

Minutes of the Meeting

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLANNING AND
PROGRAMMING FOR THE MILWAUKEE URBANIZED AREA**

DATE: August 28, 2019
TIME: 9:30 a.m.
PLACE: West Allis City Hall
Common Council Chambers
7525 West Greenfield Avenue
West Allis, Wisconsin 53214

Milwaukee Urbanized Area Members Present

Donna Brown-Martin, Chair Director, Department of Transportation, Milwaukee County
Fred Abadi Director of Public Works, City of Waukesha
Samir Amin City Engineer, City of Milwaukee
Daniel Boehm President and Managing Director, Milwaukee County Transit System
Allison M. Bussler Director of Public Works, Waukesha County
Chad Chrisbaum Project Manager, City of Milwaukee
(Representing Vanessa Koster)
Peter Daniels City Engineer, City of West Allis
Jon Edgren Director of Public Works, Ozaukee County
Carolynn Gellings Manager of Engineering Services,
Waukesha County Department of Public Works
Thomas M. Grisa Director of Public Works, City of Brookfield
Michael Martin Director of Public Works, Village of Hales Corners
Jeffrey S. Polenske City Engineer, City of Milwaukee
Scott M. Schmidt Highway Commissioner/County Engineer, Washington County
David Tapia Civil Engineer, City of Milwaukee
(Representing Robert Bauman)
Andrea Weddle-Henning Transportation Engineering Manager,
Milwaukee County Department of Transportation
William Wehrley City Engineer, City of Wauwatosa
John F. Weishan, Jr. Supervisor, 16th District, Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors

Non-Voting Members Present

Kevin Muhs, Secretary Executive Director,
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
Tony Barth Systems Planning Chief, Southeast Region,
(Representing Dewayne Johnson) Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Brian Udovich Highway Operations Manager, Jefferson County Highway Department

Guests and Staff Present

Melinda Dejewski City Engineer/Director of Public Works, City of St. Francis
Traci Gengler Principal Engineer, City of West Allis
Christopher T. Hiebert Chief Transportation Engineer,
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission

Ryan W. Hoel.....Deputy Chief Transportation Engineer,
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission

Jeffrey Katz..... City Engineer and Director of Neighborhood Services,
City of Greenfield

Mary Jo Lange Director of Public Works/City Engineer, City of Cudahy

Andrew LedgerSenior Civil Engineer, City of Wauwatosa

Montre Moore Public Involvement and Outreach Specialist,
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission

Glen Morrow..... City Engineer, City of Franklin

Xylia Rueda Planner,
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission

Ken SmithLegislative Research Analyst, Research Services Division,
Office of the Comptroller, Milwaukee County

Mike Steiner.....Assistant City Engineer, City of Wauwatosa

Jacob Varnes Local Program Manager, Southeast Region,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Mike Wieser..... Assistant City Engineer, City of Cedarburg

ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m. by Ms. Brown-Martin, Chair of the Advisory Committee on Transportation System Planning and Programming for the Milwaukee Urbanized Area (Milwaukee TIP Committee). She welcomed all present and 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. She then asked those attending the meeting to introduce themselves.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Brown-Martin asked if there were any public comments. No public comments were made.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 5, 2018, MEETING

Ms. Brown-Martin indicated that the Committee is being asked to consider approval of the minutes of the October 5, 2018, meeting. She asked if the Committee members had any changes, and upon hearing none, called for a motion. Ms. Weddle-Henning made a motion to approve the minutes for the meeting held on October 5, 2018. The motion was seconded by Mr. Grisa, and the Committee unanimously approved the minutes.

REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE PROCESS TO EVALUATE, PRIORITIZE, AND RECOMMEND PROJECTS FOR FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION SURFACE BLOCK GRANT TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM – MILWAUKEE URBANIZED AREA (STP-M) FUNDING

Mr. Muhs stated Commission staff will review with the Committee potential changes to the evaluation and prioritization process that would be utilized to recommend projects for years 2023-2025 STP-M funding later this year, as documented in staff memorandum entitled, “*Potential Changes to be Considered to the Process to Evaluate, Prioritize, and Recommend Projects for Federal Highway Administration Surface Transportation Block Grant Program-Milwaukee Urbanized Area Funding*”. He stated that, if there is no resolution on formal changes to the process at this meeting, another meeting will be held in early October for the Committee to continue discussion on potential changes to the process.

[Secretary's note: The memorandum is available on the Commission's website at:
<http://www.sewrpc.org/SEWRPCFiles/CommissionFiles/CommitteeFiles/2019/2019-08-28-agenda-mke-tip-att1.PDF>]

Mr. Muhs then indicated that Mr. Hoel will be reviewing, with the Committee, the current process to evaluate, prioritize, and recommend projects for STP-M funding, and potential changes that have been suggested to the process.

Following Mr. Hoel's review of the current process, the following discussion by the Committee occurred:

1. Mr. Grisa suggested that, given the number of potential changes to the process being discussed by the Committee, Commission staff should seek agreement by the Committee members after discussing each potential change. Ms. Brown-Martin indicated that representatives not on the Committee from the communities in the Milwaukee urbanized area in attendance will be permitted to ask questions and make comments.
2. Mr. Grisa stated that, in considering changes to the STP-M process, Committee members should consider them from a regional perspective. Mr. Polenske agreed, but added that other factors such as equitable investments in underserved communities should also be considered. Mr. Grisa stated that he recognizes that the City of Milwaukee and Waukesha County have great needs for maintaining their arterial roadways. However, under the current process, there are communities with needs that have no expectation of receiving funding.
3. Ms. Brown-Martin stated that the changes need to be able to address projects that fall just short of having enough evaluation points to be recommended for funding over multiple funding cycles. Mr. Muhs responded that a couple of the potential changes to the process being discussed at the meeting directly address that concern.

The following sections summarize the Committee discussion on each of the potential changes to the process to evaluate, prioritize, and recommend projects for STP-M funding.

Consider Revising the Procedures for Distributing the Allocation of Available Highway STP-M Funding Between the Three Highway Project Categories

Mr. Hoel stated that, at their October 5, 2018, meeting, members of the Milwaukee TIP Committee expressed concern that the distribution of available highway STP-M funding between the three highway project categories considered two criteria related to the amount of STP-M funds requested in the three categories and one criterion related to historical levels of funding approved for the three categories. Mr. Hoel stated that one option to address this concern would be to eliminate one of the two criteria related to the amount of STP-M funds requested in determining the amount of available STP-M funding that is allocated to the three project categories.

The following discussion occurred during and following Mr. Hoel's review of this potential change:

1. Ms. Bussler stated that Waukesha County has highways that will need to be widened to provide additional traffic lanes upon their reconstruction. Ms. Bussler added that, even though the County has other, non-capacity expansion, projects that are currently a higher priority, it is considering applying for the widening projects in the next funding cycle because of concerns that the lack of such projects being recommended for funding would affect the criterion related to historical levels in future cycles. Mr. Hoel noted that, given the City of Brookfield's capacity expansion project

being recommended for funding in the last funding cycle, the proportion of capacity expansion projects historically approved for STP-M funding will likely be about the same for the 2023-2025 funding cycle.

2. Mr. Hoel stated that, as an alternative to prioritizing projects by type, the projects could be evaluated together. Mr. Polenske stated that he would be supportive of the Commission staff evaluating all of the projects together.
3. Mr. Grisa stated that it may be difficult to compare different project types together. He then suggested that, if the number of criteria for distributing the available highway STP-M funding to the project categories was reduced to two, the two criteria consist of the one related to historical levels of funding approved for the three categories and the one related to the amount requested by projects of areawide significance.
4. Responding to an inquiry by Ms. Bussler, Mr. Muhs stated that Commission staff could explore making the scoring between the different project types more equivalent in order to allow the all of the projects to be scored together.

Mr. Hoel stated that, based on the discussion of the Committee, the Commission staff would evaluate utilizing two, rather than three, criteria for distributing the available highway STP-M funding, and evaluating all three projects together.

Consider Adding a New Criterion Used to Evaluate All Project Types That Would Provide Points to Projects Based on the Sponsor-Indicated Priority Ranking

Mr. Hoel stated that, at their October 5, 2018, meeting, members of the Milwaukee TIP Committee had expressed a desire to consider the priorities provided by project sponsors as part of the process to evaluate, prioritize, and recommend projects for STP-M funding. He added that it was also suggested that the project sponsor's priorities be considered in determining recommendations for funding in cases where multiple projects have the same score. He stated that one option could be utilizing sponsor-provided priorities as part of a new criterion that provides additional points based on the priority of the project. He added another option would be to allow the exchanging of a project sponsor's lower priority projects initially recommended for funding with their projects of higher priority.

The following discussion occurred during and following Mr. Hoel's review of this potential change:

1. Mr. Polenske stated that perhaps utilizing the sponsor-provided priority in a secondary evaluation would be acceptable. However, he indicated that he would be opposed to adding a new criterion related to the sponsor-provided priority, as he would not like to have one of the City of Milwaukee's projects not approved for funding because another sponsor had an otherwise lower-scoring project with a higher sponsor-provided priority.
2. Ms. Bussler suggested that sponsor-provided priorities could be part of the Committee discussion when considering which projects should be recommended for funding.
3. Mr. Grisa stated that he was opposed to having a separate criterion related to the sponsor-provided priority, but he would support utilizing it for prioritizing projects having the same evaluation score.
4. Mr. Polenske stated that a sponsor may have local justification for prioritizing their projects that could be provided to the Committee for consideration.

5. Mr. Edgren suggested that the project justifications should be documented and provided to the Committee, rather than requiring the sponsor to justify their project in person at the meeting.

Mr. Hoel stated, based on discussion by the Committee, Commission staff will develop, for Committee consideration, a process for providing sponsor's project justification to the Committee for its consideration of projects for STP-M funding, and a process for prioritizing projects that have the same evaluation score.

Consider Adding a New Criterion Used to Evaluate All Project Types That Would Provide Points to Projects Based on the Number of Funding Cycles That a Project Has Been Submitted Without Being Recommended for STP-M Funding

Mr. Hoel stated that, prior to the October 5, 2018, meeting, members of the Milwaukee TIP Committee suggested that consideration be given to evaluating all projects with a criterion related to the number of previous STP-M funding cycles that a project had applied, but was not recommended for funding. He stated that one option would be for the number of previous STP-M funding cycles that a project had applied, but was not recommended for funding, be considered as part of a new criterion that provides additional points based on the number of previous funding cycles that a project was evaluated for, but did not receive, STP-M funding.

The following discussion occurred during and following Mr. Hoel's review of this potential change:

1. Mr. Muhs stated that this suggested change was added to address projects that may not have scored enough points to be recommended for STP-M funding over a number of funding cycles.
2. Mr. Amin stated that a sponsor could apply for projects well ahead of when they were needed in order to receive points under such a criterion.
3. Mr. Grisa and Mr. Abadi stated that, after not receiving funding for their projects over a number of funding cycles, sponsors could consider utilizing local funds for their projects, rather than Federal funds. Ms. Weddle-Henning stated that this criterion could potentially assist in funding projects, such as Milwaukee County's Rawson Avenue project, that had evaluation scores that resulted in their project being prioritized just below or near projects recommended for STP-M funding.
4. Mr. Hiebert suggested that local and county arterial roadways could have different thresholds for receiving points under the measure of use criterion. Ms. Bussler suggested that the thresholds for the measure of use criterion could also be lowered.

Mr. Hoel stated that, based on the discussion by the Committee, the Commission staff will not develop a criterion related to the number of funding cycles that a candidate had applied, but was not recommended for STP-M funding. In addition, he stated the Commission staff would evaluate making adjustments to the thresholds for the measure of use criterion.

[Secretary's note: Commission staff considered making adjustments to the thresholds for the measure of use criterion, but did not formally pursue it further, as it was found that lowering the thresholds for points received by this criterion may result in more projects having the same evaluation score, but would likely not result in much change in the projects that have been previously recommended for STP-M funding.]

Consider Developing a Process That Allows Projects from Smaller Communities a Greater Chance of Receiving STP-M Funding

Mr. Hoel stated that, prior to the October 5, 2018, meeting, a member of the Milwaukee TIP Committee suggested that projects from smaller communities should have a greater chance of being approved for STP-M funding. He stated that potential solutions could include setting aside a certain amount of the available highway STP-M funding for projects in smaller communities/counties, such as 10 percent of the available highway STP-M funding. These funds could be limited to projects from smaller communities (such as those having a population of less than 50,000) and to sponsors that do not already have a project initially recommended for STP-M funding or that have not received STP-M funding for a project over a certain number of funding cycles. He added that projects eligible for such a set-aside could be ranked, regardless of project type, based on their project score, and the estimated project costs of the highest priority projects that fall within the amount set aside for smaller communities/counties would be initially recommended for funding.

The following discussion occurred during and following Mr. Hoel's review of this potential change:

1. Responding to an inquiry made by Mr. Abadi, Mr. Hoel stated that, under the previous evaluation and prioritization process utilized prior to 2013, a smaller community could allow their entitlement balance to increase over a number of funding cycles to a level that would allow them to fund a project. Ms. Bussler stated that the previous process was more predictable than the current process, which made it easier for sponsors to plan for the implementation of their projects with STP-M funding. However, FHWA indicated to the Commission staff that it considered the previous system a suballocation of STP-M funding, which is not permitted under Federal regulations. This resulted in the Committee developing the current process in 2013.
2. Ms. Dejewski stated that the Committee should consider the infrastructure needs of communities with a population under 50,000 people and understand that these communities also have the need for STP-M funding for preserving their roadways.
3. Responding to an inquiry made by Mr. Martin, Mr. Muhs stated that Commission staff would inquire to FHWA staff whether they would permit the setting aside funds for smaller communities, and update committee members at the October meeting.
4. Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Grisa, Mr. Muhs stated that Commission staff utilized a threshold of a population of 50,000 or less as a potential threshold for eligibility for the small community set-aside as this population threshold is utilized by the U.S. Census to define an urbanized area. Ms. Bussler suggested that if a small community set-aside is added to the process, the method for determining eligible sponsors should be something other than population.

Mr. Hoel stated that based on discussion by the Committee, Commission staff will develop for Committee consideration a procedure that would allow projects from smaller communities a greater chance of receiving STP-M funding.

Consider Utilizing the Measure of Safety Criterion in the Evaluation of Resurfacing/Reconditioning and Reconstruction to Same Capacity Projects in Addition To Capacity Expansion Projects

Mr. Hoel stated that FHWA suggested that consideration be given to adding a safety criterion to the STP-M evaluation, prioritization, and recommendation process. Mr. Hoel stated that one option would be to utilize the same safety criterion utilized for capacity expansion projects to evaluate candidate resurfacing/reconditioning and reconstruction to same capacity projects would prioritize those roadways with higher rates of crashes. He noted that a crash-related criterion was previously considered by the Committee for

resurfacing/reconditioning and reconstruction to same capacity projects, but was not utilized for those project types, as it is unclear for these project types whether measures would be implemented to effectively reduce the number of crashes.

The following discussion occurred during and following Mr. Hoel's review of this potential change:

1. Mr. Griza and Mr. Edgren questioned the applicability of the safety criterion for use in evaluating resurfacing/reconditioning and reconstruction to same capacity. Mr. Griza noted that there is already a separate Federal funding source for safety projects.
2. Mr. Polenske stated that considering safety would allow a more comprehensive evaluation of the candidate STP-M projects. He noted that the City of Milwaukee considers safety on all of their projects.
3. Mr. Abadi questioned the use of the safety criterion on resurfacing/reconditioning and reconstruction to same capacity projects as it would be unknown whether a project would address any safety issue prior to preliminary engineering being completed.
4. Mr. Grisa stated that evaluating the crashes on all of the candidate STP-M projects would take a significant effort by the Commission staff. Mr. Hoel responded that the Commission staff is suggesting the use of the areawide crash rate as the basis of the safety criterion for the resurfacing/reconditioning and reconstruction projects, as it utilized for the capacity expansion projects.
5. Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Grisa, Mr. Daniels stated that the City of West Allis has completed stand-alone safety projects, including adding turn lanes, that could also have been implemented as part of a resurfacing/reconditioning and reconstruction to same capacity projects.
6. Responding to comments made by Ms. Bussler during the review of the measure of safety criterion, Mr. Hoel stated that select principal arterials have been given the National Highway System (NHS) designation since the implementation of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21), and that a municipality would have to work with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) if they wish to remove the designation. Ms. Bussler noted that some projects are not eligible for certain funding sources because of the NHS designation.

Ms. Brown-Martin then asked the Committee members to indicate whether they would support Commission staff evaluating using the measure of safety criterion as part of the scoring of resurfacing/reconditioning and reconstruction to same capacity projects. A majority of the members indicated their support for Commission staff further evaluating the use of a safety criterion, with eleven supporting and six opposing.

Consider Utilizing a New Criterion Used to Evaluate All Project Types Related to Security

Mr. Hoel indicated that the FHWA suggested that consideration be given to adding security measures to the STP-M evaluation, prioritization, and recommendation process. He stated that VISION 2050 contains recommendations related to security, such as the resiliency of the network through alternative routes when arterial segments are disrupted and increasing resiliency (or reducing susceptibility) of portions of the arterial network to flooding. He noted that Commission staff believe that creating criteria related to system resiliency is difficult without the identification of alternative routes during system disruption and that creating criteria related to flood resiliency is difficult without identification of bridges and other portions or the arterial system that are susceptible to flooding. He stated that, as the Commission staff is intending to develop a regional resiliency plan for transportation infrastructure over the next two years that will

identify alternative routes and susceptible bridges and roadways, criteria that could utilize such identification be considered following the completion of that plan.

Mr. Hoel asked if there was any objection by the Committee that security-related criteria not be considered until the Commission staff complete the regional resiliency plan. There was no objection by any member of the Committee.

Consider Including a New Criterion Used to Evaluate All Project Types That Provides Points to Candidate Projects Based on the Traffic Signal Coordination/Intersection Priority Based on the Criteria Identified in the Regional Transportation Operations Plan (RTOP)

Mr. Hoel stated that the FHWA suggested that consideration be given to incorporating the RTOP into the STP-M evaluation, prioritization, and recommendation process. He stated that this could be achieved by adding a new criterion that provides bonus points for projects that include traffic signal coordination or improvement of stand-alone signals based on the prioritization process contained in the current RTOP.

The following discussion occurred during and following Mr. Hoel's review of this potential change:

1. Responding to an inquiry made by Mr. Abadi, Mr. Hoel stated that such a criterion would serve to provide additional points to projects that would include measures to improve traffic flow, such as signal coordination and intersection improvements. He noted that such measures are currently eligible for FHWA Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funds.

Mr. Hoel asked if there was any interest by the Committee in a RTOP-related criterion being added to the STP-M evaluation process. There was no interest expressed by any member of the Committee.

Consider Utilizing the Job/Housing Balance and Transit Accessibility Criteria in the Evaluation of Resurfacing/Reconditioning and Reconstruction to Same Capacity Projects, in Addition to Capacity Expansion Projects

Mr. Hoel stated that the Commission staff received a comment as part of the development of the 2019-2022 transportation improvement program that consideration be given to utilizing the criteria related to job/housing balance and transit accessibility in the evaluation of all projects, rather than of only the capacity expansion projects. He noted that the use of criteria related to job/housing balance and transit accessibility was originally recommended by the Commission's Advisory Committee on Regional Housing Planning and the Environmental Justice Task Force, as part of the development of the regional housing plan completed in early 2013. He stated that, while having a job/housing balance and the provision of transit in a community may serve to address congestion in that and adjacent communities, it could also alleviate automobile traffic and improve the operation of all arterial roadways within the community.

The following discussion occurred during and following Mr. Hoel's review of this potential change:

1. Responding to inquiries from Mr. Grisa, Mr. Muhs stated that the relationship between highway projects and a community having a job/housing balance is that there would be potentially less overall vehicle miles of travel (VMT) within and adjacent to the community.
2. Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Wehrley, Mr. Hoel stated the bonus points received for the job/housing balance and provision of transit for candidate projects involving a roadway located along the boundary of two or more communities would be calculated based on the weighted average of the points that would be received by all of the communities affected.

3. Ms. Bussler noted that although the job/housing balance is important, she does not believe it has significance on roadways.
4. Mr. Polenske stated that improvement projects could provide opportunities for implementing transit, bicycle, and pedestrian accommodations, adding that consideration could be given to projects that implement such measures. Ms. Brown-Martin added that transit and pedestrian accommodations along a roadway can serve to assist in the mobility of persons with disabilities. Mr. Grisa agreed that a criterion could be utilized that provided additional points for increasing accessibility, such as providing bicycle and pedestrian accommodations.
5. Ms. Lange expressed concern about roadways along transit routes not receiving STP-M funds. Mr. Hoel responded that the measure of use category includes both vehicular traffic volumes and transit ridership in the evaluation of all projects.

Mr. Hoel indicated that, based on the Committee's discussion on this item, Commission staff would not add job/housing balance and provision of transit criteria to non-capacity expansion projects. Mr. Hoel added that, based on the discussion of the Committee, the Commission staff will develop for its consideration a criterion related to providing transit, bicycle, and pedestrian accommodations in the evaluation of all projects.

Consider Increasing the Potential Maximum Bonus Points Received for the Job/Housing Balance and Transit Accessibility Criteria

Mr. Hoel stated that the Commission staff received a comment as part of the development of the 2019-2022 transportation improvement program that consideration be given to increasing the maximum amount of points that can be received by the criteria related to job/housing balance and transit accessibility—each providing up to 5 additional points to candidate capacity expansion projects. He noted that the maximum 10 points that can be received by a candidate capacity expansion project utilizing these criteria could affect whether that project is initially recommended for STP-M funding.

The following discussion occurred during and following Mr. Hoel's review of this potential change:

1. Mr. Chrisbaum stated that in reviewing the assessment of impact of years 2021-2022 STP-M project evaluation and selection procedures on minority populations and low income populations, provided in the STP-M memorandum last year, shows that over the last three funding cycles projects located in Milwaukee County and the City of Milwaukee—the county and city with the highest proportion of both of these populations—received more than or about their proportionate share of STP-M funding. He stated that while this has been the case, he suggested that there be a criterion that helps ensure that this continues to occur. Mr. Hoel noted that this assessment has been part of the STP-M evaluation process since 2015 and is provided to the Committee for its consideration as it determines which projects are available for funding. He added that the evaluation also includes an evaluation of whether projects initially recommended for STP-M funding are proportionally located within areas having concentrations of minority populations and low-income populations.
2. Responding to an inquiry from Mr. Grisa, Mr. Hoel stated that more detailed assessments of impact on minority populations and low-income populations are conducted as part of the development of the regional transportation improvement program and regional transportation plan.

3. Mr. Grisa stated that he supports evaluating the impact on minority populations and low-income populations by projects recommended for the STP-M funding, as a whole, but expressed concern regarding evaluating such impacts at the project level.
4. Mr. Muhs suggested that the Committee continue to review the evaluation of the impacts of the recommended STP-M projects on minority populations and low-income populations prior to the final recommendation of projects for STP-M funding, and that any concerns with the results of the evaluation would be addressed as part of the discussion of determining which projects are recommended for funding.

Mr. Hoel asked whether there was any objection to the maximum points received by the criteria related to job/housing balance and provision of transit remaining at 5 additional points each. There was no objection expressed by the Committee.

Next Milwaukee TIP Committee Meeting

Ms. Brown-Martin stated that, as the Committee's discussion has resulted in additional work needing to be completed by Commission staff to evaluate potential changes to the evaluation criteria, the Committee will meet again in an October meeting to further discuss changes to the STP-M evaluation and prioritization process. Mr. Hoel stated that the Commission staff will provide Milwaukee TIP Committee members and the communities with eligible roadways for STP-M funding a notice via email for the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Milwaukee TIP Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 11:47 a.m. on a motion from Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Edgren, and carried unanimously by the Milwaukee TIP Committee.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kevin J. Muhs
Secretary