

MINUTES OF THE NINTH MEETING

SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGIONAL
FREEWAY SYSTEM ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DATE: December 13, 2001
TIME: 3:30 p.m.
PLACE: Tommy G. Thompson Youth Center
Banquet Room 1
Wisconsin State Fair Park
640 South 84th Street
West Allis, WI 53214

Committee Members Present

William R. Drew Vice Chairman, SEWRPC
Chairman
F. Thomas Ament Milwaukee County Executive
Philip E. Barnes Acting Wisconsin Division Administrator,
Federal Highway Administration,
U. S. Department of Transportation
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
Frank Busalacchi Secretary/Treasurer, Teamsters Local 200
James T. Dwyer Chairperson,
Waukesha County Board of Supervisors
Theresa M. Estness Mayor, City of Wauwatosa
Daniel M. Finley Waukesha County Executive
Edward J. Friede Systems Planning Manager, District 2,
(representing Leslie J. Fafard) Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Jean M. Jacobson Racine County Executive
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 Meaux Administrative Coordinator,
(representing Katherine L. Smith) Ozaukee County
Kenneth F. Miller Chairperson, Washington County Board of Supervisors
Allen L. Morrison Chairman, Walworth County Board of Supervisors
Karen O. Ordinas Chairman,
Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors
Frederick J. Patrie Director of Public Works,
(representing Allen K. Kehl) Kenosha County,
Betty A. Pearson Executive Vice President (retired),
West Bend Chamber of Commerce

Philip J. Scherer.....Executive Director,
 Transportation Development Association of Wisconsin
 Mariano A. Schifalacqua.....Commissioner, Department of Public Works,
 (representing John O. Norquist) City of Milwaukee
 James G. WhiteSupervisor, Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors
 Thomas H. Buestrin (Ex-Officio)..... Chairman, SEWRPC

Staff Members and Guests Present

Fareen Abbas..... Transportation Engineer, HNTB
 Donna L. Brown..... Urban Modal Manager, District 2,
 Wisconsin Department of Transportation
 Ray Cox..... Citizen
 Linda CutlerExecutive Director, Milwaukee Regional Medical Center
 Brian G. DuPont..... Highway Commissioner, Walworth County
 Philip C. Evenson.....Executive Director, SEWRPC
 Jeffrey M. Gonyo Central Committee Member, Stop Unnecessary Road Expansion
 Patrick E. Hawley..... Traffic Section Director, HNTB
 Brett Hulsey..... Senior Midwest Representative, Sierra Club
 Nick LelackPlanner, 1000 Friends of Wisconsin
 Robert J. Madison Citizen
 Thomas L. Millonzi..... Organizer, Teamsters Local 200
 David A. Novak..... Director of Public Works,
 Milwaukee County
 Kenneth M. Pesch Highway Commissioner, Washington County
 Jeffrey Polenske City Engineer, City of Milwaukee
 Patrick A. Pittenger Senior Planner, SEWRPC
 Larry Sandler..... Reporter, Milwaukee Journal Sentinel
 Jay Schad..... Budget and Policy Analyst, Office of Policy and Budget,
 Wisconsin Department of Transportation
 Dennis A. Shook Reporter, Waukesha Freeman
 Robert Stockinger..... Citizen
 Brian SwensonVice President, HNTB
 Kevin SoucieSoucie & Associates
 Caryl Terrell Director, John Muir Chapter, Sierra Club
 Rosemary Wehnes.....Organizer, John Muir Chapter, Sierra Club
 Gustav W. Wirth, Jr.....Commissioner, SEWRPC
 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 OCTOBER 9, 2001, MEETING

Chairman Drew asked if there were any questions or comments on the [minutes of the Advisory Committee's eighth meeting](#) held on October 9, 2001. There being no questions or comments, a motion

to approve the minutes as published was made by Mr. Busalacchi, seconded by Mr. Beitzel, and carried unanimously by the Committee.

CONSIDERATION OF PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION THAT THE FREEWAY SYSTEM RECONSTRUCTION PLAN FOR SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN SHOULD INCLUDE DESIGN AND DESIGN-RELATED SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS

Chairman Drew asked Mr. Yunker to proceed with a presentation regarding the inclusion of design and design-related safety improvements as a recommendation to be included in the preliminary freeway system reconstruction plan for southeastern Wisconsin.

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

Following Mr. Yunker's presentation, Chairman Drew pointed out that a copy of the recommendation by the Technical Subcommittee regarding this matter had been distributed to the Advisory Committee prior to this meeting. He asked for a motion to recommend that design and design-related safety improvements be included in the preliminary recommended plan for the reconstruction of the regional freeway system within southeastern Wisconsin as recommended by the Technical Subcommittee. A motion to that effect was made by Mr. Finley and seconded by Mr. Miller. Chairman Drew asked if there were any questions or discussion regarding the motion. Mr. Finley asked for additional information regarding the process that will be followed to develop, review, and approve the preliminary recommended plan. Mr. Evenson stated that the approval of the inclusion of design and design-related safety improvements in the preliminary recommended plan for freeway system reconstruction did not represent the final preliminary recommended plan of this Committee, as the Committee had yet to address the topic of additional lanes on selected segments of the freeway system. He added that, following the adoption of a complete preliminary recommended plan by this Committee, Commission staff would obtain comments through meetings with County Boards, municipalities, state legislators, business and community groups, and from the general public through public informational meetings and hearings. He stated that following the period of review and feedback, the Advisory Committee would be asked to consider the comments made, particularly by each County Board, and formulate a final recommended plan to be formally considered by the full county boards of each county within the Region. Following action by each of the county boards, the Regional Planning Commission will give formal consideration to the actions of the counties and make a final set of recommendations to the Secretary of the Wisconsin Department of Transportation.

Mayor Estness asked what level of engineering had been performed as part of this study during the development of freeway system reconstruction alternatives. Mr. Yunker stated the engineering that had been performed had been at a system level during the development of freeway system reconstruction alternatives, but that when available, information had been drawn from other, more detailed studies that were ongoing or previously completed. He noted that these other studies included a preliminary engineering study that had previously been completed for IH 94 in Kenosha and Racine Counties, the ongoing Marquette Interchange preliminary engineering study, and the previously completed IH 94 East-West Corridor Study.

Mayor Estness expressed her interest in the proposed design and design-related safety improvements of the Zoo Interchange and of the nearby Wisconsin Avenue and Watertown Plank Road service interchanges. Mr. Yunker responded that a graphic could be provided to show the proposed reconfiguration of the Zoo Interchange and nearby service interchanges. He added that this proposed reconfiguration was prepared as part of the study to provide estimates of costs and impacts, and

subsequent preliminary engineering and environmental studies may be expected to consider this and numerous other alternatives, and the final design would be determined by those studies.

Chairman Drew stated that, as had been discussed at the Committee's previous meeting, Advisory Committee members would be allowed to vote on matters such as those before the Committee at a meeting in person or through written correspondence transmitted prior to the meeting. He noted that correspondence was received from three Committee members-Messrs. Fafard, Kehl, and Sheehy-supporting the inclusion of design and design-related safety improvements in a preliminary freeway system reconstruction plan for Southeastern Wisconsin.

[Secretary's Note: [Copies of the correspondence transmitted by Messrs. Fafard, Kehl, and Sheehy](#) are included in Attachment B to these minutes.]

There being no further questions or comments, the motion to include design and design-related safety improvements in a preliminary freeway system reconstruction plan for southeastern Wisconsin was approved unanimously by the Advisory Committee.

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF COSTS AND IMPACTS OF A FREEWAY SYSTEM RECONSTRUCTION ALTERNATIVE WHICH WOULD INCLUDE ADDITIONAL LANES

Chairman Drew stated that, in addition to the freeway system reconstruction alternative with additional lanes presented at this meeting, Advisory Committee members could request that other alternatives be developed that would include only some of the proposed widenings included in this initial alternative. He asked that requests for the development of other alternatives be provided either at this meeting or to the Commission staff by December 19, 2001. Mr. Schifalacqua stated that while he realized that there was a desire to complete the study as soon as possible, he believed it was appropriate to allow more time to request that additional alternatives be prepared, as the information had been presented for the first time at this meeting. He suggested that it may be appropriate to allow additional alternatives to be proposed for consideration at the next Technical Subcommittee meeting. Mr. Evenson stated that it was intended that all alternatives would be developed prior to the next Technical Subcommittee meeting to allow for discussion of all alternatives requested to be developed at that time.

Chairman Drew asked Mr. Yunker to proceed with a presentation regarding a freeway system reconstruction alternative which would include additional lanes.

[Secretary's Note: A [copy of the presentation distributed at this meeting](#) for this agenda item is included in Attachment C 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 costs of a freeway section reconstruction alternative with additional lanes, Mr. Schifalacqua asked if the costs included right-of-way acquisition. Mr. Yunker stated that the estimated costs did include the estimated costs of right-of-way acquisition.

Mr. Ament asked if the estimated costs were expressed in current dollars or year of expenditure dollars. Mr. Yunker responded that the costs were expressed in year 2000 dollars.

Mr. Ament asked if the costs and impacts associated with the reconstruction of the system interchanges of the regional freeway system with additional lanes was included as part of the alternative with additional lanes presented at this meeting. Mr. Yunker responded affirmatively that the estimated costs and impacts included additional lanes through the freeway system interchanges.

Mayor Bloomberg asked if the \$700 million dollar increase, about 13 percent, included in the presentation was in addition to the cost to reconstruct the regional freeway system with design and design-related safety improvements only. Mr. Yunker stated that was correct, the increase in estimated cost mentioned by Mayor Bloomberg represented the estimated additional cost to reconstruct the regional freeway system with additional lanes compared to an alternative with design and design-related safety improvements only. He stated that the estimated cost to reconstruct the regional freeway system under a replace-in-kind alternative was approximately \$3.4 billion, about \$5.5 billion under an alternative with design and design-related safety improvements only, and about \$6.2 billion under an alternative with design and design-related safety improvements and additional lanes.

2. In reference to the major areas of right-of-way acquisition needs under a reconstruction alternative with additional lanes, Mayor Bloomberg asked if the figures presented for the Marquette Interchange represented all requirements under such an alternative or the increment required to reconstruct that portion of the regional freeway system with additional lanes in addition to the needs associated with design and design-related safety improvements. Mr. Yunker responded that the right-of-way acquisition needs presented were in addition to those required to implement design and design-related safety improvements only, as was currently under consideration as part of the Marquette Interchange preliminary engineering study. He stated that under an alternative with design and design-related safety improvements only, about 16 acres of land would be required, 10 residential relocations would be required, five commercial/industrial building relocations would be required, and there would be no government/institutional building relocations required.

Ms. Jacobson asked Commission staff to identify the three governmental or institutional structures that would need to be acquired as part of reconfiguration of the Marquette Interchange under an alternative with additional lanes. Mr. Yunker responded that the three structures identified in the presentation were the Marquette University Carpenter Tower Dormitory, the Milwaukee County Courthouse Annex, and a building housing a church located west of IH 43 on 12th Street between Highland Boulevard and Vliet Street.

3. Regarding the forecast traffic congestion in the year 2020 under an alternative with additional lanes, Mayor Bloomberg asked if estimates of total delay and lost time would be developed as part of the study to illustrate the benefits of reducing traffic congestion. Mr. Yunker responded that Commission staff would attempt to prepare estimates of reduced delays and would provide any information developed in the appropriate section of Chapter VI to be developed for review by the Technical Subcommittee.
4. Mr. Ament asked if a program would be developed that would provide a schedule for when reconstruction may be expected to occur for each segment and system interchange of the regional freeway system. Mr. Yunker stated that a program illustrating the potential reconstruction of each segment and system interchange of the regional freeway system in five year increments would be prepared following the development of a freeway system reconstruction plan by this Advisory Committee. Mr. Yunker added that it may be expected that approximately one-third of the regional freeway system will require reconstruction by the year 2010, approximately another third by the year

2020, and the final third by the year 2030. He noted that the most efficient time to reconstruct a freeway pavement is following the second resurfacing of the original pavement. He added that several freeway segments, including USH 45 between the Zoo and North Interchanges, IH 94 in Kenosha and Racine Counties, and IH 94 between Milwaukee and Waukesha Counties had already been resurfaced twice. He stated that the time required to perform preliminary engineering and environmental studies, final engineering, right-of-way acquisition, and construction requires the Wisconsin Department of Transportation to initiate preliminary engineering and environmental studies on these freeway segments as soon as possible following completion of this study.

5. Mr. Ament asked if the Advisory Committee would be voting at its next meeting on the inclusion of additional lanes on selected segments of the freeway system. Mr. Yunker responded that it was the expectation of Commission staff that the Advisory Committee would discuss additional alternatives at its next meeting, and perhaps make a preliminary recommendation with respect to rebuilding the freeway system with additional lanes.

Mr. Ament asked whether an alternative proposing a substantial increase in the Region's public transit system was considered in place of adding lanes on the freeway system. Mr. Yunker stated that the forecasts of traffic volume and congestion do indeed already assume substantial improvement and expansion of transit service. He added that the year 2020 forecasts of vehicle traffic volume and congestion assume the implementation of the regional land use and transportation plans, including an increase in transit service of approximately 70 percent, land use development with "smart growth" practices at regional and neighborhood levels, and the continued improvement of the surface arterial street system. Mr. Ament stated that it was important to always note these assumptions when presenting information regarding the forecasts of traffic congestion.

8. Ms. Ordians noted that under an alternative with additional lanes, there would be only a modest reduction in the number of miles of congested freeways compared to 1999, a reduction from 65 miles on an average weekday in 1999 to 58 miles in the year 2020. Mr. Evenson stated that while it was correct that there would only be a modest expected reduction in traffic congestion in the year 2020 under an alternative with additional lanes compared with traffic congestion experienced in 1999, the alternative with additional lanes may be expected to result in a substantial reduction in traffic congestion in the year 2020 compared to alternatives without additional lanes -- 58 miles of congested freeways as compared to 122 miles of congested freeways on an average weekday in the year 2020, a 52 percent reduction

Ms. Ordians stated that it would be desirable to understand the costs and benefits of not widening with additional lanes on selected freeway segments, and asked that an alternative that would propose the widening of all freeways included in the alternative presented at this meeting, with the exception of IH 94 between the Marquette and Zoo Interchanges, be prepared for Technical Subcommittee and Advisory Committee consideration. Mr. Evenson responded that such an alternative would be developed.

9. Ms. McCutcheon stated that she will be transmitting a letter to Commission staff which will summarize the comments of the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources staff to date with respect to the study. She briefly summarized some of the comments included in the letter. Mr. Evenson stated that a copy of the letter would be put in the minutes of this meeting and would be brought to the attention of the Technical Subcommittee.

[Secretary's Note: [The letter transmitted by Ms. McCutcheon to Commission staff is included in Attachment D to these minutes along with the letter response from Commission Staff.](#)]

10. Mr. Novak stated that he believed that it was important to reiterate that the regional transportation plan recommends the improvement of the Region's arterial street and public transit systems and, as was previously mentioned by Mr. Yunker, the implementation of those recommendations is assumed in the development of forecasts of traffic congestion for this study. He stated that he wanted to reiterate that there is inadequate funding not only to reconstruct the freeway system, but also to implement the planned improvement of the surface arterial street system and public transit system within southeastern Wisconsin.
11. Regarding the forecasts of vehicle travel and congestion prepared by the Commission staff, Mr. Meaux noted that it appeared that forecast vehicle traffic and congestion was not substantially affected by improved and expanded public transit. Mr. Evenson agreed, noting that public transit represents less than 3 percent of all trips made on an average weekday within the Region, and even a substantial increase in the amount of transit services provided could be expected to result in a 1 to 2 percent shift to public transit. In response to a question from Mr. Meaux, Mr. Yunker stated that most of the projected growth in vehicle traffic and congestion was due to projected regional growth in households and employment.

[Secretary's Note: The projected regional household and employment growth upon which the forecasts of vehicle traffic and congestion are based are the official household and employment growth forecasts from the Commission's regional land use and transportation plans. Actual household growth within southeastern Wisconsin has been closely following this forecast, while actual employment growth has been exceeding the employment forecast.]

DETERMINATION OF 2002 MEETING DATES AND TIMES

Chairman Drew indicated that a proposed schedule for an additional six meetings, one in each of first six months of 2002, had been distributed to Advisory Committee members.

[Secretary's Note: [A copy of the proposed schedule of future meetings](#) is included in Attachment E to these minutes.]

Mr. Drew stated that each of the subsequent meetings was proposed to be held on a Thursday at 3:30 p.m. at the Tommy G. Thompson Youth Center Building at State Fair Park, with the next proposed meeting tentatively scheduled for January 10, 2002. He asked that Advisory Committee members advise the staff as soon as possible if they would be unavailable for any of these meeting dates.

[Secretary's Note: Following the meeting, it was determined that the Advisory Meeting tentatively scheduled for January 10, 2002, would not be held. The next meeting of the Advisory Committee, will be held at 3:30 p.m. on Thursday, February 21, 2002, at the Tommy G Thompson Youth Center Building at State Fair Park.]

OTHER BUSINESS

Chairman Drew stated that members of the public would not be permitted to address the Advisory Committee at this meeting or future Committee meetings, but would be permitted to transmit written correspondence to the Commission staff at Committee meetings. He stated that following the approval of the preliminary recommended plan by the Advisory Committee, public hearings would be held in each of the seven counties of the Region, and the public would have an opportunity to provide their comments at that time, and that additionally, comments may be transmitted to Commission staff via mail, e-mail, or the study website. He acknowledged receiving written correspondence from guests in attendance at the meeting, and stated that the comments received would be documented in the next volume of the "Record of Public Comments" of the study.

ADJOURNMENT

The ninth meeting of the Advisory Committee was declared adjourned at 4:55 p.m. by Chairman Drew.

Signed

Philip C. Evenson
Recording Secretary

* * *

PCE/KRY/PAP/kjk
2/28/02
#57513 v1 - FRS 12-13-01 AC Minutes