

Minutes of the Eighteenth Joint Meeting of the

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

DATE: January 18, 2018
TIME: 10:30 a.m.
PLACE: West Allis City Hall
7525 W. Greenfield Avenue
West Allis, Wisconsin

Members Present

Committee on Regional Land Use Planning

Julie Anderson Director of Public Works and Development Services, Racine County
Chair
Anthony Barth (alternate for Sheri Schmit) Project Development Supervisor,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Robert Bauman Alderman, City of Milwaukee
Andy Buehler Director of Planning and Development, Kenosha County
Harlan Clinkenbeard City Planner, City of Pewaukee
Amy Connolly (alternate for Matthew Sadowski) Director of City Development, City of Racine
Paulette Enders Director of Development, City of Wauwatosa
Jason Fruth Planning and Zoning Manager, Waukesha County
Vanessa Koster Planning Manager, City of Milwaukee Department of City Development
Maria Pandazi (alternate for Jennifer Andrews) City Planner, City of Waukesha
Steven Schaer Manager of Planning and Zoning, City of West Allis
Karen Sands Director of Planning, Research and Sustainability
Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District
Andrew Struck Director, Planning and Parks Department, Ozaukee County
Todd Stuebe Director of Community Development, City of Glendale
Todd Willis (alternate for Daniel Ertl) Economic Development Coordinator, City of Brookfield

Committee on Regional Transportation Planning

Fred Abadi Director of Public Works, City of Waukesha
Julie Anderson Director of Public Works and Development Services, Racine County
Anthony Barth (alternate for Sheri Schmit) Project Development Supervisor,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Scott Brandmeier Director of Public Works/Village Engineer, Village of Fox Point
Donna Brown-Martin Director, Bureau of Planning and Economic Development,
Division of Transportation Investment Management, Wisconsin Department of Transportation
David Cox Village Administrator, Village of Hartland
Peter Daniels Interim City Engineer/Director of Public Works, City of West Allis
Jon Edgren Director of Public Works/Highway Commissioner, Ozaukee County

Michael Friedlander (alternate for Gail Good) Program and Policy Analyst,
 Bureau of Air Management, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
 Steven Houte Village Engineer, Village of Mount Pleasant
 Ghassan Korban Commissioner of Public Works, City of Milwaukee
 Nik Kovac Alderman, City of Milwaukee
 Max Marechal City Engineer, City of West Bend
 Jeffrey Polenske City Engineer, City of Milwaukee
 Andrew Tillman (alternate for Daniel Boehm) Transit Planner, Milwaukee County Transit System
 Brian Udovich Highway Operations Manager, Jefferson County
 Willie Wade Vice President, Employ Milwaukee
 Liaison to the Environmental Justice Task Force
 Dennis Yaccarino Senior Budget and Policy Manager, Budget and Management Division
 Department of Administration, City of Milwaukee
 Mark Yehlen Commissioner of Public Works, City of Racine

Guests and Staff Present

Lee Bergquist Reporter, Milwaukee Journal Sentinel
 Michael Hahn Executive Director, SEWRPC
 Christopher Hiebert Chief Transportation Engineer, SEWRPC
 Ryan Hoel Principal Engineer, SEWRPC
 Andrew Levy Systems Planning Supervisor,
 Southeast Region, Wisconsin Department of Transportation
 Eric Lynde Chief Special Projects Planner, SEWRPC
 Kevin Muhs Deputy Director, SEWRPC
 Nelson Ogbuagu Director, Transportation Department, City of Kenosha
 Nakeisha Payne Public Involvement and Outreach Manager, SEWRPC
 David Schilling Chief Land Use Planner, SEWRPC
 Charles Wade Planning Section Chief, Bureau of Planning and Economic Development,
 Division of Transportation Investment Management, Wisconsin Department of Transportation

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Anderson called the joint meeting of the Advisory Committees on Regional Land Use Planning and Regional Transportation Planning to order at 10:35 a.m., welcoming those in attendance. She stated that roll call would be accomplished through circulation of a sign-in sheet and, given the length of time since the last meeting, asked Committee members and Commission staff to introduce themselves.

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 JUNE 29, 2016

Ms. Anderson asked if there were any questions or comments on the June 29, 2016, meeting minutes. There were none. On a motion by Mr. Clinkenbeard seconded by Mr. Cox, the June 29, 2016, meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO VISION 2050 ADDRESSING FEDERAL HIGHWAY SAFETY PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS

Ms. Anderson noted that the Committee members received copies of the document entitled “Establishing Targets for the Federal Safety Performance Measures” prior to the meeting, which outlines a proposed amendment to VISION 2050 incorporating proposed targets for the Federal safety performance measures. She also noted that two summary PowerPoint handouts—one related to the Federal performance management requirements (available [here](#)) and one related to establishing targets for the safety performance measures (available [here](#))—were distributed to members at the meeting (these materials are available on both Committee pages through the SEWRPC website).

She then asked Mr. Hoel to review the Federal performance management requirements and the establishment of safety targets. Mr. Hoel stated that the establishing of safety targets is part of the national performance management framework that was created by the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21). He noted that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) have nearly completed the rulemaking for implementation of the national performance management framework. He indicated that as part of the performance management framework, WisDOT is responsible for establishing statewide targets for a number of highway performance measures related to safety, pavement/bridge condition, and performance of the National Highway System (NHS), freight, and congestion mitigation and air quality. In addition, transit operators in the Region are responsible for establishing targets for their services for transit performance measures related to the condition of their transit vehicles and other facilities and transit safety. He added that, following the establishment of targets by the State and transit operators, the Commission, as the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for the Region, is required to establish targets for both the highway and transit performance measures. He noted that, based on the timing of development of regulations for the performance measures, the deadlines for establishing targets for the other highway performance measures would be in late 2018.

Mr. Hoel then reviewed the preliminary recommended targets for the five national highway safety performance measures—number and rate of fatalities, number and rate of serious injuries, and the number of non-motorized (pedestrian and bicyclist) fatalities and serious injuries. He stated that the Commission staff proposes that the regional targets be established for the period of 2046-2050 and be based on the consideration of historical trends in fatalities and serious injuries, on the State’s strategic highway safety plan recommendations, and on VISION 2050. He noted that Commission staff developed and evaluated three alternative methods for establishing the targets—one based on statewide targets, one on long-term trends, and one on short-term trends. He stated that the preliminary recommended years 2046-2050 targets were based on long-term trends—which resulted in the most aggressive targets amongst the alternative methods. He noted that the establishment of the short-term targets for the metropolitan planning area, as required by the Federal planning regulations, would be based on the years 2046-2050 regional targets. Mr. Hoel said that the monitoring of safety performance relative to the short-term targets would be documented in the Commission’s Annual Report and on its website. He added that the regional long-term targets will be reviewed and potentially updated every four years as part of the interim regional plan update and every 10 years as part of the major regional plan update.

Mr. Hoel indicated that the Commission staff is asking for the Committees’ approval to seek public comment on the draft amendment incorporating the safety target-setting process into VISION 2050. Following the public comment period, the Committees will be presented any comments received and will

consider approval of the target-setting process and preliminary recommended years 2046-2050 targets for inclusion in VISION 2050. In addition, Mr. Hoel stated that the Commission staff is asking for the Committees' endorsement of the years 2014-2018 targets, which are based on the long-term 2046-2050 targets, for the five performance measures for the Metropolitan planning area for action by the Commission's Executive Committee (meeting scheduled for February 15, 2018).

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

1. Mr. Polenske asked how the performance targets would be used and about the consequences for not achieving the targets. Mr. Hoel responded that the targets would be incorporated into the Commission's areawide transportation planning and programming process. He indicated that Commission staff will assist local governments in achieving the targets, although Commission adoption of the targets does not constitute a commitment by local governments. He noted that, while there are consequences for the State of Wisconsin should statewide targets not be met (such as additional reporting requirements and, in some cases, restrictions on the use of certain funding), there are no consequences for the Commission and transit operators should their established targets not be met. He added that based on the Federal requirements, the Commission is only required to incorporate the Federal performance measures into its areawide transportation planning and programming processes. He indicated that some performance measures are relatively easy to establish targets for, such as safety (e.g., number and rate of fatalities) and pavement and bridge conditions (e.g., good, fair, or poor condition), which have long been monitored in some form. However, there are other performance measures for which it may be more difficult to establish targets (e.g., percent of system that is reliable or the freight reliability index), as the methods used to calculate the measures are relatively new and data have only recently been made available. He added that establishing targets for such performance measures will likely become easier the more they are used and analyzed and as more data become available.

Mr. Polenske noted that VISION 2050 recommends multimodal improvements (e.g., public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian) and expressed concern that seeking to achieve the highway safety targets could lead to additional roadway capacity and geometric improvements that could negatively impact alternative travel modes. Mr. Muhs indicated that Commission staff shared Mr. Polenske's concerns and would work to avoid such unintended consequences.

In terms of incorporating the performance measures into the programming of projects, Mr. Hiebert noted that the transportation improvement program (TIP) will include a description of how the projects programmed in the TIP promote the achievement of the safety performance targets. Mr. Hoel added that the project selection processes that are used to select certain projects for funding, such as that used for county and local projects seeking Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STP) urbanized area funds, could be one avenue for incorporating the performance measures into the programming of projects.

Mr. Bauman asked what staff was proposing to add to the plan. Mr. Hoel responded that VISION 2050 would be amended to incorporate the highway safety performance targets and identify how their achievement would be monitored.

Mr. Bauman expressed concern that safety-related recommendations in VISION 2050 (as presented in Attachment C to the draft VISION 2050 amendment) could be used to endorse

highway capacity expansion, noting the City of Milwaukee's strong opposition to highway capacity expansion, especially on IH 94 between 70th Street and 16th Street. Mr. Kovac asked if staff had examples of safety being used to justify capacity reductions rather than increases. Mr. Muhs responded that safety was a factor in recent road diet projects along S. 2nd Street and S. 5th Street in the City of Milwaukee. He noted that it was difficult to identify a transit example given the Region has not been investing in public transit improvements. Mr. Kovac suggested that transit investments made along a corridor would result in reduced automobile traffic volumes and could improve safety and save lives.

2. Mr. Wade asked what has caused the long-term decline in vehicular crashes involving serious injury. Mr. Hoel responded that the decline in the number of serious injuries, as well as the number of fatalities, has occurred due to a number of factors, including advances in vehicle and roadway technology, changes in traffic laws and enforcement levels, advances in emergency medical services, education efforts, and the implementation of engineered safety solutions. He noted that human behavior contributes, alone or in combination with other factors (environmental or roadway conditions and/or vehicle failure), to about 90 to 95 percent of vehicular crashes.
3. Mr. Muhs noted that the non-motorized safety performance target is the only one that does not have a rate associated with it. He added that vehicle-miles of travel (VMT), which is used for the rate-based measures, is not considered appropriate for non-motorized crashes. He stated that the Commission staff is exploring the appropriate data source to be used to calculate a rate for non-motorized crashes. He noted that the trend in the occurrence of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries has been flat or slightly increasing in recent years, and that staff believes this may be due to an increased mode share for non-motorized travel rather than stagnant or declining safety. Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Brandmeier, Mr. Hoel indicated that the number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries used for the safety performance measure include only those involving a motorized vehicle. Mr. Bauman indicated that in downtown Milwaukee it is far safer to walk than to drive.
4. Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Cox, Mr. Hiebert indicated that the VMT used in estimating the rate-based performance measures included transit travel. Responding to another inquiry by Mr. Cox, Mr. Muhs indicated that transit travel is typically safer than automobile travel.
5. Mr. Bauman suggested that autonomous vehicles (AVs) could essentially eliminate crashes and asked if the impact of AVs was being considered. Mr. Muhs responded that there has been increasing interest in AVs in recent years and that staff is closely monitoring advances in AV technology. He noted that AVs were considered during the development of VISION 2050. He stated that the transition to exclusive AV operation on roadways—which would provide the most benefit in safety—is likely many years away. He added that experts are currently predicting about half the fleet would be autonomous by the year 2045, so we are likely to have a mixed fleet of autonomous and driver vehicles for the near future. Mr. Bauman suggested it is better to mandate safety improvements within vehicles rather than spend limited financial resources on freeway expansion. Mr. Muhs stated that mandating safety improvements within vehicles would be beyond the scope of VISION 2050. Mr. Hoel indicated that an alternative to mandating safety improvements in vehicles would be putting incentives in place that encourage automobile manufacturers to include safety improvements within vehicles, such as making the provision of certain safety features a condition of a vehicle model receiving the highest safety ratings. He added that increased demand by the driving public for such features would also encourage

automobile manufacturers to include more vehicle safety improvements. He noted that the average age of the vehicle fleet has increased over the past 20 years, as people are keeping their vehicles for longer periods, resulting in new safety features being included in the fleet at a slower rate.

6. Mr. Stuebe asked why the safety performance targets were not set at zero. Mr. Muhs indicated that staff believes it is appropriate to have aggressive but achievable targets, noting that areas that have established safety targets of zero, such as New York City, have not shown the political will or true desire to achieve such a target by banning cars.
7. Ms. Connolly asked if it was possible to break the safety data down by travel mode. Mr. Muhs responded that the safety performance measures being used are specified by FHWA as part of implementation of the national performance management framework, but that Commission staff could break the safety data down by travel mode as part of preparing the regional safety implementation plan.

Ms. Anderson asked if there were any further questions or comments. There being none, she stated that the Commission staff is asking for the Committees' approval to seek public comment on the proposed process to incorporate the target setting into VISION 2050 as an amendment and the proposed long-term (years 2046-2050) targets for each of the five Federal safety performance measures. Additionally, the Commission staff is asking for the Committees' endorsement of the years 2014-2018 targets for the five performance measures for the metropolitan planning area for action by the Commission's Executive Committee meeting scheduled for February 15, 2018, in order to meet Federal performance measure requirements. She then asked for a motion to approve the proposed amendment. Mr. Clinkenbeard moved and Mr. Brandmeier seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

DISCUSSION OF POTENTIAL AMENDMENT TO VISION 2050 RELATED TO IMPROVEMENTS SERVING THE FOXCONN MANUFACTURING CAMPUS

Mr. Hahn indicated that the Commission staff was not requesting Committee action on this item at this meeting based on recent information received by the Commission staff from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). When Commission staff developed the agenda for this meeting, the intent was to ask the Committees to review and consider a potential amendment to VISION 2050 related to improvements serving the Foxconn manufacturing campus so that staff could present the amendment for public comment. This was done in anticipation of a very tight schedule based on an indication that an amendment would need to be adopted by the Commission prior to April 1, 2018. Staff has been working with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) and FHWA on the best course of action given the lack of precedent for this type of amendment. The amendment would involve amending both VISION 2050 and the TIP for several surface arterial improvements WisDOT is planning in the vicinity of the Foxconn manufacturing campus being developed east of IH 94 in Racine County. The situation around the amendment is quickly evolving, making it a challenge to accurately plan for the improvements that would be included in the amendment. Staff has decided to postpone Committee consideration of the potential amendment based on information received from FHWA the day before the meeting indicating the amendment does not need to be completed by April 1. Postponement will allow more time for WisDOT to complete its design work, hopefully avoiding the risk of having to amend VISION 2050 and the TIP multiple times. Staff is also intending to incorporate land use changes and multimodal improvements as part of the amendment and the additional time will allow staff to more accurately and carefully identify and include these changes and improvements. Staff anticipates scheduling another

meeting of the Committees in the next month or two to consider a proposed amendment that staff could present for public comment. The following comments and discussion points were made regarding the potential amendment:

1. Ms. Anderson stated that there are many pieces related to the Foxconn development that are simultaneously progressing, noting that the Town of Yorkville had a public hearing the night prior to the meeting related to amending the Town's land use plan. Mr. Buehler agreed, noting that the Village of Somers was also pursuing a substantial amendment to the Village's land use plan.
2. Mr. Kovac noted an estimated public cost of over \$4 billion for the planned Foxconn development. He asked how much of that sum was for transportation purposes and if any was being spent on public transit. He also asked which of the planned transportation improvements to support Foxconn were not already recommended in VISION 2050. Mr. Hahn responded that the surface arterial improvements being planned by WisDOT in the vicinity of the Foxconn campus would be added to VISION 2050 as part of the potential plan amendment, and that the total estimated cost is \$134 million. He noted that the reconstruction of IH 94 North-South, including widening IH 94 from six to eight travel lanes, was already recommended in VISION 2050 and the cost is included in the over \$4 billion sum. He indicated that none of the over \$4 billion sum was proposed to be spent on public transit to his knowledge.

[Secretary's Note: The total cost estimate most recently reported by WisDOT for the reconstruction of IH 94 North-South, including widening IH 94 from six to eight travel lanes, is about \$500 million. The State has committed to providing about \$252 million in State funding for this reconstruction project and is seeking another approximately \$246 million in Federal Infrastructure for Rebuilding America (INFRA) grant program funding.]

Mr. Kovac asked if the Committees could direct the Commission to block the planned roadway improvements unless transit improvements are also made. Ms. Anderson responded that she did not believe the Committees had the authority to direct the Commission to block the roadway improvements. She noted the IH 94 North-South project has been planned for decades, is shovel-ready, and is funded through Act 58, which authorizes the State's Foxconn incentive package. Mr. Bauman agreed with Mr. Kovac that clarification on the Committees' authority is needed, noting that the City of Milwaukee would not support the planned roadway improvements without improvements to public transit to provide the ability for City residents to access Foxconn jobs. He noted that WisDOT is currently studying improvements to the Amtrak Hiawatha line between Milwaukee and Chicago, which is essentially shovel-ready, and that at a minimum these passenger rail improvements should be funded.

[Secretary's Note: If Federal action is required related to a transportation project, including approval of Federal funds for a project and approval of an environmental document for a project using Federal funds, that project is required to be included in the regional transportation plan (i.e., VISION 2050) and TIP. The surface arterial improvements being planned by WisDOT in the vicinity of the Foxconn campus, which are being funded solely with State funds (not Federal funds), do not appear to require any Federal action in order to proceed to construction. As such, not including the improvements in the plan or TIP would not prevent WisDOT from advancing the projects to construction with solely State funding. Regardless,

Commission staff would like to proceed through the plan amendment process so that the improvements are accurately depicted in the plan, and so staff can incorporate significant land use changes and desirable multimodal improvements associated with the Foxconn campus.]

3. Mr. Clinkenbeard asked about the status of the commuter rail line that was previously studied connecting Kenosha, Racine, and Milwaukee and the plans for transit-only lanes. Mr. Hahn responded that the Kenosha-Racine-Milwaukee (KRM) commuter rail line is recommended in VISION 2050, but there are no current proposals for moving it forward. Mr. Muhs noted that the authority created to implement the KRM commuter rail line was dissolved in 2011.
4. Mr. Brandmeier indicated that he believed mass transit serving the Foxconn campus was likely beneficial given the scale of the development, but that the Committees' role is advisory and the Committees should not dictate what happens in an individual community. Mr. Bauman indicated that the City of Milwaukee represents a significant portion of the Region's population, contains high concentrations of poverty, and has many residents who are not currently in the labor force and need access to jobs. He noted that City residents are paying for Foxconn improvements in three ways, through State taxes, utility bills, and local property taxes used to pay local governments' utility bills.
5. Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Daniels, Mr. Muhs indicated that WisDOT is currently planning to use only State funds for the surface arterial improvements to serve the proposed Foxconn development, so any project programmed to be funded with Federal Surface Transportation Block Grant Program funding would not be affected by the implementation of these improvements.
6. Mr. Clinkenbeard asked if the Racine and Kenosha urbanized area boundaries would need to be adjusted further due to the proposed Foxconn development. Mr. Muhs indicated that the adjusting of the urbanized area boundaries occurs following the delineation, as part of the decennial U.S. Census, of urbanized areas throughout the Nation. He noted that the adjustments are necessary, in part, because the U.S. Census-defined urbanized areas are predominately based on population density, which does not capture all existing urban development. Mr. Muhs stated that the latest adjustments were completed following the 2010 U.S. Census. He added that, while further adjustments could be made to these boundaries, if necessary, the area of the proposed development for the Foxconn manufacturing center would be included in the adjustments that would be made to the urbanized area boundaries delineated as part of the year 2020 U.S. Census.

Ms. Anderson asked if there were any further questions or comments. There were none. She stated that the Commission staff is not requesting any action on this item at this meeting. Mr. Hahn indicated that the Commission staff anticipates scheduling the next meeting in late February or March depending on how the situation develops, and that staff would attempt to provide as much advance notice to the Committees as possible.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Anderson asked if there were any public comments. There were none.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Anderson thanked everyone for attending and announced the meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael G. Hahn
Recording Secretary

MGH/KJM/CTH/RWH/EDL
VISION 2050 - Joint AC Minutes - Mtg 18 - 1/18/18 (00240533).DOCX (PDF: #242071)