

Minutes of First Meeting

**MILWAUKEE COUNTY TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT
PROGRAM ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Date: Thursday, March 10, 2005
Time: 1:30 p.m.
Place: Milwaukee County Transit System
Administration Facility
First Floor Conference Room
1942 North 17th Street
Milwaukee WI, 53205

Committee Members Present

Brian Dranzik..... Research Analyst,
(representing James G. White) Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors
Bret Mayborne Director of Planning and Research,
(representing Peter W. Beitzel) Metropolitan Milwaukee Association of Commerce
Robert Madison..... Citizen Member
Don Natzke Director, Milwaukee County
Office for Persons with Disabilities
Jeffrey S. Polenske..... City Engineer, City of Milwaukee
Gary Portenier..... Program Planning Coordinator,
Milwaukee County Department on Aging
Nancy Senn Transportation Planning Manager, Milwaukee County
Department of Parks and Public Infrastructure
Michael E. Vebber Vice President and Director of Operations,
Milwaukee County Transit System

Staff and Guests Present

Albert A. Beck Principal Planner, Southeastern Wisconsin
Regional Planning Commission
Daniel A. Boehm Manager of Research and Planning,
Milwaukee County Transit System
Kenneth J. Warren Managing Director,
Milwaukee County Transit System
Kenneth R. Yunker Deputy Director, Southeastern Wisconsin
Regional Planning Commission

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Yunker introduced himself and thanked the Advisory Committee members for agreeing to serve on the Committee. He asked the members present to introduce themselves, and indicated that roll call would be accomplished with a sign-in sheet circulated by Commission staff.

Mr. Yunker discussed the role of the Advisory Committee in the transit planning effort, stating that this Advisory Committee will guide the development of the new transit system development plan for the Milwaukee County Transit System. He noted that the study to prepare the transit system development plan was very important to the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors and Executive, to the transit system, and to its riders as it would identify needed improvements in transit services and capital equipment, identify the costs associated with those improvements, and provide recommendations on how to fund those costs.

Mr. Warren also thanked those present for serving on the Committee and noted that the transit system has worked with the Commission in the past on long-and short-range studies dealing with the transit system or transit issues as part of the Commission's transportation planning efforts. He stated that Commission's regional transportation system plan includes many sound transit service recommendations, including expanding the areas served by public transit to coincide with urban growth and providing faster and more frequent transit services. He noted that many of the Commission's recommendations for improving public transit service in the Region have not been implemented due to a lack of funding, and there was a need to identify a means of providing the needed local funding. He stated that he hoped the Committee could continue to function in some advisory role after the current study was completed.

Mr. Yunker indicated that the Commission staff would act as the Committee's Secretary and assume responsibility for the preparation of meeting minutes.

REVIEW OF OUTLINE FOR SEWRPC COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE PLANNING REPORT NO. 279, "MILWAUKEE COUNTY TRANSIT SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT PLAN: 2006-2010"

Mr. Yunker led the Committee through a review of the outline for the study report that identified the proposed content of each chapter. He stated that the Committee would be asked to review draft copies of each chapter as they were prepared by the Commission staff. He noted that if significant revisions or additions to the text of the draft chapters were required as a result of Committee review comments, the new or revised text for the chapter would be identified in the meeting minutes to allow for Committee review at the next meeting. He added that the Committee would also be asked to review two newsletters prepared to document the study findings and recommendations.

During his review of the report outline, Committee members raised the following questions and comments:

1. Mr. Vebber referred to Mr. Warren's comments on the lack of adequate local financial resources to carry out transit improvement recommendations identified in previous planning efforts. He asked if funding for the recommended transit services would be addressed in the transit system development plan. Mr. Yunker stated that recommendations identifying how to provide adequate local funding for the existing transit system and the recommended service improvements would be included in the plan. He noted that the plan would include short-range (five-year) forecasts of the costs, revenues, and available public assistance funds from Federal, State and County sources for both the existing and recommended transit system, and would identify any funding shortfall with the financial resources that are currently available to Milwaukee County. He indicated that alternatives to the current mechanisms available for funding public transit services, including creating some form of dedicated funding for public

- transit, would be discussed in depth with the Committee and recommendations included in the study report and summary newsletters. He also noted that the issue of providing dedicated funding for public transit was also being looked at under an initiative to advance the commuter rail service recommendations of the Kenosha-Racine-Milwaukee Corridor Study. That initiative was being lead by the Cities and Counties of Kenosha, Milwaukee, and Racine in partnership with the local business community, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT), and the Commission.
2. Mr. Natzke stated that it was clear to him that the study would not specifically provide for an in depth analysis of the Milwaukee County Transit Plus paratransit service, but would identify changes in the paratransit service that are necessary in response to proposed changes to the operation of the County's fixed-route bus service. He indicated that he would be most concerned with proposed changes to the bus system affecting the areas served, service hours, or fares charged, any of which could negatively impact the Transit Plus paratransit service. He indicated that he wanted to make sure that if proposed bus service changes could result in service reductions or higher fares for the Transit Plus paratransit service or have other negative impacts on disabled users, that such impacts would be identified and discussed in the study report. He also noted that now that the County's bus routes were being operated with accessible buses, disabled individuals were learning to use the bus system and becoming a larger part of its ridership. He stated that he would like to see the study recommendations include enhancements to the County's fixed-route bus services that will assist disabled individuals with using the bus system. Mr. Yunker stated that the Commission staff would look at revising the text in the appropriate section of Chapter I to address Mr. Natzke's comments.
 3. Mr. Portenier commented that the specialized transportation services for elderly persons sponsored by the Milwaukee County Department of Aging should not be overlooked in the study. He stated that the transit service needs of the elderly population served by the Department of Aging services should be identified and considered in identifying changes and enhancements to the County's fixed-route bus services that could encourage the elderly to increase their use of the bus system. Mr. Yunker indicated the service provided by the Department of Aging and its target population would be described in Chapter III in which the existing transit services provided by the Milwaukee County Transit System and other major public transit service providers serving Milwaukee County would be documented.

REVIEW OF PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF CHAPTER I, "INTRODUCTION," OF SEWRPC COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE PLANNING REPORT NO. 279, "MILWAUKEE COUNTY TRANSIT SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT PLAN: 2006-2010"

Mr. Yunker lead the Committee through a review of the preliminary draft of Chapter I, "Introduction," referring to slides from a summary presentation being displayed to those present. As he went through the chapter, he asked for comments and questions on its content from the Committee.

Mr. Natzke referred to the text in the middle of page 7 indicating that the study would only identify changes in the paratransit service that were necessary in response to proposed changes to the operation of the County's fixed-route bus service. He restated his earlier comments on the need to identify and discuss the negative impacts that reducing bus services or raising bus fares could potentially have on the Transit Plus paratransit service and its users, and on how the study should also consider enhancements to the County's fixed-route bus services that would assist disabled individuals with using the bus system. Mr. Yunker indicated the text in this section would be revised to reflect Mr. Natzke's comments along with those of Mr. Portenier.

[Secretary's Note: The following text has been added after the first sentence in the first full paragraph on page 7:

“Where changes are considered to the bus system which could result in a reduction in service for the Transit Plus paratransit service or an increase in the user fares for the paratransit service, the potential impacts of such service changes on the Transit Plus service and its disabled users have been identified. The plan also identifies potential enhancements to the County’s fixed-route bus services that could assist and encourage disabled individuals and the County’s elderly population in making use of the bus system.”]

There being no further discussion, a motion to approve the preliminary draft of Chapter I, “Introduction,” as amended was made by Mr. Polenske, seconded by Mr. Vebber, and carried unanimously by the Committee.

REVIEW OF PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF CHAPTER II, “LAND USE AND TRAVEL PATTERNS” OF SEWRPC COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE PLANNING REPORT NO. 279, “MILWAUKEE COUNTY TRANSIT SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT PLAN: 2006-2010”

Mr. Yunker asked Mr. Beck to lead the Committee through a review of the preliminary draft of Chapter II. Mr. Beck went through the chapter with the Committee, referring to slides from a summary presentation being displayed to those present. During the review of the chapter, the following questions were raised and comments made by Committee members:

1. Referring to Table 2-5 on page 3a, Mr. Portenier commented that the racial minority population groups identified in the table were different from the grouping used by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. Mr. Yunker stated that for this table, the Commission had combined the two population groups defined by the 2000 Census as “Asian” and “Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander” into one population group named “Asian and Pacific Islander,” and had condensed the Census name for the “Hispanic or Latino” group to “Hispanic”. He indicated that a footnote would be added to the table to indicate the “Asian” and “Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander” populations had been combined, and that the Census name for the “Hispanic or Latino” group would be used in the table.
2. Referring to Table 2-7 on page 3c, Mr. Natzke suggested that transit system staff could possibly provide information on the current number of disabled persons registered to use the Transit Plus paratransit service and on those using the accessible bus service, and that this information could be reported in the chapter to supplement the census information. Mr. Beck agreed to check on the availability of this information and revise the text describing the characteristics of the transit dependant population to incorporate the available data.

[Secretary's Note: Milwaukee County Transit System staff have indicated there were approximately 17,600 disabled persons in Milwaukee County registered to use the Transit Plus paratransit service as of February 2005. There is no comparable information on the number of individuals using the County’s accessible bus service. However, disabled passengers using wheelchairs made approximately 38,600 passenger trips on the fixed-route bus system during 2004. The

following paragraph has been added after the paragraph in the middle of page 4:

“To supplement the 2000 Census data on disabled persons, information was obtained from the Milwaukee County Transit System on the number of disabled persons that are registered with the Transit Plus paratransit service. As of February 2005, approximately 17,600 persons were registered as eligible users of the paratransit service. The residential locations of these registered paratransit users are shown on Map 2-4A. About 7,400, or about 42 percent, of the registered users make at least one trip on the Transit Plus service each month, and about 2,700, or about 15 percent, of the registered users use the paratransit service at least 20 times per month.”

Map 2-4A will be distributed at the April 21, 2005, Advisory Committee meeting. Text documenting the number of trips made on the County’s accessible bus service by disabled passengers using wheelchairs will be included in Chapter III documenting the existing transit system.]

3. Referring to Table 2-9 on page 4c, Mr. Dranzik requested that the minority population figures reported in the table also include a category identifying the African American population that was part of low-income families or resided in households with no vehicle available. Mr. Yunker stated that the nonwhite category in the table would be revised to present information for the Black /African American population and the population of other races.

[Secretary’s Note: Revised copies of Tables 2-5 and 2-9 are included in Attachment A to these minutes.]

4. Referring to the intercounty person trip information displayed on Map 2-12, Mr. Vebber noted the imbalance in person trip volumes by direction for each county and asked for an explanation of the trip data displayed on the map. Mr. Yunker stated that the map presents person trips in produced-attracted format. By way of example, he explained that in 2001 there were 253,200 person trips produced in Waukesha County and attracted to locations in Milwaukee County; that is, there were 253,200 trips made on an average weekday by residents of Waukesha County to and from Milwaukee County. He stated that the map footnote and chapter text would be revised to provide a better explanation of how person travel was being displayed on Map 2-12.

[Secretary’s Note: The footnote on Map 2-12 has been replaced with the following footnote:

“Trips are based on the resident household survey and include all trip purposes. Trips are shown in produced-attracted format – that is, from area of production to area of attraction. The production county for a trip having one end at “home”, that is either beginning at or ending at home, is the county location of the “home” and the attraction county is the “non-home” end county location for that trip. The production county for trips having neither end at “home” is the county location of the trip origin and the attraction county is the county location of the trip destination. Thus, the trips shown on the map generally indicate

the trips made on an average weekday by the residents of a county to and from each other county.”

The following text has been added after the fifth sentence of the second full paragraph on page 9 where reference is made to Map 2-12:

“Trips are shown on the map in produced-attracted format – that is, from area of production to area of attraction. The production county for a trip having one end at “home”, that is either beginning at or ending at home, is the county location of the “home” and the attraction county is the “non-home” end county location for that trip. The production county for trips having neither end at “home” is the county location of the trip origin and the attraction county is the county location of the trip destination. Thus, the trips shown on Map 2-12 largely indicate the trips made on an average weekday to and from Milwaukee County by residents of the six counties of the Region outside Milwaukee County.”]

There being no further discussion, a motion to approve the preliminary draft of Chapter II, “Land Use and Travel Patterns,” as amended was made by Mr. Vebber, seconded by Mr. Natzke, and carried unanimously by the Committee.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Yunker stated that the Commission staff would like to schedule the next meeting of the Advisory Committee in about five to six weeks. He indicated that staff would send out an e-mail to Committee members with suggested dates and times for the two meetings. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Albert A. Beck
Acting Secretary

Attachments: #91494, #96788

Attachment A

AAB/RLM/rlm/lw
04/5/04
Doc#91494

Table 2-5

POPULATION BY RACE IN MILWAUKEE COUNTY: 1980 - 2000

Year	Total Population	White		Nonwhite ^a							
				Black / African American		American Indian and Alaska Native		Asian and Pacific Islander ^b		Other Race	
		Number	Percent of Total Population	Number	Percent of Total Population	Number	Percent of Total Population	Number	Percent of Total Population	Number	Percent of Total Population
1980	964,988	788,729	81.7	149,435	15.5	5,838	0.6	5,745	0.6	15,244	1.6
1990	959,275	718,918	74.9	195,470	20.4	6,994	0.7	15,308	1.6	22,585	2.4
2000 ^a	940,164	633,446	67.4	240,113	25.5	11,907	1.3	28,930	3.1	48,227	5.1

^aFor the 2000 Federal census, individuals could report that they were of more than one race. The figures on this table indicate the number of persons reported as being of a given race (as indicated by the column heading), including those who were reported as that race exclusively and those who were reported as that race and one or more other races. Accordingly, the population figures by race sum to more than the total population.

^bThe population reported under this category includes persons identified as "Asian" and as "Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander" in the 2000 Census.

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC.

Table 2-6

**HISPANIC OR LATINO POPULATION
IN MILWAUKEE COUNTY: 1980 - 2000**

Year	Total Population	Hispanic or Latino Population ^a	
		Number	Percent of Total Population
1980	964,988	29,343	3.0
1990	959,275	44,671	4.7
2000	940,164	82,406	8.8

^aPersons of Hispanic or Latino origin may be of any race.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC.

Table 2-9

**LOW-INCOME PERSONS AND ZERO AUTO HOUSEHOLDS
IN THE MINORITY POPULATION IN MILWAUKEE COUNTY: 1980-2000**

Year	Total Population	Persons in Low-Income Families ^a									
		Total		White		Minority					
		Number	Percent of Low-Income Population	Number	Percent of Low-Income Population	Black/African American		Other Race ^b		Hispanic or Latino ^c	
				Number	Percent of Low-Income Population	Number	Percent of Low-Income Population	Number	Percent of Low-Income Population	Number	Percent of Low-Income Population
1980	964,988	239,352	100.0	143,155	61.5	78,965	33.0	10,487	4.4	14,468	6.2
1990	959,275	302,186	100.0	163,309	50.2	121,776	40.3	39,973	13.2	24,365	7.5
2000	940,164	297,565	100.0	105,860	35.6	133,970	45.0	57,735	19.4	43,776	14.7

Year	Total Households	Households with No Vehicle Available									
		Total		White		Minority					
		Number	Percent of Zero-Auto Households	Number	Percent of Low-Income Population	Black/African American		Other Race ^b		Hispanic or Latino ^c	
				Number	Percent of Zero-Auto Households	Number	Percent of Zero-Auto Households	Number	Percent of Zero-Auto Households	Number	Percent of Zero-Auto Households
1980	363,653	68,230	100.0	50,062	71.2	18,055	26.5	2,235	3.3	1,935	2.8
1990	373,048	69,098	100.0	40,421	59.2	23,814	34.5	4,015	5.8	2,562	3.8
2000	377,729	61,631	100.0	30,705	49.8	25,093	40.7	5,863	9.5	4,257	6.9

^aIncludes persons residing in households with a total family income less than 200 percent of the federal poverty level (see Table 2-8) which is the threshold for qualifying for State public assistance through the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program.

^bOther race includes all persons who identified themselves as American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, or some other minority race.

^cPersons of Hispanic or Latino origin may be of any race. Accordingly, the low-income population and zero-auto household figures for white, Black/African American, Other Race, and Hispanic or Latino persons shown in this table will sum to more than the total figures shown for low-income persons and zero-auto households.

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC.