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INTRODUCTION

Over the past decade interest has developed in the Kenosha-Racine-Milwaukee (KRM) corridor for improved commuter transportation service. This interest has been manifested by the creation of a group involving major employers and municipalities and counties within the corridor which has as its objective the improvement of transit service within the corridor. The Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC), the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the seven-county Southeastern Wisconsin region, has completed two studies^1,2 which focus on transit improvements throughout the KRM corridor.

On behalf of an intergovernmental partnership of the counties and cities of Kenosha, Racine and Milwaukee, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) and SEWRPC, SEWRPC is undertaking the EIS and Project Development phase of the KRM Alternatives Analysis in order to produce a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), refine the previous alternatives analysis, and further develop a commuter transportation project within the corridor. This study is funded by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5309 “New Starts” program, WisDOT, and the members of the KRM intergovernmental partnership. The products of this study will be used to support an application to the FTA for funding of Preliminary Engineering (PE) under the FTA’s New Starts program.

---


The purpose of this report is to describe both the current Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Starts project evaluation and rating process as it applies to land use as well as the methodologies, strategies and activities that have been employed to produce a Transit Oriented Development Portfolio for each proposed station area.

Early in the process the decision was made that the basis for land use testing and evaluation in the KRM program would assume a commuter rail transit alternative for the eight stations that were discussed in the previous study. Host communities concurred with these station locations. A ninth station area was added at the request of the City of Milwaukee regarding a south side station location within the City.

II. THE ROLE OF STATION AREA PLANNING IN THE KRM ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

The Transit Oriented Land Use Report provides documentation of the level of socio-economic change foreseen along the corridor attributable to both the presence of transit and local community policy initiatives and programs which will direct the type, density and location of development. The FTA New Starts criteria reflect the importance of considering land use impacts in both market development of ridership for the transit system, as well as associated economic impacts which will accrue regionally in Southeastern Wisconsin.

An interactive process was undertaken with communities at selected station areas to define both real estate and market interest for transit supportive development. At the same time, it was important to understand community interest, support and capacity to realize identified development potentials.
The objectives of the FTA criteria, which seek to focus development and investment in and near station areas to induce transit ridership, must be balanced against local community land use development preferences in each location. Thus, an interactive process with local agencies to understand the way in which development and investment can be “captured” and measured at each transit station area was the focus of the work.

The development potential arising out of these analyses forms the basis for future policies and actions to be adopted and pursued by participating units of government and other interests to realize transit supportive land use in association with the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). The program results in the development of a unique Transit Oriented Development Portfolio which defines the level of anticipated socioeconomic change at each station area, along with attendant policies, initiatives and implementation strategies required to realize them. The process sought the necessary commitment and support from local units of government with land use and development control and authority to undertake these initiatives. This level of local support and commit provides the FTA clear demonstration and understanding of how the planned Transit Supportive Land Use and Future Development Patterns program will be realized in the future.

III. INTERFACE WITH THE FTA “NEW STARTS” EVALUATION PROCESS

In its evaluation of the land use affecting New Starts Projects, the FTA explicitly considers the following transit-supportive land use ranking
Land use and transit supportive policies are critical to a successful New Starts program.

The New Starts program is a nationally competitive process.

Land use and transit supportive policies are critical to a successful New Starts program.

categories and factors based on information submitted to the FTA by local agencies:

- Existing land use
- Transit supportive plans and policies, including the following factors:
  - Growth management
  - Transit-supportive corridor policies
  - Supportive zoning regulations near transit stations, and
  - Tools to implement land use policies
- Performance and impacts of policies, including the following factors:
  - Performance of land use policies, and
  - Potential impact of the envisioned transit project on regional land use

The FTA applies the “New Starts” criteria and measures to evaluate candidate transit improvement projects seeking federal capital or operating funding assistance. Funding for New Starts programs is a nationally competitive process. The KRM Commuter Link project will be judged against other projects using the criteria outlined above. In short, the degree to which a project can demonstrate land use planning and policies to promote transit, the greater the chances for funding support.

In order to complete an assessment of the KRM Commuter Link project relative to the FTA New Starts guidelines, a four step station area planning process was developed. It included, (1) an inventory and analysis of existing conditions, (2) the development of preliminary station area plans,

3 FTA FY 2006 New Starts Evaluation and Rating Process, Appendix D, Section II.C.
(3) the assessment of the performance and impacts of policies that encourage growth management, including transit-oriented development within and adjacent to potential station sites, and (4) the development of transit supportive policies, and local agency adoption of the station area program (Station Area Development Portfolio). The process is described in greater detail in Section IV. Overview of Technical Approach.

The measures by which transit supportive land use and future development patterns are evaluated include: existing land use patterns, plans and policies, and expected impacts. To this end, the transit supportive station area plans included here address and/or make recommendations with regard to the following factors, where applicable:

- Regional and community growth management, such as development concentrations and land conservation efforts;
- Transit supportive corridor policies, such as those which encourage higher density development patterns and enhance pedestrian access;
- Supportive zoning regulations near transit stations, such as increased density, appropriate building placement, and reduced off street parking requirements;
- Tools to implement land use policies, such as regulatory and financial incentives and outreach efforts;
- “Performance” of application of land use policies to comply with transit supportive land use regulations, such as current development proposals within one-half (1/2) mile of the station site; and
- Potential impacts of a transit project on overall land use, such as the adaptability of station area land for development or redevelopment.
IV. OVERVIEW OF TECHNICAL APPROACH

The Transit Oriented Development component of the KRM Alternatives Analysis consists of the following four elements:

1. Inventory and analysis,
2. Development of transit-supportive land use plans and policies,
3. Assessment of the performance and impacts of those plans and policies, and
4. Production of a Station Area Development Portfolio

Preparation of each of these elements included local community area review and public participation and input in the process. The remainder of this section describes the methodologies to be applied to the performance of each of these four elements of the KRM land use and development program.

V. INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS

The inventory and analysis phase of the planning process was intended to document conditions relevant to both the New Starts process, and the documentation necessary for communities to prepare informed station areas plans. The study area surrounding each preliminary station was determined to be one half mile, or roughly a ten minute walk from each station.
○ **Physical Conditions and Current Plans** - Existing land uses and physical conditions were determined through general field inspection and mapped for each station area. Access and circulation features and urban design elements present within each area were also documented.

A “windshield” survey was undertaken in each station area to view and record and photograph conditions first hand. This included documentation of handicapped accessibility, sidewalks and street connectivity, existing land uses, physical conditions, including sites subject to change, neighborhood and study area character, and other urban design and circulation features. A Geographic Information Systems (GIS) parcel-level mapping was developed for each station area. Base mapping resources included SEWRPC and the Counties of Milwaukee, Racine, and Kenosha.

Each community provided relevant data including comprehensive plans, growth and development plans, pending and planned development projects, street network information, zoning ordinances, local and regional policies and agreements, population, households and employment statistics, and site plans or descriptions of the station area.

The process resulted in the preparation of three maps, including both text and graphics describing existing conditions. These included: land use; circulation and access; and, urban design.
A real estate market analysis was conducted to determine the potential market over a fifteen year time frame.

Residential demand potential was generated by reviewing building permit activity and existing conditions.

A variety of techniques were utilized to determine retail demand.

Real Estate Market Overview Analysis - As part of the station area planning process a detailed market assessment was conducted in each station area to determine future market demand and development potential between the years 2005 and 2020, a fifteen year time frame. Future market potential for residential demand, retail demand, and office demand was generated.

To calculate residential demand for the half mile station area, the 2004 State of Wisconsin Department of Administration forecasts of population and households, 2005-2020 was utilized. Assumptions were made with regard to replacing older housing stock within the station area, and the percentage of units that represented. Building permit activity data was also reviewed to determine the pace of new construction in the past. Utilizing this information, the number of new residential units forecast over the next 15 years for the station area as a whole was estimated.

Retail demand was determined by assessing the availability of land in the station area, retail concentrations elsewhere in the community, and overall competitiveness of the station area for retail development. The type and scale of retail development that would be supportable at the station was determined by assessing population density, area demographics, retail sales, level of competition and retail market conditions. The estimates of supportable retail space were based on the strength of the station location and scale of retail development that the market could support.

The office potential at the station area was determined by evaluating the existing office inventory in the market radius, researching office
Office potential in the station area was another important component in the market analyst.

A summary of market demand is provided for each station area.

Vacancies and rental rates, determining office-prone employment trends, and assessing the employment base. The availability of land in the station area was also considered for the type and scale of development that could be supported.

The following table summarizes the market potential of each of the station area over a fifteen year period. Note that the market assessment is one element to be considered in developing preliminary land use concepts for the station area. Community policies and preferences for future development, and the long-term nature of the transit-supportive land use program are other significant factors. While the market analysis looked fifteen years into the future, proposed development and land use changes in the study reflect a thirty year planning horizon and are discussed later in this section.
The public involvement process is an important part in the land use component.

Stakeholder interviews provided the project team with insight from a variety of community representatives.

---

### Table 1
Station Area Market Demand, 2005-2020*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total Residential (units)</th>
<th>Total Retail (sq. ft)</th>
<th>Total Office (sq. ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somers</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>17,500-25,000</td>
<td>15,000-20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>40,000-55,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonia</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>110,000-140,000</td>
<td>40,000-50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Creek</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>105,000-125,000</td>
<td>60,000-80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Milwaukee</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>40,000-55,000</td>
<td>25,000-40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cudahy/St. Francis</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>70,000-100,000</td>
<td>40,000-55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Side Milwaukee</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>30,000-45,000</td>
<td>35,000-60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Milwaukee</td>
<td>4,520</td>
<td>325,000-450,000</td>
<td>900,000-1,050,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


- **Public Involvement** - The public involvement process included stakeholder interviews, issues and opportunity workshops, and design workshops at each of the nine station locations. Together, the station area interviews and workshops are an important component of the Public Information (PI) Plan for the study.

- **Stakeholder Interviews** – Stakeholder interviews provided the consulting team the opportunity to meet informally with a variety of individuals within a community area to gain first hand impressions regarding development potentials near candidate commuter station areas. Interview candidates were collaboratively identified between the project team and host communities with the intent of reaching a broad spectrum of community interests. The interviews provided the opportunity to meet with policy makers, citizens, developers, service agencies, and other community interests to understand current community plans, proposed projects, and other ideas for transit.
supportive land use. The dates of the stakeholder interviews follow.
Each of the stakeholder interviews were held at the respective city or village halls.

- Kenosha: Thursday, February 2, 2006
- Somers: Tuesday, February 7, 2006
- Racine: Thursday, March 16, 2006
- Caledonia: Thursday, February 9, 2006
- Oak Creek: Tuesday, May 9, 2006
- South Milwaukee: Tuesday, February 28, 2006
- Cudahy: Thursday, January 12, 2006
- St. Francis: Friday, March 10, 2006
- South Side Milwaukee: Saturday/Sunday, July 22/23, 2006
- Downtown Milwaukee: Friday, April 7, 2006

- **Station Area Workshops** – Public workshops were held in host communities to understand the station area needs and the type and mix of new development. The meetings served an educational function regarding the overall KRM Commuter Link project, as well as explaining the benefits of a transit oriented development program. The workshops allowed interested community members to voice their ideas, concerns, or aspirations for the area. “Issues and opportunities” for each of the station areas were documented and were integrated into the station area plans developed after the Inventory and Analysis phase of work. The Issues and Opportunities Workshops were held at the respective city or village halls in each of the communities on the following dates:
VI. STATION AREA PLAN CONCEPTS - FUTURE CONCEPT

In order to develop consensus around community’s preferences for transit supportive land use and development patterns, the project team prepared station area planning concepts for each station area. The Future Concept describes short and long term development potentials, as well as proposed land use, access and circulation, and urban design changes in the station area. The future land use and development concept is based on future market potential, community input, previous plans and policy initiatives, and land use planning analysis.

Future Land Use

Land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land use densities at each station area were determined between a combination of public input and preferences in the planning process, and working with local community planning staff to determine the future land used.
use categories and densities of development associated with each
category. The plans illustrate potential transit supportive land use and
development patterns, as well as key sites and properties which may be
“subject to change” in the future. Sites subject to change represent re-use
or redevelopment sites due to vacancy, underutilization, obsolescence, or
deterioration. The market analysis for the project projected demand to the
year 2015. Because the SEWRPC official forecast, and the project planning
horizon extend double the length of time – to the year 2035 - the amount of
development interpolated in the land use plans is roughly double the
amount of the market analysis.

The concept plans built upon current land use patterns and land use plans
and policies for each community to ensure a realistic picture. A comparison
of existing and future land uses is provided in the Station Area Plan
Concepts. The development potential for each station area, indicating the
proposed land uses changes over the thirty year period, 2005-2035, is
provided in the section on *Economic Effects*, below.

**Future Access and Circulation Patterns**

Considering land use plan recommendations, and current community plans
for street and other capital improvements, circulation and access
recommendations were developed. These included preliminary commuter
rail station facilities design, multimodal access needs, bicycle and sidewalk
improvements, parking, streetscape improvements, desirable street and rail
road grade separations, new street and circulation patterns, and related
improvements. Recommended improvements emphasized enhancing
multimodal access to commuter train stations and completing or developing
a strong and well connected bicycle and pedestrian network within the
Urban design plays an important role in successful transit oriented development.

Future Urban Design Framework

- The pedestrian streetscape experience
- Maintenance of the street wall (retail buildings with storefronts built up to the sidewalk)
- Open spaces, including public plazas and parks, all amenities for both cyclists and pedestrians, should be considered. An illustrative perspective of a significant street or feature within the station area is provided.
- The placement of commuter and station area parking in a manner which minimizes impacts to the pedestrian environment

Station Area Workshops

To build community consensus for preliminary preferred plans, station area workshops were conducted at each station area to receive community and stakeholder input and preferences with respect to the preliminary land use, circulation and access and urban design plans. Workshop ideas and suggestions which are consistent with sound land use and transit supportive development principles were incorporated into the plans. Station area workshops were held in host communities on the following dates:

- Kenosha   Thursday, June 20, 2006
- Somers    Thursday, August 10, 2006
- Racine    Thursday, June 29, 2006
- Caledonia  Wednesday, July 12, 2006
- Oak Creek  Thursday, July 27, 2006

in association with HNTB and Cambridge Systematics
VII. ECONOMIC EFFECTS

A key element of the New Starts process is the economic effects assessment of proposed transit supportive land uses. For this analysis, the project team quantified the following for each station study area:

- Number of new residential dwellings
- Square feet of new retail and office space
- Projected new population
- Projected new employment
- Increase in retail sales
- Increase in assessed valuation of real estate

As discussed in the land use section above, development quantities were derived from locations within each station area that are “subject to change” and thus are the locations of new development in each station study area.

Using this methodology the following development potential has been identified for each station area, for residential, retail, and office uses.

A comparison between 2020 market potential (Table 1) and year 2035 development potential for residential, retail and office uses is provided in Table 2. Based on this development potential, projected population and employment estimates are presented in Tables 3 and 4. Finally, the net
new overall assessed value of new development within the station study area and potential for new sales tax resulting from private real estate development was estimated and summarized.

### Table 2

Year 2035 Development Potential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>3,330</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>986,500</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somers</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>17,500-25,000</td>
<td>0**</td>
<td>15,000-20,000</td>
<td>0**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>40,000-55,000</td>
<td>372,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>154,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonia</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>2,115</td>
<td>110,000-140,000</td>
<td>311,500</td>
<td>40,000-50,000</td>
<td>244,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Creek</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>105,000-125,000</td>
<td>645,000</td>
<td>60,000-80,000</td>
<td>60,000-80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Milwaukee</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>2,085</td>
<td>40,000-55,000</td>
<td>660,000</td>
<td>25,000-40,000</td>
<td>465,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cudahy/St. Francis</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>70,000-100,000</td>
<td>1,145,000</td>
<td>40,000-55,000</td>
<td>87,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Side Milwaukee</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>30,000-45,000</td>
<td>1,130,000</td>
<td>35,000-60,000</td>
<td>462,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Milwaukee</td>
<td>4,520</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>325,000-450,000</td>
<td>2,390,000</td>
<td>900,000-1,050,000</td>
<td>3,090,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


** No future retail or office land uses are presented in the Somers Portfolio to reflect community input.
Population and Employment Characteristics

The future development quantities within each station area (Table 2) can be translated into population and employment change measures. Population estimates are provided in Table 3. In order to generate population estimates for the year 2035, parcels identified as "subject to change" in the Future Land Use Maps were utilized as these are the parcels where proposed development is expected to occur. Any parcels within the subject to change areas that had a residential component were extracted for further analysis. Utilizing the density assumptions that had been generated for each type of land use in the Future Land Use Maps, the number of dwelling units (i.e. households) were estimated by applying the density assumption to each parcel extracted. Next, average household size assumptions (generated for each county by SEWRPC as part of their 2035 forecasts) were applied to each dwelling unit. Note that average household size varied by type of household (single family versus multi family). The next step was to subtract the existing population from the projected population for the residential parcels being analyzed in order to get the net new population. The net new population estimate was added to the 2005 population estimate for the half mile area as presented in the Market Assessment report for a total estimated 2035 total population for the half mile area.

Table 4 following indicates the New Starts ranking criteria that identifies average population per square mile as a measure of density, and thus presents a greater potential for transit use. The population forecast (current and future population in station areas) has been calculated to persons per square mile in order to compare each station area to the New Starts ranking criteria.
### Table 3- Population Projections – Year 2035

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha</td>
<td>6,418</td>
<td>12,268</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>15,618</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somers</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>1,751</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>2,736</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine</td>
<td>5,756</td>
<td>12,268</td>
<td>113%</td>
<td>10,070</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonia</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td>5,294</td>
<td>264%</td>
<td>6,740</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Creek</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>5,251</td>
<td>600%</td>
<td>6,685</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Milwaukee</td>
<td>4,578</td>
<td>6,568</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>8,362</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cudahy</td>
<td>4,531</td>
<td>6,356</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>8,092</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Side</td>
<td>3,751</td>
<td>5,482</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>6,979</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>1,733</td>
<td>12,733</td>
<td>635%</td>
<td>16,210</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4- FTA New Starts Ranking Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Avg. Pop Density (persons/ sq. mile)</th>
<th>Minimum Population Required in Half Mile Station Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>&gt; 15,000</td>
<td>11,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>10,000-15,000</td>
<td>7,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>6,667 - 10,000</td>
<td>5,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Medium</td>
<td>3,333- 6,667</td>
<td>2,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>&lt; 3,333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employment estimates (number of jobs) are provided in Table 5. In order to generate employment estimates for the year 2035, parcels identified as "subject to change" in the Future Land Use Map were utilized as these are the parcels where proposed development is expected to occur. Parcels that had an employment based land use, i.e. office, commercial, or industrial, were extracted for further analysis. Applying the floor area ratio (FAR) assumptions presented in the Future Land Use Map, each parcel identified as office or commercial was assigned a total square foot calculation. Utilizing an employment standard developed by SEWRPC, a per square foot per employee ratio was applied in order to generate the number of employees for office and commercial land uses. For future industrial uses, a different SEWRPC standard was applied; i.e. .12 acres/employee ratio. Once total employment estimates were generated, the existing employment in the areas subject to change was subtracted out in order to obtain the number of net new jobs by the year 2035.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station Area</th>
<th>Total 2005 Employment</th>
<th>Total Projected Employment for 2035</th>
<th>% Change (2005-2035)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha</td>
<td>6,285</td>
<td>7,730</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somers</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine</td>
<td>2,578</td>
<td>4,023</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonia</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>520%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Creek</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1,456</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Milwaukee</td>
<td>2,897</td>
<td>4,747</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cudahy</td>
<td>2,237</td>
<td>4,437</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Side Milwaukee</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>4,039</td>
<td>143%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Milwaukee</td>
<td>33,128</td>
<td>43,478</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The future assessed value for the proposed land use development plans was generated.

Increased real estate assessed Values can be a strong indication of the effects of the transit supportive development program.

Assessed valuation was determined for both single family and multi family residential land uses.

Real Estate Development - Change in Assessed Values

Increased real estate assessed values can be a strong indication of the effects of the transit supportive development program. Based on comparable developments near each station area as identified as part of the market analysis, a general estimate of future net new assessed valuations was determined for each station area. In order to generate estimate future values, the following process was utilized.

The local assessor for each station areas was contacted to obtain the most current assessed values for those parcels identified as “subject to change”. Data is reported for both building and land values. The current building values for parcels subject to change were removed. Using the development quantities proposed for each station area, the study team developed an estimate of taxable increased assessed valuation as follows:

**Single Family:** The proposed new development was defined in number of new units. To determine the quantities of proposed new development as an increase in square feet, data provided by MTD Marketing Services LLC of Neenah, WI was utilized. Multiplying the average square foot size of single family homes (approximately 2,300 square feet) with the proposed number of new units, the study team defined the proposed total number of square feet for single family developments.

**Multi Family:** The proposed new development was defined in number of new units. An average square foot size for new multi family units of 1,500 square feet was utilized. Using average construction costs and a multiplier factor for other development costs, the total square foot value of proposed future multi family development was calculated.
Assessed values for future commercial, office, and industrial land uses were also calculated.

Local developers were interviewed to determine current building and sales costs in the area.

Commercial, Office and Industrial: The land use categories of future commercial, office and industrial development were defined as an increase in total square footage as identified above.

The estimates of building costs per square foot for multi family, commercial, office and industrial developments were obtained from RS Means Building Construction Cost Data 2007, 65th Edition. The median unit cost for each related category was used and the city cost indexes (Kenosha 1.011, Milwaukee 1.067, and Racine 1.017) were applied to obtain a more regional value of cost per square foot. The estimate of building costs for single family homes was obtained from MTD Marketing Services LLC data and interviews with local developers.

To convert the building costs to sales cost for single family and multi family, the market assessment for each station area and local interviews with active developers were relied on. Interviews with regional government agencies, condominium developers and commercial developers provided data for the study team to establish a ratio for commercial, office, and industrial development. A multiplier of 2.0 for single family homes, 1.8 for multi-family developments, and 1.5 for commercial, office and industrial was applied to the respective building costs and reported as sales cost in the Economic Effects Table for each station.

Finally, future assessed values were assumed at 100% of sales cost. In those cases where the community’s values were not assessed at 100%, the current equalizer rate of that community was applied to establish the 100% assessed value (in today’s dollars) for existing parcels in the subject to change area.
This data is presented for each station area in the Economic Effects Tables in the Appendix. The tables define the assessed value for future development in each land use category. The final tabulation shows the net change in assessed value for all future proposed development.

**Increase in Retail Sales Taxes**

In order to determine the potential for additional retail sales, proposed retail development square footage was multiplied by the average sales per square foot per year to establish the total retail sales revenue per square foot per year. Retail sales data was derived from Urban Land Institute report of “Stores in US Neighborhood Shopping Centers 1995 and US Mall Report 2006”. The sales performance figure used is $250.00 per square foot. The current retail sales tax for each community was applied to this total and is reported as the retail sales tax revenue per year on proposed future retail development. This data is shown in a table for each of the communities with proposed future retail development.

Note that the City of Milwaukee has created a local exposition district, “The Wisconsin Center District” which is contiguous with Milwaukee County. Within this district, food and beverages for on-premise consumption are subject to a .25% tax, rental cars to a 3% tax and hotel rooms and other temporary lodging to a tax up to 9%. The room tax consists of a basic 2% room tax and, for rooms furnished within the City of Milwaukee, an “additional” 7% room tax. These taxes are not included in these reports: but would be applicable to respective developments in cities located in the County of Milwaukee. The proposed increase in annual assessed values, the potential increase in annual retail sales and sales tax for each station area is presented below in Table 6.
Table 6 provides a summary of assessed values, proposed, retail sales, and proposed sales tax revenues in 2006 dollars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station Area</th>
<th>Proposed Increase in Assessed Values Per Year (in millions)*</th>
<th>Proposed Retail Sales per Year (in millions)*</th>
<th>Proposed Retail Sales Tax Revenues (in millions)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha</td>
<td>$956.5</td>
<td>$83.4</td>
<td>$4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somers</td>
<td>$105.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine</td>
<td>$495.4</td>
<td>$46.5</td>
<td>$2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonia</td>
<td>$668.9</td>
<td>$31.0</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Creek</td>
<td>$812.4</td>
<td>$71.8</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Milwaukee</td>
<td>$724.3</td>
<td>$57.5</td>
<td>$3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cudahy</td>
<td>$645.0</td>
<td>$100.0</td>
<td>$5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Side Milwaukee</td>
<td>$568.9</td>
<td>$142.0</td>
<td>$8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Milwaukee</td>
<td>$2,938.1</td>
<td>$218.8</td>
<td>$12.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In 2006 dollars
VIII. TRANSIT SUPPORTIVE POLICIES

Major policy initiatives to facilitate transit supportive development in order to realize desired land use and economic effects were identified for sub-regional and local implementation. Included in this analysis are the policy implications of the proposed program addressing current land use planning recommendations, regulatory environment for achieving desired transit oriented development densities, parking and access, economic development and implementation objectives and needs. Transit supportive policy recommendations that would facilitate transit supportive development within the system were outlined to establish the field of policy initiatives and commitments needed by governmental and other agencies to realize desired land use and economic effects.

It is important to point out that many communities already apply a number of existing transit supportive policies which should remain. These have been identified in the analysis. Further, new transit supportive policy recommendations are characterized as follows:

- **Transportation Infrastructure** – identifies appropriate transportation infrastructure that would be conducive to a pedestrian friendly transit oriented district
- **Planning Initiatives** – recommends key policy initiatives to encourage a range of land uses, including residential, commercial, civic, and employment uses
- **Design Guidelines** – identifies appropriate street and building characteristics that are conducive to a pedestrian friendly, transit oriented district
• **Zoning** – provides appropriate zoning tools that would allow for appropriate transit oriented developments, including mixed-use, density bonuses and density flexibility, shared parking, bicycle amenities, high quality architecture, and stricter code enforcement

• **Development Review** – recommends expedited review processes for those proposed developments within the station area.

• **Financing Tools** - suggests finance and redevelopment finance tools, land assembly, and federal and state funding sources that allocate funds to transit supportive infrastructure and programs

Given the fact that transit service in the corridor is several years away, adopted policies which will encourage implementation are important to provide future, incremental direction to managing development and redevelopment which is conducive to transit when service begins.

**IX. STATION AREA DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO**

The Station Area Development Portfolio documents the key outcomes of the commuter station area planning program as described above. The Station Area Development Portfolios include the anticipated land use program, economic benefits, land use supportive policies and key implementation strategies to achieve station area transit supportive development goals. The Portfolio also includes a review of the station area planning program and incorporates the design plans for each station location.
X. COMMUNITY ACCEPTANCE AND RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT

The program has solicited the endorsement of all local governments hosting a transit station within their community. Each community’s body of government was given a presentation on the Portfolio and then asked to approve a Resolution in support of the land use program. Meeting dates for each community when the Resolution was adopted are as follows:

- Kenosha City Council: November 20, 2006
- Somers Town Board: December 12, 2006
- Racine City Council: December 19, 2006
- Caledonia Village Board: January 16, 2007
- Oak Creek: December 19, 2006
- South Milwaukee: November 21, 2006
- Cudahy: November 8, 2006
- South Side Milwaukee: tbd
- Downtown Milwaukee: tbd

A copy of each Resolution is provided in the Appendix to this report.
Appendix
Economic Effects Tables
Kenosha Station Economic Effects

### Real Estate Development Economic Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Proposed Development</th>
<th>Proposed Increase in Number of Units</th>
<th>Proposed Sq. Ft. Increase</th>
<th>Building Costs per Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Building Costs</th>
<th>Sales Cost</th>
<th>Current Assessed Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>187,200</td>
<td>$68.00</td>
<td>$12,729,600.00</td>
<td>$25,459,200.00</td>
<td>25,459,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family</td>
<td>3258</td>
<td>4,887,000</td>
<td>$97.00</td>
<td>$474,039,000.00</td>
<td>$853,270,200.00</td>
<td>853,270,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>986,500</td>
<td>$92.00</td>
<td>$90,758,000.00</td>
<td>$136,137,000.00</td>
<td>136,137,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$577,526,600.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,014,866,400.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,014,866,400.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessed Value of Proposed Development: $1,014,866,400.00
Current Assessed Value of Subject to Change Parcels: $58,337,760.00
Net Change: $956,528,640.00
Percentage Change: 1639.64%

### Retail Sales Economic Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Retail Sq. Ft. Increase</th>
<th>Sales per sq.ft./year</th>
<th>Total Retail Sales Revenue per sq.ft./year</th>
<th>Retail Sales Tax Revenue (5.5% Current Rate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>333,750</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$83,437,500.00</td>
<td>$4,589,062.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Somers Station Economic Effects

#### Real Estate Development Economic Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Proposed Development</th>
<th>Proposed Total Number of Units</th>
<th>Proposed Total Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Building Costs per Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Building Costs</th>
<th>Sales Cost</th>
<th>Current Assessed Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>303,600</td>
<td>$102.00</td>
<td>$30,967,200.00</td>
<td>$61,934,400.00</td>
<td>$61,934,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>258,000</td>
<td>$97.50</td>
<td>$25,155,000.00</td>
<td>$45,279,000.00</td>
<td>$45,279,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>310</strong></td>
<td><strong>561,600</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$56,122,200.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$107,213,400.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$107,213,400.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Assessed Value of Proposed Development: $107,213,400.00
- Current Assessed Value of Subject to Change Parcels: $2,681,800.00
- **Net Change**: $104,531,600.00
- **Percentage Change**: 3897.81%

#### Retail Sales Economic Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Retail Sq. Ft. Increase</th>
<th>Sales per sq. ft./year</th>
<th>Total Retail Sales Revenue per sq. ft./year</th>
<th>Retail Sales Tax Revenue (5.1% Current Rate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>186,000</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Real Estate Development Economic Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Proposed Development</th>
<th>Proposed Total Number of Units</th>
<th>Proposed Total Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Building Costs per Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Building Costs</th>
<th>Sales Cost</th>
<th>Current Assessed Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
<td>$97.00</td>
<td>$232,800,000.00</td>
<td>$419,040,000.00</td>
<td>419,040,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>488,000</td>
<td>$92.00</td>
<td>$44,896,000.00</td>
<td>$67,344,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>67,344,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>154,500</td>
<td>$108.00</td>
<td>$16,686,000.00</td>
<td>$25,029,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,029,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$294,382,000.00</td>
<td>$511,413,000.00</td>
<td>$511,413,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessed Value of Proposed Development: $511,413,000.00

Current Assessed Value of Subject to Change Parcels: $15,992,300.00

Net Change: $495,420,700.00

Percentage Change: 3097.87%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Retail Sq. Ft. Increase</th>
<th>Sales per sq.ft./year</th>
<th>Total Retail Sales per sq.ft./year</th>
<th>Retail Sales Tax Revenue (5.1% Current Rate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>186,000</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$46,500,000.00</td>
<td>$2,371,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Caledonia Station Economic Effects

#### Real Estate Development Economic Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Proposed Development</th>
<th>Proposed Total Number of Units</th>
<th>Proposed Total Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Building Costs per Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Building Costs</th>
<th>Sales Cost</th>
<th>Current Assessed Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>481,740</td>
<td>$102.00</td>
<td>$49,137,480.00</td>
<td>$98,274,960.00</td>
<td>98,274,960.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>2,847,000</td>
<td>$97.50</td>
<td>$277,562,500.00</td>
<td>$499,648,500.00</td>
<td>499,648,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311,500</td>
<td>$92.60</td>
<td>$28,844,900.00</td>
<td>$43,267,350.00</td>
<td>43,267,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>244,000</td>
<td>$109.00</td>
<td>$26,596,000.00</td>
<td>$39,894,000.00</td>
<td>39,894,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$382,160,880.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$681,084,810.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$681,084,810.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessed Value of Proposed Development $681,084,810.00

Current Assessed Value of Subject to Change Parcels $12,182,682.00

Net Change $668,902,128.00

Percentage Change 5490.60%

#### Retail Sales Economic Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Retail Sq. Ft. Increase</th>
<th>Sales per sq. ft./year</th>
<th>Total Retail Sales Revenue per sq. ft./year</th>
<th>Retail Sales Tax Revenue (5.1% Current Rate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>124,650</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$31,162,500.00</td>
<td>$1,589,287.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Real Estate Development Economic Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Proposed Development</th>
<th>Proposed Total Number of Units</th>
<th>Proposed Total Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Building Costs per Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Building Costs</th>
<th>Sales Cost</th>
<th>Current Assessed Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>437,000</td>
<td>$86.00</td>
<td>$37,582,000.00</td>
<td>$75,164,000.00</td>
<td>75,164,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family</td>
<td>2410</td>
<td>3,615,000</td>
<td>$102.00</td>
<td>$368,730,000.00</td>
<td>$663,714,000.00</td>
<td>663,714,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td>645,000</td>
<td>$97.00</td>
<td>$62,565,000.00</td>
<td>$93,847,500.00</td>
<td>93,847,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$468,877,000.00</td>
<td>$832,725,500.00</td>
<td>$832,725,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessed Value of Proposed Development** $832,725,500.00  
**Current Assessed Value of Subject to Change Parcels** $20,231,256.00  
**Net Change** $812,494,244.00  
**Percentage Change** 4016.03%

### Retail Sales Economic Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Retail Sq. Ft. Increase</th>
<th>Sales per sq.ft./year</th>
<th>Total Retail Sales Revenue per sq.ft./year</th>
<th>Retail Sales Tax Revenue (5.6% Current Rate)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>287,500</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$71,875,000.00</td>
<td>$4,025,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Additional City of Milwaukee Wisconsin Center District taxes may apply.
### South Milwaukee Station Economic Effects

#### Real Estate Development Economic Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Proposed Development</th>
<th>Proposed Total Number of Units</th>
<th>Proposed Total Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Building Costs per Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Building Costs</th>
<th>Sales Cost</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family</td>
<td>2085</td>
<td>3,127,500</td>
<td>$102.00</td>
<td>$319,005,000.00</td>
<td>$574,209,000.00</td>
<td>$574,209,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>660,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>$97.00</td>
<td>$64,020,000.00</td>
<td>$96,030,000.00</td>
<td>$96,030,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>465,000</td>
<td>465,000</td>
<td>$114.00</td>
<td>$53,010,000.00</td>
<td>$79,515,000.00</td>
<td>$79,515,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>$63.00</td>
<td>$2,520,000.00</td>
<td>$3,780,000.00</td>
<td>$3,780,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$438,555,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$753,534,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$753,534,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessed Value of Proposed Development: $753,534,000.00

Current Assessed Value of Subject to Change Parcels: $29,172,776.00

Net Change: $724,361,224.00

Percentage Change: 2483.00%

#### Retail Sales Economic Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Retail Sq. Ft. Increase</th>
<th>Sales per sq.ft./year</th>
<th>Total Retail Sales Revenue per sq.ft./year</th>
<th>Retail Sales Tax Revenue (5.6% Current Rate)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$57,500,000.00</td>
<td>$3,220,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Additional City of Milwaukee Wisconsin District taxes may apply.
### Cudahy/St Francis Station Economic Effects

#### Real Estate Development Economic Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Proposed Development</th>
<th>Proposed Total Number of Units</th>
<th>Proposed Total Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Building Costs per Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Building Costs</th>
<th>Sales Cost</th>
<th>Current Assessed Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family</td>
<td>2140</td>
<td>3,210,000</td>
<td>$102.00</td>
<td>$327,420,000.00</td>
<td>$589,356,000.00</td>
<td>589,356,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>1,145,000</td>
<td>$97.00</td>
<td>$111,065,000.00</td>
<td>$166,597,500.00</td>
<td>166,597,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>87,000</td>
<td>87,000</td>
<td>$114.00</td>
<td>$9,918,000.00</td>
<td>$14,877,000.00</td>
<td>14,877,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$448,403,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$770,830,500.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$770,830,500.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessed Value of Proposed Development** $770,830,500.00

**Current Assessed Value of Subject to Change Parcels** $125,792,555.00

**Net Change** $645,037,945.00

**Percentage Change** 512.78%

### Retail Sales Economic Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Retail Sq. Ft. Increase</th>
<th>Sales per sq. ft./year</th>
<th>Total Retail Sales Revenue per sq. ft./year</th>
<th>Retail Sales Tax Revenue (5.6% Current Rate)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$100,000,000.00</td>
<td>$5,600,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Additional City of Milwaukee Wisconsin District taxes may apply
### South Side Milwaukee Station

#### Real Estate Development Economic Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Proposed Development</th>
<th>Proposed Increase in Number of Units</th>
<th>Proposed Sq. Ft. Increase</th>
<th>Building Costs per Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Building Costs</th>
<th>Sales Cost</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>1,882,500</td>
<td>$102.00</td>
<td>$192,015,000.00</td>
<td>$345,627,000.00</td>
<td>345,627,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>1,136,708</td>
<td>$97.00</td>
<td>$110,260,768.00</td>
<td>$165,391,014.00</td>
<td>165,391,014.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>462,475</td>
<td>$114.00</td>
<td>$52,722,150.00</td>
<td>$79,083,225.00</td>
<td>79,083,225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$354,997,826.00</td>
<td>$590,101,239.00</td>
<td>$590,101,239.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Assessed Value of Proposed Development**: $354,997,826.00
- **Current Assessed Value of Subject to Change Parcels**: $21,114,663.00
- **Net Change**: $568,886,576.00
- **Percentage Change**: 2694.75%

#### Retail Sales Economic Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Retail Sq. Ft. Increase</th>
<th>Sales per sq.ft./year</th>
<th>Total Retail Sales Revenue per sq.ft./year</th>
<th>Retail Sales Tax Revenue (5.6% Current Rate)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>568,354</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$142,088,500.00</td>
<td>$7,956,956.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Additional City of Milwaukee Wisconsin Center District taxes may apply.

---

in association with HNTB and Cambridge Systematics
### Downtown Milwaukee Station

#### Real Estate Development Economic Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Proposed Development</th>
<th>Proposed Total Number of Units</th>
<th>Proposed Total Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Building Costs per Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Building Costs</th>
<th>Sales Cost</th>
<th>Current Assessed Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>11,850,000</td>
<td>$102.00</td>
<td>$1,208,700,000.00</td>
<td>$2,175,660,000.00</td>
<td>2,175,660,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>2,393,000</td>
<td>232,121,000</td>
<td>$97.00</td>
<td>$232,121,000.00</td>
<td>$348,181,500.00</td>
<td>348,181,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>3,095,500</td>
<td>352,887,000</td>
<td>$114.00</td>
<td>$352,887,000.00</td>
<td>$529,330,500.00</td>
<td>529,330,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>13,860,000</td>
<td>$63.00</td>
<td>$13,860,000.00</td>
<td>$20,790,000.00</td>
<td>20,790,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,807,568,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,807,568,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,073,962,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,073,962,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessed Value of Proposed Development: $3,073,962,000.00

Current Assessed Value of Subject to Change Parcels: $135,845,758.00

Net Change: $2,938,116,242.00

Percentage Change: 2162.83%

#### Retail Sales Economic Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Retail Sq. Ft. Increase</th>
<th>Sales per sq. ft.</th>
<th>Total Retail Sales Revenue per sq.ft.</th>
<th>Retail Sales Tax Revenue (5.6% Current Rate)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>875,000</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$218,750,000.00</td>
<td>$12,250,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Additional City of Milwaukee Wisconsin Center District taxes may apply.
RESOLUTION NO: 130-06

BY: THE MAYOR

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE KENOSHA, RACINE AND MILWAUKEE (KRM) COMMUTER LINK STATION AREA PLANNING PROGRAM IN KENOSHA, WISCONSIN

WHEREAS, the Counties and Cities of Milwaukee, Racine, and Kenosha, in cooperation with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation have agreed to sponsor a Transit Alternatives Analysis Corridor Study/Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for enhanced public transit service generally east of I-94 in the Counties of Kenosha, Racine and Milwaukee; and

WHEREAS, the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC), through an intergovernmental agreement, has agreed to serve as project manager for the purpose of managing the Transit Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (AA/DEIS); and

WHEREAS, the KRM project purpose and need is to provide high quality transit service connecting Kenosha, Racine, and Milwaukee Counties with each other and with Northeastern Illinois improving access to jobs and labor force, encouraging high density mixed use and more efficient land development around stations, and attracting increased transit ridership potentially reducing highway traffic volumes and congestion and attendant air pollutant emissions; and

WHEREAS, the SEWRPC seeks to meet the requirements of the Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) New Starts Program for the project to be eligible for discretionary capital funding; and

WHEREAS, among other criteria, the FTA places importance on transit supportive land-use planning and development in transit station areas, as a means of building ridership to support proposed projects; and

WHEREAS, preliminary station area development plans for the existing Kenosha commuter rail station at 54th Street and 13th Avenue and the Union Pacific Railroad have been developed and included as part of the KRM Transit Oriented Development Portfolio; and

WHEREAS, Kenosha has reviewed the preliminary transit supportive land use plans and policies.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Common Council of the City of Kenosha, Wisconsin, as follows:
Section One. The Kenosha area will benefit from the proposed expanded transit service connecting Kenosha, Milwaukee, and Racine Counties with each other and with Northeastern Illinois and also from the transit oriented development around its proposed commuter rail station.

Section Two. The station area plans developed as part of the KRM Commuter Link study for Kenosha, and included in the KRM Transit Oriented Development Portfolio, is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Kenosha land use and Comprehensive Plan.

Section Three. That Kenosha endorses the station area plan and policies and will take appropriate steps toward implementation as recommended as part of the KRM Transit Oriented Development Portfolio if commuter rail is chosen for implementation.

Section Four. That Kenosha urges FTA acceptance and endorsement of the complete KRM Transit Oriented Development Portfolio.

Dated this 20th day of November, 2006.

Attest: Debra L. Salas
Deputy City Clerk

Approve: John M. Antaramian
Mayor
Date: November 21, 2006

Drafted by: Department of City Development
1CPC/2006/Nov9/resol-krm
STATE OF WISCONSIN)  
(COUNTY OF KENOSHA)

JEAN ANDERSON, being first duly sworn on oath deposes and says that on the  
13 day of Dec., A.D., 2006, she posted in at least three of the most  
public places in the Town of Somers, Kenosha County, Wisconsin to wit:

Somers Town Hall  
7511 12th Street  
Somers, Wisconsin

Somers Fire Station #2  
818 12th Street  
Somers, Wisconsin

Somers Post Office  
Somers, Wisconsin

Fair, true and complete copies of Resolution 34-06, Resolution Supporting the  
Kenosha, Racine and Milwaukee (KRM) Commuter Link Station Area Planning  
Program in Town of Somers, Wisconsin.

Affiant further states that attached hereto and made a part of this affidavit is a  
fair, true and complete copy of said Resolution and that the copy which she  
posted are in all respects fair, true and complete copies of said Resolution is  
hereto attached and made a part hereof.

\[Signature\]  
JEAN ANDERSON, DEPUTY TOWN CLERK

Subscribed and sworn to before me  
this 13 day of Dec., A.D., 2006

\[Signature\]  
Diane Apostol
Notary Public, Kenosha County, Wisconsin
My commission expires: Aug 2, 2009
A RESOLUTION
SUPPORTING THE KENOSHA, RACINE AND MILWAUKEE (KRM) COMMUTER LINK STATION AREA PLANNING PROGRAM IN TOWN OF SOMERS, WISCONSIN

Whereas, the Counties and Cities of Milwaukee, Racine, and Kenosha in cooperation with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation have agreed to sponsor a Transit Alternatives Analysis Corridor Study/Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for enhanced public transit service in the Counties of Kenosha, Racine and Milwaukee; and

Whereas, the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC), through an intergovernmental agreement, has agreed to serve as project manager for the purpose of managing the Transit Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (AA/DEIS); and

Whereas, the KRM project purpose and need is to provide high quality transit service connecting Kenosha, Racine, and Milwaukee Counties with counties in Northeastern Illinois, improving access to jobs and labor force and attracting increased transit ridership as well as potentially reducing highway traffic volumes and congestion and attendant air pollutant emissions; and

Whereas, the SEWRPC seeks to meet the requirements of the Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) New Starts program in order for the project to be eligible for discretionary capital funding; and

Whereas, among other criteria, the FTA places importance on transit supportive land-use planning and development in transit station areas, as a means of building ridership to support proposed projects; and

Whereas, tentative station area development plans for the Town of Somers proposed commuter rail station and the Union Pacific Railroad have been proposed and included as part of the KRM Commuter Link Transit Supportive Land-Use Plans and Policies Portfolio; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE TOWN BOARD OF THE TOWN OF SOMERS, WISCONSIN, AS FOLLOWS:

Section One. The Town of Somers will benefit from the proposed expanded transit service connecting Kenosha, Milwaukee, and Racine Counties and with counties in Northeastern Illinois and from the transit oriented development around its proposed commuter rail station.
Section Two. The Town of Somers urges FTA acceptance and endorsement of the concept of *KRM Commuter Link Transit Supportive Land-Use Plans and Policies Portfolio*.

THIS RESOLUTION WAS PASSED AND APPROVED THE **12** DAY OF December, 2006 BY THE TOWN OF SOMERS, WISCONSIN.

TOWN OF SOMERS

By: Carol Fischer, Chairperson

Attest: Jean Anderson, Deputy Clerk/Treasurer
Support of the Kenosha, Racine, and Milwaukee (KRM) Commuter Link Station Area Planning Program in Racine, Wisconsin

Whereas, the Counties and Cities of Milwaukee, Racine, and Kenosha, in cooperation with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation, are sponsoring a Transit Alternatives Analysis Corridor Study/Draft Environmental Impact Study for enhanced public transit service; and

Whereas, the project purpose and need is to provide high quality transit service connecting Kenosha, Racine, and Milwaukee Counties (KRM) with each other and with Northeastern Illinois thereby improving access to jobs and labor force, encouraging high density mixed use and more efficient land development around stations, and attracting increased transit ridership potentially reducing highway traffic volumes and congestion and attendant air pollutant emissions; and

Whereas, the KRM project seeks to meet the requirements of the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) New Starts program in order for the project to be eligible for discretionary capital funding; and

Whereas, among other criteria, the FTA places importance on transit supportive land-use planning and development in transit station areas, as a means of building ridership to support proposed projects; and

Whereas, preliminary station area development plans for the Racine commuter rail station on the Union Pacific Railroad line at State Street have been developed and included as part of the KRM Commuter Link Transit Supportive Land-Use Plans and Policies Portfolio; and

Whereas, the City of Racine has reviewed the preliminary transit supportive land use plans and policies.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the Common Council of the City of Racine, that the City of Racine will benefit from the proposed expanded transit service connecting Kenosha, Milwaukee, and Racine Counties with each other and with Northeastern Illinois and also from the transit oriented development around its proposed commuter rail station.

Further resolved, that the station area plan developed as part of the KRM Commuter Link study for the City of Racine and included in the Transit Supportive Land-Use Plans and Policies Portfolio is consistent with the goals and objectives of the City of Racine's land use and comprehensive plans.

Further Resolved, that the City of Racine endorses the station area plan and policies and will
take appropriate steps toward implementation as recommended as part of the Transit Supportive Land-Use Plans and Policies Portfolio if commuter rail is chosen for implementation.

Further Resolved, that the City of Racine urges FTA acceptance and endorsement of the complete KRM Commuter Link Transit Supportive Land-Use Plans and Policies Portfolio.

Fiscal Note: N/A
RESOLUTION NO. 06-35

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE KENOSHA, RACINE AND MILWAUKEE (KRM) COMMUTER LINK STATION AREA PLANNING PROGRAM IN SOUTH MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN

WHEREAS, the Counties and Cities of Milwaukee, Racine, and Kenosha in cooperation with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation have agreed to sponsor a Transit Alternatives Analysis Corridor Study/Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for enhanced public transit service generally east of I-94 in the Counties of Kenosha, Racine and Milwaukee; and

WHEREAS, the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC), through an intergovernmental agreement, has agreed to serve as project manager for the purpose of managing the Transit Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (AA/DEIS); and

WHEREAS, the KRM project purpose and need is to provide high quality transit service connecting Kenosha, Racine, and Milwaukee Counties with each other and with Northeastern Illinois improving access to jobs and labor force, encouraging high density mixed use and more efficient land development around stations, and attracting increased transit ridership potentially reducing highway traffic volumes and congestion and attendant air pollutant emissions; and

WHEREAS, the SEWRPC seeks to meet the requirements of the Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) New Starts program in order for the project to be eligible for discretionary capital funding; and

WHEREAS, among other criteria, the FTA places importance on transit supportive land-use planning and development in transit station areas, as a means of building ridership to support proposed projects; and

WHEREAS, preliminary station area development plans for the City of South Milwaukee proposed commuter rail station on Milwaukee Avenue and the Union Pacific Railroad have been developed and included as part of the KRM Commuter Link Transit Supportive Land-Use Plans and Policies Portfolio; and

WHEREAS, the City of South Milwaukee has reviewed the preliminary transit supportive land use plans and policies.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED, by the Common Council of the City of South Milwaukee, as follows:

Section One. The City of South Milwaukee will benefit from the proposed expanded transit service connecting Kenosha, Milwaukee, and Racine Counties with each
other and with Northeastern Illinois and also from the transit oriented development around its proposed commuter rail station.

Section Two. The station area plans developed as part of the KRM Commuter Link study for the City of South Milwaukee, and included in the Transit Supportive Land-Use Plans and Policies Portfolio, is consistent with the goals and objectives of the City of South Milwaukee land use and comprehensive plans.

Section Three. The City of South Milwaukee endorses the station area plan and policies and will take appropriate steps toward implementation as recommended as part of the Transit Supportive Land-Use Plans and Policies Portfolio if commuter rail is chosen for implementation.

Section Four. The City of South Milwaukee urges FTA acceptance and endorsement of the complete KRM Commuter Link Transit Supportive Land-Use Plans and Policies Portfolio.

THOMAS ZEPECKI, Mayor

Attest:

KATHLEEN M. LISOWSKI, City Clerk

Adopted: November 21, 2006

Approved: November 22, 2006
RESOLUTION 6361
SUPPORTING THE KENOSHA, RACINE AND MILWAUKEE (KRM) COMMUTER LINK STATION AREA PLANNING PROGRAM IN (CITY OF CUDAHY), WISCONSIN

Whereas, the Counties and Cities of Milwaukee, Racine, and Kenosha in cooperation with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation have agreed to sponsor a Transit Alternatives Analysis Corridor Study/Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for enhanced public transit service generally east of I-94 in the Counties of Kenosha, Racine and Milwaukee; and

Whereas, the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC), through an intergovernmental agreement, has agreed to serve as project manager for the purpose of managing the Transit Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (AA/DEIS); and

Whereas, the KRM project purpose and need is to provide high quality transit service connecting Kenosha, Racine, and Milwaukee Counties with each other and with Northeastern Illinois improving access to jobs and labor force, encouraging high density mixed use and more efficient land development around stations, and attracting increased transit ridership potentially reducing highway traffic volumes and congestion and attendant air pollutant emissions; and

Whereas, the SEWRPC seeks to meet the requirements of the Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) New Starts program in order for the project to be eligible for discretionary capital funding; and

Whereas, among other criteria, the FTA places importance on transit supportive land-use planning and development in transit station areas, as a means of building ridership to support proposed projects; and

Whereas, preliminary station area development plans for the (City of Cudahy) proposed commuter rail station at (street location) and the Union Pacific Railroad have been developed and included as part of the KRM Commuter Link Transit Supportive Land-Use Plans and Policies Portfolio; and

Whereas, the (City of Cudahy) has reviewed the preliminary transit supportive land use plans and policies;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL, OF THE (CITY OF CUDAHY), WISCONSIN, AS FOLLOWS:
Section One. The (City of Cudahy) will benefit from the proposed expanded transit service connecting Kenosha, Milwaukee, and Racine Counties with each other and with Northeastern Illinois and also from the transit oriented development around its proposed commuter rail station.

Section Two. The station area plans developed as part of the KRM Commuter Link study for the (City of Cudahy), and included in the Transit Supportive Land-Use Plans and Policies Portfolio, is consistent with the goals and objectives of the (City of Cudahy) land use and comprehensive plans.

Section Three. The (City of Cudahy) endorses the station area plan and policies and will take appropriate steps toward implementation as recommended as part of the Transit Supportive Land-Use Plans and Policies Portfolio if commuter rail is chosen for implementation.

Section Four. The (City of Cudahy) urges FTA acceptance and endorsement of the complete KRM Commuter Link Transit Supportive Land-Use Plans and Policies Portfolio.

THIS RESOLUTION WAS PASSED AND APPROVED THE 8TH DAY OF NOVEMBER 2006 BY THE (CITY OF CUDAHY), WISCONSIN.

[Signature]
John R. Hohenfelet
Mayor

[Signature]
Joseph P. Henika
City Clerk / Treasurer / Comptroller
Attest

Approved as to Form: ROBERT J. JURSIK, City Attorney
Wis. State Bar No. 01012957