Wisconsin Traffic Operations Sketch Planning
SPT Meeting 6
February 7, 2007 | 9:00 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.
CR 501 HF Eau Claire 12

MINUTES

Attending:

Sharon Bremser, WisDOT	Dan Krechmer, Cambridge Systematics
John Corbin, WisDOT	Sam Van Hecke, Cambridge Systematics
Phil DeCabooter, WisDOT	Chad Hammerl, E&K
Marie Treazise, WisDOT	Jim Hanson, SEH
Ron Becker, WisDOT	Kate Miner, SEH
Dave Vieth, WisDOT	Brian Scott, SRF
Tim Hanley, WisDOT	Janelle Monette, SRF
Gary Brunner, WisDOT	Lee Gibbs, SEH
Peter Rafferty, UW-Madison	Matt Gjersvik, SRF
Todd Szymkowski, UW-Madison	
Chris Hedden, Cambridge Systematics	

Actions:

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. Changes to draft presentation materials
2. Add footnote to report detailing potential sophistication of tool
3. Develop more detailed technology spectrums for application

Minutes:

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Schedule

The next workshop (SPT 7) is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, April 17 from 9:00-12:00. It was moved from the original date of April 11 to avoid conflict with a scheduled operations managers meeting.

3. Presentation – Sketch Planning Scenario

CRITERIA

Chris Hedden reviewed the two goal-two methodology strategy behind the project. He discussed the process and reasons for updating the original 42 criteria to a more

manageable 12 criteria (see slide #10 in Appendix). John Corbin mentioned the road weather safety audit from TOPS as an exemplary GIS-based convergence of weather data and crash data. Dave Veith raised concerns about double counting due to the inclusion of both ADT Forecast Year and ADT Growth. Chris Hedden acknowledged double counting as a potential problem and said that criteria weights need to factor this in.

John and Dave both mentioned the need to consider development pressures. John said we should address interim needs and develop network strategies that accommodate interim growth in response to economic development.

Peter Rafferty mentioned that there is no measure of capacity expansion versus ITS deployment as a solution to increased demand. This led to a discussion of the usefulness of the ability to identify expansion potential, possibly through consideration of adjacent land use. Corridors could be identified and compared by expansion potential, with the understanding that operational strategies are more vital and essential at corridors where expansion is not possible to accommodate economic development.

Congestion was discussed. It was mentioned that a criteria for future year congestion in a no-build scenario, we may have a useful comparison to expansion as a solution. John wants the Consulting Team to look into a duration component for Peak Hour V/C-LOS, as David Cipra frequently recommends.

It was suggested that the safety criteria be expanded to include incident components, recognizing that in the short term there will be little emphasis on incident over safety, but there is the potential for evolution, so **Crash Rate → Crash and Incident Rate** and **Crash Severity → Crash and Incident Severity**.

This effort is targeted at the state highway backbone network. There is the potential for freight focus. Identification of freight backbone corridors would be useful (a potential project for C-FIRE). There was agreement in limiting the analysis to backbone routes, one key issue being that there are no weekend hourly volumes for non-backbone roadways which is important for tourism-related corridors.

John mentioned that there is potential for a sophistication of this project application related to freight and tourism and he would be interested in seeing some annotation of these possibilities, possibly as a footnote to a final report.

There is a need to make more connections with planning as part of this project, address planning data needs not yet being met, provoke the interest of planning chiefs, and make sure that there are some backbone programming committee/ITS Sketch Plan connections.

Phil DeCabooter doesn't think ITS can be a substitute for capacity expansion and thinks it is important to draw distinction between what ITS is and what we are trying to

accomplish (rather than just maintain). The majority of the need will be for traveler information. We need to use benefits (ie. performance indicators) to sell ITS strategies, for example making the value of a quick response to a traffic incident clear.

Other changes recommended during the criteria discussion include: **Safety→ Safety and Reliability**, **Development Pressures → Economic Development**.

CRITERIA EXERCISE

An exercise (Slide #12 in Appendix) that will be used as an input into the weights assigned the 12 criteria was conducted. The draft results were as follows:

Exercise 1

	Criteria	Score
G	Crash Rate	62
H	Crash Severity	57
F	Congestion Future	50
E	Peak Hour (LOS)	49
A	ADT Base Year	44
L	Event/Traffic Generators	41
I	Weather Index	38
B	ADT Forecast Year	31
J	ADT Growth Rate	31
K	HC ADT Growth Rate	23
C	HC ADT Base Year	18
D	HC ADT Forecast Year	18

Exercise 2

	Criteria	Score
B	Safety	11
A	Mobility	9
C	Developmental Pressures	1

These will be converted into percentages for the final analysis. In discussion of individual results, several people noted the high weight of safety. John noted how freight became low priority when compared with others. John summarized the influences on the weighting as being both strategic (how does this fit into dept proceedings?) and tactical (in what areas can ITS contribute the most?).

COMMUNICATING THE RESULTS

Chris Hedden resumed the ppt slides with the Communicating the Results section (slide #13). The altered Wisconsin Heartland Corridor Map was passed out for comments. There was generally positive feedback. Some recommended changes include spelling

out acronyms and changing the DOT Facility icon. John recommended grouping the Technology Applications as **Detection/Surveillance**, **Incident Management**, **Traffic Management**, and **Traveler Information**.

John also pointed out the benefits of having detailed spectrums for technology applications and offering a wide range and variety of solutions. The Consultant Team will develop these further.

SCENARIO

Dan Kretchmer went through the sample scenario developed to show the process and get comments on the analysis for ITS deployment classification. There was generally positive feedback. The thresholds from the example are representative and subject to change. The Functional Group teams will contribute more detailed research and working knowledge to the ultimate threshold levels.

NEXT STEPS

Consultants will begin data gathering by speaking with Meta Manager representatives and looking at RWIS for weather info. Now that the methodology is relatively set, the Functional Groups will be doing more in-depth research into corridor-level ITS deployment. Chad Hammerl pointed out that there may be some differences in the methodology for the Signals work.

4. Next Meetings

Consultants will have a teleconference to facilitate data handoff and other upcoming work.

The next SPT workshop (SPT 7) is scheduled for Tuesday, April 17th from 9:00-12:00. The next draft tech memo will be sent out at least one week prior (April 10). The agenda for SPT 7 will be sent out two weeks prior (April 3).

The Consultant team will meet via teleconference on March 27.

A 10-15 minute presentation on the ITS Sketch Plan will be given at the Smartways annual meeting on April 3. Peter Rafferty will add the item to the Smartways agenda.

Meeting Adjourned at 11:45 a.m.