



**Wisconsin Traffic Operations Sketch Planning
SPT Meeting 9
October 22, 2007 | 1:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
DOT CR 701 HF Waukesha 14
MINUTES**

Attendees

John Corbin, WisDOT
Phil DeCabooter, WisDOT
Dave Kreitzmann, WisDOT
Marie Treazise, WisDOT
John Shaw, WisDOT
John Nordbo, WisDOT
Dave Vieth, WisDOT
Dawn Krahn, WisDOT
Phil DeCabooter, WisDOT
John Shaw, WisDOT

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

Action Items

Short-Term (before next SPT meeting)

- List of Attendees at Regional Meetings will be sent out
- Meeting in early December will be scheduled
- Madison Metro Map and Badger Corridor section will be prepared

Long-Term

- Design standards for Corridor maps will attempt to improve readability for colorblind individuals
- Notation for functional class will be revised on Corridor maps
- Regional DDC maps will be developed
- Major Metro area maps will be developed
- Corridor prioritization will be pushed up in the project schedule
- Identified roadways in the SE will be included (provided technical difficulties are minimal)
- A statewide map including notation of exceptional localized or "special" influences will be developed
- Layers or "technology slices" will be developed

Key Items

Regional Visit Updates – Corridor Updates – Issues

Members of the Sketch Planning Team (SPT) met with representatives from all 5 WisDOT regions between 10/12 and 10/19. There was general approval for the draft Corridor-level sketch planning products and seemed to be a high level of understanding for the purpose and need of the project results and how to read/utilize the results. There were several spot-specific comments for additional considerations and/or corrections that should be applied to the results.

There were also several broader comments from regional DOT staff. These are listed below, along with several other topics that arose during this discussion.

- **Maps are too busy in some places**

It was determined that the level of activity on the maps is suitable for the corridor management and project initiation level. A 5-region quilt work of maps showing only the Deployment Density Class (DDC) would help on the “30,000 ft” broad-level.

- **Blow-up maps of metro areas would be helpful**

It was agreed that for major metro areas (4-5), blow-ups would be helpful. This is important because although the Corridors address connectivity, they lack clarity when describing the node function of metropolitan areas.

- **Network Layers Idea**

The idea of adding more specific network layers (or “technology slices”) was introduced, which could involve a statewide view of technology specific recommendations. An example might be a statewide map showing where CCTV would be recommended. This could then be developed in greater detail to reflect recommended and existing infrastructure, benefits, and O & M costs at certain levels of investment. Some potential network layers introduced include:

- CCTV
- Detection/Surveillance
- RWIS
- DMS/PCMS
- Ramp Meters, Controls
- Signals/Signal Systems

These network layers would also help address comments from regional DOT staff regarding how to measure impacts and develop guidelines for benefits. They would also greatly aid management and budgeting decisions made at the WisDOT executive level.

- **Maps are difficult to view by colorblind individuals**

The SPT mapping team agreed to look into potential solutions to improve the legibility/readability of the Corridor map series.

- **Several local impacts are not included in Corridor maps, “Packer Factor”**

In response to several comments from regional DOT staff identifying local phenomenon that would influence their deployment strategies but were not included in the methodology, the idea was advanced that a statewide map which included notation of such factors would be a helpful additional product. An example might be a notation indicating that a particular roadway is vulnerable to heavy snowfalls, or fog-related crashes, or weekend tourist traffic.

For Corridor-level maps, capturing these “special-other” local influences will be important for the credibility of the maps and will be incorporated into the Corridor description on the page opposite each map.

It was noted that WisDOT Project Management is hesitant to invest a great deal more time and resources into the ongoing refinement of all 37 Corridors, but would rather prefer a shifting of focus towards the metropolitan nodes (4-5) and the highest priority Corridors (7-10) connecting these. As a result, the prioritization of the Corridors will likely be pushed up in the project schedule to enable the functional groups to narrow their focus.

- **Mismatching DDC colors and signpost colors can be confusing**

It was generally agreed that it is acceptable to have mismatching DDC and signpost colors, so long as the reasons are clearly stated in the Corridor descriptions.

- **Corridor maps do not capture the Corridor priorities (freight, safety, etc.)**

It was generally agreed that these factors should be incorporated into Corridor descriptions.

- **Functional Class (as stated in the Corridor map signposts) does not match with regional understanding of FCLASS in some cases**

Following discussions with Brad Javenkoski of WisDOT, it was determined that the most likely reason was that the State Trunk Inventory File (the source of FCLASS for MetaManager and therefore the SPT) determines FCLASS based on certain federal standards, such as urban boundaries determining the urban/rural classification. Regional WisDOT staff may be using greater detail, such as cross-sectional characteristics, to determine FCLASS (in this case, the presence of a curb/gutter would indicate an urban roadway, its absence would indicate a rural roadway). It was decided that MetaManager is the most reliable uniform source for FCLASS and should continue to be the source for FCLASS determination, though the communication problem this creates needs to be addressed.

The most widely accepted solution involves simplifying the labeling of FCLASS on the signposts to an A,B, or C, which is then “translated” to correspond with a particular technology spectrum.

- A Urban Freeway/Expressway
- B Rural Freeway/Expressway
- C Arterials – Rural and Urban

- **Metadata / Source Data should be available in an electronic format**

It was agreed that metadata should be made available, possibly through an arrangement with TOPS Lab. The SPT Team should keep this in mind as they are refining the methodology.

- **Events in the Twin Cities were not considered**

This could be incorporated into both Corridor-level descriptions and into the statewide map making special note of local phenomena.

- **Existing ITS plans should be incorporated into Sketch Plan**

It was agreed that existing ITS plans may be important, particularly for referencing, but results should not be overly influenced by work outside of the sketch planning methodology. The existing ITS plan in the Superior region is the most important currently identified plan for citation.

- **Several important roadways in the SE are not included in the 2030 Corridors/Backbones**

The incorporation of the identified roadways may be helpful and does not discredit/violate our commitment to the 2030 Corridors as a basis for analysis. Pending confirmation that we have consistent MetaManager data for the suggested roadways, they should be added to the sketch plan, provided that technical difficulties will not create significant delays.

- **There are draft 2030 updates that are not currently included in the sketch plan**

It was agreed to not include these updates as they are still in draft form and do not include many critical roadways.

- **Infrastructure-related improvements are not included among the potential solutions/technologies**

Some negatives of including these might be a loss of focus and a suggested maintenance budget commitment. Some positives might be a useful balance of conventional vs. operational solutions. It was determined that infrastructure-related improvements should be noted for specific Corridors where relevant, but not exhaustively explored.

Regional Meetings Follow-up

Several attendees expressed desire to see the attendance lists for the regional meetings in order to identify any gaps.

A thank-you message should be sent out, possibly coupled with a brief statement of how regional comments have been addressed in the sketch plan.

Final Report Outline

The WisDOT PMs agreed to meet internally and review current project status and where they can prioritize the Final Report components. An effort will be made to meet within the next 4-6 weeks.

Benefit Cost Update

It was noted that the related US 41 Benefit-Cost analysis is underway and will be closely related to sketch planning activities.

One of the goals will be the development of precedent and procedure for more detailed Corridor-level planning with the sketch plan as an input.

Technology Scans

WisDOT Project Management noted that the desire to see detailed documentation of emerging technologies may be of lessening priority. However, it will be important to note, when considering current technologies, whether these will potentially aid/hinder newer technologies or programs (such as CVISN).

Items for Continued Emphasis

WisDOT Project Management emphasized some important areas. The institution and integration of the project will continue to be very important. Also, there are several steps that should be taken for inreach. Another round of regional meetings may be important, focusing on the planning and operations chiefs. Also, meetings with executive-level stakeholders at Central Office will be important.

Next Meetings

The next meeting is targeted for the first week in December. For the meeting, the consultant team will focus on having prepared the Madison Metro map and the Badger Corridor map

WisDOT Traffic Operations Sketch Planning
SPT Meeting 9 Minutes
October 22, 2007

prepared, along with full Corridor-level description for the Badger and all appendices for the Badger. Also available will be some of the statewide summary maps for technologies.

The meeting adjourned at 4 pm.