advisory Committee's fifth meeting held on June 21, 2001](#). There being no questions or comments, a motion to approve the minutes as published was made by Mr. Dwyer, seconded by Mr. Beitzel, and carried unanimously by the Committee.

PRESENTATION OF PROJECTED TRAFFIC IMPACTS OF THE POSSIBLE NEW FREEWAY SEGMENT CONNECTING IH 43 AND USH 45 IN NORTHERN MILWAUKEE COUNTY/SOUTHERN OZAUKEE COUNTY

Chairman Drew asked Mr. Yunker to precede with a presentation regarding the projected traffic impacts of the possible new freeway segment connecting IH 43 with USH 45.

[Secretary's Note: A copy of the [presentation](#) distributed at the meeting for this agenda item and the next agenda item is included in Attachment A to these minutes.]

Following Mr. Yunker's presentation of the topic, Advisory Committee members raised the following questions and comments:

1. Ms. Ordians noted the forecast reduction in traffic volumes on an average weekday on Good Hope Road and Brown Deer Road if the possible new freeway was constructed along the Good Hope Road alignment. She further noted the substantial current traffic volumes on Good Hope Road and Brown Deer Road, and likely future increase in traffic volumes, if the possible freeway segment was not constructed. Mr. Yunker replied that the focus of this study is on the reconstruction of the existing freeway system, and the improvements which should be incorporated in that system upon its reconstruction. He noted that the results of the traffic impact analysis of the possible new freeway indicated that the possible new freeway may not be expected to significantly decrease or increase the average weekday traffic volume on any segment of the existing freeway system, and therefore may not be expected to change the reconstruction needs of any segment of the existing freeway system.
2. Mayor Bloomberg noted that the amount of average weekday traffic volume forecast for the possible new freeway for each of the three alignments was greater than the amount of traffic that was forecast to be diverted from surface arterial streets. Mr. Yunker responded that only selected surface arterial streets, those that could be expected to have the greatest reductions in average weekday traffic, were displayed in the presentation, and that numerous additional arterial streets could be expected to experience reduced traffic levels. He stated that the section of Chapter VI, "Design and Evaluation of Freeway System Reconstruction Alternatives," which will include discussion of the information included in this presentation, will list additional surface arterial facilities for which the forecast traffic volumes could be expected to be affected by the possible new freeway segment.
3. Ms. Smith indicated that she believed that a new freeway segment connecting IH 43 and USH 45 in southern Ozaukee County would entail substantial construction costs and right-of-way impacts and that there would be no support within Ozaukee County to construct such a new freeway.

PRESENTATION OF CONCEPTUAL RECONSTRUCTION ALTERNATIVES FOR INITIAL PORTION OF EXISTING FREEWAY SYSTEM

Chairman Drew asked Mr. Yunker to precede with a presentation of conceptual reconstruction alternatives for an initial portion of the existing freeway system. During Mr. Yunker's presentation of the topic, Advisory Committee members raised the following questions and comments:

1. Regarding the summary maps of Segment Nos. 1 and 2 which displayed the conceptual design for IH 94 in Kenosha and Racine Counties and IH 94 between the Milwaukee/Racine County Line and the Mitchell Interchange, Mr. Kufirin asked what changes were planned for weigh stations and rest stops.

Mr. Yunker responded that a reconstructed weigh station immediately north of the Illinois/Wisconsin State line serving northbound traffic would be included in the conceptual design of Segment No. 1. He pointed out that further details on the conceptual design would be provided on a series of detailed maps for each segment to be displayed on aerial photos. Mr. Friede added that a decision had not yet been made regarding the location of a weigh station to serve southbound traffic on IH 94, and that it may be located in either Racine County or in the City of Oak Creek in Milwaukee County.

Mr. Kufirin also noted that several bridges over IH 94 in Oak Creek had recently been reconstructed and asked if those recently reconstructed bridges could accommodate the additional lanes included in the conceptual design of Segment No. 2. Mr. Yunker responded that those recently reconstructed bridges could accommodate the additional traffic lanes included in the conceptual design.

2. Mr. Novak indicated that he believed that it is important to clearly state what improvements may entail additional right-of-way, noting that the information presented appeared to indicate that additional traffic lanes did not require new right-of-way on IH 94 between the Wisconsin-Illinois State line and the Mitchell Interchange, but would require additional right-of-way through the Mitchell Interchange. Mr. Yunker stated that Commission staff would attempt to express the extent and reason for any right-of-way requirements on both a segment-by-segment basis and a systemwide basis. He also added that the potential need for right-of-way was not constraining development of alternatives during this phase of the study.
3. Regarding the summary map of Segment No. 5, which displayed USH 41/45 from the Zoo Interchange to the North Interchange, Ms. Bloomberg pointed out that the series of service interchanges north of the Zoo Interchange resulted in undesirable conditions with numerous motorist decisions required. She suggested that the area warranted special consideration. Mr. Yunker noted that collector-distributor roadways immediately north of the Zoo Interchange were included in the conceptual design for this segment. Mr. Evenson stated that while a level of analysis such as that which has been developed as part of the Marquette Interchange preliminary engineering study could not be conducted as part of this study, it may be possible to use that particular area as an example of how a collector-distributor system could operate and potentially more detailed information could be drawn from previous studies. Mr. Fafard indicated that the Wisconsin Department of Transportation intended to conduct a preliminary engineering study of the Zoo Interchange following the completion of this study.
4. Mayor Bloomberg noted that the base maps for some of the summary maps included in the presentation displayed all crossing streets while others had streets missing, and suggested that the maps be reviewed for consistency and accuracy. Mr. Yunker agreed, and indicated that the maps would be revised prior to the distribution of the final draft of the additional sections of Chapter VI, "Design and Evaluation of Freeway System Reconstruction Alternatives," which would include the summary maps.
5. Regarding Segment No. 7 which included USH 41 from the USH 41/45 interchange to the Washington/Dodge County line, Mr. Pesch asked why potential additional right-of-way could be required when no additional lanes had been included in the conceptual design of the segment. Mr. Yunker responded that the potential for additional right-of-way requirements existed because the existing median for that segment was 50 feet wide, but the desirable median width is 60 feet wide. He added that Commission and consultant staff would further review the reconstruction alternatives and construction history for that segment to determine if there are other alternatives for reconstructing the freeway to meet current design standards without the potential for additional right-of-way

requirements. Mr. Pesch pointed out that USH 45 north of 41/45 interchange also had been constructed with a 50-foot median. Mr. Yunker stated that Commission and consultant staff would review USH 45 as well and provide additional information in the minutes to this meeting.

[Secretary's Note: After reviewing further the existing design and construction history of USH 41 and USH 45 north of the USH 41/45 interchange, it was determined that the conceptual designs for both segments, Nos. 7 and 8, would indicate that no new right-of-way would be required under reconstruction to modern design standards.]

6. Ms. Pearson asked if there were any plans for a new service interchange on USH 45 at CTH NN in Washington County. Mr. Friede stated that as part of an update of the jurisdictional highway system plan for Washington County, conducted by the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission for Washington County, an interchange on USH 45 at CTH NN would not be included in that plan. This recommendation was endorsed by the Advisory Committee for that study, which was comprised of representatives of each municipality within the County, as well as representatives of the County, State, and Federal governments. Ms. Pearson asked if it was possible for a private organization to encourage the development of an interchange by providing private funding for its construction. Mr. Fafard responded that while funding can have an impact on the potential for a project's implementation, there is a rigorous process that must be followed prior to the construction of any interchange.
7. Ms. Ordians asked if any service interchanges would be recommended to be closed as part of this study. Mr. Yunker stated that the closing of certain service interchanges to address operational problems is an option that could be considered during subsequent preliminary engineering studies of specific freeway segments and interchanges. Ms. Ordians stated that she believed it was appropriate for recommendations to be made as part of this study suggesting the consideration during preliminary engineering of closing service interchanges where the Advisory Committee agrees that consideration of that option is warranted. Mr. Yunker replied that the freeway segment design deficiency maps had identified those service interchanges which were located too close to freeway system interchanges, as well as those service interchanges spaced too close together. He added that the collector-distributor roadways included in the conceptual designs presented at this meeting address locations where freeway service and system interchanges are spaced too close together, and the auxiliary lanes included in the conceptual designs address those locations where freeway service interchanges are spaced too close together. An alternative to the collector-distributor roadways and auxiliary lanes could be the closure of selected service interchanges.
8. Mr. Kufirin asked if this study would address traffic mitigation efforts that would be conducted during reconstruction activities. Mr. Yunker responded that they would not be addressed as part of this study, but could be expected to be addressed as part of preliminary engineering studies to be conducted for the reconstruction of each segment and system interchange of the freeway system.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business to come before the Advisory Committee.

CONFIRMATION OF NEXT MEETING DATE

Chairman Drew stated that the next Advisory Committee meeting would be held at 3:30 p.m. on August 23, 2001, at the Tommy G. Thompson Youth Center at State Fair Park.

ADJOURNMENT

The sixth meeting of the Advisory Committee was declared adjourned at 4:50 p.m. by Chairman Drew.

Signed

Philip C. Evenson
Recording Secretary

PCE/KRY/PAP/kjk
8/10/01
#47212