

MINUTES OF THE ELEVENTH MEETING
(as corrected and approved by the Advisory Committee)

SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGIONAL
FREEWAY SYSTEM ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DATE: April 2, 2003
TIME: 3:30 p.m.
PLACE: Downtown Transit Center
Harbor Lights Room
909 E. Michigan Street
Milwaukee, WI

Committee Members Present

William R. Drew Vice Chairman, SEWRPC
Chairman
Robert Cook Executive Director, Transportation
Development Association of Wisconsin
Terrence Cooley Chief of Staff,
(representing Lee Holloway) Office of the Milwaukee County Board Chair
Brian G. DuPont Highway Commissioner, Walworth County
(representing William M. Norem)
James T. Dwyer Chairperson, Waukesha County
Board of Supervisors
Theresa M. Estness Mayor, City of Wauwatosa
Daniel M. Finley Waukesha County Executive
Leslie J. Fafard Director, District 2,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Jean M. Jacobson Racine County Executive
Allan K. Kehl Kenosha County Executive
Kenneth J. Leonard Deputy Administrator,
Division of Transportation Investment Management,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Bruce E. Matzke Wisconsin Division Administrator,
Federal Highway Administration,
U. S. Department of Transportation
Gloria L. McCutcheon Southeast Regional Director,
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Dennis W. Melvin Representative, West Bend Area Chamber of Commerce
Kenneth F. Miller Chairperson, Washington County
Board of Supervisors
John O. Norquist Mayor, City of Milwaukee
Marvin E. Pratt President, City of Milwaukee
Common Council
Tim Sheehy President, Metropolitan Milwaukee
Association of Commerce
Jeff Speaker Mayor, City of Brookfield
Scott K. Walker Milwaukee County Executive

James G. White Supervisor, Milwaukee County
Board of Supervisors
Gustav W. Wirth, Jr. Chairperson, Ozaukee County
Board of Supervisors
Thomas H. Buestrin (Ex-Officio) Chairman, SEWRPC

Staff Members and Guests Present

Robert J. Bauman Attorney
Steve Brachman Story Hill Neighborhood Association
Linda Brazean Citizens Allied for Sane Highways (CASH),
Story Hill Neighborhood Association
Todd Broadie Citizen
Erik Brooks Reporter, Kenosha News
Donna L. Brown Systems Planning Manager, District 2,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
John Buczywski-Carlson Citizen
Vince Bushell Riverwest Currents
Ernesto Chacon Deputy Director,
Milwaukee Governor's Office
Paul Counsell Water Tower Landmark Trust
Patrick T. Curley Director, Intergovernmental Relations,
City of Milwaukee
Emily Dobbins Legislative Assistant,
16th Aldermanic District, City of Milwaukee
Royal Eckstein Citizen
Roy B. Evans Attorney at Law, Advantage Business Partners LLC
Philip C. Evenson Executive Director, SEWRPC
Sandy Folaron Citizen
Nancy Frank Associate Professor/Chair, Department of Urban Planning,
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
James J. Godsil Community Roofing
Bob Greene Merrill Park Neighborhood Association
Mary Heuer CASH
Christopher T. Hiebert Senior Engineer, SEWRPC
Terry Horst Senior Transportation Design Engineer, HNTB
Steven Jacquart Policy Director, Office of the Mayor,
City of Milwaukee
Dewayne J. Johnson Deputy Director, District 2,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Sonya Jongsma Knauss Riverwest Currents
David M. Jolicoeur Engineer, SEWRPC
Mark Kass Reporter, WisPolitics.com
Reid Knutson Wisconsin Concrete Pavement Association
Darrel Koehler Citizen
Eileen Koehler Citizen
Robert Krug Supervisor, Milwaukee County
Board of Supervisors
Glenn M. Lampark Director of Public Works, Racine County

Jeff Landin Chief of Staff,
Office of the Waukesha County Executive

Michael M. Lemens Director of City Engineering,
City of Kenosha

Dwight E. McComb Planning and Program Development Engineer,
Federal Highway Administration,
U.S. Department of Transportation

Mark McComb Citizen

Steve M. Mokrohisky Chief of Staff / Director of Communications,
Office of the Milwaukee County Executive

Bill Moore Sierra Club

Geary Morales Reporter, Shepherd Express

David A. Novak Consultant

Todd O'Leary Convention Services Manager,
Greater Milwaukee Convention and Visitors Bureau

Frederick J. Patrie Director of Public Works, Kenosha County

Kenneth M. Pesch Highway Commissioner, Washington County

Jeffrey Polenske City Engineer, City of Milwaukee

Patrick A. Pittenger Senior Planner, SEWRPC

Karyn Rotker Staff Attorney, ACLU

James Rowen Policy Director, Office of the Mayor,
City of Milwaukee

Ronald J. Rutkowski Director, Transportation Planning Division,
Milwaukee County Department of Public Works

Sean Ryan Reporter, Daily Reporter

Larry Sandler Reporter, Milwaukee Journal Sentinel

Jay Schad Budget and Policy Analyst, Office of Policy and Budget,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Monty C. Shadd Legislative Assistant

Mariano A. Schifalacqua Commissioner of Public Works, City of Milwaukee

Dennis A. Shook Reporter, Waukesha Freeman

Gretchen Schuldt CASH

Melanie Scott WISN Radio

Bruce Spann Edwards & Associates, Inc.

Brian S. Swenson Vice-President, HNTB

Thomas W. Tollaksen Manager, Village of River Hills

Bob Trainer CASH

Sandra Rusch Walton President, Story Hill Neighborhood Association

Rosemary Wehnes Organizer, John Muir Chapter, Sierra Club

Anthony Williams Merrill Park Neighborhood Association

Kenneth R. Yunker Deputy Director, SEWRPC

Chet A. Zurawik Deputy Highway Commissioner,
Milwaukee County Department of Public Works

WELCOME AND ROLL CALL

Chairman Drew welcomed all members present and indicated that roll call would be accomplished with a sign-in sheet circulated by Commission staff.

CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 21, 2002, MEETING

Chairman Drew asked if there were any questions or comments on the minutes of the Advisory Committee's tenth meeting held on March 21, 2002. There being no questions or comments, a motion to approve the minutes as published was made by Mr. Dwyer, seconded by Mr. Miller, and carried unanimously by the Committee.

COMMISSION STAFF POWERPOINT PRESENTATION ON MATERIALS COMPLETING THE STUDY REPORT

Chairman Drew noted that each member of the Advisory Committee had received a packet of information prior to this meeting which included draft materials including an additional section of Chapter VI and Chapter VII of the study report. He then asked Mr. Yunker to proceed with a presentation regarding the draft materials to be considered by the Advisory Committee to complete the study.

[Secretary's Note: A copy of the Commission staff presentation distributed at this meeting for this agenda item is included in [Attachment A](#) to these minutes.]

Following Mr. Yunker's presentation of the topic, Mr. DuPont noted that the Walworth County Board of Supervisors has requested that the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) conduct preliminary engineering and environmental assessment studies on the completion of the USH 12 freeway between the Cities of Elkhorn and Whitewater. He stated that it may be appropriate to note the County Board of Supervisor's action on page 53 of Chapter VI, which presents comments on the completion of the USH 12 freeway. Mr. Yunker indicated that Commission staff would consider changing the text on page 53 of Chapter VI.

[Secretary's Note: The following sentence will be added to the end of the first full paragraph on page 53 of Chapter VI of the draft study report:
"The Walworth County Board of Supervisors has requested the Wisconsin Department of Transportation conduct the preliminary engineering and environmental impact assessment studies for the completion of the USH 12 freeway in Walworth County."]

Chairman Drew then noted that Mayor Norquist had requested to make a presentation to the Advisory Committee, and asked Mayor Norquist to proceed with his presentation.

[Secretary's Note: Mayor Norquist made a PowerPoint presentation which questioned the benefits of the freeway system within Milwaukee County, and outlined its costs. Commission staff was unable to obtain a copy of the presentation to attach to these minutes.]

Following his presentation, Mayor Norquist stated that he would be voting in favor of the alternative to rebuild the regional freeway system using modern design standards and with additional lanes on 108

miles of the system. Mayor Norquist stated that if the other six counties and Milwaukee County suburban communities wanted the freeways within their communities widened, he would respect their positions and not vote against the widening of those freeway segments. He added that he hoped that the Committee membership would take into consideration the position of the City of Milwaukee and the majority of the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors when considering the proposed widening of the additional 19 miles of the freeway system, largely within the City of Milwaukee.

Chairman Drew then asked if the Advisory Committee had any other questions or comments before the Committee moved onto the action items on the agenda. Advisory Committee members raised the following questions and comments:

1. Mayor Estness noted that she had received a letter from the Village of River Hills indicating their preference of widening to six lanes instead of eight on IH 43 through the Village. She asked if the letter had been sent to each of the Advisory Committee members. Chairman Drew indicated that it was his belief that the Village sent the letter to each member of the Advisory Committee.
2. Mayor Speaker asked about the potential schedule for the reconstruction of the regional freeway system as shown on Map 7-1, page 12a of Chapter VII. He indicated that the schedule showed that the segment of IH 94 between CTH J and the Zoo Interchange may be reconstructed in the 2016 to 2025 time period. Mr. Yunker responded that the potential reconstruction schedule shown on Map 7-1 is tentative in nature, and not a recommended schedule, and was based upon pavement and bridge condition and other factors including cost and funding. He added that the actual time of reconstruction will be determined by the WisDOT. Mayor Speaker stated that the City of Brookfield would prefer that this freeway segment be shown as reconstructed in the 2009 to 2015 time period based upon the need to coordinate with planned City projects, and as well the pavement condition and rehabilitation history of this segment of IH 94. Mr. Yunker agreed with the potential need to reconstruct this freeway segment in the 2009 to 2015 time period, and noted that the staff had discussed showing this segment of IH 94 as being reconstructed in that time period, and showing the segment of USH 45 between the North and Richfield Interchanges as being reconstructed in the 2016 to 2025 time period, rather than the 2009 to 2015 time period.
3. Mr. Sheehy asked if his understanding that the Governor and State Legislature would receive copies of the final plan was correct, and that each freeway segment would first proceed to preliminary engineering and environmental impact assessment studies, including additional substantial public involvement and consideration of reconstruction alternatives as well as addressing the funding requirements, before any actual reconstruction begins. Mr. Evenson indicated that his understanding was correct, and noted that this study is the opportunity to look at reconstruction system-wide rather than segment-by-segment. Mayor Norquist added that he believed that the Marquette Interchange project preliminary engineering did not include preparation of a full environmental impact statement, but rather a more limited environmental assessment study. Mr. Sheehy then noted that the final recommended system plan may not necessarily be what will actually be constructed. He added that a previous SEWRPC plan included an extension of what used to be the Park East Freeway (STH 145) and another freeway along the Lake Michigan shoreline, commonly referred to as the Lake Freeway, and that due to local opposition, neither segment was actually constructed. Mayor Norquist added that those opposed had to expend a lot of time and energy to prevent those projects from proceeding to construction, and he believed it would have been better if those projects had not been recommended in early system plans.

There being no further questions or comments on this agenda item, Chairman Drew indicated that the Committee was ready to move into the action items on the agenda. Chairman Drew stated that the Committee would first vote on the remaining section of Chapter VI as presented to the Committee. He added that Chapter VII of the draft report would then be divided into two separate votes, with the first vote considering pages 1-14 regarding ancillary recommendations and a potential reconstruction schedule, and the second vote considering pages 14-19, the final recommended plan. Mr. Finley noted that some Committee members were absent, and had sent representatives. He asked Chairman Drew to review the rules established by the Committee regarding voting. Chairman Drew stated that at their October 9, 2001 meeting, the Committee determined that only Advisory Committee members, and not alternates, would be permitted to vote. He stated that if a Committee member could not attend the meeting, he or she could submit to the Committee Chairman in advance of the meeting their position and vote concerning any aspect of the final plan recommendations. He then stated that he had received three such letters from Advisory Committee members – Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors Chairman Lee Holloway, Teamsters Local Union No. 200 Business Representative Thomas Millonzi, and Walworth County Board of Supervisors Chairman William Norem – and that their votes would be recorded as indicated in their letters.

[Secretary's Note: Copies of the letters from Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors Chairman Lee Holloway, Teamsters Local Union No. 200 Business Representative Thomas Millonzi, and Walworth County Board of Supervisors Chairman William Norem are included in [Attachment B](#) to these minutes.]

CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF ADDITIONAL SECTION OF CHAPTER VI, "DESIGN, EVALUATION, AND CONSIDERATION OF FREEWAY RECONSTRUCTION ALTERNATIVES"

Chairman Drew asked Mr. Yunker to briefly summarize the additional section of Chapter VI. Following Mr. Yunker's review, Chairman Drew asked if there were any questions or comments on the additional section of Chapter VI. Mr. DuPont noted that the letter sent by Walworth County Board of Supervisors Chairman William Norem did not address the draft Chapters separately, but rather identified a position on the final recommended plan. Chairman Drew responded that he did not believe that the additional section of Chapter VI was going to be controversial, but he did not intend to interpret from any of the letters a position other than that stated in their letter. He added that if an Advisory Committee member that is not present, wished to be recorded regarding this topic, he would accept letters from them following the meeting. There being no further discussion on the additional section of Chapter VI, on a motion by Ms. Jacobson, seconded by Mr. Finley, and carried unanimously, the Advisory Committee approved the additional section of Chapter VI.

CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF PAGES 1-14 OF CHAPTER VII, "RECOMMENDED FREEWAY SYSTEM PLAN AND PROGRAM"

Chairman Drew asked Mr. Yunker to briefly summarize pages 1-14 of Chapter VII. Following Mr. Yunker's review, Chairman Drew asked if there were any questions or comments on pages 1-14 of Chapter VII. Mayor Speaker, on a motion seconded by Mr. Finley, requested that Map 7-1 on page 12a of Chapter VII be amended to show the potential time period of reconstruction of IH 94 between the Zoo Interchange and CTH J as the years 2009 to 2015 and of USH 41/45 between the North Interchange and the Richfield Interchange be shown as 2016 to 2025. Chairman Drew then asked for questions or comments on Mayor Speaker's proposed amendment. There being no further discussion on this amendment, Chairman Drew asked that the amendment be put to a vote. The amendment to move the

potential schedule for reconstruction of IH 94 between the Zoo Interchange and CTH J to the 2009-2015 time period and of USH 41/45 between the North Interchange and the Richfield Interchange to the 2016-2025 time period passed on a unanimous vote.

Chairman Drew then asked if there was any further discussion of pages 1-14 of Chapter VII. There being no further discussion, on a motion by Mr. Wirth, seconded by Mr. Dwyer, and carried unanimously, pages 1-14 of Chapter VII were approved as amended.

CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF PAGES 14-19 OF CHAPTER VII, "RECOMMENDED FREEWAY SYSTEM PLAN AND PROGRAM"

Chairman Drew asked Mr. Yunker to briefly summarize pages 14-19 of Chapter VII, including the final staff recommendation to reconstruct the regional freeway system to modern design standards and providing additional capacity on 108 miles of the freeway system. Following Mr. Yunker's review, Chairman Drew asked if there were any questions or comments on pages 14-19 of Chapter VII, including the staff recommendation. Mayor Estness stated that during the reconstruction of USH 45 north of North Avenue, the WisDOT needed to be cognizant of the proximity of the freeway to schools. Ms. Jacobson then made a motion to approve pages 14-19 of Chapter VII, including the staff recommendation to include the provision of additional capacity on 108 miles of the regional freeway system. Mr. Wirth seconded the motion and Chairman Drew asked if there was any further discussion on the motion to approve pages 14-19 of Chapter VII.

Mr. Walker moved to amend the motion such that the final plan would include the provision of additional capacity on 127 miles of the regional freeway system – specifically, adding to the 108 mile recommendation the widening to eight lanes of IH 94 between the Marquette and Zoo Interchanges and of IH 43 between the Mitchell Interchange and Silver Spring Drive, as proposed in the preliminary recommended plan.

[Secretary's Note: The specific changes to the report text and staff recommendation proposed by Mr. Walker are provided in [Attachment C](#) to these minutes.]

Mr. Walker indicated that the strength of the development in neighborhoods such as the Historic King Drive neighborhood is due to the neighborhood's proximity and access to freeways. He added that office and retail development rely on access to freeways and by not widening all 127 miles as preliminarily recommended, traffic congestion would double on some freeway segments, hindering development and redevelopment in Milwaukee County. He stated that the regional freeway system and its operation are of vital importance to the economic maintenance and growth of Milwaukee County. He added that the freeway system is vitally important to Milwaukee County residents, noting that over 50 percent of the daily traffic on the Milwaukee County freeway system is made by Milwaukee County residents, and another 40 percent of Milwaukee County freeway system daily traffic is to and from Milwaukee County businesses. Mr. Walker also noted that for many freeway segments, including the most congested segments, there is nearly an equal amount of travel in each direction of the freeway during morning and afternoon peak hours. Mr. Walker stated that contrary to some reports directed at his position regarding freeway expansion, providing additional capacity on IH 94 between the Zoo and Marquette Interchanges will not require the relocation of graves. Mr. Walker added that he did not want to send a plan to the WisDOT that would prohibit them from considering additional capacity on these freeway segments within Milwaukee County. He stated that it was clear to him that failure to consider additional capacity on these freeway segments would be devastating to the economic maintenance and growth of Milwaukee County.

Mr. White stated that he was going to be consistent in his support for additional capacity on 127 miles of the regional freeway system, and seconded Mr. Walker's amendment to the main motion. He stated that he believed that adding capacity to 127 miles of the regional freeway system would help Milwaukee become more competitive in attracting and retaining jobs. Mr. White stated that while some Milwaukee County and City of Milwaukee elected officials believed that reconstructing IH 94 between the Zoo and Marquette Interchanges and IH 43 between the Mitchell Interchange and Silver Spring Drive to their current capacity would not hurt Milwaukee County's economic growth potential, he disagreed with that assessment. He stated that the City of Milwaukee continues to have an extremely high African American unemployment rate, while Statewide the unemployment rate is below national averages. Mr. White stated that by not providing additional capacity, a message was being sent to businesses to relocate outside of Milwaukee County. He added that Milwaukee County needs to consider the needs of business and industry, and the potential impacts on economic development. Mr. White stated that while it is important to note the objections of a vocal minority, their concerns should not take precedence over the benefit of all Milwaukee County residents. He added that by denying additional capacity of these freeway segments, Milwaukee County will be left out of a potential economic growth opportunity. Mr. White stated that additional capacity on 127 miles of the freeway system is the best opportunity for Milwaukee County to attract jobs that depend on over-the-road transportation. Mr. White added that it would be short-sighted to send a final plan to the WisDOT that does not give them the opportunity to consider additional capacity on 127 miles of the freeway system. Mr. White added that the members of this Advisory Committee understand that supporting this amendment does not prevent local communities from having a voice during the preliminary engineering and environmental assessment studies of each freeway segment. He noted the importance for this Region to speak with a decisive and cohesive voice regarding the final plan.

Mr. Pratt stated that he would be voting against the proposed amendment. He noted that 15 members of the City of Milwaukee Common Council recently expressed their support for additional capacity on 108 miles of the regional freeway system, but unanimously opposed the remaining 19 miles. Mr. Pratt stated that Committee members should be supportive of the positions taken by City of Milwaukee elected officials and by the majority of the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors and reject the proposed amendment. He added that he was troubled by the ability to maintain sensitivity to neighborhoods adjacent to the freeway system, when reconstructing to modern design standards and with additional capacity on 127 miles of the freeway will require 216 residential relocations and 31 commercial/industrial relocations.

Mr. Walker responded that the alternative with additional capacity on 108 miles of the freeway system supported by Mr. Pratt and the City of Milwaukee will require an estimated 180 residential relocations and 23 commercial/industrial relocations, and the difference between the 127 miles of freeway widening alternative and the 108 miles of freeway widening alternative is 36 residential relocations and 8 commercial/industrial relocations.

Ms. McCutcheon indicated that the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WisDNR) had developed a position statement and a letter detailing the WisDNR's position on a final plan. She stated that the WisDNR could give qualified support for reconstruction the regional freeway system to modern design standards and with additional lanes on 108 miles of freeway. She stated that the WisDNR supported the regional approach of the study, and the goal of obtaining a regional consensus on a final plan.

[Secretary's Note: A copy of the letter from, and position paper of, the WisDNR has been included in [Attachment D](#) to these minutes.]

Mayor Speaker asked if the amendment put forth by Mr. Walker, with additional capacity on 127 miles of the freeway system, would require the WisDOT to study additional capacity on those segments during preliminary engineering, but did not necessarily mean that additional capacity will be provided on those segments. Mr. Yunker responded that his assessment was correct. Mayor Speaker asked about the cost of providing additional capacity to those segments following their reconstruction to modern design standards without additional lanes. Mr. Yunker responded that this would mean reconstructing a freeway segment a second time to add capacity after that segment had already been reconstructed to modern design standards, and could represent a doubling of costs.

Mr. Fafard indicated that the WisDOT had not prepared a formal statement at this time, but wanted to thank the SEWRPC for conducting the study and for attempting to seek a regional consensus on a final plan. He stated that the WisDOT would support the SEWRPC staff recommendation for the final plan which proposes including additional capacity on 108 miles of the freeway system. He added because of a lack of regional agreement, the WisDOT could not, at this time, support additional capacity on the additional 19 miles of the freeway system.

Mr. Sheehy asked if Committee members would be allowed to submit additional comments for the record following the upcoming vote. Mr. Drew stated that those comments would be accepted.

[Secretary's Note: At the time of publishing of these minutes, Commission staff had not received any additional comments from Advisory Committee members.]

Mr. Sheehy stated that based upon feedback from the membership of the Metropolitan Milwaukee Association of Commerce (MMAC) and from the MMAC Infrastructure Task Force, he would be supporting the amendment put forth by Mr. Walker. Mr. Sheehy stated that it made more sense to plan for broad options, with the benefits and costs of those options being further addressed, and the final decisions made, after preliminary engineering and environmental assessment studies.

Mayor Norquist stated that he was opposed to the amendment put forth by Mr. Walker. He stated that the amount of land required to reconstruct the regional freeway system with additional lanes on 127 miles of freeway would have severe neighborhood impacts, especially in the City of Milwaukee. He added that "doubling decking" the freeway in the Story Hill Neighborhood would have substantial negative impacts on that neighborhood. Mayor Norquist stated that the final plan needed to have built-in flexibility. He added that the amount of Federal highway dollars allocated to Wisconsin are fixed, and that the only way to fund this recommended plan is by reaching into taxpayer pockets and increasing taxes. Mayor Norquist stated that contrary to statements by organizations such as the Transportation Development Association (TDA), gasoline taxes are not voluntary. Mayor Norquist added that modern design standards do not always have to be met, citing a U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration publication titled, *Flexibility in Highway Design*, and the WisDOT *Facilities Development Manual*. Mayor Norquist stated that he believed it was absurd to pass the amendment put forth by Mr. Walker and force those opposed to these 19 miles of freeway expansion to continue to expend enormous amounts of time and energy fighting elements of the plan that he believes are not in the best interest of the City of Milwaukee.

Mr. Finley stated that he was in favor of the amendment put forth by Mr. Walker. He added that he believed that this was the closest the Region would ever come to agreement on the final plan. Mr. Finley stated that he believed that the best thing for the economic vitality of Waukesha County is an economically healthy Milwaukee County. He added that he believed that not widening these 19 miles of freeway will hinder development in Milwaukee County.

Mr. Cook stated that the statement made by Mayor Norquist was inaccurate. The TDA does not characterize the gasoline tax as voluntary. It is a user fee dedicated to paying for the transportation system. He added that TDA had recently completed a study showing that highways have an economic benefit to the state and that with every \$1 invested in freeways, there is a \$3 return. Mr. Cook stated that the freeway system is important to the mobility and economic growth of the Southeastern Wisconsin Region and the entire State of Wisconsin and he would, therefore, support the amendment put forth by Mr. Walker.

Mayor Norquist stated that he believed Mr. Cook's membership on this Committee was inappropriate because he was a resident of Dane County. Mr. Cook responded that the TDA is a statewide organization with the goal of establishing and maintaining a balanced transportation network that meets Wisconsin's present and future mobility needs in an efficient and effective manner. He stated that the state is responsible for the southeastern Wisconsin freeway system, and the freeway system serves both southeastern Wisconsin and statewide needs. Therefore, he believed that his membership on this Committee was entirely appropriate.

Ms. Jacobson stated that she could remember the gridlock in downtown Milwaukee before the freeway system was first constructed. She added that the construction of the freeway system opened up the City of Milwaukee to those who resided in adjacent counties, and that by not adding capacity on those freeway segments leading into downtown Milwaukee, those who reside in the adjacent counties most likely will not desire to return to downtown Milwaukee. Ms. Jacobson stated that she thought it would be a disservice to the Region and the State to not consider adding capacity to 127 miles of the regional freeway system. She added that she respected Mayor Norquist's efforts to enhance the City of Milwaukee, but the transportation needs of Milwaukee needed to be addressed. Ms. Jacobson stated that transportation plays a vital role in everything people do and that there is not a single person that does not benefit from transportation. She added that she believed that the preliminary recommended plan was the correct plan for this Region, and therefore would support the amendment put forth by Mr. Walker.

Chairman Drew asked if there were any additional comments or questions on the amendment put forth by Mr. Walker, seconded by Mr. White, to include the provision of additional capacity on 127 miles of the regional freeway system. Mr. Dwyer suggested a roll call vote. Mr. Walker's motion to amend the final plan to include the provision of additional capacity on 127 miles of the regional freeway system, seconded by Mr. White, passed on a vote of 14 ayes to 9 nays, with Messrs. Buestrin, Cook, Drew, Dwyer, Finley, Melvin, Miller, Norem, Sheehy, Speaker, Walker, White, Wirth, and Ms. Jacobson voting in favor of the amendment. Messrs. Fafard, Holloway, Kehl, Leonard, Millonzi, Norquist, Pratt and Ms. Estness and Ms. McCutcheon voted against the amendment. Mr. Matzke abstained from the vote.

Mayor Norquist made a motion to further amend the main motion such that the final plan would include a financial element. Mr. Pratt seconded the motion. Mr. White stated that it was his understanding that the WisDOT did not request that the SEWRPC prepare a financing element for the plan. Mr. DuPont suggested modifying the proposed amendment to require the WisDOT to present to the State Legislature and Governor a financing plan, before proceeding to the reconstruction of each freeway segment. Mayor Norquist and Mr. Pratt stated that they would accept the modification proposed by Mr. DuPont. Mr.

Sheehy indicated that he would support the amendment. Mr. Dwyer stated that he would not support the amendment. There being no further discussion on the proposed amendment, Chairman Drew asked for a voice vote. The amendment to recommend that the WisDOT present to the State Legislature and Governor a freeway system financing plan, before proceeding to the reconstruction of each freeway segment carried.

Mayor Norquist made a motion to further amend the main motion such that the final plan would include a recommendation that affordable housing be provided for no less than 10 percent of the residential units proposed in the Pabst Farms development in the City of Oconomowoc. He stated that currently all 1,400 proposed residential units are luxury homes. Mr. Pratt seconded the amendment.

Mr. Wirth stated that the scope of this plan was to study regional freeway reconstruction, and questioned whether the proposed amendment was in order. Chairman Drew ruled that the amendment put forth by Mayor Norquist was in order. Mr. Finley noted that he respectfully disagreed with the Chairman's ruling. He stated that the goal of this plan was to reach a consensus on how the regional freeway system should be reconstructed, not on the amount, location, and type of housing stock that should be provided in one specific land development project.

Mayor Norquist responded that transportation and land use planning cannot be separated. He stated that the Pabst Farms development was going to place a greater demand on the regional freeway system. Mr. White asked if the Commission would be conducting a separate study in the future, analyzing planned development and the provision of affordable housing in the Region. Mr. Evenson responded that the Commission staff will soon be conducting a major update of the regional land use plan, to be followed by preparation of a housing element, including addressing affordable housing.

There being no further discussion on the proposed amendment, Mayor Norquist asked Chairman Drew for a roll call vote. Chairman Drew agreed, and on a vote of 6 ayes to 10 nays, the amendment to include the recommendation for affordable housing for no less than 10 percent of the residential units proposed in the Pabst Farms development in the City of Oconomowoc failed, with Messrs. Drew, Norquist, Pratt, Walker, White and Ms. Estness voting in favor of the amendment. Messrs. Buestrin, Cook, Dwyer, Finley, Kehl, Melvin, Miller, Speaker, Wirth and Ms. Jacobson voting against the amendment. Messrs. Fafard, Leonard, Matzke, Sheehy, and Ms. McCutcheon abstained from the vote.

Chairman Drew asked if there was any further discussion or possible amendments to the main motion. There being no further discussion or proposed amendments, Chairman Drew asked for a roll call vote on pages 14-19 of Chapter VII as amended to include the provision of additional capacity on 127 miles of the regional freeway system and to recommend that the WisDOT present to the State Legislature and Governor a financing plan before proceeding to the reconstruction of each freeway segment. On a vote of 15 ayes to 8 nays, pages 14-19 of Chapter VII as amended were approved. Messrs. Buestrin, Cook, Drew, Dwyer, Finley, Kehl, Melvin, Miller, Norem, Sheehy, Speaker, Walker, White, Wirth and Ms. Jacobson voting in favor of pages 14-19 of Chapter VII as amended. Messrs. Fafard, Holloway, Leonard, Millonzi, Norquist, Pratt and Ms. Estness and Ms. McCutcheon voted against pages 14-19 of Chapter VII as amended. Mr. Matzke abstained from the vote.

OTHER BUSINESS

Chairman Drew stated that additional correspondence had been received from City of Milwaukee Common Council President Marvin Pratt, the Safety with Increased Freeway Transportation (SWIFT)

coalition, and the Greater Milwaukee Association of Realtors. He stated that this and any related correspondence would be included with the minutes.

[Secretary's Note: Correspondence received from City of Milwaukee Common Council President Marvin Pratt, SWIFT, the Greater Milwaukee Association of Realtors, and the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration are included in [Attachment E](#) to these minutes.]

Chairman Drew noted that with the recommendation of a final plan for freeway system reconstruction that this was likely the last meeting of the Advisory Committee, and he thanked the Committee members on behalf of the Commission for their work over the past two years.

ADJOURNMENT

The eleventh meeting of the Advisory Committee was adjourned at 5:40 p.m. by Chairman Drew.

Signed

Philip C. Evenson
Recording Secretary

* * *

PCE/DRY/DMJ/kjk
5/9/03
#81770 v2 - FRS 4-2-03 AC Minutes