

**MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING**

**SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION**

**Advisory Committee on Transportation System  
Planning and Programming in the Milwaukee Urbanized Areas**

DATE: April 30, 2009  
TIME: 9:30 A.M.  
PLACE: Milwaukee County Downtown Transit Center  
Harbor Lights Room  
909 East Michigan Street  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Milwaukee Urbanized Area Members Present

Voting Members

- Brian Dranzik, Chairman ..... Fiscal and Policy Administrator, Department of  
Transportation and Public Works, Milwaukee County
- John M. Bennett ..... City Engineer, City of Franklin
- Rollin Bertran..... Traffic Engineer, Department of Transportation and  
Public Works, Transportation Division, Milwaukee County
- Allison M. Bussler ..... Interim Director, Department of Public Works,  
Waukesha County
- Jennifer Collins ..... Research Analyst, County Board, Milwaukee County  
(Representing Roy de la Rosa)
- Robert R. Dreblow .....Highway Commissioner, Ozaukee County
- Lois C. Gresl ..... Major Projects Manager, City of Milwaukee  
(Representing City of Milwaukee)
- Thomas M. Grisa ..... Director of Public Works, City of Brookfield
- Robert C. Johnson..... Transit Director, Waukesha Metro Transit,  
City of Waukesha
- Michael G. Lewis .....City Engineer, City of West Allis
- Michael J. Maierle .....Manager of Long-Range Planning, City of Milwaukee
- Jeffery J. Mantes ..... Commissioner, Department of Public Works,  
City of Milwaukee
- Michael J. Martin ..... Director of Public Works, Village of Hales Corners
- Daniel Naze.....Director of Public Works, Village of Whitefish Bay  
(Representing Scott Brandmeier)
- Jeffrey S. Polenske..... City Engineer, City of Milwaukee, Milwaukee County
- Jack Takerian ..... Interim Director, Department of Transportation and  
Public Works, Milwaukee County
- Paul Vornholt..... Director, Division of Intergovernmental Relations,  
City of Milwaukee
- Bill Wehrley..... City Engineer, City of Wauwatosa  
(Representing William A. Kappel)
- Joseph Wiczorek ..... Project Engineer, Department of  
(Representing Milwaukee County) Public Works, Milwaukee County

Non-Voting Members

Steven R. Coons..... System Planning Supervisor,  
 (Representing Dewayne Johnson) Wisconsin Department of Transportation  
 Kenneth R. Yunker ..... Executive Director, SEWRPC

Guests and Staff Present

Tim Barbeau..... Engineer, Village of Butler  
 Tom Boyke ..... Project Engineer, Ruekert & Mielke, Inc.  
 Charlene Brady ..... County Board Supervisor, Washington County  
 Jim Buske..... Engineering and GIS Manager, Village of Brown Deer  
 Megan Carr ..... Citizen  
 Peter Daniels ..... Project Engineer, City of West Allis  
 Paul G. Day ..... Interim Director of Public Works, City of Waukesha  
 David De Angelis..... Village Manager, Village of Elm Grove  
 Melinda Dejewski ..... City Engineer and Director of Public Works,  
 City of St. Francis  
 Jon Edgren ..... Highway Commissioner, Washington County  
 James F. Engelhardt ..... Wisconsin Business Development Director, Clark Dietz, Inc.  
 Melvin K. Ewert..... Trustee, Village of Germantown  
 Gary Evans..... Highway Engineering Manager, Waukesha County  
 Michael Friedlander ..... Transportation Analyst, Bureau of Air Management,  
 Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources  
 Mark Frye ..... Director of Public Works, City of Oconomowoc  
 Daniel Goetz ..... County Board Supervisor, Washington County  
 Thomas J. Hafner ..... Director of Public Works, City of Delafield  
 Christopher T. Hiebert ..... Chief Transportation Engineer, SEWRPC  
 William J. Hoppe ..... City Engineer, City of Mequon  
 Ryan W. Hoel..... Principal Engineer, SEWRPC  
 Douglas Johnson ..... Administrative Coordinator, Washington County  
 John R. Johnson ..... Mayor, City of Muskego  
 James Keegan..... Chief of Planning and Development,  
 Milwaukee County Parks  
 Thomas Kempinski ..... Village President, Village of Germantown  
 Margaret Liedtke..... Engineer, City of Waukesha  
 Michael Loughran ..... Planning and Development Manager, City of Milwaukee  
 Eric D. Lynde..... Engineer/Planner, SEWRPC  
 David Nguyen ..... Major Projects Manager, Office of Recovery and Reinvestment,  
 Wisconsin Department of Transportation  
 Ann Olson ..... Legislative Policy Advisor, Waukesha County  
 Tim Rhode ..... Village Administrator, Village of Butler  
 Xylia N. Rueda..... Research Analyst, SEWRPC  
 Bill Sell ..... Bay View Neighborhood Association  
 David Simpson..... City Engineering/Director of Public Works Projects,  
 City of Muskego  
 Peter Sorce ..... County Board Supervisor, Washington County

Robert Swiderski..... Senior Transportation Engineer, OMNI Associates, Inc.  
Thomas W. Tollaksen .....Village Manager, Village of River Hills  
Art Zabel ..... Trustee, Village of Germantown

**ROLL CALL**

Chairman Dranzik called the meeting of the Advisory Committee on Transportation System Planning and Programming for the Milwaukee Urbanized Area (Milwaukee Area TIP Committee) to order at 9:36 a.m. He indicated that a sign-in sheet was being circulated for the purposes of taking roll and recording the names of all persons in attendance at the meeting, and declared a quorum of the Committee present.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 20, 2009 MEETING**

Chairman Dranzik indicated that the first item on the agenda was the consideration and approval of the minutes for the previous meeting of the Committee, held on March 20, 2009. The minutes were approved as written on a motion by Mr. Grisa, seconded by Mr. Mantes, and carried unanimously by action of the Committee.

**REVIEW OF CANDIDATE STAGE 1 AND 2 SOLICITATION PROJECTS FOR AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM – MILWAUKEE URBANIZED AREA FUNDING**

Mr. Dranzik asked Mr. Yunker to review the listing of candidate Stage 1 and 2 solicitation projects deemed eligible for American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Federal Highway Administration Surface Transportation Program – Milwaukee Urbanized Area (ARRA FHWA STP-MUA) funds as determined by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT). Mr. Yunker noted that the list includes over \$220 million in candidate projects seeking \$38.6 million in ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funding, including 11 bridge projects (\$41 million), 85 rehabilitation and reconstruction projects on arterial streets and highways (\$148 million), 30 rehabilitation and reconstruction projects on nonarterial streets (\$24 million), and two rehabilitation projects on streets which include arterial and nonarterial segments (\$4 million). The following questions and comments were raised in the ensuing discussion:

1. Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Robert C. Johnson, Mr. Edgren stated that the project to reconstruct with additional lanes CTH Y between CTH Q and STH 175 would be removed from the project list should WisDOT approve the proposed removal of an area including Lannon Road (CTH Y) from the adjusted year 2000 Milwaukee urbanized area boundary that was requested by Washington County. Mr. Edgren noted that Washington County made the request to remove a segment of CTH Y from the urbanized area based on the understanding that there may be a greater possibility that the CTH Y project would be approved for funding within the \$109.5 million in ARRA FHWA STP funds available for county and municipal projects outside the State’s urbanized areas over 200,000 in population. Responding to an inquiry from Mr. Nguyen, Mr. Yunker stated that the Advisory Committee approved an adjusted year 2000 Milwaukee urbanized area boundary at its November 12, 2003 meeting, and again on December 21, 2004, to incorporate additional modifications proposed by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation. He added that Commission staff agreed to the adjusted urbanized area boundary change proposed by Washington County, and the Advisory Committee on April 16, 2009, and the Executive Committee of the Commission at its

April 23, 2009, meeting approved the proposed modification to the year 2000 adjusted Milwaukee urbanized area. He stated that Commission staff would be sending a letter to WisDOT requesting consideration and approval of the proposed modification to the adjusted year 2000 Milwaukee urbanized area boundary.

[Secretary's Note: A copy of the letter transmitted to WisDOT is included as Attachment A to these minutes, and a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Wisconsin Department of Transportation response not approving the proposed modification is included as Attachment B to these minutes.]

2. Responding to an inquiry from Mr. Grisa, Mr. Yunker stated that the CTH Y project would remain on the list of project deemed eligible for ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funding, unless the area including CTH Y was approved by WisDOT to be removed from the year 2000 adjusted Milwaukee urbanized area.
3. Responding to an inquire by Mr. Takerian, Mr. Yunker stated that Washington County would no longer be allocated regular annual FHWA STP-MUA funds for the planned lane miles for CTH Y between CTH Q and STH 175 should the area including this segment of CTH Y be approved by WisDOT for removal from the year 2000 adjusted Milwaukee urbanized area.
4. Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Nguyen, Mr. Yunker stated that the \$38.7 million in ARRA would not be reduced should the area including CTH Y be removed from the year 2000 adjusted Milwaukee urbanized area, and that the funding level for the urbanized area is based on the year 2000 Census defined urbanized area. He noted that adjustments can be made adding area to the Census-defined urbanized area, which include adjustments to better define the true urbanized area by including areas of commercial and industrial urban development, not capable of consideration by the Census; adjustments to avoid having a street or highway located alternately within and outside the urbanized area boundary and then having to use Federal urban and rural funds on a single project; adjustments to include entire communities in the urbanized area; and adjustments to create a more uniform urbanized area boundary.

#### **CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF THE PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS FOR AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM – MILWAUKEE URBANIZED AREA FUNDING**

Mr. Dranzik noted the next item on the agenda was the project selection process. Mr. Yunker suggested that the Advisory Committee consider which criteria should be used in the process to select projects for ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funds. He noted that the criteria could include the proportion of planned lane miles of arterial facilities under jurisdiction of each county and community, priority to candidate projects that can be constructed in 2009, and priority to candidate projects that are located in economically distressed areas. Mr. Yunker suggested that the Advisory Committee also decide whether the selection of projects to receive ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funds should be considered independent of FHWA STP-MUA balances of each county and local government. He noted that counties and local governments having positive FHWA STP-MUA balances would benefit by having ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funds added to their FHWA STP-MUA funds, as they would have a greater probability that their candidate project would potentially be selected for ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funds. He added that counties and local governments having a negative FHWA STP-MUA balance would have a lesser probability that their candidate project would potentially be selected for ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funds. However, these

communities would receive a one-time increase in their FHWA STP-MUA balance potentially giving them a greater chance in their candidate projects being selected for routine annual FHWA STP-MUA funding. The following questions and comments were raised in the ensuing discussion:

1. Mr. Polenske suggested that a method to give projects located in economically distressed areas priority for ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funding by adjusting the proportion of lane miles of the arterial streets and highways within each county and local government based on their average equalized value per capita.
2. Ms. Bussler stated that the Advisory Committee has a long history of using planned lane miles of arterial facilities as a means to allocate FHWA STP-MUA funds between the communities of the Milwaukee urbanized area, and suggested that the Advisory Committee continue to do so in selecting projects for ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funding. Mr. Vornholt stated that the FHWA STP-MUA ARRA funds are different in that the ARRA requires that projects located in economically distressed areas be given priority. Mr. Polenske noted that the Commission staff has provided the Committee with useful information related to economically distressed areas that could be used in prioritizing candidate projects located within economically distressed areas. Mr. Yunker noted that, based on year 2000 census data, economically distressed areas within the Milwaukee urbanized area are particularly located within the City of Milwaukee, but that there are also areas in the Cities of Wauwatosa, Cudahy, South Milwaukee, West Allis, and Waukesha.
3. Mr. Grisa stated that the Committee had tentatively agreed at its March 20, 2009, meeting to divide the ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funding with 30 percent for the rehabilitation and reconstruction of bridges and 70 percent for the resurfacing and reconstruction of arterial streets and highways and collector streets (with the final project selection to be determined following review by the Advisory Committee of the listing of candidate projects), and suggested that instead each community be allowed to determine which of their projects are funded within their allocation of ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funds. Mr. Yunker noted that the rehabilitation and reconstruction of local bridges have been typically funded through FHWA bridge program funds, and have not been historically funded with routine annual FHWA STP-MUA funding. He added that a local bridge fund program was not specifically included in the ARRA, and that any local bridge projects in the Milwaukee area would need to be funded within the \$38.7 million in FHWA ARRA funding allocated to the Milwaukee urbanized area. Mr. Takerian stated that the Advisory Committee did not know the number of candidate bridge projects seeking ARRA funds at the March 20, 2009, meeting when he had suggested to divide the ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funding between the rehabilitation and reconstruction of bridges and the resurfacing and reconstruction of arterial streets and highways and collector streets. He stated that because the candidate bridge projects deemed eligible for ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funds were predominately located within Milwaukee County, he agreed that the ARRA funds not be divided between types of projects. The Committee was in agreement with not dividing ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funds between bridge and arterial street projects.
4. Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Takerian, Mr. Nguyen responded that the ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funds cannot be used to partially fund projects previously obligated for other Federal funding sources, such as routine annual FHWA STP-MUA funds. Mr. Takerian then

suggested that the current FHWA STP-MUA balance for each county and local government should not be credited with their allocation of ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funds.

5. Mr. Grisa suggested that the ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funds be allocated based on the proportion of lane-miles of planned arterial streets and highways in each county and local government, and that the current FHWA STP-MUA balances for each county and local government be credited with their allocated share of ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funding, similar to the process previously recommended by the Advisory Committee for selecting projects for routine annual FHWA STP-MUA funding. He noted that by using this method, every county and local government within the Milwaukee urbanized area would benefit by receiving an increase in their current STP-MUA balance, regardless of whether they had a project selected for ARRA funding. He added that under this method, the City of Milwaukee would still be allocated their proportionate share of the ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funding for implementation of their candidate projects. Mr. Nguyen noted that the selection process previously recommended by the Advisory Committee was developed for funding that was annually allocated to the Milwaukee urbanized area. He added that the ARRA funding is different in that the ARRA funding is likely a one-time allocation, the primary purpose of the ARRA is to create or maintain jobs, and that the ARRA specifically required that priority be given to projects located in economically distressed areas.
6. Mr. Bennett expressed support for treating ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funds separate from the regular annual FHWA STP-MUA funds based on counties or local governments with a negative FHWA STP-MUA balance being less likely to receive ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funding for one or more of their candidate projects.
7. Mr. Goetz stated the two candidate projects in Washington County—the reconstruction with additional traffic lanes of CTH Q between USH 41/45 and Pilgrim Road and the reconstruction with additional traffic lanes of CTH Y between CTH Q and STH 175—are ready for implementation now and noted that these projects would create jobs and economic stimulus in 2009.

Mr. Takerian made a motion to treat ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funds separate from regular annual FHWA STP-MUA funding. Mr. Vornholt seconded the motion. The following questions and comments were raised in the ensuing discussion:

1. Mr. Lewis stated his support for crediting the FHWA STP-MUA balances of each county and local government with their allocation of ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funds based on their proportion of lane-miles of arterial streets and highways, allowing every county and local government to benefit by receiving an increase in their FHWA STP-MUA balance.
2. Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Grisa, Mr. Yunker stated that under Mr. Takerian's motion, the FHWA STP-MUA balances for each community would not be credited with their allocation of ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funding.
3. Mr. Polenske suggested that the Advisory Committee should first determine how the ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funds would be allocated to each county and local government within the Milwaukee urbanized area.

Mr. Takerian agreed, and withdrew his motion, with Mr. Vornholt in agreement.

Mr. Polenske then made a motion that the ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funds be distributed by the proportion of lane-miles of arterial streets and highways within each county and local government adjusted based on their average equalized value per capita. Mr. Vornholt seconded the motion. The following questions and comments were raised in the ensuing discussion:

1. Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Grisa, Mr. Polenske stated that the ARRA states that priority shall be given to projects that are located within economically distressed areas. Mr. Yunker stated that the ARRA also stated that priority shall be given to projects projected to be completed within a three year time period following its enactment. He added that WisDOT has defined an even shorter timeframe for projects to be ready for implementation. He suggested that timing of implementation should also be considered as a criteria in the selection of projects for ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funds. Mr. Dreblow agreed and stated that preference should also be given to shovel-ready projects. Mr. Vornholt noted that there are a number of shovel-ready projects on the list provided by the City of Milwaukee. Mr. Nguyen stated that the State would prefer that priority should be given first to projects which can be completed by the end of the year, and then to projects located within economically distressed areas. He noted that if the Advisory Committee agrees to allocate ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funding based solely on economically distressed areas, shovel-ready projects may not be selected. Mr. Polenske noted that all of the projects deemed eligible for ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funding by WisDOT should be able to be completed within the three year time period specified by the ARRA.
2. Ms. Bussler noted that the City of Milwaukee would greatly benefit should the proportion of lane-miles of arterial street and highways in each county and local government adjusted based on the average equalized value per capita be used as a criteria in selecting candidate projects for ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funding. Mr. Polenske stated that other criteria could be considered, but stated that priority must be given to economically distressed areas.
3. Mr. Yunker suggested that the Advisory Committee allow Commission staff to prepare alternatives for the allocation of funding and selection of projects for ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funds based on the suggestions and concerns identified at this meeting by Advisory Committee members and by local governments within the Milwaukee urbanized area. He noted that WisDOT has requested that the selection of projects for ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funding be made by Friday, May 8, 2010, and suggested that the Advisory Committee meet again on Wednesday, May 6, 2010.

Mr. Polenske agreed to withdraw his motion, with Mr. Vornholt in agreement, based on the Advisory Committee meeting to discuss alternative criteria in selection candidate projects for ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funding at a subsequent Committee meeting.

Mr. Naze asked if a county or local government could determine which projects would proceed based on their allocation of ARRA FHWA STP-MUA funding. Mr. Yunker stated that the Commission staff would likely identify potential projects within the total amount of funding allocated to counties and local governments. However, it would be the staff's intent to not require that these potential projects be selected for funding, but rather that each county and community work with the Wisconsin Department of

Transportation and Commission staff to determine the projects to be completed within their total allocated funding.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Committees, the meeting was adjourned on a motion from Mr. Mantes, seconded by Mr. Vornholt, and carried unanimously by the Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth R. Yunker  
Acting Secretary

\* \* \*