Any person planning to attend this meeting who needs some type of special accommodation in order to participate should call the County Clerk’s Office at 715-261-1500 or e-mail infomarathon@mail.co.marathon.wi.us one business day before the meeting.

SIGNED

PRESIDING OFFICER OR DESIGNEE

NOTICE POSTED AT COURTHOUSE:

By: County Clerk
Date: 
Time: a.m/p.m.

FAXED TO: Daily Herald City Pages Marshfield News
Mid-west Radio Group – 848-3158

FAXED BY: LJ Schultz
FAX DATE/TIME: 12/1/15 9:57 a.m.
FAX BY/DATETIME: ljs 12-1-15 1:30 p.m.
Commissioners: Jim Tipple, George Peterson, Mike Wodalski (for Ermeling), Gaylene Rhoden (for Opal), Randy Fifrick (for Voll), Mark Thuot (for Hoehn), Jim Griesbach (for Kluck), Dave Meurett (for Habeck)
Absent: Betty Hoenisch, Milt Olson, Jeff Weisenberger, Jim Riehle, Steve Hagman, Raynard Zunker, Brent Jacobson
TAC Members: Rebecca Frisch, Dave Mack, Brad Lenz, Darryl Landeau, Greg Seubert, Philip Gritzmacher
Others Present: Jeff Pritchard, Andrew Lynch, Steve Kunst, Joe Gehin, Kathi Zoern, Jean Abreu

1. Call to Order
The presence of a quorum, the agenda being properly signed and posted, the meeting was called to order by Chair Tipple at 2:00 p.m. in Room 2, 212 River Drive, Wausau, Wisconsin.

2. Welcome and Introductions
All were welcomed and introductions were made. As membership and the agenda items crossed all three bodies, the decision was made to hold a joint meeting.

3. Approve Minutes:
A. June 9, 2015 Marathon County Metropolitan Planning Commission’s Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Technical Advisory Committee
Action: MOTION / SECOND BY LENZ / RHODEN TO APPROVE THE JUNE 9, 2015 MARATHON COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION’S METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO) TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE, NO DISSENT.
B. June 9, 2015 Marathon County Metropolitan Planning Commission
Action: MOTION / SECOND BY PETERSON / RHODEN TO APPROVE THE JUNE 9, 2015 MARATHON COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE, NO DISSENT.
C. July 14, 2015 Marathon County Metropolitan Planning Commission’s Water Quality Management Technical Advisory Committee
Action: Noting the correction to the year on the agenda, MOTION / SECOND BY LENZ / MACK TO APPROVE THE JULY 14, 2015 MARATHON COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION’S WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (WQMTAC) MINUTES. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE, NO DISSENT.

4. Marathon County Metropolitan Planning Commission Bylaws – Update Article III Commission Membership and Article IX General
Discussion: The bylaws were distributed with the meeting packet. Changes to the membership (Article III) were the result of changes to the urban area designation which removed the towns of Texas and Bergen from the urbanized area and added the village of Brokaw. Because the County does not have the authority to approve the Commission’s annual Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Article IX, Section 3 was changed to state that the annual UPWP would be submitted for informational purposes only to the County’s Executive Committee.
Action: MOTION / SECOND BY GRIESBACH / FIFRICK TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENTS TO THE MARATHON COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION BYLAWS AS DISCUSSED AND FORWARD THE AMENDED BYLAWS TO THE MARATHON COUNTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR ITS CONSIDERATION. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE, NOT DISSENT.
Follow Through: The amended Bylaws will be forwarded to the Executive Committee for its consideration at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

5. Wausau Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan  
Discussion: With the assistance of the consultant, Toole Design Group, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Sub-committee has worked over a year on the new bike/ped plan. A public information meeting (PIM) had been held July 30, starting the public comment period. It was anticipated that the final plan would be endorsed by the sub-committee at its August meeting and brought back to the Commission in September. An overview presentation was given of the draft plan which included the plan’s methodology, observations, improvements, implementation timeframe, and costs. Any comments regarding this plan should be forwarded to staff.  
Action: NONE AT THIS TIME, FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY.  
Follow Through: Comments received will be considered for incorporation into the plan. The final plan will be presented to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Sub-committee for its consideration and forwarding to the Commission at its September meeting.

6. Wausau Area Sewer Service Plan, 2015  
A. Plan Authorization and Budget  
B. Memorandum of Agreement  
Discussion: These two items were discussed jointly. The resolution and cooperative agreement were included in the meeting packet. The proposal from North Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (NCWRPC) to oversee the update to the plan had been discussed by the WQMTAC and recommended for adoption by the Commission. The cooperative agreement identified the seven served communities, with Marathon County representing the unserved communities with the potential to be served in the future. The cost of the plan would be divided equally among the eight signatory communities. It was noted:  
♦ Areas of need would be identified following the DNR’s requirements  
♦ Village of Brokaw:  
  o Served by the city of Wausau  
  o Outside the current sewer service area  
  o Unclear how this would fit within the plan  
♦ If all parties approve the agreement, the project would start early 2016, completed by the end of 2016  
♦ The plan:  
  o Maintains compliance with EPA regulations  
  o Necessary for sewer extensions which impacts how communities develop  
♦ The cooperative agreement formalizes the process – past plans had been done without a formal agreement  
♦ Any amendments would follow the current procedure until the update is completed  
Action: MOTION / SECOND BY PETERSON / THUOT TO APPROVE THE WAUSAU URBAN AREA SEWER SERVICE PLAN COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT RESOLUTION. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE, NO DISSENT.  
Follow Through: The resolution and cooperative agreement will be forwarded to all of the signatory communities for consideration and execution. The project will begin upon execution by all parties.

7. Metro Area Transit – Community Impacts  
Discussion: The provision of transit service for the metro area has become an issue. As the designated transit planning agency, the Commission is responsible for the development of the Transit Development Plan (TDP) for the metro area and Metro Ride, the service provider.
Information on the impact of the provision of transit service, including economic benefits, the populations served, and public support, was provided. Also included in the distributed information was financial and ridership trend data and a letter from transit director Seubert to county administrator Karger requesting financial support from the county. Discussion points included:

- The TDP’s scheduled update may have to occur sooner than anticipated (2017) due to recent interest by Schofield and Rothschild to extend service to those communities
- Previous TDP recommendations for a successful system included:
  - Expanding service to other communities with higher density (Rib Mountain, Rothschild, Schofield and Weston)
  - Expand service to Saturdays – would probably help work related transit issues for users
  - Expand evening service – may assist 2nd and 3rd shift workers
- The Transit Commission foresees a bleak future for transit unless measures are taken
  - Mobility is a key component to a strong economy
  - The city of Wausau cannot sustain a viable transportation option on its own
- Questions for this body’s consideration:
  - Is mobility important to the area?
  - Do businesses’ customers cross municipal boundaries?
  - What is the role of transit in the metro area? In the communities?
  - Can the city of Wausau maintain transit’s current level of service?
- Regional Transit Authorities (RTA) are not an option in Wisconsin
- Metro Ride cannot cross municipal boundaries without a service agreement
- The recent City Pages article regarding the Millennials’ views regarding transit
- State and federal aid will be lost if the transit system is eliminated
- If eliminated, this would be the state’s only urban area without transit
- Lack of support for transit from area businesses
- Need to have a response from the County.

Action: NO ACTION NECESSARY, FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY.

Follow Through: This discussion will continue at a future meeting.

Action: CONSENSUS REACHED THAT THE NEXT MEETING WILL BE SCHEDULED SEPTEMBER 8, 2015 AT 2:00 PM.

Action: There being no further business to come before the members, MOTION / SECOND BY GRIESBACH / FIFRICK ADJOURN THE MEETING OF THE MARATHON COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION AT 2:57 PM. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE, NO DISSENT.

MOTION / SECOND BY WODALSKI / FIFRICK ADJOURN THE MEETINGS OF THE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND THE WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:57 PM. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE, NO DISSENT.

Submitted by:
Dave Mack, MPO Director
Marathon County
Conservation, Planning and Zoning
DM:ljs
POLICY FOR APPROVAL OF TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

The following policy is used by the Wausau MPO in developing the Transportation Improvement Program allocation of the STP/Urban funds for the Wausau Metropolitan Area.

1. **COST SHARE**

   The Wausau MPO has established the federal share of STP/Urban projects at fifty percent (50%). The balance of the project costs, fifty percent, is the responsibility of the sponsoring local government.

2. **PROJECT ELIGIBILITY**

   The following are criteria used by the Wausau MPO in determining STP/Urban project eligibility:

   A. The STP/Urban funding which is pooled by the Wausau MPO communities should be primarily utilized for roadways under county, city, village, or town jurisdiction.

   B. STP/Urban funds will only be programmed within the Wausau adjusted urbanized area boundary approved by the Wausau MPO and state DOT.

   C. The costs of feasibility studies are not eligible for STP/Urban funding.

   D. The cost of preliminary design is not eligible for STP/Urban funding.

   E. Right-of-way acquisition costs are not eligible for STP/Urban funding.

   F. Projects with total construction costs of less than $100,000 are not eligible for STP/Urban funding.

   G. Relocation costs are not eligible for STP/Urban funding.

   H. Isolated traffic signal installation projects are not eligible for STP/Urban funding.

   I. Sidewalk projects are not eligible for STP/Urban funding unless the project is in conjunction with an STP/Urban funded project.

   J. Railroad crossing projects are not eligible for STP/Urban funding unless the railroad crossing project is in conjunction with an STP/Urban funded project.

   K. Transit capital and bikeway projects in conformance with SAFETEA-LU requirements are eligible for STP/Urban funding.

   L. The sponsoring local government is required to present a letter of agreement indicating financial commitment to the STP/Urban funded project.

3. **PRIORITIZATION CRITERIA FOR TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES**

   The recommended Transportation Improvement Program within the *Long Range Transportation Plan for the Wausau Metropolitan Area* and the prioritization criteria within
this section assist the Marathon County Metropolitan Planning Commission in selecting projects for STP/Urban funding. Project prioritization will be guided by the *Long Range Transportation Plan for the Wausau Metropolitan Area*. Projects eligible for STP/Urban funding will be prioritized every two years in relation to the three year STP/Urban funding allocation. With the communities submitting projects to the MPO, the following criteria and points system are applied to the projects by the MPO staff. Staff takes recommendations to the MPO Technical Advisory Committee who submits projects ranked by the criteria to the Marathon County Metropolitan Planning Commission for final approval.

1. **Key Component of Transportation System:** 20%
   - This criterion gives merit to projects according to their overall relationship with the rest of the transportation system as outlined in local and regional adopted comprehensive and land use plans.
     - **6 Points:** The roadway, transit, bicycle or pedestrian project would have a high, positive impact on the overall transportation system. Examples: projects that occur on principal arterials; transit projects that enhance system-wide transit service, bicycle/pedestrian projects that are included in adopted bike/ped. plans or occur along identified bicycle routes, or provide a critical link in the transportation system.
     - **4 Points:** The roadway, transit, bicycle or pedestrian project would have a moderately positive impact on the overall transportation system. Example: projects that occur on minor arterials.
     - **2 Points:** The roadway, transit, bicycle or pedestrian project would have a low, positive impact on the overall transportation system.
     - **0 Points:** The roadway, transit, bicycle or pedestrian project would have little or no positive impact on the overall transportation system.

2. **Preserves Existing System:** 15%
   - This criterion rewards those projects that strive to preserve the existing transportation infrastructure.
     - **6 Points:** The roadway, transit, bicycle or pedestrian project preserves the existing system, and may include replacement and rehabilitation along a transportation corridor. Examples: roadway projects that enhance travel along major transportation corridors or address pavement conditions; transit projects that enhance service along existing routes or enhance the overall system; bicycle/pedestrian projects that enhance the existing bicycle or pedestrian system, including replacement and rehabilitation of existing facilities.
     - **4 Points:** The roadway, transit, bicycle or pedestrian project preserves the existing system, but may include some new construction to provide connections and continuity along a major corridor.
     - **2 Points:** The roadway, transit, bicycle or pedestrian project preserves some of the existing system, but is dominated by significant changes in alignments, routes, and facilities along a minor corridor.
     - **0 Points:** The roadway, transit, bicycle or pedestrian project does not strive to preserve the existing system.
3. Cost Effectiveness: 15%
   This criterion reflects the results of a candidate project compared to the costs of the project (i.e. number of bus riders attracted per day). Using an estimated cost of the project, and number of users, a measure of the project’s cost-per-user may be calculated to provide a point of comparison among the projects.
   6 Points: The roadway, transit, bicycle or pedestrian project is highly cost effective.
   4 Points: The roadway, transit, bicycle or pedestrian project is moderately cost effective.
   2 Points: The roadway, transit, bicycle or pedestrian project is not very cost effective.
   0 Points: The roadway, transit, bicycle or pedestrian project is not cost effective.

4. Promotes Efficient System Management and Operation: 5%
   This criterion rewards those projects that promote an increase in density (population and/or employment), serve areas of mixed land uses, and reduce auto dependency.
   6 Points: The roadway, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project meets all three criteria (density, mixed use, and auto dependency).
   4 Points: The roadway, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project meets two of the criteria.
   2 Points: The roadway, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project meets only one criterion.
   0 Points: The roadway, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project meets none of the criteria.

5. Project Coordination: 10%:
   This criterion gives weight to projects that can be coordinated with other projects in the area.
   6 Points: Coordination of the roadway, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project with another planned or programmed project would result in significant cost and time savings.
   4 Points: Coordination of the roadway, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project with another planned or programmed project would result in moderate cost and time savings.
   2 Points: Coordination of the roadway, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project with another planned or programmed project would result in minimal cost and time savings.
   0 Points: Coordination of the roadway, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project with another planned or programmed project would result in no cost or time savings.

6. Safety: 20%
   This criterion is based on an assessment of existing safety and security problems and the extent to which the proposed project will reduce such problems. Crash statistics and standards should be used when considering roadway and bicycle/pedestrian projects, while safety and security aspects of passengers should be considered for transit projects. Some Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) measures may be used for this criterion.
   6 Points: The roadway, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project would have a high, positive impact on safety and security (i.e. reduction in crashes).
   4 Points: The roadway, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project would have a moderate, positive impact on safety and security.
2 Points: The roadway, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project would have a low positive impact on safety and security.

0 Points: The roadway, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project would have no impact on safety and security.

7. Congestion Relief: 5%
This criterion is based on an assessment of existing congestion problems and the impact a proposed project may have in reducing such problems. Existing congestion can be evaluated across all modes by looking at the volume of traffic or the number of people affected by the congestion. This criterion will also look at differing levels of ITS measures for congestion relief.

6 Points: The roadway, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project would have a high, positive impact on reducing congestion. Examples: roadway projects that may include new arterial roadways, traffic operations systems/ITS improvements; transit projects that increase service capacity, increase service reliability, decrease vehicle crowding, or reduce travel time; bicycle/pedestrian projects that provide bicycle path/lanes, or sidewalks to serve commuters, new sidewalks along principal arterials, or connections between communities.

4 Points: The roadway, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project would have a moderate, positive impact on reducing congestion. Examples: roadway projects that may include minor arterial roadways that would provide auxiliary lanes, left-turn bays, or park-and ride lots; transit projects that increase service capacity and reliability, but to a lesser extent than other projects may; bicycle/pedestrian projects that would fill in sidewalk gaps between origins and destinations or provide a bicycle path/lanes with mixed commuter or other non-recreational use.

2 Points: The roadway, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project would have a low, positive impact on reducing congestion. Examples: roadway projects that would provide minor traffic signalization enhancement; transit projects that may increase passenger comfort or convenience (i.e. bike racks); bicycle/pedestrian projects that would provide signage or a bicycle path/lane or sidewalk that is primarily for recreational travel or not on the system.

0 Points: The roadway, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project would have little to no positive impact on reducing congestion.

8. Multimodalism: 10%
This criterion rewards projects that accommodate more than one mode of travel.

6 Points: The roadway, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project accommodates more than three modes of travel.

4 Points: The roadway, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project accommodates only three modes of travel.

2 Points: The roadway, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project accommodates only two modes of travel.

0 Points: The roadway, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project accommodates only one mode of travel.
## 2013-2018 STP-Urban Projects Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>QUESTION NUMBER</th>
<th>HIGHEST POSSIBLE SCORE</th>
<th>V. OF KRONENWETTER</th>
<th>T. OF RIB MOUNTAIN</th>
<th>CITY OF SCHOFIELD</th>
<th>MARATHON COUNTY</th>
<th>CITY OF WAUSAU</th>
<th>CITY OF WAUSAU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20% 1</td>
<td>0.2,4,6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% 2</td>
<td>0.2,4,6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% 3</td>
<td>0.2,4,6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% 4</td>
<td>0.2,4,6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% 5</td>
<td>0.2,4,6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% 6</td>
<td>0.2,4,6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% 7</td>
<td>0.2,4,6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% 8</td>
<td>0.2,4,6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL SCORE    | 6               | 4             | 4.3          | 2.2           | 2.2           | 4.5           | 4             |

Funding: Total Project Cost
- Townline Rd. #1: $854,800
- Rib Mtn Dr. #2: $1,792,158
- S. 1st Ave. #3: $2,585,000
- Old 51 #3: $992,224
- CTH N #5: $1,291,500
- Grand Ave #6: $1,512,000

Construction Portion Only
- Townline Rd. #1: $739,200
- Rib Mtn Dr. #2: $1,240,000
- S. 1st Ave. #3: $1,836,000
- Old 51 #3: $868,224
- CTH N #5: $1,137,750
- Grand Ave #6: $1,322,000

50% funded by STP-Urban
- Townline Rd. #1: $369,600
- Rib Mtn Dr. #2: $620,000
- S. 1st Ave. #3: $918,000
- Old 51 #3: $434,112
- CTH N #5: $568,875
- Grand Ave #6: $661,000

* ($943,000)

Ranked Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>50% of Project</th>
<th>Running Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Townline Rd. #1</td>
<td>568,875</td>
<td>568,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rib Mtn Dr. #2</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>1,188,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 1st Ave. #3</td>
<td>661,000</td>
<td>1,849,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old 51 #3</td>
<td>369,600</td>
<td>2,219,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTH N #5</td>
<td>434,112</td>
<td>2,653,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Ave #6</td>
<td>489,775</td>
<td>3,143,362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*June 2015, City of Schofield was awarded $25,000 additional dollars for their project