

Minutes of the Meeting

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

DATE: October 3, 2019
TIME: 1:30 p.m.
PLACE: West Allis City Hall
Common Council Chambers
7525 West Greenfield Avenue
West Allis, Wisconsin 53214

Milwaukee Urbanized Area Members Present

Donna Brown-Martin, Chair Director, Department of Transportation, Milwaukee County
Fred Abadi Director of Public Works, City of Waukesha
Samir Amin City Engineer, City of Milwaukee
Allison M. Bussler Director of Public Works, Waukesha County
Chad Chrisbaum Engineer in Charge, Transportation Infrastructure Division,
(Representing Robert Bauman) Department of Public Works, City of Milwaukee
Peter Daniels City Engineer, City of West Allis
Jon Edgren Director of Public Works, Ozaukee County
Julie Esch Deputy Director, Department of Transportation,
(Representing Brian Dranzik) Milwaukee County
Carolynn Gellings Manager of Engineering Services,
Department of Public Works, Waukesha County
Joshua Glass Project Technician, Highway Department,
(Representing Scott Schmidt) Washington County
Thomas M. Grisa Director of Public Works, City of Brookfield
Mitch Harris Transit Planner II, Milwaukee County Transit System
(Representing Daniel Boehm)
Vanessa Koster Planning Manager, Department of City Development,
City of Milwaukee
Michael Martin Director of Public Works, Village of Hales Corners
Kimberly Montgomery Director of Intergovernmental Relations Division,
Department of Administration, City of Milwaukee
Jeffrey S. Polenske Director of Public Works, City of Milwaukee
Andrea Weddle-Henning Director of Transportation Engineering,
Department of Transportation, Milwaukee County
William Wehrley City Engineer, City of Wauwatosa
John F. Weishan, Jr. Supervisor, 16th District, Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors
Dennis Yaccarino Senior Budget and Policy Manager,
Office of Budget and Management, City of Milwaukee

Non-Voting Members Present

Kevin Muhs, Secretary Executive Director,
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission

Michael Friedlander Program and Policy Analyst,
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Hans Higdon Planning Supervisor, Southeast Region,
(Representing Dewayne Johnson) Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Brian Udovich Highway Operations Manager,
Highway Department, Jefferson County

Guests and Staff Present

Roslin Burns Program and Planning Analyst, Southeast Region
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Leeann Butschlick Director of Public Works, Village of Shorewood
Melinda Dejewski City Engineer/Director of Public Works, City of St. Francis
Traci Gengler Principal Engineer, City of West Allis
Randy Groth Superintendent of Public Works, Village of River Hills
Christopher T. Hiebert Chief Transportation Engineer,
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
Ryan W. Hoel Deputy Chief Transportation Engineer,
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
Ethan S. Johnson Senior Engineer,
Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
Jeffrey Katz City Engineer and Director of Neighborhood Services,
City of Greenfield
Ashley Kiepczynski Design Engineer, City of Oak Creek
Glen Morrow City Engineer, City of Franklin
Tamara Simonson City Engineer, City of New Berlin
Matthew Sullivan Assistant City Engineer, City of Oak Creek
David Tapia Major Projects Manager,
Department of Public Works, City of Milwaukee
Jacob Varnes Local Program Manager, Southeast Region,
Wisconsin Department of Transportation

ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. by Ms. Brown-Martin, Chair of the Advisory Committee on Transportation System Planning and Programming for the Milwaukee Urbanized Area (Milwaukee TIP Committee). She 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. She then asked those attending the meeting to introduce themselves.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Brown-Martin asked if there were any public comments. No public comments were made.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 28, 2019, MEETING

Ms. Brown-Martin indicated that the Committee is being asked to consider approval of the minutes of the August 28, 2019, meeting. She asked if the Committee members had any changes, and upon hearing none, called for a motion. Mr. Martin made a motion to approve the minutes for the meeting held on August 28, 2019. The motion was seconded by Mr. Polenske, and the Committee unanimously approved the minutes.

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

Mr. Muhs stated that Mr. Hoel of the Commission staff will review with the Committee a further analysis of potential changes to the evaluation and prioritization process that would be utilized to recommend projects for years 2023-2025 STP-M funding later this year, as documented in the staff memorandum entitled, “Results of Evaluation of Potential Changes to be Considered to the Process to Evaluate, Prioritize, and Recommend Projects for Years 2023-2025 Federal Highway Administration Surface Transportation Program – Milwaukee Urbanized Area Funding.” He stated that Commission staff would seek a consensus on any potential changes or approval of any potential changes by the Committee.

[Secretary’s note: The memorandum is available on the Commission’s website at:
<https://www.sewrpc.org/SEWRPCFiles/CommissionFiles/CommitteeFiles/2019/2019-10-03-agenda-mke-tip-att1.PDF>]

The following sections summarize the Committee discussion on each of the potential changes to the process to evaluate, prioritize, and recommend projects for STP-M funding.

Consider Revising the Procedures to Allow Sponsors to Provide Further Justification for Consideration by the Committee as it Reviews the Initial Prioritization of STP-M Projects

Mr. Hoel noted that, at their August 28, 2019, meeting, members of the Milwaukee TIP Committee agreed that project sponsors could provide justification for funding their projects, beyond the evaluation criteria, that would be considered by the Committee as it reviews the application of the evaluation criteria and the resulting initial prioritization of STP-M projects. Mr. Hoel stated that Commission staff would propose that the STP-M process be revised such that the memorandum prepared by Commission staff summarizing application of the STP-M process, and identifying the projects initially recommended for funding, include a listing of any further justification for recommending a project for STP-M funding.

The following discussion occurred during and following Mr. Hoel’s review of the potential changes to the STP-M evaluation process:

1. Responding to an inquiry from Mr. Chrisbaum, Mr. Hoel stated that this potential process change would apply to all projects submitted for consideration for STP-M funding.
2. Mr. Grisa suggested that a word limit—such as 500 words—be placed on the length of the justification provided for each project.
3. Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Hoel, Mr. Grisa suggested that the justification information provided on the applications prepared for the projects be utilized without any modification or summary by Commission staff.

Mr. Hoel asked if there were any objections to the proposed changes as identified in the memorandum, along with suggestions made by Committee members, with respect to the Committee considering sponsor-provided justification for each candidate project from the application in the determination of projects for receiving STP-M funding. There was no objection to the proposed changes by the Committee.

Consider Two Potential Changes Related to Distributing the Available Highway Funding Among the Three Project Types

Mr. Hoel stated that, at their August 28, 2019, meeting, members of the Milwaukee TIP Committee requested that Commission staff evaluate two potential methods for revising the procedures for distributing the available highway STP-M funding between the three project types—resurfacing/reconditioning projects, reconstruction to same capacity projects, and capacity expansion projects (widening and new facilities):

- Distribute available STP-M funding to the three project categories based on two criteria, rather than three criteria
- Eliminate the distribution of funds into three categories, and evaluate all candidate projects together

Mr. Hoel stated that Commission staff evaluated distributing available STP-M funding between the three project categories based on two criteria—the STP-M funding requested by candidate projects having areawide significance and the percentage of STP-M funding historically approved for each project category. He noted that this was done by comparing the distribution of available highway STP-M funding between the three project categories based on utilizing the original three criteria and the two proposed criteria for both the 2019-2020 and 2021-2022 STP-M funding cycles. He stated that, based on the evaluation, utilizing the two criteria, rather than the three, would not have affected the projects initially recommended for funding under both funding cycles. However, utilizing the two criteria would have resulted in additional funding initially recommended for the City of Brookfield's proposed capacity expansion project.

Mr. Hoel stated in that Commission staff evaluated a number of options for evaluating all of the candidate projects together utilizing the candidate projects for the 2019-2020 STP funding cycle. He noted that only the 2019-2020 STP-M funding cycle was utilized, as the 2021-2022 STP-M cycle only had one capacity expansion project. He stated that Commission staff, as part of this evaluation, considered alternative scoring procedures for evaluating the capacity expansion projects, and evaluated them based on their ability to score capacity expansion projects equivalent to the other project categories. He noted that, based on this evaluation, none of the alternatives considered would have resulted in a capacity expansion project being proposed for funding.

Mr. Hoel stated that, based on the evaluation of the two potential changes to the STP-M evaluation process, Commission staff would propose that the three project categories continue to be evaluated separately and that the available highway STP-M funding be distributed based on two criteria—the STP-M funding requested by candidate projects having areawide significance and the percentage of STP-M funding historically approved for each project category.

There being no discussion by the Committee, Mr. Hoel asked if there were any objections to the proposed changes as identified with respect to the distribution of available highway funding among the three project types. There was no objection to the proposed changes by the Committee.

Consider Utilizing the Measure of Safety Criterion in the Scoring of Resurfacing/Reconditioning and Reconstruction to Same Capacity Projects in Addition to Capacity Expansion Projects

Mr. Hoel stated that, at their August 28, 2019, meeting, some members of the Milwaukee TIP Committee requested Commission staff evaluate using the measure of safety criterion as part of scoring resurfacing/reconditioning and reconstruction to same capacity projects, along with capacity expansion projects. Mr. Hoel stated that Commission staff evaluated utilizing the safety criterion that is utilized for the capacity expansion projects on the resurfacing/reconditioning and reconstruction to same capacity projects utilizing projects submitted in the 2019-2020 and 2021-2022 funding cycles. As part of the

evaluation, the maximum potential points for the potential safety criterion were initially set at 5 points for resurfacing/reconditioning projects and 10 points for the reconstruction to same capacity projects. Mr Hoel noted that, as shown on Table 5 of the memorandum, the maximum points for the measure of connectivity criterion was reduced by 5 points for both project categories, and the measure of pavement condition was reduced by 5 points for the reconstruction to same capacity project category in order to accommodate the maximum points added from the safety criterion.

Mr. Hoel stated that evaluation of the safety criterion on the projects from the two funding cycles found that, while not affecting the projects that were initially recommended for funding in those cycles, the application of the safety criterion did affect the ranking of a number of other projects—increasing or decreasing project scores by up to 7 positions for reconstruction to same capacity projects and up to 3 positions for resurfacing/reconditioning projects.

Mr. Hoel stated that, based on the results of the evaluation, Commission staff would propose that the process be revised to include evaluating candidate resurfacing/reconditioning and reconstruction to same capacity projects with a safety criterion, in order to prioritize those roadways with higher rates of crashes. He stated that initially the Commission staff would suggest setting the maximum potential points for this criterion at 5 points for resurfacing/reconditioning projects and 10 points for the reconstruction to same capacity projects, and adjusting other criteria as indicated on Table 5 of the memorandum.

The following discussion occurred during and following Mr. Hoel's review of this potential change in methodology:

1. Responding to an inquiry from Mr. Amin, Mr. Hoel stated that, in order to maintain a total of 100 maximum points available under the reconstruction to same capacity project category with the proposed addition of 10 points for the measure of safety criterion, the maximum number of points available for pavement condition for reconstruction to same capacity projects is proposed to be reduced from 50 to 45 points, along with reducing the maximum points available for the measure of connectivity criterion from 15 to 10 points.
2. Responding to a question from Ms. Gellings, Mr. Hoel stated that, based on the STP-M project eligibility established by the Milwaukee TIP Committee, stand-alone intersection projects that address safety issues would not be eligible for STP-M funding, as such projects already can be funded with Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funding. However, intersection improvements that address safety issues that are part of a corridor project would be eligible to receive STP-M funding.
3. Ms. Bussler asked how the safety criterion would be applied in the case of a project involving an intersection and a roadway, noting that a project involving one intersection and one mile of roadway can be a high-cost project. Mr. Hoel indicated that the crash rate calculated for use with the safety criterion for such projects would include total crashes within the project limits, including the intersection.
4. Mr. Grisa inquired whether crashes along cross-streets that intersect the candidate projects would be included in the crash rates calculated for the projects. Mr. Hoel stated that, for previous funding cycles, Commission staff have either included only crashes at the intersection (and not along the cross street) or crashes along the cross street within 100 feet of the intersection. He noted that WisDOT utilizes crashes on cross-streets within 250 feet of intersections in the calculation of the crash rate for projects.

5. Mr. Grisa questioned whether crashes that occur at intersections serving as the project limits would be included in the crash rates calculated for the candidate projects, and suggested that such crashes only be included in the crash rate should safety improvements be proposed at those intersections as part of the project. Mr. Abadi questioned whether the Commission staff would know that safety issues are being addressed as part of the project, given that such any safety improvements for addressing those issues are not typically known until preliminary engineering is completed. Mr. Muhs replied that an assumption can be made that sponsors will choose to address safety deficiencies as part of a project if they have an opportunity to do so. Ms. Bussler noted that certain types of resurfacing projects in Waukesha County likely would not address safety concerns. Mr. Polenske and Ms. Weddle-Henning both indicated that they—the City of Milwaukee and Milwaukee County, respectively—attempt to address safety as part of their resurfacing projects. Mr. Muhs noted that pedestrian and bicycle accommodations are examples of safety improvements that can be implemented as part of resurfacing projects. Mr. Polenske added that traffic signal visibility improvements is another example of how safety can be improved as part of a resurfacing project.
6. Mr. Muhs asked Committee members how intersections at the end of a project corridor should be considered in the methodology. Mr. Grisa stated that crashes that would not be addressed by the project should not be counted. Mr. Hoel suggested that intersection crashes that have occurred along the roadway within the project limits would be included in the crash rate calculation, and intersection crashes that occur along cross-streets or intersections adjacent to, but not within, the project limits will not be included in the crash rates calculated for the candidate project.
7. Mr. Polenske recommended that the maximum points received under the measure of safety criterion for reconstruction to same capacity projects be 5 points rather than 10, and that the maximum points received by the measure of pavement condition criterion remain at 50 points.

Mr. Muhs asked if there were any objections to the proposed change to evaluate resurfacing/reconditioning and reconstruction to the same capacity projects with a measure of safety criterion, as utilized for the capacity expansion projects, with the maximum points received being 5 points (and the maximum points for the measure of connectivity criterion being reduced by 5 points). He noted that intersection crashes that have occurred along the roadway within the project limits would be included in the crash rate calculation, and intersection crashes that occurred along cross-streets or at intersections adjacent to, but not within, the project limits will not be included in the crash rates for the project. There was no objection to the proposed changes by the Committee.

Consider Developing a Process that Allows Projects from Smaller Communities a Greater Chance of Receiving STP-M Funding

Mr. Hoel stated that, at their August 28, 2019, meeting, the Milwaukee TIP Committee requested Commission staff develop a process to allow projects from smaller sponsors to have a greater chance of being approved for STP-M funding. Mr. Hoel stated that an evaluation of the past three STP-M funding cycles found that most of the largest eligible sponsors, in terms of proportionate share of planned-lane miles and vehicles-mile travelled, received nearly all of the available STP-M funding for their projects. He added that this has likely resulted in the decline in the number of the smaller sponsors applying for STP-M funding over the last three funding cycles.

Mr. Hoel stated that, as a result of this evaluation, Commission staff would propose that the STP-M evaluation process be revised such that 10 percent of the available highway STP-M funding be set-aside for projects from sponsors that 1) have a proportionate share of less than 2.5 percent of the total existing VMT on the local arterial street and highway system in the Milwaukee urbanized area; 2) do not already

have a project initially recommended for STP-M funding based on the application of the evaluation criteria for the current funding cycle; and 3) have not received STP-M funding for a project within the previous two funding cycles.

The following discussion occurred during and following Mr. Hoel's review of this potential change in methodology:

1. Responding to a question from Mr. Martin, Mr. Hoel indicated that Commission staff chose 10 percent as the amount of funding to be set aside for smaller communities because it would provide a reasonable amount of STP-M funding (typically about \$4 to \$5 million per funding cycle) to allow one or two projects from smaller sponsors to be funded.
2. Responding to an inquiry by Ms. Gellings, Mr. Hoel stated it is proposed that the calculation of the 10 percent smaller sponsor set-aside would not include any of the funding that would be made available for transit capital projects.
3. Mr. Grisa asked if the 10 percent set-aside funding will be split into the three project categories—resurfacing, reconstruction to same capacity, and capacity expansion. Mr. Hoel stated that it is proposed that the 10 percent set aside funding would not be split into three categories, and that scores for all projects eligible for the smaller sponsor set-aside would be ranked together.
4. Responding to an inquiry from Mr. Amin, Mr. Hoel stated that it is proposed that should a sponsor have a project recommended for the funding distributed to the three project categories (the other 90 percent of highway STP-M funding), that sponsor would not be eligible to receive funding from the 10 percent smaller sponsor set-aside funding.
5. Ms. Brown-Martin asked if any meeting guests had any questions or comments. Ms. Dejewski recommended that more than 10 percent of the available highway STP-M funding should be set aside for projects from small communities. Mr. Martin agreed that more funding should be set aside for small communities. Mr. Muhs stated that, over time, the proposed methodology should allow many small communities to receive project funding. Mr. Hoel noted that it is expected that the smaller sponsor set-aside would be monitored as part of the review of the STP-M process by the Committee—typically prior to each new funding cycle. Should it be deemed necessary by the Committee as part of those reviews, adjustments to the percentage of the set-aside could be considered at that time.
6. Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Grisa, Mr. Hoel stated that smaller sponsors would have an opportunity to receive funding from the set-aside even if their project scores are below the threshold for being designated of areawide significance.

Mr. Hoel asked if there were any objections to the proposed changes as identified with respect to establishing a 10 percent set-aside for projects from smaller sponsors. There was no objection to the proposed changes by the Committee.

Consider Developing a Procedure for Prioritizing Among Projects with the Same Project Score

Mr. Hoel stated that the Commission staff propose that a procedure be added to the STP-M evaluation process for prioritizing projects with the same project score. He stated that in the case of two or more projects from the same sponsor having the same score, it is proposed that project priorities provided by the sponsor would be utilized to prioritize these projects. He then stated that, in the case of two or more projects from different project sponsors having the same score, it is proposed that such projects would be prioritized

based on the ratio of the sponsors' remaining share of the available highway STP-M funding based on the amount of planned arterial lane-miles (minus the amount requested by the project and any of their other projects having a higher project score) to the amount requested for these projects. He noted that Figure 3 of the memorandum includes a sample prioritization of candidate projects from different sponsors having three projects with the same score—sponsored by the City of Milwaukee and the City of West Allis—from the 2021-2022 STP-M funding cycle.

The following discussion occurred during and following Mr. Hoel's review of this potential change in methodology:

1. Responding to a question from Ms. Bussler, Mr. Hoel stated, in the case of projects prioritized at the cut-off line for funding allocated to a project category and would not be fully funded, the Committee can decide to partially fund such projects or fully fund another project with a lower score from the same project category, or fund a project from a different project category.

Mr. Hoel asked if there were any objections to the proposed changes as identified with respect to the recommended procedure to prioritize projects having the same score. There was no objection to the proposed changes by the Committee.

Consider Developing a Criterion Related to Providing Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Accommodations in the Evaluation of All Projects

Mr. Hoel stated that, at their August 28, 2019, meeting, the Milwaukee TIP Committee requested Commission staff develop a criterion that would be utilized to evaluate all projects for consideration by the Committee that promotes accessibility of all users with respect to transit, bicycles, and pedestrians. Mr. Hoel indicated that Commission staff would propose that a maximum of 5 bonus points be added to a project's score based on the type of new transit, bicycle, and pedestrian accommodations proposed for the project, as shown on Table 7 of the memorandum.

The following discussion occurred during and following Mr. Hoel's review of this potential change in methodology:

1. Responding to a question from Ms. Bussler, Mr. Muhs stated that a bus priority system refers to traffic signal technology that gives priority to bus movements through signalized intersections.
2. Responding to a question from Ms. Montgomery, Mr. Hoel stated that the 5 bonus points for the proposed criterion would be added to the points received by the projects from the other evaluation criteria.
3. Mr. Polenske suggested adding another pedestrian measure related to providing new/widened sidewalk connection to transit stops that would be worth 2 bonus points.
4. Mr. Polenske suggested that the term "bus" be changed to "transit" in Table 7 of the memorandum.

Mr. Hoel asked if there were any objections to the proposed changes with respect to adding a criterion related to the provision of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian accommodations, as identified in the memorandum with changes suggested by Committee members. There was no objection to the proposed changes by the Committee.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Milwaukee TIP Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m. on a motion from Ms. Weddle-Henning. The motion was seconded by Ms. Bussler, and carried unanimously by the Milwaukee TIP Committee.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kevin J. Muhs
Secretary

KJM/RWH/ESJ/esj
Doc #00250513