



**Wisconsin Traffic Operations Sketch Planning
SPT Meeting 5
December 8, 2006 | 11:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.
CR 501 HF Eau Claire 12**

MINUTES

Attending:

Sharon Bremser, WisDOT
John Corbin, WisDOT
Marie Treazise, WisDOT
Gary Brunner, WisDOT
Todd Szymkowski, UW-Madison
Chad Hammerl, E&K
Chris Hedden, Cambridge Systematics
Dan Krechmer, Cambridge Systematics
Ken Leonard, Cambridge Systematics
Sam Van Hecke, Cambridge Systematics
Janelle Monette, SRF
Kate Miner, SEH
Joe Kern, SRF

Actions:

The following actions represent tasks that require follow-up as a result of this or previous meetings. They are numbered for reference only and their status will be discussed at each of the SPT meetings.

1. Integrate Interim Operations Needs into Corridor Sketch Plan Methodology (Appendix, slide 1)
2. Update Criteria Table
3. Schedule January Workgroup Teleconference
4. Plan for February 7 Partial Day Workshop

1. Welcome and Introductions – Sharon Bremser

2. Discussion

- a. Emerging Criteria and Overall Corridor Planning Methodology –Chris Hedden

**Overall Corridor Planning Methodology Discussion (see Appendix for PPT Slides)
-Chris Hedden and Dan Krechmer**

Goal of the presentation is to set the stage for criteria discussion and get answers to some questions. The goal of the methodology is to identify where criteria will fit into process and identify future direction.

Discussion with planning folks (who want prioritized lists for corridor planning purposes) has led to development of two goals with two methodologies for process (see PPT slide 1). The question arises: What product do we want to prioritize? All Corridors? By link? By specific projects or elements within the Corridor?

John Corbin has general sense that by corridor is most effective.

Question from John: Is it possible to integrate a link level tool that screens out what is appropriate for each corridor? Taking statewide network view might encourage system sustainability (though preempting local deliberation). This could be used with a concept of staged implementation. Consistency bonuses would be key. Filter can be applied the same everywhere statewide.

Todd Szymkowski believes it makes sense to do 2nd goal (Prioritization process, slide 1) before Develop ITS Solutions by Corridor.

Chris states that this has been the topic of previous questioning. His reasoning for the structure is that the presented methodology allows potential costs of potential projects to be a part of the corridor ranking process. If the corridors were to be ranked first, they would be prioritized based on high level factors only. By doing the corridor ranking second, the ranking can include the ITS projects that come out of the first stage, along with their costs as part of the evaluation ranking process.

Chris also discussed how creating a Meta module represents an opportunity to identify appropriate operational alternatives within Meta itself. He said that this would be a natural next step and a further project WisDOT could develop after this initial effort.

Sharon Bremser believes 2030 planning process has already developed some prioritization (ex. cameras near Janesville on I-90). Regions have already talked to locals. This system would bring the benefit of having prioritization on one sheet of paper. We should avoid redoing work.

Dan wonders how we determine which corridor is on top. Operational problems or deficiencies?

Chris doesn't know if we can do much more than provide guidance for the regions. Specific corridor decision-making will remain on region.

John points out that we are addressing two issues, (1) the supplementing of the current prioritization scheme and (2) recognizing that there needs to be another point where we react to outcomes of prioritization. Because we are deemphasizing priority in some

corridors, we will need to address operational deficiencies. After a decision of investment is made, we need to mitigate the de-emphasis.

John points out that we have to depend upon regional staff in interacting with locals. Education will have to be part of this effort.

Dan references slide 7, pointing out the adding of customer service factors to better gauge mobility. Throughout the process, we should think about changing technologies (especially in personal vehicles).

John points out that the Backbone Committee has been a focal point of discussion on how meta will be used and will likely be identifying some specific Meta Manager areas for revision. The SPT will want timing of revision recommendations to coincide with Backbone Committee's identification process.

Todd points out that we may want to check distribution centers of freight and integrate them into planning process. John asks about where we get at decision-points for low priority corridors. Development pressures, etc. could be identified.

Clarification on slide 10 – District Priority Management Corridors is a general term and does not refer to Prioritized Corridors.

According to the methodology described on slide 10, data behind a corridor triggers a solution set and identifies technology applications on the corridor level for the entire state.

Todd believes it may be too time intensive to run through this routine for all corridors rather than taking the top 20%, sorting them to begin.

Chris organized it this way so all regions would get ITS solutions for all their corridors and would get a statewide look.

Chris asks about corridor adjacencies and whether there is a methodology to connect continuous routes from driver perspective.

Dan points out that one of the criteria is "Is this an alternative route?". You will end up prioritizing one over the other.

John mentions that we are looking in at one of the set of projects. WisDOT anticipates having they will have a statewide surveillance and ramping plan. This document would be held up next to regional and corridor plans.

Todd references slide 12. We could create large matrix and just update technology. John suggests that meta manager could be set to activate annually or biannually.

Chris points out that one of the strengths of the design is that it gets through difficulties of ITS's constant evolution by developing something stable.

John refers back to slide 2 and mentions that the only thing hasn't been covered is strategy to integrate interim operations infrastructure needs. How do we recognize that deliberation is warranted of a secondary deliberation following de-emphasis? He gives the example of signal systems. If we identify the top 10 routes in need, then we know signal systems upgrade schedules along most of key routes, but we also know we may not be addressing layer below that (safety needs, growth with incident diversion).

Todd mentions the need for WisDOT to think of how the system functions long-term (after consultant contract has expired).

John mentions the need for a comprehensive traffic management and operations organizational assessment at some point, which could result in an operations planning position.

b. Initial Criteria - Janelle Monette and Jim Hanson

Janelle Monette introduces the Criteria table layout and Criteria developed for the *Travel Warning and Information Systems* and *Ramp Control and Surveillance Sketch Plans*. Chad Hammerl follows with additional Criteria related to the *Traffic Signals System Sketch Plan*.

Janelle used the process laid out by the corridor management team to divide table. She broadened the Politically driven section into Environment. Many of the Criteria are intended to spark interest and generate conversation and may be eliminated. Janelle hopes to eliminate inapplicable criteria today and mentions that the report at end of year will be another opportunity.

Area	Criteria Name	Inc?	Discussion
Mobility			
	Lane Merges	N	
	Speed Change	Y	
	Delays	N	
	Queing	N	
	Ramp Closures	Y	
	Lane Closures	Y	

WisDOT Traffic Operations Sketch Planning

SPT Meeting 5 Minutes

December 8, 2006

	Roadway Closures	N	
	Incident Management	N	
	Peak Hour Volume	Y	good concept, could also have v/c hour measure where you try to take v/c ration by hour, weigh by hour, for each day take v/c ratio and add it up (include duration of level of congestion involved)
	Staff response time	N	
	Ramp Closure History	Y	
	Ramp Corridor Criteria	N	
	Ramp Heavy Usage Criteria	N	
	Adverse Freeway Operations Criteria	N	
	Reversible Criteria	N	Not applicable
	Tolling Criteria	N	Not applicable
	ADT	N	
	2020 functional class	Y	
	2000 ADT	Y	Worthwhile, allows notification for amber alert, traveler expectations
	2020 ADT	Y	
	2020 congestion	Y	Clarification: LOS with number assignment (1-6)
	2000 HCADT or %	Y	
Safety			General Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Looking for crash rate, severity, some hot spot criteria (also consider heavy vehicle or truck crash), deer-vehicle crash Chad clarifies that for Signal Plan we would be looking for one for crash rate for arterials, one for freeways
	Crash Rate	Y	
	Accident Locations (pin map)	Y	Change to Accident Hot Spots
	Crash Record Information	N	
	# access points/mile	Y	

	severity Index	Y	
Enviro			General Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision-point comes under environment, number, relative significance, complexity of decision-points (complexity would cover "weaving") Alternate route utilization may come by expert opinion def. Is # of times alternate route is used annually Add Presence of Major Trauma Center Add Projected Distribution Centers Add Presence of Military Center
	Adverse Environmental Conditions		
	Fog	Y	
	Snow/Ice	Y	
	Flooding	Y	
	Availability of Alternate Routes	Y	
	Route Importance	Y	
	2000 population	Y	
	Event Centers	Y	John: Add Major to Event Centers, Sharon: Could link event size or capacity with population to create metric for event impact
	truck route	N	Get same data from HCADT
	recreational factor	Y	Will get clarification on purpose, determining factors.
	Land Conversion rate	Y	

Chad listed additional Criteria for the Signal Management Plan, including: **Primary Route, Arterial Route, Proximity to Freeway, and Space between Signalized Intersections.**

Janelle clarified that this list is for both ITS Applications and Ranking and will need to be separated at some point. Janelle thanked everyone for their valuable feedback.

3. Schedule

- a. Draft Criteria Tech Memo due to SPT Stakeholders 12/23

4. Next Meeting – Chris Hedden

Plan is to call in (w/ minimally update version of process) in early January.

Targeting partial day workshop for Feb.7 (9-10:30) with workgroup meeting at 8 and from 10:30-12.

Meeting is planned to coincide with next WisDOT stakeholder workshop (around objective of finalizing planning process and preferred alternatives). Criteria report is due by end of calendar year. Can have some scenarios plugged into strawman by late Jan/early Feb. Following week is Operations Managers Meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 1:30pm.

Appendix – PPT Slides from Presentations