



City of Milwaukee

200 E. Wells Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin
53202

Meeting Minutes

CITY-COUNTY TASK FORCE ON CLIMATE AND ECONOMIC EQUITY

*Ald. Nik Kovac and
Sup. Marcelia Nicholson, Co-Chairs*

*Pam Fendt, Linda Frank, Julie Kerksick, Ted Kraig, Janet
Meissner Pritchard, Supreme Moore Omokunde, Pamela
Ritger, Erick Shambarger, Rafael Smith, and Freida Webb*

*Staff Assistant: Linda Elmer, lerner@milwaukee.gov,
414-286-2231
Legislative Liason: Luke Knapp, luke.knapp@milwaukee.gov,
414-286-8637*

*Google documents for this body can be found at :
<http://bit.ly/CCTFCEE>*

Tuesday, September 21, 2021

11:00 AM

Virtual

Transportation and Mobility Work Group

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/91080545858>

Meeting ID: 910 8054 5858

One tap mobile

+13126266799,,91080545858# US (Chicago)

+19294362866,,91080545858# US (New York)

Dial by your location

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 929 436 2866 US (New York)

+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

Meeting ID: 910 8054 5858

Find your local number: <https://zoom.us/u/abiLH3MXYT>

1. Call To Order (Time)

11:05am

2. Roll Call

Ted Kraig, Matt Donath, Dennis Grzezinski, Kevin Muhs, Pam Ritger, James Davies,

Jennifer Evans

3. Review and Approval of Minutes

Dennis Grzezinski– move to approval of Sep 7th minutes. No objections.

4. Process and Follow Up on Proposal Drafting

Ted – hoping to have a draft write up to submit to full task force by beginning of November.

Discussion with Matt prior to meeting of having one person from each subgroup commit to drafting their section of the plan.

Matt – Still waiting for more direction from Erick/Full task force on what level of detail is needed at this point since there was discussion of a consultant helping write the plan. We have a lot of the information already but will need to be organized depending on their input

5. Update on 30th Street Corridor Development Proposal – Pam Ritger

Pam – working with Rails to Trails to put together a letter to advocate for using ARPA funding to purchase this section of rail. City/County would potential be an easier path forward than the State, since we aren't sure how much control legislature would have over a project/ARP funding.

Sent a letter with business owners, stake holders, etc to all members of the common council and county supervisors. Some questions back from specific alders but overall supportive from a majority of elected officials.

Recently, Rep Goyke, who has been pushing for this idea for a long time, wanting the Governor and state DOT to purchase the railroad. Federal funding to help upgrade freight rail and additional funding to build trail and further upgrades.

Potential cost of \$15 million to purchase the railroad. Rep. Goyke was working with Governor Evers administration to see what the level of interest would be.

Benji Timm from DCD has been planning along the 30th St corridor and thought the state might be better suited to own this because they have the staff and expertise in this area already and the city/county does not.

Priority of Alder Bauman and others is making sure the rail can be used for a commuter rail – the bike trail would be secondary. The rail would get close to connecting to the intermodal station and would allow for connection to the Hop and downtown areas.

Kevin – the state owns numerous rails already and has agreements in place for Watco to “lease” and use their rails. The 30th ST corridor is unique in that Watco owns the rail outright, but if they are interested in selling to the state, it would return to the more “normal” arrangement.

6. Discussion of Public Transportation Subgroup Proposals

- Build 7 BRT corridors by 2030 –*
27th Street (currently undergoing corridor-level feasibility study) 16.9
- *Fond du Lac Avenue 13.3*
 - *National Avenue – Greenfield Avenue 8.3*
 - *Capitol Drive 11.3*
 - *East Side (Downtown to Bayshore, via UWM) 8.2*
 - *1st Street – Howell Avenue (including Bay View and MMIA) 13.8*
 - *Mayfair Road – 108th Street 12.5*

High level cost estimates:

Capital Cost: \$670 million to \$1.3 billion (in \$2020) to plan, design, and construct 84 miles of BRT (range depends on level of roadway reconstruction vs. dedicating existing travel lanes to transit)

Operating Cost: Up to \$40 million annually (in \$2020) to largely replace local services in these corridors with BRT, and increase frequencies slightly on most corridors (substantially on Mayfair Road – 108th Street line). Doesn't include any potential revenue increases from increased fare collections. These operating costs are estimates on the high end and have the potential to drop.

Reason for BRT is the low cost compared to light rail or other commuter options. This is already a major undertaking but converting to light rail or other by 2030 would be more difficult.

Ted – what is the difference between the low range and high range of costs?

Kevin – low end would be limited infrastructure changes, only building stations and painting the lanes for BRT. High end would be ideal scenario of infrastructure changes such as protected lanes, curbs, landscaping, other street changes to improve functionality.

Dennis – To have the impact we want, it must be paired with reducing single occupant vehicle trips and working to reduce subsidies for personal vehicles, promoting mass transit, etc.

Kevin – revenue and incentive side of this is important but to take equity part of the plan seriously, there needs to be reasonable alternatives to personal vehicle use.

Ted – any projects here planned to be redone so we can coordinate investments from state/ county?

Kevin – National Ave is planned to be redone soon, not the entire 8 mile stretch. It would require a shift in perspective from the DOT to include BRT in their initial plans.

Dennis – coalition that released an alternative to I94 expansion called for changed that coordinate with BRT. Could be opportunity to align.

Ted – potential cost is probably the largest ask in the plan. Is this something we could get federal money for?

Kevin – depending on administration, it should be somewhere between 50-80% federal funding. We also likely wouldn't be able to apply for federal funding for all of these between now and 2030 – the Senate likely wouldn't award Milwaukee that level of funding because it's a competitive process.

Increase the Frequency and Extent of Transit Service by XX%

Enhance the operations of the transit system. As soon as practicable, improve the frequency and hours of transit service in the County, prioritizing corridors that were unable to be enhanced under the budget limitations of MCTS NEXT. This would

include adding four additional High Frequency Routes (service every 15 minutes or better during the daytime), enhancing some existing High Frequency routes to come every 10 minutes during the daytime (all would be replaced by BRT routes once those are implemented, and therefore costs for this enhancement are not included below), extending the service hours of Daytime routes to include evening service, and extending service hours on some High Frequency corridors to provide 24 hours-a-day service on most days. Partner with van service providers to provide access to jobs in business parks not easily or efficiently served by fixed-route bus. More frequent service and extending the hours of service will enhance access to jobs, education, and other opportunities and basic needs for transit riders. It will also make the system more attractive to more members of the public, increasing ridership.

High level cost estimates:

Capital Costs (Bus purchases for additional High Frequency Routes): \$4 to 8 million (in \$2020)

Increased Operating Costs for:

- Additional High Frequency routes: \$4 to 5 million annually (in \$2020)*
 - Extending service hours of Daytime routes: \$1 million annually (in \$2020)*
 - Providing 24 hour service on select routes: \$2 to 2.5 million annually (in \$2020)*
 - On-Demand Van Service to business parks in Mequon, Germantown, Menomonee Falls, Brookfield, New Berlin, Franklin, and Oak Creek: \$XX annually (in \$2020)*
- Doesn't include any potential revenue increases from increased fare collections.*

Ted – potential funding source for increased operating costs?

Kevin – likely the only resource would be increase in vehicle registration fees. On demand service to business parks would make jobs more accessible and increase the overall effectiveness of the transit service. A more detailed cost estimate is being worked on and should be ready in October.

Dennis – currently Milwaukee residents without cars can only ride public transit to 124th and there is no additional public transit from there. The van service provides transportation to get these residents out to jobs that have left the City.

Kevin – locations listed are job centers and concentrated jobs within that area. Pick up and transfer locations are being sorted out and part of the cost proposal. Pick up locations would be well known locations that are near heavily used public transit

Increase Transit System Speed and Passenger Amenities

Identify capital funding sources to invest in physical infrastructure for the transit system to speed up service and improve passenger amenities. Infrastructure to speed up service includes piloting and then implementing bus lanes in congested areas along High Frequency routes and implementing transit signal priority along the same routes across the County to reduce the amount of time buses spend at red lights. Passenger amenities include enhanced shelters at high ridership stops and implementing basic shelters at many more stops across the County. Enhanced shelters would include more space, improved appearance, consideration of heating for waiting passengers, real-time information screens, and improved system information, among other amenities. All stops should be enhanced to meet current ADA standards, including a concrete pad where passengers board and alight, and an accessible sidewalk path to the nearest intersection and nearby destinations.

Enhanced shelters, ADA improvements, signal coordination/priority: Very context specific, but approximately \$1 to \$1.5 million per mile.

Some lack of clarity on “bang for your buck” on these amenities, but increase in

ridership and accessibility.

The costs listed are primarily capital costs, would not be an increase in operating costs. Potential operating cost increase if heated/cooled bus stops are included.

7. Public Questions or Comments – Up to 2 minutes per speaker

Speaker – wants to see more of a complete plan for transit that talks about the benefits to the city, not only the costs. Systems that connect all the major points of interests and drive reinvestment in the city rather than talking about getting commuter to the suburbs.

8. Next Meeting Date

Tuesday, October 5th, 11:00am

9. Adjourn (Time)

*12:09pm
Minutes provided by Ted Kraig.*