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Guidance of KRM
Commuter Rail Studies

- Intergovernmental Partnership
  - Technical Steering Committee
- “Temporary and “Limited Authority” Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Transit Authority
Studies to Date

- Transit Alternatives Analysis
- Draft Environmental Impact Statement
- “New Starts” Application to Federal Transit Administration
Proposed KRM Commuter Rail Service

Will connect Milwaukee and Racine to existing Chicago-Kenosha commuter rail

33-mile commuter rail line using existing Union Pacific Railroad (UP) and Canadian Pacific Railway (CP) freight lines

9 stations
- Existing stations at Kenosha and Milwaukee
- New Stations at Somers, Racine, Caledonia, Oak Creek, South Milwaukee, Cudahy, and Milwaukee South Side
Proposed KRM Commuter Rail Service (continued)

- **Level of service**
  - Service provided in both directions along corridor during all time periods
  - 14 weekday trains in each direction

- **Train operation**
  - Service provided by meeting existing Metra trains at either Kenosha or Waukegan
  - Diesel-multiple-unit cars ("DMUs" or self-propelled coaches)
Proposed Bus Service Alternative

- The bus alternative is an improved and expanded bus service
  - The best that can be done with improved and expanded bus service over existing streets and highways to provide a similar service as commuter rail, while maintaining the unique advantages of bus service

- 29 stations or stops – limited stop service

- 14-17 weekday buses in each direction

- Motor coach vehicles with commuter bus amenities

- Buses operate as their own collector/distributor

- Traffic signal prioritization
Evaluation and Comparison of Commuter Rail and Bus Alternatives

- Key measures of evaluation and comparison
  - Capital and operating costs
  - Travel time and speed
  - Travel reliability, comfort, and convenience
  - Transit ridership
  - Impact on highway system
  - Alternative during IH 94 freeway reconstruction
  - Air pollutant emissions and energy impacts
  - Promoting more efficient development and redevelopment
  - Providing increased accessibility to jobs
  - Encouraging corridor economic development by more closely linking southeastern Wisconsin and northeastern Illinois
  - Providing improved accessibility to General Mitchell International Airport
  - Providing improved accessibility to arts, culture, and entertainment
  - Providing improved accessibility to colleges and universities
Evaluation and Comparison: Travel Time

- Commuter rail will be much faster than bus in connecting the Kenosha, Milwaukee, and Racine areas to each other and with Northeastern Illinois.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Average Speed</th>
<th>Average Travel Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Rail</td>
<td>38 mph</td>
<td>53 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>20 to 29 mph</td>
<td>83 to 108 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In comparison, a trip by automobile between Milwaukee and Kenosha during the peak traffic hours may be expected to require 54 minutes.
Evaluation and Comparison: Ridership

- Commuter rail may be expected to attract nearly three times the ridership of bus
  - Annually, commuter rail will attract 1.88 million trips vs. 0.66 million for bus

- Commuter rail will also attract longer trips and passenger-miles from commuter rail ridership will represent five times the passenger-miles as the bus—23.1 million passenger-miles vs. 4.6 million for bus
Evaluation and Comparison: Accessibility to Jobs

- Due to its higher average speeds and resulting lower travel times, commuter rail will provide greater accessibility to the significant number of jobs in the KRM/northeastern Illinois corridor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Jobs (1 mile station radius—Year 2000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Milwaukee: 110,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee County: 21,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha and Racine Counties: 28,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago North Shore Suburbs: 95,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago North Side: 58,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Chicago: 599,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- An estimated 246,000, or 41 percent, of City of Milwaukee residents reside within 3 miles of the two proposed KRM train stations in the City, some within walking distance and others within a short connecting bus or shuttle ride or drive or drop-off by automobile. Of these City residents, 58 percent, or 143,000, are minorities, and 29% do not have access to an automobile.
Evaluation and Comparison: More Efficient Development and Redevelopment

- Commuter rail will have the potential to result in more efficient, higher density land development and redevelopment around its stations in the corridor and reduce urban sprawl
  - Encourage desirable needed and planned development/redevelopment in central cities of Milwaukee, Racine, and Kenosha and inner, older suburbs of Cudahy, St. Francis, and South Milwaukee
  - Encourage higher density, more efficient development in developing communities of Oak Creek, Caledonia, and Somers
The potential for future economic growth of southeastern Wisconsin through more closely linking to Northeastern Illinois is one of a few major economic development themes being advanced for southeastern Wisconsin by the Milwaukee 7.

Companies have cited the importance of this link to Northeastern Illinois to retaining and attracting qualified employees, and maintaining and expanding its presence in southeastern Wisconsin.

Due to its much higher average speeds and shorter travel times, commuter rail will do a significantly better job of more closely connecting Kenosha, Racine, and Milwaukee to each other and to northeastern Illinois and Chicago.
Evaluation and Comparison: Capital and Operating Costs

• Commuter rail would have higher capital costs and annual operating and maintenance (O&M) costs than bus (2007 dollars)
  
  • Capital cost — $206 million for commuter rail compared to $28 million for bus
  
  • Annual Operating & Maintenance cost — $11.8 million for commuter rail (including shuttles) compared to $3.2 million for bus
  
  • About 80 to 90% of the capital and net operating and maintenance costs may be expected to be funded with Federal and State funds
KRM Commuter Rail Potential Funding ($2007)

Capital Cost—$206 million
- $103 million Federal discretionary grant (FTA)
- $18 - 27 million FHWA CMAQ grants
- $38 - $42.5 million State share
- $38 - $42.5 million Local share (Potential $4 million annual debt service on 20 year bond)

Operating Cost—$11.8 million
- $4.6 million fare revenue
- $4.1 million State assistance
- $2.2 million Federal assistance
- $0.9 million Local share
Southeastern Wisconsin Needs a Good Public Transit System

- To meet the travel needs—work, education, healthcare, shopping—of the significant portion of the population (11% of households) without an automobile.

- To provide a necessary and desirable alternative in heavily traveled corridors and areas.

- To support higher density and infill development and redevelopment, which results in efficiencies for public infrastructure and services, including transportation.
Southeastern Wisconsin Needs a Good Public Transit System (continued)

- To contribute to efficiency in the transportation system, including reduced highway traffic and congestion, air pollution and energy consumption.
- To enhance economic development/quality of life
  - To connect workers with jobs
  - To access opportunities for higher education
  - To provide choice
  - To reduce household expenditures on transportation, permitting greater savings, other expenditures, and higher standard of living
## Public Transit Funding Crisis

- **Last 7 years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Service Reductions</th>
<th>Fare Increases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee County</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukesha County</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10-75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukesha City</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine City</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha City</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Reductions include routes, service hours, frequency, and express service**
  - 40,000 jobs now not accessible by transit

- **Projections for next five years**
  - 35% reduction – Milwaukee County
  - 20-25% reductions for other systems
Public Transit Funding Crisis – Why?

- Federal and State funding provide **70 to 80%** of transit annual operating funding
  - Have not increased with inflation
- No ability to replace Federal and State funds with local property taxes
- Nearly **100%** of Federal funds intended for capital projects are being spent on operating funding
Existing Public Transit System

- 8 existing public transit systems
- Compared to their peers, very efficient and effective

- Milwaukee County Transit System
  - Total operating cost per rider
    - 31% below average of their 22 peers
    - 5th lowest
  - Net operating cost per rider
    - 32% below average
    - 4th lowest
Nearly Every Other Metro Area Has Dedicated Local Transit Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>2000 Population (in millions)</th>
<th>Source of Local Dedicated Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.25% Sales tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.0% Sales tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, OH</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.0% Sales tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>Sales tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.6618% payroll tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati, OH</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.3% payroll tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk, VA</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento, CA</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.5% Sales tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.375% Sales tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio, TX</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.5% Sales tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas, NV</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.25% Sales tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee, WI</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence, RI</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>6.25 cents per gallon gas tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.25% Sales tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.0% Sales tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo, NY</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.125% Sales tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis, TN</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.0% Sales tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City, UT</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>Sales tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville, FL</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.0% Sales tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.2% payroll tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.5% Sales tax</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Need for Dedicated Transit Funding

- Dedicated transit funding is essential
  - Preserving existing transit service
  - Implementing service improvements and expansion
  - Considering and implementing major transit initiatives