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CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Yunker called the joint meeting of the Advisory Committees on Regional Land Use Planning and Regional Transportation System Planning to order at 9:30 a.m., welcoming those in attendance. Mr. Yunker noted that neither Ms. Anderson nor Mr. Dranizk could attend, and he would chair the meeting. Mr. Yunker then introduced Mr. Udovich of the Jefferson County Highway Department. Mr. Yunker noted that the Census-defined Milwaukee Urbanized Area extends into a 2.7 square mile area of the Town of Ixonia in Jefferson County. The Commission will include this portion of Jefferson County in its Federally-required areawide transportation planning and programming conducted for Southeastern Wisconsin per agreement with Jefferson County. He added that this will include a representative of Jefferson County serving as a liaison to applicable SEWRPC transportation planning advisory committees, including the Advisory Committee on Regional Transportation System Planning. Mr. Yunker then asked members and guests to introduce themselves and stated that roll call would be accomplished through circulation of a sign-in sheet.
Mr. Yunker noted that revisions to plan objectives and alternative plan evaluation criteria based on comments from the last Joint Advisory Committee meeting were incorporated into a revised version in Attachment 4 of the February 25 meeting minutes. Mr. Yunker stated that comments on the revised plan objectives and alternative plan evaluation criteria would be appropriate under this agenda item. Mr. Kovac stated that Objective 2.1 and its supporting criteria should clearly address the need to reduce the disparities that exist between white and minority populations in the Milwaukee metropolitan area, as evidenced in the draft Commission Memorandum Report “A Comparison of the Milwaukee Metropolitan Area to Its Peers.” Mr. Lynde indicated that Objective 2.1 had been revised based on the suggestions of the City of Milwaukee representatives that attended the February 25, 2015, Joint Advisory Committee meeting, and that it now calls for reducing the disparities between white and minority populations. He noted that the objectives are goal statements and include a “directional” component (e.g. reduce disparities between white and minority populations), while the criteria are specific measures that will quantify how well each alternative plan meets each objective, and by definition, do not specify a direction. Mr. Yunker indicated that Commission staff would consider how to address Mr. Kovac’s comments and identify any changes to the objectives and criteria in the minutes of the meeting.

[Secretary’s Note: Following the February 25 meeting, Commission staff contacted Mr. Kovac who elaborated that he felt strongly that Criterion 2.1.1 should not be stated as benefits/impacts to a particular population group(s) and that it should be a goal of everyone to reduce segregation and disparities. Objective 2.1 provides this goal, but Commission staff determined it would be appropriate to expand Criterion 2.1.1 into five different criteria to more explicitly tie the objective to its criteria. The new criteria emphasize the importance of reducing disparities, and reflect the analyses staff proposes to conduct to evaluate the alternative plans on how well they would improve or worsen conditions for minority and low-income populations. These criteria are included in Attachment 1 to these minutes. Staff would propose that these analyses be summarized within Chapter III of Volume II of Planning Report No. 55, and that a complete evaluation of the benefits and impacts of the alternative plans to minority and low-income populations also be included in an Appendix to Volume II.

In addition, Commission staff determined it would be appropriate and beneficial to incorporate the proposed discussions related to the alternative plan evaluation as specific criteria, rather than separated from the criteria. In doing so, the criteria would more fully reflect the key considerations for comparing how well each objective is met by each alternative plan. While these new criteria may not be quantified directly, they will draw upon the measures of other criteria and aid in determining how well each alternative plan meets the specific objectives under which they are listed. Attachment 1 to these minutes includes the new criteria, which are based on the discussions proposed previously.]
Mr. Yunker asked if there were any additional questions or comments on the February 25, 2015, meeting minutes. There were none. Mr. Yunker asked for a motion to approve the meeting minutes. On a motion by Mr. Clinkenbeard seconded by Mr. Justice the February 25, 2015, meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

DISCUSSION OF SCHEDULE AND LOCATION OF FUTURE JOINT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Mr. Yunker noted that members of the Committees were provided a tentative schedule for future meetings in their meeting packets. Mr. Lynde noted a new meeting date may be added on May 27, 2015, which is highlighted in yellow on the schedule. He stated that the meeting will be held if staff makes sufficient progress on the VISION 2050 alternative plans. Mr. Lynde then stated that staff will notify members of the Committees by email two weeks prior if the May 27 meeting will be held or cancelled. Mr. Yunker stated that the next Joint Advisory Committee meeting would be held on June 24 if the May 27 meeting is cancelled. Mr. Yunker noted the proposed May 27 meeting will be at 9:30 a.m. in the West Allis City Hall Common Council Chambers if it is held and the June 24 meeting will be at 9:30 a.m. in Meeting Room 5 of the Tommy G. Thompson Youth Center at State Fair Park.

CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE CITY OF MILWAUKEE REQUEST TO AMEND THE FiscALLY-CONSTRAINED YEAR 2035 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN

Mr. Yunker noted that the year 2035 regional transportation system plan remains in effect until VISION 2050 is completed. He noted the Advisory Committee on Regional Transportation System Planning has reviewed a number of amendments to the year 2035 plan while preparing VISION 2050. Mr. Yunker stated that the City of Milwaukee has requested an amendment to the year 2035 fiscally-constrained regional transportation system plan to include an extension of the proposed Milwaukee Streetcar system to the lakefront in downtown Milwaukee. Mr. Yunker noted memorandums describing the proposed amendment and an analysis of fiscal constraint of the proposed amendment were provided to Advisory Committee members (see Attachment 2).

Mr. Yunker stated that the capital costs for implementing the lakefront extension are estimated to be $25 million. The Milwaukee Common Council and Mayor have approved $15 million in local funding for implementing the extension, and as well authorized City staff to pursue Federal transit funding and private funding for the remaining $10 million in capital costs. City staff has indicated they will pursue a U.S. Department of Transportation (U.S. DOT) Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) grant and potentially U.S. DOT Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5309 – Small Starts discretionary funding to fund the remaining $10 million needed to fully fund the project. Mr. Yunker added that the operating cost for the extension is estimated to be $550,000 annually. Operating costs are expected to be funded by farebox revenues, sponsorship and advertising revenues, and a combination of Federal, State, and local funding sources.

Mr. Yunker stated that Commission staff has concluded that it is reasonable to assume there would be sufficient capital and operating funding available to implement the lakefront extension by the year 2035, the design year of the currently adopted regional transportation system plan. The following comments and discussion points were made:
1. Mr. Polenske noted project readiness is one of the TIGER grant criteria. He stated that addition of the lakefront extension to the year 2035 fiscally-constrained regional transportation system plan will help to demonstrate project readiness. Mr. Polenske added that there is TIF capacity to fund the remaining capital costs of the extension available if the TIGER grant is not awarded.

2. Mr. Justice asked if the potential impact on other transit operators in the Region had been considered. Mr. Yunker responded that Commission staff had been requested by Milwaukee County to analyze the impacts of the 2.1 mile initial Streetcar line and the 0.4 mile extension on the Milwaukee County Transit System (MCTS). This study concluded that the Streetcar would not be expected to have any significant effect on the operations or ridership of MCTS, given the routing and limited extent of the initial proposed Streetcar. In addition, if current Federal laws and funding levels are not modified, it may be expected that the Streetcar would either have no effect or slightly increase the amount of Federal funding MCTS receives. Also, the City of Milwaukee has proposed a new local funding source—parking revenues from areas served by the Streetcar—for the Streetcar. Mr. Yunker added that Commission staff supports the City’s request to amend the year 2035 fiscally-constrained regional transportation system plan to add the extension. He noted this request is consistent with amendments for past projects such as the Kenosha-Racine-Milwaukee (KRM) commuter rail line.

Mr. Yunker asked if there were any further questions or comments on the City of Milwaukee request to amend the Fiscally-Constrained Year 2035 Regional Transportation System Plan to add an extension of the proposed Milwaukee Streetcar system to the lakefront in downtown Milwaukee. There were none. Mr. Yunker asked for a motion to approve the request. Mr. Polenske moved and Mr. Saunders seconded to approve the City of Milwaukee request to amend the Fiscally-Constrained Year 2035 Regional Transportation System Plan to add an extension of the proposed Milwaukee Streetcar system to the lakefront in downtown Milwaukee. The motion was approved with Mr. Justice voting no.

REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT APPENDICES OF SEWRPC PLANNING REPORT NO. 55, VISION 2050: A REGIONAL LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN FOR SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN

Mr. Yunker noted two draft appendices will be reviewed under this agenda item, including Appendix D, “A Comparison of the Milwaukee Metropolitan Area to Its Peers” and Appendix E, “Adopted County and Local Comprehensive Plans in Southeastern Wisconsin.”

Appendix D, “A Comparison of the Milwaukee Metropolitan Area to Its Peers”

Mr. Yunker asked Mr. Muhs of the Commission staff to review the revised draft of Appendix D. Mr. Muhs noted the revised draft includes additional data regarding air quality, principal cities in metropolitan areas, and comparisons of principal cities to their metropolitan areas. Mr. Muhs added that the additional data are summarized in the revised executive summary. Mr. Muhs then reviewed the revised executive summary (see Attachment 3 for the preliminary and revised drafts of the executive summary). The following comments and discussion points were made during the review:

1. Mr. Kovac stated that the revised executive summary provides an excellent overview of the data included in Appendix D. He noted that the data show significant disparities between whites and minorities in educational attainment and income in the Milwaukee metro area. Mr. Kovac added that this supported his suggestion that a VISION 2050 objective should be to reduce racial disparities. Mr. Kovac also stated that the data show that the Milwaukee area street and highway
system performs very well compared to other metro areas, but transit service is in substantial
decline while other areas are on the increase. He noted this is a result of funding being available
for freeway reconstruction and a lack of dedicated funding for public transit.

2. Mr. Grisa noted the Milwaukee metro area ranked fairly high compared to its peers with respect
to vehicle revenue hours of public transit service per capita. He questioned whether this was
consistent with the heading in the executive summary -- An Unbalanced Transportation System.
Mr. Grisa also stated the summary in the back of the report was a better and more balanced
presentation of the study findings than the executive summary at the front of the report. Mr.
Yunker responded that the unbalanced transportation system heading referred to the 20 percent
decrease in transit service and 40 percent decrease in transit ridership which was experienced in
the Milwaukee metro area over the last 15 years. He indicated that a more appropriate title may
be: “A Transportation System Losing Balance.” He stated the executive summary attempts to
focus on the key findings of the peer comparison, while the summary at the back of the report
attempts to briefly present all of the report findings. He added that there was a concern that the
key findings were not apparent in the more comprehensive summary in the back of the report.

[Secretary’s Note: The heading in the Executive Summary was changed to: “A
Transportation System Losing Balance.”]

3. Mr. Grisa asked if Appendix D could include data on transit and total transportation system
spending in the Milwaukee metro area compared to its peers. Mr. Yunker responded that staff
believed such data were not readily available.

4. Mr. Kovac noted that at the February 25, 2015, meeting, Commission staff questioned the
inclusion of some of the metropolitan area comparisons regarding transit service because of the
unique geographies of several metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs), such as those MSAs with
large areas unsuitable for urban development. Mr. Muhs noted Table 59 “Vehicle Revenue Hours
of Public Transit Per Capita” was revised to include data from urbanized areas instead of MSAs.
He noted urbanized areas are more compatible with this type of data presentation because they
are generally more compact and may not include as much area unsuitable for urban development.
Mr. Kovac noted the concern that transit service in the Milwaukee metro area is becoming limited
in its area of service provided, and is no longer reaching many jobs. Mr. Muhs added that one
reason the Milwaukee metro area still ranks high among its peers in vehicle revenue hours of
public transit per capita may be its span of daily service. MCTS operates for more hours during a
24-hour period than many of its peers.

Mr. Yunker asked if there were any further questions or comments on Appendix D, “A Comparison of the
Milwaukee Metropolitan Area to Its Peers.” There were none. Mr. Yunker asked for a motion to approve
Appendix D. Mr. Justice moved and Mr. Bauman seconded to approve Appendix D, “A Comparison of
the Milwaukee Metropolitan Area to its Peers.” The motion was approved with Mr. Grisa and Ms.
Bussler voting no.

Appendix E, “Adopted County and Local Comprehensive Plans in Southeastern Wisconsin”
Mr. Yunker asked Mr. McKay of the Commission staff to review the preliminary draft of Appendix E.
Mr. Yunker asked if there were any questions or comments on Appendix E after the review. There were
none. Mr. Yunker asked for a motion to approve Appendix E. Mr. Justice moved and Mr. Struck
seconded to approve Appendix E, “Adopted County and Local Comprehensive Plans in Southeastern Wisconsin.” The motion was approved unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Yunker asked if there were any public comments. There were none.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Yunker noted the next Joint Advisory Committee meeting is tentatively scheduled for 9:30 a.m. on May 27, 2015, in the West Allis City Hall Common Council Chambers. He noted the May meeting could be canceled if sufficient progress is not made on the testing and evaluation of VISION 2050 alternative plans. He added that there is a meeting scheduled for 9:30 a.m. on June 24, 2015, in Meeting Room 5 of the Tommy G. Thompson Youth Center at State Fair Park. Mr. Yunker then thanked everyone for attending and declared the meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Benjamin R. McKay
Recording Secretary
Presented below are a series of VISION 2050 plan objectives and associated criteria proposed to be used to evaluate the VISION 2050 alternative land use and transportation system plans. Plan objectives are specific goals or ends that guide the preparation and evaluation of alternative land use and transportation system plans, and would be the desired outcome of the VISION 2050 recommendations. The associated criteria measure the extent to which each alternative plan meets each objective, and will be used to evaluate and compare the alternative plans.

Healthy Communities

- **Objective 1.1**: Vibrant, walkable neighborhoods that contribute to the Region’s distinct character.
  - **Criterion 1.1.1**: Number of people living in walkable areas
  - **Criterion 1.1.2**: Population density
  - **Criterion 1.1.3**: Employment density

- **Objective 1.2**: Active transportation options that encourage healthy lifestyles.
  - **Criterion 1.2.1**: Bicycle level of service
  - **Criterion 1.2.2**: Bicycle network connectivity
  - **Criterion 1.2.3**: Benefits and impacts to public health

- **Objective 1.3**: Compact urban development and limited rural development that maximize open space and productive agricultural land.
  - **Criterion 1.3.1**: Remaining farmland and undeveloped land
  - **Criterion 1.3.2**: Impacts to natural resource areas

- **Objective 1.4**: Environmentally-sustainable development and transportation that minimize the use of nonrenewable resources and adverse impacts on the Region’s natural environment, including biodiversity, air, and water.
  - **Criterion 1.4.1**: Preservation of areas with high groundwater recharge potential
Criterion 1.4.2: Impervious surface
Criterion 1.4.3: Energy use
Criterion 1.4.4: Greenhouse gas emissions and other air pollutants
Criterion 1.4.5: Impacts to water resources and water quality
Criterion 1.4.6: Ability to address issues related to climate change
Criterion 1.4.7: Overall environmental sustainability

Objective 1.5: A transportation system that minimizes disruption of neighborhood and community development, including adverse effects on the property tax base.
Criterion 1.5.1: Homes, businesses, land, and parkland acquired

Objective 1.6: Safe and secure travel environments that minimize loss of life, injury, and property damage.
Criterion 1.6.1: Crashes by mode

Equitable Access

Objective 2.1: Benefits and impacts of investments in the Region’s transportation system should be shared fairly and equitably and serve to reduce disparities between white and minority populations.
Criterion 2.1.1: Level of accessibility to jobs and activity centers for minority and low-income populations by mode
Criterion 2.1.2: Minority and low-income populations served by transit
Criterion 2.1.3: Transit service quality for minority and low-income populations
Criterion 2.1.4: Minority and low-income populations benefited and impacted by new and widened arterial street and highway facilities
Criterion 2.1.5: Transportation-related air pollution impacts on minority and low-income populations

Objective 2.2: Affordable transportation and housing that meet the needs and preferences of current and future generations.
Criterion 2.2.1: Households with affordable housing + transportation costs
Criterion 2.2.2: Ability to accommodate demographic shifts

Objective 2.3: Reduce job-worker mismatch.
Criterion 2.3.1: Areas with a job-worker mismatch
Costs and Financial Sustainability

► **Objective 3.1**: A land development pattern and transportation system that support economic growth and a globally-competitive economy.
  
  ▼ **Criterion 3.1.1**: Impact of the distribution of growth on property values
  ▼ **Criterion 3.1.2**: Return on investment
  ▼ **Criterion 3.1.3**: Ability to connect to nearby metro areas and leverage the value of those areas
  ▼ **Criterion 3.1.4**: Potential for attracting residents and businesses

► **Objective 3.2**: A financially-sustainable transportation system that minimizes life-cycle capital and operating transportation costs.
  
  ▼ **Criterion 3.2.1**: Average annual transportation system investment

► **Objective 3.3**: Transportation options that minimize private transportation costs.
  
  ▼ **Criterion 3.3.1**: Private transportation costs per capita
  ▼ **Criterion 3.3.2**: Per household cost savings of streets and highways delay reduction
  ▼ **Criterion 3.3.3**: Per household cost savings of transit delay reduction
  ▼ **Criterion 3.3.4**: Resilience in adapting to changing fuel prices

► **Objective 3.4**: Urban development that can be efficiently served by transportation, utilities, and public facilities.
  
  ▼ **Criterion 3.4.1**: Supportive infrastructure costs

Mobility

► **Objective 4.1**: A balanced, integrated, well-connected transportation system that provides choices among transportation modes.
  
  ▼ **Criterion 4.1.1**: Trips per day by mode
  ▼ **Criterion 4.1.2**: Vehicle miles of travel
  ▼ **Criterion 4.1.3**: Vehicle miles of travel per capita
  ▼ **Criterion 4.1.4**: Impacts of technology changes

► **Objective 4.2**: Reliable, efficient, and universal access to employment centers, educational opportunities, services, and other important places.
Objective 4.3: Well-maintained transportation infrastructure.

- Criterion 4.3.1: Pavement condition
- Criterion 4.3.2: Transit fleet condition

Objective 4.4: An acceptable level of service on the transportation system.

- Criterion 4.4.1: Congestion on arterial streets and highways
- Criterion 4.4.2: Travel time delay
- Criterion 4.4.3: Average trip times

Objective 4.5: Fast, frequent, and reliable public transit services that maximize the people and jobs served.

- Criterion 4.5.1: Access to transit
- Criterion 4.5.2: Access to fixed-guideway transit
- Criterion 4.5.3: Transit service quality

Objective 4.6: Convenient, efficient, and reliable movement of goods and people.

- Criterion 4.6.1: Transportation reliability
- Criterion 4.6.2: Congestion on the regional freight network
- Criterion 4.6.3: Impacts to freight traffic
Table 1 below provides brief descriptions of the criteria proposed to be used to evaluate the VISION 2050 alternative land use and transportation system plans. In addition to the criteria, population and employment by subarea and residential development by unit type would be presented to aid in comparison of the alternative plans.

TABLE 1: CRITERIA DESCRIPTIONS

Healthy Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Criterion Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td>Number of people living in walkable areas</td>
<td>Estimates of the number of residents and the proportion of the Region in walkable areas in 2050. The walkability of an area is scored on a scale of 0 to 100, with greater than 50 considered “walkable.” Scores are based on pedestrian friendliness metrics (such as population density, block length, and intersection density) and walking distance to amenities (such as schools, parks, retail services, and employment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2</td>
<td>Population density</td>
<td>Estimates of total population per square mile of developed land for the Region in 2010 and 2050 and of population per square mile of developed land for new residential development in the Region through 2050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3</td>
<td>Employment density</td>
<td>Estimates of total jobs per square mile of developed land for the Region in 2010 and 2050 and of jobs per square mile of developed land for new employment-supporting land uses in the Region through 2050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td>Bicycle level of service</td>
<td>An estimate of bicyclist comfort and existing/perceived operational conditions on bicycle facilities in the Region in 2050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2</td>
<td>Bicycle network connectivity</td>
<td>Assessment of the connectivity of the Region’s bicycle network, including identification of potential gaps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3</td>
<td>Benefits and impacts to public health</td>
<td>Assessment of the potential benefits and impacts of each alternative plan on public health in the Region through 2050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td>Remaining farmland and undeveloped land</td>
<td>Estimates of the land that would remain as total farmland, farmland with Class I or Class II soils, farmland preservation areas identified in county farmland preservation plans, or undeveloped land in 2050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Criterion Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2</td>
<td>Impacts to natural resource areas</td>
<td>Estimates of the land with natural resource features that would potentially be impacted by transportation projects in the Region through 2050. Lands to include wetlands, primary and secondary environmental corridors, isolated natural areas, critical species habitats, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources managed lands and land legacy places, and lands protected by land trusts and other non-profit natural resource conservation organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.1</td>
<td>Preservation of areas with high groundwater recharge potential</td>
<td>An estimate of areas with very high and high groundwater recharge potential overlapping with remaining farmland, undeveloped land, and very low density residential development in 2050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.2</td>
<td>Impervious surface</td>
<td>An estimate of the total impervious surface in the Region in 2050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.3</td>
<td>Energy use</td>
<td>Estimates of the average annual amounts of energy used by residential buildings and transportation in the Region in 2050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.4</td>
<td>Greenhouse gas emissions and other air pollutants</td>
<td>An estimate of annual greenhouse gas emissions and other air pollutants produced in the Region from mobile sources and residential buildings in 2050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.5</td>
<td>Impacts to water resources and water quality</td>
<td>Assessment of potential impacts of each alternative plan on the existing water resources and the quality of water in the Region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.6</td>
<td>Ability to address issues related to climate change</td>
<td>Assessment of how each alternative plan may perform related to climate change impacts, primarily related to impacts on infrastructure due to flooding associated with more frequent heavy storm events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.7</td>
<td>Overall environmental sustainability</td>
<td>Assessment of the expected environmental sustainability of the alternative plans based on multiple environmental criteria. To include discussion on sustainable building practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.1</td>
<td>Homes, businesses, land, and parkland acquired</td>
<td>Estimates of the number of homes and businesses and the amount of land and parkland that would potentially be acquired for transportation projects in the Region through 2050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.1</td>
<td>Crashes by mode</td>
<td>Estimates of average annual crashes by severity (including fatalities and injuries) and by mode (including vehicle, and bicycle/pedestrian crashes) in the Region in 2050.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Equitable Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Criterion Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>Level of accessibility to jobs and activity centers for minority and low-income populations by mode</td>
<td>An assessment of whether minority and low-income populations would be expected to have improved accessibility to jobs and major activity centers by automobile and by transit. To include a comparison of increases in transit accessibility to increases in highway accessibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>Minority and low-income populations served by transit</td>
<td>An assessment of the fixed-route transit service area in relation to areas having concentrations of minority and low-income populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>Transit service quality for minority and low-income populations</td>
<td>An assessment of which areas—particularly areas having concentrations of minority and low-income populations—would receive the most benefit from any improvements in transit quality. Transit quality to be determined based on the speed, frequency, and number of routes/lines serving an area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4</td>
<td>Minority and low-income populations benefited and impacted by new and widened arterial street and highway facilities</td>
<td>An assessment of the location of any new or widened arterial street/highway facilities to areas of minority and low-income populations. To include analysis of: whether minority and low-income populations would be expected to utilize the facilities; the extent to which areas would receive any potential benefits from the facilities; whether any area would disproportionately bear any potential impacts from the facilities (including possible property acquisition); and whether there is an over-representation of minority and low-income populations along any freeways that would be widened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5</td>
<td>Transportation-related air pollution impacts on minority and low-income populations</td>
<td>An assessment of whether there would be an expected disproportionate impact on minority and low-income populations with respect to transportation-related air pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>Households with affordable housing + transportation costs</td>
<td>An estimate of the total number of housing units in the Region in 2050 that are affordable at the household median income, based on combined transportation costs and housing costs (45 percent of income or less is considered affordable).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td>Ability to accommodate demographic shifts</td>
<td>Assessment of the ability to accommodate expected demographic shifts based on land development and travel patterns in the Region in 2050. To include discussion on accessibility for people with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1</td>
<td>Areas with a job-worker mismatch</td>
<td>An estimate of the ratio of jobs to households in areas throughout the Region in 2050.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Costs and Financial Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Criterion Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.1 Impact of the distribution of growth on property values Evaluation of the potential change in property values for various areas in the Region under different land development patterns based on national examples. To include discussion of how compact development in built out areas can increase property tax revenues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.2 Return on investment Assessment of the various benefits and impacts associated with certain types of investment in each alternative plan in relation to the expected costs of those investments. Benefits and impacts expressed as estimated dollar amounts where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.3 Ability to connect to nearby metro areas and leverage the value of those areas Assessment of how each alternative plan may provide better connections to nearby metro areas, such as Chicago, Madison, and the Fox Valley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.4 Potential for attracting residents and businesses Assessment of how well each alternative plan would make the Region more attractive to potential residents and businesses based on multiple quality of life-related criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.1 Average annual transportation system investment Estimates of operating, maintenance, and capital costs (annualized and in year 2015 dollars) of arterial streets/highways, transit, and bicycle facilities in 2050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3.1 Private transportation costs per capita Estimates of the typical costs (annualized and in year 2015 dollars) to individuals of driving and using transit in the Region in 2050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3.2 Per household cost savings of streets and highways delay reduction Estimates of the cost savings (average annual and average weekday) associated with reducing delay on arterial streets and highways in the Region in 2050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3.3 Per household cost savings of transit delay reduction Estimates of the cost savings (average annual and average weekday) associated with reducing delay for transit in the Region in 2050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3.4 Resilience in adapting to changing fuel prices Assessment of how each alternative plan may perform under different future fuel price assumptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4.1 Supportive infrastructure costs Capital cost estimate (in year 2014 dollars) of extending public sewer, water, and roads to new development in the Region through 2050 by density type and location.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Criterion Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1</td>
<td>Trips per day by mode</td>
<td>Estimates of personal vehicle, transit, and non-motorized trips on an average weekday in 2050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2</td>
<td>Vehicle miles of travel</td>
<td>An estimate of the average annual vehicle miles of travel in the Region in 2050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.3</td>
<td>Vehicle miles of travel per capita</td>
<td>An estimate of the average annual vehicle miles of travel in the Region in 2050 per Region resident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.4</td>
<td>Impacts of technology changes</td>
<td>Assessment of the potential for new technologies (e.g. self-driving cars, drones, ability to work from home) to impact travel in the Region by 2050. To include identification of the likelihood and challenges related to implementation of certain technologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1</td>
<td>Travel time to important places by mode</td>
<td>Estimates of the average travel times in 2050 from certain locations to major activity centers by automobile and by transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2</td>
<td>Access to park-ride facilities</td>
<td>An estimate of the accessibility of park-ride facilities in 2050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.3</td>
<td>Access to health care facilities</td>
<td>An estimate of the accessibility of health care facilities in the Region in 2050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1</td>
<td>Pavement condition</td>
<td>Estimates of the percentages of the arterial street and highway system that are in good condition and poor condition in 2050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.2</td>
<td>Transit fleet condition</td>
<td>An estimate of the percentage of transit vehicles in the Region exceeding expected useful life in 2050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.1</td>
<td>Congestion on arterial streets and highways</td>
<td>Estimates of the degree and duration of traffic congestion on arterial streets and highways (including freeways) in the Region in 2050, measured in centerline miles experiencing moderate, severe, or extreme congestion. Reported for peak and off-peak periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.2</td>
<td>Travel time delay</td>
<td>Estimates of system-wide travel time delay (average annual and average weekday) for all modes and by mode in 2050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.3</td>
<td>Average trip times</td>
<td>Estimates of the average trip times in 2050 for various geographies and trip types.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.1</td>
<td>Access to transit</td>
<td>Estimates of the total number of residents with access to fixed-route transit and the total number of jobs accessible by fixed-route transit in the Region in 2050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.2</td>
<td>Access to fixed-guideway transit</td>
<td>Estimates of the total number of residents with access to fixed-guideway transit and the total number of jobs accessible by fixed-guideway transit in the Region in 2050. Transit service is considered to be fixed-guideway if it has its own right-of-way (bus rapid transit, light rail, or commuter rail).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Criterion Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.3</td>
<td>Transit service quality</td>
<td>An estimate of transit quality in the Region based on the speed, frequency, and number of routes/lines serving a particular area. Reported as a regional average for the area served by fixed-route transit service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.1</td>
<td>Transportation reliability</td>
<td>Estimates of the level of variability in travel times for personal vehicles and by transit for various geographies in 2050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.2</td>
<td>Congestion on the regional freight network</td>
<td>Estimates of the degree and duration of traffic congestion on the regional freight network in 2050, measured in centerline miles experiencing moderate, severe, or extreme congestion. Reported for peak and off-peak periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.3</td>
<td>Impacts to freight traffic</td>
<td>Assessment of impacts to freight travel of the alternative plans based on multiple travel-related criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * *
MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Advisory Committee on Regional Transportation System Planning

FROM: Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission staff

DATE: March 20, 2015

SUBJECT: PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE ADOPTED YEAR 2035 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

This Advisory Committee, along with the Commission’s Advisory Committee on Regional Land Use Planning, is currently guiding the work on a major update of the regional land use and transportation plan in Southeastern Wisconsin—called VISION 2050—extending the design year of the plan from 2035 to 2050. The Commission staff is proposing an amendment to the year 2035 fiscally-constrained regional transportation plan in Milwaukee County adding an extension of the proposed Milwaukee streetcar system to the lakefront in downtown Milwaukee as requested by the City of Milwaukee. This proposed amendment would be considered for approval by the Advisory Committee on Regional Transportation System Planning at its next scheduled meeting to be held at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, April 22, 2015, in the Common Council Chambers at the West Allis City Hall. The agenda and the remaining meeting materials for that meeting will be mailed to Committee members at a later date, approximately two weeks before the meeting. The Commission will be soliciting public comment on this proposed amendment to the year 2035 regional transportation plan through April 21, 2015. Any comments received, along with Commission staff responses, will be provided to Committee members prior to the meeting. The remainder of the memorandum describes the proposed amendment.

The City of Milwaukee has requested that the year 2035 fiscally-constrained regional transportation plan be amended to include an extension of the proposed Milwaukee streetcar system to the lakefront in downtown Milwaukee. Based on detailed planning and engineering study conducted by the City and action by its Common Council and Mayor, the City of Milwaukee has initiated final engineering for the construction of a 2.1-mile initial streetcar line in the Milwaukee central business district and the Lower East Side, and has initiated work to implement a 0.4-mile extension of the system to serve the lakefront. The 2.1-mile initial streetcar line is identified in the transit system element of the year 2035 regional transportation plan. The 0.4-mile extension of the system to serve the lakefront is proposed to be added to the planned transit system element. Map 1 attached to this memorandum shows the planned transit system in the downtown Milwaukee area under the year 2035 fiscally-constrained regional transportation system plan. Map 2 shows the proposed planned year 2035 fiscally-constrained transit system with the lakefront extension of the Milwaukee streetcar system.

* * *
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MAP 1

PUBLIC TRANSIT ELEMENT OF THE ADOPTED YEAR 2035 FISCALLY-CONSTRAINED REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN - DOWNTOWN MILWAUKEE AREA

Source: SEWRPC.
Document Path: I:\Tran\WORK\RTSP2035\Amendments\Milwaukee Streetcar Extension\Streetcar Extension.mxd

- 2 -
Public Transit Element of the Proposed Amended Year 2035 Fiscally-Constrained Regional Transportation System Plan - Downtown Milwaukee Area

- Rapid Bus Transit Route
- Commuter Rail
- Express Bus Transit Route
- Flexible Transit Route
- Streetcar
- Walk Access Transit Service Area

Source: SEWRPC.
Document Path: I:\Tran\WORK\RTSP2035\Amendments\Milwaukee Streetcar Extension\Streetcar Extension Amended.mxd
SEWRPC Staff Memorandum

ANALYSIS OF FISCAL CONSTRAINT OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE YEAR 2035 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN TO ADD THE LAKEFRONT EXTENSION TO THE MILWAUKEE STREETCAR SYSTEM IN DOWNTOWN MILWAUKEE

The City of Milwaukee has requested that the year 2035 fiscally-constrained regional transportation plan be amended to include an extension of the proposed Milwaukee streetcar system to the lakefront in downtown Milwaukee. Based on detailed planning and engineering study conducted by the City and action by its Common Council and Mayor, the City of Milwaukee has approved the construction of a 2.1-mile initial streetcar line in the Milwaukee central business district and Lower East Side area, and a 0.4-mile extension of the system to serve the lakefront area. The City has initiated the final phase of design engineering for the construction of the 2.1-mile initial streetcar line, and has initiated detailed planning, project development, and design engineering for the 0.4-mile extension. The 2.1-mile initial streetcar line is identified in the transit system element of the fiscally-constrained year 2035 regional transportation plan based on the implementation of this portion of the system having been approved for a sufficient amount of Federal and local funding to be fully funded. The remainder of this memorandum summarizes an analysis of fiscal constraint of the proposed amendment to the year 2035 fiscally constrained regional transportation plan to add to the planned transit system a 0.4-mile extension of the Milwaukee streetcar system to serve the lakefront area.

The capital costs for the implementation of the lakefront extension of the Milwaukee streetcar system are currently estimated to be $25 million. The Common Council and Mayor has to date approved $15 million in local funding, or 60 percent of the $25 million, for the implementation of the extension, and as well authorized City staff to pursue Federal transit funding and private funding for the remaining $10 million in capital costs needed to implement the project. City staff have indicated that they will pursue United States Department of Transportation (U.S. DOT) Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) and potentially U.S. DOT Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5309 – Small Starts discretionary funding to fund the remaining $10 million needed to fully fund the project. TIGER funds are available to a wide variety of transportation projects, including road, rail, transit, and port projects. Projects are selected for TIGER funding based on their ability to achieve national transportation objectives related to safety, economic competitiveness, state of good repair, livability, and environmental sustainability. While, the TIGER program is highly competitive, 10 streetcar projects have been approved for a total of $282 million in TIGER funding since the program was initiated in 2009. FTA Small Starts funding is available to eligible fixed guideway and bus rapid transit projects having a total cost of less than $250 million and seeking a Federal share of less than $75 million. A number of streetcar projects have been approved for FTA Small Starts funding, with most of these projects being larger than the lakefront extension of the Milwaukee streetcar system. The City staff is also authorized by action of the City Council and Mayor to pursue private funding contributions. Private funding, specifically from private non-profit organizations, has been successfully used to fund portions of streetcar projects around the country, including projects in the Cities of Portland and Cincinnati. Other potential funding for the project could include Federal Highway...
Administration (FHWA) Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funding—which has funded previous streetcar project capital costs in Southeastern Wisconsin.

Furthermore, while the City’s desire is to supplement existing local funding dedicated to the Lakefront Extension with non-local funding and is actively pursuing potential funding opportunities, the City of Milwaukee has adequate financial capacity to provide the additional $10 million necessary to fully fund the Lakefront Extension if necessary. To date, a total of $59 million in local Tax Increment Financing (TIF) funding has been dedicated to the streetcar project and, if non-local funding sources do not become available for the Lakefront Extension, an additional $10 million could be dedicated from TIF sources upon Common Council and Mayor approval.

The operating cost for the lakefront extension is estimated to be $550,000 annually in 2018 dollars. The operation of the extension is expected to be funded by farebox revenues, sponsorship and advertising revenues, and a combination of Federal, State, and local funding sources. The City could pursue funding a portion of the operating costs for the lakefront extension with CMAQ funding, which can be used in the funding of the first 3 to 5 years of operation of a new transit service. In 2014, the City was approved for $3.18 million in CMAQ funding which is expected to be used to assist in funding the first 1.5 years of operation for the initial streetcar line. The City may seek additional CMAQ funding to assist in the funding of the operation of an additional 1.5 years of service. In addition, upon implementation of the lakefront extension, the City may be eligible to receive State operating assistance for the operation of the system. With respect to local funding, the City Council and Mayor approved, if necessary, the use of the City’s parking revenues to assist in the funding of the operation of the streetcar system.

Based on the preceding, the Commission staff concludes that it is reasonable to assume that there would be sufficient capital and operating funding available to implement the lakefront extension by the year 2035—the design year of the plan.

* * *
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This memorandum report provides a statistical comparison of the Milwaukee metropolitan area with 13 other metro areas in the midwest and 13 other metro areas throughout the nation (see Map 1). The purpose was to assess how the Milwaukee area compares with other areas in a number of key measures, including population growth and characteristics, the economy, and transportation. The comparison includes data on existing conditions as well as changes primarily since 2000. Major findings of the comparison are noted below.

Population Growth and Characteristics
- The Milwaukee area has experienced slower population growth than most other metro areas.
- No significant differences were identified between the Milwaukee area and other metro areas with respect to population age, minority population proportion, and education levels.
- The Milwaukee area has greater disparities between white and minority populations than nearly all other metro areas in terms of education, per capita income, and poverty.

Economy
- The Milwaukee area has high home value/price relative to midwest metro areas, but is near average compared to the national metro area group.
- The Milwaukee area is among the worst in terms of job loss, and has experienced a greater reduction in inflation-adjusted per capita income.
- Job growth in the metro areas outside the midwest has generally been stronger than in the midwest metro areas.

Transportation
- The Milwaukee area performs better than nearly all other metro areas with respect to measures of transportation congestion—work commute travel time, travel time delay, and change in travel time delay over the last 30 years.
- The Milwaukee area has a lower number of people commuting to work by carpool, but higher numbers biking, walking, and using transit to work. Only Chicago, Pittsburgh, Portland, Minneapolis, and Denver have higher proportions of commuting by public transit.
- Over half of the other metro areas have some form of rail transit in addition to buses, and two-thirds of the metro areas have a dedicated local funding source for transit. Local funds cover only about 15 percent of the Milwaukee County Transit System (MCTS) operating deficit.
- MCTS has experienced a larger decline in ridership and service levels than nearly all other metro areas, with most other metro areas experiencing an increase in ridership and service levels.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report provides a statistical comparison of the Milwaukee metropolitan area with 13 other metro areas in the midwest and 13 other metro areas throughout the nation (see Map 1). The purpose was to assess how the Milwaukee area compares with other areas on a number of key measures, including population growth and characteristics, the economy, and transportation. The comparison includes data on existing conditions as well as changes primarily between 2000 and 2013. Major findings of the comparison are noted below. These findings provide valuable information for use in developing VISION 2050, a long-range regional land use and transportation plan for Southeastern Wisconsin.

- **A Slow-growth Area** – The Milwaukee metro area has had slower population growth than most metro areas. Of the 26 peers in this report, 17 grew by 10 percent or more from 2000 to 2013 compared to about 5 percent growth for the Milwaukee area.

  In terms of job “growth,” the recession had nationwide impacts, but only the Cleveland and Detroit metro areas fared worse than the 5 percent overall job loss in the Milwaukee area from 2001 to 2013. Manufacturing employment in the Milwaukee area has also continued its long-term decline, although it continues to account for 15 percent of total employment, ranking Milwaukee first among its peers.

  Even though the Milwaukee area has experienced slower population growth and above average job loss, housing values and home selling prices in the Milwaukee area are among the highest in the midwest and rank near the middle of metro areas outside the midwest.

- **Strong Evidence of Disparities** – Within the Milwaukee metro area’s population, there are significant disparities between whites and minorities—far more pronounced than the disparities in almost all other metro areas. Whites on average have significantly higher educational attainment levels and per capita income levels, and a far lower poverty rate. Similar disparities also exist between whites and minorities within the City of Milwaukee itself.

  There are also significant disparities for education, per capita income, and poverty between City of Milwaukee residents and residents of the rest of the Milwaukee metro area. These geographical disparities in the Milwaukee area exceed the disparities between central cities and their suburbs in almost all other metro areas.
• **Unbalanced Transportation System** – Several indicators show that the highway system in the Milwaukee metro area performs well in comparison to other metropolitan areas. Travel time delay and congestion costs for auto commuters in the Milwaukee area are among the lowest for midwest and other metropolitan areas. The increase in travel time delay for auto commuters in the Milwaukee area over the past three decades is also among the lowest compared to midwest and other metro areas.

The Milwaukee area does not compare nearly as well with respect to public transit. While the Milwaukee area continues to have among the highest transit service levels per capita compared to midwest and other metro areas, it has experienced among the most severe declines in transit service and ridership—20 percent and 40 percent, respectively, since 2000—compared to its peers. The root of this decline is its unique method of funding transit, which is heavily dependent on State and Federal funds and uses local funds coming from property taxes. Two-thirds of the peer metro areas have a local dedicated source of funding—typically a sales tax—which provides the bulk of their funding. Milwaukee has by far the largest transit system of its peers not supported by dedicated funding. The other peer metro area transit systems without dedicated funding provide 1/2 to 1/5 the transit service per capita provided in Milwaukee. This would suggest that action is needed to provide dedicated local transit funding, or at least increase State transit funding, to avoid Milwaukee’s transit levels shrinking to the much lower levels of those peers without dedicated funding.