### **Minutes of the Meeting**

# ADVISORY COMMITTEES ON TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING FOR THE KENOSHA, MILWAUKEE, RACINE, AND ROUND LAKE BEACH URBANIZED AREAS

DATE: April 9, 2013

TIME: 1:30 p.m.

PLACE: Wisconsin State Fair Park Tommy G. Thompson Youth Center Meeting Room 5 640 South 84<sup>th</sup> Street Milwaukee, WI 53214

# Milwaukee Urbanized Area Members Present

Fred Abadi	Director of Public Works, City of Waukesha
John M. Bennett	City Engineer, City of Franklin
Peter Daniels	Principal Engineer,
(Representing Michael Lewis)	City of West Allis
Brian Dranzik, Chair	Director, Milwaukee County Department of Transportation
Michael Einweck	Director, Department of Public Works, Village of Hartland
Gary Evans	Manager, Highway Engineering Division, Waukesha County
Lloyd Grant, Jr.	Managing Director, Milwaukee County Transit System
Lois C. Gresl	Major Projects Manager,
(Representing Ghassan Korban)	City of Milwaukee
Thomas M. Grisa	Director of Public Works, City of Brookfield
Michael J. Maierle	Manager of Long-Range Planning, City of Milwaukee
James Martin	Fiscal and Budget Administrator,
(Representing Chris Abele)	Milwaukee County Department of Transportation
Jeffrey S. Polenske	City Engineer, City of Milwaukee
Clark Wantoch	Director of Highway Operations,
(Representing Milwaukee County)	Milwaukee County Department of Transportation
Martin Weddle	
(Representing Michael Mayo, Sr.)	Milwaukee County
Tom Wondra	Washington County Highway Commissioner

Non-Voting Members Present

Sandra K. Beaupré	Director, Bureau of Planning,
	Division of Transportation Investment Management,
	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Dwight McComb	Planning and Program Development Engineer
(Representing George Poirier)	U.S. Department of Transportation,
	Federal Highway Administration

Peter T. McMullen	Air Management Specialist, Bureau of Air Management,
	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Sheri Schmit	Systems Planning Group Manager,
(Representing Dewayne J. Johnson)	Southeast Region,
	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Kenneth R. Yunker	Executive Director, SEWRPC
Kenosha Urbanized Area Members Present	
Sandra K. Beaupré	Director, Bureau of Planning,
	Division of Transportation Investment Management,
	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Shelly Billingsley	Director, Engineering Division, City of Kenosha
Ron Iwen	Director, Department of Transportation, City of Kenosha
Michael M. Lemens	Director, Public Works, City of Kenosha
Dwight McComb	Planning and Program Development Engineer
(Representing George Poirier)	U.S. Department of Transportation,
	Federal Highway Administration
Peter T. McMullen	Air Management Specialist, Bureau of Air Management,
	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Sheri Schmit	Systems Planning Group Manager,
(Representing Dewayne J. Johnson)	Southeast Region,
	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Racine Urbanized Area Members Present	
Julie Anderson	Director of Public Works, Racine County
Sandra K. Beaupré	Director, Bureau of Planning,
	Division of Transportation Investment Management,
	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Dwight McComb	Planning and Program Development Engineer
(Representing George Poirier)	U.S. Department of Transportation,
	Federal Highway Administration
Peter T. McMullen	Air Management Specialist, Bureau of Air Management,
	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Bill Sasse	Director of Engineering, Village of Mount Pleasant
Sheri Schmit	Systems Planning Group Manager,
(Representing Dewayne J. Johnson)	Southeast Region,
	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Albert Stanek	Parking and Transit Systems Manager, City of Racine

-3-

# Round Lake Beach Urbanized Area Members Present

Sandra K. Beaupré	Director, Bureau of Planning,
-	Division of Transportation Investment Management,
	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Dwight McComb	Planning and Program Development Engineer
(Representing George Poirier)	U.S. Department of Transportation,
	Federal Highway Administration
Peter T. McMullen	Air Management Specialist, Bureau of Air Management,
	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Sheri Schmit	Systems Planning Group Manager,
(Representing Dewayne J. Johnson)	Southeast Region,
	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Guests and Staff Present	
Jason Barrett	STP-U/STP-R Program Manager,
	Division of Investment Management,
	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Roslin Burns	Planning and Program Analyst Advanced, Southeast Region,
	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Robert Douglas	Police Chief and Administrator, Village of Chenequa
Dave Eastman	Assistant to the City Administrator/Director of City Services,
	City of Glendale
Henry Elling	Village Administrator/Zoning Administrator, Village of Summit
Mary Forlenza	Chief, Local Transportation Programs and Finance,
	Division of Transportation Investment Management,
	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Michael Friedlander	Transportation Analyst, Bureau of Air Management,
	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Christopher T. Hiebert	Chief Transportation Engineer, SEWRPC
Ryan W. Hoel	Principal Engineer, SEWRPC
Tressie Kamp	Statewide Multi-Modal Programs Manager,
	Division of Transportation Investment Management,
	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Will Kline	Local Program Unit Leader,
	Division of Transportation Investment Management,
	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Jim Lindhorst	Senior Engineer, City of St. Francis
Susan E. Morrison	Urban and Regional Planner,
	Bureau of Planning and Economic Development,
5	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
David Murphy	Director of Public Works/Village Engineer, Village of Grafton
Andrew RohdeLo	ocal Program Engineer, Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Kon Komeis	Assistant City Engineer, City of Franklin
Xylia N. Kueda	Iransportation Planner, SEWRPC
Jennifer Sarnecki	Urban and Regional Planning Supervisor, Southeast Region,
	Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Guests and Staff Present (continued)

Robert Schmidt	Local Program Manager, Southeast Region,
	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Tamara Simonson	City Engineer, City of New Berlin
David Simpson	Director of Public Works, City of Muskego
Richard Sokol	Director, Department of Neighborhood Services,
	City of Greenfield
Nathan Check	Director of Public Works, City of Mequon

# WELCOME AND ROLL CALL

Chair Dranzik called the meeting of the Advisory Committees on Transportation System Planning and Programming for the Kenosha, Milwaukee, Racine, and Round Lake Beach Urbanized Areas to order at 1:30 p.m. He welcomed all present and noted that the meeting was a joint meeting of the Advisory Committees on Transportation System Planning and Programming for the Kenosha, Milwaukee, Racine, and Round Lake Beach Urbanized Areas (TIP Committees).

Chair Dranzik indicated that a sign-in sheet was being circulated for the purposes of taking roll and recording the names of all persons in attendance at the meeting, and declared a quorum of the four Committees present.

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OCTOBER 2, 2012, AND OCTOBER 29, 2012, MEETINGS.

Chair Dranzik indicated that the first item on the agenda was the consideration and approval of the minutes for previous meetings of the TIP Committees held on October 2, 2012 and October 29, 2012. The minutes were approved as written on a motion by Mr. Grisa, seconded by Mr. Bennett, and carried unanimously by action of the TIP Committees.

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 28, 2012, MEETING.

Chair Dranzik indicated that the second item on the agenda was the consideration and approval of the minutes for a previous meeting of the Milwaukee TIP Committee held on November 28, 2012. The minutes were approved as written on a motion by Mr. Grisa, seconded by Mr. Bennett, and carried unanimously by action of the Milwaukee TIP Committee.

# CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE 2013-2016 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN.

At the request of Chair Dranzik, Mr. Yunker reviewed the proposed amendments requested by Wisconsin Department of Transportation and local units of government. He noted that in addition to the 8 proposed amendments described in the memorandum (enclosed with these minutes as Attachment 1), Commission staff is asking that the Committee also consider 5 additional proposed amendments (enclosed with these minutes as Attachment 2), all located within the Milwaukee Urbanized Area, that were provided to the Committee prior to the meeting.

There being no discussion, Mr. Einweck made a motion to approve the 13 proposed amendments to the 2013-2016 TIP. The motion was seconded by Mr. Evans, and was carried unanimously by the TIP Committees.

# CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF THE FEDERAL CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CMAQ) FUNDING FROM THE OCTOBER 29, 2012, JOINT MEETING:

Mr. Yunker asked that Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) representatives describe the solicitation of projects for the next funding cycle of Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funding. Ms. Forlenza and Ms. Kamp then reviewed with the TIP Committees a handout summarizing the upcoming solicitations of projects for CMAQ funding (enclosed with these minutes as Attachment 3) and a timeline of the solicitation (enclosed with these minutes as Attachment 4). Ms. Forlenza stated that the new CMAQ funding cycle would be for the years 2014 through 2018. She noted that based on the proposed State budget there would be about \$11.6 million in CMAQ funding available annually for projects. She stated that because of the substantial backlog of CMAQ projects being delayed until the years 2014 through 2016, there may potentially be only about \$32 million in CMAQ funding available for new projects during the new funding cycle. She noted that WisDOT and Commission staffs have developed a table identifying the CMAQ funded projects having substantial delays in implementation. She added that some of the projects have been programmed for a long period of time without implementation, and that WisDOT will require new projects approved for CMAQ funding during the new funding cycle to be implemented within a specified timeframe. She added that CMAQ projects will lose their funding if not completed by the deadline established. Ms. Schmit stated that the TIP Committees were provided with a revised table of backlogged projects that has been updated by project sponsors with the current timing of project implementation and potential issues with implementing the project (as enclosed with these minutes as Attachment 5).

Responding to inquiries by Mr. Stanek, Mr. Yunker stated that, based on the handout prepared by WisDOT staff related to proposed strategies to manage current and future CMAQ projects (as enclosed with these minutes as Attachment 6), there would be a 6-year sunset clause added to project agreements between the WisDOT and the project sponsor to allow WisDOT staff to better manage the implementation of those projects. He noted that a similar clause would be added to agreements for new STP and local bridge projects.

Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Stanek, Ms. Forlenza stated that over the years there have not been many project sponsors that have dropped their projects approved for CMAQ funding. She noted that until now WisDOT has not required project sponsors to implement their projects within a specific timeframe, so some have remained programmed without progressing towards implementation.

Responding to another inquiry by Mr. Stanek, Ms. Forlenza stated that years 2014-2018 CMAQ funding cycle is longer than previous cycles. She stated that WisDOT added additional years of funding due to the existing CMAQ projects being delayed and deferred into the years 2014 through 2016, noting that year 2014 is already over programmed with CMAQ projects. Mr. Yunker noted that this has resulted in about \$8 million in CMAQ funding being available annually for the years 2014-2018 CMAQ funding cycle. Mr. Yunker added that the \$11.6 million in annual CMAQ funding being proposed for the 2013-2015 biennial State budget is generally consistent with previous budgets. Ms. Forlenza stated that the actual amount of CMAQ funding that would be available for the next funding cycle will not be known until the 2013-2015 biennial State budget is passed this summer. Ms. Kamp noted that \$37 million was made available to new projects under the previous years 2011-2013 CMAQ funding cycle.

Mr. Polenske expressed support for the sunset clause that will be used by WisDOT, but added that sometimes issues arise during project implementation that affect their timely completion. He also noted that a number of the City of Milwaukee CMAQ projects listed on the table of backlogged projects have already been completed or are ready for construction.

Mr. Yunker stated that there is a lesson to be learned from the current backlog of projects. He stated that as the Committee and staff review, evaluate, and prioritize candidates for CMAQ funding, the likelihood of a project being implemented within a reasonable timeframe could be considered. He stated that the Federal government requires that all of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) funding, including CMAQ funding, allocated to a state in a particular year to be obligated, or spent, in that year, and that any unobligated funds would need to be returned to the Federal government. He added that WisDOT staff work hard each year to ensure that all of the funding that the State receives is obligated. He noted that in the case of CMAQ funding, in some years there has not been enough CMAQ funds to other non-CMAQ projects, potentially located outside of Southeastern Wisconsin, which is something that should be avoided.

Ms. Forlenza stated that WisDOT will be providing on its website guidance on the solicitation for the years 2014-2018 CMAQ funding cycle, and other information on the CMAQ program, to assist project sponsors seeking CMAQ funding. Mr. Forlenza stated that WisDOT staff will be making clear in the guidance and the application that when a project sponsor applies for CMAQ funding their community is making a financial commitment and that the sponsor is committing to implementation of the project in the timeline specified.

Responding to an inquiry by Ms. Gresl, Ms. Forlenza stated that she understands that issues may arise requiring delay or changes to a project during its implementation, adding that project sponsors need to work with WisDOT staff as the issues occur so that they can be resolved in a timely fashion. She added that project sponsors can still ask for time extensions and additional funding if available.

Responding to inquiries by Mr. Stanek regarding reporting requirements, Ms. Forlenza stated that the FHWA does not require the quarterly reporting by project sponsors. Mr. Schmidt added that WisDOT's local program management consultant coordinates with project sponsors during the implementation of their project, and that they provide WisDOT staff with a report on the status of projects.

# CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF THE PROCEDURE FOR SELECTING CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM – MILWAUKEE URBANIZED AREA (STP-M) FUNDS.

Mr. Yunker stated that over the past 20 years Commission staff and the Milwaukee TIP Committee together with the local governments in the Milwaukee urbanized area have developed and utilized guidelines for the eligibility, evaluation, and the prioritization of projects for STP-M funds. He stated that this process to evaluate and recommend projects for STP-M funds involved a system of crediting STP-M funding annually to each governmental unit having current jurisdictional responsibility for eligible arterial facilities based on their relative need represented by the proportion of total eligible existing and planned arterial facility lane-miles identified in the adopted regional transportation plan. He added that these needbased credits were accumulated from year-to-year with debits occurring from each governmental unit's account as projects are selected for implementation. He stated that each candidate project is rated and prioritized under the evaluation and selection process based on each governmental unit's credit balance and the estimated Federal share of the proposed project cost. He noted that this process has been viewed by local governments to be fair and equitable, and has been well accepted by the communities within the Milwaukee urbanized area. He stated, however, that FHWA has informed Commission staff that it considers this process a sub-allocation of funds—which is not to be utilized—and not a process of project evaluation and selection. He added that FHWA staff has recommended that evaluation criteria be developed for consideration in the evaluation and selection of projects for STP-M funding, with those evaluation criteria reflecting the performance desired from the transportation system in Southeastern Wisconsin as expressed in the objectives of the adopted regional transportation plan and the performance monitoring requirements of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) enacted in

July 2012. He stated as such the Commission staff would be working with the Milwaukee TIP Committee to develop revised procedures to evaluate, prioritize, and recommend project for STP-M funding.

Responding to a question by Mr. Abadi regarding the timing of the development of the revised procedures, Mr. Yunker stated that the Commission staff would like the revised procedures to be completed by late April or early May to allow project sponsors sufficient time to review and consider the revised procedures before the applications for STP-M funding is due on June 28, 2013.

#### Review and Discussion of Procedures and Evaluation Criteria Used in Other Urbanized Areas

Mr. Yunker stated that Commission staff researched the processes used in other urbanized areas for the selection of Federal Surface Transportation Program funding that is allocated to those areas. He noted that urbanized areas reviewed were selected based on their being of similar size in population to the Milwaukee urbanized area, and as well the Minneapolis/St. Paul and Chicago area urbanized areas based on their proximity to the Milwaukee urbanized area. He then reviewed a document entitled, "Comparison of Elements of the Process Used by Various Metropolitan Planning Organizations for the Selection of Federal Surface Transportation Program Funds Allocated to Similar Sized Urbanized Areas to the Milwaukee Urbanized Area" (enclosed with these minutes as Attachment 7). He stated that this document provides a comparison of the process used by the metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) that serve the urbanized areas reviewed-that is, who solicited and rated projects, what were the categories of eligible projects, whether the project scoring was quantitative or qualitative, and who recommends projects for funding. He noted that some of the project scoring procedures used criteria that were qualitatively, or subjectively, scored, but most of the criteria were quantitatively, or objectively, scored. He noted that some of the MPOs established funding targets for various types of roadway projects and for other modes of travel, such as for bicycle/pedestrian and transit projects. He also noted that the preliminary engineering phase of the project has been made ineligible for STP funding by some of the MPOs reviewed.

Mr. Bennett stated that the current process to evaluate and recommend projects for STP-M funding is understandable, and suggested that the revised process should not be made too complicated. Mr. Yunker agreed that it is important that the new process for the evaluation of county and local projects for STP-M funding be understandable.

Mr. Yunker then reviewed with the Committee a document entitled, "Summary of Criteria Utilized in the Selection of Federal Surface Transportation Program Funding Allocated to Urbanized Areas Similar in Size to the Milwaukee Urbanized Area" (enclosed with these minutes as Attachment 8). He stated that this document provides a summary of the evaluation criteria used by each of the MPOs reviewed. He noted that it is important that the Committee carefully consider the implications of using particular criteria. He added that the use of a criteria related to cost effectiveness may give preference to a resurfacing rather than a reconstruction project because of the typically lower costs associated with resurfacing projects, and use of a criteria related to congestion may give preference to capacity expansion projects.

Ms. Gresl stated that the use of criteria to evaluate project may require project sponsors to report data related to their candidate projects, adding that it may be difficult for smaller project sponsors to report this data if required to do so.

Mr. Evans inquired whether the funds would be divided into different categories so that similar types of projects could compete for funding. Mr. Yunker responded that the Milwaukee TIP Committee could make the decision to allocate funding into different categories.

Responding to an inquiry made by Mr. Evans, Ms. Forlenza stated that under MAP-21, bridge projects not on the National Highway System would be funded under the Surface Transportation Program (STP)

rather than a separately funded bridge program. She added that State law specifies that WisDOT administer the STP and bridge program separately, and specifies the process used to evaluate and select projects for bridge funding. She noted that WisDOT is currently working with FHWA to determine how to best meet the new requirements for bridge project funding in MAP-21. She stated that because the Milwaukee urbanized area receives an allocation of STP funding, and bridge projects are eligible for STP funding, the Committee could choose to fund bridge projects. Mr. Yunker added that while bridge projects under the current funding cycle would have a separate funding program, candidate bridge projects may be part of future STP funding cycles.

Responding to inquiries made by several Committee members, Ms. Forlenza stated that the current funding cycle for the STP and bridge programs covers the years 2013 through 2018.

Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Stanek, Mr. McComb stated that the Federal regulations have restrictions on the suballocation of STP funding allocated to an urbanized area to smaller geographic areas, but that there is no restriction on the suballocation of STP funding to different project types.

#### Discussion of Types of Projects to be Considered for STP-M Funding

Mr. Yunker then reviewed with the Committee a document entitled, "Potential Eligible Projects for Federal Highway Administration Surface Transportation Funding Allocated to the Milwaukee Urbanized Area" (enclosed with these minutes as Attachment 9). He stated that the Milwaukee TIP Committee has in the past recommended that streets and highways under County and local government jurisdiction identified as arterials in the adopted regional transportation system and county jurisdictional highway system plans-including those County and local arterials on the National Highway System-and transit capital projects be considered for funding with STP-M funds. He noted that projects on collector streets which are not identified in regional transportation or county jurisdictional highway system plans were recommended to be ineligible for STP-M funds. He added that with regards to transit projects, the Committee has historically recommended that STP-M and FTA Section 5307 funds allocated to the Milwaukee urbanized area be split between highway and public transit modes based upon the relative proportion of capital needs of each mode as determined in the regional transportation system plan. He noted that typically about 35 percent of the available funds are allocated to public transit capital needs and about 65 percent are allocated to highway projects. He further noted that this has resulted in a transfer of \$10.7 million in STP-M funds to transit projects. He as well noted that while there has been a shortfall of STP-M funding compared to FTA Section 5307 funds in recent years, the Committee has recommended that the transfer of FTA Section 5307 funds to highway projects should not occur since FTA Section 5307 funds can be used by Milwaukee area transit operators to fund certain transit operating expenses, as well as capital projects. He stated that as transportation enhancement-type, safety and intersection improvement projects, and CMAQ capital projects can be funded through their own funding programs, these types of projects were recommended by the Committee to not be eligible for use of STP-M funds.

Responding to an inquiry by Ms. Gresl, Ms. Kamp stated that about \$7 million is available annually statewide for projects to be funded with FHWA Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) funding, which was created by MAP-21. Ms. Forlenza added that the STP-Enhancement funding, Safe Routes to School funding, and other funding were combined under the new Transportation Alternative Program.

Responding to inquiries made by Mr. Grisa and Mr. Stanek on the current transit funding situation, Mr. Yunker stated that because of the shortfall in transit operating funding, transit operators within the Milwaukee urbanized area utilize much of the FTA Section 5307 capital funding it receives to fund their operating costs, as this funding can as well be used to fund capitalized maintenance costs, which can result in the delay of the purchasing of needed replacement buses. He noted that the State has been a principal source of funds for the operation of the public transit systems, adding that the amount of operating assistance allocated to transit operators by State was reduced by 10 percent in the 2011-2013 biennial State budget. He stated that the loss of transit operating funds is difficult for the transit operators

to make up, and generally results in a reduction of transit service. Mr. Yunker added that any increase in State operating assistance, as well the creation of a local dedicated funding source for transit, is dependent on actions by the State Legislature and Governor. Mr. Dranzik stated that the need for additional transit funding has resulted in Milwaukee County in using other funding programs to fund bus replacement, including FHWA Interstate Cost Estimate, FHWA STP-M, and FHWA CMAQ funding. Mr. Yunker suggested that the Milwaukee TIP Committee have a broader discussion of the current transit funding situation at a future meeting.

Mr. Grisa suggested that the eligibility of projects for STP-M funding not be broadened beyond the current eligibility—streets and highways under local and county jurisdiction identified as arterials in the adopted regional transportation plan—including County and local arterials on the National Highway System—and transit projects. Mr. Bennett agreed adding that the Milwaukee urbanized area does not currently receive sufficient funds to implement all of the needed resurfacing and reconstruction of the local and county arterial street and highway system. Mr. Evans agreed in continuing the eligibility of arterial streets and highway and transit projects for STP-M funding, as previously established by the Milwaukee TIP Committee, and that other types of projects should continue to be considered ineligible for STP-M funding.

Mr. Polenske suggested that perhaps safety improvement projects—beyond the safety improvements required as part of roadway project—be considered for STP-M funding. Mr. Schmidt stated that currently there is Federal and State Highway Safety Improvement Program funding available for local and county safety and intersection improvement projects, and that the State is considering making additional HSIP funding available for safety projects.

Mr. Yunker stated that based on the discussion by the Milwaukee TIP Committee it appears that there is general agreement that streets and highways under County and local government jurisdiction identified as arterials in the adopted regional transportation system and county jurisdictional highway system plans including those County and local arterials on the National Highway System—and transit capital projects should continue to be considered for funding with STP-M funds. He added that with regards to transit projects, the Committee appears in general agreement that has historically recommended that FHWA STP-M and FTA Section 5307 funds allocated to the Milwaukee urbanized area should continue to be split between highway and public transit modes based upon the relative proportion of capital needs of each mode as determined in the regional transportation system plan, noting that typically about 35 percent of the available funds are allocated to public transit capital needs and about 65 percent are allocated to highway projects. He further stated that the Committee appears to be also in general agreement that as transportation enhancement-type, safety and intersection improvement projects, and CMAQ capital projects would be funded through their own funding program, and that these types of projects should continue to not be eligible for use of STP-M funds.

Responding to an inquiry made by Ms. Simonson regarding the State administrative code requiring pedestrian and bicycle accommodations for reconstruction projects using State and Federal funding (commonly known as Trans 75), Mr. Yunker stated that the provision of bicycle and pedestrian accommodations would be part of the project funded with STP-M funding. He noted that Trans 75 does not require the provision of bicycle and pedestrian accommodations for resurfacing projects.

# Discussion and Consideration of Evaluation Criteria to be Used in the Selection of Surface Arterial Resurfacing/Reconditioning/Reconstruction/New Construction Projects for STP-M Funding

Mr. Yunker then reviewed with the Committee a document entitled, "Potential Evaluation Criteria for Use in Selecting Arterial Resurfacing, Reconditioning, Reconstruction, and New Construction Projects for Federal Highway Administration Surface Transportation Funding Allocated to the Milwaukee Urbanized Area" (enclosed with these minutes as Attachment 10). Mr. Yunker stated that the evaluation criteria that the Milwaukee TIP Committee could utilize to evaluate candidate resurfacing/reconditioning, reconstruction, and new construction projects for STP-M funding could include a measure of need criterion based on the pavement condition of the roadway, a measure of use criterion based on the existing traffic volume along the roadway, a measure of importance criterion based on the length of the route and the functional classification of the roadway, and a measure of community equity criterion similar to the process historically used by the Committee to evaluate projects.

Ms. Forlenza stated that WisDOT may not be able to provide in the future the data necessary to calculate the measure of equity criterion and recommended that the criteria used in the evaluation of STP-M projects be performance based.

Mr. Yunker stated that there are also two suggested criteria related to the job/housing balance and the provision of transit within a community. He noted these criteria were recommended for consideration in the evaluation of projects for STP-M funding in the regional housing plan, as adopted by the Commission in March of this year, and by the Commission's Environmental Justice Task Force. Mr. Yunker stated that the Commission staff, as part of the development of the adopted regional housing plan, analyzed the relationship between job wages and housing within sub-areas of the Region to determine whether they would be projected to have a job/housing imbalance. The analysis considers existing job and housing conditions and projected job and housing growth determined from adopted county and local comprehensive plans.

Mr. Bennett questioned the relevancy of the use of criteria related to job/housing imbalance and the provision of transit in the evaluation of projects for STP-M funding, particularly their connection to the need for resurfacing or reconstructing a roadway facility. Mr. Yunker stated that the intention of the adopted regional housing plan recommendation to include a criterion related to job/housing balance is to encourage those communities with a job/housing imbalance to consider including in their comprehensive plans housing that matches the types of low and moderate wage jobs offered within their community, or as an alternative to provide transit service within their communities. He added that the criteria related to job/housing imbalance and the provision of transit could be used in the evaluation of candidate capacity expansion projects: reconstructing arterials with additional traffic lanes and constructing new arterials. He noted that a community that has low and/or moderate waged jobs but does not offer housing for lowand/or moderate-income workers, and lacks the provision of transit, encourages more travel on roadways within their community and adjacent communities. Mr. Yunker noted that candidate capacity expansion projects could receive a negative score for these criteria should the project be located within a community with a low and/or moderate job/housing imbalance, as identified in the adopted regional housing plan, or is located within a community with a lack of transit service. He stated as an alternative, bonus points could be provided to projects located in communities with a job/housing balance and transit service. He noted that these criteria are suggested to be applied to candidate capacity expansion projects as those communities having a job/housing balance and the provision of transit within their community could serve to address congestion within those communities, as well within adjacent communities.

Responding to an inquiry made by Mr. Grisa regarding which communities would be considered served by transit, Mr. Yunker stated the Commission staff would identify for the next meeting which communities are served by transit and the level of service provided within these communities.

Mr. Grisa then asked whether the job/housing analysis conducted as part of the regional housing plan reflected that some low-income workers are residing in a household with higher income workers, and would not have a need for a low-cost housing unit. Mr. Yunker responded that the Commission staff would provide a response in the meeting minutes.

[Secretary's note: In response to Mr. Grisa inquiry, the average number of workers per households for each wage level—low, medium, and high—was not considered in the calculation of the number and cost of housing units

within each sub-area shown on Map 1 of the handout related to potential criteria to evaluate candidate highway projects for STP-M funding (as attached to these minutes as Attachment 10). However, the number of projected housing units estimated to be added between the years 2010 and 2035 within each sub-area was adjusted by the average number of full- and part-time workers per household in each sub-area to allow for a more accurate comparison of the number of jobs to housing capacity within each sub-area.]

Mr. Bennett expressed concern about how communities would be determined to have or not have the provision of transit within their community. He noted that some communities, like the City of Franklin, are located in an area where transit service is provided by the County and as a result do not have control over whether transit is provided in their community even if transit is desired or had been previously provided and removed. Mr. Yunker noted that Milwaukee County Transit System, which is the transit operator in Milwaukee County, had cut the transit service that had been serving portions of the City of Franklin.

Mr. Bennett also expressed concern that some of the criteria being suggested—such as traffic volume and length of the facility—could favor larger communities as they would be expected to have more higher-volume and longer roadways. Mr. Yunker suggested that the Committee should carefully consider the implications of the criteria selected to evaluate candidate STP-M projects.

Mr. Abadi expressed concern that if a candidate project would receive points based on pavement rating, the project sponsor may be encouraged to not maintain the condition of their arterial facilities over time in order to receive a higher score. Mr. Daniels added that the use of evaluation criteria, such as the criterion related to pavement condition, may emphasize reconstruction over resurfacing projects, and suggested allocating proportions of the available STP-M funding to different types of roadway projects. Mr. Evans agreed noting that the County heavily considers pavement condition when prioritizing resurfacing and reconstruction projects and traffic volume and crash rates when prioritizing reconstruction with additional traffic lanes projects.

Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Grisa, Mr. Yunker stated that the Committee could choose to use multiple criteria to evaluate the candidate projects for STP-M funding and that the Committee could choose to weight criteria that it wants to emphasize.

Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Daniels, Mr. Yunker stated that the potential measure of use criterion related to the length of the route that the project is located on would include the entire continuous length of the facility and that it may cross multiple municipalities.

Mr. Yunker then reviewed with the Committee additional potential criteria that could be used for the evaluation of highway projects, but would require that a candidate project have completed preliminary engineering before applying for funding. He stated that the Commission staff would like the Committee to consider at this meeting whether a candidate project should be required to have preliminary engineering completed to apply for STP-M funding. He noted that a candidate project having completed preliminary engineering prior to applying for STP-M funding may have a greater chance to be implemented without significant delays.

Ms. Forlenza stated that project sponsors intending to seek STP-M funding that complete preliminary engineering with only local funding would also have to fund with local funding the cost of the State review that is required for all Federally funded highway projects to ensure that State and Federal standards are being met.

Responding to inquiries made by Mr. Abadi, Ms. Forlenza stated WisDOT's local program management consultant would still need to review the preliminary engineering for any candidate project that would be seeking STP-M funding, regardless of whether preliminary engineering is required to be completed in order for a project to able to apply for funding.

Mr. Evans stated that requiring candidate projects to have preliminary engineering completed prior to applying for STP-M funding could result in projects sponsors paying the cost to complete preliminary engineering to State and Federal standards, but not actually having the construction of their projects be recommended for STP-M funding.

Mr. Abadi suggested that there could be cost savings on preliminary engineering if project sponsors would be permitted to work directly with WisDOT staff, rather than through WisDOT's local program management consultant, to ensure that their candidate projects are meeting State and Federal standards. Mr. Forlenza stated that WisDOT does not have the staff to review the preliminary engineering of all candidate projects to ensure that the requirements are being met.

Mr. Grisa suggested that preliminary engineering not be required to be completed for a candidate project to apply for STP-M funding. He suggested that any project that has completed preliminary engineering to State and Federal standards should receive additional points, as it shows that the project sponsor is more committed to implementing that project.

Mr. Bennett agreed that preliminary engineering should not be required to be completed for candidate project to apply for STP-M funding. Mr. Evans agreed noting that Waukesha County would not want to risk funding preliminary engineering on a project to State and Federal standards without knowing whether the construction for the project would be funded.

Mr. Polenske stated that a criterion related to completing preliminary engineering may be reasonable depending upon how it is weighted.

Mr. Wantoch expressed concern about the use of the pavement surface evaluation and rating (PASER) system in determining the score for the criterion related to pavement condition, as the pavement condition rating for a roadway can vary by the person conducting the evaluation. Mr. Yunker responded that Commission staff would evaluate the pavement condition of each of the candidate projects so that all candidate projects would be evaluated consistently and comparatively.

Mr. Daniels suggested that process to evaluate candidate projects for STP-M funding be kept as simple as possible. Mr. Yunker agreed adding that having the evaluation criteria should be objective rather than subjective could assist in achieving that goal.

Mr. Grisa indicated that he would suggest that candidate projects seeking STP-M funding receive extra points for having completed preliminary engineering and for demonstrating how the projects would reduce the amount of congestion and the number of crashes along the roadway. He further suggested that the criteria used to evaluate candidate projects for STP-M include criteria related to the volume-to-capacity ratio along the roadway, the importance of the roadway, the condition of the roadway (perhaps related to the life-cycle of the roadway), and equity. He noted that it may not be possible to implement life cycle consideration for the current STP-M funding cycle, but suggested that it should be considered for future funding cycles. He also suggested that cost effectiveness could be considered. Mr. Yunker noted that the volume-to-capacity ratio would likely emphasize capacity expansion projects as the ratio should always be less than one for reconstruction and resurfacing projects. Mr. Grisa suggested that there

may be a need for different criteria to evaluate capacity expansion projects and resurfacing/reconstruction to same capacity projects.

Ms. Gresl suggested that the process to evaluate be simple with a smaller number of criteria and multiple categories of projects, noting the evaluation criteria and process used in the Memphis urbanized area.

Responding to an inquiry made by Ms. Gresl, Mr. Yunker stated that the project sponsors would not have to provide any additional information than what is already being requested in the application prepared by WisDOT for the STP-M solicitation. He added that Commission staff would gather all of the information, including the evaluation of the pavement condition that would be necessary to evaluate all of the candidate projects with the process that is developed and approved by the Milwaukee TIP Committee.

Responding to another inquiry by Ms. Gresl, Mr. Yunker stated that because the prioritization and recommendation of projects for STP-M funding would be based on evaluating candidate projects with criteria, project sponsors would have to use the funding on the project that was approved for funding, and as well would no longer be permitted to substitute their approved STP-M project for other highway projects in their community/county.

Responding to an inquiry by Ms. Schmit, Mr. Yunker stated that the Commission staff would prepare a proposed process to evaluate, prioritize, and recommend candidate projects for STP-M funding that would be reviewed and discussed by the Committee at its next meeting, which would be held within the next two weeks. He added that Commission staff would be sending a meeting notice by email to Milwaukee TIP Committee members and to local governments within the Milwaukee urbanized area having eligible facilities for STP-M funding.

Mr. Grisa stated that whatever process that the Committee develops for the evaluation, prioritization, and recommendation of candidate projects for the current STP-M funding cycle, could be reviewed and revised by the Committee for future STP-M funding cycles.

## ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the TIP Committees, the meeting was adjourned at 3:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth R. Yunker Acting Secretary

KRY/RWH/XNR/dad 00210902.DOC

Attachment 1

# SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

W239 N1812 ROCKWOOD DRIVE • PO BOX 1607 • WAUKESHA, WI 53187-1607 •

TELEPHONE (262) 547-6721 FAX (262) 547-1103

KENOSHA MILWAUKEE OZAUKEE RACINE WALWORTH WASHINGTON

WAUKESHA

Serving the Counties of:

	ſ	7	1
	Γ		}
Г		5	

#### MEMORANDUM

- TO: All Members of the SEWRPC Advisory Committees on Transportation System Planning and Programming for the Kenosha, Milwaukee, Racine, and Round Lake Beach Urbanized Areas
- FROM: Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission Staff
- DATE: March 25, 2013

## SUBJECT: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE 2013-2016 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN

Eight proposed amendments to the 2013-2016 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Southeastern Wisconsin are provided in Attachment 1 to this memorandum. The proposed amendments are being requested by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation and local units of government. One of the eight proposed amendments would revise a project currently in the TIP. The remaining seven proposed amendments represent the addition of new projects to the TIP.

The proposed amendments may not be expected to affect the implementation schedule of other projects currently programmed in the TIP, and the entire TIP as amended may be expected to remain consistent with projected available funding. All of the amendments are exempt from the requirement to conduct an air quality conformity, or regional emissions, analysis with respect to the State of Wisconsin Air Quality Implementation Plan, as the projects entail highway preservation, transit preservation, or environmental enhancement activities.

Should you have any questions concerning the proposed TIP amendments being transmitted with this memorandum for your consideration and action, please do not hesitate to call.

\* \* \*

KRY/CTH/RWH/XNR/xnr 210216.DOC Enclosure

#### Attachment 1

#### NEW PROJECTS TO BE ADDED TO THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE MILWAUKEE TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT AREA --MILWAUKEE COUNTY 2013-2016

		PROJECT				ESTIMA	ATED COSTS	(\$1.000)			AIR
PROJECT SPONSOR	NO	DESCRIPTION / STATE ID	TYPE			2013	2014	2015	2016	REMAINING	QUAL STAT
M LWAUKEE COUNTY	518	MOB LITY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE PLANNING AND COORDINATION OF PUBLIC	TP	DETAIL COSTS	PE ROW CONST						EXEMPT
		TRANSPORTATION SERVICES FOR			OTHER	365.2					
		PERSONS WITH DISABILIT ES IN			TOTAL	365.2					
		MILWAUKEE COUNTY: 2013		SOURCE	LOCAL	73.0					
				FTA NF	FEDERAL	292.2					
		4009992			TOTAL	365.2					1
	519	PURCHASE OF CONCRETE BUS PADS IN M LWAUKEE COUNTY: 2013	TP	DETAIL COSTS	PE ROW						EXEMPT
					CONST OTHER	80.0					
					TOTAL	80.0					
				SOURCE	LOCAL	16.0					
				FTA NF	FEDERAL	64.0					
		4009893			TOTAL	80.0					1
	520	PURCHASE AND INSTALLATION OF	TP	DETAIL	PE						EXEMPT
		SH ELDS ON 326 MCTS BUSES		00373	CONST						
					OTHER	750.0					
					TOTAL	750.0					
				SOURCE	LOCAL	150.0					
			FTA 5307	FEDERAL	600.0						
		4009999			TOTAL	750.0					1

#### NEW PROJECT TO BE ADDED TO THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE MILWAUKEE TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT AREA --WASHINGTON COUNTY 2013-2016

		PROJECT				ESTIMATED COSTS (\$1,000)							
PROJECT SPONSOR	NO	DESCRIPTION	I / STATE ID	TYPE			2013	2014	2015	2016	REMAINING	QUAL STAT	
STATE OF WISCONSIN	517	MAINTENANCE OVER FROM P LGRIM RD TO VILLAGE OF GERMAN	RLAY ON STH 145 O CTH P N THE NTOWN (5.72 MI)	HP	DETAIL COSTS	PE ROW CONST OTHER	150.0   			  1,725.0 		EXEMPT	
		8000083	2475-12-30		SOURCE OF FUNDS	LOCAL STATE FEDERAL TOTAL	150.0  150.0  150.0			1,725.0  1,725.0  1,725.0			

#### NEW PROJECT TO BE ADDED TO THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE MILWAUKEE TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT AREA --WAUKESHA COUNTY 2013-2016

		PROJECT				ESTIM/	ATED COSTS	(\$1,000)			AIR
PROJECT SPONSOR	NO	DESCRIPTION / STATE ID	TYPE			2013	2014	2015	2016	REMAINING	QUAL STAT
NTERFAITH SENIOR	521	MOB LITY MANAGER POSITION TO PLAN AND COORDINATE	TP	DETAIL COSTS	PE ROW						EXEMPT
PROGRAMS		WAUKESHA COUNTY: 2013			OTHER	46.4					
					TOTAL	46.4					
				SOURCE	LOCAL	9.3					
				OF FUNDS	STATE						
				FTA NF	FEDERAL	37.1					
		7429998			TOTAL	46.4					1

#### Attachment 1 (continued)

#### NEW PROJECT TO BE ADDED TO THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE KENOSHA, RACINE, WALWORTH TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT AREA -- KENOSHA COUNTY 2013-2016

		PROJECT			ESTIMATED COSTS (\$1,000)							
PROJECT SPONSOR	NO	DESCRIPTION / STATE ID	TYPE				2014	2015	2016	REMAINING	QUAL STAT	
KENOSHA COUNTY	522	MOB LITY MANAGER POSITION TO PLAN AND COORDINATE TRANSPORTATION SERVICES IN KENOSHA COUNTY: 2013	TP	DETAIL COSTS	PE ROW CONST OTHER TOTAL	  62.0 62.0					EXEMPT	
		1009967		SOURCE OF FUNDS FTA NF	LOCAL STATE FEDERAL TOTAL	12.4  49.6 62.0						

#### AMENDMENT TO EXISTING PROJECT IN THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE KENOSHA, RACINE, WALWORTH TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT AREA -- RACINE COUNTY 2013-2016

		PROJECT				ESTIMATED COSTS (\$1,000)						
PROJECT SPONSOR	NO	DESCRIPTION / S	TATE ID	TYPE				2014	2015	2016	REMAINING	QUAL STAT
MOUNT PLEASANT (V LLAGE)	AT 436 CONSTR ASPHALT TO STH 2 PATH FR (608) PATHWA	CONSTRUCTION OF A 1 ASPHALT TRAIL FROM N TO STH 20, PAVING OF / PATH FROM STH 20 TO PATHWAY, AND NSTAL	DNSTRUCTION OF A 10 FT WIDE SPHALT TRAIL FROM MARINER DR D STH 20, PAVING OF AN EXIST NG ATH FROM STH 20 TO PIKE RIVER	EE	DETAIL COSTS	PE ROW CONST OTHER	63.4 201.8			  		EXEMPT
	()	BIKE LANES ON OAKES RD AND ON SOUTHERN FRONTAGE RD 3069998 1693-34-74		SOURCE OF FUNDS CMAQ	LOCAL STATE FEDERAL TOTAL	203.2 53.0  212.2 265.2						

The above project is being amended to add \$63,400 in right-of-way acquisition to the year 2013.

#### NEW PROJECT TO BE ADDED TO THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE KENOSHA, RACINE, WALWORTH TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT AREA -- RACINE COUNTY 2013-2016

		PROJECT			ESTIMATED COSTS (\$1,000)							
PROJECT SPONSOR	NO	DESCRIPTION / STATE ID	TYPE			2013	2014	2015	2016	REMAINING	QUAL STAT	
RACINE COUNTY	523	MOB LITY MANAGER POSITION TO PLAN AND COORDINATE	TP	DETAIL COSTS	PE ROW						EXEMPT	
		RACINE COUNTY: 2013			CONST OTHER	 55.2						
					TOTAL	55.2						
				SOURCE	LOCAL	11.0						
				OF FUNDS	STATE							
				FTA NF	FEDERAL	44.2						
		3009978			TOTAL	55.2					1	

#### Attachment 2

#### Page A - 5

#### NEW PROJECT TO BE ADDED TO THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE MILWAUKEE TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT AREA --MILWAUKEE COUNTY 2013-2016

		PROJECT				ESTIMA	ATED COSTS	(\$1,000)			AIR
PROJECT SPONSOR	NO	DESCRIPTION / STATE ID	ТҮРЕ			2013	2014	2015	2016	REMAINING	QUAL STAT
STATE OF WISCONSIN	524	CONSTRUCT A SALT SHED AT ST PAUL AVE AND IH 94 IN THE CITY OF MILWAUKEE	HP	DETAIL COSTS	PE ROW CONST	  1,150 0					EXEMPT
					TOTAL	1 150 0					
				SOURCE OF FUNDS	LOCAL STATE FEDERAL	 1,150 0 					
		8009462 1060-29-	60		TOTAL	1,150 0					

#### NEW PROJECT TO BE ADDED TO THE

#### TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE MILWAUKEE TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT AREA --OZAUKEE COUNTY 2013-2016

		PROJECT				ESTIM/	ATED COSTS	(\$1,000)			AIR
PROJECT SPONSOR	NO	DESCRIPTION / STATE ID	TYPE			2013	2014	2015	2016	REMAINING	QUAL STAT
MEQUON (CITY)	525	SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS AT THE INTERSECTION OF PIONEER RD AND GRANVILLE RD N THE CITY OF MEQUON	HS	DETAIL COSTS	PE ROW CONST OTHER	14.4  	  40 2 				EXEMPT
		2090007 2697-03-0	1	SOURCE OF FUNDS HSIP	TOTAL LOCAL STATE FEDERAL TOTAL	14.4 1.4  13 0 14.4	40 2 4.1  36.1 40 2	   			

#### NEW PROJECTS TO BE ADDED TO THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE MILWAUKEE TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT AREA --WASHINGTON COUNTY 2013-2016

		PROJECT					ESTIMA	ATED COSTS	(\$1,000)			AIR
PROJECT SPONSOR	NO	DESCRIPTION / STATE ID	ז כ	TYPE			2013	2014	2015	2016	REMAINING	QUAL STAT
STATE OF WISCONSIN	526	REHAB LITATION OF BR DGES ALONG USH 41 FROM STH 145	то	HP	DETAIL COSTS	PE ROW		182 5 				EXEMPT
		STH 33 IN WASHINGTON COUN (12 35)	TY			CONST OTHER					4,088.0	
						TOTAL		182 5			4,088.0	
					SOURCE OF FUNDS	LOCAL						
					NHS	FEDERAL		146 0				
		8009458 1100	0-43-00			TOTAL		182 5				
	527	RESURFACING OF THE PARK A	ND		DETAIL	PE						EVEMDT
	011	RIDE LOT AT USH 45 AND PARA	ADISE	пр	COSTS	CONST						
						OTHER						
						TOTAL		93 2				1
					SOURCE	LOCAL						
					OF FUNDS	STATE		93 2				
		0000450				FEDERAL						
		8009459 2707	7-03-71			TOTAL		93 2				
	528	INSTALLATION OF A SKID RESIS	STANT		DETAIL	PE						EVENDE
	520	SURFACE TREATMENT ON STH	164	ΗP	COSTS	ROW						EXEMPT
		NORTH OF MONCHES RD IN				OTHER	30 0					
		WASHINGTON COUNTY				TOTAL	30.0					1
					SOURCE	LOCAL						
					OF FUNDS	STATE	3 0					
					HSIP	FEDERAL	27 0					
		8009463 2370	0-01-70			TOTAL	30 0					

Attachment 3



Date:April 2013To:Eastern Wisconsin Local Government UnitsFrom:Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) Local Transportation<br/>Programs and Finance SectionSubject:2014-2018 CMAQ Program Cycle Applications<br/>Application Deadline: June 14, 2013

WisDOT is preparing to accept the next round of applications for the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program. Examples of eligible CMAQ projects include new and expanded public transit services, carpool and vanpool programs, park-and-ride lots, new bicycle and pedestrian facilities, corridor-based traffic signalization, alternatively fueled vehicles, diesel engine retrofit and idling reduction strategies. **Applications are due June 14, 2013.** 

The CMAQ application should be available in mid-April at the WisDOT CMAQ website: http://www.dot.wisconsin.gov/localgov/aid/cmaq.htm. Note that WisDOT recently updated *The Sponsor's Guide to Non-Traditional Transportation Project Implementation* (available at http://www.dot.wisconsin.gov/localgov/docs/sponsors-guide.pdf), which outlines federal and state requirements for implementing CMAQ and other multi-modal transportation projects. Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact WisDOT staff, particularly new participants to the CMAQ process or any applicants with project eligibility questions.

A government unit with taxing authority must sponsor all CMAQ projects, even if the private sector is involved in the project. Local sponsors in the following non-attainment and maintenance counties are eligible to apply for CMAQ funds: Milwaukee, Racine, Kenosha, Waukesha, Ozaukee, Walworth, Washington, Sheboygan, Kewaunee, Manitowoc and Door. Federal CMAQ guidance is available at http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/guidance/guidecmaq.cfm.

The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Act (MAP-21) is current through September 2014 but will need to be re-authorized during the State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2014-2018 time period covered by this WisDOT CMAQ funding cycle. WisDOT is programming this award cycle under the assumption that federal funding will continue at the SFY 2013 level of \$11.6 million annually. Funding available could change based upon the state biennial budget or the federal transportation act that follows MAP-21. WisDOT is programming projects primarily for SFYs 2015-2018, although requests for funding in earlier years may be considered on a case-by-case basis. Projects are most typically funded at 80% federal, with higher percentages allowed on a small number of categories. **The application deadline is June 14, 2013.** A selection committee consisting of staff from the Southeastern Wisconsin and Bay-Lake Regional Planning Commissions, WisDOT and the Department of Natural Resources will review all project applications. Final concurrence from the Regional Planning Commissions is required for inclusion of CMAQ projects in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

CMAQ projects must demonstrate realistic emission reductions from projects that reduce vehicle trips or Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), reduce congestion, reduce vehicle emissions from improvements to vehicles and fuels or provide education, outreach and marketing activities with quantifiable emission reduction benefits. WisDOT encourages local governments to read through the application guidelines and *Sponsor's Guide* and to work with their appropriate WisDOT Region Office and Regional Planning Commission to develop projects.

The CMAQ selection committee will likely contact applicants to clarify information or request more specific data that is needed to estimate project emissions reductions. WisDOT looks forward to local participation in developing meaningful CMAQ projects. Given the continued high interest in the program, we expect a strong demand for the limited dollars available. Please call or e-mail WisDOT Region Office staff in your area to obtain application materials or other information.

#### WisDOT Contact Information

WisDOT Southeast Region Robert Schmidt robert1.schmidt@dot.wi.gov Phone: (262) 548-8789

WisDOT Central Office Tressie Kamp tressie.kamp@dot.wi.gov Phone: (608) 266-3973

#### **RPC Contact Information**

Southeastern Wisconsin RPC (SEWRPC) Ryan Hoel Phone: (262) 547-6721 WisDOT Northeast Region Glenn Landis glenn.landis@dot.wi.gov Phone: (920) 492-4110

Bay-Lake RPC Jeff Agee-Aguayo Phone: (920) 448-2820

# WisDOT Schedule

# 2014-2018 Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality Improvement Program

# April 2013

	Tasks to Be Completed	Date
1.	WisDOT publishes 2014-2018 CMAQ guidelines, instructions, and applications on WisDOT Web site.	4-15-2013
2.	<ul><li>WisDOT regions:</li><li>A. Conduct local informational meetings.</li><li>B. Work with locals to develop project applications for 2014-2018 program cycle.</li></ul>	April & May 2013
3.	WisDOT receives 2014-2018 CMAQ project applications from locals.	6-14-2013
4.	WisDOT CMAQ selection committee reviews applications.	June- November 2013
5.	WisDOT receives emissions reductions estimates from SEWRPC and BLRPC.	8-15-2013
6.	WisDOT CMAQ selection committee approves 2014-2018 Program.	November 2013
7.	WisDOT notifies locals of approved CMAQ projects.	11-30-2013
8.	WisDOT publishes approved project lists on WisDOT CMAQ Web site.	December 2013

# Attachment 5 Appendix B (revised)

Current Cycle

Project	SCHD_DT	PROJ_ID	CPNT_TY	TITLE	LIMIT	Federal	Amount	Charges to	Remaining	Sponsor			
approved						Amount	Encumbere	Date	Encumbere				
for cycle							d		nce				
2010-13	1/25/2012	1693-33-14	MIS	AMTRAK ADVERTISING	MILWAUKEE TO CHICAGO	\$480,000	\$ 449,989	\$ 414,675	\$ 35,314	Amtrak			
2010-13	7/25/2015	1693-34-79		CLEAN FLEET EMISSIONS REDUCTION	CITY OF MILWAUKEE	\$1,071,404	\$-	\$-		City of Milwaukee			
2010-13	6/25/2014	1693-35-10	MIS	CLEAN FLEET EMISSIONS REDUCTION	20 CNG REFUSE TRUCKS	\$576,000	\$-	\$-		City of Milwaukee			
2010-13	6/25/2012	1693-35-02	I/E	CNG FUEL PROGRAM	3025 W RUBY AVENUE	\$11,391	\$ 15,506	\$ 599	\$ 14,907	City of Milwaukee			
2010-13	5/25/2014	1693-35-72	LLC	CNG FUEL PROGRAM	3025 W RUBY AVENUE	\$1,816,000	\$-	\$-		City of Milwaukee			
2010-13	3/25/2012	1693-35-06	C/E	COMPUTER OPTIMIZATION TRAFFIC SGNLS	CAPITOL AND FOND DU LAC CORRIDORS	\$160,800	\$ 188,427	\$ 1,447	\$ 186,980	City of Milwaukee			
2010-13	11/25/2011	1693-35-07	C/E	COMPUTER OPTIMIZATION TRAFFIC SGNLS	34 VARIOUS LOCATIONS	\$55,200	\$ 69,618	\$ 979	\$ 68,639	City of Milwaukee			
2010-13	8/25/2013	1693-35-96	LFA	COMPUTER OPTIMIZATION TRAFFIC SGNLS	CAPITOL AND FOND DU LAC CORRIDORS	\$63,528	\$-	\$-		City of Milwaukee			
2010-13	2/25/2014	1693-35-97	LFA	COMPUTER OPTIMIZATION TRAFFIC SGNLS	34 VARIOUS LOCATIONS	\$33,368	\$-	\$-		City of Milwaukee			
2010-13 Int	12/25/2012	1693-25-30	TST	EXPRESS BUS ROUTE	BAYSHORE-UW-DOWNTOWN-AIRPORT	\$4,303,680	\$-	\$-		Milwaukee CO	Second yea	r transfer to	o FTA
2010-13 Int	12/25/2012	1693-25-31	TST	EXPRESS BUS ROUTE	CAPITOL DR/DOWNER AVE-124TH TO UW	\$2,046,300	\$-	\$-		Milwaukee CO	Second yea	r transfer to	o FTA
2010-13	6/25/2013	1693-35-76	TST	EXPRESS BUS ROUTE -former BRT	FOND DU LAC NATIONAL/GREENFIELD AV	\$3,200,000	\$-	\$-		Milwaukee CO	Second yea	r transfer to	o FTA
2010-13	4/10/2012	1693-38-71	LET	HANK AARON STATE TRAIL	33RD COURT BRIDGE & APPROACHES	\$1,265,699	\$ 846,244	\$ 459,908	\$ 386,336	DNR			
2010-13	12/25/2011	1693-35-08	C/E	INSTALL SEMI-ACTUATED OPERATION	32 LOCAL INTERSECTIONS CITYWIDE	\$47,200	\$ 56,890	\$ 1,093	\$ 55,797	City of Milwaukee			
2010-13	12/25/2011	1693-35-09	C/E	INSTALL SEMI-ACTUATED OPERATION	10 CONNECTING HIGHWAY INTERSECTIONS	\$24,000	\$ 27,379	\$ 755	\$ 26,624	City of Milwaukee			
2010-13	3/25/2014	1693-35-98	LFA	INSTALL SEMI-ACTUATED OPERATION	32 LOCAL INTERSECTIONS CITYWIDE	\$361,200	\$-	\$-		City of Milwaukee			
2010-13	3/25/2014	1693-35-99	LFA	INSTALL SEMI-ACTUATED OPERATION	10 CONNECTING HIGHWAY INTERSECTIONS	\$137,200	\$-	\$-		City of Milwaukee			
2010-13	12/25/2011	1693-35-03	C/E	INSTALLATION OF TRANSIT PRIORITY	EXPRESS BUS/TROLLEY CIRCULATOR RTES	\$200,000	\$ 89,547	\$ 1,526	\$ 88,021	City of Milwaukee			
2010-13	8/25/2013	1693-35-93	LFA	INSTALLATION OF TRANSIT PRIORITY	EXPRESS BUS/TROLLEY CIRCULATOR RTES	\$680,000	\$-	\$-		City of Milwaukee			
2010-13	6/25/2015	1693-35-75	LLC	KENOSHA COUNTY PARK AND RIDE LOT	TERWALL TERRACE V PLEASANT PRAIRIE	\$371,082	\$-	\$-		Kenosha CO			
2010-13	7/25/2013	1693-42-71	TST	KENOSHA ELEC STREETCAR EXPANSION	CITY OF KENOSHA	\$4,200,000	\$-	\$-		City of Kenosha			
2010-13	9/25/2011	1693-34-07	C/E	LAKE MICHIGAN PHASE 3	AUGUSTA TO MELVIN & DEKOVEN TO 24TH	\$180,510	\$ 214,020	\$ 8,461	\$ 205,559	City of Racine			
2010-13	5/25/2013	1693-34-77	LLC	LAKE MICHIGAN PHASE 3	AUGUSTA TO MELVIN & DEKOVEN TO 24TH	\$855,600	\$-	\$-		City of Racine			
2010-13	5/25/2012	1693-35-01	C/E	MILWAUKEE SMART TRIPS	PILOT TARGETED MARKETING PROGRAM	\$273,247	\$ 5,851	\$ 572	\$ 5,279	City of Milwaukee			
2010-13	4/25/2012	1693-34-05	M/E	OZAUKEE CO/DOWNTOWN MILW CONNECTOR	HAMPTON AVENUE TO MILL ROAD	\$130,270	\$ 146,103	\$ 7,697	\$ 138,407	Milwaukee CO			
2010-13	5/25/2013	1693-34-25	R/E	OZAUKEE CO/DOWNTOWN MILW CONNECTOR	HAMPTON AVENUE TO MILL ROAD	\$2,342,307	\$ -	\$-		Milwaukee CO			
2010-13	12/25/2011	1693-34-04	C/E	PIKE RIVER PATHWAY CONNECTION	RACINE CO TRAIL TO S OF LANNON TR	\$35,957	\$ 72,988	\$ 10,527	\$ 62,461	Mt Pleasant			
2010-13	2/25/2013	1693-34-24	R/E	PIKE RIVER PATHWAY CONNECTION	RACINE CO TRAIL TO S OF LANNON TR	\$41,146	\$ -	\$-		Mt Pleasant			
2010-13	11/25/2013	1693-34-74	LLC	PIKE RIVER PATHWAY CONNECTION	RACINE CO TRAIL TO S OF LANNON TR	\$161,466	\$ -	\$-		Mt Pleasant			
2010-13	2/25/2012	1693-36-01	C/E	TRAFFIC SIGNAL OPTIMIZATION	50 MILWAUKEE CO TRAFFIC SIGNALS	\$252,973	\$ 11,553	\$ 389	\$ 11,164	Milwaukee CO			
2010-13	11/25/2011	1693-34-78	MIS	TRUCK FLEET TRAINING ON ECO DRIVING	DRIVER EDUCATION INITIATIVE	\$105,980	\$ 132,555	\$ 80	\$ 132,475	DNR			

\$25,483,507

\* \$3.008 million transfer to FTA is complete for SE Wis. Marketing Partnership

\* \$2.3 million transfer to FTA is completed for 7 Replacement Buses - City of Kenosha

\* \$9,549,980 transfer to FTA is complete for 3 Mil. Co. Express Bus Routes

Prior Cycle Encumbered

#### Additional Schedule date information added FIIPS changes since report completed last Additional project added Proiect design/construction completed

-	Project design	i/constructio	Incompleted			1		1				1		1			
Project Authorized for charging date	PROJ_ID	CPNT_TY	TITLE	LIMIT	Federal Amount	Amount Encumbered	Charges to Date	Remaining Encumberence	Sponsor e	SPONSOR REMARKS	Preliminary Plans	Env Doc	Final Plans	Request to Advertise	Construction begin Date	Construciton completed	Final Reimbursement submittal
12/17/2008	1693-33-03	MIS	AMTRAK ADVERTISING	MILWAUKEE TO	\$240,000	0 \$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$	- Amtrak	closing initiated			1	1			
9/14/2006	2984-41-00	M/E	BICYCLE LANE	CHICAGO VARIOUS ARTERIAL ROADWAYS	\$16,000	0 \$ 34,917	\$ 8,780	\$ 26,13	7 City of Milwaukee	Design complete as of 10/16/12.							10/31/2013
11/12/2008	1693-45-00	M/E	BIKE & PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIONS	CITY OF KENOSHA	\$30,938	8 \$ 36,693	\$ -	\$ 36,69	3 City of Kenosha	The City has a two party contract with the State. The contract is valid until May 31, 2013.	April 2013	April 2013	TBD Based on DAAR review time of preliminary plans and number of comments	TBD Based on DAAR review time of preliminary plans and number of comments.			
12/17/2007	1693-30-08	M/E	BIKE TRAIL EXTENSION	NASH PARK AND 45TH S TRAIL	T \$48,745	5 \$ 57,226	\$ -	\$ 57,22	6 City of Kenosha	The City submitted a scoping change in January 2011. The scoping change was approved in August 2011. The City is in the process of updating all necessary submittals using the revised sponsor sheets. Staff plans on submitting a draft Request to Advertise early January 2013.	2/15/2013	2/15/2013	TBD Based on DAAR review time of preliminary plans and number of comments.	TBD Based on DAAR review time of preliminary plans and number of comments.	Summer 2013 (Anticipate 6/17/13)	Fall 2013 (Anticipate 10/18/13)	Early 2014
11/12/2008	1693-47-00	C/E	CBD Proposed Interconnected System	City of Waukesha Downtown Bus Dist	\$42,662	2 \$ 56,069	\$ 41,289	\$ 14,78	0 City of Waukesha	Early on it was anticipated that construction of the CBD project would be coordinated with 3 HSIP projects (2718-01-92/93 & 09-70) These 3 projects were to be Local Force construction 8/31/11 City lost Project Engineer Will need Consultant help to move forward - 9/30/11 City decided to change from LFA to State Let for 3 HSIP projects - 12/31/11 Amendment No. 2 for CBD ID 1693-47-00 - 5/1/12 Following the Small Purchase Procedure the City went through theRFP process to hire TAD,Inc for the Design of the 3 HSI projects. Because of the nature of the projects it is most efficient to construct at the same time. CBD schedule is delayed to match HSIP. The 3-Party Contract for HSIP (currently with DAAR / DOT for approval) lists DSR submittal Feb. 1, 2013, Final e-submit May 13, 2013, Let Aug.1, 2013.	10/6/2010	3/1/2013	5/13/2013	8/1/2013	9/1/2013	11/1/2013	12/31/2013
9/16/2008	1693-47-71	MIS	CLEAN FLEET	CITY OF MILWAUKEE	\$264,476	6 \$ 330,675	\$ 80	\$ 330,59	5 City of Milwaukee	Complete; Project Reimbursement Request in Progress.							4/30/2013
31/2012(reautho)	3831-05-00	C/E	DOWNTOWN	53RD & 11TH/TDM ID	\$513,360	0 \$ 426,602	\$ 426,602	\$	- Kenosha CO	Final reimbursement request is being prepared.	4/1/2012	??	5/15/2012				11/29/2012
10/12/2005	3831-05-70	LLC	DOWNTOWN	53RD & 11TH AVE/TDM	\$2,852,000	0 \$ 3,217,145	\$ 3,136,832	\$ 80,31	.3 Kenosha CO	Work is near completion.	4/1/2012	??	5/15/2012	6/9/2012	12/1/2012	2/28/2013	4/30/2013
3/20/07 (reautho)	2984-02-09	C/E	FOREST HOME/LINCOLN/OKLA	ID 3831-05-01 COMPUTER- CONTROLLED SIGNAL	\$0	0 \$ 128,147	\$ 110,221	\$ 17,92	City of Milwaukee (100%)	Alternative Signal Systems Analysis Completed. Proceeding to Final Design Under Project I.D. 1693-48-01 per above.		N/A	N/A				N/A
4/22/2002	1693-25-03	C/E	GLENDALE PEDESTRIAN/BIKE PATH	Community Center Complex	\$42,936	5 \$ 57,539	\$ 56,174	\$ 1,36	5 Glendale	In October, the City of Glendale awarded a contract to Poblocki Paving Corp. for the construction of the Glendale Pedestrian/Bike Path. The construction of the path is complet and we are in the process of making the first payment to Poblocki Paving Corp.	12/10/2010 e	4/11/2012	7/27/2012	6/12/2012	9/11/2012	10/16/12 ?	Within two months of project completion
9/22/2006	1693-25-10	MIS	GMIA Natural Gas	10 Vehicles for GMIA	\$97,600	0 \$ 121,999	\$ 114,164	\$ 7,83	5 Milwaukee CO	Project is completed., closed except for JV 12/31/12		1	1	1	<u>.</u>		1
6/11/2007	1693-31-79	LLC	HOLTON STREET	RESERVOIR TO CENTER	\$571,200	0 \$ 713,999	\$ 664,667	\$ 49,33	2 City of Milwaukee	Construction Complete							10/31/2013
3/13/2012	2990-08-70	LLC	HOWARD AVENUE	IOWA AND HOWARD AV	′Е \$287,968	8 \$ 359,960	\$ -	\$ 359,96	0 City of Saint Francis	Staffing changes within the City and the Council held up the project. Roadway deteriorating had to be addressed before the project could move forward. Work has been completed and the City is in the process of closing out the project. *additional detail is available if needed.	1/19/2011	5/16/2011	2/20/2012	3/19/2012	6/18/2012	substantial completion 9-7- 2012	no reimbursements requested to date. Will be working on over the next few months.
11/12/2008	1693-48-00	M/E		SIX ALL-WAY STOP	\$8,000	0 \$ 11,959	\$ 11,175	\$ 78	4 City of Milwaukee	Design complete as of 6/6/11.							10/31/2013
11/12/2010	1693-48-90	LFA	INSTALL	SIX ALL-WAY STOP	\$304,000	0 \$ 410,013	\$ 184,575	\$ 225,43	8 City of Milwaukee	Construction to be completed by 12/31/12.							12/31/2014
9/19/2004	1693-32-06	C/E	INTER-JURISDICTIONAL TRAFFIC	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM VAR LOC	\$114,160	0\$ 153,649	\$ 33,884	\$ 119,76	5 Milwaukee CO	is close to completion. Actually, we are waiting on approval by WISDOT for our Request for Advertising so that we can advertise and let the project as soon as possible. Back in late 2010, an extension was approved for this project by WISDOT. Overall, this project was challenging in nature having 16 individual locations within the project limits. As far as overall project delay, there was a lengthy delay in the approval of the Environmental process.	4/26/2012	4/26/2012	7/20/2012	12/12/2012	N/A	N/A	2013
3/20/2012	1693-46-20	R/E	JACKSON PARK AND RIDE LOT	WEST END OF APPLE LANE	\$128,640	0\$ 160,908	\$ 108	\$ 160,80	0 Village of Jackson	Village has closed on the last parcel late Nov 2012, and can now move forward with construciton.		10/7/2011	Mar-12	N/A	May-12	Certification of Right of Way pending hoping for mid February 2013 approval	Apr-13
7/5/2000	2984-24-00	C/E	KINNICKINNIC RIVER	S 6TH/W ROSEDALE - E WASHINGTON ST	\$180,000	0 \$ 268,031	\$ 264,741	\$ 3,29	0 City of Milwaukee	Engineering Complete; Project Closeout pending.							10/31/2013
4/7/2005	1693-25-78	LLC	LAKE GENEVA BIKE TRAIL PHASE II	Veterans Park/Business/School Links	\$126,152	2 \$ 158,030	\$ 105,795	\$ 52,23	5 City of Lake Geneva	The City of Lake Geneva has been working very diligently with DAAR to bring these two projects to a close. We believe we now have everything in to the DOT to finalize these projects and are awaiting final approval and payment. The City had earnestly begun to complete these projects about two years ago, but when they were reviewed, it was determined that new rules had come into place since they were begun, and the City had to go back and comply with these rules on the projects. All of that has now been completed. Final Reimb approved 1-14-13							Approved 1/14/13, paid 2/4/13 - not marked as final in accounting system

#### Prior Cycle Encumbered

Additional Schedule date information added FIIPS changes since report completed last Additional project added

	Project design	/constructio	on completed														
Project Authorized for charging date	PROJ_ID	CPNT_TY	TITLE	LIMIT	Federal Amount	Amount Encumbered	Charges to Date	Remaining Encumberence	Sponsor	SPONSOR REMARKS	Preliminary Plans	Env Doc Fir	nal Plans	Request to Advertise	Construction begin Date	Construciton completed	Final Reimbursement submittal
7/10/200	2 3845-03-70	LLC	MEMORIAL BIKE TRAIL PAVING	SAGE STREET - SOUTH STREET	\$183,184	\$ 228,989	\$ 212,093	\$ 16,896	City of Lake Geneva	The City of Lake Geneva has been working very diligently with DAAR to bring these two projects to a close. We believe we now have everything in to the DOT to finalize these projects and are awaiting final approval and payment. The City had earnestly begun to complete these projects about two years ago, but when they were reviewed, it was determined that new rules had come into place since they were begun, and the City had to go back and comply with these rules on the projects. All of that has now been completed. Final Reimb approved 1-14-13							Approved 1/14/13, paid 2/4/13 - not marked as final in accounting system
3/25/200	5 1693-31-07	M/E	MILW CBD PED	WIS. AVE WATER ST	\$520,000	\$ 666,428	\$ 353,231	\$ 313,196	City of Milwaukee	Placed on temporary hold by WISDOT pending reconciliation of total project expenditures.	12/1/2014		3/1/201	5 4/1/2015	5/1/2015	10/31/2015	1/31/2016
7/24/200	5 1693-31-77	LLC	MILW CBD PED	KILBOURN AVE	\$3,752,078	\$ 4,401,509	\$ 3,962,209	\$ 439,301	City of Milwaukee	Initial summary of project expenditures completed. Placed on temporary hold by WISDOT pending reconciliation of total project expenditures.	12/1/2014	·	3/1/201	5 4/1/2015	5/1/2015	10/31/2015	1/31/2016
11/18/199	9 2190-06-00	M/E	Milwaukee Central	PED. CORRIDORS (Phases	\$1,718,251	\$ 1,424,238	\$ 1,143,724	\$ 280,514	City of Milwaukee	Placed on temporary hold by WISDOT pending reconciliation of total project expenditures. Initial Summary of project expenditures completed	12/1/2014		3/1/201	5 4/1/2015	5/1/2015	10/31/2015	1/31/2016
6/7/200	2 2190-06-70	LLC	MILWAUKEE CENTRAL	PED. CORRIDORS (Phases	\$8,219,763	\$ 8,318,008	\$ 7,640,273	\$ 677,735	City of Milwaukee	Placed on temporary hold by WISDOT pending reconciliation of total project expenditures.	12/1/2014		3/1/201	5 4/1/2015	5/1/2015	10/31/2015	1/31/2016
2/6/200	7 2190-09-00	I/E	MILWAUKEE CENTRAL	PED. CORRIDORS (Phase	\$400,000	\$ 626,086	\$ 16,790	\$ 609,296	City of Milwaukee	Placed on temporary hold by WISDOT pending reconciliation of total project expenditures.	12/1/2014		3/1/201	5 4/1/2015	5 5/1/2015	10/31/2015	1/31/2016
4/28/200	3 2190-09-70	LLC	MILWAUKEE CENTRAL	PED. CORRIDORS (Phase	\$3,600,000	\$ 5,625,064	\$ 10,574	\$ 5,614,490	City of Milwaukee	Placed on temporary hold by WISDOT pending reconciliation of total project expenditures.	12/1/2014		3/1/201	5 4/1/2015	5 5/1/2015	10/31/2015	1/31/2016
9/8/200	3 1693-51-00	M/E	OAK LEAF TRAIL PHASE	3900 W Bradley Rd to 2900 W Mill Rd	\$69,920	\$ 73,585	\$ 1,058	\$ 72,528	Milwaukee Co Parks	Froject design has been completed. Project was just authorized in November 2012 for advertisement for construction bids. Bids will be opened in January 2013 for construction in spring/early summer 2013. Project design process was held up due to difficulty with obtaining real estate rights from WE Energies for use of their right of way for construction, operation and	12/15/2011	12/28/2011	7/11/2013	2 11/12/2012	2 NA	NA	3/15/2013
1/25/200	7 1693-37-00	C/E	PARKING MANAGEMENT	SUMMERFEST SHUTTLE BUS	\$196,800	\$ 334,105	\$ 193,336	\$ 140,769	City of Milwaukee	Design In Progress Under 3 Party Design Services Contract			9/30/2013	3			3/30/2014
11/6/200	1 2704-01-03	C/E	RACINE - STURTEVANT BIKE TRAIL	PHASE 2: WILOW ROAD - WISCONSIN ST	\$64,000	\$ 90,483	\$ 83,672	\$ 6,811	Racine Co	The one and only open CMAQ project for Racine County has recently been approved for advertising. It will be bid and built in 2013. Const phase is TE	6/1/2010	12/1/2010	10/16/2012	2 11/7/2012	2 6/1/2013	10/15/2013	2/1/2014
9/8/200	8 1693-40-03	MIS	RIDE SHARE SHUTTLE	LOW INCOME SHUTTLE SERVICE	\$139,250	\$ 174,062	\$ 54,250	\$ 119,812	City of Racine	Project requested to be closed by sponsor on11/27/12							-
4/6/200	5 1693-30-70	LLC	RIVERWALK QUAAS CREEK PARK	ENTERPRISE ST - PARK PROPERTY LIMIT	\$485,165	\$ 606,496	\$ 606,496	\$ -	City of West Bend	On November 29, 2012, I received word from our Parks Department (who administered this grant) that they had received final reimbursement on this project. Please check your records. I believe that this project is finally done. Project has final reimb 11/26/12, closed except for JV 12/31/12							
10/28/200	3 1693-49-01	M/E	Signal Interconnect & System Timing	South of Sixth St to City Limits	\$57,040	\$ 71,928	\$ 34,044	\$ 37,884	City of Racine	9-28-12 Submitted Project Completion Certificate and Final Request for Payment, closed except for JV 12/31/12							
10/28/200	8 1693-49-02	M/E	Signal Interconnect & System Timing	Sixth St & North to City Limits	\$64,400	\$ 71,092	\$ 48,514	\$ 22,579	City of Racine	9-28-12 Submitted Project Completion Certificate and Final Request for Payment , closed except JV 12-31-12							
5/5/201	2 1693-49-71	LLC	Signal Interconnect & System Timing	South of Sixth St to City Limits	\$381,800	\$ 477,250	\$ -	\$ 477,250	City of Racine	All Signal Interconnect & System Timing projects are under construction at this time. Notice to Proceed for City of Racine Contract 23-12 (K2-025) was given on August 14, 2012 and the Date of Completion is March 2, 2013. Contract funding extension has been approved until June 17, 2013. These projects were let in late summer 2011. Bid prices were high and we rebid in spring 2012.	2/10/2012	2/10/2012	5/21/2012	2 5/26/2012	8/6/2012	3/29/2013	2 mnths from construction completion
5/5/201	1 1693-49-72	LLC	Signal Interconnect & System Timing	Sixth St & North to City Limits	\$414,000	\$ 517,544	\$ 44	\$ 517,500	City of Racine	All Signal Interconnect & System Timing projects are under construction at this time. Notice to Proceed for City of Racine Contract 23-12 (K2-025) was given on August 14, 2012 and the Date of Completion is March 2, 2013. Contract funding extension has been approved until June 17, 2013. These projects were let in late summer 2011. Bid prices were high and we rebid in spring 2012.	2/10/2012	2/10/2012	5/21/201	2 5/26/2012	2 8/6/2012	3/29/2013	2 mnths from construction completion
7/5/200	2984-21-00	M/E	SUMMERFEST PARKING MGT SYST	VARIOUS CITY/MILW PKG GARAGES	\$232,000	\$ 284,099	\$ 284,099	\$ -	City of Milwaukee	Design complete as of 6/22/12.							6/30/2013
6/29/199	4 2984-10-90	LFA	TIME-OF-DAY- ACTUATED	NO TURN ON RED SIGNALS	\$62,690	\$ 75,712	\$ 3,927	\$ 71,785	City of Milwaukee	LFA executed 4/8/11 and project uses unique LED product that needed to be installed and verified for durability and efficacy. Currently awaiting product delivery with construction to be completed by 4/30/13.							10/31/2013
11/12/201	0 1693-48-01	C/E	TRAFFIC ADAPTIVE	SIGNALIZE	\$120,000	\$ 13,509	\$ 3,959	\$ 9,551	City of Milwaukee	Three Party Design Service Contract for Final System Design currently in process of final execution		9/20/2013	4/4/2014	1			9/30/2014
11/12/200	8 1693-48-02	C/E	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	CITY OF WAUKESHA 46	\$144,680	\$ 188,164	\$ 188,164	\$-	City of Waukesha	Project closed except for JV					1	1	
7/24/200	5 1693-36-00	C/E	WASHINGTON	INT OF USH 41 USH 45 STH 145	\$0	\$ 4,605	\$ 4,605	\$-	Washington Co	CLOSED except for JV 11/30/12							
6/1/201	1 1693-36-70	LLC	WASHINGTON COUNTY PARK & RIDE	INT OF USH 41 USH 45 STH 145	\$155,213	\$ 194,016	\$ -	\$ 194,016	Washington Co	We filed for our final reimbursement from DAAR in September. Last I heard they were waiting to "obtain WisDOT direction regarding the non-participating change orders and if further paperwork will be required prior to processing the reimbursement request. Will let you know when we have an answer." Final Reimbursment approved 1-14-13	5/27/2009	9/29/2006	4/27/2013	1 6/6/2011	7/18/2011	. 1/20/2012	11/21/2012
6/12/200	7 1693-32-70	LFA	WEST GREENFIELD AVENUE	S LAYTON BLVD TO S CESAR CHAVEZ	\$527,937	\$ 747,778	\$ 668,896	\$ 78,882	City of Milwaukee	Construction Complete			_				already sent out
9/15/200	9 2135-04-00	C/E	WEST NORTH AVENUE	MLK JR. DRIVE TO 7th STREET	\$62,140	\$ 81,617	\$ 81,617	\$ 0	City of Milwaukee	Design Completed							10/31/2013
5/9/201	1 2135-04-70	LLC	WEST NORTH AVENUE	MLK JR. DRIVE TO 7th	\$345,791	\$ 432,285	\$ 46	\$ 432,239	City of Milwaukee	Construction Completed; Project Currently being closed out.							10/31/2013

#### Prior Cycle Not Encumbered

	Additional Schedule date informat FIIPS changes since report complet Additional project added Project design/construction compl	ion added ted last leted													
SCHD_DT	Project Authorized PROJ_ID date	CPNT_TY	TITLE	LIMIT	Federal Amount	Amount Encumbered	Charges to Date	Sponsor	SPONSOR REMARKS	Preliminary Plans	Env Doc	Final Plans	Request to Advertise	Construction begin Date	Construciton Final completed Reimbursem ent submittal
1/25/2013 - new date 1/24/14	LOADED IN 08 1693-44-70	LFA	BICYCLE LANE INSTALLATIONS	VARIOUS ROADWAYS CITY OF MILWAUKEE	\$264,000	) \$ .	- \$	- City of Milwaukee	Projects previously included currently under construction under Project I.D. 2984-41-70. Remaining funds to be used for further implementation of facilities identified in the City of Milwaukee Bike plan: specific locations to be determined.	t 9/1/2013	3	11/1/2013	3	5/1/2014	4 9/1/2014 12/1/2014
10/25/2012	9/11/2012 2984-41-70	LFA	BICYCLE LANE INSTALLATIONS	VARIOUS ARTERIAL ROADWAYS	\$384,000	919,418	3 \$ 12,37	6 City of Milwaukee	LFA Contract Authorized; construction began Fall, 2012						9/30/2013 12/31/2013
4/25/2014, new date 6/25/14	LOADED IN 08 1693-45-70	LLC	BIKE & PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIONS	CITY OF KENOSHA	\$177,891	l \$ -	- \$	- City of Kenosha	See comments for project 1693-45-00	See commer	nts for project 1	693-45-00			
1/25/2013, new date 8/25/13	LOADED IN 04 1693-29-78	LLC	BIKE TRAIL CROSSING WASHINGTON RD	N TO S SIDE OF WASHINGTON RD	\$428,000	) \$ -	- \$ 4	0 City of Kenosha	The original project was rescoped due to project bids being over estimated cost. The scoping change was submitted in January 2010. The scoping change was approved in October 2010. Currently, the City is working with DAAR on the Hazmat Reports. It was determined from a Phase 1 that a Phase 2.5 is needed. The area in which the report is needed is owned by WE Energies. The City is currently working with WE Energies to obtain access rights to the site. Once the City has access to the site the Phase 2 5 will be completed. The City is also working on updating necssary submittals using the revised sponsor sheets.	TBD based o ease	on current nego ment and result	tiations with V ts from the Ph	VE Energies for ase 2.5.	Fall 2013 (Anticipate 9/16/13)	Summer 2014 End of 2014
1/25/2013, new date 8/25/13	LOADED IN 05 1693-30-78	LLC	BIKE TRAIL EXTENSION	NASH PARK AND 45TH ST TRAIL	\$280,288	3\$-	- \$	- City of Kenosha	See comments for project 1693-30-08	See commer	nts for project 1	.693-30-08			
4/25/2014	LOADED IN 04 1693-31-72	LLC	BROWNS LAKE DR/CTH W	STH 11 - 840 FT. NE OF FOXTRAIL CIR	\$165,028	3 \$ .	- \$	- City of Burlington	The City requested additional funds to complete this project due to additional ROW acquisition costs and additional utility relocates required for the project. The request was denied. We are seeking financing methods to cover the additional costs related to this trail project, however at this time we have not identified additional dollars that can be committed to the project. 2-4-12: we are in the process of scheduling a meeting with Sara Arnold at DAAR to discuss moving this project forward. The dates shown assume we move forward with good direction after our meeting this month (February). We will follow up if there are significant changes to the schedule	Anticipated June 2013	Anticipated August 2013	Anticipated January 2014	Anticipated April 2014	Anticipated June 2014	Anticipated Anticipated October 2014 January 2015
10/25/2013, new date	LOADED IN 08 1693-47-70	LLC	CBD Proposed Interconnected System	City of Waukesha Downtown Bus Dist	\$178,058	3\$-	- \$	- City of Waukesha	Schedule delayed to coincide with 3 HSIP projects (2718-01-92/93 & 09 70) Let Aug. 1 2013	9- 10/6/2010	3/1/2013	5/13/2013	8/1/2013	9/1/2013	11/1/2013 12/31/2013
5/12/2015	LOADED IN 05 1693-32-04	I/E	CROSSTOWN CONNECTOR BRIDGE	OVER STH 100	\$128,800	) \$ -	- \$	- City of West Allis	Waiting permission to cross UP tracks	2014	4 2014	4 2014	4 2014	1 201	5 2015 2015
5/12/2015	LOADED IN 05 1693-32-74	LET	CROSSTOWN CONNECTOR BRIDGE	OVER STH 100	\$855,177	7 \$ -	- \$	- City of West Allis	Waiting permission to cross UP tracks	2014	4 2014	4 2014	1 2014	1 201	5 2015 2015
7/25/2013, new date 3/25/14	(LOADED IN 96) 2984-02-99 - funds moved to 1693-48-91	LFA	FOREST HOME/LINCOLN/OKLAH OMA/27TH	COMPUTER-CONTROLLED SIGNAL SYSTEM	\$352,000	) \$ -	- \$	- City of Milwaukee	System to be fully operational by June, 2015				5/4/2014	¥ 7/15/2014	4 6/15/2015 9/15/2015
7/25/2012	7/5/2012 1693-25-73	LLC	GLENDALE PEDESTRIAN/BIKE PATH	Community Center Complex	\$38,664	\$ 48,331	L\$	- Glendale	In October, the City of Glendale awarded a contract to Poblocki Paving Corp. for the construction of the Glendale Pedestrian/Bike Path. The construction of the path is complete and we are in the process of making the first payment to Poblocki Paving Corp.	12/10/2010	4/11/2012	7/27/2012	2 6/12/2012	9/11/2012	10/16/12 ? within two months of competion of construction
12/25/2012, new date 4/25/13	LOADED IN 04 1693-32-76	LLC	INTER-JURISDICTIONAL TRAFFIC	COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM VAR LOC	\$646,776	5\$-	- \$	- Milwaukee CO	Once WISDOT authorizes the construction, we will be ready to encumbe and move forward.	er N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3/2013	11/2013 2013
5/25/2013	LOADED IN 08 1693-46-70	LLC	JACKSON PARK AND RID LOT	E WEST END OF APPLE LANE	\$344,596	5 \$ -	- \$	- Village of Jackson	The current status is the Village of Jackson has now (last week) closed on the property where the Park-n-Ride lot is being constructed. We wi this week submit the plans for review with the bidding and constructio dates for the spring of 2013.	2010 n	0 10/7/2013	1 Mar-13	3 Apr-13	3 Jun-13	3 Sep-13 Oct-13
7/25/2015	TST - requested 1693-42-70 3/4/13	TST	KENOSHA ELECTRIC STREETCAR EXPNSN	EXPANDED CENTRAL AREA OF KENOSHA	\$4,006,168	3 \$ -	- \$	- City of Kenosha	There should be two grants out there for streetcar expansion. The tota for both is over 8 million dollars. We are in the process of getting the local match and will start design and engineering work next year and construction the following year.	l Fund	d transfer has b	een requested	d by Kenosha ar	nd is in the proce	ess of being reviewed.
10/25/2012	9/19/2012 2984-24-70	LLC	KINNICKINNIC RIVER BIK TRAIL	E S 6TH/W ROSEDALE - E WASHINGTON ST	\$1,340,000	)\$ 1,675,000	\$	- City of Milwaukee	Construction Started Late Fall, 2012.						8/31/2013 11/30/2013

#### Prior Cycle Not Encumbered

	Additional Schedu FIIPS changes sinc Additional project Project design/cor	le date informa e report comple added nstruction comp	tion added eted last eleted														
SCHD_DT	Project Authorize dat	d PROJ_ID e	CPNT_TY	TITLE	LIMIT	Federal Amount	Amount Encumbered	Charges to Date	Sponsor	SPONSOR REMARKS	Preliminary Plans	Env Doc	Final Plans	Request to Advertise	Construction begin Date	Construciton completed	Final Reimbursem ent submittal
1/25/2013, new date 4/25/13	LOADED IN 0	8 1693-51-70	LLC	OAK LEAF TRAIL PHASE 3	3900 W Bradley Rd to 2900 W Mill Rd	\$378,080	\$	- \$	- Milwaukee Co Parks	Construction bid opening is scheduled for January 2013. Contracts will be in place for spring/early summer 2013 construction.	NA	NA	NA	NA	3/15/2013	6/30/2013	6/1/2014
8/25/2013, new date 2/25/14	V LOADED IN 0	5 1693-33-74	LLC	RAWSON AVE TRAFFIC SIGNAL SYSTEM	NICHOLSON AVE TO 10TH AVE	\$56,764	\$	- \$	City of South Milwaukee	The subject project has been delayed due to intersecting construction projects (15 <sup>th</sup> Avenue Reconstruction, ARRA project completed in 2010) and Nicholson Avenue/Pennsylvania avenue (STP completed in 2012), revised scope of work submitted by City of South Milwaukee and approved by WisDOT; Additional funding required by City had to be budgeted to complete project and consultant costs incurred by City to meet submittal requirements. PER was submitted in 2011, but not accepted by DAAR. City would like to get project back on schedule for 2013 construction.	3/1/2013	3/1/2013	5/1/2013	6/1/2013	8/1/2013	10/1/2013	12/15/2013
9/25/2013, new date 11/25/13	LOADED IN 0	5 1693-37-70	LLC	SUMMERFEST PARKING MGMNT SYS-PH 2	SHUTTLE BUS	\$743,200	\$	- \$	- City of Milwaukee	To be let to contract pending completion of final design under Project I.D. 1693-37-70 currently in progress per notes above.				11/30/2013	4/1/2014	9/1/2014	12/1/2014
7/25/201	2 6/22/201	2 2984-21-70	LLC	SUMMERFEST PARKING MGT SYST PH 1	AT VARIOUS CITY/MILW PKG GARAGES	\$1,036,000	\$	- \$ 3	5 City of Milwaukee	Construction let to contract November, 2012					4/15/2013	8/9/2013	11/9/2013
7/25/2013, new date 3/25/14	LOADED IN 0	8 1693-48-91	LFA	TRAFFIC ADAPTIVE SIGNAL SYSTEM	SIGNALIZE INTERSECTIONS	\$336,000	\$	- \$	- City of Milwaukee	System to be fully operational by June, 2015				5/4/2014	7/15/2014	6/15/2015	9/15/2015
7/9/2013, new date 6/25/13	LOADED IN 0	8 1693-43-70	LLC	WEST ALLIS CROSS- TOWN CONNECTOR	BIKE AND PEDESTRIAN TRAIL	\$698,400	\$	- \$	- City of West Allis	Waiting permission to cross UP tracks	7/28/2011	7/20/2011	3/22/2013	5/22/2013	7/1/2013	11/20/2013	12/1/2013
8/13/201	3	1000-40-70	LET	Amtrak Train Shed		\$7,880,000	\$	- \$	- State	Was 1693-34-70 and 1693-40-70, now combined, Total project has Earmark and State funding as well							

\$20,717,890

# CMAQ Program Management Strategies

# How to manage current CMAQ projects?

- 1. Request submittal of project updates on a quarterly/semi-annual basis
  - a. What is the status of the project?
  - b. What are the expenditures to date?
  - c. What has been done since last update?
  - d. Are there any schedule changes that need to take place? Why?
- 2. For projects without sunset dates, initiate a date when the project will be reviewed by WisDOT/SEWRPC/FHWA for determination of either:
  - a. Continuation of the project as is
  - b. Re-applying for funding

# How to better manage future CMAQ funding cycles?

- 1. Applications
  - a. Require more project details (preliminary engineering)
    - i. How is the sponsor going to meet the requirements of CMAQ funding
  - b. Add a "Key Program Requirements Confirmation" initials page similar to STP and Local Bridge applications
- 2. Project agreements
  - a. Include a six-year sunset clause into CMAQ SMAs in the upcoming award cycle.
  - b. Sunset date for design/construction completion/final invoice (STP and local bridge program uses 6 years from when the funds are initially available, not when the project is authorized). The language will read as follows: "The project must be constructed by June 30, 2020, and the Sponsor must submit a project completion certificate to WisDOT by this date."
  - c. Make it a program requirement for sponsors to provide project updates as suggested in #1 above.
- 3. Consider sponsor's outstanding/delayed/stalled projects when evaluating new applications. WisDOT will need to collaborate further with other members of the CMAQ selection committee to determine willingness to define a sponsor's project history as a pervasive ranking criterion.

Attachment 7

# COMPARISON OF ELEMENTS OF THE PROCESS USED BY VARIOUS METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS (MPO) FOR THE SELECTION OF FEDERAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (STP) FUNDS ALLOCATED TO SIMILAR SIZED URBANIZED AREAS TO THE MILWAUKEE URBANIZED AREA

			<b>.</b>			a	Hampton Roads		
		Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana	Indianapolis	Memphis Urban Area		Capital Area	Transportation Planning		
	Mid-America Regional	Regional Council of	Metropolitan Planning	Metropolitan Planning	Mid-Ohio Regional	Metropolitan Planning	Organization	Metropolitan Council	
Project Selection	Council (Kansas City,	Governments	Organization	Organization	Planning Commission	Organization (Austin,	(Norfolk/Virginia	(Minneapolis/St. Paul,	Chicago Metropolitan
Characteristic	MO/KS) <sup>1</sup>	(Cincinnati, OH) <sup>1</sup>	(Indianapolis, IN)	(Memphis, TN) <sup>1</sup>	(Columbus, Ohio)	TX)	Beach, VI)	MN)	Agency for Planning
Responsibility for	MPO staff	MPO staff	MPO staff	MPO staff	MPO staff	MPO staff	MPO staff	MPO staff	Subregional Council of
Project Solicitation									Mayors (CoM) <sup>2</sup> staff
Responsibility for	MPO staff	MPO staff	Project Sponsor	MPO staff	MPO staff	MPO staff	MPO staff	Committees established	Either the subregional
Candidate Project								for each project	CoM staff or the project
Rating								category made up of	sponsor
								MPO staff and	
								Advisory Committee	
								members, and staff	
								from area local and	
								county public work	
								departments and state	
								and other regional	
								agencies.	
Categories established	• bicvcle/pedestrian	• highway	• new signalization	• major road	• major widening/new	• general (all eligible	<ul> <li>highway capacity</li> </ul>	principal arterials	The project categories
for rating candidate	• public transportation	• public transportation	• existing roadway	construction	roadway (capacity	projects for STP	<ul> <li>corridor operational</li> </ul>	(non-freeway)	varv by regional
projects	<ul> <li>bridge replacement</li> </ul>	• non-highway freight	capacity improvement	• resurfacing	expansion projects)	funding, except for	improvements	<ul> <li>minor arterials (4</li> </ul>	Council of Mayors
1	and rehabilitation	nrojects	• new roadway	<ul> <li>hicycle/nedestrian</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>minor widening/</li> </ul>	exclusively bicycle	<ul> <li>bridge</li> </ul>	sub-categories)	(CoM) area. Typically.
	• roadway capacity	(Other eligible projects	construction	• signalization	intersections/signals	and pedestrian	• intermodel facilities	<ul> <li>biovele/pedestrian</li> </ul>	only highway projects
	• Toadway capacity	not covered by the three	• readway	• signalization	(minor widening	projects)	• Internioual facilities	• bicycle/pedestrian (While there is not an	are scored with
	• transportation	not covered by the three	• Toauway		nrojects involve	• bicycle and	• transit and fixed	(while there is not all	evaluation criteria
	operations and	project types would be	reconstruction/		adding center turn	• Dicycle and pedestrian	guideway	evaluation cinena	While other projects
	management	examined and	renabilitation		lanos and widoning	• CAMPO contors	improvement and	category for transit	may be eligible such as
	(including highway	the Drienitization	• roadway resurfacing		avisting lanes)	• CANFO centers	expansion	projects under the STP	transportation control
	preservation projects)		• bridge replacement		existing failes)	(projects that serve	• transit vehicle	program, such candidate	measures (TCM) and
	• transportation safety	Subcommittee	<ul> <li>bridge rehabilitation</li> </ul>		• bike and pedestrian	or support	replacement/purchase	projects may be	transit projects
	(including safety	compared to the other	<ul> <li>intersection</li> </ul>		• transit	implementation of	• other fixed guideway	considered for STP	avaluation critoria is
	education, outreach,	candidate projects.)	improvement		• system preservation	development	and transit ITS	funding, but must be	typically not used for
	and engineering		<ul> <li>bicycle enhancement</li> </ul>			"Centers" identified	<ul> <li>planning studies</li> </ul>	originally submitted	typically not used for
	projects)		• pedestrian			in the long-range	• transportation	under, and evaluated	consideration of project
			enhancement			transportation plan)	demand management	with criteria established	selection.
			• freight enhancement				• intelligent	for, the CMAQ	
			• transit enhancement				transportation	program.)	
			capital				systems		
Project scoring	Mostly objectively	Mostly objectively	Objectively scored	Mostly objectively	Subjectively scored	Mostly objectively	Both objectively and	Subjectively scored	Most are objectively
1 isjeet bearing	scored but some	scored but some	cojectively beored.	scored but some criteria	sugering boorda.	scored but some criteria	subjectively scored	Subjectively booled.	scored
	criteria subjectively	criteria subjectively		subjectively scored		subjectively scored	depending on criteria		500100.
	scored	scored		subjectively scored.		subjectively sected.	and project category		
	scorea.	scorea.	1				and project category.	1	1

							Hampton Roads		
		Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana	Indianapolis	Memphis Urban Area		Capital Area	Transportation Planning		
	Mid-America Regional	Regional Council of	Metropolitan Planning	Metropolitan Planning	Mid-Ohio Regional	Metropolitan Planning	Organization	Metropolitan Council	
Project Selection	Council (Kansas City,	Governments	Organization	Organization	Planning Commission	Organization (Austin,	(Norfolk/Virginia	(Minneapolis/St. Paul,	Chicago Metropolitan
Characteristic	MO/KS)	(Cincinnati, OH)	(Indianapolis, IN)	(Memphis, TN)	(Columbus, Ohio)	TX)	Beach, VI)	MN)	Agency for Planning
Other considerations in	Follow-up technical	Geographic equity (by	Established funding	During workshop a	Funding targets,	Public comments, the	Prior commitments,	Developed alternative	Varies by subregional
developing listing of	analysis, public and	county) and other local	targets and the project	variety of	priorities indicated by	funding targets	funding targets, and	funding scenarios. (The	CoM. For example, the
projects recommended	stakeholder input, and	considerations, such as	priorities of the	considerations are	project sponsor, and	established for CAMPO	established funding	projects listed for each	listing of projects
for funding (through	informally geographic	project supports other	implementing agencies,	discussed, such as the	number of projects	Centers and bicycle and	criteria, such as priority	project category under	recommended for
materials produced by	equity and the	project or development.	geographic equity, and	established funding	funded.	pedestrian projects, and	to projects involving a	each alternative follow	funding is developed
MPO staff and	distribution of funding		project sponsor	targets, project		requested "set asides",	number of communities,	the established ranking)	generally following the
conversations with	among the project		deliverability.	readiness, likelihood of		such as for MPO	projects having regional		rankings developed of
MPO staff)	categories.			project or project phases		planning and	significance, projects		the candidate projects.
				being implemented in 4-		programming efforts	that cannot be funded		Other factors
				year period, the level of		and emergency recovery	by other sources, and		considered, include
				funding being requested		projects.	projects involving ITS		requested funding level
				by each project			improvement		and funding targets.
				category, and					
				geographical equity.					
Established funding	None	None	• 25% - pavement	• 67.5% - major road	4-year funding targets	• 15% for bicycle and	MPO and Advisory	None	6 of the 11 CoM do not
targets			preservation projects	construction projects	established by the MPO	pedestrian	Committee establishes		have funding targets.
			• 25% - roadway	• 10% - resurfacing	for STP, CMAQ, TE	improvement	funding targets for		The funding targets
			expansion projects	projects	funding sources. For	projects	highway and non-		vary by the remaining 5
			• 15% - bridge	• 7.5% - bicycle/	STP funding, 20% to	• 50% to projects that	highway projects prior		CoM. Funding targets
			preservation projects	pedestrian projects	40% is targeted for non-	serve or support	to project solicitation.		are generally
			• 7% - bicycle/	• 7.5% - signalization	highway capacity	areas designated as	Typically, the funding		established for highway
			pedestrian expansion	projects	expansion projects, and	"Centers" in the	targets are about 60%		projects (70-80%) and
			projects	1 0	60% to 80% of the	MPO's long-range	for highway projects		TCM-type projects (20-
			• 10% - transit	7.5% - reserved for	funds is targeted for	transportation plan.	and 40% for non-		30%)
			expansion projects	project c#208281	highway capacity	(Can include general	highway projects.		
			• 18% - operations and	1 5	expansion projects.	and bicycle/			
			maintenance projects	<ul> <li>ost overruns</li> </ul>		pedestrian projects.)			
			F- J						
Who develops listing of	Advisory Committees	Advisory Committee	MPO staff, guided by	Advisory Committee, as	Advisory Committee	Advisory Committee	Advisory Committee	The MPO's	Either an advisory
projects recommended	in Kansas and Missouri	-	Advisory Committee	part of a "workshop",	-	-	-	Transportation	committee of the
for funding?				from alternative				Advisory Board (TAB)	subregional CoM or the
				scenarios developed by				from alternative funding	subregional CoM
				MPO staff.				scenarios developed by	
								Advisory Committee.	

		Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana	Indianapolis	Memphis Urban Area		Capital Area	Hampton Roads Transportation Planning		
	Mid-America Regional	Regional Council of	Metropolitan Planning	Metropolitan Planning	Mid-Ohio Regional	Metropolitan Planning	Organization	Metropolitan Council	
Project Selection	Council (Kansas City,	Governments	Organization	Organization	Planning Commission	Organization (Austin,	(Norfolk/Virginia	(Minneapolis/St. Paul,	Chicago Metropolitan
Characteristic	MO/KS)	(Cincinnati, OH)	(Indianapolis, IN)	(Memphis, TN)	(Columbus, Ohio)	TX)	Beach, VI)	MN)	Agency for Planning
Eligibility of	Not Eligible	Ohio – Not Eligible	Not Eligible (ROW also	Tennessee – Eligible	Eligible	Eligible	Eligible	Not Eligible	Varies by subregional
preliminary engineering		Kentucky – Eligible	not eligible)	Mississippi – Not					CoM., but PE and ROW
for funding		Indiana -Eligible		Eligible (ROW also not					are typically not
				eligible)					eligible.
Limitations on amount	None	Ohio – \$6 million	None	None	Limited to 25 percent of	None	None	\$7 million for principal	All but 2 of the 11 CoM
of STP funding		Kentucky – \$5 million			the annual funding			arterials, minor reliever,	have established limits:
requested per project		Indiana – none			allocation.			minor expander, and	• 4 have an established
								minor augmenter	amount-\$1 million
								projects, and	to \$2.5 million.
									• 5 have established a
								\$5.5 million for minor	percentage of
								connector and bicycle	allocation-50 to
								and pedestrian projects.	100%.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> MPO is responsible for the selection of projects in an urbanized area located within multiple states.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> All of the Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding that is allocated to the urbanized areas within the seven-county Northeastern Illinois Region is combined and sub-allocated to the City of Chicago and the 11 subregional Councils of Mayors (CoM) based on previously established agreements. Each of the 11 subregional CoM have developed their own process for selecting candidate projects for STP funding within their respective area.

# SUMMARY OF CRITERIA UTILIZED IN THE SELECTION OF FEDERAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM FUNDING ALLOCATED TO URBANIZED AREAS SIMILAR IN SIZE TO THE MILWAUKEE URBANIZED AREA

#### Kansas City Urbanized Area

The Mid-America Regional Council (MARC), which serves as the MPO for the Kansas City urbanized area, solicits candidate projects for Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding allocated to the urbanized area, along with Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program (BR) funds. Candidate projects for STP funding are rated with evaluation criteria developed for all projects (maximum of 25 points) and developed for six project categories (maximum of 75 points each)—bicycle/pedestrian projects, public transportation projects, bridge replacement and rehabilitation projects, highway capacity expansion projects, transportation outreach and engineering projects. While highway preservation projects have been eligible for funding, not many of these types of projects have been pursued by project sponsors. The evaluation criteria were developed for each of the nine policy goals identified in the Kansas City area long-range transportation plan. To develop funding recommendations, the MARC's Kansas and Missouri STP/Bridge Priorities Committees considers the scores calculated for each candidate project and other factors such as follow-up technical analysis and public and stakeholder input, as well as informally geographic equity and the distribution of funding among the six project categories. Below is a summary of the evaluation criteria used for all projects and for three select project categories—capacity expansion, operations and management, and public transportation projects.

#### Scoring Used for All Projects (25 points)

Criteria	Points	Criteria Measurement Methodology
Accessibility Improves Access to Environmental Justice Areas	5	Points based on whether the project is located within, or provides access to, census-tracts with a high proportion of low-income and minority populations.
Energy Use and Climate Change Reduction in Greenhouse Gases/Carbon-Based Fuels	5	Points based on whether the project would implement measures demonstrated to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and use of carbon based fuels.
"Place Making		
Consistency with Local/Regional Plans	4	Points based on whether the project is identified in local plans, implements a multi- agency plan, advances local goals and objectives, and/or is consistent with regional objectives (1 point each).
Supports "Creating Quality Places" (Complete Streets) Principles	4	Points based on whether the project will improve walkability, transit access or mobility, and bicycle access or mobility, and/or will address other "Creating Quality Places" (complete streets) principles (1 point each).
Other Criteria		
Status of Project Development	4	Points based on completing particular phases of the project.
Leverages Other Funds	3	Points subjectively given based on whether the project would be funded by other non-traditional funding, such as private funding.

Scoring Used for Select Project Categories (75 points each)

Criteria	Capacity Expansion Projects	Operations and Management Projects	Public Transportation Projects	Criteria Measurement Methodology
Public Health Improvement of Other Modes Level of Service	5	5	7	Points based on the number of transportation modes—pedestrian, bicycle, and transit— that would have an improved level of service.

	Capacity	Operations and Management	Public	
Criteria	Projects	Projects	Projects	Criteria Measurement Methodology
"Metrogreen" Implementation		5	3	Points based on how the project implements, or provides connections to, the network of off-road trails recommended under the area's "MetroGreen" initiative.
Reduces Ozone Emissions	5	5	5	Points based on whether the project would include implementation of an ozone emission reduction measure.
Economic Vitality Supports the Regional Freight Network	5	5		Points based on whether the highway is on the identified freight network and/or the project improves freight movement.
Serves Regional Activity/Employment Centers	5	5	10	Points based on whether the project would serve existing and/or future regional activity and employment centers.
Place Making Serves Planned Development or redevelopment	5			Points based on whether the projects serves planned development or redevelopment identified in local land use or comprehensive plans, local economic development plans, and/or state economic development plans.
Environment	10	5	10	Points based on whether the project preserves or restores environmentally sensitive lands, cultural resources, and agricultural lands and/or includes an environmental mitigation plan.
Safety/Security				
Crash Severity Rate	2	3		Points based on a level of 3-year severity rate calculated based on the proportion of weighted fatal crashes, injury crashes, and property damage only crashes to total crashes.
Crash Rate	2	3		Points based on level of 3-year crash rate and determined based on established ranges.
Safety Study	3	5		Points are received by providing a summary of a crash analysis conducted for the project.
Implementation of Safety Countermeasures	3	4		Points subjectively given based on whether the projects include implementation of safety measures.
Transit Safety and Security			10	Points based on implementation of transit safety and security elements.

	Capacity	Operations and	Public	
Criteria	Expansion	Management	Transportation	Criterie Meesserer ent Methodalore
Criteria	Projects	Projects	Projects	Criteria Measurement Methodology
System Performance				
Current and Future Level of Service	6			Based on estimated level of service (LOS) and determined based on established ranges.
Current and Future AADT per Lane	8	10		Points based on level of annual average daily traffic per lane and determined based on established ranges.
Congestion Management	3	4		Points based on whether project is located on the Congestion Management System network and currently operates under congested conditions.
System Efficiency	3			Points based on whether project includes congestion mitigation measures identified in the Congestion Management Process.
Operational Efficiency			5	Points based on whether project improves coordination with other transit services, reduces operating costs without reducing ridership, or increases ridership on existing routes.
Single Occupancy Vehicle Trips		3		Points subjectively based on whether project would reduce single occupancy vehicle trips.
Corridor/Access Management		3		Points based on whether project implements a corridor/access management plan.
"Smart Moves" Implementation			10	Points based on how the project addresses the service objectives—types of service, system coordination, and reduction in operating costs without reduction in ridership—of the area's long-range transit plan called, "Smart Moves".
System Condition	10	10	15	Points based on the extent that the project addresses system preservation needs—e.g. extends useful life of facility, vehicle replacement, transit preventative maintenance activities, and improves or enhances transit facilities.

#### **Cincinnati Urbanized Area**

The Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional Council of Governments (OKI), which serves as the MPO for the Cincinnati urbanized area, solicits candidate projects for Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding allocated to the urbanized area, along with Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air-Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funds. Candidate projects for STP funding are rated with evaluation criteria developed for all projects (maximum of 55 points) and developed for three project categories (maximum of 45 points each)—highway, public transportation, and non-highway freight projects. In some cases, other types of eligible projects submitted by project sponsors may be considered. The evaluation criteria were developed generally based on the nine transportation goals identified in the Cincinnati area long-range transportation plan. A recommended ranking of all projects (STP and CMAQ) is developed by OKI's Prioritization Subcommittee based on the two sets evaluation criteria, which is reviewed and approved by OKI's Intermodal Coordinating Committee. Other considerations, such as project supports other project or development. OKI staff will then determine from the recommended rankings which projects would be funded with either STP or CMAQ funding based on their eligibility. The ICC then develops the listing of project sponsors recommended for STP and CMAQ funding. Below is a summary of the evaluation criteria used for all projects and for three project types eligible for STP funding—highway, public transportation, and non-highway freight projects. Other eligible projects not covered by these three project types would be examined and subjectively ranked by the Prioritization Subcommittee compared to the other candidate projects.

Criteria	Points	Criteria Measurement Methodology
Replacement/Expansion	5	Points based on proportion of project that involves replacement and expansion activities.
Environmental Justice	5	Points subjectively given based on project's potential net benefit to low income and minority populations.
Implements "Strategic Regional Policy Plan"	5	Points based on whether the project is located along urban-type developments, serves brownfield or greyfield properties, includes "green" infrastructure strategies, includes efforts to avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts to environmentally sensitive areas, and/or is located adjacent to or through environmentally sensitive areas.
Consistency with Local Plans	5	Points based on whether the project is consistent with a local comprehensive plan.
Air Quality Improvement/Energy Reduction	10	Points based on whether implementation of the project would result in the reduction of vehicle miles travelled and/or vehicle hours travelled.
Local Match	10	Points based on percentage of local match exceeding 20 percent and determined based on established ranges.
Existing Condition	5	Points based on the existing condition of the facilities or vehicles.
Economic Vitality	5	Points based on whether project would create or retain jobs.
History of Project Delivery	-5	Negative points given based on the number of projects that the project sponsor has delayed past the programmed year.
Applicant Requesting Additional Funds for Project	-2	Negative points given based on the percent increase of funds being requested for a project previously approved for funding.
Intermodal Connections	5	Points based on whether the project involves improvement of intermodal connections.

Scoring Used for All Projects (55 points)

# Scoring Used for Project Categories (45 points each)

Criteria	Points	Criteria Measurement Methodology
Highway Projects	<u>45</u>	
Crash Rate	5	Points based on level of crash rate and determined based on established ranges.
Safety Impact	5	Points subjectively given based on whether the projects would improve safety.
Current Level of Service	5	Points based on estimated level of service (LOS).
Improvement of Level of Service	5	Points subjectively given based on whether implementation of the project would improve level of service.
Current ADT	5	Points based on level of average daily traffic and determined based on established ranges.
Freight Volumes	5	Points based on the percentage of freight volume and determined based on established ranges.
Roadway Classification	5	Points based on the projects existing functional classification.
Supports "Complete Streets" principles	5	Points based on the number of modes—highway, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian— accommodated as part of the project, and whether the project includes traffic calming measures.
Status of Project Development	5	Points based on completing particular phases of the project.
Transit Projects	<u>45</u>	
Transit Safety and Security	5	Points based on implementation of safety and security elements.
Useful Life	5	Points based on the expected useful life of the project estimated by using Federal Transit Administration guidelines and determined based on established ranges.
System Improvement	5	Points based on whether project would have a positive improvement to the system and/or passengers.
Project Type	10	Points based on the type of project, such as purchasing of new or replacement vehicles, constructing a transit facility, or purchasing of non-revenue equipment.
Timing of Implementation	5	Points based on number of years needed to implement project and determined based on established ranges.
Ridership Impact	10	Points based on the level of increase in ridership estimated with implementation of the project.
Capital Utilization	5	Points based on the amount of years or percentage of miles exceeding the useful life of the vehicle or facility being replaced. (New vehicles or facilities receive no points.)

Criteria	Points	Criteria Measurement Methodology
Non-Highway Freight Projects	<u>45</u>	
Mode Traffic Flow	5	Points based on the proportion of volume to capacity $(v/c)$ in the area of the specific mode affected by the project and determined based on established ranges.
Impact on Highway Congestion	20	Points based on the level of large trucks estimated to be diverted from highway facilities.
Safety Improvement	5	Points subjectively given based on the level of improvement to safety conditions with implementation of the project.
Timing of Implementation	5	Points based on number of years needed to implement project.
Reliability	5	Points subjectively given based on the estimated improvement to on-time deliveries.
Functional Characteristic of Freight Mode Type	5	For rail projects, points are given based on the functional characteristics of the rail facility. For water port projects, points are given based on the level of shipping service conducted at the port and the accessibility of the port by highway and rail.

#### Indianapolis Urbanized Area

The Indianapolis MPO solicits candidate projects for Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding for the Indianapolis urbanized area as part of the development of the area transportation improvement program. Candidate projects for STP funding are rated with evaluation criteria developed for 12 project categories—new signalization, existing roadway capacity improvement, new roadway construction, roadway reconstruction/rehabilitation, resurfacing, bridge replacement, bridge rehabilitation, intersection improvement, bicycle enhancement, pedestrian enhancement, freight enhancement, and transit enhancement capital projects (maximum of 100 points each). The evaluation criteria were developed based on five policy guidelines which are meant to guide the development of the area TIP. To develop funding recommendations, the Indianapolis Region Transportation Improvement Program (IRTIP) Committee considers the scores calculated for each candidate project and other factors such as the established funding targets and the project types: 25% for pavement preservation projects, 25% for roadway expansion projects, 15% for bridge preservation projects. Relow is a summary of the evaluation criteria for each of the 12 project categories.

Criteria	Points	Criteria Measurement Methodology
New Signalization	<u>100</u>	
New Signal Warrants	70	Points based on how many MUTCD-defined signal warrants are met.
Federal Functional Classification	15	Points based on the leg of the intersection with the highest Federal functional classification.
Signal Coordination/Interconnection	15	Points based on whether signal coordination or interconnection is included in the project.
Existing Roadway Capacity Improvement	<u>100</u>	
Federal Functional Classification	15	Points based on the Federal functional classification of the roadway.
Existing Operations	25	Points based on severity of existing level of service (LOS) with LOS C or higher receiving no points.
Future Operations	25	Points based on severity of forecast 2035 LOS with LOS D or higher receiving no points.
Existing Average Daily Traffic Volume	25	Points based on average daily traffic volume averaged across corridor segments.
Permanent Neighborhood Disruption/Relocation	10	Points given if no acquisition of existing structures is needed, penalty of -5 points if acquisition is needed.
New Roadway Construction	<u>100</u>	
Projected Average Daily Traffic Volume	40	Points based on projected average daily traffic volume averaged across corridor segments.
Project is Regionally Significant	25	Based on regional significance of the new roadway.
Project Enables Connectivity/ Continuity of the Corridor	25	Based on connectivity and continuity of roadway corridor.
Permanent Neighborhood Disruption/Relocation	10	Points given if no acquisition of existing structures is needed, penalty of -5 points if acquisition is needed.

Criteria	Points	Criteria Measurement Methodology
Roadway Reconstruction and Rehabilitation/Roadway Resurfacing	<u>100</u> <u>each</u>	
Federal Functional Classification	10	Points based on the Federal functional classification of the roadway.
Pavement Condition Index	50	Points based on existing pavement condition as determined by the Pavement Condition Index and determined with established ranges.
Existing Average Daily Traffic Volume	40	Points based on average daily traffic volume averaged across corridor segments.
Bridge Replacement/Bridge	<u>100</u>	
Rehabilitation	each	
Sufficiency Rating	40	Points based on the bridge sufficiency rating, with ratings over 50 not eligible for STP funding for replacement and ratings over 80 not eligible for STP funding for rehabilitation determined with established ranges.
Structurally Deficient or Functionally Obsolete	25	Points based on whether the bridge is structurally deficient or functionally obsolete. If neither, the project is not eligible for STP funding for replacement.
Federal Functional Classification	10	Points based on the Federal functional classification of the roadway.
Existing Average Daily Traffic Volume	25	Points based on average daily traffic volume averaged across corridor segments.
Intersection or Intersection Groups	<u>100</u>	
Existing Average Daily Traffic Volume	40	Points based on average daily traffic volume averaged across intersection groups.
Accident rates	20	Points based on the average accident rate per million vehicles averaged across intersection groups determined with established ranges.
Existing Operations	20	Points based on severity of existing level of service (LOS) with LOS D or higher receiving no points.
Future Operations	20	Points based on projected improvement to peak hour LOS.
Bicycle Enhancement	<u>100</u>	
Constructs New Exclusive Bicycle Lane or Multi-Use Path	50	Points based on length of the project if the project includes exclusive bicycle lanes or multi-use path, and determined with established ranges.
Constructs New Public Bicycle Storage	10	Points based on the number of added bicycle parking spaces.
Proximity to Primary Corridor in Bicycle Plan	20	Points based on whether the project is located on or connects to a primary corridor in the Regional Bikeways Plan.
New or Rehabbed Sidewalk/Multi- use Path Connecting to a Bus Stop or Rapid Transit Station	20	Points based on connectivity to existing or planned mass transit routes.

Criteria	Points	Criteria Measurement Methodology
Pedestrian Enhancement	<u>100</u>	
Sidewalk Expansion/Rehabilitation	20	Points based on project length, and determined with established ranges.
Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan Consistency	15	Points based project located on recommended corridor in Regional Pedestrian Plan or identified as a needed segment in a walkability study.
Connects missing link in sidewalk	20	Points based on connectivity to sidewalks identified in the Regional Pedestrian Plan
Eliminates Pedestrian/Vehicle Hazard	15	Points based on elimination of existing hazards to pedestrians
Connects multiple pedestrian destinations	15	Points based on connectivity to high density residential, commercial, office and/or mixed-use districts
New or Rehabbed Sidewalk/Multi- use Path Connecting to a Bus Stop or Rapid Transit Station	15	Points based on connectivity to existing or planned mass transit routes
Freight Enhancement	<u>100</u>	
Implements recommendation from Freight Plan	25	Based on list of Priority Freight Infrastructure Projects in the Indianapolis Intermodal Freight System Plan
Improves Congestion on Established Truck Route	25	Points based on existing intersection LOS on established truck routes defined in the Indianapolis Intermodal Freight System Plan
Allows more direct routing of trucks	15	Points based on connectivity to Interstate interchanges and primary arterials
Eliminates existing impediment on established truck route	10	Points based on improvement to overpass clearances and intersection turning radius
Improves safety on established truck route	15	Points based on improvement to safety factors as determined in the Indianapolis Intermodal Freight System Plan
Improves access to inter-modal freight transfer	10	Points based on type of intermodal transfer
Transit Enhancement Capital Projects	<u>100</u>	
Expand/Maintain Transit Service Accessibility	25	Points given if project extends sidewalk access at bus stops, maintains access at existing bus stops, increases multimodal accessibility, or provides additional bus stops
Improves Safety and Security	10	Points given for transit service with lighting, audio, and visual monitoring
Improves Comfort/Amenities of Transit Patrons	25	Points given for the use of shelters and benches
Enhances Communications/ Information Sharing	15	Points based on use of informational signage, electronic media, or support of marketing efforts
Implements the Comprehensive Operation Analysis or Regional Mass Transit Service Plan Recommendations	10	Points based on project's relationship to existing plans
Utilizes Technology for Transit Service Planning	15	Points based on the use of computer software and Web access

#### **Memphis Urbanized Area**

The Memphis Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) solicits candidate projects for Surface Transportation Program funding allocated to the Memphis urbanized area. The candidate projects are rated with evaluation criteria developed for four project categories—major road construction projects (maximum of 100 points plus potentially 20 bonus points), resurfacing projects (maximum of 50 points), bicycle/pedestrian projects (maximum of 50 points), and signalization projects (maximum of 50 points). The evaluation criteria were developed generally based on the area long-range transportation plan. Project selection scenarios are developed by the MPO and presented to the MPO's Engineering and Technical Committee (ETC) as part of a "workshop" to select a preferred funding scenario. In developing the preferred funding scenario, the ETC also considers during the workshop the established funding targets, project readiness, likelihood of project or project phases being implemented in 4-year period, the level of funding being requested by each project category, and geographical equity. The Memphis MPO established funding targets for each project category: 67.5% for major road construction projects, 10% for resurfacing projects, 7.5% for bicycle/pedestrian projects, and 7.5% for signalization projects, with the remaining 7.5% reserved for project cost overruns. Below is a summary of the evaluation criteria used for each project category.

Criteria	Points	Criteria Measurement Methodology
Major Road Construction Projects	<u>120</u>	
Congestion	20	Points are determined by established ranges of existing annual average daily traffic (up to 4 points), existing volume to capacity ratio (up to 4 points), estimated reductions in travel time delay (up to 10 points), and based on whether project includes congestion mitigation measures identified in the Congestion Management Process (up to 2 points).
Safety	18	Points based on level of crash rate as determined by established ranges (up to 8 points), along with points subjectively given based on whether project includes implementation of traffic calming improvements (up to 5 points) and/or additional design improvements that improve safety (up to 5 points).
Multimodal	16	Points based on whether project will improve bicycle, pedestrian, transit and/or freight access and mobility (up to 4 points each).
Land Use	14	Points based on whether project is consistent with locally adopted plans and advances local goals and objectives (between -14 and +14 points). Negative points if project is inconsistent with an adopted plan and/or has a negative land use impact.
Environmental Justice	6	Points based on whether project positively or negatively impacts an environmental justice community (between -6 and +6 points).
Environment	6	Points based on whether project will have negative or adverse environmental impacts (between -6 and +6 points).
Air Quality	6	Points based on whether project will negatively, neutrally, or positively impact air quality in the region.
Network Continuity	6	Points based on whether project will increase the efficiency of the overall transportation system, promoting greater region-wide connection.
Cost Effectiveness	4	Points based on level of total project cost per vehicle-mile traveled per mile of project length, as determined by established ranges.
Security	4	Points based on whether project will improve public security, including both motorized and non-motorized users of the transportation system.
Bonus Points – Local Funding Overmatch	10	Bonus points to projects for which lead agency can overmatch the typical minimum 20% local match requirement (10 points for 36% or more local match, 5 points for 25%-35% of local match).
Bonus Points – Project Readiness	10	Points based on whether project advanced work and progressed since project was originally submitted (only for "carry over" projects from previous TIP)

Criteria	Points	Criteria Measurement Methodology
Resurfacing Projects	<u>50</u>	
Pavement Condition Index (PCI)	20	Points based on level of roadway's pavement condition as measured by its PCI, as determined by established ranges.
Proximity to Land Uses	10	Points based on whether project is located near industrial (10 points), commercial/retail/office (8 points), or residential development (6 points).
Other Improvements	10	Points based on whether project includes ADA-accessible sidewalks, crosswalks or curb ramps (5 points) or bicycle-related improvements (up to 5 points).
Annual Average Daily Traffic	10	Points based on level of existing average daily traffic, as determined by established ranges.
Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects	<u>50</u>	
Proximity to Land Uses	20	Points based on whether project is located near schools and colleges (up to 6 points), parks (up to 5 points), retail centers (up to 3 points), employment centers (up to 3 points), and/or transit routes (up to 3 points).
Network Continuity	15	Points based on whether project will promote greater region-wide connection (15 points) or have local connection benefits (10 points).
Inclusion in Plans	10	Points based on whether project is identified in MPO's bicycle/pedestrian plan or LRTP (10 points), a locally adopted plan (8 points), or neither (5 points).
Additional Design Improvements	5	Points based on whether project includes additional design improvements that retrofit existing facilities to increase pedestrian/bicycle safety, convenience, and comfort.
Signalization Projects	50	
Existing Intersection Level of Service	15	Points based on level of estimated LOS prior to project's signalization improvements.
Future Intersection Level of Service	10	Points based on level of estimated LOS resulting from project's signalization improvements.
Annual Average Daily Traffic	8	Points based on level of existing annual average daily traffic, as determined by established ranges.
Crash Rate	8	Points based on level of crash rate, as determined by established ranges.
Other	9	Points based on whether project will benefits other modes of transportation (3 points), is part of a coordinated signal project (3 points), and/or will use newer technology (3 points).

#### **Columbus Urbanized Area**

The Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission (MORPC), the MPO for the Columbus urbanized area, solicits candidate projects for Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding, along with for Congestion Mitigation and Air-Quality Improvement (CMAQ) and Transportation Enhancement funding. Projects types eligible for STP funding are major widening and new roadway projects; intersections, signals, and minor widening projects which involve adding center turn lanes and widening existing lanes; bike and pedestrian projects; transit projects, and system preservation projects. Each candidate project is first subjectively scored up to 10 points for each of the six policy goals identified in the area long-range transportation plan—economy; natural resources; energy; collaboration; health, safety, and welfare; and sustainable neighborhoods—based on reviewing information provided by the project sponsor, and a relative comparison with the other candidate projects. The score for each goal is then weighted based on weighting factors established by goal for each project scorings, and develops a listing of projects recommended for STP, CMAQ, and TE funding based on the candidate project scores and rankings, community needs, regional goals, and the funding targets established for the three funding sources. Below are the weighted maximum score and the information considered for each policy goals under the five project categories. Detail regarding the information requested from project sponsors for each of the six policy goals is provided in Attachment A.

#### Scoring Used for Project Categories (100 points each)

	Maximum Points per Project Category						
Policy Goal and Criteria Considered	Major Widening or New Roadway	Minor Widening, Intersections, or Signals	Bike and Pedestrian	Transit	System Preservation		
Economy	30	25	15	20	15		
Congested VMT Reduction, Travel Delay Reduction, Level of Service Analysis, Existing Truck Percentage, Intermodal Traffic, Non-Retail Jobs within 1 Mile, Impact on Job Growth, Potential Utilization Rating, Number of Users							
Natural Resources	10	10	15	15	10		
Listing of Sensitive Lands, Emission Reduction, Greenroads Rating							
Energy	10	10	10	15	10		
Project Components that Save Energy, Any Extraordinary Energy Aspects							
Collaboration	15	10	10	15	15		
Maturity of Project, Amount and Percentage of Funding Requested, Private Sector Funding, Number of Funding Partners, Documentation of Collaboration							

		Maximum	Points per Project	t Category	
Policy Goal and Criteria Considered	Major Widening or New Roadway	Minor Widening, Intersections, or Signals	Bike and Pedestrian	Transit	System Preservation
Health, Safety, and Welfare	25	30	25	15	35
Crash Data, Pavement Condition Rating, Bridge Rating, Components that Maximize System Longevity, State of Good Repair Aspects, New Transit System Ridership					
Sustainable Neighborhoods Displacements, Environmental Justice, Sidewalk Percentage, Relationship to Sidewalk System, Regional Bikeway Plan Adherence, Near Transit Line, Enhances Transit Service, 2010 Origin/Destination Density, 2035 Origin/Destination Density	10	15	25	20	15

### Austin Urbanized Area

The Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO), the MPO for the Austin urbanized area, solicits candidate projects for Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding. Candidate projects for STP funding are rated with evaluation criteria developed for general projects—including all eligible projects for STP funding, except for exclusively bicycle and pedestrian projects—and exclusively bicycle and pedestrian projects (maximum of 100 points each). Any of the candidate projects that serve or support areas designated as CAMPO Centers in the MPO's long-range transportation plan, and that do not add through traffic lanes (with exception), are also rated with evaluation criteria developed for such projects (maximum of 100 points). The MPO's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) considers the scores and ranking of general and bicycle and pedestrian projects, and requested "set asides", such as for MPO planning and programming efforts and emergency recovery projects—to develop a listing of projects recommended for STP funding. The established funding targets include 15% of STP funding for exclusively bicycle and pedestrian projects and 50% of STP funds for CAMPO Centers projects which can include highway and bicycle and pedestrian projects. Below is a summary of each of the three sets of evaluation criteria.

Criteria	Points	Criteria Measurement Methodology
Safety		
Preventative Safety Measures	3	Points subjectively given based on detailed documentation of improvements to documented safety issues being provided with application.
Crash Reduction Factor	4	Points are given relative to other candidate projects based on results of an analysis using the Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) Roadway Safety Design Model (up to 4 points) or the estimated number of crashes eliminated per 3 years per mile (up to 3 points).
Texas Strategic Highway Emphasis Areas	2	Project's crash reductions address the Texas Strategic Highways Safety Plan's 'Crash Type and Location' Emphasis Areas.
Safety Improvements for Non- Motorized Users	1	Project receives points for reducing the conflict points between motorize and non- motorized modes by exceeding minimum AASHTO/ADA/ITE bicycle and pedestrian accommodation standards.
Efficiency		
TDM and TSM Measures	4	Points given based on the number of established transportation demand management and transportation system management measures or strategies implemented as part of the project. (Four points requires implementation of five or more of these strategies.)
Bottleneck/Gap Elimination	5	Points received for removing a "bottleneck" or completing "gap" identified in CAMPO's 2008/2009 Roadway Congestion Analysis, by the Bottleneck Study Committee, or by the TxDOT 100 Most Congested Roadways Report.
Security		
Incident Management	2	Points received for providing infrastructure or equipment that increases responder safety or deploys ITS technology.
ITS	2	Points received if the project provides for data capture and management through ITS technology, or project provides for arterial/freeway management systems or traffic incident management systems using ITS technology.

Scoring Used for General Projects (100 points)

Criteria	Points	Criteria Measurement Methodology
Mobility and Access		
Travel Time	12	Project receives points based on the level of congestion as identified by the 2008/2009 Roadway Congestion Analysis and/or as by identified using a travel demand model under year 2015, 2025, or 2035 conditions, and based on the type of congestion reduction measures proposed as part of the project.
Capacity	8	Points awarded based on an estimate of the additional maximum daily person throughput that would be accommodated by the project.
VMT Reduction	7	Project receives points if it provides transit service, makes operational or safety improvements to a roadway which support transit and non-motorized modes, or includes one or more managed lanes.
Connectivity		
Arterial Connectivity	4	Project receives points for completing gaps in the roadway, pedestrian, and bicycle network, and for providing intersection improvements or ITS investments that support routing traffic along alternative routes during incidents.
Seamless Public Transportation	4	Points awarded for providing greater interconnectedness in the public transportation system, including creating a new intermodal or park & ride facility that connects 2 or more transit routes, adding capacity that supports an existing or planned transit route, prioritizing public transit over other modes in the project corridor, and increasing the number of residents or businesses with access to public transit.
Freight Connections	2	Project receives points for improving connections between freight modes, or capacity for freight movement.
Environment		
Emissions Reduction	15	Project received points based on the measures proposed to be implemented as part of the projects that would be expected to reduce transportation related air emissions and energy consumption by reducing per capita VMT.
Environment, Noise, and Neighborhood Character	5	Project receives points for avoiding environmental sensitivity areas and historical areas, and for including a context sensitive solutions process.
Environmental Justice	5	Project supports an equitable distribution of the impacts and benefits of the transportation system regardless of income, age, or ethnicity. Points awarded for the project being located wholly or partially within an Environmental Justice area an increasing non-tolled access to jobs, healthcare, culture, or education.
Economy		
Access to Employment and Education	3	Points awarded for providing direct access to an existing school, park, library, community center, college, employer of more than 100 individuals, commercial center (5+ businesses), or a residential area of more than 20 units per acre.
Economic Development	2	Project receives points if the application provides documentation of how the project would leverage local investments to support significant economic development in mixed-use, walkable areas.

Criteria	Points	Criteria Measurement Methodology
Funding Commitment	5	Points given based on level of local match greater than 20%, and for documentation of private sector investment in the project.
Cost-Efficient Improvement	5	Points awarded based on the cost/benefit ratio of the project, which is measured as the total points awarded to the project excluding this criterion divided by the total project cost.

#### Scoring Used for Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects (100 points)

Criteria	Points	Criteria Measurement Methodology
Safety		
Crash History	10	Points based on the number of documented bicycle or pedestrian-related injury crashes in the area to be affected by the proposed facility over the last three-year period for which data is available.
Conflict Factor	5	Project receives points for separating motorized and non-motorized modes determined by established ranges of the existing speed limit of the roadway.
Mobility Needs	10	Points awarded based on the proposed new or improved bicycle and/or pedestrian facility being identified as a low, medium, or high priority corridor in the 2035 High Priority Bicycle Corridor or Pedestrian District.
Access to Destinations	10	Points awarded for candidate project providing direct access to an existing school, park, library, community center, college, large employer, commercial center, or high-density residential area.
Intermodal Connectivity	15	Points awarded based on the number of connections the project has to other transportation modes.
Efficiency – Barrier/Gap Elimination	10	Project receives points based on the reduction in distance that must be traveled from the corridor's endpoints, as determined by established ranges.
Land Use – Centers Concept	10	Project is awarded points for being located within or directly connected to a CAMPO 2035 Center (identified priority mixed-use developments or areas)
Environmental Justice	10	Points awarded for being located within or directly connect to an Environmental Justice Area
Security Measures	10	Project receives points for candidate project including lighting, bicycle racks, and bicycle lockers.
Economy		
Funding Commitment	5	Points awarded based on the cost/benefit ratio of the project, which is measured as the total points awarded to the project excluding this criterion divided by the total project cost.
Cost-Efficient Improvement	5	Points awarded based on the cost/benefit ratio of the project, which is measured as the total points awarded to the project excluding this criterion divided by the total project cost.

# Scoring Used for CAMPO 2035 Centers (100 points)

Criteria	Points	Criteria Measurement Methodology
General Transportation Benefits	10	Points given based on multiplying the mobility and connectivity score received by the project by 0.16 for "general" projects and 0.12 for bicycle pedestrian projects (up to 4 points), safety and system preservation score received by the project by 0.12 for "general" projects and 0.09 for bicycle pedestrian projects (up to 3 points), and environmental preservation score received by the project by 0.12 for "general" projects and 0.30 for bicycle pedestrian projects (up to 3 points).
Land Use and Transportation Integration		
Plan Development	7	Points awarded based on design-level plan being completed for the project, or the project is identified in a local downtown plan, comprehensive plan, or capital improvement program.
Encourage Higher Density Development	17	Project receives points for demonstrating that the project would meet or exceed housing and employment capacity projected in the 2035 regional plan (up to 5 points) and housing accommodation levels assumed in the 2035 regional plan (up to 5 points), and the project is considered a catalyst project (up to 7 points)
Encourage Diversity of Land Uses	12	Project receives points based on the number of land uses served (up to 6 points), and whether the project would have an effect on improving jobs-housing balance of an area (up to 6 points).
Design	12	Points awarded for demonstrating that the project would increase street connectivity within a Center (up to 6 points), increase access to transit within a Center (up to 4 points), and reduce parking footprint in the Center (up to 2 points).
Travel Demand Management		
SOV Travel Reduction	10	Project receives points based on measurable support or improvement in the use of alternatives to Single Occupancy Vehicle travel within and connecting to the Center.
Trip Reduction	10	Points awarded based on the level of trip reduction potential of the Center served by the project.
Partnerships and Community Involvement		
Formal Partnerships	10	Points based on the number of letters of support submitted by a public or private sector entity that indicated a commitment to direct in-kind or financial participation in the project.
Community Involvement	5	Points awarded based on the documentation of a robust public involvement process (up to 3 points) and letters of support and records of public meetings that include positive comment about the project (2 points).
Leveraging Outside Investment	7	Points awarded based on the documentation the project being located near a development having an approved Master Development Agreement, a mixed use private developments on one or more sites in the vicinity of the project, a designated TIF district, or other public-funded investment, existing business development, or economic development district.

#### Norfolk/Virginia Beach Urbanized Area

The Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization (HRTPO), which serves as the MPO for the Norfolk/Virginia Beach urbanized area, solicits candidate projects for Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding allocated to the urbanized area, along with Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air-Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funds. The candidate projects are rated with evaluation criteria developed for ten project categories—highway capacity, corridor operational improvements, bridge, intermodal facilities, transit and fixed guideway improvement and expansion, vehicle replacement/purchase, other fixed guideway and transit ITS, planning studies, transportation demand management, and intelligent transportation systems (maximum of 100 points each). The MPO's Transportation Programming Subcommittee (TPS) which considers the project ratings and rankings—along with funding targets, and established funding criteria, such as priority to projects involving a number of communities, projects having regional significance, projects that cannot be funded by other sources, and projects previously approved for STP funding to ensure completion, then to other on-going projects eligible for STP funding, and then to unfunded and new candidate projects. A summary of the evaluation criteria considered for each of the categories, except transportation demand management, are listed below. Evaluation criteria have not yet been established by the MPO for the travel demand management category as only one on-going rideshare project has applied for funding under this project category.

Criteria	Points	Criteria Measurement Methodology
Highway Capacity	<u>100</u>	
Congestion Level	20	Points based on level of existing and future congestion.
Cost-Effectiveness	20	Project with lowest cost per vehicle miles travelled (VMT) gets 20 points and the project with the highest cost per VMT gets 0 points. Points for the other projects determined by straight line interpolation.
System Continuity	20	Based on whether the project completes a link in the transportation system.
Safety	20	Points subjectively based on assessment of safety improvements proposed as part of the project.
Air Quality	10	Points based on implementation of the project resulting in the reduction of NOx (5 points) and hydrocarbons (5 points)
Project Readiness	10	Points subjectively based on the stage of readiness of the project, with projects having detailed design and cost estimates available receiving the highest points.
Corridor Operational Improvements	<u>100</u>	
Arterial level of service (LOS) based on Average Travel Speed	25	Project with lowest average speed (or worst LOS) gets 25 points and the projects having a LOS C or better getting 0 points. Points for the other projects determined relative to project receiving 20 points.
Average Daily Traffic (ADT) of Roadway	20	For both existing and future ADT, the project having the highest ADT gets 10 points with the remaining projects receiving points relative to the highest ADT.
Cost-Effectiveness	25	Project with lowest cost per vehicle miles travelled (VMT) gets 25 points and the project with the highest cost per VMT gets 0 points. Points for the other projects determined by straight line interpolation.
Existing Accident Experience	20	Project with highest crash rate gets 20 points with the remaining projects receiving points relative to the highest crash rate.
Project Readiness	10	Points subjectively based on the stage of readiness of the project, with projects having detailed design and cost estimates available receiving the highest points.

Criteria	Points	Criteria Measurement Methodology
Bridge	<u>100</u>	
Sufficiency Rating	60	Points based on VDOT Bridge Sufficiency Index relative to other projects
Average Daily Traffic Volume	30	Points based on average daily traffic volume relative to other projects
Project Readiness	10	Points subjectively based on the stage of readiness of the project, with projects having detailed design and cost estimates available receiving the highest points.
Intermodal Facilities	<u>100</u>	
Linkages or Connections	40	Points subjectively determined based on whether and how project will establish connections between modes or existing corridors and centers
Accommodations of Intermodal Movements	25	Points subjectively determined based on whether and how project will improve intermodal connections
Freight Movements	25	Points subjectively determined based on whether and how project will improve rail or vehicular access to freight distribution facilities, ports, or major industrial clients
Project Readiness	10	Points subjectively based on the stage of readiness of the project, with projects having detailed design and cost estimates available receiving the highest points.
Transit and Fixed Guideway Improvement and Expansion	<u>100</u>	
Congestion Relief	10	Project with the highest estimated percentage in reduction in trips gets 10 points and the projects expected to not result in any reduction in highway trips receiving 0 points. Points for the other projects determined relative to project receiving 10 points.
Facility Usage	20	Project with the highest estimated ridership gets 20 points and the projects having the lowest getting 0 points. Points for the other projects determined by straight line interpolation.
Cost Effectiveness	20	Project with lowest cost per ridership gets 20 points and the project with the highest cost per passenger gets 0 points. Points for the other projects determined by straight line interpolation.
Air Quality	20	Points based on implementation of the project resulting in the reduction of NOx (10 points) and hydrocarbons (10 points).
Coverage Area	20	Points based on a relative assessment of population and employment within service coverage area.
Project Readiness	10	Points subjectively based on the stage of readiness of the project, with projects having detailed design and cost estimates available receiving the highest points.
Transit Vehicle Replacement/Purchase	<u>100</u>	
Average age of the vehicles	35	Points subjectively scored based on assessment of vehicle fleet average age.
Number of Vehicles to Replace	10	Points subjectively scored based on the proportion of the total vehicle fleet to be replaced.
Emissions	30	Points subjectively based on the relative change of emissions from the old and new vehicles.

Criteria	Points	Criteria Measurement Methodology
Cost Effectiveness	10	Project with lowest cost per ridership gets 20 points and the project with the highest cost per passenger gets 0 points. Points for the other projects determined by straight line interpolation.
Average Mileage	15	Points subjectively based on the average mileage of the vehicles being replaced.
Other Fixed Guideway and Transit ITS Projects	<u>100</u>	
Service Reliability	25	Points subjectively scored based on assessment of whether project would increase reliability of the transit system.
Passenger Safety, Comfort, and Convenience	30	Points subjectively scored based on assessment of whether project would improve passenger safety, comfort, and convenience.
Transit System Efficiency	10	Points subjectively scored based on assessment of whether the project would improve the efficiency of the transit system.
Revenue Collection	25	Points subjectively scored based on assessment of whether project would improve the collection of revenue.
Data Collection	10	Points subjectively scored based on assessment of whether project would improve the transit data collection system.
Planning Studies	<u>100</u>	
Major Issue or LRTP Revision	25	Points subjectively scored based on assessment of whether study is necessary to address a major issue or to revise the long-range transportation plan.
Safety Issue	15	Points subjectively scored based on assessment of whether study would address safety issues.
Encouraging Multimodal Transportation	10	Points subjectively scored based on assessment of whether study would address multi-modal transportation.
Addressing Regional Mobility or Accessibility Needs	20	Points subjectively scored based on assessment of whether study would address the mobility or accessibility needs of the area.
Well-Defined Study	10	Points subjectively scored based on assessment of whether the purpose, design concept and scope for the study were well defined.
Supporting Economic Development	10	Points subjectively scored based on assessment of whether the goals and objectives of the study show support for economic development.
Environmental Preservation/Protection	10	Points subjectively scored based on assessment of whether the goals and objectives of the study demonstrate preservation or protection of the environment.
Intelligent Transportation Systems	<u>100</u>	
Peak Traffic Flow	15	Points subjectively scored based on assessment of whether project would improve traffic flow during peak congestion periods and/or special events.
Safety	25	Points subjectively scored based on assessment of whether project would be expected to result in a decrease in the number or severity of roadway crashes.
Level of Service	20	Points subjectively scored based on assessment of whether project would improve level of service or and/or incident management.

Criteria	Points	Criteria Measurement Methodology
Addressing Regional Mobility or Accessibility Needs	10	Points subjectively scored based on assessment of whether project would address the mobility or accessibility needs of the area.
Improve Communication to Provide Better Motorist Information	20	Points subjectively scored based on assessment of whether project would improve the communication systems to provide better and more accurate traffic information to motorists.
Part of Regional ITS Strategic Plan	10	Points subjectively scored based on assessment of whether project implements the regional intelligent transportation system (ITS) strategic plan.

#### Minneapolis/St. Paul Urbanized Area

The Metropolitan Council, which serves as the MPO for the Minneapolis-St. Paul Urbanized Area, solicits candidate projects for Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds allocated to the urbanized area, along with Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air-Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funds. Candidate projects for STP funding are rated with evaluation criteria developed for six project categories—non-freeway principal arterial projects (maximum of 1,200 points), minor arterial – relievers projects (maximum of 1,250 points), minor arterial – expanders projects (maximum of 1,200 points), minor arterial – augmenters projects (maximum of 1,200 points), minor arterial – connectors projects (maximum of 1,200 points), and bicycle/pedestrian projects (maximum of 1,200 points). The classification of the four minor arterial types depends on its location and purpose. (A description of the minor arterial types is provided in the table below.) Transit and transportation system management capital projects may also be funded with STP funding, but these projects are evaluated using criteria developed for selecting projects for CMAQ funding. Separate committees are formed to score and rank the candidate projects for each project categories. These committees are made up of MPO staff and members of the MPO's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), along with staff from area local and county public work departments and state and other regional agencies. Scores for each evaluation criteria are subjectively determined for each candidate project based on reviewing information provided by the project sponsor related to the criteria, and relative to the other candidate projects. Following the rankings developed for each project category, the TAC develops at least two alternative funding scenarios for STP funding. The funding scenarios vary only by the amount that each project category would be funded following the established ranking of projects for each funding category. At least one of the funding scenarios proposed is generally based on the relative level of funding requested under the six evaluation categories. The MPO's Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) then approves a listing of projects for STP funding by either choosing one of the funding scenarios developed by the TAC, or by developing its own funding scenario following the established ranking of projects for each funding category. Below is a summary of the evaluation criteria used for each type of the six project categories.

	Maximum Points Per Project Category					
	Minor Arterials					
Criteria	R*	E*	C*	A*	PA*	Criteria Measurement Methodology
Relative Importance	100	100	100	100	100	Points based on length of project (only for relievers), existing and forecast annual average daily traffic, and whether public transit is currently provided on project roadway.
Crash Rate	50					Points based on 3-year crash rate on principal arterial being relieved (only for relievers).
Roadway Condition and Age				240		Points based on age and condition of section of augmenter (only for augmenters) to be reconstructed via project.
Crash Reduction	50	150	150	80	150	Points based on estimated reduction in crashes on project roadway resulting from project.
Goods Movement			100			Points based on ton vehicle miles of project that does not meet standard of 10 ton loads but will be built to meet that standard.
Shoulder Improvements and Non-motorized Travel			175			Points based on whether project will include paved or gravel shoulders on rural highways (up to 100 points) or provide separate pedestrian and bicycle facilities in rural town centers (up to 75 points).
Air Quality	100	50		60	50	Points based on estimated reduction in CO, NOx, and/or VOC emissions resulting from project.
Congestion	75					Points based on hours of congestion per day on principal arterial being relieved (only for relievers).
Congestion Reduction	75	100		60	75	Points based on estimated reduction in congestion at most congested location on project roadway resulting from project.
Cost Effectiveness – Crash Reduction	125	125	125	60	125	Points based on total project cost per crash reduced resulting from project.

Criteria for Minor Arterial and Principal Arterial Projects

	Maximum Points Per Project Category					
	Minor Arterials					
Criteria	R*	E*	C*	A*	PA*	Criteria Measurement Methodology
Cost Effectiveness – Air Quality	75	75		60	75	Points based on total project cost per emissions reduction per day resulting from project.
Cost Effectiveness – Congestion Reduction	75	75		60	100	Points based on total project cost per increase in hourly person throughput resulting from project.
Cost Effectiveness – Goods Movement			75			Points based on ton vehicle miles not accommodating 10 ton loads divided by total cost of project.
Cost Effectiveness – Shoulder Improvements			75			Points based on shoulder improvement calculation divided by total cost of project.
Long-Range Plan Objectives	100	100	100	100	100	Points based on project's support of strategies identified in region's long-range land use and transportation plans.
Affordable Housing Goals	50	50		50	50	Points based on level of project community's progress in addressing its affordable housing goals.
Land Use and Access Management	75	100	100	50	100	Points based on project's use of a local access management plan, project's consistency with county or state access management plan, and whether project's community has a regulatory framework for access control.
Corridor Access Management	75	100	100	50	100	Points based on whether project helps to implement access management plan by removing or modifying nonconforming access points.
Multimodal	125	75		130	75	Points based on whether project will improve bicycle, pedestrian, transit and/or freight access and mobility.
Project Readiness	100	100	100	100	100	Points based on how many steps have been taken toward implementation of project.
Total Points	1,250	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	

\*Key: R=Reliever - provides relief to congested principal arterials.

E=Expander - provides connections to developing suburban areas.

C=Connector - provides connections between rural areas.

A=Augmenter – provides an alternative to principal arterials within the "IH 494/IH 694 ring"

PA=Principal Arterial (non-freeway)

# Criteria for Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects (1,200 points)

Criteria	Points	Criteria Measurement Methodology
Facility Type	250	Points based on significance of barrier to be crossed by project, how well project improves network connectivity, and importance of separate bicycle/walkway segments to be connected.
Potential Use	250	Points based on current population density, employment density, and college/university enrollment (each within one mile of project), and how project will provide more direct connections between trip origins and destinations.
Cost Effectiveness	200	Points based on total project cost divided by totals of: current population, future population, current employment, and future employment, each within one mile of project limits (up to 50 points each).
Safety/Security	100	Points based on how well project will address safety issues and security needs for project location.
Long-Range Plan Objectives	100	Points based on project's support of strategies identified in region's long-range land use and transportation plans.
Affordable Housing Goals	50	Points based on level of project community's progress in addressing its affordable housing goals.
Multimodal	50	Points based on whether project will improve bicycle and pedestrian access to transit routes.
Project Readiness	200	Points based on how many steps have been taken toward implementation of project.

#### **Chicago** Area

All of the Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding that is allocated to the urbanized areas within the seven-county Northeastern Illinois Region is combined and sub-allocated to the City of Chicago and the 11 subregional Councils of Mayors (CoM) based on previously established agreements. STP funding is administered by the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP), the MPO for the portions of the Chicago and Round Lake Beach urbanized areas within the State of Illinois, and by the Illinois Department of Transportation. Each of the 11 subregional CoM have developed their own process for selecting candidate projects for STP funding within their respective area. Generally, the CoM planning staff review and rate each candidate project, and subregional CoM Technical Committees make recommendations on which candidate projects. The evaluation criteria used varies by subregional CoM, but common evaluation criteria include: traffic volume and/or congestion mitigation, pavement condition, air quality benefits and/or implementation of transportation control measures, safety, project readiness, and regional benefit/inter-governmental projects. Other projects types may also be eligible for STP funding within the subregional CoM, but these projects are generally evaluated by the CoM Technical Committees based on information provided by the project sponsor. Following approval by the subregional CoM, the listing of projects selected for funding is forwarded to CMAP for inclusion in the area TIP. Below is the evaluation criteria utilized by two of the subregional CoM. The North Shore CoM updated their evaluation criteria in 2012.

Criteria	Points	Criteria Measurement Methodology
Traffic Volume (AADT)	20	Points based on the AADT of the road, and determined based on established ranges.
Regional Transportation Significance	20	Points based on the IDOT functional classification of the roadway, and determined based on established ranges.
Safety	15	Points based on a comparison of the three-year average crash rate against IDOT's average crash rate for the type of roadway being improved, and determined based on established ranges.
Intergovernmental Importance	15	Points based on the number of jurisdictions sponsoring the project.
Air Quality Benefits	20	Points based on reduction of automobile trips, VMT, or emissions with a penalty for projects with negative air quality benefits
Pavement Condition	15	Points based on the existing pavement condition of the roadway.
Level of Service –OR– Volume/Capacity Ratio	20	Points based on either level of service or volume/capacity ratio, whichever produces the highest score, and determined based on established ranges.
Transportation Control Measure Component	5 each	Five points given for each transportation control measure included as part of the project.

Northwest Council of Mayors (125+ points)

# North Shore Council of Mayors (100 points)

Criteria	Points	Criteria Measurement Methodology
Regional Transportation Significance	20	Points based on the IDOT functional classification of the roadway (up to 10 points) and the number of project sponsors funding the project (up to 10 points), and determined based on established ranges.
Safety	20	Points based on the ranking of the number of vehicle crashes, pedestrian crashes, and bicycle crashes amongst the candidate projects determined with established ranges, and based on whether there was a crash involving a fatality and/or incapacitating injury (up to 5 points each)
Pavement Condition	20	Points based on the existing pavement condition of the roadway.
Congestion Mitigation	15	Points based on both existing level of service and the expected level of service improvement.
Complete Streets/Multimodal	15	Points based on whether project includes transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements are part of the project, and whether project appears in local, subregional, or regional plans.
Project Readiness	5	Points based on whether preliminary engineering has been initiated or completed for the project.
Local Needs 5		Points based on whether project sponsor had not had a project in the last 10 years.

\* \* \*

CTH/RWH #208281

# POTENTIAL ELIGIBLE PROJECTS FOR FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION SURFACE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ALLOCATED TO THE MILWAUKEE URBANIZED AREA

The Advisory Committee on Transportation System Planning and Programming for the Milwaukee Urbanized Area has developed guidelines for the selection of projects for the Federal Highway Administration Surface Transportation Program – Milwaukee Urbanized Area (STP-M) funds. As well, the Advisory Committee has made recommendations of which types of projects should or should not be funded with STP-M funds. With the Advisory Committee considering a new procedure for the selection of projects for STP-M funding, a review of the past recommendations of the Advisory Committee on the types of projects that would be considered for STP-M funding in the current and future funding cycles is necessary. The following lists potential project types to be considered by the Advisory Committee for STP-M funding:

- 1. <u>Highway Projects</u> The resurfacing and reconstruction of streets and highway functionally classified as collector and arterial facilities within the Milwaukee urbanized area are eligible for use of STP-M funds. The Advisory Committee in the past has recommended that projects on streets and highways under County and local government jurisdiction identified as arterials in the adopted regional transportation system and county jurisdictional highway system plans—including those County and local arterials on the National Highway System—should be funded with STP-M funds. Additionally, it was recommended that projects on collector streets which are not identified in regional transportation or county jurisdictional highway system plans should not be funded with STP-M funds.
- 2. <u>Transit Projects</u> The Advisory Committee in the past has recommended that the STP-M and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307 funds allocated to the Milwaukee urbanized area be split between highway and public transit modes based upon the relative proportion of capital needs of each mode as determined in the regional transportation system plan. Under the year 2035 regional transportation system plan, 37 percent of the available funds would be allocated to public transit capital needs and 63 percent would be allocated to highway projects. Historically, this has resulted in a transfer of \$10.7 million in STP-M funds to transit projects. While there has been a shortfall in STP-M funding compared to FTA Section 5307 funds in recent year, the transfer of FTA Section 5307 funds to highway projects has not occurred since FTA Section 5307 funds can be used by Milwaukee area transit operators to fund transit operating costs as well as capital projects.
- 3. <u>Transportation Enhancement Projects</u> The Advisory Committee in the past has recommended that transportation enhancement projects should not be funded with STP-M funds as such projects have been historically funded through funds available on a statewide basis. Under The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (MAP-21) bill enacted in 2012, transportation enhancement projects—along with recreational trail projects, safe-routes to school projects, and projects involving the construction of roadways within former Interstate System routes or other divided highways—would still be funded through a new program called, Transportation Alternatives program. Beginning under MAP-21, the Milwaukee urbanized area will receive an allocation of Transportation Alternative funding. Commission staff is expecting that the Advisory Committee would be asked to meet later this year to guide the development of procedures to select projects for Transportation Alternatives program funds.
- 4. <u>Bridge Projects</u> The rehabilitation and reconstruction of local bridges have been historically funded through FHWA and State bridge program funds, and have not been historically funded with STP-M funding. Under MAP-21, bridge projects not on the National Highway

System would be funded under the Surface Transportation Program rather than a separately funded bridge program. Additionally, the bridge activities eligible under the program were expanded. Under the current funding cycle, WisDOT is intending to continue to administer the STP and bridge programs separately, as specified under State law, but is working with FHWA to determine how to best meet the new requirements for project funding in MAP-21.

- 5. <u>Safety and Intersection Improvement Projects</u> Because safety and intersection improvement projects have historically been funded through its own FHWA Highway Safety Improvement Program funding, the Advisory Committee in the past has recommended that these types of projects not be funded with STP-M funding, but these projects are eligible for use of STP-M funds. Under MAP-21, safety and intersection improvement projects would continue to be funded under a separate highway safety improvement program, but as well continue to be eligible for STP-M funding.
- 6. <u>Congestion Management and Air-Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) Projects</u> CMAQ-type capital projects are eligible to be funded with FHWA STP-M funding. Because CMAQ-type projects have historically been funded through its own FHWA funding programs, the Advisory Committee in the past has recommended that CMAQ-type projects not be funded with FHWA STP-M funding. Under MAP-21, CMAQ-type projects would continue to be funded under the CMAQ program, and CMAQ-type capital projects continue to be eligible for STP-M funding.

\* \* \*

KRY/RWH 00210008.DOC

#### Attachment 10

# POTENTIAL EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR USE IN SELECTING ARTERIAL RESURFACING, RECONDITIONING, RECONSTRUCTION, AND NEW CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS FOR FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM FUNDING ALLOCATED TO THE MILWAUKEE URBANIZED AREA

The following are potential evaluation criteria for consideration by the Advisory Committee on Transportation System Planning and Programming for the Milwaukee Urbanized Area for use in selecting arterial resurfacing/reconditioning/reconstruction/new construction projects for Federal Highway Administration Surface Transportation Program – Milwaukee Urbanized Area (STP-M) funding:

- 1. Measure of need Based on pavement condition determined by an evaluation of the roadway by Commission staff using the WisDOT Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating (PASER) system.
- 2. Measure of use Based on traffic volume determined by either:
  - Existing average weekday traffic (AWDT) volume or
  - Existing AWDT per traffic lane.
- 3. Measure of importance Based on:
  - Length of the route the project is located on, such as length of county trunk highway or continuous length of local arterial, and/or
  - The current functional classification of the roadway—principal arterial, minor arterial, and collector—as developed by WisDOT, reviewed by SEWRPC, and approved by FHWA.
- 4. Measure of equity - Based on receipt of proportionate share of STP-M funding in relationship to relative need. Similar to the current method for the selection of projects for STP-M funding, a "paper" funding balance would be maintained by Commission staff for each governmental unit having current jurisdictional responsibility for eligible facilities (all arterial facilities on the adopted regional transportation plan). The "paper" fund balances would be accumulated from year-to-year, and would be credited STP funds annually based on its proportion of total eligible existing and planned arterial facility lane-miles in the adopted regional transportation plan, with debits to occur from each account as projects are selected for implementation. In the order of the project priority as indicated in the application by the project sponsors, projects would be evaluated by comparing each county's or local municipality's estimated potential "paper" fund balance to the requested Federal funding share of each candidate project. Projects from communities having positive "paper" fund balances (including the Federal cost of the requested project) would receive all of the points established for this evaluation criterion. For projects from communities having negative "paper" fund balance (including the Federal cost of the requested project), the score would be determined by reducing the established points for the criterion by the number of years needed to return to a positive balance. This would be calculated by the ratio of the negative fund balance for the community (including the Federal funding for the requested project) to the estimated STP funding allocated annually to the community was calculated.
- 5. For candidate projects involving capacity expansion by either providing additional trafficcarrying lanes to existing arterial facilities or constructing new arterial facilities, a negative score would be given for projects located in counties and local communities having a:

- Job/housing imbalance<sup>1</sup> Based on the county and local government being within an area identified as having a projected lower and/or moderate job/housing imbalance<sup>2</sup> as identified in the adopted regional housing plan, or as refined by the county and local government with more detailed information than what was used to develop the regional housing plan (see Map 1).
- Lack of transit service Based on whether the County and local community is not served by transit service (see Map 2).

Or, in the alternative, bonus points could be provided to projects located in communities and counties with a job/housing imbalance and transit service. Application of criteria of this type was recommended by the Commission's Advisory Committee on Regional Housing Planning and Environmental Justice Task Force.

Other criteria used for the selection of highway projects, but would require careful consideration by the Advisory Committee of their implications, could include:

- 1. Existing level of congestion Could be based on existing average level-of-service for the roadway or estimated existing volume-to-capacity ratio. (This criterion may emphasize capacity expansion projects. As well, this criterion would identify that a roadway may have a high level of congestion, but does not address whether improvements or measures would be implemented to effectively reduce congestion.)
- 2. Roadway crashes Could be based on crash rate of total crashes, crash rate of fatal/incapacitating injury crashes, and/or average annual number of fatal/incapacitating injury crashes using the latest crash data available over a three- or five-year period. (This criterion would identify that a roadway may have a high level of crashes, but does not address whether measures would be implemented to effectively reduce the number or severity of crashes.)
- 3. Volume of truck traffic Could be based on the amount of average weekday truck volumes or on a percentage of trucks. (This criterion would emphasize roadways within or serve truck-heavy urban land uses such as industrial and commercial land uses.)
- 4. Project readiness Could be based on whether project has initiated or completed preliminary engineering and/or right-of-way acquisition. (This criterion would benefit communities

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> As part of the development of the regional housing plan, Commission staff analyzed the relationship between anticipated job wages and housing for each planned sewer service area within the region to determine whether, based on existing job and housing conditions and projected job and housing growth determined from adopted county and local comprehensive plans, they would be projected to have a job/housing imbalance. The analysis was conducted only for planned sewer service areas because the local communities within these areas, as opposed to within non-sewered areas, would more likely designate extensive areas for commercial and industrial uses or for medium to high residential land uses, which would accommodate jobs and affordable housing, respectively. More information on the job/housing analysis and the adopted regional housing plan can be found on the Commission's website (www.sewrpc.org/SEWRPC/housing.htm).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> A lower-cost job/housing imbalance is an area with a higher percentage of lower-wage employment than lowercost housing. A moderate-cost job/housing imbalance is an area with higher percentage of moderate-wage employment than moderate-cost housing. An area is considered as having a job/housing imbalance if the housing to job deficit is of 10 or more percentage points.

having the resources to initiate or complete preliminary engineering and right-of-way acquisition.)

5. Cost effectiveness – Could be based on the ratio of the total cost of the project—preliminary engineering, right-of-way acquisition, and construction—to existing average weekday traffic volume or vehicle miles travelled. (This criterion may emphasize resurfacing and reconditioning projects over reconstruction projects.)

The below criteria could be considered by the Advisory Committee, but would require that a candidate project have completed preliminary engineering to apply for funding.

- 6. Reduction in the level of congestion Could be based on the estimated improvement in the average level-of-service for the roadway or reduction in the volume-to-capacity ratio following implementation of the project. (This criterion may emphasize capacity expansion projects.)
- 7. Accommodation of bicycles and pedestrians, with points based on the level of accommodation provided. For example, higher points being given for bicycle lanes being proposed than for shared-lanes being proposed as part of the project. (The development of this criterion would require the identification of which accommodations would be considered and a determination of which accommodations would receive higher or lower points.)
- 8. Accommodation of transit, with points based on the particular type of operational improvement that would benefit transit being proposed as part of the project, such as signal prioritization and/or dedicated transit lanes. (The development of this criterion would require establishing a listing of measures that would be considered for scoring purposes.)
- 9. Implementation of particular safety measures being proposed as part of the project. (The development of this criterion would require establishing a listing of measures that would be considered for scoring purposes.)
- 10. Implementation of particular traffic flow improvement measures, such as signal coordination, being proposed as part of the project. (The development of this criterion would require establishing a listing of measures that would be considered for scoring purposes.)
- 11. Avoidance and/or mitigation of impacts to environmentally sensitive areas, such as environmental corridor, isolated natural resource areas, wetlands, and floodplains. (This criterion could reduce a project score based on level of negative impact.)
- 12. Avoidance of impacts to prime agricultural lands. (This criterion could reduce a project score based on level of negative impact.)

\* \* \*

KRY/RWH

00210075.DOC

#### Map 1



Source: Local Government Comprehensive Plans and SEWRPC.





WRFC.