

Minutes of the Meeting

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

DATE: September 22, 2021

TIME: 10:30 a.m.

PLACE: Virtual Meeting

Milwaukee Urbanized Area Members Present

Donna Brown-Martin, Chair Director, Department of Transportation, Milwaukee County
Robert J. Bauman Alderman, City of Milwaukee
Karen Braun Manager of Engineering Services,
Department of Public Works, Waukesha County
Allison M. Bussler Director of Public Works, Waukesha County
Thomas M. Grisa Director, Department of Public Works, City of Brookfield
Alex Damien Interim Director of Public Works, City of Waukesha
Peter Daniels City Engineer, City of West Allis
Julie Esch Deputy Director, Department of Transportation,
Milwaukee County
Russell Goodwin Supervisor, 18th District, Milwaukee County
Warren Guettel Construction Superintendent, Ozaukee County
(Representing Jon Edgren)
Jerrold Kruschke City Engineer, City of Milwaukee
Sam Leichtling Planning Manager, Department of City Development,
City of Milwaukee
Michael Martin Director of Public Works, Village of Hales Corners
Kimberly Montgomery Director of Intergovernmental Relations Division,
Department of Administration, City of Milwaukee
Jeffrey S. Polenske Commissioner of Public Works, City of Milwaukee
Scott M. Schmidt Highway Commissioner/County Engineer,
Washington County
William Wehrley City Engineer, City of Wauwatosa
Dennis Yaccarino Senior Budget and Policy Manager, City of Milwaukee

Non-Voting Members Present

Kevin Muhs, Secretary Executive Director,
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
Tony Barth Systems Planning Chief, Southeast Region
(Representing WisDOT – Southeast Region) Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Tom Dieckelman President, Wisconsin Coach Lines, Inc.
Brian Udovich Highway Operations Manager,
Highway Department, Jefferson County

Guests and Staff Present

Tammy Bockhorst Legislative Aide, Alderman Bauman's Office,
City of Milwaukee

Roslin Burns Program and Planning Analyst, Southeast Region
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Leeann Butschlick.....Director of Public Works, Village of Shorewood
Chad Chrisbaum..... Engineer in Charge, Transportation Infrastructure Division,
(Representing Samir Amin) Department of Public Works, City of Milwaukee
Brian Engelking Transit Director, Waukesha Metro Transit
Cindy Flower State Program Engineer, Southeast Region
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Anthony Geiger.....Grants Manager, Milwaukee County
Bryan Haas..... Project Engineer, City of Greenfield
Tom Hagie Administrator, Town of Brookfield
Christopher Hiebert..... Chief Transportation Engineer,
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
Hans Higdon Systems Planning Supervisor, Southeast Region,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Ryan HoelDeputy Chief Transportation Engineer,
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
Ethan Johnson Senior Engineer,
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
Kristen B. Lundeen Director of Public Works/City Engineer,
City of Mequon
Ben McKay Deputy Director,
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
Ryan Schmidt..... Staff Engineer, City of Cudahy
Tamara Simonson City Engineer, City of New Berlin
Ken SmithResearch Analyst, Milwaukee County
Hana Takhtfiroozeh Transportation Engineer,
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
Kyle E. Vandercar.....City Engineer, City of South Milwaukee
Jacob Varnes Local Program Manager, Southeast Region,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation

ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 10:30 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. Mr. Hoel indicated that the attendance of Committee members and guests participating via the webinar was recorded by Commission staff, and he asked attendees participating via conference call to introduce themselves.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 31, 2020, MEETING

Ms. Brown-Martin stated that the Milwaukee TIP Committee is being asked to consider approval of the minutes of the January 31, 2020, meeting. She asked if the Committee members had any changes to the minutes, and upon hearing none, called for a motion. Mr. Polenske made a motion to approve the minutes for the meeting held on January 31, 2020. The motion was seconded by Ms. Bussler, and the Committee unanimously approved the minutes.

REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF SEWRPC MEMORANDUM, “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”

At the request of Ms. Brown-Martin, Mr. Hoel reviewed the 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*, which was sent to Committee members by email prior to the meeting.

[Secretary’s Note: The 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* can be accessed from the following link:
<https://www.sewrpc.org/SEWRPCFiles/CommissionFiles/CommitteeFiles/2021/2021-09-17-memo-mke-tip.PDF>]

Mr. Hoel reviewed the current process used by the Milwaukee TIP Committee to select projects under the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) Surface Transportation Block Grant Program – Milwaukee Urbanized Area (STP-M), described in detail in Attachment 1 of the staff memorandum. He noted that the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) is currently soliciting projects for years 2026-2027 STP-M funding, with applications for candidate projects for STP-M funding due to WisDOT by October 15, 2021. Mr. Hoel indicated that on July 30, 2021, Commission staff requested TIP Committee members and local communities with arterial facilities eligible for STP-M funding submit for consideration by the Milwaukee TIP Committee potential changes to the current evaluation and prioritization process. He added that both Milwaukee County and the City of Milwaukee separately provided letters, included in the staff memorandum as Attachments 2 and 3, requesting potential changes to the STP-M evaluation and prioritization process. These suggested changes involved expanding the use of the current bonus criteria, or desired-outcome criteria—transit, bicycle, and pedestrian accommodation, job/housing balance, and transit accessibility criteria—and adding five new criteria related to reliability, connectivity, local funding of affordable housing, proximity to multifamily zoning, and environmental justice populations usage criteria.

Mr. Hoel noted that the current process primarily prioritizes candidate projects based on the characteristics of the roadway, such as pavement condition, roadway usage, and roadway function, and that Milwaukee County and the City of Milwaukee are proposing that a greater emphasis be given to criteria that seek a desired outcome beyond the characteristics of the roadway. Mr. Hoel reviewed in detail each of the proposed changes to the evaluation and prioritization process. In terms of implementing the requested changes, he stated that there could be two separate types of criteria—one related to the physical and operational characteristics of the roadway and one related to the desired-outcome based criteria. In addition, he reviewed two alternative methods for implementing the suggested changes to the STP-M process—one based on the maximum scores suggested by Milwaukee County for the desired-outcome criteria and one based on the maximum scores received by the current desired-outcome criteria.

Following Mr. Hoel’s review of the memorandum, the following comments and questions were raised by the Committee:

1. Mr. Martin stated that the proposed criteria would seem to favor the more urban areas of the Region that have higher populations of people of color and low-income populations.

2. Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Martin, Mr. Hoel stated that none of the suggested changes to the STP-M evaluation and prioritization process would affect the 10 percent small sponsor set-aside created to assist smaller communities in getting their projects funding. Mr. Martin then inquired about the success of the small-sponsor set-aside. Mr. Hoel stated that during the last STP-M funding cycle, three projects were initially recommended for \$6.9 million in STP-M funding from the smaller-sponsor set-aside—one each from the Village of Greendale, City of Oak Creek, and Village of West Milwaukee. He added that by decision of the Committee, funding was also recommended for preliminary engineering for a project in the Village of Menomonee Falls.
3. Mr. Schmidt inquired about the amount of STP-M funding that was awarded to the City of Milwaukee and Milwaukee County during the last funding cycle. Mr. Hoel noted that during the years 2023-2025 STP-M funding cycle, the Committee recommended \$9,800,000 in STP-M funding for highway projects sponsored by Milwaukee County and \$15,347,672 in STP-M funding for highway projects sponsored by the City of Milwaukee. Mr. Muhs noted that Attachment A of the January 31, 2020, meeting minutes lists all the projects recommended by the Committee for years 2023-2025 STP-M funding.
4. Mr. Schmidt inquired about how the new criteria would impact the ability of smaller communities and counties to access the 90 percent of STP-M highway funding available to all communities. Mr. Hoel stated that under the current STP-M project evaluation and prioritization process, some criteria pertaining to the physical condition of roadways, such as traffic volume, tend to favor projects in larger communities. He noted that the proposed criteria may assist some smaller communities in getting their projects funded.
5. Mr. Grisa stated that a significant amount of work and analyses by Commission staff went into the development of the current STP-M evaluation and prioritization process. He added that careful consideration went into developing the current bonus criteria, while still focusing primarily on the physical and operational characteristics of the roadway in evaluating and prioritizing projects for funding.
6. Mr. Grisa stated that, rather than changing the STP-M evaluation and prioritization process, concern should be focused on getting more funding to fix roadways. He added that he believed that sponsors that continually do not receive STP-M funding for their projects, eventually fund the projects with local dollars. Mr. Grisa stated that the Committee previously decided to direct 10 percent of STP-M funding to transit projects, recognizing the increasing funding needs of public transit, which is very generous. Mr. Grisa noted that Committee members previously recognized that STP-M funding is limited and made a commitment to not seek STP-M funding for projects that could be funded through other funding sources such as the Federal Congestion Management and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) and Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). In addition, he stated that there are other Federal funding sources focused on residential development, such as those distributed by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and other economic development grants. Mr. Grisa requested information on other sources of funding, noting that project scores could be adjusted accordingly if a project could access funding from other sources.

[Secretary's Note: The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is the Federal agency responsible for national policy and programs that address housing needs, improve and develop communities, and enforce fair

housing laws. Two of the major programs that HUD provides funding for include the CDBG Program and the HOME Program.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program – CDBG funds are allocated by formula to States, counties, and communities, and can be used to renovate housing, construct or improve public facilities (such as water, sewer, streets, and neighborhood centers), purchase property, and assist private businesses in economic development activities. At least 70 percent of the funding must be used for activities that benefit low- to moderate-income persons. With respect to roadways, the construction, reconstruction, and rehabilitation of the roadways, sidewalks, and curb and gutter, along with water and sewer lines, would be eligible for CDBG funds. However, in complying with the objectives of the funds, the roadways funded with CDBG funds would need to serve areas having a majority of low- to moderate-income populations. Often, the use of CDBG funds for use for roadway improvement projects is done to support or serve private housing investment adjacent to the roadway.

HOME Investment Partnerships Program – The HOME program works similar to the CDBG program, in that funding is allocated by formula to participating states, counties, communities, and other entities to increase the supply and affordability of housing and homeownership for low-income families. HOME projects are funded at a 75 percent federal/25 percent local split. However, the HOME program provides for a reduction in the local match for based on whether it is determined that they are in severe fiscal distress. In the Milwaukee urbanized area, Ozaukee, Milwaukee, Washington, and Waukesha Counties and the City of Milwaukee participate in HOME programs. HOME funds cannot be utilized for infrastructure projects.]

7. Mr. Grisa suggested that an evaluation be conducted on how the prioritization of projects from the previous STP-M funding cycle would have been affected by the suggested changes to the STP-M project evaluation and prioritization process. Mr. Grisa expressed concern about the large number of new points that would be added under the suggested changes to the STP-M project evaluation and prioritization process. He said that the additional points may direct funding away from maintaining roadways in a good state of repair, which is the primary goal of the STP-M program.

[Secretary's Note: Commission staff will provide Committee members, for discussion at their next meeting, with an evaluation of the two alternative methods of implementing the suggested changes, as presented in the September 17, 2021, memorandum.]

8. Mr. Grisa inquired whether counties and communities utilize criteria beyond the typical roadway physical and operational criteria in the identification of their own projects. He noted that sponsors can utilize whatever process they want in choosing which projects to submit for STP-M funding.

[Secretary's Note: Commission staff requested information Milwaukee County and the City of Milwaukee related to their processes or procedures in determining which projects to advance, in particular, as they relate to the changes they requested be made to the STP-M evaluation and prioritization process.

Milwaukee County provided a memorandum from the County Executive outlining the recommended 2020 budget, which outlines the County's policy directives on racial equity and inclusion, as provided in Attachment 1 to these minutes. In addition, they provided links to the Racial Equity Budget Tools that the Milwaukee County Department of Transportation prepared for each of its divisions that details how they meet the "investing in equity objectives" of the County Executive and County Board: [Airport](#), [Transportation Services](#), [Highway Maintenance](#), [Fleet Management](#), [Paratransit System](#), and [the Director's Office](#). In addition, Milwaukee County identified the [draft purpose and need report](#) for the Milwaukee County North-South Transit Enhancement Study. The needs identified for the project serve as an example of how the County is implementing its equity policy, which includes helping to remedy existing inequities and longstanding systemic racism, improve access for underserved populations, and support dense, equitable, and pedestrian-oriented mixed-use developments.

The policies utilized by the City of Milwaukee are outlined in Attachment 2 to these minutes. The information provided included the scoring procedures utilized by the City in evaluating its roadway projects, internal/external policies that shaped their prioritization and selection process, and materials from the Government Alliance on Race and Equity (GARE), which the City has begun to utilize as part of its decision-making processes.]

9. Mr. Grisa indicated that preliminary engineering would be necessary to fully know which highway reliability (or traffic flow) measures would be implemented, which is the basis for projects receiving points under the highway reliability measure. In addition, he questioned the need for the criterion when the implementation of highway reliability measures could be funded by other funding sources. He noted that having preliminary engineering completed as part of the requirements for submitting project applications has been discussed by the Committee previously. However, he indicated that the Committee decided not to require preliminary engineering based on concerns that smaller sponsors would not be willing to take the risk of initiating preliminary engineering without knowing whether the project would be funded.
10. Mr. Grisa questioned why expanding the job/housing balance and the transit accessibility criteria to all projects is being considered again. In addition, questioned the use of multi-family zoning in the evaluation of highway projects. Ms. Brown-Martin noted that she was not part of the previous Committee discussion regarding these criteria and raised them as they are especially important to the County.
11. Ms. Bussler stated that she shared many of the same concerns as Mr. Grisa. She noted that, with respect to the expansion of the job/housing balance criterion to all projects and the proposed new criterion related to the zoning of multi-family housing, county governments have no ability to affect local zoning. As such, she indicated that including such criteria would be unfair to county projects.
12. Ms. Bussler asked Commission staff if they could report back to the Committee on the process the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) uses to prioritize STP funding in other areas of the state, such as the small urban areas having a population of 5,000 to 50,000 and the rural areas

of the State. Mr. Hoel indicated that Commission staff would obtain this information and report back to the Committee.

[Secretary's Note: Commission staff will provide Committee members, for discussion at their next meeting, with a summary of the process utilized by in the evaluation of projects for Surface Transportation Program (STP)-Urban (outside of TMA/MPO areas), STP-Rural and Local Bridge improvement programs.]

13. Mr. Leicthling stated that the suggested changes by the City of Milwaukee were intended to better align transportation investment with land use and economic development, and to prioritize projects in communities that are working to achieve the Regional Housing Plan and VISION 2050 recommendations.
14. Mr. Leicthling stated that examples provided by Commission staff for meeting the proposed affordable housing criterion do not fully meet the City's request. However, he recognized that efforts to develop affordable housing can come from a variety of sources. He indicated that the City would need to further consider the suggested criterion related to affordable housing.
15. With respect to the proposed criterion relating to project located within neighborhoods with zoning accommodating multifamily housing developments, Mr. Leicthling questioned Commission staff's suggestion that a new criterion could award points based on proximity to land uses characterized as Small Lot Traditional Neighborhoods, in addition to land uses characterized as Mixed-Use City Center and Mixed-Use Traditional Neighborhoods. Mr. Muhs stated that Commission staff included all three land use categories because they are consistent with VISION 2050's recommendations for new development in urban service areas. He added that the Small Lot Traditional Neighborhood land use category includes multifamily housing in addition to single-family homes. Mr. Muhs said that Commission staff thought this criterion could incentivize communities to adopt zoning consistent with VISION 2050's land use recommendations.
16. Mr. Daniels asked if the Committee would cast individual votes for each proposed criterion. Mr. Hoel stated that the Committee can choose to consider each criterion individually or the Committee can choose to consider a set of criteria. Mr. Daniels stated that he would prefer that the Committee consider each proposed criterion individually. He noted that he would like the STP-M evaluation and prioritization process to be simple, and he stated that the process is becoming confusing. He further noted that some of the proposed criteria seem to be duplicative. Mr. Grisa stated that since the Committee has asked Commission staff to provide additional information, the Committee should not vote on any proposed criteria at this meeting.
17. Ms. Brown-Martin stated that, from Milwaukee County's perspective, a main objective of the proposed criteria is to support public transit. She said that even though 10 percent of STP-M funding currently is allocated by the Committee to public transit projects during each STP-M funding cycle, more needs to be done to support public transit through roadway rehabilitation and reconstruction projects. Ms. Brown-Martin stated that, with respect to the proposed connectivity and affordable housing criteria, Milwaukee County, including the Milwaukee County Department of Transportation, is placing an emphasis on equity when considering all its projects—not just transportation projects. She further noted that Milwaukee County understands that other counties and communities have their own priorities, and she stated that Milwaukee County would like to achieve a balance with respect to allocating STP-M funding.

18. Mr. Hoel indicated that WisDOT has established a deadline of October 15, 2021, for counties and communities to submit applications for STP-M funding. He stated that there is time for the Committee to meet again if it chooses to do so. Ms. Brown-Martin asked if there is enough time for Commission staff to gather the requested information and report back to the Committee. Mr. Hoel indicated that Commission staff should have enough time.
19. Mr. Leichtling asked if Commission staff could provide information on how peer Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) in other states distribute their STP funding. Mr. Hoel noted that Commission staff have conducted some of this research already.

[Secretary's Note: Commission staff will provide Committee members, for discussion at their next meeting, with examples of the types of criteria that are utilized by other Metropolitan Planning Organizations, like the Commission, in evaluating highway projects for FHWA STP funding.]

20. Ms. Brown-Martin stated that the Committee will not vote on any of the proposed changes to the STP-M evaluation and prioritization process at this meeting. Mr. Hoel suggested that the Committee could meet to further consider the suggested changes to the STP-M evaluation and prioritization process. Mr. Muhs asked Committee members to contact Commission staff if meeting the week that applications are due is too close to WisDOT's deadline for submitting applications for STP-M funding.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Milwaukee TIP Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 12:01 p.m. on a motion from Mr. Martin.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kevin J. Muhs
Secretary

From: [SH County Executive](#)
Subject: County Executive Crowley Introduces Recommended 2022 Budget
Date: Friday, October 1, 2021 2:55:18 PM
Attachments: [image008.png](#)



OFFICE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE

DAVID CROWLEY

MILWAUKEE COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Colleagues,

Earlier today, I had the opportunity to present to our County Board our 2022 recommended budget. In the face of many challenges, and in a time of unprecedented difficulties, our 2022 recommended budget makes significant investments in Milwaukee County's vision to become the healthiest county in Wisconsin by achieving racial equity. Building on our first strategic plan in more than 20 years, this budget acknowledges the history of intentional, institutional, and systemic racism that has left some in our communities behind.

The 2022 recommended budget builds on our three strategic focus areas, and begins to make the changes needed to achieve our goals. We've begun *Bridging the Gap* to move resources upstream to address the root causes of racial disparities: this budget begins to reimagine how our government is structured to put our residents first, and enhance collaboration, capacity and accountability of departments to best serve our constituents. We've continued *Creating Intentional Inclusion* to ensure as many perspectives as possible are at the decision-making table: we once again asked departments to use the Racial Equity Budgeting Tool to share how their budget addresses racial equity. And, for the first time in a long time, we held an employee town hall to hear directly from our frontline staff on what they needed to continue their outstanding service of our residents – the result is the largest investment in employee compensation in recent memory, including funding specifically to address racial and gender inequities in our pay structure. Finally, we've continued *Investing in Equity*, even in the face of a widening structural budget deficit: we've made targeted investments in our vision, and have prioritized funds to expand housing and mental health resources, advance public health and safety, and continue battling the dual pandemics of systemic racism and COVID-19.

I am proud of this budget, and even more proud to work with incredible public servants such as yourselves. While long-term fiscal challenges remain in Milwaukee County, this budget puts our organization in the best position to continue our economic recovery and improve the lives of county residents. The next step for this budget is for it to be considered and amended or approved by the Board of Supervisors. You can find the entire text of our recommended budget at county.milwaukee.gov/psb (as well as answers to some [frequently asked questions](#), including questions asked at the employee town hall), and, as always, my inbox is always open for your questions or concerns. Thank you for all you do to make Milwaukee County a great place to live for all our residents.

Respectfully,

County Executive David Crowley

county.milwaukee.gov

From: Chrisbaum, Chad T <cchris@milwaukee.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 12:20 PM
To: Hoel, Ryan W.
Cc: Kruschke, Jerrel; Polenske, Jeffrey S.; Tapia, David
Subject: MC Project Selection
Attachments: Final Prioritization Model 2021.docx; GARE-Racial_Equity_Toolkit.pdf; GARE-Racial-Equity-Action-Plans.pdf; GARE-Equitable-Development.pdf; GARE-Contract_For_Equity.pdf

CAUTION: This e-mail originated from outside the Commission. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Ryan,

As expected, when we are reviewing and developing our selections for submittal to the SEWRPC for Federal Block Grant funds as part of the Surface Transportation Program (STP) solicitation, we primarily use the criteria developed, and subsequently revised by the Milwaukee TIP Committee in 2013. This ensures that we will have projects that are identified as having “area-wide significance” and are competitive within the program.

On local projects, that we have funding control over, our process to evaluate and prioritize projects continues to evolve and is significantly different. We are now using additional criteria that helps us achieve broader City goals around equity, health, and climate. While our process is tailored specifically to the City of Milwaukee, we feel that incorporating some of the following criteria into the Milwaukee TIP Committee’s STP process will result in projects that more closely adhere to the SEWRPC’s Vision 2050 Regional Land Use and Transportation Plan.

The model we've created for prioritizing and selecting projects is contained in the first attachment to this email and is a starting point for developing projects that will have the greatest impact on our City. It was borne out of the following plans/policies:

- Minneapolis 20-Year Streets Funding Plan-
 - <https://www2.minneapolismn.gov/government/departments/public-works/tpp/20-year-plan/>
 - <https://nacto.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Minneapolis-20-Year-Streets-Funding-Plan.pdf>
- Portland Project Prioritization-
 - <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/article/685568>
- Milwaukee Complete Streets Policy-
 - Policy- <https://milwaukee.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3686857&GUID=BE0E7943-4BBF-48B0-B53C-D91EF4ADC249&Options=&Search=&FullText=1#.W83hl4A12I.link>
 - 2019 Annual Report- <https://city.milwaukee.gov/ImageLibrary/Groups/cityBikePed/2020-Images/Complete-Streets/MilwaukeeCompleteStreetsHealthandEquityReport2019.pdf>

As a part of the City of Milwaukee’s Complete Streets Policy, we are currently working on additional revisions to our internal policies, procedures, and processes through the development of a Complete Streets Handbook. This handbook will further ensure our projects meet goals related to safety, equity, and mobility.

In addition to the aforementioned criteria, we are beginning to use the Government Alliance on Race and Equity (GARE) toolkit (see attached), and its appurtenant documents, to assist us in making decisions in project selection and development that avoid institutionalized exclusion.

While this multi-faceted approach is a work in progress, we feel it is a move in a direction that rightly identifies infrastructure improvement projects as not only improvements to the condition of physical assets, but also an incorporation of design elements that make the transportation corridors into safer, more accessible, and more attractive livable spaces for all user groups.

Chad Chrisbaum, P.E.

City of Milwaukee | Department of Public Works | Engineer in Charge |
841 N. Broadway, RM 710 | Milwaukee, WI 53202 | Direct line: 414.286.0470 | EMail: cchris@milwaukee.gov



The City of Milwaukee is subject to Wisconsin Statutes related to public records. Unless otherwise exempted from the public records law, senders and receivers of City of Milwaukee e-mail should presume that e-mail is subject to release upon request, and is subject to state records retention requirements. See City of Milwaukee full e-mail disclaimer at www.milwaukee.gov/email_disclaimer

Attachments: Final Prioritization Model 2021.docx (on next page)
[GARE-Racial_Equity_Toolkit.pdf](#);
[GARE-Racial-Equity-Action-Plans.pdf](#);
[GARE-Equitable-Development.pdf](#);
[GARE-Contract_For_Equity.pdf](#)

50 Total points available

Use (10 points)

- User volumes
 - Average traffic volume score: 25k+ = 5, 15k-25k = 4, 10k-15k = 3, 5k-10k = 2, 2k-5k = 1, <2k = 0
 - At intersections, use highest ADT of all intersecting streets
- Population Density
 - Projects in census tract with highest 20% population density awarded 5 points, then 4 3 2 1
 - Identify population per square mile for each census tract

Equity (20 points)

- NRSA
 - Projects in NRSAs are awarded 10 points
- Race
 - Projects in majority non-white census tracts are awarded 5 points
- Vehicle Availability
 - Projects in census tract with lowest 20% vehicle availability awarded 5 points, then 4 3 2 1

Safety (20 points)

- Pedestrian High Injury Network (PHIN)
 - Projects in PHIN are awarded 10 points
- Crash Risk x Broader Area (10 points total)
 - 1 points if 30 mph street or higher
 - 1 points if 3 or more total travel lanes
 - 1 point if no significant bike/ped amenities (beyond sidewalks/transverse crosswalks)
 - 1 point if transit in project area
 - Do not count if transit corridor intersects project corridor without stop?
 - 4 points if census tract is in top 25% of census tracts by number of injury crashes (KABC)
 - 3 points if in top 50%
 - 2 points if in top 75%
 - 1 point otherwise
 - 2 points if census tract is in top 50% of census tracts by number of injury crashes (KABC)
 - 1 point otherwise

Sources

- User Volumes: [WisDOT traffic count map](#)
- Population Density: US Census Bureau
- NRSA: NRSA Map
- Race: US Census Bureau
- Vehicle Availability: US Census Bureau
- PHIN: PHIN Map
- Crash Risk: Google Maps + MCTS Network Map
- KABC Crashes: WisDOT police reported crash database

Rules

- Census tracts
 - If corridor, only use census tracts that the project moves through entirely/mostly
- General rule: assume value of worst statistic
- Volume
 - If intersection, choose street with highest volume
 - If corridor, choose highest volume on corridor
- Population Density
 - If few (4 or less) census tracts, choose tract with highest density
 - If many (5 or more) census tracts, choose tract with median density
- PHIN
 - If corridor, count as “no” if mostly not PHIN
 - If intersection, count as yes if touching PHIN
- Speed Limit
 - If corridor, choose speed limit for majority of corridor
 - If intersection, choose highest speed limit
- Vehicle Availability
 - Take score of tract with highest % of housing units without access to a vehicle