



**Wisconsin Traffic Operations Infrastructure Plan
SPT Meeting 11
March 10, 2008 | 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
DOT CR Room 419 HF
MINUTES**

Attended:

Sharon Bremser, WisDOT
John Corbin, WisDOT
Marie Treazise, WisDOT
Graham Heitz, WisDOT
Dave Vieth, WisDOT
Aileen Switzer, WisDOT
Jennifer Murray, WisDOT
Tim Hanley, WisDOT
John Shaw, WisDOT

Joanna Bush, WisDOT
Peter Rafferty, UW-Madison
Todd Szymkowski, UW-Madison
Brian Scott, SRF
Chad Hammerl, E&K
Chris Hedden, Cambridge Systematics
Sam Van Hecke, Cambridge Systematics
Jim Hanson, SEH
Robert Frey, HNTB

Action Items

- Update TOPS Lab Project Website
- WisDOT Comments on Draft Deliverables by March 19
- Schedule Teleconference to Follow DTIM Meeting (March 20)

Items

1. Welcome and Introductions – Sharon Bremser

Everyone was welcomed and it was noted that this will be the last large group meeting as part of the Traffic Operations Infrastructure Plan.

2. Schedule – Chris Hedden

Chris Hedden reviewed the schedule. Important dates are summarized as part of the Next Steps.

3. Overview and Feedback on Summary and Appendices – All

Four draft deliverables (Corridor Summaries, Appendix A - Traffic Mgmt and Surveillance, Appendix B - Traveler Info, Appendix C - Signals) were introduced.

CS walked through the Corridor Summaries, requesting feedback, particularly on the cost breakdowns. Suggestions for improvement for the costs summary included:

- Adding more detailed explanation to the technology layers (what technologies belong to each area, what do they include in their costs)
- Delineating between capital, maintenance, operations, and life cycle replacement costs (this will enable WisDOT planners to visualize a cost profile over time and understand their commitment to operational costs)
- Including primary routes in addition to corridor names

WisDOT Traffic Operations Infrastructure Plan
SPT Meeting 11 Minutes
March 10, 2008

- Noting the year of \$s (2007)
- Presenting values as more highly rounded or in a range
- Clarifying assumptions (such as existing infrastructure's role, where costs overlap)
- Including 511 and marginal staffing cost implications to STOC (communicating with Kelly Langer and others for estimates)

Suggestions for improvement on the overall Corridor Summaries document included:

- Including statewide technology layer images
- Updating Corridor names to match changed 2030 Corridor names

SRF presented Appendix A – Traffic Management and Surveillance. There was general approval. One suggestion was to put corridor cost summaries next to each corridor during the next reformat.

SEH presented Appendix B – Traveler Information. There was general approval.

Jacobs presented Appendix C – Signals and clarified several assumptions which went into signals cost estimations. Ownership and jurisdictional transfer were not considered (document in written in "perspective of WI motorist"). The assumed standard signal upgrade involves periodic retiming, semi-actuation. The assumed advanced signal upgrade includes Advanced Traffic Management Systems (ATMS) and integrated corridor operation. There was general approval.

4. Finalize Deliverables – Chris Hedden

The Final Deliverables will include:

- Cost Summaries and Schedule (1-2 pages)
- Executive Summary (about 10 pages)
- High-Impact Brochure
- Traffic Operations Infrastructure Plan Summary
 - Project Purpose
 - How TOIP should be utilized and applied
 - Description of technical process with reference to Tech Memos for supplemental info
 - Cost Summaries and Schedule

- Priority and Emerging Priority Corridors Deployment Maps and Cost Summaries
 - Metro Node Deployment Maps
 - Remaining Corridor Deployment Maps
- Technical Appendix A - Traffic Management and Surveillance
- Technical Appendix B – Traveler Information
- Technical Appendix C – Signals

All documents should be posted on the TOPS Lab project website and include John Corbin as primary contact for further information. It was noted that consultant logos are unnecessary from now on.

5. Planning and Programming Process Integration – All

There was discussion of how the TOIP can be integrated into the normal business activities of WisDOT. There are several concrete ideas:

- As a check box on the Authorization Report
- Concept Definition Report
- As a check box on the Design Study Report

The TOIP will also be referenced during the formation of statewide traffic operations management contracts and elements could be integrated into the ITS Design Manual.

There was discussion of how WisDOT can best update the TOIP. It was loosely suggested that the “need” portion of the TOIP (MetaManager-driven Deployment Density Classes) could be updated every two years with limited to no consultant assistance whereas the “solution” portion of the TOIP (signposts prescribing technology packages) could be updated every six years with consultant assistance.

6. TOIP Roll out – All

For the roll-out process for the TOIP, final versions will be shown to management level, DTIM and the Backbone Committee, and the regions will likely be revisited with the final cost estimates. There will likely be some consultant assistance utilized for the regional visits.

7. Technical Scan Update – Brian Scott

The Technology Scan was introduced by SRF (Note: It includes work from SEH and Jacobs as well). It was presented with the caveat that technology changes quickly. The document can be used as “preferred reading” for master contracts and to justify decisions such as why not to use video in certain situations.

8. Other Issues/Next Steps

The draft deliverables will be open to comment until March 19.

Following a March 20th BHO meeting with DTIM, there will be a conference call which will include some consultant representation.

On April 1, the Draft Final Report will be submitted.

On April 16, comments from WisDOT on the Draft Final Report will be due.

On May 16, all final deliverables will be submitted.

The TOPS Lab Project Website will be updated ASAP.