



**Wisconsin Traffic Operations Infrastructure Plan
SPT Meeting 10
December 3, 2007 | 10:00 a.m. – noon
DOT CR 701 HF Waukesha 14
MINUTES**

Attendees:

Sharon Bremser, WisDOT
John Corbin, WisDOT
Phil DeCabooter, WisDOT
Dave Kreitzmann, WisDOT
Marie Treazise, WisDOT
Aileen Switzer, WisDOT
John Shaw, WisDOT
Joanna Bush, WisDOT
John Nordbo, WisDOT
Adam Boardman, WisDOT

Darren Schoer, WisDOT
Todd Szymkowski, UW-Madison
Brian Scott, SRF
Chad Hammerl, E&K
Chris Hedden, Cambridge Systematics
Sam Van Hecke, Cambridge Systematics
Jim Hanson, SEH

Key Discussion Points

Purpose

The purpose of the SPT 10 meeting was to highlight the response of the regions to the draft Corridor maps, relate how their comments have been integrated into the project, and present new work including the corridor prioritization methodology, the metro node mapping, the Badger State corridor results including appendices for all functional areas, the draft statewide layer maps, and the resolution of various technical issues.

Corridor Prioritization

Following the presentation of the preliminary corridor prioritization results, feedback was offered on the potential breakdowns and their use for WisDOT. There was support for use of two tiers.

One would represent the state's most critical corridors, characterized by the need for "contiguous infrastructure deployment" which would include the top 5 corridors.

The second would provide a focus for non-infrastructure based deployments and would include the top 13 corridors.

There was general discussion of where/how the corridor prioritization could be used by WisDOT. The idea of combining system performance indicators with incidental targets of opportunity was raised. The importance of using prioritized corridors in scoping was raised. There was discussion of similarities between Wisconsin and Colorado's budget pools for operations technology deployment and O & M. The possibility of the prioritized corridors serving as a potential resource into OPB earmark determination was introduced. It was determined that preparing maps of the tiers would be an important next step. It was decided that costs would be developed only for the Top 13 Corridors.

Metro Node Maps

The seven prepared Metro Node maps were shared. There was some debate on whether this number was correct with suggestions being made of adding Stevens Point or dropping La Crosse. The importance was raised of showing the different corridors within the Metro Node area and distinguishing those which are Top 5 or Top 13.

Badger Corridor Results

The overall format and results for the Badger State Corridor analysis was presented by CS. There was general approval for the format and level of detail. The importance of version control was raised, as there will likely be frequent updates to corridor-level analyses.

Surveillance and Detection

The Surveillance and Detection Appendix for the Badger State Corridor was presented by SRF. There was general approval for the format and level of detail. It was urged that the question of whether or not to include existing ITS deployments in costs tables be thoughtfully resolved. It was recommended that there should be a distinction between leased and owned fiber. Clarification of existing vs. proposed deployments will continue to be an important element.

Traveler Information

The Traveler Information Appendix for the Badger State Corridor was presented by SEH. There was general approval for the format and level of detail. There was discussion of how best to display portable DMS and whether it generates confusion to show PDMS as having fixed locations.

Signal Systems

The Signal Systems Appendix for the Badger State Corridor was presented by E&K. There was general approval for the format and level of detail. It was suggested that ramp termini could potentially be shown as points. Some of the difficulties of incorporating signal systems into the larger sketch planning effort were discussed. The importance of highlighting several (20-30) ramp terminal situations, focusing on signal systems serving alternate routes, and providing generalized results for platform standards were all stressed.

Statewide Layer Maps

The statewide layer maps were presented by SRF, SEH, and E&K. These will be developed to greater detail in the future.

Technical Issues

The alternate display for US 53 was introduced. It was suggested that the recommendations for US 53's old alignment be eliminated.

WisDOT Traffic Operations Sketch Planning
SPT Meeting 10 Minutes
December 3, 2007

The presentation of reasons for not including the potential additional SE roadways was accepted.

Next Steps

There was discussion of the importance of WisDOT PMs getting together and discussing how best the statewide layers and resulting scenarios can be synthesized with the corridor-level analysis. They will plan a January meeting and include Chris Hedden.

Inreach (internal outreach) planning should occur in mid-January to be most effective.

There may be need for an implementation/action plan for taking turning the overall sketch plan process into a biannual event.