

Minutes of the Fifth Joint Meeting of the

**ADVISORY COMMITTEES ON REGIONAL LAND USE PLANNING
AND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLANNING**

DATE: April 23, 2014

TIME: 9:30 a.m.

PLACE: West Allis City Hall, Common Council Chambers
7525 W. Greenfield Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Members Present

Committee on Regional Land Use Planning

Julie Anderson Director of Public Works and Development Services, Racine County
Chair
Jennifer Andrews City Planner, City of Waukesha
Robert J. Bauman Alderman, City of Milwaukee
Andy M. Buehler Director of Planning Operations, Kenosha County
David Cialdini (alternate for Teig Whaley-Smith) Milwaukee County Economic Development
Harlan E. Clinkenbeard City Planner, City of Pewaukee
Daniel F. Ertl Director of Community Development, City of Brookfield
Neal Frauenfelder Senior Planner, Walworth County
Land Use and Resource Management Department
Jason Fruth Planning and Zoning Manager, Waukesha County
Jeffrey B. Labahn Director, Community Development and Inspections, City of Kenosha
Brian Dranzik Director, Department of Transportation, Milwaukee County
Patricia Najera City Plan Commissioner, City of Milwaukee
Eric Nitschke Regional Director, Southeast Region,
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Mark Piotrowicz City Planner/Operations Manager, City of West Bend
Karen Schmiechen (alternate for Sheri Schmit) Program and Policy Analyst,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Doug Seymour Director of Community Development, City of Oak Creek
Matthew Sadowski Assistant Director, City of Racine Department of City Development
Andrew T. Struck Director, Planning and Parks Department, Ozaukee County
Todd Stuebe Director of Community Development, City of Glendale

Committee on Regional Transportation System Planning

Brian Dranzik Director, Department of Transportation, Milwaukee County
Chair
Fred Abadi Director of Public Works, City of Waukesha
Julie Anderson Director of Public Works and Development Services, Racine County

Committee on Regional Transportation System Planning (continued)

Sandra K. Beaupré Director, Bureau of Planning,
Division of Transportation Investment, Wisconsin Department of Transportation

John Bennett..... City Engineer, City of Franklin

Kevin Brunner..... Director of Central Services,
Walworth County Department of Public Works

Jennifer Gonda..... Legislative Liaison Director, City of Milwaukee

David E. Cox..... Village Administrator, Village of Hartland

Gary Evans..... Highway Engineering Division Manager,
Waukesha County Department of Public Works

Michael Friedlander (alternate for Bart Sponseller) Bureau of Air Management,
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

Nik Kovac Alderman, City of Milwaukee

Michael M. Lemens Director of Public Works and City Engineer, City of Kenosha

Michael Loughran (alternate for Ghassan A. Korban) Department of Public Works,
City of Milwaukee

Eric Nitschke..... Regional Director, Southeast Region,
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

Jeff Polenske City Engineer, City of Milwaukee

Karen Schmiechen (alternate for Sheri Schmit)..... Program and Policy Analyst,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Albert Stanek (alternate for Mark H. Yehlen) Parking and Transit System Manager,
City of Racine

Dennis Yaccarino..... Senior Budget and Policy Manager, Budget and Management Division,
Department of Administration, City of Milwaukee

Willie Wade Alderman, City of Milwaukee;
Liaison to the Environmental Justice Task Force

Thomas Winter (alternate for Michael Giugno)..... Director of Schedule and Planning,
Milwaukee County Transit System

Guests and Staff Present

Ann Dee AllenSenior Public Involvement and Outreach Specialist, SEWRPC

Christopher T. HiebertChief Transportation Engineer, SEWRPC

Ryan W. Hoel..... Principal Engineer, SEWRPC

Nancy Holmlund..... Past President, Racine Interfaith Coalition;
Vice Chair, Environmental Justice Task Force

Eric D. Lynde.....Principal Transportation Planner/Engineer, SEWRPC

Benjamin R. McKayPrincipal Planner, SEWRPC

Kevin J. Muhs Senior Transportation Planner, SEWRPC

William Mohr.....Supervisor, Southeast Freeways, Wisconsin Department of Transportation

David A. SchillingChief Land Use Planner, SEWRPC

Kerry Thomas Executive Director, TransitNOW

Kenneth R. Yunker Executive Director, SEWRPC

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Dranzik called the joint meeting of the Advisory Committees on Regional Land Use Planning and Regional Transportation System Planning to order at 9:30 a.m., welcoming those in attendance. Mr. Dranzik stated roll call would be accomplished through circulation of a sign-in sheet.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLANNING MEETING HELD ON FEBRUARY 19, 2014

Mr. Dranzik asked if there were any questions or comments on the February 19, 2014, meeting minutes. Mr. Stanek referred to Attachment 1 of the minutes and suggested updating the table to show a comparison of year 2035 travel forecasts to estimated actual travel using the most current data available. Mr. Yunker indicated that the table was included in the year 2035 regional transportation plan and that the comparison of year 2035 forecasts to estimated actual travel would be included in VISION 2050. Mr. Dranzik then asked for a motion to approve the meeting minutes and noted that only members of the Advisory Committee on Regional Transportation System Planning should vote on the motion. Mr. Bennett moved and Mr. Abadi seconded to approve the February 19, 2014, meeting minutes. The motion was approved unanimously.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEES ON REGIONAL LAND USE PLANNING AND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLANNING HELD ON MARCH 12, 2014

Mr. Dranzik asked if there were any questions or comments on the March 12, 2014, meeting minutes. Mr. Yunker noted that Commission staff met with City of Milwaukee members who could not attend the March 12 meeting. He stated that their comments on the materials reviewed at the March 12 meeting are shown in Exhibit A of today's agenda. Mr. Yunker stated that approval of the March 12 meeting minutes would include approval of the comments set forth in Exhibit A. Ms. Beaupré referred to the proposed revision of text regarding the status of the Chicago-Milwaukee-Madison high speed rail line in Volume I, Chapter III, of the VISION 2050 plan report and stated that WisDOT prefers the original text. She stated that WisDOT Advisory Committee members would abstain from the vote. Mr. Kovac stated that he has an additional comment on the Guiding Statements. Mr. Yunker suggested the Committees consider approval of the revised Guiding Statements separately after the vote on the minutes. Mr. Kovac agreed. Mr. Dranzik then asked for a motion to approve the meeting minutes. Mr. Clinkenbeard moved and Mr. Abadi seconded to approve the March 12, 2014, meeting minutes. The motion was approved unanimously. Ms. Beaupré and Ms. Schmiechen abstained from the vote.

Mr. Kovac suggested adding a sentence to the introductory paragraph of the Guiding Statements following the sentence added at the recommendation of the Commission's Environmental Justice Task Force as follows: "The best way to ensure that benefits and impacts are shared in such a manner is to increase racial and economic integration throughout the Region." Mr. Dranzik asked for a motion to approve the revised Guiding Statements. Mr. Kovac moved and Mr. Stanek seconded to approve the revised Guiding Statements, including the suggested revision by Mr. Kovac. The motion was approved unanimously.

REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT OUTLINE OF SKETCH LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION SCENARIOS FOR VISION 2050

Mr. Yunker stated that the intent of the sketch scenarios is to examine the implications of future land use patterns and transportation system development. He stated that the examination of these scenarios is an intermediate step in the planning process that will lead to development and evaluation of more detailed alternative land use and transportation plans. Mr. Yunker then asked Mr. Lynde of the Commission staff to review the draft outline of the sketch land use and transportation scenarios (see Attachment 1). Mr. Lynde stated that the intent of the scenario planning process is to engage and inform the public about the potential benefits and consequences of a range of conceptual development patterns that vary in location, mix, and density of new development and transportation investments. He noted that Commission staff is working with a consultant (Placeways) to develop the sketch scenarios and their comparison using the CommunityViz scenario planning tool. He stated that the sketch scenarios will be presented and evaluated at the next series of visioning workshops and input from the workshops will be used to refine the scenarios into more detailed alternative plans. The following comments and discussion points were made during the review:

1. Mr. Bauman referred to Scenario A – Trend and asked whether economic impacts of the Region continuing to follow current trends will be analyzed. He added that aggressively investing in improved public transit and fixed guideway transit may be expected to result in greater future regional economic and population growth. Mr. Yunker stated that such economic impacts of each of the scenarios will be discussed and a more detailed evaluation will be performed on the detailed alternative plans in the next step of the planning process.
2. Mr. Polenske suggested changing “bicycle facilities” to “bicycle and pedestrian facilities” in each of the scenario descriptions. The Advisory Committees agreed.
3. Mr. Clinkenbeard asked if each scenario will include multiple land use development patterns. Mr. Lynde responded that each scenario will include one conceptual land use development pattern.
4. Mr. Kovac referred to the first generation year 1990 regional land use and transportation system plan and asked if actual trends have been consistent with the first generation preferred alternative plan. Mr. Clinkenbeard responded that actual trends have not necessarily reflected the preferred alternative from the first generation regional plan. He stated that the Commission is an advisory body and implementation of the regional plan is dependent upon the actions of the local units of government in the Region. Mr. Yunker stated that a newsletter describing the alternatives evaluated as part of the first generation regional plan will be provided to Committee members. He noted that the alternatives included a Controlled Existing Trend Plan, Corridor Plan, and Satellite City Plan.

[Secretary’s Note: SEWRPC Newsletter Vo. 6 – No. 3 (6/1966) describes the alternative plans set forth in the year 1990 regional land use and transportation system plan. The newsletter is available on the SEWRPC website: <http://www.sewrpc.org/SEWRPCFiles/Publications/nl/SEWRPC-Newsletter-V06-N03-1966.pdf>.]

Mr. Lynde asked Mr. Muhs of the Commission staff to review the different transit technologies that will be included in Scenario C – Compact Transit-Oriented Development within Urban Centers, Scenario D – Compact Transit-Oriented Development along Commuter Rail Connecting Urban Centers, and Scenario C+D – Compact Transit-Oriented Development within Urban Centers and along Commuter Rail. Mr. Muhs described the transit technologies used in the scenarios as follows:

- Scenario C: Light rail/bus rapid transit (BRT) with dedicated lanes (separate right-of-way in some places), signal priority, significant stations with off board fare payment, stops every half mile to mile, and 5-15 minute frequencies. Areas with long, straight, and wide rights-of-way would be a more likely candidate for BRT
- Scenario D: Commuter rail using existing or former freight corridors, crossing gates, stations every two to four miles, and 15-60 minute frequencies
- Scenario C+D: Includes both light rail/BRT and commuter rail technologies.

The following comments and discussion points were made during the review:

1. Mr. Bauman stated that BRT and light rail are distinguishable and have different levels of attractiveness to riders. Mr. Muhs responded that the characteristics of different corridors, such as ridership and amount of space for dedicated right-of-way, are considerations when determining whether BRT or light rail would be the appropriate technology. Mr. Yunker stated that the differences between BRT and light rail will be noted for the sketch scenario comparison and discussed in-depth under the more detailed alternative plans.
2. Mr. Evans asked if the scenarios will identify a target level of public transit investment that would result in enough reduced freeway congestion that future expansion is not necessary. Mr. Yunker responded that a target will not be identified but the issue will be considered in the comparative evaluation between the scenarios. Mr. Kovac asked if the integrated cost of the freeway and transit systems proposed under each scenario will be evaluated. Mr. Yunker responded that these costs will be compared. Mr. Polenske stated that a high level of investment should be made in pedestrian facilities to complement transit facilities.

Mr. Dranzik asked if there were any further questions or comments on the draft outline of sketch land use and transportation scenarios for VISION 2050. There were none. Mr. Dranzik asked for a motion to approve the draft outline. Mr. Abadi moved and Mr. Lemens seconded to approve the draft outline of sketch land use and transportation scenarios for VISION 2050. The motion was approved unanimously.

REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT LIST OF POSSIBLE CRITERIA FOR COMPARISON OF VISION 2050 SCENARIOS

Mr. Yunker noted that the comparison of sketch scenarios will be more conceptual than the in depth evaluation of detailed alternative plans. He noted that the draft list may be modified as Commission staff continues to work with the CommunityViz scenario planning tool and determines which criteria are feasible to estimate for each future scenario. Mr. Yunker then asked Mr. Lynde to review the draft list of possible criteria for comparison of VISION 2050 scenarios (see Attachment 2). The following comments and discussion points were made during the review:

1. Mr. Friedlander asked how the greenhouse gas emissions criterion will be estimated. Mr. Hiebert responded that greenhouse gas emission factors will be developed for the different components of

land use and transportation and applied to each of the scenarios. Mr. Friedlander noted that additional air pollutants could be added to the criteria. Mr. Hiebert responded that this would be possible for vehicle emissions as the MOVES emissions model developed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency can estimate greenhouse gas emissions as well as other pollutants.

2. Mr. Kovac suggested adding criteria to compare the scenarios with respect to economic and racial integration. Mr. Yunker stated that while current socio-economic data is available, projections for the year 2050 with respect to race and household income would be difficult to incorporate into the scenarios. Mr. Yunker noted that staff will incorporate regional housing plan analyses and recommendations into the VISION 2050 plan. Mr. Kovac asked if the analyses are quantitative. Mr. Yunker responded that Commission staff prepared a projected job/housing balance analysis that compares anticipated housing by type to anticipated jobs by wage level in sewerred communities in the Region based on local government comprehensive plans. He stated that staff prepared plan recommendations to address projected job/housing imbalances based on this analysis. Mr. Kovac asked if this will help determine benefits and impacts of various scenarios on minority and low-income populations. Mr. Yunker stated that the VISION 2050 plan will include an evaluation of potential benefits and adverse impacts of preliminary plan recommendations on minority and low-income populations. Mr. Kovac responded that this evaluation needs to start early in the planning process.
3. Mr. Polenske stated that new programs, such as bike share programs, could transform how people travel. He suggested including bicycle trips in the trips per day criterion. Mr. Yunker stated that staff will attempt to do this.
4. Mr. Stanek asked if the transit service coverage area criterion will consider service levels in addition to geography. Mr. Lynde responded that service levels will be considered. Mr. Yunker noted that the alternative plans will be evaluated in greater detail than the sketch scenarios in regard to transit service levels. The comparison of the sketch scenarios is intended to provide an understanding of the basic differences of alternative future development patterns and transportation system development.
5. Mr. Seymour asked if the criteria need to be expanded to address the suggestions in the letter from the Regional Transit Initiative dated April 21, 2014, which was emailed to members prior to the meeting and distributed at the meeting (see Attachment 3). Mr. Yunker responded that it may be difficult to expand on the criteria because the scenarios will be less detailed than the alternative plans, but most of the suggested additions in the letter may be possible to address. He added that a more detailed evaluation can be performed on the alternative plans.
6. Mr. Friedlander asked how energy use in residential and non-residential buildings will be measured. Mr. Lynde responded that staff is still working on how to estimate that criterion using the CommunityViz tool.
7. Mr. Stanek asked about the origin of the phrasing of the “benefits and impacts to minority and low-income populations” criterion. Mr. Yunker responded that the phrasing is based on Title VI requirements. Mr. Kovac suggested moving the criterion from the qualitative section to the quantitative section. Mr. Yunker responded that staff will attempt to quantify the criterion at the scenario level. Mr. Bauman suggested evaluating the impact of the various scenarios on

households without access to an automobile. Mr. Yunker responded that staff will also attempt this evaluation.

Mr. Yunker stated that no approval is needed for this agenda item because Commission staff is continuing to develop and refine potential criteria based on comments and suggestions from the Committees and the limitations of comparing conceptual level scenarios. Mr. Yunker stated that Commission staff will attempt to quantify the criteria listed as qualitative in the draft list of possible criteria. He added that criteria that cannot be quantified at the sketch scenario level will likely be quantified as part of the evaluation of detailed alternative plans.

DISCUSSION OF SCHEDULE AND LOCATION OF FUTURE JOINT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Mr. Yunker noted that a tentative schedule for future joint advisory committee meetings was included in the meeting packets as a reminder for members of the Committees. He noted that the meeting originally scheduled for July 23, 2014, has been rescheduled for July 30, 2014, and will be held in the West Allis Common Council Chambers. Mr. Bauman noted that there will be a conflict for several City of Milwaukee members on June 11, 2014, and September 10, 2014, because of Common Council committee meetings. He requested that the start time for these meetings be moved from 9:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. There was no objection. Mr. Yunker stated that staff will email an updated meeting schedule to members of the Advisory Committees.

[Secretary's Note: The September 10, 2014, joint Advisory Committee meeting has been tentatively rescheduled to September 17, 2014, at 1:30 p.m.]

REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF PRELIMINARY DRAFT CHAPTERS AND APPENDICES OF SEWRPC MEMORANDUM REPORT 215: "REVIEW AND UPDATE OF THE YEAR 2035 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN"

Mr. Dranzik noted that a preliminary draft chapter and two preliminary draft appendices will be reviewed under this agenda item, including Chapter 6, "Update of Year 2035 Regional Transportation Plan;" Appendix A, "Year 2035 Regional Transportation Plan: Fiscally-Constrained Estimated Costs and Attendant Revenues;" and Appendix B, "Evaluation of the Impacts of the Fiscally-Constrained Plan on Minority and Low-Income Populations in Southeastern Wisconsin."

Mr. Dranzik asked Mr. Hoel of the Commission staff to review the Review and Update of the Year 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (<http://www.sewrpc.org/SEWRPC/Transportation/RTSPUpdate2014.htm>). Mr. Hoel stated that the Commission conducts an interim review and update of the regional transportation plan every four years. He stated that the current year 2035 regional transportation plan was adopted by the Regional Planning Commission in 2006, and reviewed with minor amendment in 2010. The review of the year 2035 plan examines the validity of plan forecasts, assesses transportation system performance, reviews plan implementation progress, and examines whether it remains reasonable for the plan recommendations to be accomplished over the next 20 years, given the implementation of the plan to date and existing and reasonably expected future funding.

Mr. Hoel stated the conclusion reached in 2006 and again in 2010 was that plan recommendations were reasonably consistent with existing and reasonably expected to be available future revenues. This conclusion is no longer possible given the elimination of indexing the State motor fuel tax to inflation and

the failure of Regional Transit Authority (RTA) legislation providing dedicated local funding for transit. As a result, the original year 2035 plan is now considered to be a “vision” plan, outlining the desirable transportation system improvements considered to be necessary to address the current and future transportation needs of the Region. He stated that it is also necessary to identify a “fiscally-constrained” year 2035 plan that includes those elements of the “vision” 2035 plan which can only likely be achieved within the restrictions of existing and reasonably expected to be available revenues, including the limitations on the use of those revenues. Mr. Yunker noted that, once adopted, the VISION 2050 plan will replace the year 2035 regional transportation plan. He noted that the review of the year 2035 plan should help to better understand the funding issues that need to be addressed in the VISION 2050 plan. The following comments and discussion points were made during the review:

1. Mr. Bauman referred to Map 6-6, which shows the estimated time frame for completion of freeway reconstruction under the “fiscally-constrained” year 2035 plan, and inquired whether projects could be removed from the fiscally-constrained year 2035 plan. He noted that removing the project to reconstruct IH 94 between 70th Street and 16th Street in Milwaukee County from the fiscally-constrained plan could make an estimated \$1.2 billion available for the reconstruction of the freeway segments proposed to be deferred beyond the plan design year 2035. Mr. Yunker responded that Commission staff worked with WisDOT to identify the freeway reconstruction projects that could be implemented by the year 2035 given current and expected funding constraints. He stated that the project to reconstruct IH 94 between 70th Street and 16th Street was added to the fiscally-constrained plan because the project is currently going through preliminary engineering and environmental impact studies. He added that the other freeway reconstruction projects were included in the fiscally-constrained plan largely based on the current conditions of the bridges and roadway along those segments.
2. Mr. Bauman stated that it is the official position of the City of Milwaukee not to add capacity or make major design improvements to the IH 94 east-west segment within the City. He stated the City Assessor’s Office has estimated a 15 percent decrease in property value in the Story Hill neighborhood if freeway capacity is expanded during reconstruction. Mr. Yunker responded that it is appropriate to include the project in the fiscally-constrained plan because WisDOT is currently conducting preliminary engineering on IH 94 between 70th Street and 16th Street to address the current condition of the bridges and pavement, congestion, and crashes along this segment of freeway. He noted that a number of alternatives are being considered and analyzed by WisDOT as part of preliminary engineering for the project, including rebuild as-is, various options to rebuild to modern design standards, rebuilding with additional lanes, and rebuilding with the existing number of lanes. He added that WisDOT has, and will continue, to provide extensive opportunities for input from the public and affected local governments during preliminary engineering. A determination as to how IH 94 will be reconstructed will not be made by WisDOT until the conclusion of preliminary engineering.
3. Mr. Clinkenbeard stated that the IH-94 east-west segment in the City of Milwaukee impacts transportation in the entire Region. Mr. Yunker noted that the service life of the roadway and bridges on this segment of the freeway is coming to an end. Mr. Bauman stated that the City of Milwaukee only objects to increased capacity and design improvements and supports reconstructing the roadway and bridges as-is. He noted that the savings of reconstructing the freeway segment as-is in the City of Milwaukee could be used to implement freeway reconstruction projects not currently in the fiscally-constrained plan. Mr. Yunker stated that the design details are developed during the preliminary engineering phase of a reconstruction project.

He stated that all of the freeway segments in the Region will need to be reconstructed at some point. He stated that the review and update of the year 2035 plan identifies which reconstruction projects cannot be completed by 2035 given existing and reasonably expected to be available revenues. He noted that the conclusions of the review and update of the year 2035 plan regarding the additional funding necessary to implement plan recommendations serve to inform the VISION 2050 planning process. He indicated that the Commission staff would add a discussion on the City of Milwaukee's position regarding the widening of freeway segments in the City to Chapter 6 of the review and update of the year 2035 plan.

[Secretary's Note: The following paragraph has been added following the first paragraph on page 6-23 of Chapter 6:

“At the April 23, 2014, meeting of the Commission's Advisory Committee on Regional Transportation System Planning, City of Milwaukee representatives suggested that the fiscally-constrained plan be amended to remove the rebuilding to modern design standards and widening of the 18 miles of freeway in the City. They expressed opposition to rebuilding to modern design standards and widening any freeway segment within the City, citing that there would be significant impacts associated with those widenings due to the densely populated neighborhoods immediately adjacent to those freeway segments. The City representatives as well suggested that any funding made available due to reconstructing as-is these 18 miles of freeway could be used to avoid deferral of some of the 166 miles of freeway reconstruction that would not be implemented by the year 2035 due to constraints of existing and reasonably expected available funding.”]

4. Mr. Ertl asked whether it may be possible to add capacity and design improvements to the IH 94 east-west freeway segment in the City of Milwaukee largely without expanding its footprint. Mr. Kovac suggested conducting a cost-benefit analysis of adding capacity to the IH 94 east-west segment in the City of Milwaukee. Mr. Yunker responded that it would be appropriate for such an analysis at this time to be conducted during preliminary engineering of the IH 94 project.
5. Mr. Stanek asked if long-term maintenance costs were considered as part of the fiscal constraint analysis for year 2035 plan. Mr. Yunker stated that long-term maintenance costs are included in the estimated costs of the fiscally-constrained year 2035 plan.
6. Mr. Wade stated that there may be environmental concerns related to widening the IH 94 east-west segment in the City of Milwaukee, such as increased air pollution. Mr. Yunker suggested inviting WisDOT staff to provide a presentation at the next joint Advisory Committee meeting. Mr. Bauman stated that WisDOT staff should address the concerns discussed during the current meeting. Mr. Bauman suggested consideration of the review and update of the year 2035 plan be delayed until WisDOT has made a presentation. Mr. Yunker indicated that the Commission staff was seeking approval of Chapter 6 and Appendices A and B of the review and update in order to move forward and focus on the major reevaluation of the regional transportation plan as part of VISION 2050. He noted that the regional transportation plan recognizes that the final decision on how any freeway segment will be reconstructed is made at the conclusion of preliminary engineering. Mr. Clinkenbeard indicated that traffic volumes may increase on adjacent arterial

streets and highways as a consequence of not providing sufficient capacity on a freeway segment. Mr. Bauman disagreed, indicating that there have been examples where traffic volumes have not increased on adjacent facilities due to changes in travel behavior. He indicated that he would not support approval of the review and update of the year 2035 regional transportation plan unless it was amended to recommend that the IH 94 east-west segment in the City of Milwaukee be reconstructed to its existing capacity.

Mr. Dranzik asked if there were any further questions or comments on Chapter 6 and Appendices A and B of the review and update of the year 2035 regional transportation plan. There were none. Mr. Dranzik asked for a motion to approve Chapter 6 and Appendices A and B of the review and update of the year 2035 regional transportation plan and noted that only members of the Advisory Committee on Regional Transportation System Planning should vote on the motion. Mr. Abadi moved and Mr. Evans seconded to approve Chapter 6 and Appendices A and B of the review and update of the year 2035 regional transportation plan. The motion was approved by a majority vote of seven to five.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Dranzik asked if there were any public comments. Ms. Holmlund made the following comments:

1. Ms. Holmlund introduced herself as a member of the Commission's Environmental Justice Task Force (EJTF) and stated that she found today's discussion very informative. She noted that the original construction of the freeway system through the City of Milwaukee disrupted the lives of many residents. She stated that it seems the same issue is reoccurring and the City of Milwaukee members of the Advisory Committees do not want reconstruction to negatively impact residents.
2. Ms. Holmlund stated that it would be useful for the EJTF to receive background on the first generation regional land use and transportation plan and requested that Commission staff forward the newsletter describing the alternatives evaluated as part of the first generation regional plan to the EJTF members.

[Secretary's Note: A link to the newsletter on the SEWRPC website was forwarded to EJTF members.]

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Dranzik thanked everyone for attending and asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Clinkenbeard moved and Mr. Bennett seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Benjamin R. McKay
Recording Secretary

* * *

**DRAFT OUTLINE OF SKETCH VISION 2050
LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT SCENARIOS**

The following provides an outline of initial possible “sketch” land use and transportation development scenarios for consideration by the Commission’s Advisory Committees on Regional Land Use Planning and Regional Transportation System Planning. The sketch scenarios on the following pages are meant to be conceptual alternatives of how the Region might look and function in the future, representing a range of possible futures for land use and transportation system development. They are intended to be “what if” illustrations:

- *What if...we continue current trends?*
- *What if...we emphasize medium and high density development and focus on improving existing transit services?*
- *What if...we focus on highly compact, transit-oriented development in conjunction with developing a fixed-guideway transit system?*

The two basic elements that vary between the scenarios are:

1. Location, density, and mix of new development and redevelopment.
2. Components of the transportation system.

One of the primary purposes for including scenario planning in the VISION 2050 process is to translate the complicated land use and transportation issues facing our Region into simple concepts that are easy to comprehend. At the same time, it is important not to lose sight of the complexities of these issues, and to appreciate the difficult decisions that must be made to address these issues. The proposed scenario planning exercise will attempt to achieve this balance.

Total anticipated regional growth in population, households, and employment would be held constant in each scenario in order to compare the tradeoffs between scenarios. Criteria are being designed to measure the relative benefits, costs, and impacts—at a basic, sketch level—of the scenarios. These criteria will be developed in alignment with the VISION 2050 Guiding

Attachment 1 (continued)

Statements, which identify in general terms the Region's initial vision. Showing how well each scenario would align with the Guiding Statements will allow people to determine how desirable they believe a particular scenario to be. It should also be recognized that there are some issues that are difficult to capture in the simple criteria being developed. These issues will be discussed in a more qualitative nature.

Visualization is another critical component of understanding the differences among scenarios. Graphics will be used to present the scenario comparisons to the public, with visualization techniques that attempt to convey the information in a way that makes it interesting for those reviewing and providing feedback on the scenarios.

By reviewing and interpreting the scenario comparison results, this particular step in the VISION 2050 process is aimed at identifying generally preferred themes for developing the Region's land and transportation system. These general themes would build on the key values and priorities expressed through initial visioning activities and would then be used to develop a set of detailed alternative land use and transportation plans, each including a specific land development pattern and transportation system.

SCENARIO A – TREND

Land Use: Baseline

This scenario provides a baseline to compare to other alternative futures, and represents a continuation of current trends in declining urban density. Most development is assumed to occur at medium and low densities within existing urban centers or at the immediate outer boundary of existing urban centers, but some development would occur at low densities outside of existing urban centers.

Transportation: Baseline

Under this scenario, there would be no improvements or expansion of transit service, with continuing current trends resulting in service reductions. Segment-by-segment reconstruction of the freeway system is assumed to continue, with traffic lanes added on congested facilities and minimal new arterial street and highway facilities constructed. Bicycle facilities—bike lanes, wider curb lanes, paved shoulders—are provided as arterials are reconstructed, and off-street facilities are added gradually.

SCENARIO B – CONTROLLED GROWTH WITH IMPROVED BUS TRANSIT

Land Use: Higher Density Development

New development under this scenario is assumed to occur largely as infill or redevelopment in existing urban centers, and at the immediate outer boundary of existing urban centers. Medium and high density urban development is emphasized, resulting in a reversal of trends in declining urban density.

Transportation: Improved Existing Transit Services

This scenario would include a significant increase in existing transit services—including expansion of service areas, hours, frequency of service, and express bus service—with transit services continuing to be provided predominantly by buses. Bicycle facilities—bike lanes, wider curb lanes, paved shoulders—are provided as arterials are reconstructed, with a regional

system of off-street facilities developed beyond gradual additions. Highway capacity additions are implemented only to address the residual traffic congestion which may not be alleviated by transit, bicycle, and other measures.

SCENARIO C – COMPACT TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT WITHIN URBAN CENTERS

Land Use: Compact Transit-Oriented Development

This scenario concentrates new development primarily along light rail or bus rapid transit (BRT) lines and particularly at light rail or BRT stations. There is an emphasis on high density urban development, mostly through infill or redevelopment in existing urban centers. Very little growth occurs outside existing urban centers.

Transportation: Light Rail/BRT and High Levels of Bicycle Accommodation

Under this scenario, a system of light rail and BRT lines within urban centers is developed beyond a significant increase to existing bus transit services (service to new areas, additional hours, increased service frequency, and express bus service). Higher levels of bicycle accommodation, beyond bicycle facilities provided as part of arterial reconstruction, are provided—such as protected bicycle lanes—in key bicycle corridors. A Region-wide system of off-street bicycle facilities is also developed. Highway improvements are limited to modernization to current design standards as highways are reconstructed.

SCENARIO D – COMPACT TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT ALONG COMMUTER RAIL CONNECTING URBAN CENTERS

Land Use: Compact Transit-Oriented Development

This scenario concentrates new development primarily adjacent to commuter rail stations. There is an emphasis on high density urban development, mostly through infill or redevelopment in existing urban centers. Very little growth occurs outside existing urban

centers, with the exception of areas adjacent to commuter rail stations located between urban centers.

Transportation: Commuter Rail and High Levels of Bicycle Accommodation

Under this scenario, a system of commuter rail lines between urban centers is developed beyond a significant increase to existing bus transit services (service to new areas, additional hours, increased service frequency, and express bus service). Higher levels of bicycle accommodation, beyond bicycle facilities provided as part of arterial reconstruction, are provided—such as protected bicycle lanes—in key bicycle corridors. A Region-wide system of off-street bicycle facilities is also developed. Highway improvements are limited to modernization to current design standards as highways are reconstructed.

**SCENARIO C+D – COMPACT TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT
WITHIN URBAN CENTERS AND ALONG COMMUTER RAIL**

Land Use: Compact Transit-Oriented Development

This scenario concentrates new development primarily along light rail, BRT, and commuter rail lines and particularly at light rail, BRT, and commuter rail stations. There is an emphasis on high density urban development, mostly through infill or redevelopment in existing urban centers. Very little growth occurs outside existing urban centers, with the exception of areas adjacent to commuter rail stations located between urban centers.

Transportation: Light Rail/BRT/Commuter Rail and High Levels of Bicycle Accommodation

Under this scenario, a light rail/BRT system within urban centers and a commuter rail system between urban centers are developed in addition to a significant increase in existing local bus transit services (service to new areas, additional hours, and increased service frequency). Higher levels of bicycle accommodation, beyond bicycle facilities provided as part of arterial reconstruction, are provided—such as protected bicycle lanes—in key bicycle corridors. A Region-wide system of off-street bicycle facilities is also developed. Highway improvements are limited to modernization to current design standards as highways are reconstructed.

**DRAFT LIST OF CRITERIA FOR COMPARING
SKETCH VISION 2050 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION SCENARIOS**

The following provides a list of possible measurable criteria being considered by the Commission staff, which would be estimated for use in comparing sketch land use and transportation scenarios. The criteria are being developed using a scenario planning tool (CommunityViz), which will allow assessment—as best as can be done with a general sketch scenario—of the extent to which each scenario is consistent with the initial vision described generally by the VISION 2050 Guiding Statements. The criteria are being designed to measure the relative benefits, costs, and impacts of the scenarios so they can be easily compared. Given the conceptual nature of the scenario comparison during this step of the process, the criteria will be estimated at a basic, sketch level. Moving forward into the next step of the process—the development and evaluation of detailed alternative land use and transportation plans—the estimates are likely to change as staff refines the calculations and develops alternative plans that are based on the scenarios, but include a higher level of detail.

Possible quantitative scenario comparison criteria:

- Job-housing balance (balance of wages and housing types)
- Use mix (score based on the mix of residential and commercial land uses)
- Walkability (index based on factors affecting the ability to walk to destinations)
- Transit service coverage area
- Population served by transit
- Households served by transit
- Jobs accessible by transit
- Average distance to transit (residential and non-residential)
- Average distance to commercial
- Average distance to parks and recreation
- Remaining farmland area
- Remaining open space
- Level of bicycle accommodation

Attachment 2 (continued)

- Travel time delay
- Vehicle-miles of travel (total and per capita)
- Trips per day (personal vehicle and transit)
- Greenhouse gas emissions (from vehicles and buildings)
- Energy use (residential buildings and non-residential buildings)
- Cost of housing and transportation
- Cost of new transportation infrastructure (capital and operating)
- Cost of new residential infrastructure (water, sewer, etc.)
- Cost of providing government services

Scenarios will also be compared with respect to:

- Population by subarea
- Employment by subarea
- Residential density
- Employment density
- Employees by type (retail and other)
- Residential by type (single family, multi-family, etc.)

Some scenario comparisons cannot be quantified or are very difficult to accurately quantify. For these comparisons, qualitative discussions would be used instead to assist in considering the tradeoffs between scenarios. Possible qualitative scenario comparison discussions:

- Benefits and impacts to minority and low-income populations
- Potential for attracting residents and businesses
- Impact on public health
- Effect of demographic shifts
- Resilience in adapting to rising fuel prices
- Ability to address issues related to climate change
- Ability to connect to nearby metro areas and leverage the value of those areas

SE Wisconsin Regional Transit Initiative

Date: April 21, 2014

To: Eric Lynde, SEWRPC

From: SE Wisconsin Regional Transit Initiative

Re: Comments in regards to

1. **Draft List of Criteria for Comparing Sketch VISION 2050 Land Use and Transportation Scenarios**
2. SEWRPC's response to comments submitted by the Regional Transit Initiative and regional economic and community leaders on the VISION 2050 guiding principles

Thank you for considering our comments related to the VISION 2050 Draft Guiding Statements in the letter dated February 24th, 2014. Several of the important concerns and recommendations expressed, although not included in the guiding statements, were included in the recently released draft list of criteria for VISION 2050 sketch scenario plans.

In addition, we believe that it is essential that future VISION 2050 brochures and documents explicitly connect the transportation and land use statements — the framework of VISION 2050—to the economic, workforce, and quality of life impacts and outcomes that people care about. This is a key factor in building engagement in the VISION 2050 process, and buy-in for implementing the plan.

The following comments are in regard to the document distributed by SEWRPC on April 10, 2014:

Draft List of Criteria for Comparing Sketch VISION 2050 Land Use and Transportation Scenarios

Each of the draft criteria, and in particular the criteria listed below, are needed to provide a strong foundation of information that is important to creating a long range land use and transportation plan that will meet SE Wisconsin's needs, and build on its' many assets, provided the following refinements are incorporated.

We are requesting that the following refinements and priorities be incorporated into the list of criteria to provide the clear and accurate information that is needed to effectively understand and weigh the tradeoffs across the various sketch scenarios. The list could be simplified through combining similarly themed criterion. Efforts should be made to include the full list not be reduced.

- Draft criterion: Transit service coverage area, population served by transit, households served by transit, and jobs accessible by transit

Recommendation: Indicate the level of transit service, which will answer the questions: What is meant by "served"? What is the level of service that will reach the desired outcomes?

Additionally, consider incorporating a function that will measure transit access to jobs in relation to the location of the workers.

Steering Committee

Earl Buford
Wisconsin Regional
Training Partnership/Big Step

Dr. Michael Burke
Milwaukee Area Technical College

Lafayette Crump
African American Chamber of
Commerce, Prism Technical

Mike Fabishak
Associated General Contractors-
Greater Milwaukee

Paula Penebaker
YWCA SE Wisconsin

Jeramey Jannene
Urban Milwaukee

Dr. Carmel Ruffolo
UW Milwaukee and UW Parkside

Brian Schupper
Greater Milwaukee Committee

Marcus White
Greater Milwaukee Foundation

Kerry Thomas
Transit NOW

Contact Information
Kerry Thomas
kthomas@transitnow.org
P: (262) 246-3724
M: (414) 303-1951

(Continued)

Attachment 3 (continued)

- Draft criterion: Travel time delay
Recommendation: In parallel, “transit trip time” is an important indicator and should be included, which expresses the transportation quality and efficiency in various scenarios. Travel time efficiency and convenience are a crucial part of job access, ridership, and quality of life that supports workforce and economic development. A recent Public Policy Forum report, *Getting to Work*, found that long transit trip times are a significant barrier to employment, and to employers’ access to workers.
- Draft criterion: Trips per day (personal vehicle and transit)”
Recommendation: Include bicycle and pedestrian trips criteria, as a growing component of the transportation system. Increasing bike and pedestrian use supports multiple guiding statements and should be included in the criteria to appropriately support the plans and implementation guided by those statements.
- Draft criterion: Cost of housing and transportation
Recommendation: Clarify that this criteria is related to households.
- Draft criterion: Cost of new residential infrastructure (water, sewer, etc.):
Recommendation: An accurate reflection of new infrastructure costs must include commercial, business, and government, which carry a substantial portion of the cost impact.
- Draft criterion: Greenhouse gas emissions
Recommendation: Rename to “Air pollutants” and in addition to greenhouse gas emissions, include 2 major air pollutants that impact health: nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), and fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}). Data for both of these pollutants is publicly available from EPA websites. These air pollutants are considered to be the primary bad actors responsible for the many health impacts of air pollution, which span the life-course, including effects on preterm birth, asthma, cardiovascular disease, and premature death."

Lastly, providing the criteria data by county will provide the information that is needed to make the trade-offs clear for each location, which would likely be lost in a regional averaging process.

We’d like to thank the staff at SEWRPC for their significant efforts to develop a valuable new sketch scenario planning process, and utilizing the community engagement visualizing tool, “Community Viz.”

Sincerely,



Kerry Thomas

On behalf of the Regional Transit Initiative Steering Committee

cc: Kevin Muhs, SEWRPC