

Minutes of the Meeting

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLANNING AND
PROGRAMMING FOR THE MILWAUKEE URBANIZED AREA**

DATE: June 24, 2015
TIME: 9:30 a.m.
PLACE: Wisconsin State Fair Park
Tommy G. Thompson Youth Center
Meeting Room 5
640 South 84th Street
Milwaukee, WI 53214

Milwaukee Urbanized Area Members Present

Brian Dranzik, Chair Director, Milwaukee County Department of Transportation
Allison M. Bussler Director of Public Works, Waukesha County
Jeffrey M. Chase City of Engineer, City of Brookfield
(Representing Tom Grisa)
Chad Chrisbaum..... Project Manager, City of Milwaukee
(Representing Robert Bauman)
Alex Damien Project Manager, City of Waukesha
(Representing Fred Abadi)
Peter Daniels Principal Design Engineer, City of West Allis
(Representing Michael G. Lewis)
Jon Edgren Assistant Director of Public Works, Ozaukee County
(Representing Robert Dreblow)
Gary Evans..... Manager, Highway Engineering Division, Waukesha County
Ghassan Korban Commissioner, Department of Public Works, City of Milwaukee
James Martin..... Director of Operations,
Milwaukee County Department of Transportation
Michael J. Martin Director of Public Works, Village of Hales Corners
Jeffrey S. Polenske..... City Engineer, City of Milwaukee
Andrea Weddle-Henning Transportation Engineering Manager,
Milwaukee County Department of Transportation
Dennis Yaccarino..... Senior Budget and Policy Manager, Budget and Management Division,
Department of Administration, City of Milwaukee

Non-Voting Members Present

Kenneth R. Yunker, Secretary Executive Director,
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
Donna Brown-Martin..... Local Roads, Rails, and Harbor Director
(Representing Don Gutkowski) Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Robert Elkin..... Planning Supervisor, Southeast Region,
(Representing Brett Wallace) Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Dwight McComb Planning & Environmental Manager,
 (Representing George Poirier) Federal Highway Administration
 Peter T. McMullen Program and Planning Analyst, Bureau of Air Management,
 Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
 Brian Udovich Highway Operations Manager, Jefferson County Highway Department

Guests and Staff Present

Roslin Burns Planning and Program Analyst, Southeast Region,
 Wisconsin Department of Transportation
 Melinda Dejewski City Engineer/Director of Public Works
 City of St. Francis
 Joshua W. Depies Engineer,
 Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
 Roberto Gutierrez Chief Southeast Freeways Design,
 Wisconsin Department of Transportation
 Michael Hahn Deputy Director,
 Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
 Ryan W. Hoel Principal Engineer,
 Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
 Matt Janecke Town Administrator/Clerk,
 Town of Lisbon
 Bill Mohr Design Supervisor,
 Wisconsin Department of Transportation
 Karyn Rotker Poverty, Race & Civil Liberties Project Attorney,
 ACLU of Wisconsin Foundation
 Robert Schmidt Local Program Manager, Southeast Region,
 Wisconsin Department of Transportation
 Matthew Schreiber Urban and Regional Planner,
 Division of Transportation Investment and Management,
 Wisconsin Department of Transportation
 Richard Sokol Director of Neighborhood Services,
 City of Greenfield

ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m. by Mr. Dranzik, Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Transportation System Planning and Programming for the Milwaukee Urbanized Area (Milwaukee TIP Committee). He welcomed all present and 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. He then asked those attending the meeting to introduce themselves.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Dranzik asked if there were any public comments. Ms. Rotker stated that the adopted regional housing plan recommended that job/housing balance and the provision of transit in a community be included as criteria in evaluating projects for Federal funding, including Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Surface Transportation Program – Milwaukee Urbanized Area (STP-M) funding. She stated that

projects should be required to be located in communities which have a job/housing balance and provide access to transit. She stated that only utilizing criteria related to job/housing and provision of transit to evaluate candidate capacity expansion projects, as well as the limited points that can be received for these criteria, has little or no effect on the projects being selected for STP-M funding.

REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE PROCEDURES TO EVALUATE, PRIORITIZE, AND RECOMMEND PROJECTS FOR FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM – MILWAUKEE URBANIZED AREA (STP-M) FUNDING

At the request of Chairman Dranzik, Mr. Yunker began review of the staff memorandum entitled, “Potential Changes to be Considered to the Procedures to Evaluate, Prioritize, and Recommend Projects for Federal Highway Administration Surface Transportation Program – Milwaukee Urbanized Area Funding.” Mr. Yunker noted that in 2013 the Commission worked with the Milwaukee TIP Committee and local governments within the Milwaukee urbanized area to revise the long-used procedures used to evaluate, prioritize, and recommend candidate projects for STP-M funding, and that the revised procedures were used in the evaluation of candidate projects for years 2015-2018 STP-M funding later that year. Mr. Yunker explained that the purpose of this meeting was to review potential changes to the procedures prior to their use in the evaluation, prioritization, and recommendation of candidate projects for years 2019-2020 STP-M funding, noting that applications for candidate projects for STP-M funding were due to the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) on July 31, 2015. Mr. Yunker suggested that the Committee act on the individual proposed changes to the procedures as they are reviewed by Mr. Hoel.

Consider the Use of Pavement Condition of a Roadway Prior to the Application of a Temporary Maintenance Overlay

Mr. Hoel stated that a member of the Milwaukee TIP Committee had requested that the pavement condition criterion be revised to allow a local government to request the Commission staff to evaluate the condition of the pavement for a segment of roadway that is in such poor condition that the local government intends to provide a maintenance overlay to maintain the roadway until the STP-M funding would be available for implementing the reconstruction or resurfacing/reconditioning project work. Mr. Hoel stated that Commission staff would propose that the procedures be revised for the evaluation of candidate projects for years 2019-2020 STP-M funding to allow a project sponsor to request that Commission staff evaluate the condition of the pavement prior to the implementation of a maintenance overlay, and that the condition of the pavement prior to the maintenance overlay would be used in the evaluation of the candidate project.

The following comments and questions were made during and following Mr. Hoel’s review of the proposed change to the STP-M evaluation procedures:

1. Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Evans, Mr. Yunker stated that Commission staff evaluates the condition of pavement for each candidate project.
2. Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Michael Martin, Mr. Yunker stated that given the relatively small number of 2019-2020 projects, the Commission has sufficient staff to evaluate the pavement condition for all candidate projects.

3. Mr. Polenske stated that the City initiated a program two years ago to mill and overlay with 2 inches of asphaltic pavement a roadway requiring reconstruction to extend the life of the pavement (typically 5 to 7 years) until funding is available to reconstruct the road.
4. Responding to an inquiry by Ms. Weddle-Henning, Mr. Yunker stated that it would be reasonable to use the rating of pavement condition for a project that had previously applied for 2015-2018 funding, but was not approved, for STP-M funding and which later had a maintenance overlay applied.
5. Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Evans, Mr. Polenske stated that pavement condition is not the only criterion used in determining which roadways are chosen for a maintenance overlay, and that the City would not apply such an overlay on roadways that have structural problems.
6. Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Daniels, Mr. Korban responded that the City of Milwaukee considers both where the pavement is in its life cycle and the number of years since the roadway was last resurfaced.

Mr. Yunker asked if there were any objections to the proposed change that a project sponsor for candidate projects for years 2019-2020 STP-M funding be allowed to request that Commission staff evaluate the condition of the pavement prior to the implementation of a maintenance overlay, and that the condition of the pavement prior to the maintenance overlay would be used in the evaluation of the candidate project. There was no objection to the proposed change by the Committee.

Consider Developing a Threshold to Determine Which Candidate Capacity Expansion Projects are of Areawide Significance

Mr. Hoel explained that some members of the Milwaukee TIP Committee expressed interest in developing a threshold to determine which candidate expansion projects are of regional significance, similar to candidate resurfacing/reconditioning and reconstruction to same capacity projects. In addition, it was suggested that the percentage of the funding requested by candidate projects identified as having areawide significance for each project type—resurfacing/reconditioning, reconstruction to same capacity, and capacity expansion—be used to assist the Committee in determining the allocation of available STP-M funding to the three project types, along with the proportion of STP-M funding historically approved for each project type, and the proportion of STP-M funding being requested for each project type.

Mr. Hoel stated that the Commission staff would propose that capacity expansion projects having a minimum threshold score of 64.5 points would be identified as having areawide significance. He noted that resurfacing/reconditioning projects and reconstruction to the same capacity projects have a minimum threshold score of 73 points to be identified as having areawide significance. He also stated that staff recommend that the procedures to evaluate and recommend STP-M funding be revised such that, in the consideration by the Committee in the allocation of available STP-M funding to the three project types, the Commission staff would provide Committee members with the proportions of the STP-M funding being requested by projects identified as having areawide significance for each project type, along with historical proportions of STP-M funding approved for projects and the proportion of STP-M funding being requested for each project type.

The following comments and questions were made during and following Mr. Hoel's review of the proposed change to the STP-M evaluation procedures:

1. Mr. Evans expressed concern that a candidate capacity expansion projects could be approved for STP-M funding and during preliminary engineering, questions could be raised as to whether it warrants capacity expansion. He suggested that there should be a traffic volume threshold for such candidate projects. Mr. Yunker responded that Commission staff will review candidate capacity expansion projects and identify to the Committee any concerns with respect to the need for additional traffic lanes.

Mr. Yunker asked if there were any objections to the proposed changes as identified with respect to the identification of the candidate capacity expansion projects having areawide significance. There was no objection to the proposed change by the Committee.

Reconsider Utilizing the Measure of Pavement Condition Criterion for Evaluation of Capacity Expansion Projects

Mr. Hoel stated that a member of the Milwaukee TIP Committee requested that pavement condition not be a criteria in the evaluation of capacity expansion projects. The member of the Committee requesting the change noted that such projects are typically identified and prioritized by traffic volumes and crash rates while resurfacing/reconditioning and reconstruction to same capacity projects are typically identified and prioritized based on condition of pavement. Mr. Hoel stated that the Commission staff recommends that the evaluation criteria used for the evaluation of candidate capacity expansion projects for STP-M funding continue to include consideration of pavement condition, as in cases where there are two otherwise equivalent projects, the project having the worst pavement condition should be prioritized.

The following comments and questions were made during and following Mr. Hoel's review of the proposed change to the STP-M evaluation procedures:

1. Mr. Evans stated that Waukesha County considers the level of traffic volume and crash rates in identifying and prioritizing capacity expansion projects involving the widening to provide additional traffic lanes, and that pavement condition should not be a consideration in the evaluation of candidate capacity expansion projects for STP-M funding. He noted that most roads in Waukesha County are in good condition, so capacity expansion projects within Waukesha County may not score well compared to other candidate projects.
2. Mr. Polenske stated that he believes pavement condition should continue to be considered in the evaluation of capacity expansion projects and that the weighting for the measure of pavement condition criterion for candidate capacity expansion projects seems appropriate.
3. Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Daniels, Mr. Hoel responded that candidate capacity expansion projects involving a new facility would receive 10 out the maximum 20 points. Mr. Evans stated that 10 points for this criterion seemed low. He noted that there were potentially two candidate capacity expansion projects for STP-M funding—the extension of 124th Street and the extension of Springdale Road. Mr. Yunker suggested that candidate capacity expansion projects involving a new facility receive points under the measure of pavement condition criterion based on the average number of points received by the other capacity expansion projects for this criterion.
4. Mr. Michael Martin suggested that for the evaluation of candidate capacity expansion projects the maximum points received under the measure of pavement condition criterion be reduced to 10 points and the maximum points received under the measure of congestion criterion be increased to 50 points. Mr. Polenske stated he would be opposed to reducing the maximum points received

by candidate capacity expansion projects under the measure of pavement condition criterion, noting that the roadways with the worst condition should be prioritized.

Mr. Evans made a motion that the procedures to evaluate, prioritize, and recommended candidate projects for STP-M funding be revised such that for the evaluation of candidate capacity expansion projects the maximum points received under the measure of pavement condition criterion is 10 points and the maximum points received under the measure of congestion criterion be 50 points. The motion was seconded by Ms. Bussler, and was not carried on a vote of 7 ayes and 7 nays. Mr. Yunker stated that as a result of this vote, the points allotted for the measure of pavement condition and measure of congestion would not be changed in the evaluation of candidate capacity expansion projects.

Mr. Yunker asked if there was any objection by the Committee in revising the procedures to evaluate, prioritize, and recommend projects for STP-M funding such that candidate expansion projects involving new facilities would be given points under the measure of pavement condition criterion based on the average points received by the other candidate capacity expansion projects for this criterion. There was no objection of the proposed change by the Committee.

Reconsider the Process Utilized to Transfer, or Flex, FHWA STP-M Funding for Use on Transit Projects

Mr. Hoel stated that it was requested through public comment that the process to transfer, or flex, STP-M funding to transit capital projects as part of these procedures be reconsidered to allow additional funding to be transferred to transit capital projects. Mr. Hoel stated that historically the long-used process has resulted in the flexing of \$10.7 million in STP-M funds to transit projects. However, the transfer of these funds had occurred throughout the 1990s when the available STP-M funding exceeded Federal Transit Authority (FTA) Section 5307 funding. In recent years, the amount of STP-M and FTA Section 5307 funding has been about the same, which would result in the transfer of FTA Section 5307 funding for use on highway projects. However, the Milwaukee TIP Committee determined not to transfer any FTA Section 5307 funds to county and municipal highway projects as it was recognized that these funds could be used to fund transit operating costs, as capitalized maintenance, as well as capital projects. In addition, Federal law now prohibits a transfer of FTA funds to highway projects.

Mr. Hoel stated that the Commission staff proposes that the procedures to evaluate, prioritize, and recommend projects for STP-M funding be revised such that, should the transfer of STP-M funding to transit capital projects not be proposed due to the relative amounts of FTA Section 5307 funding and FHWA STP-M funding received in a year, that 10 percent of the annual available year 2019-2020 STP-M funding be made available each funding cycle for transit capital funding, and more specifically, for bus replacement. He explained that based on historic annual STP-M funding levels, the suggested allocation to transit capital projects would be about \$1.6 to \$2.1 million in STP-M funding being made available annually to such projects. Such an allocation would allow the replacement of about 4 to 5 buses per year.

The following comments and questions were made during and following Mr. Hoel's review of the proposed change to the STP-M evaluation procedures:

1. Ms. Bussler stated she would be opposed to changing the procedures to allocate 10 percent of the available STP-M funds annually to transit projects, as there is not sufficient funding available to adequately maintain the arterial streets and highways within the urbanized area. Mr. Edgren expressed his agreement.

2. Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Chase with respect to the reason for the need in additional transit capital funding, Mr. Yunker replied that much of the transit service reductions that have occurred over the last decade is a result of public transit in the Milwaukee urbanized area being heavily dependent on Federal and State funding, which provides about 70 to 80 percent of the annual transit operating assistance. He noted that State funding in particular has not increased with inflation—in fact, State funding decreased by 10 percent in the 2011-2013 biennial State budget. He added that the Milwaukee area is one of the last few metropolitan areas of its size without dedicated local funding, such as a sales tax. He stated that with respect to Federal transit funding, transit operators in the urbanized area have had to use their FTA Section 5307 funding—which is primarily intended for capital projects such as bus replacement—for operating funding. In addition, under MAP-21, the transit capital funding situation has been effectively reduced significantly for transit operators in the Milwaukee urbanized area.
3. Mr. Korban noted that there are significant funding needs for both transit and highways, and asked whether there may be other funding sources to fund transit capital projects. Chairman Dranzik replied that prior to MAP-21 there were other options to fund transit capital projects, but that funding is no longer available. He noted that the decline in Federal funding for transit capital projects began 15 years ago with transit operators being allowed to use FTA Section 5307 funds—intended for capital transit projects—for operating expenses. As a result, transit operators were encouraged to use these funds for operation of their systems. He noted as well that the Milwaukee County Transit System had historically received about \$7 million annually in discretionary FTA Section 5309 transit capital funding, but that program was replaced with a program having a formula allocation—reducing the amount of funding to about \$2 million available annually for transit capital projects. He stated that transit operators are struggling to replace transit vehicles with the transit capital funding available now. Chairman Dranzik stated that both the needs of highways and transit need to be addressed.

Chairman Dranzik then asked if the Committee would agree that the procedures to evaluate, prioritize, and recommend projects for STP-M funding be revised such that, should a transfer of STP-M funding to transit capital projects not occur due to the relative amounts of FHWA STP-M and FTA Section 5307 funding, that 10 percent of the annual available STP-M funding be made available each funding cycle—beginning with 2019-2020 STP-M funding—for transit capital funding, specifically, bus replacement. Nine members of the Committee indicated support for the proposed change, with the remaining five members indicating opposition.

Responding to an inquiry by Mr. McComb, Mr. Yunker stated that, depending on the number of candidate transit capital projects applying for 2019-2020 STP-M funding, the Commission staff would develop a process to allocate the transit capital funding to the projects.

Reconsider Requiring That a Candidate Project Have Completed Preliminary Engineering as a Condition for Apply for STP-M Funds

Mr. Hoel stated that a public comment received by the Committee requested that the use of certain criteria, such as measuring impacts to environmentally sensitive lands and air quality, be included in the STP-M procedures. Mr. Hoel stated that during the development of the procedures, the Milwaukee TIP Committee had considered, but ultimately rejected, requiring the completion of preliminary engineering for candidate projects for STP-M funding as a condition of being eligible for STP-M funding, noting that there was concern that such a requirement would hurt some communities because they would have to fund preliminary engineering through local funds without any guarantee of Federal funding for construction. He added that if the Committee had required projects to have completed preliminary

engineering, a number of additional criteria could be considered in the evaluation, including criteria related to the avoidance and/or mitigation of impact to environmentally sensitive lands, the accommodation of public transit, the accommodation of bicycles and pedestrians, and the implementation of traffic flow improvement measures (signal coordination). Mr. Hoel stated that the Commission staff would propose that the Committee continue to not require the completion of preliminary engineering as a condition for applying for STP-M funding. He added that such a requirement would be impractical for the 2019-2020 application cycle, as WisDOT is currently soliciting applications for candidate STP-M projects to be submitted at the end of July.

Mr. Yunker asked if there were any objections by the Committee to continuing to not require the completion of preliminary engineering as a condition for applying for STP-M funding. There was no objection by the Committee.

Consider Providing Bonus Points to Candidate Projects for Having Completed Preliminary Engineering

Mr. Hoel stated a Committee member had suggested that, rather than requiring preliminary engineering being completed as a condition of applying for STP-M funding, bonus points be given to a candidate project that has completed preliminary engineering to State and Federal standards. The following questions and comments were made during Mr. Hoel's review of this proposed change to the STP-M evaluation procedures:

1. Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Michael Martin, Mr. Yunker stated that, should the Committee agree to this potential change, a candidate project that has completed preliminary engineering would receive additional points in the evaluation, but would not be guaranteed funding.

Mr. Yunker asked if there was any interest by the Committee to give bonus points to candidate projects that have completed preliminary engineering. There was no interest expressed by any member of the Committee.

Consider Providing Bonus Points to Candidate Projects Based On Serving/Impacting Minority and Low-Income Populations

Mr. Hoel stated that a public comment was received suggesting that criteria be used to measure the benefits and impacts that candidate STP-M projects may have on minority and low-income populations. Mr. Hoel stated that the Commission staff proposes that the evaluation of candidate projects for years 2019-2020 STP-M funding include an assessment of whether a proportionate share of preliminary recommended projects for funding would be located within or adjacent to areas of minority and low-income populations. He noted that the assessment of whether minority and low income populations receive the benefits of a proportionate share of the projects recommended for funding would be presented to the Committee along with the results of evaluating the candidate projects with the criteria—prior to any decision on which projects would be approved for STP-M funding. Mr. Yunker stated that a similar evaluation was prepared for the projects recommended for years 2015-2018 STP-M funding and is provided as Attachment 1 of the memorandum.

Mr. Yunker asked if there were any objections by the Committee to including with the evaluation of candidate projects for years 2019-2020 STP-M funding, an assessment of whether a proportionate share of preliminary recommended projects for funding would be located within or adjacent to areas of minority and low-income populations. There was no objection by the Committee.

Consider Adding a New Criterion Based on a Project Serving Areas of Planned Sustainable or Infill Development

Mr. Hoel stated that a public comment was received suggesting that additional criteria be considered with respect to whether a project would promote infill and sustainable development and would be consistent with the adopted regional land use plan. Mr. Hoel noted that the Committee had already determined that only projects on streets and highways under county and municipal jurisdiction identified as planned arterials in the adopted regional transportation plan would be eligible for STP-M funding. He added that the adopted year 2035 regional transportation plan is designed to serve, and be consistent with, the adopted year 2035 regional land use plan, which recommends that new urban development should be accommodated within and around existing urban centers as infill development, redevelopment, and the orderly expansion of planned urban service areas on lands proximate to these centers. Mr. Hoel stated that the Commission staff recommends that STP-M funding continue to be limited to candidate projects on the planned arterial street and highway system recommended in the year 2035 regional transportation plan. All candidate projects would therefore be limited to projects which are consistent with the regional land use plan.

Mr. Yunker asked if there was any objection by the Committee that STP-M funding continue to be limited to candidate projects on the planned arterial street and highway system recommended in the year 2035 regional transportation plan. There was no objection by the Committee.

Consider Whether the Type of Work Proposed – Resurfacing, Reconditioning, or Reconstruction – is Consistent With the Candidate Project Life Cycle

Mr. Yunker explained that if the Milwaukee TIP Committee desired to include the consideration of where a project is in its life cycle in the procedures to evaluate and recommend candidate projects for STP-M funding, the Commission staff would propose to consider facility life cycle in the following manner. It would require that the project sponsors provide to Commission staff for each of their candidate projects, a summary on the existing pavement structure, the year that the segment of roadway was constructed or last reconstructed, and the years and type or work of any subsequent rehabilitations. Utilizing this information, Commission staff would evaluate each candidate project to determine whether it is consistent with its roadway life cycle, assuming a typical life of a roadway is 50 to 60 years, with the first rehabilitation occurring 20 to 30 years following a roadway's construction or reconstruction and two subsequent rehabilitations occurring every 8 to 18 years. Mr. Yunker noted that there would likely be many questions on the results of the evaluation, as many projects could have unique conditions. The following questions and comments were raised during and following Mr. Yunker's review of the proposed change:

1. Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Korban, Mr. Yunker stated that the consideration of where a project is in its life cycle in the evaluation of projects for STP-M funding has been raised from time-to-time by Committee members.

Mr. Yunker asked if there was any interest by the Committee in giving consideration, as part of the evaluation of projects for STP-M funding, of whether the proposed work is consistent with the candidate project life cycle. There was no interest expressed by any member of the Committee.

Consider Modifying the Measure of Safety Criterion

Mr. Hoel stated that the procedures to evaluate and recommend projects for years 2015-2018 STP-M funds included a criterion related to traffic safety (crash history) in the evaluation of capacity expansion projects. He noted that this criterion gives a maximum of 15 points to the candidate capacity expansion project with the highest crash rate based on the latest five-year average crash rate along the candidate

project. The remaining capacity expansion projects then receive points proportionally based on how the average crash rate along these facilities compare to the crash rate of the project with the highest crash rate. He added that the Milwaukee TIP Committee agreed as part of the next STP-M funding cycle to consider changing this criterion such that candidate projects would instead receive points based on how the average five-year crash rate along the candidate project compares to the areawide average crash rates for County and municipal arterial roadways.

Mr. Hoel stated that based on the crash data available from the crash database maintained by the University of Wisconsin-Madison's Traffic Operations and Safety Laboratory (TOPSLab), the Commission staff can estimate the number and rate of crashes that have occurred on the existing county and municipal roadways on the arterial street and highway system within the Milwaukee urbanized area. He noted that Table 2 of the memorandum included the estimated number and rate of crashes occurring along the municipal and county arterial streets and highways in the Milwaukee urbanized area in the years 2009 through 2013 for urban or rural roadways based on their cross-section. Mr. Hoel stated that the Commission staff suggests that the measure of safety criterion used to evaluate candidate capacity expansion projects be revised for the years 2019-2020 STP-M funding cycle such that these candidate projects would receive points under this criterion based on the percentage that the average five-year crash rate for the project is of the Milwaukee urbanized area average rate of crashes for arterial roadways with an urban or a rural cross-section, as shown on Table 3 of the memorandum. He stated that a Committee member that was unable to attend the meeting had suggested prior to the meeting that average crash rates used for the measure of safety criterion exclude crashes involving deer and those in which driver condition is a contributing factor in the crash. He noted that driver condition would be defined as any observed physical impairment of a driver caused by alcohol or drug use, a medical condition precipitating the crash (such as a seizure, black out, diabetic reaction, heart attack, and stroke), or some other condition, as recorded on the crash report by the presiding law enforcement officer. Mr. Hoel stated that deer crashes were already excluded from the crash data provided in Tables 2 and 3 of the memorandum, and that revised versions of Tables 2 and 3 of the memorandum had been prepared to exclude crashes where driver condition is a contributing factor in the crash. He noted that these revised tables were provided to Committee members prior to the start of the meeting. (The revised Tables 2 and 3 are included in these minutes as Attachment A.)

Mr. Hoel noted that the memorandum provided to the Committee included a suggestion that candidate STP-M projects could be provided bonus points if the rate of crashes involving a fatality or serious injury exceeded the average crash rate for the urbanized area, in an attempt to add a criterion consistent with the national performance goal of reducing the number of fatalities and serious injuries. However, he stated that such a criterion may only be appropriate if preliminary engineering was required as a condition for being eligible for STP-M funding, as any safety measure that would be implemented to potentially reduce fatal/serious injury crashes as part of a project would be identified during preliminary engineering. He stated that because the Committee had agreed to continue to not require completion of preliminary engineering as a condition to be eligible for STP-M funding earlier in the meeting, the Commission suggests that criteria related to fatal/serious injury crashes not be added to the procedures.

1. Mr. Polenske questioned whether the number of accidents may be expected to decline with the addition of capacity to a roadway. Mr. Evans responded that based on the Waukesha County's experience, adding traffic lanes with a median decreases crash rates by about 25 percent, noting that other elements like access control can also reduce the number of crashes.

Mr. Yunker asked if there was any objection by the Committee to revising the measure of safety criterion used to evaluate candidate capacity expansion projects such that these candidate projects would receive

points based on the percentage that the average five-year crash rate for the project is of the Milwaukee urbanized area average rate of crashes for arterial roadways with an urban or a rural cross-section, excluding crashes involving deer or caused by the driver's condition, as shown on revised Tables 2 and 3 shown on Attachment A of these minutes. No objection was expressed by the Committee.

Consider a Criterion Based On the Level of Truck Traffic

Mr. Hoel stated a member of the Milwaukee TIP Committee had suggested that candidate resurfacing/reconditioning/reconstruction to same capacity projects be evaluated with a criterion based on the level of heavy truck traffic along the route of the candidate project, as heavy trucks can damage roadway pavements. He noted that such a measure could as well be used to measure the level of freight that utilize the roadway segment. Mr. Yunker stated that based on the limited locations on community/county arterial street and highway system where truck volumes are measured by WisDOT and the effort necessary to measure such data, the Commission staff proposes that a measure of truck use criterion not be utilized for the evaluation of candidate projects for years 2019-2020 STP-M funding.

Mr. Yunker asked if there was any interest by the Committee in adding a criterion based on the level of truck traffic in the evaluation of projects for STP-M funding. There was no interest expressed by any member of the Committee.

Reconsider the Use of the Measure of Community/County Equity Criterion

Mr. Hoel stated that the Commission staff received public comment following the development of the procedures to evaluate, prioritize, and recommend projects for years 2015-2018 STP-M funding questioning the use of the measure of community/county equity criterion. He stated given the limited influence of the community/county equity criterion on the projects recommended for years 2015-2018 STP-M funding, the Commission staff proposes dropping this criterion from consideration. However, should the Milwaukee TIP Committee agree to continue the use of the community/county equity criterion for the evaluation of candidate resurfacing/reconditioning and reconstruction to same capacity projects, Commission staff will attempt to work with WisDOT staff to estimate the community/county equity balances based on the allocated 2019-2020 STP-M funding.

1. Ms. Bussler suggested that the Committee still analyze and measure the community/county equity criterion even if it is no longer considered a criterion in the evaluation process. Ms. Bussler stated that use of the community/county equity criterion may not have affected the projects recommended for STP-M funding in that funding cycle, but could affect the projects recommended for funding in future funding cycles. She requested that the Committee be provided with information on community/county equity along with the evaluation of whether minority and low-income population areas receive a proportionate share of the STP-M funding.
2. Mr. Schmidt stated that WisDOT no longer maintains the funding balances for each community and county, and suggested that Commission staff would need to track the balances. Mr. Yunker stated that it is possible that the Commission could maintain the community/county equity funding balances, as the Commission has the length of lane miles of planned arterial street and highway for each community and county within the Milwaukee urbanized area. However, the Commission staff would need information from WisDOT with respect to the final amount of Federal funding used by the projects approved for STP-M funding.
3. Mr. Dranzik questioned the value of keeping track of community/county equity measure if it would not be used in the prioritization process. Mr. Chase responded that the measure would allow the Committee to track how STP-M funding has been distributed to the

communities/counties within the Milwaukee urbanized area. Ms. Bussler stated that it makes sense to distribute funds based on system needs, but the Committee should have a way to consider how STP-M funding has been distributed to the communities/counties within the urbanized area. She noted that she was not opposed to changing the evaluation procedures such that the measure of community/county equity criterion would no longer be utilized in the evaluation and prioritization of candidate projects for STP-M funding, but she believes that the Committee should be provided with information on community/county equity.

4. Mr. Yunker stated that, should the Committee agree to no longer include the measure of community/county equity criterion in the procedures to evaluate, prioritize, and recommend projects for STP-M funding, the Commission staff could provide the Committee with information on the community/county equity for its consideration in determining which projects are selected for STP-M funding. He noted that even when community/county equity was the only criterion considered under the previous procedures to evaluate and recommend projects for STP-M funding, there were communities that chose to forgo use of STP-M funding.
5. Mr. McComb stated that factors other than the evaluation criteria could be considered, including community/county equity, when comparing projects of equal standing with respect to application of the criteria.

Mr. Yunker asked whether there was any opposition by the Committee to change the procedures to evaluate, prioritize, and recommend candidate projects for STP-M funding such that the community/county equity criterion would not be used to evaluate the candidate projects, but the Commission staff would provide the Committee with information on the community/county equity as it considers recommending projects for STP-M funding. There were no objections expressed by the Committee.

Measure of Congestion

Mr. Yunker stated that a member of the Committee that is not in attendance at the meeting had contacted Commission staff and requested that the measure of congestion used in the evaluation of candidate capacity expansion projects be based on the forecast average weekday volume-to-design capacity ratio rather than the existing average weekday volume-to-design capacity ratio. He stated that Commission staff would agree that the forecast volume-to-capacity ratio is an appropriate measure for the evaluation of capacity expansion projects. He stated that the Commission staff would propose that the current and forecast average weekday volume-to-design capacity ratio be given equal weight under the measure of congestion criterion. He stated that the Committee was provided prior to the meeting with the proposed scoring for current and forecast average weekday volume-to-design capacity ratios. (A copy of the two tables is included with these minutes as Attachment B).

Mr. Yunker asked whether there was any opposition by the Committee to the proposed change that the current and forecast average weekday volume-to-design capacity ratio be given equal weight under the measure of congestion criterion used to evaluate capacity expansion projects. There were no objections expressed by the Committee.

Job/Housing Imbalance/Transit Accessibility

Mr. Yunker noted the comments made by Ms. Rotker during the public comment section of the meeting. He stated that the Commission's Advisory Committee on Regional Housing Planning and the Commission's Environmental Justice Task Force (EJTF) recommended during the development of the adopted regional housing plan that the Commission work with the TIP Committees, with review by the

EJTF, to establish revised criteria that include job/housing balance and provision of transit for the selection of projects for STP-M (and potentially STP allocated to the other urbanized areas within the Region) and Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air-Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funding. Mr. Yunker noted that during the development of the new procedures to evaluate, prioritize, and recommend candidate projects for STP-M funding, there were concerns raised by members of the Committee about the connection of job/housing balance and provision of transit as criteria with respect to the need for resurfacing and reconstructing a roadway facility, and their relevance for the evaluation and recommendation of such projects for STP-M funding. It was suggested that such criteria be used for the evaluation of capacity expansion projects, as having a job/housing balance and the provision of transit in a community could serve to address congestion in those communities, and that such criteria could serve as bonus points for communities having a projected balance of jobs and housing based on their comprehensive plans and that are also served by transit. Mr. Yunker stated that under the procedures developed and approved by the Milwaukee TIP Committee, capacity expansion projects would receive 5 bonus points under a job/housing balance criterion if the project is located within a community identified as having neither a projected lower nor moderate job/housing imbalance, and that under a provision of transit criterion they would receive up to a maximum of 5 bonus points depending on the level of transit service currently provided within the local community.

Mr. Yunker stated that the Commission staff recommends that the use of the criteria related to job/housing balance and provision of transit continue to be utilized for the evaluation of candidate capacity expansion projects for STP-M funding (up to 5 bonus points each). He asked whether there was any objection by the Committee with respect to the continued use of these two criteria for the evaluation of candidate capacity expansion projects. There was no objection expressed by the Committee.

REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE 2015-2018 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN

At the request of Chairman Dranzik, Mr. Yunker reviewed the three proposed amendments to the 2015-2018 transportation improvement program (TIP) as summarized in the staff memorandum titled "*Proposed Amendments to the 2015-2018 Transportation Improvement Program for Southeastern Wisconsin.*" Mr. Yunker stated that the Commission staff had received following the transmittal of the memorandum to the Committee a fourth proposed amendment to the 2015-2018 TIP involving the funding of the Milwaukee County administration of the FTA Section 5310 program for the Milwaukee urbanized area. He noted that Milwaukee County has agreed to be the designated recipient of these funds for the urbanized area, thereby taking on the responsibilities of a designated recipient that was previously held by the State. He noted that information on the proposed TIP amendment was provided to Committee members prior to the meeting. (Information on the additional proposed amendment is included with these minutes as Attachment C).

Following the review of the proposed amendments to the 2015-2018 TIP, Mr. Michael Martin made a motion to approve the proposed amendments to the 2015-2018 TIP as presented, including the additional proposed amendment related to the administration of the FTA Section 5310 program for the Milwaukee urbanized area. The motion was seconded by Ms. Weddle-Henning and was passed unanimously by the Committee.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Milwaukee TIP Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kenneth R. Yunker
Acting Secretary

KRY/RWH/JWD
10/28/2015
Doc #00226811

Attachment A

Table 2 (revised)

FIVE-YEAR CRASH RATES FOR TOTAL, FATAL INJURY, AND SERIOUS INJURY CRASHES FOR THE EXISTING MUNICIPAL AND COUNTY ARTERIAL STREET AND HIGHWAY SYSTEM WITHIN THE MILWAUKEE URBANIZED AREA BY CROSS-SECTION TYPE: 2009-2013

Cross-Section Type ¹	Average 5 year Crash Rate ^a (Crashes per 100,000,000 vehicle-miles travelled)		
	Total Crashes	Fatal Injury Crashes	Serious Injury Crashes
Urban	352.7	0.4	6.1
Rural	115.7	0.4	3.7
Total	279.8	0.4	5.4

Source: Wisconsin Traffic Operations and Safety Laboratory and SEWRPC

^a Crash rates exclude crashes involving deer and crashes where the driver condition is a contributing factor in the crash. Driver condition is defined as any observed physical impairment of a driver caused by alcohol or drug use, a medical condition precipitating the crash (such as seizure, black out, diabetic reaction, heart attack, and stroke), or some other condition, as recorded on the crash report by the presiding law enforcement officers.

Table 3 (revised)

SUGGESTED REVISED SCORING FOR SAFETY CRITERION USED FOR EVALUATION OF CANDIDATE CAPACITY EXPANSION PROJECTS

Percentage of Average Rate of Arterial Roadway Crashes in the Milwaukee Urbanized Area	Average 5 year Crash Rate (Crashes per 100,000,000 vehicle-miles travelled)		Points
	Urban Cross-Section	Rural Cross-Section	
175 or more	617.2 or more	202.5 or more	15
150 to 174	529.0 to 617.1	173.5 to 202.4	12.5
125 to 149	440.9 to 528.9	144.6 to 173.4	10
100 to 124	352.7 to 440.8	115.7 to 144.5	7.5
75 to 99	264.5 to 352.6	86.8 to 115.6	5
50 to 74	176.3 to 264.4	57.8 to 86.7	2.5
Less than 50	Less than 176.3	Less than 57.8	0

Consider the Forecast Volume-to-Capacity Ratio in the Measure of Congestion Criterion

Following the Milwaukee TIP Committee receiving the June 9, 2015, memorandum summarizing possible changes to the procedures to evaluate, prioritize, and recommend projects for STP-M funding, a Committee member that would be unable to attend the meeting suggested to Commission staff another potential change to the procedures involving the revision of the measure of congestion criterion—used in the evaluation of candidate capacity expansion projects only—to be based on the forecast average volume-to-capacity ratio rather than the existing average volume-to-capacity ratio.

The Commission staff would agree that the forecast volume-to-capacity ratio would be a suitable measure for the evaluation of capacity expansion projects. However, in order to prioritize candidate projects involving segments of roadway currently experiencing congestion, the Commission staff proposes that the current and forecast volume-to-capacity ratio be given equal weight under the measure of congestion criterion, as follows:

Table B-8a

SCORING FOR CURRENT VOLUME-TO-CAPACITY RATIO CRITERION^b

Volume-to-Capacity Ratio	Points
1.40 or more	20
1.20 to 1.39	15
1.00 to 1.19	10
0.80 to 0.99	5
Less than 0.80	0

^b *The current level of congestion for projects involving existing facilities would be developed based on the most recent traffic count reported by WisDOT. For new facilities, the current level of congestion would be developed by estimating the level of congestion of adjacent existing arterial facilities under current conditions.*

Table B-8b

SCORING FOR FORECAST VOLUME-TO-CAPACITY RATIO CRITERION^c

Volume-to-Capacity Ratio	Points
1.40 or more	20
1.20 to 1.39	15
1.00 to 1.19	10
Less than 1.00	0

^c *The forecast level of congestion for both existing and new facilities would be developed by Commission staff utilizing the Commission's travel simulation models that were used in the development and evaluation of the year 2035 regional transportation plan.*

Should the Milwaukee TIP Committee agree with these proposed changes, Tables B-8a and B-8b above would replace Table B-8 of Attachment 1 located on page 28 of the June 9th memorandum.

* * *

Attachment C

NEW PROJECT TO BE ADDED TO THE
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE MILWAUKEE TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT AREA --
MILWAUKEE COUNTY 2015-2018

PROJECT SPONSOR	PROJECT			ESTIMATED COSTS (\$1,000)						AIR QUAL STAT	
	NO	DESCRIPTION / STATE ID	TYPE		2015	2016	2017	2018	REMAINING		
MILWAUKEE COUNTY	463	MILWAUKEE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION OF THE SECTION 5310 PROGRAM FOR THE MILWAUKEE URBANIZED AREA	TP	DETAIL COSTS							EXEMPT
				PE	--	--	--	--	--	--	
				ROW	--	--	--	--	--	--	
				CONST	--	--	--	--	--	--	
				OTHER	118.8	120.0	120.0	120.0	120.0	--	
				TOTAL	118.8	120.0	120.0	120.0	120.0	--	
SOURCE OF FUNDS											
FTA 5310											
				LOCAL	--	--	--	--	--		
				STATE	--	--	--	--	--		
				FEDERAL	118.8	120.0	120.0	120.0	120.0		
				TOTAL	118.8	120.0	120.0	120.0	120.0		
	4009844										