Commission Purpose: The Commission shall be concerned with studies and recommendations relating to activities including but not limited to land-use; natural resources; utilities; and transportation systems within the metropolitan planning area. (Commission Bylaws last updated: 6-12-08)

Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TAC): Gaylene Rhoden, Randy Fifrick, Tim Vergara, Keith Donner, Jeff Gates, Mark Thout, Brad Lenz, Rebecca Frisch, Dave Mack, Jeff Pritchard, Darryl Landeau, Jim Griesbach, Greg Seubert, Richard Downey, Christopher Johnson, Daniel Guild, Scott Turner, Keith Rusch, Brian Grefe, Eric Lindman, David Eckmann, James Kuehn, David Meurett, Gary Olsen

Agenda Items:

1. CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS;

Policy Discussion and Possible Action:

2. APPROVE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 10, 2018 JOINT WQMTAC AND TRANSPORTATION TAC MEETING;

3. SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BLOCK GRANT FUNDING CRITERIA AND LEVELS;

4. PERFORMANCE MEASURES – WISDOT;

7. ADJOURN.

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 261-1500. For TDD telephone service, call the EMPLOYEE RESOURCES DEPARTMENT at 261-1453.
1. Call to Order / Introductions
The presence of a quorum, the agenda being properly signed and posted, the meeting was called to order by Mack for Chairperson Frisch at 1:00 p.m., Room 5, 212 River Drive, Wausau, Wisconsin.

2. Approve Minutes of the January 9, 2018 Joint Water Quality Management TAC and Transportation TAC meeting
Action: MOTION / SECOND BY VERGARA / FIFRICK TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JOINT WQMTAC AND TRANSPORTATION TAC JANUARY 9, 2018 MEETING. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE, NO DISSENT.

3. Wausau Area Sewer Service Plan (SSA) Modifications
Discussion: Mack briefly explained the elimination of the steep slopes as part of the draft Wausau Area Sewer Service Plan’s Environmentally Sensitive Area that was discussed last fall. After the draft document was reviewed by WisDNR, their concerns were the deletion of the steep slopes. The Wausau area would be the only one in the state without including that discussion in the plan. Landeau highlighted the materials that were changed. It was suggested by WisDNR to include a discussion on the steep slopes in the plan that reflects the ideas of including steep slopes in the environmentally sensitive areas. Steep slopes are typically considered to be 12% or greater, vulnerable to soil erosion, with 12-20% manageable with good management practices.
Action: MOTION / SECOND BY FIFRICK / MULLALEY TO DIRECT STAFF TO HOLD A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE WAUSAU URBAN AREA SEWER SERVICE PLAN AND INCORPORATE THE STEEP SLOPE CHANGES. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE, NO DISSENT.
Follow Through: Staff to inform the public in the Wausau Urban Area Sewer Service Plan and incorporate the steep slope changes.

4. Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Amendment
Discussion: Lynch expressed the MPO Bicycle and Pedestrian sub-committee had approved the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Amendment at their March 22, 2018 meeting. The project amendments are as follows:
- Business 51/Schofield Avenue to west Grand Ave in the City of Schofield will have an off-street path;
- 72nd Avenue Packer Drive to International Drive in the City of Wausau with an off-street path along 72nd Ave.
- 72nd Avenue to Innovation Way in the City of Wausau with an off-street path providing east-west connectivity across the Industrial Park with areas of wetlands having a boardwalk.
Action: MOTION / SECOND BY LENZ / KUNST TO APPROVE THE CHANGES IN THE WAUSAU METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PLAN. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE, NO DISSENT.
Follow Through: Staff will present the Amendment to the Planning Commission for approval.
5. **2018-2022 Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Grant Applications Ranking**

**Discussion:** Lynch explained the scoring process with the applications ranking.

- The Village of Rothschild-Schofield Business 51 bypass trail was explained by Vergara. Two options were mentioned based on the steep slope on the intersection. The City of Schofield would be developing the north end of the corridor with the Village of Rothschild modifying the route to include Kort Street and W. Grand Avenue.
- City of Wausau Business Campus Trail to 72nd Ave. Lenz described the proposed project for multi-use trail through the Wausau’s Business Campus. The proposed project would run along 72nd Ave. though the Business Campus underneath Hwy 29 and end at Sunny Vale Park.
- Lenz explained the third project being the Business Campus trying to avoid the wetlands and connect out to Innovation Way/County Road O. This would create an east-west trail multi-use trail.
- The City of Wausau and Wausau School District would create the Wausau Safe Routes to School Plan which consists of the City of Wausau's 8 main elementary schools and 2 middle schools. This project would improve walking and bicycling to school within the City of Wausau. The city of Wausau would be the sponsor not the school district. The schools mapped out are the schools that are located within the city of Wausau.

**Action:** MOTION / SECOND BY LENZ / IFRICK TO MAKE THE VILLAGE OF ROTHCHILD-SCHOFIELD PROJECT FIRST, WAUSAU SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PLAN SECOND, 72ND AVENUE PROJECT THIRD, AND BUSINESS CAMPUS TRAIL EAST-WEST CONNECTOR PROJECT FOURTH. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE, NO DISSENT.

**Follow Through:** Staff will send this ranking to WisDOT for their inclusion in TAP Grant evaluations.

6. **Draft Transit Development Program (TDP) Review**

**Discussion:** Lynch briefed the committee on the Metro Ride Transit Development Plan. The press release will be released tomorrow April 11, 2018 announcing the plan. The full report is listed on the website.

**Action:** MOTION / SECOND BY MULLALEY / SEUBERT TO ENDORSE THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND BE AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC REVIEW. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE, NO DISSENT.

**Follow Through:** An update will be provided at a future meeting.

7. **Next Meeting Date** – To be Determined.

**Action:** No Action Needed.

**Follow Through:** None needed at this time.

8. **Adjourn**

There being no further business, MOTION / SECOND BY MULLALEY / IFRICK TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 2:00 PM. MOTION CARRIED VOICE VOTE, NO DISSENT.

Submitted by:
David Mack, MPO Director
For Rebecca Frisch, MPO TAC Chair
Marathon County
Conservation, Planning and Zoning
BI
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.
### Alternate STP Funding Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Const. Total</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Federal Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Federal Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townline</td>
<td>1,137,750</td>
<td></td>
<td>568,875</td>
<td>682,650</td>
<td>796,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rib Mtn Dr</td>
<td>1,240,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>744,000</td>
<td>868,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 1st Ave</td>
<td>1,322,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>661,000</td>
<td>793,200</td>
<td>925,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old 51</td>
<td>739,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>369,600</td>
<td>443,520</td>
<td>517,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTH N</td>
<td>868,224</td>
<td></td>
<td>434,112</td>
<td>520,934</td>
<td>607,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Ave</td>
<td>1,836,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>489,775</td>
<td>1,101,600</td>
<td>1,285,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,143,362</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,318,404</td>
<td>3,107,265</td>
<td>2,959,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(40,942)</td>
<td>36,097</td>
<td>183,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,143,362</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(40,942)</strong></td>
<td><strong>36,097</strong></td>
<td><strong>183,562</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3,143,362 Available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Const. Total</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Federal Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Federal Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. 6th Street</td>
<td>1,070,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>535,000</td>
<td>642,000</td>
<td>749,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County K</td>
<td>289,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>144,500</td>
<td>173,400</td>
<td>202,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch Street</td>
<td>1,241,810</td>
<td></td>
<td>620,905</td>
<td>745,086</td>
<td>869,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,602,827</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,301,414</td>
<td>815,400</td>
<td>951,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>484,453</td>
<td>348,553</td>
<td>212,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,602,827</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,301,414</strong></td>
<td><strong>815,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>951,300</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1,299,853 Available
Key Modifications

Modifications to the metropolitan planning process include the following:

**Long Range Transportation Plan (Plan)**

- The Plan will include a description of the performance measures and performance targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system.
- The Plan will also include a system performance report and subsequent updates evaluating the condition and performance of the transportation system with respect to the established performance targets.
- MPOs have the option of developing multiple scenarios for consideration during the development of the Plan.

**Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

- The TIP will include, to the maximum extent practicable, a description of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving the performance targets established in the Plan, linking investment priorities to those performance targets.

**Performance-Based Planning and Programming – (PERFORMANCE MEASURES)**

The federal transportation bills MAP-21 and FAST Act require incorporation of Performance-Based Planning and Programming (PBPP) in the development of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Long Range Transportation Plans (LRTP) and Transportation Improvement Programs (TIP). The Final Rule on Statewide and Nonmetropolitan Transportation Planning and Metropolitan Transportation Planning further defined that the TIP shall include, to the maximum extent practicable, a description of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving the 23 CFR 490 performance measures targets identified in the metropolitan transportation plan, linking investment priorities to those performance targets (23 CFR 450.326(d)).

The Wausau Metropolitan Planning Organization has participated in performance-based planning and programming and will continue doing so under the pertinent rules, goals, and performance measure targets described here. The Wausau MPO webpage and the MPO’s Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) can be accessed here:

http://www.co.marathon.wi.us/Departments/ConservationPlanningZoning/WausauMPO.asp

The broad national performance measure goals (23 USC 150) are listed here:

- Safety - To achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads
- Infrastructure Condition - To maintain the highway infrastructure asset system in a state of good repair
- Congestion Reduction - To achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the National Highway System
• System Reliability - To improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system
• Freight Movement and Economic Vitality - To improve the national freight network, strengthen the ability of rural communities to access national and international trade markets, and support regional economic development.
• Environmental Sustainability - To enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the natural environment
• Reduced Project Delivery Delays - To reduce project costs, promote jobs and the economy, and expedite the movement of people and goods by accelerating project completion through eliminating delays in the project development and delivery process, including reducing regulatory burdens and improving agencies' work practices.

These goals can be seen at: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/about/goals.cfm

From these goals, the specific national performance measures, as established under MAP-21/FAST Act (49 USC 625 and 23 CFR 490) are as follows:
• PM1 – Safety
  • Number of fatalities
  • Fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled
  • Number of serious injuries
  • Serious injuries per 100 million vehicle miles traveled
  • Number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries
• PM2 – Infrastructure
  • Percentage of pavements of the Interstate System in Good condition
  • Percentage of pavements of the Interstate System in Poor condition
  • Percentage of pavements of the non-Interstate NHS in Good condition
  • Percentage of pavements of the non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition
  • Percentage of NHS bridges classified as in Good condition
  • Percentage of NHS bridges classified as in Poor condition
• PM3 – System Performance on NHS
  • Interstate Travel Time Reliability Measure: Percent of person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable
  • Non-Interstate Travel Time Reliability Measure: Percent of person-miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable
• PM3 – Freight Movement
  • Freight Reliability Measure: Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) Index
• Transit
  • Rolling Stock: The percentage of revenue vehicles (by type) that exceed the useful life benchmark (ULB).
  • Equipment: The percentage of non-revenue service vehicles (by type) that exceed the ULB.
  • Facilities: The percentage of facilities (by group) that are rated less than 3.0 on the Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) Scale.
  • Infrastructure: The percentage of track segments (by mode) that have performance restrictions. Track segments are measured to the nearest 0.01 of a mile.
In the Wausau Metropolitan Area, the Transit goals are being tracked by the transit providers and the CMAQ goals do not apply because the Wausau Area is an attainment area for air pollution, based on the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WisDNR).

**Long Range Transportation Plan Performance Indicators**

The Wausau MPO included a set of transportation related performance indicators in its 2016 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The full list of those indicators is included below. The MPO began tracking those indicators annually over the last few years. This data shows trends and changes and, with continued tracking, will help illustrate the condition of the transportation system in this area. To access the Long Range Transportation Plan, go to: http://www.co.marathon.wi.us/Departments/ConservationPlanningZoning/WausauMPO.aspx

Long Range Transportation Plan – Performance Indicators

1. Safety
   A. Streets and Highways
      1) Total crashes
      2) Total fatal crashes
      3) Total severe injury crashes

2. Accessibility and Mobility of People and Freight
   A. Streets and Highways
      1) Level of Service (LOS)
      2) System mileage
      3) Functionally Classified Mileage
   B. Transit
      1) Wausau Metro Ride (fixed route), and ADA paratransit service (urban),
      2) North Central Health Care Demand Response Service (county wide)
         a. Passenger trips
         b. Passenger miles
         c. Passengers per revenue mile
         d. Passengers per revenue hour
         e. Revenue hours of service
         f. Revenue miles of service
      3) Percent Urbanized Area Served by Transit

C. Integration and Connectivity of the Transportation System, Across and Between Modes for People and Freight
   1) Streets and Highways
   2) Designated park & ride capacity and use
   3) Airport Passenger Volume (enplanements)
3. Efficient Management and Operations
   A. Streets and Highways
      1) Deficient directional miles, based on Level of Service (LOS) determinations for base 2010 model network
      2) Hours of congested travel
   B. Transit
      1) Passengers/revenue hour of operation, passengers/revenue mile of operation, passenger miles traveled, number of passenger trips

4. System Preservation
   A. Streets and Highways
      1) Pavement condition – number of miles and percent of total miles in each category
      2) Bridge Structure Condition – Sufficiency Rating

5. Regional Trends
   A. Population
   B. Households

Several of the Indicators are directly connected to the national performance measures. The MPO already tracks crashes, pavement condition, and bridge condition. The MPO will begin tracking the other indicators as part of the national performance measure requirements.

Safety Performance Measure Targets (PM1)

In January 2018, the Wausau Metropolitan Planning Organization resolved to plan and program projects so that they contribute toward the accomplishment of the WisDOT’s calendar year 2018 HSIP target(s). In August 2018, WisDOT established their newest performance targets for 2019, they are:

- Number of fatalities – 555.7,
- Rate of fatalities – 0.915 per 100 million vehicle miles traveled,
- Number of serious injuries – 2,967.6,
- Rate of serious injuries – 4.785 per 100 million vehicle miles traveled, and
- Number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries – 342.

The MPO’s projects related to safety can be seen below in a number of TIP projects.

Pavement and Bridge Condition Performance Measure Targets (PM2)

With this document being approved, the Wausau Metropolitan Planning Organization resolved to plan and program projects so that they contribute toward the accomplishment of the WisDOT’s calendar years 2019 and 2021 Pavement and Bridge Condition performance measures on the National Highway System (NHS). The WisDOT is using simplified measures for broad national comparisons. Details of the target calculation can be obtained from WisDOT. The PM2 measures can be seen in Exhibits A and B:
The MPO’s Surface Transportation Block Grant-Urban (STBG-U) selection process uses criteria that include safety performance, roadway improvements as well as for multimodal enhancements. Future decisions within the TIP development process will be made with these targets in consideration.

Freight Movement and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Performance Measure Targets (PM3)

Again, with this document being approved, the Wausau Metropolitan Planning Organization resolved to plan and program projects so that they contribute toward the accomplishment of the WisDOT’s calendar years 2019 and 2021 Freight Movement and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality performance measures on the National Highway System (NHS). With the Wausau MPO being in an air quality non-attainment area, it is not necessary to consider performance measures for air quality and only the Freight and Travel Reliability performance measures will be determined.

The WisDOT is also using simplified measures for broad national comparisons for these targets as well. Details of the target calculations can be obtained from WisDOT. The PM3 measures can be seen in Exhibit C:
### Exhibit C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>2017 Measure Results</th>
<th>2-year Target</th>
<th>4-year Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Percent of person-miles traveled that are reliable on the Interstate</td>
<td>97.90%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Percent of person-miles traveled that are reliable on Non- Interstate</td>
<td>93.90%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Truck Travel Time Reliability Index on the Interstate</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transit State of Good Repair and Transit Asset Management (Transit)**

The U.S. Department of Transportation requires the establishment of state of good repair and transit asset management (TAM) performance targets by public transit providers that receive federal funds.

Wausau Area Transit System (Metro Ride) is the recipient of the following public transportation programs in the Wausau Metro area:

- Section 5307 Transit Formula Grant
- Section 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities Grant

Metro Ride has submitted a letter to WisDOT agreeing to be a part of and support the WisDOT TAM statewide group plan. Metro Ride will provide WisDOT with information pertaining to its fleet and the fleet’s condition. Metro Ride will also appoint and account executive to execute the WisDOT TAM plan. Metro Ride will plan and develop programs that will adhere to the goals established and assist WisDOT in achieving the performance targets develop in the WisDOT TAM plan.

The Wausau MPO has submitted a letter to WisDOT agreeing that in its Long Range Transportation Planning process agrees to plan and program projects that contribute to meeting the goals and TAM performance targets established by WisDOT TAM statewide group plan that is endorsed by Metro Ride.

As of October 1, 2018, the WisDOT has not finalized the statewide group TAM plan but has determined the performance measure targets for the TAM plan the statewide group. The Transit Asset Management targets are as follows:
## Transit Asset Management Performance Measure Targets (A-90)

1) **Rolling Stock - Percent of revenue vehicles that have met or exceeded their useful life benchmark**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>2018 Target (%)</th>
<th>2018 Performance (%)</th>
<th>2018 Difference</th>
<th>2019 Target (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB - Articulated Bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO - Automobile</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR - Over-the-road Bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU - Bus</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU - Cutaway</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB - Double Decker Bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV - Minivan</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR - Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB - School Bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV - Sports Utility Vehicle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VN - Van</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) **Equipment - Percent of service vehicles that have met or exceeded their useful life benchmark**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>2018 Target (%)</th>
<th>2018 Performance (%)</th>
<th>2018 Difference</th>
<th>2019 Target (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automobiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucks and other Rubber Tire Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel Wheel Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) **Facility - Percent of facilities rated below 3 on the condition scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>2018 Target (%)</th>
<th>2018 Performance (%)</th>
<th>2018 Difference</th>
<th>2019 Target (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passenger / Parking Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative / Maintenance Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>