

Minutes of the Twenty-Ninth Joint Meeting of the

**ADVISORY COMMITTEES ON REGIONAL LAND USE PLANNING
AND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING (“VISION 2060 COMMITTEE”)**

DATE: June 23, 2026

TIME: 9:30 a.m.

PLACE: Program Room, Waukesha Public Library
321 Wisconsin Avenue
Waukesha, WI 53186

Members Present

Committee on Regional Land Use Planning

Michael CotterDirector, Land Use and Resource Management Department, Walworth County
Chair

Roley Behm Director of Public Works and Development Services, Racine County

Andy Buehler.....Director of Planning and Development, Kenosha County

Matthew Carran Director of Economic Development and Tourism, Village of Menomonee Falls

Timothy Casey Director of City Development, City of Kenosha

John Fellows Director of Community Development, City of West Bend

Tanya Fonseca Planning Director, Department of City Development, City of Milwaukee

Jason Fruth..... Planning and Zoning Manager, Waukesha County

Jason Gallo.....City Planner, City of Oconomowoc

Bob Harris..... Director of Planning and Development, City of Port Washington

Kristi LaineDirector of Community Development, City of Oak Creek

Flannery MarlinMunicipal Program Manager, Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District

Maria Pandazi City Planner, City of Waukesha

Steven Schaer..... Manager of Planning and Zoning, City of West Allis

Andrew StruckDirector, Planning and Parks Department, Ozaukee County

Richard VanDerWal..... Planning Administrator, City of Brookfield

Gina Vlach City Planner, City of Greenfield

Committee on Regional Transportation Planning

Allison Bussler..... Director of Public Works, Waukesha County
Chair

Tony Barth (alternate for Roberto Gutierrez) Project Development Supervisor,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Gregory Boldt Director of Highways and Highway Commissioner, Kenosha County

Chad Chrisbaum (alternate for Kevin Muhs)..... Engineer in Charge,
Transportation Infrastructure Division, City of Milwaukee

Melinda DejewskiCity Engineer, City of West Allis

Jon EdgrenDirector of Public Works and Highway Commissioner, Ozaukee County

Brian Engelking (alternate for Alex Damien)..... Transit Manager, City of Waukesha

Steve Fuentes President and CEO, Milwaukee County Transit System

Richard Hough.....Director of Public Works and Highway Commissioner, Walworth County

John Rodgers..... Deputy Director, Milwaukee County Department of Transportation

Charles WadeDirector, Bureau of Planning and Economic Development,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Brett WallaceEngineering Services Manager, Waukesha County

Guests and Staff Present

Patrice Brunette Parks and Highway Division Manager, Racine County
Barry Gore Principal Special Projects Planner, SEWRPC
Stephanie Hacker Executive Director, SEWRPC
Jennifer Harris Deputy Director, Comprehensive Injury Center, Medical College of Wisconsin
Ryan Hoel Chief Transportation Engineer, SEWRPC
Kaleb Kutz Transportation Planner, SEWRPC
Andrew Levy Systems Planning Supervisor, Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Eric Lynde Special Projects Director, SEWRPC
Benjamin McKay Deputy Director, SEWRPC
Samuel Mercier Senior Transportation Planner, SEWRPC
Nikki Payne Chief Community Engagement Specialist, SEWRPC
Estela Peterson Planning Technician, SEWRPC
Jennifer Sarnecki Deputy Chief Transportation Planner, SEWRPC
Dana Shinnors Senior Transportation Planner, SEWRPC
Bryan Walter Senior Land Use Planner, SEWRPC
Miranda Walser Senior Special Projects Planner, SEWRPC

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Cotter called the joint meeting of the Advisory Committees on Regional Land Use Planning and Regional Transportation Planning (“VISION 2060 Committee”) to order at 9:30 a.m., welcoming those in attendance. He indicated that a roll call would be accomplished by the sign-in sheet at the door.

**REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE
JOINT MEETING HELD ON FEBRUARY 3, 2026**

Mr. Cotter asked if there were any questions or comments on the minutes from the last meeting on February 3, 2026, held during the first convening of the VISION 2060 Committee. There were none. On a motion by Mr. Casey seconded by Mr. Rodgers, the February 3, 2026, minutes were approved unanimously.

UPDATE ON VISION 2060 PLANNING ACTIVITIES

Mr. Cotter introduced Mr. McKay, who outlined the meeting agenda before introducing Mr. Mercier and Mr. Walter to provide updates on the VISION 2060 planning activities. Mr. Mercier reported that the transportation and land use inventories are underway and will be available for review at the next Joint Advisory Committee meeting.

Mr. Walter stated that Commission staff had met with 72 local planners about expectations for growth and development. He noted that Commission staff had presented the VISION 2060 concept and approach to numerous stakeholder groups with the intention of developing a plan that is responsive to the needs of residents and that can be more effectively implemented. He also announced the launch of an online engagement platform as part of a broader engagement strategy, which employs a combination of new and traditional outreach methods to better reach members of the general public. He then introduced Ms.

Shinners to provide details about the VISION 2060 engagement strategy. Ms. Shinners provided a framework for the Commission's engagement strategy, broken into five phases, and communicated the Commission's broad goals for engagement. She outlined how the Commission intends to involve all residents in the planning process through enhanced messaging, the employment of new and traditional engagement methods, the distribution of engagement materials, and metrics to evaluate community engagement.

REVIEW OF PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED THEMES AND PLANNING ISSUES OF REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

Mr. Mercier initiated the review of significant themes and planning issues previously identified by the Committee during a group activity from the February 3, 2026, meeting. He noted that the list was broadly grouped into three themes and was intended to guide future Committee discussions rather than serve as a comprehensive list of issues that VISION 2060 will address. Mr. Walter and Mr. Mercier reviewed a summary of the themes, grouped into housing, development, and local funding; transportation; and environmental.

Mr. Wallace indicated that he did not believe that one of the identified issues—that types of housing being built are driven by developer profit and not resident needs—was an accurate statement. He suggested revising it to acknowledge the relationship between developer profitability and community housing desires. Mr. Walter noted this suggestion and stated that the issues presented were the issues as stated by the Committee members at the prior meeting and did not necessarily reflect content that would be included in VISION 2060. They will be considered as VISION 2060 is developed.

REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF VISION 2060 TECHNICAL REPORT #1: REVIEW OF VISION 2050

Mr. Mercier introduced the review of VISION 2060 Technical Report #1: Review of VISION 2050. He summarized that the intent of the report is to evaluate the accuracy of VISION 2050 forecasts, assess progress towards implementing recommendations, and identify regional trends since the plan's adoption. Recommendations were broken down into broader topic areas. He then provided an outline of how recommendation implementation statuses were measured, ranging from substantially implemented to not implemented.

Mr. Walter noted that many of the assessments were qualitative in nature and indicative of the actions taken since the plan's adoption rather than a quantitative assessment of complete implementation. He introduced the six broad recommendation themes and presented key findings related to land use recommendations related to housing, development, and community facilities.

Mr. Walter introduced a roundtable discussion and provided instructions for participants. The purpose of the activity was to encourage participants to assess the recommendations from VISION 2050 and determine how Commission staff can improve upon or adjust recommendations in VISION 2060. Participants were asked to engage in a small group discussion with those seated at their tables to review the recommendations, determine if each recommendation should remain unchanged or could be improved upon, and record individual and group ideas on provided worksheets. The completed discussion worksheets were collected by Commission staff at the end of the meeting.

[Secretary's Note: The Committee generally supported the direction of the housing, development, and community facilities recommendations. Responses emphasized the need

to recognize differences between urban, suburban, and rural communities. Responses highlighted the continued need for affordable housing and a range of housing types, the importance of connecting housing and employment, and the need to better communicate benefits and costs of increased residential density. There was also interest in clarifying the role of transit-oriented development where rapid transit opportunities are limited and in considering a broader range of approaches to parks and community facilities.]

Mr. Walter then presented key findings about land use recommendations related to environmental resources and agriculture and again invited Committee members to engage in a roundtable discussion.

[Secretary's Note: Responses generally indicated strong support for preserving environmental corridors and other assets including natural areas and groundwater resources. Committee members emphasized the importance of balancing preservation with community growth and development needs. Discussion identified a need for clearer information and public engagement related to environmental corridors and greater clarity regarding agricultural lands that warrant the highest level of protection. Participants also noted the need to balance agricultural preservation with rural community growth and emerging land uses like solar energy and data centers.]

Mr. Cotter asked whether Commission staff could provide a county-level breakdown of the number of agricultural acres that were converted to urban uses since the adoption of VISION 2050. Mr. Walter responded that the data were available and that this table could be included in a revised draft of the report.

Mr. Mercier presented key findings related to the implementation of transportation recommendations, beginning with the Public Transit element, then asked the Committee members to participate in a roundtable discussion related to this group.

[Secretary's Note: Responses emphasized strengthening local and intercity transit services and improving connections to employment and other major destinations. There was considerable discussion about the feasibility and sequencing of transit investments, including the need to establish a strong core transit system before pursuing larger rapid transit expansions. Funding, ridership, changing travel patterns impacted by remote work and other trends, and service to suburban and outer communities were identified as important considerations, with some support for emphasizing flexible and demand-responsive services and prioritizing investments that are sustainable over the long term.]

Mr. Mercier continued to present the findings from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure group and again asked the Committee to break into a roundtable discussion.

[Secretary's Note: Most participants viewed bicycle and pedestrian facilities as an important component of the regional transportation system and supported their continued improvement. Discussion particularly emphasized safety, accessibility, context-sensitive design, and better separation of bicycle facilities from higher-speed traffic where appropriate. Participants also expressed interest in a stronger regional role for bicycle and pedestrian planning and better coordination among local and county plans. Concerns regarding the safety and appropriate application of bike share, scooters, and other micromobility options were also raised.]

Following the Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure discussion, Mr. Mercier presented the implementation findings related to the Transportation Systems Management and Transportation Demand Management recommendation group, then initiated the next roundtable discussion.

[Secretary's Note: The recommendations related to transportation systems management received generally strong support. Participants supported continued attention to freeway and arterial operations, traffic signal coordination, incident management, access management, and parking management. Comments generally focused on clarifying the purpose and application of individual strategies and considering safety, transit operations, and the characteristics of different roadway types and activity centers during implementation. Responses generally supported encouraging alternatives to single-occupant vehicle travel but had mixed views on some of the more aggressive travel demand management strategies. Park-and-ride facilities generated the most significant discussion, with several participants favoring a focus on improving or repurposing existing facilities rather than expanding the network. Participants also suggested broadly framing recommendations addressing vehicle pricing more clearly and emphasized opportunities to work with private-sector partners and to better integrate transportation and land use planning.]

Mr. Mercier continued to present the final recommendation group: Streets, Highways, and Freight. The Committee was again invited to provide feedback by participating in a roundtable discussion.

[Secretary's Note: Participants strongly supported maintaining the existing arterial system and addressing roadway condition and safety. Responses expressed a preference for asset management and context-sensitive improvements over broad system expansion. Discussion emphasized that complete streets and capacity improvements should be evaluated based on local context, need, and competing transportation priorities rather than applied uniformly. Participants also supported continued consideration of environmental impacts, emerging technologies, and alternative energy infrastructure but suggested that some of these areas may be more appropriately driven through private-sector partnerships. There was strong support for maintaining the Region's freight transportation system and addressing truck movement, safety, and infrastructure needs. Participants supported continued attention to the Muskego Yard Bypass and other freight improvements, although some questions were raised regarding the appropriate regional role in pursuing a new truck-rail intermodal facility and the extent to which such investments should be driven by the private sector. There was also discussion of refining truck regulation and workforce need recommendations, while security was viewed as a lower priority compared with other freight issues.]

Mr. Walter noted that additional opportunities would be available to provide feedback on recommendations, including on the engagement website, and that the preliminary draft of VISION 2060 Technical Report # 1 would remain open for Committee comment and further review following the meeting. Mr. Walter thanked the Committee for their participation in the roundtable activity and invited members to share individual comments on how to refine, theme, or edit recommendations, and to bring up issues that should be addressed in VISION 2060, using their individual worksheets.

Mr. Cotter asked for motion to approve the preliminary draft of VISION 2060 Technical Report #1, subject to incorporation of minor comments received during the post-meeting review period and further Committee review of any substantive revisions. Mr. Fuentes moved and Mr. Buehler seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Cotter asked if there were any public comments; there were none.

NEXT STEPS AND ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Cotter announced that the next meeting would likely be held virtually in August. This meeting would involve the review and consideration of the drafts of VISION 2060 Technical Reports #2 and #3, which would include the land use and transportation inventory reports.

Mr. Walter and Mr. Mercier thanked the Committee for their participation and feedback. Mr. Cotter extended the opportunity to continue working on individual worksheets outside the meeting if respondents needed more time to develop their suggestions, then asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Casey moved and Mr. Carran seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 11:06 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Estela Peterson
Recording Secretary