

Minutes of the Twenty-Third Joint Meeting of the

**ADVISORY COMMITTEES ON REGIONAL LAND USE PLANNING  
AND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING**

DATE: February 12, 2020  
TIME: 9:30 a.m.  
PLACE: West Allis City Hall – Common Council Chambers  
7525 W. Greenfield Avenue  
West Allis, Wisconsin

**Members Present**

Committee on Regional Land Use Planning

Julie Anderson ..... Director of Public Works and Development Services, Racine County  
Chair  
Robert Bauman ..... Alderman, City of Milwaukee  
Donna Brown-Martin.....Director, Milwaukee County Department of Transportation  
Andy Buehler.....Director of Planning and Development, Kenosha County  
Paulette Enders..... Director of Development, City of Wauwatosa  
Michael Friedlander (alternate for Gail Good) ..... Program and Policy Analyst,  
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources  
Gabriel Gilbertson (alternate for Matthew Carran) ..... Planner, Village of Menomonee Falls  
Aaron Hertzberg.....Economic Development Director, Milwaukee County  
Kristi Johnson ..... Community Development Manager, City of Greenfield  
Vanessa Koster..... Planning Manager, City of Milwaukee Department of City Development  
Matthew Sadowski.....Planning and Redevelopment Manager, City of Racine  
Sandy Scherer (alternate for Jason Fruth)..... Senior Planner, Waukesha County  
Debora Sielski..... Deputy Planning and Parks Administrator, Manager of Planning Division,  
Washington County Planning and Parks Department  
Andrew Struck .....Director, Planning and Parks Department, Ozaukee County  
Todd Stuebe .....Director of Community Development, City of Glendale  
Charles Wade.....Director, Bureau of Planning and Economic Development,  
Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Committee on Regional Transportation Planning

Donna Brown-Martin.....Director, Milwaukee County Department of Transportation  
Chair  
Clement Abongwa .....Director of Highways/Highway Commissioner, Kenosha County  
Anthony Barth (alternate for Dewayne Johnson) ..... Planning Section Chief,  
Wisconsin Department of Transportation  
Mitch Batuzich.....Transportation Planner,  
Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation  
Daniel Boehm ..... President and Managing Director, Milwaukee County Transit System

Chad Chrisbaum (alternate for Samir Amin).....Engineer-in-Charge,  
City of Milwaukee Department of Public Works  
Peter Daniels .....City Engineer, City of West Allis  
Brian Engelking (alternate for Fred Abadi) ..... Director, Waukesha Metro Transit  
Julie Esch .....Deputy Director, Milwaukee County Department of Transportation  
Douglas Ferguson ..... Senior Analyst, Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning  
Liaison to Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning  
Carolynn Gellings .....Manager of Engineering Services,  
Waukesha County Department of Public Works  
Thomas Grisa..... Director of Public Works, City of Brookfield  
Nik Kovac ..... Alderman, City of Milwaukee  
Matthew Maederer (alternate for Scott Brandmeier).....Director of Public Works/Village Engineer,  
Village of Brown Deer  
Max Marechal ..... City Engineer, City of West Bend  
Jeffrey Polenske .....Commissioner of Public Works, City of Milwaukee  
John Rooney..... Commissioner of Public Works/City Engineer, City of Racine  
Charles Wade.....Director, Bureau of Planning and Economic Development,  
Wisconsin Department of Transportation  
Dennis Yaccarino..... Senior Budget and Policy Manager, City of Milwaukee

**Guests and Staff Present**

Kevin Muhs..... Executive Director, SEWRPC  
Elizabeth Callin..... Senior Transportation Planner, SEWRPC  
Joel Dietl ..... Deputy Chief Land Use Planner, SEWRPC  
Traci Gengler ..... Principal Engineer, City of West Allis  
Christopher Hiebert.....Chief Transportation Engineer, SEWRPC  
Andrew Levy ..... Systems Planning Supervisor,  
Southeast Region, Wisconsin Department of Transportation  
Eric Lynde.....Chief Special Projects Planner, SEWRPC  
Benjamin McKay ..... Deputy Director, SEWRPC  
Nakeisha Payne..... Public Involvement and Outreach Manager, SEWRPC

**CALL TO ORDER**

Ms. Anderson called the joint meeting of the Advisory Committees on Regional Land Use Planning and Regional Transportation Planning to order at 9:32 a.m., welcoming those in attendance. She indicated roll call would be accomplished through the circulation of a sign-in sheet.

**REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING HELD ON OCTOBER 30, 2019**

Ms. Anderson asked if there were any questions or comments on the October 30, 2019, meeting minutes. There were none. On a motion by Mr. Struck seconded by Mr. Buehler, the October 30, 2019, meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

## **REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL FOR PUBLIC COMMENT OF PRELIMINARY DRAFTS FOR 2020 REVIEW AND UPDATE OF VISION 2050**

Ms. Anderson introduced the next agenda item, which was a review and consideration of approval for public comment of preliminary drafts for the 2020 Review and Update of VISION 2050 by Commission staff. Ms. Anderson then asked Mr. Muhs to introduce the effort and provide the review. Mr. Muhs stated that staff is asking for review and consideration to send the preliminary drafts for the 2020 Review and Update of VISION 2050 out for public comment, and that an additional meeting will be held to review comments received and to approve any changes and final updates to VISION 2050.

Mr. Muhs explained that the preliminary draft of Chapter 4 reviews proposed changes to the plan based on changes documented in previous chapters, input from Committee members, and public comments received during the first round of public involvement for the 2020 Update. Mr. Muhs noted that staff is also proposing to re-title the Fiscally Constrained Transportation Plan (FCTP) to the Fiscally Constrained Transportation System (FCTS) to better make the important distinction that the portion of the recommended transportation system that can be implemented with reasonably expected revenues does not represent a desired “plan,” rather, it represents the “system” expected to occur without sufficient funding levels to maintain and improve the transportation system as recommended in VISION 2050.

Mr. Muhs then provided an overview of the proposed updates, including explaining that there were a number of improvements made to the plan’s fiscal model, which resulted in greater declines in expected funding. These changes particularly impact funding for public transit, resulting in more significant transit service decline expected under the FCTS than previously expected.

Mr. Grisa asked if there is a nexus between the expectations of the FCTS and the ability to support the recommended land use component. Mr. Muhs responded that land use and transportation are integrated in the plan, and not implementing the recommended public transit element would likely impact the recommended land use component. He also noted that the FCTS is developed, in part, to meet federal requirements.

Mr. Muhs asked Mr. Lynde to begin the review of Chapter 4. Mr. Lynde provided a summary of the process and feedback from the first round of public involvement. The following comments and discussion points were made during the presentation:

1. Mr. Kovac inquired about the data request he made previously for information about the locations of the development that is occurring inconsistent with plan recommendations. Mr. McKay responded that staff would share the data and noted that while many communities allow the development of lots at various sizes, developers may choose to develop larger lots, even if they have the option to develop smaller lots.

[Secretary’s Note: Commission staff provided this information to the Committees in an email on March 6, 2020, has included this information in Attachment 1 to these minutes, and will include the table in a revised draft of Chapter 2.]

2. Mr. Kovac also suggested that the Commission more clearly state the potential impacts of not implementing the land use recommendations, specifically as it relates to affordable housing as part of the equity analysis.

[Secretary's Note: The Equity Analysis of the VISION 2050 Land Use Component, presented in Appendix K of Volume III of VISION 2050, concluded that the recommended land use development pattern would allow for the development of multifamily housing and single-family homes on smaller lots that tend to be more affordable to a wider range of households than single-family homes on larger lots in areas of the Region that may have a shortage of affordable workforce housing. This would increase access to new job opportunities for low- and moderate-income households, which would have a positive impact on the Region's environmental justice populations. The land use equity analysis will be included in the Second Edition of Volume III of the VISION 2050 plan report.]

Mr. McKay presented the land use component of Chapter 4, for which no changes were proposed. He also explained that staff will be adding references to which plan objectives—which were identified during the initial development of the plan and categorized under four important themes—are addressed by each recommendation in the Second Edition of Volume III of the VISION 2050 plan report.

Ms. Callin presented the transportation component of Chapter 4, explaining proposed changes to the plan under the public transit, bicycle and pedestrian, travel demand management, and arterial streets and highways elements of the plan. The following comments and discussion points were made during the review:

1. Mr. Bauman asked if staff has reevaluated the plan in the context of the updated demographic data provided, specifically whether the plan should continue to recommend capacity expansion projects if slower population growth is projected. Mr. Muhs responded that Chapter 3 reviewed population growth projections and although we are currently under-forecasting jobs and slightly over-forecasting population, the review concluded that plan forecasts for population and jobs are still within a range that does not warrant adjusting the plan forecasts at this time. At the time of the next interim plan update, staff will again review whether changes to the forecasts are necessary.
2. Mr. Kovac asked for an analysis of where proposed capacity expansions could impact the goal to reduce speeds and increase safety. Mr. Muhs responded that this would depend on individual roads and that road diets are useful where excess capacity exists. He also explained that staff plans to work with Milwaukee County and others to identify potential candidate roadways for capacity reduction. This would include looking at forecast volumes, which account for land use, and areas where additional density is not expected. Mr. Muhs explained that this would be completed through the jurisdictional highway system plan (JHSP) process. Mr. Grisa stated that while capacity expansions need to be included in the plan to qualify for federal funding, road diets can be done at the discretion of local governments and, therefore, do not need to be included in the plan.
3. Mr. Stuebe asked if guidance on dockless scooter policies could be provided by the Commission and Mr. Rooney asked if guidance related to shared-mobility and autonomous vehicles could also be included. Mr. Muhs responded that staff would attempt to provide this guidance as part of a larger transportation guidelines document, which is under development.

4. Mr. Polenkse shared that, related to road diets, the City of Milwaukee recognizes that capacity reductions do not necessarily reduce outlier aggressive driving, but they can have the effect of lowering average travel speeds. He also mentioned that the City is considering how to adjust speed limits to better respond to surrounding land uses. He asked if guidance on speed limits could be included as staff explores candidate roadways for road diets. Mr. Muhs responded that staff would attempt to provide this guidance as part of the separate transportation guidelines document and in the effort to identify potential candidate roadways for capacity reduction in the JSHP. Ms. Gellings indicated she would also be interested in this information; specifically, what flexibility is allowed within the *State Statutes*. Mr. Rooney mentioned that the City of Racine had previously completed a speed study with WisDOT in downtown Racine and offered that the information may be useful to these Committees. Mr. Muhs responded that staff would attempt to provide this guidance as part of the larger transportation guidelines document. Ms. Gellings added that, while road diets may be appropriate on certain roadway segments, there is still a need to expand capacity on certain roadway segments, particularly to address safety issues related to congestion.
5. Mr. Bauman stated that the coming reauthorization of the Federal transportation law could potentially permit longer and heavier trucks. He stated his concern regarding the potential safety implications of increasing permitted truck sizes. Mr. Muhs responded that staff has not considered taking a stance on truck sizes proposed in the bill, and that he would discuss this topic further with WisDOT. Mr. Muhs did note that the New York City allows only limited travel of trucks longer than 53 feet within City limits, and that pickups and drop-offs by such vehicles are not permitted. He stated that he was unsure if such an approach would be legal for a municipality in Wisconsin.

Mr. Hiebert presented the updated financial analysis provided in Chapter 4, explaining that the analysis identified substantial funding gaps between the estimated costs to implement the public transit and streets and highways elements of VISION 2050 and the existing and reasonably expected revenue.

1. Mr. Bauman stated that two projects account for approximately half of the project costs listed in Table 4.10 and asked if the Commission has the authority to remove a transportation improvement project from the plan. Mr. Muhs responded that because of where these projects are in the design and engineering process, this would be the responsibility of the Advisory Committee on Transportation System Planning and Programming for the Milwaukee Urbanized Area, which is responsible for compiling the transportation improvement program (TIP) for the Milwaukee urbanized area. He noted that the projects Mr. Bauman referenced have already completed the planning and engineering process and a locally preferred alternative has been selected by the implementing agency. He added that the Commission is an advisory agency by *State Statute* and the final decision as to whether and how a project proceeds to implementation is to be made by the responsible State, county, or local government at the conclusion of preliminary engineering. The regional plan does not make a recommendation that is inconsistent with that decision.
2. Mr. Rooney asked if there have been discussions about how to fund infrastructure for connected vehicles, specifically if there has been thought about taxing cellular data services to fund transportation. Mr. Hiebert responded that the financial analysis identifies six commonly discussed revenue sources with the potential to address the identified funding gap, but staff recognizes that there are many other, innovative ways to fund transportation, and could look at

whether models exist for taxing wireless companies. Mr. Rooney also said that smart phones could be utilized to implement a tolling system. Mr. Muhs responded that he is aware of studies that have looked at utilizing smart phones to implement a vehicle-miles of travel (VMT) fee and that this is something staff could further explore.

Mr. Muhs presented information on the updated equity analyses. He stated that the analysis concluded that there will likely be a disparate impact on minority populations, low-income families, and people with disabilities if the public transit element is not implemented. The following comments and discussion points were made during the review:

1. Mr. Bauman asked whether there were changes made based on activity that has occurred since completion of the plan amendment related to Foxconn. Mr. Muhs stated that the local governments in the vicinity of the planned Foxconn manufacturing campus have amended their comprehensive plans and sewer service areas to allow development, so it is still reasonable to assume that development of a similar magnitude to that incorporated into the plan during the amendment related to Foxconn will occur in the affected areas, noting that plan forecasts for population and jobs have not changed from those presented in the VISION 2050 amendment related to Foxconn. Mr. Kovac expressed skepticism that Foxconn would achieve the number of jobs originally projected and that he suspected that plan forecasts may need to be updated at the time of the next interim plan update.
2. Mr. Bauman asked which of the Foxconn development road projects have not yet been started and whether those projects could be altered at this time. Mr. Sadowski mentioned that some of the development road projects are supporting other local communities, including the City of Racine. Ms. Anderson stated that most of the roads are complete or nearly complete, with the exception of CTH KR, which will likely begin construction later in 2020. She indicated she believed the projects were too far long to be altered and noted that Racine County will be looking closer at development that has occurred when updating the county's comprehensive plan.

Ms. Anderson asked for a motion to approve the preliminary draft chapter and appendices for the 2020 Review and Update of VISION 2050 for public review, clarifying that there will be another joint meeting of the Advisory Committees to consider final approval of the 2020 Review and Update. Ms. Brown-Martin moved for approval and Mr. Stuebe seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

[Secretary's Note: Commission staff received one memo and one email with comments on Chapter 4. The email, received from the Village of Menomonee Falls, requested that the downtown area of Menomonee Falls be shown as "Mixed Use Traditional Neighborhood" in the recommended land use pattern map to reflect development in that area. After reviewing the current and planned development in that area, staff determined that this was appropriate and made this change to Map 4.1 in Chapter 4. The memo, received from WisDOT, responded to a request from Commission staff for comments on the estimates of costs and revenues and the updated freeway construction schedule. The memo is provided in Attachment 2 and staff made relevant changes to the updated financial analysis in Chapter 4.]

**REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF SECOND EDITION OF SEWRPC MEMORANDUM REPORT NO. 221, “A COMPARISON OF THE MILWAUKEE METROPOLITAN AREA TO ITS PEERS”**

Ms. Anderson asked Mr. Muhs to present the executive summary of the preliminary draft of the Second Edition of SEWRPC Memorandum Report No. 221, “A Comparison of the Milwaukee Metropolitan Area to its Peers.” Mr. Muhs presented the updated report, noting that staff expects to publish the final report soon and will make it available to the Committees. The following comments and discussion points were made after the information was presented:

1. Mr. Grisa expressed concern about comparing percentage changes between metro areas because it does not take into account each metro area’s initial levels for a particular measure. Related to Table 61 in the draft report, he asked how the Milwaukee metro area could be ranked so high as it relates to vehicle revenue hours of public transit per capita. Mr. Muhs responded that, while the metro area remains highly ranked in service levels per capita, the trend has been declining service levels. Mr. Grisa then asked if it was possible that the existing transit systems are providing higher levels of service than are necessary, or are providing the wrong types of service. Mr. Bauman noted that one reason for this ranking is the high population density in the City of Milwaukee. Mr. Boehm stated that there is a history of strong demand for transit in Milwaukee and that Milwaukee County has some of the highest population density in the country. Per capita service levels are high because there are nearly 1 million people in Milwaukee County and nearly 80 percent of that population is within the transit service area. He also noted that there are much lower population densities in areas outside of Milwaukee County within the Region. Mr. Muhs stated that given the demographics, size, and density of Milwaukee County, relatively robust transit has been provided in the past that is no longer provided and service levels continue to decrease.
2. Mr. Kovac asked how the trends presented in this report compare to previous versions, specifically referencing transit service per capita and ridership. Mr. Muhs responded that there were not substantial cuts to service since between 2013 and 2018, and therefore the substantial cuts in transit service experienced in the metro area were already included in the first edition of this report. Mr. Kovac asked what staff attributes the 39 percent decrease in transit ridership to. Mr. Muhs responded that staff would be willing to investigate the factors more closely, noting that some key factors include the ease and low-cost of parking and low fuel prices.

[Secretary’s Note: Commission staff has initiated a review of the factors related to the significant transit ridership decline identified in the report and will provide a staff memorandum to the Committees documenting the findings.]

Ms. Anderson asked if there were any further questions and there were none. She noted that Committee members should contact staff with any further questions or comments regarding this report.

**DISCUSSION OF SCHEDULE AND LOCATION OF FUTURE JOINT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

Ms. Anderson asked Mr. Muhs to present the schedule for future joint meetings of the Advisory Committees. Mr. Muhs stated that staff has scheduled the next joint meeting to review and consider final

approval of the 2020 Review and Update of VISION 2050 on April 29, 2020. He noted that public comments received and any changes based on public comments will be presented at that meeting.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Ms. Anderson asked if there were any public comments. There were none.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Ms. Anderson thanked everyone for attending and asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Buehler moved and Ms. Brown-Martin seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth T. Callin  
Recording Secretary

KJM/BRM/JED/EDL/ETC

VISION 2050 - 2020 Update - Joint AC Minutes - Mtg 23 - 02-12-2020 (00253437-2).DOCX (PDF: #253478)



Attachment 1

Single-Family Residential Subdivisions by VISION 2050 Land Use Category Served by Public Sanitary Sewer in the Region: 2010-2018

Municipality	Average Lot Size						Zoning Ordinance Allows Lot Size of 10,000 sq ft or Less as a Principal Use <sup>a</sup>		
	Small Lot Traditional Neighborhood (10,000 sq ft or less)		Medium Lot Neighborhood (10,001-19,999 sq ft)		Large Lot Neighborhood (20,000 sq ft or More)				
	Number of Lots	Number of Subdivisions	Number of Lots	Number of Subdivisions	Number of Lots	Number of Subdivisions			
Kenosha County									
Village of Bristol	0	0	66	2	0	0	66	2	Yes
Village of Pleasant Prairie	0	0	45	1	0	0	45	1	Yes
Village of Salem Lakes	0	0	0	0	12	1	12	1	Yes
Village of Twin Lakes	0	0	0	0	39	1	39	1	Yes
Milwaukee County									
City of Franklin	0	0	69	1	17	2	86	3	No
City of Greenfield	0	0	25	4	0	0	25	4	Yes
City of Milwaukee	11	1	0	0	0	0	11	1	Yes
City of Oak Creek	0	0	32	2	8	1	40	3	Yes
City of Saint Francis	13	2	0	0	0	0	13	2	Yes
Ozaukee County									
City of Cedarburg	0	0	131	7	0	0	131	7	Yes
City of Mequon	0	0	12	1	185	9	197	10	No
City of Port Washington	33	1	0	0	35	2	68	3	Yes
Village of Belgium	9	1	10	1	0	0	19	2	Yes
Village of Grafton	0	0	52	2	0	0	52	2	Yes
Racine County									
Village of Mount Pleasant	5	1	12	1	13	2	30	4	Yes
Village of Sturtevant	0	0	18	1	0	0	18	1	Yes
Village of Waterford	0	0	0	0	4	1	4	1	No
Walworth County									
City of Delavan	0	0	0	0	12	1	12	1	Yes
City of Lake Geneva	330	1	0	0	0	0	330	1	Yes
Village of Walworth	92	2 <sup>b</sup>	0	0	0	0	92	2	No
Town of Delavan	0	0	71	1	0	0	71	1	No
Washington County									
City of Hartford	0	0	75	3	0	0	75	3	Yes
City of West Bend	18	1	30	1	0	0	48	2	Yes
Village of Germantown	0	0	74	1	16	1	90	2	Yes
Village of Jackson	33	1	0	0	0	0	33	1	Yes
Village of Kewaskum	0	0	5	1	0	0	5	1	Yes
Village of Slinger	0	0	9	1	19	4	28	5	Yes

Table continued on next page.

Attachment 1 (continued)

Single-Family Residential Subdivisions by VISION 2050 Land Use Category Served by Public Sanitary Sewer in the Region: 2010-2018

Municipality	Average Lot Size						Zoning Ordinance Allows Lot Size of 10,000 sq ft or Less as a Principal Use <sup>a</sup>		
	Small Lot Traditional Neighborhood (10,000 sq ft or less)		Medium Lot Neighborhood (10,001-19,999 sq ft)		Large Lot Neighborhood (20,000 sq ft or More)				
	Number of Lots	Number of Subdivisions	Number of Lots	Number of Subdivisions	Number of Lots	Number of Subdivisions			
Waukesha County									
City of Brookfield	25	1 <sup>c</sup>	53	2	34	3	112	6	No
City of Delafield	0	0	35	2	0	0	35	2	Yes
City of Muskego	0	0	24	1	162	5	186	6	No
City of New Berlin	0	0	0	0	71	2	71	2	No
City of Oconomowoc	0	0	343	8	0	0	343	8	Yes
City of Pewaukee	0	0	276	7	36	4	312	11	No
City of Waukesha	21	2	184	7	0	0	205	9	Yes
Village of Hartland	0	0	34	1	104	2	138	3	Yes
Village of Lannon	0	0	48	1	0	0	48	1	No
Village of Menomonee Falls	0	0	433	12	82	4	515	16	Yes
Village of Mukwonago	0	0	72	2	0	0	72	2	No
Village of Summit	0	0	85	2	19	2	104	4	No
Village of Sussex	0	0	112	5	96	4	208	9	Yes
Village of Wales	0	0	18	1	0	0	18	1	No
Town of Delafield	0	0	0	0	99	4	99	4	No
<b>Total</b>	<b>590</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>2,453</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>1,063</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>4,106</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>N/A</b>

<sup>a</sup> Local government zoning ordinance includes at least one zoning district that allows single-family residential lot sizes of 10,000 square feet or less as a principal use.

<sup>b</sup> The developments were accommodated under the Village Planned Unit Development Overlay District.

<sup>c</sup> Existing subdivision platted before 2010 where a school was allowed as a conditional use and demolished. Homes were constructed on the lots after 2010.

Source: SEWRPC

## Attachment 2

### MEMORANDUM

---

Date: February 24, 2020  
To: Christopher Hiebert, Chief Transportation Engineer, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission  
From: Tony Barth, Planning Chief, DTSD SE Region  
Jennifer Murray, Planning Section Chief, DTIM Bureau of Planning and Economic Development  
Subject: SEWRPC Vision 2050 Update  
Revenue Estimate and Freeway Construction and Reconstruction Project Cost

---

Mr. Hiebert,

Thank you for the information regarding the VISION 2050 plan update regarding arterial street and highway revenue estimates and estimates of cost and schedule for freeway and regionally significant surface arterial projects. You requested comments from WisDOT on these materials and welcomed any updates to the freeway cost estimates.

WisDOT has reviewed the information and has the following comments.

#### Revenue Estimates

1. Please cite the specific WisDOT Budget & Trends Report that is the source of Table 1.15 Estimate of Existing and Reasonably Expected Arterial Street and Highway Revenues.
2. For the SEWRPC Vision 2050 Plan Update, WisDOT concurs with estimate of \$60.75M bonding annually (100% Mega and 25% of Statewide Majors Programs)
3. For the SEWRPC Vision 2050 Plan Update, it is reasonable to assume a flat state budget rather than the 0.6% per year decrease stated in the materials.
4. For the SEWRPC Vision 2050 Plan Update, it is reasonable to estimate that freeway projects are funded using 100% of Mega and 25% of Statewide Majors for all sources. All SHR funds are used for large arterial and other state highway projects.

#### Project Cost Estimates

1. See cost estimate updates in column furthest to the right in Attachment 1. Cost estimates for IH 43, IH41/894, IH43/894 are lower due to recent work completed on bridge replacements, auxiliary lane, storm sewer, and noise wall construction. The remaining cost estimate updates are based on refined program level estimates which may include changes to project limits. Updated limits are included and described in footnotes at the bottom of the table. Note, IH 794 Lake IC is a newly defined project that has not been specified in previous versions of Vision 2050.
  - a. Where WisDOT does not provide updated cost estimates, 2017 costs may be inflated to current dollars if needed.

#### Fiscal Constraint

1. Recommend project schedule updates as provided in Attachment 1 for the unconstrained plan.
2. Recommend same project schedule updates as provided in Attachment 1 but prioritize Lake IC (due to projected structural needs) over other projects so that it is open to traffic between 2031-2035.

We look forward to continuing our work with you on this plan update.

**Attachment 2 (continued)**

MEMORANDUM

**Attachment 1**

Order of Freeway Projects	Freeway	Limits	SEWRPC	WisDOT
			2020 Vision Update (2017 \$M)	2019 estimates (2019 \$M)
1	IH 94 (EW)	70th Street to 16th Street (including Stadium IC)	\$ 911.6	\$ 871.0
2	IH 43	Silver Spring Drive to STH 60	\$ 474.3	\$ 551.6
3	IH 43, IH 41,894, IH 43/894 <sup>1</sup>	Moorland Road to Hale IC, Lincoln Avenue to 27th Street (including Hale IC)	\$ 1,021.6	\$ 881.0
4 (new)	IH 794 Lake IC <sup>2</sup>	Milwaukee River to Hoan Bridge	NA	\$ 200.0
5	IH 94 <sup>3</sup>	Willow Glen Road (Jefferson County) to Underwood Creek	\$ 1,021.2	\$ 1,119.0
6	IH 43	Howard Avenue to Silver Spring Drive (excluding Marquette IC)	\$ 817.9	\$ 1,110.0
7	IH 41	Burleigh Street to Richfield Interchange	\$ 874.5	\$ 1,058.0
8	IH 41	Richfield Interchange to Dodge County	\$ 421.8	\$ 433.0
9	IH 43 <sup>4</sup>	STH 20 to Moorland Road	\$ 326.7	\$ 435.0
10	IH 43	STH 60 to Sheboygan County	\$ 418.7	\$ 435.0
11	IH 43 <sup>5</sup>	Rock County to STH 20	\$ 626.4	\$ 550.0
No order identified	STH 175	Stadium Interchange to W. Lisbon Avenue	\$ 150.3	No updated estimate available
	US 12	Illinois to Rock County (including the extension of US 12 to Whitewater)	\$ 780.6	
	STH 145	Hampton Avenue to Good Hope Road	\$ 198.7	
	STH 16	STH 67 to IH 94	\$ 447.8	
	USH 45	Richfield Interchange to CTH D	\$ 330.9	
	<del>IH 43<sup>6</sup></del>	<del>IH 43 and US 12 Interchange</del>	<del>\$ 73.6</del>	

<sup>1</sup> Cost estimate reduced due to numerous bridge replacements, auxiliary lane, stormwater and noise wall construction. Western limit changed from Racine Ave (CTH Y) to Moorland Road

<sup>2</sup> New project, split off from previous larger projects

<sup>3</sup> Change west extent to include Willow Glen Road in Jefferson County

<sup>4</sup> Change west limit to STH 20

<sup>5</sup> Change east limit to STH 20

<sup>6</sup> Project removed from list. Now included in IH 43 Rock Co to STH 20