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January 11, 2010
Elements of Study and New Starts Application

- Transit Alternatives Analysis
  - Completed in 2007 and updated in 2009

- Draft Environmental Impact Statement
  - Completed in 2009

- “New Starts” Application to Federal Transit Administration (Project Evaluation)
  - Application submitted and withdrawn in 2007 and updated in 2009
KRM Commuter Rail Studies (continued)

Responsible Authorities

- Intergovernmental Partnership
  - Technical Steering Committee
- “Temporary” and “Limited Authority” Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Transit Authority (2005-2007 State budget)
- Southeastern Regional Transit Authority (SERTA)
Proposed KRM Commuter Rail Service

Will connect Milwaukee and Racine to existing Chicago-Kenosha commuter rail
- Service to Kenosha (option to Waukegan)

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

9 stations
- Existing stations at Kenosha, Racine, and Milwaukee
- New Stations at Somers, 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
  - 15 weekday trains in each direction

- **Train operation**
  - Service provided by meeting existing Metra trains at Kenosha (option for trains to 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 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></th>
<th>Milwaukee to Kenosha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commuter Rail</strong></td>
<td>38 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus</strong></td>
<td>20 to 29 mph</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 four times the ridership of the bus
  - Annually, commuter rail will attract 2.12 million trips vs. 0.56 million for bus

- Commuter rail will also attract longer trips and annual passenger-miles from commuter rail ridership will be more than five times that of the 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

**Corridor Jobs (1 mile station radius—Year 2000)**

- Downtown Milwaukee 110,300
- Milwaukee County 21,600
- Kenosha and Racine Counties 28,200
- Chicago North Shore Suburbs 95,100
- Chicago North Side 58,500
- Downtown Chicago 599,400

**Percentage of residents residing within 3 miles of KRM station**

- 41% - City of Milwaukee
- 57% - Racine County
- 64% - Kenosha County
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.
Evaluation and Comparison: Corridor Economic Development and Growth

- 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:
  - Capital cost (2009 dollars) — $232.7 million for commuter rail compared to $30.0 million for bus
  - Annual Operating & Maintenance cost (2009 dollars) — $13.4 million for commuter rail compared to $3.1 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
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

- Prepared and filed in July 2009
- Describes KRM transit alternatives analysis and environment potentially affected by KRM commuter rail implementation
- Overall, potential adverse impacts will likely be minor
  - Existing rail corridor used, most impacts would be near stations
  - All potential adverse impacts will be avoided or mitigated to the extent possible
  - Additional field investigations and further analysis are recommended to determine the potential extent of, as well as mitigation measures for, some impacts
    - Would occur during Preliminary Engineering/Final EIS
Federal Discretionary (New Starts) Grant Application

- Elements of Project Evaluation
  - Mobility improvements
  - Cost effectiveness and operating efficiencies
  - Environmental benefits
  - Land use and economic development effects
  - Local financial commitment
Mobility, Cost-Effectiveness, and Operating Efficiencies

- Ridership: about 8,300 average weekday riders in 2035 (previous estimate was about 7,400)
- Mobility improvements: about 1 million annual hours of user benefits (i.e. travel time savings)
- Cost-Effectiveness Index (CEI)
  - Ratio of annualized capital and O&M costs to annualized hours of user benefits
  - KRM New Starts CEI: $27.80 per hour of benefit (medium-low rating, acceptable to enter PE)
  - Needs to be improved to less than $25 to obtain a Full Funding Grant Agreement with FTA
- Cost per new transit rider: $16.67
Environmental Benefits

- Based on EPA air quality designation
  - Milwaukee-Racine area is nonattainment area for 2006 PM 2.5 (particulate matter) standard
  - Southeastern Wisconsin is moderate nonattainment area for 8-hour ozone standard
- KRM New Starts: High Rating
Land Use and Economic Development Effects

- Based on existing land use, transit-supportive plans and policies, and performance and impacts of policies

- Transit-oriented development land use plans for KRM station areas
  - Based on community policy preferences for type and intensity of preferred future land uses

- Job access and economic development
  - Nearly 1 million jobs within 1 mile of KRM and Metra UP North lines
  - Access to Milwaukee and Chicago airports
  - Access to cultural and educational facilities
Local Financial Commitment

- Stability of capital and operating funding for proposed guideway transit line
  - Amount of non-Federal capital matching funds
- Stability of capital and operating funding for existing transit system(s)
  - Milwaukee County Transit System
  - City of Racine and Kenosha Transit Systems
Local Financial Commitment (continued)

- Financial Plan based on SERTA authority to enact $18 vehicle rental fee, indexed to inflation

- Assumed vehicle rental fee implementation date of September 1, 2010

- Analysis results indicate maximum vehicle rental fee would need to be implemented for KRM commuter rail
Local Financial Commitment - Conclusions

- An $18 vehicle rental fee, indexed to inflation, would be adequate to fund local share of KRM commuter rail capital and operating costs.

- FTA has indicated funding for existing transit systems also needs to be addressed prior to FTA approval of an application to enter preliminary engineering.
KRM Commuter Rail Potential Funding – Capital Costs

Capital Cost - $232.7 million (2009 dollars)

- $140 million Federal discretionary grant (FTA)
- $18 million FHWA CMAQ grants
- $35 – 40 million State share
- $35 – 40 million Local share (potential $3 million annual debt service on 20 year bond)

Capital Cost - $280.0 million (YOE dollars)

- $168 million Federal discretionary grant (FTA)
- $18 million FHWA CMAQ grants
- $45 – 50 million State share
- $45 – 50 million Local share (potential $4 million annual debt service on 20 year bond)
KRM Commuter Rail Potential Funding – Operating Costs

Operating Cost - $13.4 million (2009 dollars)
- $4.1 million fare revenue
- $5.4 million State assistance
- $2.3 million Federal assistance
- $1.6 million Local share

Operating Cost - $19.3 million (2016 dollars)
- $4.9 million fare revenue
- $7.7 million State assistance
- $3.3 million Federal assistance
- $3.4 million Local share
Next Steps

• Commuter Rail Project Next Steps
  • Consider adoption of KRM commuter rail as Locally Preferred Alternative
  • Determine to submit “New Starts” application to FTA for consideration of discretionary Federal funding to enter Preliminary Engineering
  • FTA decision on entering Preliminary Engineering
  • Conduct Preliminary Engineering
  • Apply to FTA for Final Engineering and Design funding
  • FTA decision on entering Final Engineering and Design
  • Conduct Final Engineering and Design
  • FTA Decision on Full Funding Grant Agreement
  • Construction
  • Service operations begin