

**MARATHON COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION'S  
TRANSPORTATION  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**JANUARY 8, 2019**  
**1:00 P.M.**

**CONFERENCE ROOM 5**  
**212 RIVER DRIVE, WAUSAU, WI**

**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 DECEMBER 11, 2018 TRANSPORTATION TAC MEETING;
3. SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BLOCK GRANT FUNDING LEVELS;
4. SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BLOCK ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS;
5. SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BLOCK CRITERIA;
6. 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.*

SIGNED \_\_\_\_\_

  
PRESIDING OFFICER OR DESIGNEE  
NOTICE POSTED AT COURTHOUSE:

FAXED TO: 848-9361 848-5887  
Daily Herald City Pages  
Mid-west Radio Group – 848-3158  
FAXED BY: CK  
FAX DATE/TIME: 1/4/2018 2:20 PM  
FAXED BY/DATE/TIME: \_\_\_\_\_

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

**MARATHON COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Transportation Technical Advisory Committee**  
**Minutes – December 11, 2018**

**Transportation Technical Advisory Committee:** Dave Mack, Keith Donner, Gaylene Rhoden, Jeff Gates, Randy Fifrick, Brad Lenz, Darryl Landeau, Tim Vergara, Dave Meuret, Eric Lindman, Kevin Lang, Brian Grefe

**Others:** Andrew Lynch, Brenda Iczkowski, Milton Olson

**Conference Call in:** James Kuehn, Marisa Mutty

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 November 13, 2018 Transportation TAC meeting

**Action: MOTION / SECOND BY LINDMAN / DONNER TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE TRANSPORTATION TAC NOVEMBER 13, 2018 MEETING. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE, NO DISSENT.**

3. Surface Transportation Block Grant Funding Levels

**Discussion:** Mack discussed included in the packet is information regarding the alternate STP funding scenarios that were examples given from last month's meeting. The chart shows the differences from 2013 and 2017 on the splits of 80/20, 70/30, 60/40 and 50/50 and the projects looking to get funded. Currently the Wausau Area fund level is at 50/50 split.

**Action: MOTION / SECOND BY LANG / RHODEN TO RANK THE PROJECTS AND SPLIT THE FUNDS 70/30 FULLY FUNDING THE TOP PROJECTS WITH THE REMAINING FUNDS GOING TO THE LOWER PROJECTS AS LONG AS THEY MEET A 55% THRESHOLD OF FEDERAL FUNDS. IF NONE OF THEM USE THE FUNDS, THEN THAT MONEY WOULD GET ALLOCATED SO THAT THE TOP PROJECTS WOULD GET EQUAL PERCENTAGE FUNDING UP TO 80%. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE, NO DISSENT.**

**Follow Through:** Staff will bring to the planning commission for review.

4. Surface Transportation Block Eligibility Requirements

**Discussion:** Lynch mentioned the Map that was included in the packet showing the changes and modifications from last year. The STP Urban Project eligibility criteria's were reviewed for possibly any changes. After further discussion, it was decided to keep all STP Block Eligibilities except letter F which is the Projects with total construction costs of less than \$100,000 are not eligible for STBG funding.

**Action:** NONE AT THIS TIME.

**Follow Through:** Staff to research how the funding cycles impact the funding to the committee at future meetings.

Surface Transportation Block Criteria

5. **Discussion:** Postpone until next meeting.

**Action:** NO ACTION NEEDED.

**Follow Through:** More information will be brought to the committee at future meetings.

6. Next Meeting Date – To be Determined.

**Action:** No Action Needed.

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

7. Adjourn

There being no further business, **MOTION / SECOND BY RHODEN / GREFE TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 2:22 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.

## Performance-Based Planning and Programming

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.

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

Safety Performance Measure Targets (PM1)

- 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.

Pavement and Bridge Condition Performance Measure Targets (PM2)

	2-year Target	4-year Target
Measure	(2019)	(2021)
Interstate - Percentage of pavement in "Good" condition	N/A	> 45%
Interstate - Percentage of pavement in "Poor" condition	N/A	< 5%
Non - Interstate - Percentage of pavement in "Good" condition	> 20%	> 20%
Non - Interstate - Percentage of pavement in "Poor" condition	< 12 %	< 12%
Percentage of NHS bridges by deck area in "Good" condition	> 50%	> 50%
Percentage of NHS bridges by deck area in "Poor" condition	< 3%	< 3%

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

	2017	2-year Target	4-year Target
Measure	Results	(2019)	(2021)
Travel Reliability			
1) Percent of person-miles traveled that are reliable on the Interstate	97.90%	94%	90%
2) Percent of person-miles traveled that are reliable on Non-Interstate	93.90%	N/A	86%
Freight Reliability			
3) Truck Travel Time Reliability Index on the Interstate	1.16	1.4	1.6

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

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

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

2) Equipment - Percent of service vehicles that have met or exceeded their useful life  
Benchmark - None

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

<u>Performance Measure</u>	<u>2018 Target (%)</u>	<u>2018 Performance (%)</u>	<u>2018 Difference</u>	<u>2019 Target (%)</u>
Passenger / Parking Facilities				
Administrative / Maintenance Facilities				10.00

# MPO STBG New Funding Scenarios

January 2018

## 2013 Awarded Projects at 70/30

	70/30 Award	Remainder/4	New Awarded Total	New Awarded Percentage
	796,425	9024.25	805,449	70.8%
	868,000	9024.25	877,024	70.7%
	925,400	9024.25	934,424	70.7%
	517,440	9024.25	526,464	71.2%
Total	3,107,265	Since the remainder funds would not bring any project up to 80% they are divided evenly and awarded to all projects.		
Award\$	3,143,362			
Remainder	36,097			

## 2017 Awarded Projects at 70/30

	70/30 Award	Remainder up to 80%	New Awarded Total	New Awarded Percentage
	749,000	107,000	856,000	80%
	202,300	28,900	231,200	80%
Total	951,300	135,900		
Award\$	1,299,853			
Remainder	348,553			
Leftover	212,653	The remainder funds are used to bring up the awarded projects to the 80% level. Leftover funds total \$212,653 and could be used on another project.		
Local match at 30%	91,137			
Project total	303,790			