

MINUTES OF THE EIGHTH MEETING

SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGIONAL
FREEWAY SYSTEM ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DATE: October 9, 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
Gregory Bradley Legislative Aide,
(representing James G. White) Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors
Daniel M. Finley Waukesha County Executive,
Brian G. DuPont..... Highway Commissioner,
(representing Allen L. Morrison) Walworth County
James T. Dwyer..... Chairperson,
Waukesha County Board of Supervisors
Theresa M. Estness..... Mayor, City of Wauwatosa
Ronald R. Fiedler Senior Advisor,
(representing Philip J. Scherer) Transportation Development Association of Wisconsin
John B. Kohl..... County Supervisor,
(representing Kenneth F. Miller) Washington County
Kenneth J. Leonard Director, Bureau of Planning,
Division of Transportation Investment Management,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Jeffrey J. Mantes Chief Transportation Planning and Development Engineer,
(representing John O. Norquist) City of Milwaukee
Gloria L. McCutcheon..... Southeast Regional Director,
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Cecil F. Mehring, Jr..... Manager of Engineering Services,
(representing Jean M. Jacobson) Racine County, Department of Public Works
Thomas L. Millonzi..... Organizer,
(representing Frank Busalacchi) Teamsters Local 200
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 (retired),
West Bend Chamber of Commerce

Katherine L. Smith Chairperson, Ozaukee County Board

Gustav W. Wirth, Jr..... Commissioner, SEWRPC
(representing Thomas H. Buestrin)

Chet Zurawik..... Director of Highways,
(representing F. Thomas Ament) Deputy Highway Commissioner,
Milwaukee County

Staff Members and Guests Present

Fareen Abbas..... Transportation Engineer, HNTB

Robert E. Beglinger..... Chief Transportation Engineer, SEWRPC

Donna L. Brown..... Urban Modal Manager, District 2,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Philip C. Evenson..... Executive Director, SEWRPC

Edward J. Friede..... Systems Planning Manager, District 2,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Terry A. Horst..... Senior Transportation Design Engineer, HNTB

Kenneth M. Pesch Highway Commissioner,
Washington County

Patrick A. Pittenger Senior Planner, SEWRPC

Ronald J. Rutkowski Director, Transportation Planning Division,
Milwaukee County Department of Public Works

Dennis A. Shook Reporter, Waukesha Freeman

Brian Swenson Vice President, HNTB

Kevin Soucie Soucie & Associates

Rosemary Wehnes..... Organizer, Sierra Club

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 circulated by Commission staff.

CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF AUGUST 23, 2001, MEETING

Chairman Drew asked if there were any questions or comments on the [minutes of the Advisory Committee's seventh meeting held on August 23, 2001](#). There being no questions or comments, a motion to approve the minutes as published was made by Mr. Kohl, seconded by Ms. Smith, and carried unanimously by the Committee.

PRESENTATION OF COSTS AND IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE FREEWAY SYSTEM
RECONSTRUCTION ALTERNATIVE THAT WOULD ADDRESS DESIGN AND DESIGN-
RELATED SAFETY DEFICIENCIES BUT NOT ADD TRAFIC LANES

Chairman Drew asked Mr. Yunker to proceed with a presentation of regarding an initial freeway system reconstruction alternative that would address design and design-related safety deficiencies but not add traffic lanes.

[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. Regarding the estimated construction cost of the freeway system reconstruction alternative which would provide design and design-related safety improvements, Mr. Patrie asked if the estimated costs were expressed in current or future dollar values. Mr. Yunker responded that all cost estimates were reported in year 2000 dollars.
2. Regarding the substantial costs associated with the reconstruction of the Marquette Interchange, Mr. Zurawik noted that the costs include reconstruction of not only the core of the Marquette Interchange, but also six miles of connecting freeway segments. Mr. Yunker noted the high cost of the interchange is also due to it being constructed largely on structure.
3. Mr. Zurawik noted that the presentation included a reference to this regional freeway system reconstruction alternative including improvements addressing the problems of service interchanges being located too close to freeway-to-freeway interchanges, and asked if the costs associated with such improvements were included in the cost estimates for this regional freeway reconstruction alternative. Mr. Yunker responded that the costs to implement those improvements were included in the cost estimates for this reconstruction alternative.
4. Ms. Ordinans noted that the right-of-way acquisition needs included two governmental buildings, and asked which buildings would need to be acquired under this alternative. Mr. Yunker stated that both governmental buildings were associated with the reconfiguration of the Zoo Interchange. He stated that one of the buildings is located to the southwest of the Zoo Interchange, and is a Milwaukee County Zoo maintenance/storage building. He stated that the second building contains offices of the Milwaukee County Department of Public Works and the Milwaukee County Sheriff's Department, and is located to the northwest of the interchange on USH 45 at Watertown Plank Road. He noted that these buildings previously had been identified during the East-West Corridor Study as being necessary to remove in order to accommodate the reconfiguration of the Zoo Interchange.
5. In reference to the right-of-way acquisition needs associated with IH 43/94 between the Mitchell and Marquette Interchanges, Mr. DuPont noted that 43 residential relocations and four acres of additional right-of-way were listed as being required. Mr. Yunker stated that Commission and consultant staff had confirmed those estimates, and the reason for a high number of residential relocations in proportion to the number of acres required was related to several factors including small lot sizes and multifamily buildings which represent multiple residences.

6. In reference to the estimated construction costs of the regional freeway reconstruction alternative with design and design-related safety improvements, Mayor Bloomberg asked when the Commission staff would provide to the Advisory Committee the costs associated with the implementation of the other elements of the regional transportation plan. Mr. Yunker responded that later in the study, following presentation and comparison of all freeway system reconstruction alternatives, the costs of freeway reconstruction will be compared to the costs of the other elements of the regional transportation plan, and to historic available transportation revenues.
7. Regarding the forecast of traffic congestion in the year 2020 under a regional freeway system reconstruction alternative which would provide design and design-related safety improvements, Mr. Zurawik asked what the congestion conditions would be if the regional freeway system were replaced-in-kind, that is, without the design and design-related safety improvements. Mr. Yunker stated that previously as part of this study, year 2020 traffic congestion was forecast for such a regional freeway reconstruction alternative. He stated that there was only a marginal reduction in the severity of congestion expected as a result of the design and design-related safety improvements.

Mayor Bloomberg asked if a forecast of traffic congestion had been prepared for the year 2020 under a replace-in-kind freeway reconstruction alternative, but which would not assume implementation of the regional land use and transportation plans. Mr. Yunker responded that such a forecast of traffic congestion had not been prepared, because this freeway reconstruction study was being conducted within the context of the regional transportation plan.

[Secretary's Note: Commission staff will investigate the preparation of such a forecast to be presented prior to the completion of the study.]

8. Mr. Feidler asked whether the anticipated improvement in freeway traffic safety could be quantified. Mr. Yunker responded that Commission and consultant staff were attempting to develop more information regarding the expected improvement in freeway traffic safety, but were not certain that the expected improvement in freeway traffic safety could be quantified prior to preliminary engineering.
9. Mr. Patrie noted that the costs to reconstruct the regional freeway system in-kind were presented in addition to the costs to reconstruct the regional freeway system with design and design-related safety improvements. He asked if reconstruction with existing design deficiencies would be acceptable under Federal Highway Administration standards. Mr. Evenson stated that the expected construction cost to reconstruct the freeway system in-kind was provided for comparison purposes. He added that it was likely that design and design-related safety improvements would be incorporated into a reconstructed freeway system, pointing out that recently completed or ongoing preliminary engineering studies for portions of the system—I 94 in Kenosha and Racine Counties and the Marquette Interchange—have consistently concluded that such improvements are essential.
10. Ms. McCutcheon noted that it was stated during the presentation that the anticipated air pollutant emissions under the regional freeway reconstruction alternatives would be presented at the Committee's next meeting, and asked how this information will be presented. Mr. Yunker stated that forecast emissions will be presented and compared for each of the regional freeway system construction alternatives, and will be compared to historic and current emissions levels, and to Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources Air Quality State Implementation Plan emissions budgets.

11. Mr. DuPont noted that the alternative that would include design and design-related safety improvements was estimated to require 561 acres of additional right-of-way, not including 16 acres that would be required for the reconstruction of the Marquette Interchange. He asked if Commission staff could provide information regarding the total number of acres within the current freeway system right-of-way. Mr. Yunker stated that Commission staff would attempt to provide that information to the Advisory Committee in the minutes to this meeting.

[Secretary's Note: The existing freeway system right-of-way in southeastern Wisconsin approximates 12,200 acres. The 561 acres estimated to be required under an alternative that would provide design and design-related safety improvements but not additional traffic lanes, not including the 16 acres required for the Marquette Interchange, would represent an increase of about 5 percent in the total amount of land within freeway system right-of-way.]

12. Mr. Mantes asked if the Commission's traffic forecast accounted for existing intelligent transportation system (ITS) infrastructure and plans to improve those systems within southeastern Wisconsin. Mr. Yunker responded that the forecasts do assume the maintenance of existing ITS infrastructure, and its planned expansion.
13. Ms. McCutcheon asked if the differences in travel times and congestion between specific locations would be presented as a result of the travel forecasts performed for each of the alternatives initially developed. Mr. Yunker stated that Commission staff is forecasting the anticipated traffic congestion under each freeway reconstruction alternative and is addressing how that information could be best presented to the Advisory Committee and Technical Subcommittee.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mayor Bloomberg asked if this study would seek to recommend funding sources for the reconstruction of the regional freeway system. Mr. Evenson responded that the determination of recommended funding source was outside of the scope of the study. He added that the cost to reconstruct the regional freeway system under the alternative presented at this meeting, including the reconstruction of the Marquette Interchange, was approximately \$180 million per year over a 30 year period. Mr. Yunker added that the system reconstruction cost estimate presented at this meeting was similar to estimates developed by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation for the reconstruction of the regional freeway system as part of the Department's recently completed State Highway Plan. Mr. Fiedler stated that it was important to clearly state in the final study report the need to fully fund the reconstruction of the regional freeway system.

CONFIRMATION OF NEXT MEETING DATE

Chairman Drew stated that the next Advisory Committee meeting, previously scheduled for November 15th, would be cancelled due to a conflict with a Marquette Interchange preliminary engineering study public meeting on that same date. He stated that the next Advisory Committee meeting would be December 13, 2001, at the Tommy G. Thompson Youth Center at Wisconsin State Fair Park.

Chairman Drew stated that the topic of the next meeting would be the presentation of an alternative that would include additional traffic lanes on selected freeway segments in addition to the design and design-related safety improvements included in the alternative presented at this meeting. He stated at that time,

the Advisory Committee would discuss those two alternatives initially developed and any additional alternatives that may be developed for Committee review.

Ms. Ordians asked when this study was expected to be completed. Chairman Drew stated that while the cancellation of the November meeting would postpone the completion of the study, the goal remained to provide a preliminary recommended plan proposed by the Advisory Committee to the County Boards of each County in the Region in the spring of 2002.

Mr. Finley suggested that the viewpoints of all Advisory Committee members regarding systemwide alternatives should be made known to the entire Advisory Committee. He stated that while many Advisory Committee members, including himself, had designated alternates to attend Advisory Committee meetings in the past, he believed that it was important for Advisory Committee members themselves to express their viewpoints regarding alternatives in order to insure the credibility of this important study. Mr. Evenson stated that the Advisory Committee would not be asked to take a position on any alternative until information regarding all alternatives had first been presented to the Advisory Committee, reviewed by the Technical Subcommittee, and then distributed to the Advisory Committee for review prior to the meeting when the Committee would be asked to take a position. He noted that this would first be possible at a January or February meeting. Chairman Drew stated that it has been the practice for this Advisory Committee, and for the Commission in general, to allow the designation of alternates, but that he would agree to any practice desired by the Advisory Committee. Mayor Bloomberg stated that she agreed with Mr. Finley, that it was important to have the positions of Advisory Committee member's known for each of the significant decisions that will be made in the upcoming meetings. She suggested that should a member be unable to attend a Committee meeting, the member should have the opportunity to state their position in a letter to Chairman Drew. There being no objections or further discussion, Chairman Drew ruled that with respect to voting relative to Committee positions on a recommended plan for freeway system reconstruction, Advisory Committee members would be asked to state their positions at Advisory Committee meetings in person, or through pre-meeting written correspondence directed to the Chair if they are unable to attend personally. Alternates could continue to attend meetings and participate in Committee discussions as has been past practice, but the official position of an Advisory Committee member on freeway reconstruction study recommendations will need to be made in person by the Advisory Committee member at Committee meetings, or by prior letter, if unable to attend.

ADJOURNMENT

The eighth meeting of the Advisory Committee was declared adjourned at 4:40 p.m. by Chairman Drew.

Signed

Philip C. Evenson
Recording Secretary

* * *