

MINUTES OF THE SEVENTH MEETING

SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGIONAL
FREEWAY SYSTEM ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DATE: August 23, 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

Thomas H. Buestrin..... Chairman, SEWRPC
(Serving as Chairman in Chairman Drew's absence)
Peter W. Beitzel..... Vice President, International Trade,
(representing Tim Sheehy) Transportation, and Business Development,
Metropolitan Milwaukee Association of Commerce
Kathryn C. BloombergMayor, City of Brookfield
Richard A. Bolte..... Director of Public Works, Waukesha County
(representing Daniel M. Finley)
Brian G. DuPont..... Highway Commissioner, Walworth County
(representing Allen L. Morrison)
James T. Dwyer..... Chairperson,
Waukesha County Board of Supervisors
Leslie J. FafardDirector, District 2,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
John B. Kohl.....County Supervisor, Washington County
(representing Kenneth F. Miller)
Robert L. Kufrin..... City Administrator, City of Oak Creek
(representing Dale J. Richards)
Kenneth J. LeonardDirector, Bureau of Planning,
Division of Transportation Investment Management,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Gloria L. McCutcheon.....Southeast Regional Director,
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Tom MeauxAdministrative Coordinator,
(representing Katherine L. Smith) Ozaukee County
Cecil F. Mehring, Jr..... Manager of Engineering Services,
(representing Jean M. Jacobson) Racine County, Department of Public Works
Thomas L. Millonzi..... Organizer, Teamsters Local 200
(representing Frank Busalacchi)
David A. Novak.....Director,
(representing F. Thomas Ament) Milwaukee County Department of Public Works
Karen O. Ordinas..... 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
Philip J. Scherer.....Executive Director,
Transportation Development Association of Wisconsin
Mariano Schifalacqua.....Commissioner, Department of Public Works,
(representing John O. Norquist) City of Milwaukee
Gustav W. Wirth, Jr.....Commissioner, SEWRPC
(representing William R. Drew)

Staff Members and Guests Present

Robert E. Beglinger..... Chief Transportation Engineer, SEWRPC
Donna L. Brown..... Urban Modal Manager, District 2,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Linda CutlerExecutive Director,
Milwaukee Regional Medical Center
Philip C. Evenson.....Executive Director, SEWRPC
Edward J. Friede..... Systems Planning Manager, District 2,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Patrick E. Hawley.....Traffic Section Director, HNTB
Terry A. Horst Senior Transportation Design Engineer, HNTB
Gary K. Korb..... Regional Planning Educator, UW Extension
Robert Krug.....Supervisor,
Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors
Kenneth M. PeschHighway Commissioner,
Washington County
Patrick A. Pittenger Senior Planner, SEWRPC
Larry Sandler..... Reporter, Milwaukee Journal Sentinel
Dennis A. Shook Reporter, Waukesha Freeman
Kevin SoucieSoucie & Associates
Michael C. Thompson Environmental Analysis and Review Supervisor,
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Rosemary Wehnes.....Organizer, Sierra Club
Kenneth R. Yunker..... Assistant Director, SEWRPC

WELCOME AND ROLL CALL

Mr. Buestrin welcomed all members present and indicated that Chairman Drew was unable to attend this meeting, and that he would serve as the Chairman in his absence. He stated that roll call would be accomplished with a sign-in sheet being circulated by Commission staff.

CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JULY 26, 2001, MEETING

Mr. Buestrin asked if there were any questions or comments on the [minutes of the Advisory Committee's sixth meeting held on July 26, 2001](#). There being no questions or comments, a motion to approve the minutes as published was made by Mr. Leonard, seconded by Mr. Patrie, and carried unanimously.

CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF FINAL DRAFT THE STUDY REPORT AS APPROVED BY THE TECHNICAL SUB COMMITTEE

Mr. Buestrin asked if there were any comments regarding the [additional sections of Chapter VI, "Design and Evaluation of Freeway System Reconstruction Alternatives,"](#) which included the conceptual design of an initial portion of the freeway system and the consideration of a possible new freeway segment connecting IH 43 and USH 45 in northern Milwaukee County/southern Ozaukee County. Mr. Dwyer suggested that subsequent revised drafts of report materials distributed to Advisory Committee members for consideration and approval indicate what modifications were made from the materials presented to the Advisory Committee and the preliminary draft materials reviewed by the Technical Subcommittee. Mr. Yunker stated that Commission staff would attempt to do so in the future, and described the modifications that had been incorporated into the final draft version of the additional sections of the chapter. Regarding one of the modifications noted by Mr. Yunker, the revision of the final paragraph on page 8, Mr. Schifalacqua noted that there had been discussion regarding this portion of the text at the previous Technical Subcommittee meeting. He added that it had been discussed that the chapter text should indicate that the possible new freeway connecting IH 43 and USH 45 "will be considered" when regional land use and transportation plans are reevaluated and updated rather than "may be considered" as included in the final version of the text. Mr. Evenson noted that the range of transportation system alternatives to be considered in the reevaluation and update of the regional transportation plan will be the prerogative of a different Advisory Committee--which also includes City of Milwaukee representatives.

There being no further questions or comments, a motion to approve the additional sections of Chapter VI was made by Mr. Dwyer, seconded by Ms. Pearson, and carried unanimously.

PRESENTATION OF CONCEPTUAL RECONSTRUCTION ALTERNATIVES FOR REMAINING PORTIONS OF EXISTING FREEWAY SYSTEM

Mr. Buestrin asked Mr. Yunker to proceed with a presentation of conceptual reconstruction alternatives for the remaining portions of the existing freeway system.

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

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

1. In reference to the summary map of Segment No. 11 which displayed the conceptual proposals for IH 43 from STH 83 to the Hale Interchange, Mr. Kufirin noted that the conceptual design included the consideration of a new interchange between STH 83 and STH 164. Mr. Yunker stated that the inclusion of consideration of a possible new interchange was in response to a request by the Village of Mukwonago. Mr. Evenson stated that a significant amount of development has occurred in and around the Village of Mukwonago, and the existing interchanges on IH 43 at STH 83 and at STH 164 are approximately seven miles apart.
2. In reference to the summary map of Segment No. 13 which displayed IH 43 from the Marquette Interchange to Silver Spring Drive, Mr. Schifalacqua stated that he believed that to reduce the need for additional right-of-way, the design for freeway reconstruction would require retaining walls. He stated that under an alternative with additional lanes, retaining walls may represent a negative impact on the appearance of the freeway. Mr. Yunker stated that an attempt would be made to identify the

areas where retaining walls would likely be incorporated into the design of a reconstructed freeway segment under each alternative.

Also in reference to the summary map of Segment No. 13, Mr. Fafard noted that it was identified that the potential existed for additional right-of-way at a number of service interchanges upon their redesign and reconstruction with or without additional freeway traffic lanes.

3. Regarding the summary map of Segment No. 14 which displayed IH 43 from Silver Spring Drive to STH 60, Mr. Schifalacqua noted that conversion from four to eight basic traffic lanes was included on the conceptual design for this segment between Silver Spring Drive and Brown Deer Road, with substandard shoulders assumed to be provided at the recently reconstructed Silver Spring Drive interchange between Lexington Boulevard and Bender Road. Mr. Yunker responded that operation with substandard shoulders at this location was included in the conceptual design because the interchange segment was recently reconstructed. Mr. Schifalacqua suggested that it may be preferable to propose under these conceptual reconstruction alternatives that desirable standards for reconstruction be met. Mr. Schifalacqua suggested that the Technical Subcommittee discuss the issue further at its next meeting.

[Secretary's Note: At the Technical Subcommittee's September 6, 2001, meeting, the Subcommittee agreed that it would be appropriate to assume the operation of eight basic lanes at the interchange on IH 43 at Silver Spring Drive with substandard shoulders, because the interchange was recently reconstructed.]

4. Regarding the summary map of Segment No. 16 which displayed IH 94 from the Waukesha/Jefferson County Line to the IH 94/ STH 16 Interchange, Mr. Bolte questioned if the ramps at the interchange on IH 94 at CTH C met current design standards. Mr. Yunker stated that Commission and consultant staff would review the characteristics of those ramps and provide further information to the Technical Subcommittee.

[Secretary's Note: At the Technical Subcommittee's September 6, 2001, meeting, Commission staff indicated that the configuration of the interchange on IH 94 at CTH C did warrant further investigation during reconstruction of this segment. A text box that stated the following was added to the conceptual design summary map:

“Investigate reconstruction of CTH C interchange for improved ramp geometry and better operations. Investigate configuration to a diamond-style interchange. This feature will require new right-of-way.”]

Also regarding the summary map of Segment No. 16, Mayor Bloomberg noted that motorists traveling eastbound on STH 16 could not turn westbound at the IH 94/ STH 16 Interchange to IH 94 westbound, and are required to utilize CTH T to make that turning movement. Mr. Yunker responded that the IH 94/ STH 16 Interchange was recently reconstructed, and prior to the reconstruction, it was determined that very low volumes of traffic utilized the prior ramp that had allowed the connection mentioned by Mayor Bloomberg, and, therefore, the connecting ramp was not reconstructed as part of the interchange. Mr. Fafard noted that should that ramp be considered as part of a reconstructed system interchange, the proximity of the IH 94/ STH 16 Interchange and the interchange on IH 94 at

CTH T would need to be investigated. Mr. Evenson stated that Commission staff would review the possible reconfiguration of the IH 94/STH 16 Interchange upon reconstruction.

[Secretary's Note: The possible reconfiguration of the IH 94/STH 16 Interchange was discussed at the Technical Subcommittee's September 6th, 2001, meeting. Commission staff stated that that system interchange had recently been reconstructed, and that providing a freeway-to-freeway ramp between eastbound STH 16 and westbound IH 94 was considered as part of the reconstruction of that system interchange. The traffic volume on an average weekday prior to reconstruction on that connecting ramp was approximately 1,000 vehicles per average weekday. The proximity of the service interchange on IH 94 and CTH T with this system interchange ramp would make it extremely difficult to provide in terms of construction cost and right-of-way acquisition. Improvements in signing could assist motorists traveling between Capitol Drive to and from the east and IH 94. The Technical Subcommittee agreed that reconfiguration of the interchange of IH 94 and STH 16 should not be considered as part of this study.]

5. In reference to the summary map of Segment No. 17 which displayed STH 16 from the Oconomowoc River to the IH 94/ STH 16 Interchange, Mr. Bolte noted that additional lanes had not been included in the conceptual design for this segment, and suggested that potential for additional lanes be discussed at the Technical Subcommittee's next meeting. Mr. Bolte also asked that additional information be provided regarding the planned Oconomowoc bypass. Mr. Yunker responded that the Wisconsin Department of Transportation is currently conducting the final engineering and design of the Oconomowoc bypass.

[Secretary's Note: At the Technical Subcommittee's September 6, 2001, meeting, Commission staff provided additional information to the Subcommittee regarding Segment No. 17. Commission staff noted that after further review of average weekday current and forecast year 2020 traffic volumes on this segment, it was confirmed that current and forecast traffic volumes may not be expected to be sufficient to result even in moderate traffic congestion, and, therefore, additional lanes for this segment would not be considered as part of this study. Regarding the Oconomowoc bypass, it was noted that STH 16 currently is designed, and operates, at less than freeway standards between the Oconomowoc River and the interchange of STH 16 and STH 67. It was further stated that the Wisconsin Department of Transportation is currently conducting the final engineering and design for the planned Oconomowoc bypass, and that the decisions regarding the nature of that facility were being determined as part of that study. The current plans were to construct a facility to less than freeway standards.]

6. In reference to the summary map of Segment No. 18 which displayed IH 94 from the IH 94/STH 16 Interchange to the Zoo Interchange, Mayor Bloomberg noted that the potential for additional right-of-way was identified on the segment between Moorland Road and the Zoo Interchange, and the identified additional traffic lanes and truck climbing lane. She noted that there will also be increased noise impacts. Mr. Evenson responded that potential noise impacts would be among the most difficult to consider as part of this study. Mr. DuPont asked if the cost of noise barrier walls would be included in the cost estimates to reconstruct the regional freeway system. Mr. Evenson responded that the costs associated with noise barrier walls would be identified based on previous Wisconsin Department of Transportation studies. Mr. Fafard noted that when the reconstruction of a freeway segment has included additional lanes, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation has installed noise barriers at no cost to the affected local communities if the local communities determine that they are desirable.
7. Regarding the possible alternative designs for the reconstruction of STH 145 (Fond du Lac Freeway), Mr. Schifalacqua stated that the fourth alternative, the removal of the freeway spur and improvement of Fond du Lac Avenue, would likely require additional right-of-way. Mr. Yunker responded that the Commission would amend the description of that alternative. Regarding Segment No. 20, USH 41 (Stadium Freeway-North) and segment No. 21, STH 145 (Fond du Lac Freeway), Ms. Ordinars asked when alternatives for each segment would be selected for further evaluation from those included in the presentation. Mr. Yunker stated that the Technical Subcommittee would be asked to consider the alternatives and reduce the number of those alternatives at its next meeting.

[Secretary's Note: The Technical Subcommittee considered the alternatives for the reconstruction of Segment No. 20 STH 41 (Stadium Freeway North) and for Segment No. 21 STH 145 (Fond du Lac Freeway). The Technical Subcommittee reached agreement on one alternative for each of the two segments. Regarding Segment No. 20, the selected alternative for further evaluation was reconstruction as an expressway/parkway, similar to Miller Parkway with the reconstruction of the Stadium Interchange as a "high-type" service interchange. Regarding Segment No. 21, the selected alternative for further evaluation was reconstruction to freeway standards with conversion from six to four basic traffic lanes.]

8. In reference to the summary map of Segment No. 22 which displayed STH 119 (Airport Spur Freeway) from IH 94 to General Mitchell International Airport, Mr. Kufrin noted that the interchange on STH 119 at Howell Avenue had a unique configuration that was difficult for motorists to navigate, and suggested that a reconfiguration of the ramps at that interchange be included for consideration as part of the study. Mr. Yunker stated that Commission and consultant staff would review the configuration of that service interchange and provide additional information to the Technical Subcommittee at its next meeting.

[Secretary's Note: It was determined that the current configuration of the interchange on STH 119 at Howell Avenue merited consideration of reconfiguration during reconstruction. A text box containing the following note was added to the conceptual design for that segment in reference to that service interchange:

“Consider reconfiguration of Howell Avenue interchange for better operations. Preliminary engineering to address right-of-way impacts.”]

9. Regarding the estimation of costs for the reconstruction of the freeway system, Mr. Novak noted that numerous situations exist on the conceptual design summary maps where multiple alternatives for improvements were included, and asked whether the estimated costs for reconstruction would include the cost for each alternative improvement included in the conceptual designs. Mr. Yunker stated that cost estimates would be developed on a segment-by-segment basis and totaled to provide systemwide comparisons, but the costs for only one alternative improvement will be included in the cost estimates for each segment. For example, with respect to the interchange of STH 100 with IH 43, two alternatives to improve the design and safety of the interchange have been identified. One would maintain one-half of the interchange with STH 100 and the other one-half of the interchange with S. 124th Street and W. Layton Avenue. The other alternative would involve relocating the entire interchange to STH 100. The option which would best serve traffic while minimizing cost and right-of-way impacts would be incorporated in the freeway system plan reconstruction alternatives. However, both options and possibly other alternatives may be expected to be considered in subsequent preliminary engineering.
10. Regarding the estimation and presentation of potential right-of-way impacts, Mr. Novak stated that it would be important to identify the improvements which may entail additional right-of-way. Mr. Yunker responded that Commission staff would continue to attempt to explain the extent and reason for any right-of-way requirements on both a segment-by-segment basis and a systemwide basis.
11. Concerning the reaching of a consensus on a reconstructed freeway system, Mr. Novak expressed concern that Advisory Committee members would be required to endorse either the alternative with no capacity expansion, or the alternative proposing capacity expansion on 120 miles of freeway. Mr. Evenson stated that two systemwide alternatives will be fully evaluated, each with safety and design improvements, and one with capacity improvements, and presented to the Advisory Committee. He stated that those two system alternatives did not represent the only options available to the Advisory Committee, and that the Commission is prepared to evaluate additional systemwide alternatives that could include elements of each of the two system alternatives to be initially evaluated. Mr. Evenson stated that while the evaluation of additional systemwide alternatives may affect the schedule for completion of the study, the Commission would continue work on this study to assure that consensus is reached regarding the reconstruction of the regional freeway system. Mr. Yunker added that a preliminary plan for the reconstruction of the regional freeway system would be presented to the Region’s county boards and municipalities, State legislators, and to the public at a series of public hearings, with the preliminary plan to be revised in response to form a final plan.
12. Regarding the evaluation of alternatives, Mr. Schifalacqua asked what potential benefits and costs of the systemwide alternatives would be evaluated. Mr. Yunker replied that a comprehensive range of potential benefits and costs will be evaluated as part of the systemwide evaluation of alternatives. He stated that considerations will include construction costs; right-of-way impacts; impacts on traffic volumes and congestion on both the existing freeway system and the surface arterial street and highway system; air pollutant emissions; energy consumption; and land use impacts.
13. Ms. McCutcheon stated that the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources would be working with the Commission in order to develop the estimates of air pollutant emissions, and would be scheduling

a separate meeting with Commission staff prior to the next Advisory Committee meeting to discuss the freeway study.

14. Ms. Ordinans asked what the relationship is between the Marquette Interchange preliminary engineering study and this study regarding additional lanes on IH 43 and IH 94 approaching the Marquette Interchange. Mr. Yunker stated that the Wisconsin Department of Transportation was currently conducting an assessment of potential modifications to the interchange reconfiguration design, if as under one alternative being considered under this study, additional lanes are provided on connecting segments of IH 43 and IH 94. He also stated that the right-of-way and construction cost impacts were also being assessed by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation, and that that information would be provided to Commission staff and presented to the Advisory Committee as part of the systemwide evaluation of alternatives.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Scherer noted that the Commission had recently conducted a series of public meetings regarding the study. Mr. Yunker stated that Commission staff would compile the comments received at those public meetings, as well as other comments regarding the study received by September 1, 2001, and would provide those comments to the Advisory Committee before its next meeting.

CONFIRMATION OF NEXT MEETING DATE

Mr. Evenson stated that the next Advisory Committee meeting would be held at 3:30 p.m. on September 20, 2001, at the Tommy G. Thompson Youth Center at State Fair Park. He added that Chairman Drew had determined that the subsequent meeting, previously planned for October 18, 2001, would be cancelled. He stated that the Advisory Committee's other remaining meetings, previously scheduled for November 15 and December 13, 2001, were still scheduled to be held at the Tommy G. Thompson Youth Center at State Fair Park.

[Secretary's note: Following the meeting, the Advisory Committee Meeting previously scheduled for September 20, 2001, was postponed and rescheduled for 3:30 p.m. October 9, 2001, at the Tommy G. Thompson Youth Center at State Fair Park.]

ADJOURNMENT

The seventh meeting of the Advisory Committee was declared adjourned at 5:00 p.m. by Mr. Buestrin.

Signed

Philip C. Evenson
Recording Secretary

* * *