

MONDAY AUGUST 26, 2013

**AGENDA OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
MEETING HELD
THURSDAY, AUGUST 29 2013 at 6:00 P.M.
UPPER LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM, COUNTY COURTHOUSE
222 N IOWA STREET; DODOGEVILLE, WISCONSIN 53533**

State of
Wisconsin
County of
Iowa

2013-08

Item		
1)	Call the meeting to order.	Call to Order
2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Consent Agenda. b) Roll Call – Members Present. c) Minutes of the August 13, 2013 Traffic Safety Commission meeting. d) Approval of this Agenda. e) Approval of the minutes of the August 5, 2013 prior meeting. 	Consent Agenda
3)	Report from committee members and an opportunity for members of the audience to address the committee.	Public Comment
4)	ATV route consideration for adoption at the following locations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CTH F from the Lafayette County line to Berg Road along the Lafayette County line 2. CTH A between Ogden and Cook-McFall roads 3. CTH G between Lower Mifflin Road and CTH A to Rewey 	ATV route designations for adoption
5)	2012 Highway Department YE Revenue & Expense report and 2012 Financial Report review and discussion	2012 Financial Report
6)	Memorandum of Understanding between the Department Of Transportation (WisDOT), Wisconsin County Highway Association (WCHA), and Wisconsin Transportation Builders Association (WTBA)	2013 Memorandum of Understanding
7)	Performance Based Maintenance Initiative – Wisconsin Department of Transportation Oversight Committee	Performance Based Maintenance Contracting
8)	Commissioner’s Report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. 2014 Budget request review and discussion. B. July 2013 Revenue & Expense statement. C. Construction projects update: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. CTH K William’s Creek bridge b. USH 18/151 – CTH Z to CTH YZ c. STH 80 overlay STH 133 to CTH P d. Preventative Maintenance and Flood repairs update. D. Bridge office policy requirement for concrete verses steel bridge railings. E. Draft State Mowing Policy paper. 	Commissioner’s Report
9)	Motion to set the next meeting date for Monday September 30, 2013 at 6:00 P.M. and adjourn.	Adjourn

Committee Chair Approved: Yes

Amended: No

Agenda Created/Amended:

Date: 8/26/2013 Initials: CRH

Posting Verified by County Clerk/Deputy Clerk: Date: _____ Initials: _____

BLANK

TUESDAY – AUGUST 13 2013

State of
Wisconsin
County of
Iowa

**UN-APPROVED MINUTES OF THE
TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMISSION MEETING HELD
TUESDAY, AUGUST 13, 2013
HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES BUILDING – ROOM #1001
DODGEVILLE, WISCONSIN**

2013-03

Item		
#1	Meeting called to order by committee Chair Craig Hardy at 9:30 AM in Room #1001 of the Health & Human Services Building in Dodgeville.	Call to Order
#2b	Roll Call – Commissioner Hardy, State Patrolman Russell, Ryan Mayer (DOT), Matt Asleson (DOT), Karen Rogulja (SWWRPC), Greg Lee (City Dodgeville). Citizens present Mrs. Schambow and Mr. McCarville (Fayette ATV club).	Roll Call, Also Present, Certification of Meeting
#2c and d	b. Motion by Mayer, 2 nd by Russell to approve the 5/21/2013 minutes and agenda of this meeting. Motion carried.	Approval of Agenda & Minutes
#3	No comments from the public.	Comment from Public/ Supervisors
#4	Commissioner Hardy summarized information from review of the CTH G and E intersection performed by himself and Mayer. Discussion of curvature of CTH G, stop condition at location, usage of rumble strips, usage of additional signage, usage of chevrons, and other topics. Hardy summarized the existing signage at the intersection was improperly located and in lieu of removing the existing advance warning stop ahead signage; the department installed an additional sign at the proper location. Hardy summarized review of traffic accident reports at the location illustrate 3 incidents over a period of 5 years. All three of the incidents are related to issues with negotiating the CTH E curve not driving through the intersection from CTH G. Pepper commented a lot of the late night drive offs most likely go unreported. Hardy and Mayer stated rumble strips and other devices are typically reserved for high incident locations to raise awareness, that effectiveness goes down with the frequency of installations within an area. The conclusion at the present time is to monitor the additional signage installed for the advance notice of stop condition on CTH G. In addition, the sheriff's office will stop up enforcement in the area to monitor traffic flows. Mrs. Schambow expressed concerns with the incident last winter where a car drove through CTH G into their field causing damage and injuries. She felt the additional signage has made an impact, but is also concerned with fence replacement costs and safety at the location.	CTH G & E Intersection Rewey
#5 and #6	Pepper provided a summary of some issues with uploading reports to the Community Maps software maintained by UW-TIC, related to the amount of time to upload information onto the various software layers. He stated the software and program are a great tool for analysis of conditions and situations, but entering information can be frustrating and time consuming due to format and software issues. Pepper distributed and reviewed the 2013 Year-to-date accident spot map for the county. Discussion centered around the locations of the two fatalities recorded to-date in the County located along CTH XX and STH 130.	Community Maps updates and spot map review

zc-1

5

#7	<p>Hardy informed the committee the County Board had adopted an ATV/UTV ordinance for the county routes since the last meeting. The Ordinance requires review of the various routes proposed by ATV clubs to be done by the Traffic safety Commission. The commission commented for the Commissioner and Sheriff's office to review the routes proposed and provide a summary of potential issues for the committee to consider. The committee discussed the proposal of 5 routes to be considered and designated as Iowa County ATV/UTV routes: CTH A between Ogden and Cook McFall roads, CTH G from Lower Mifflin Road to CTH A, CTH DD from Walnut Hill Road to CTH K, CTH K from CTH F to Hollandale, and CTH F from the Lafayette County line to Berg Road. Mr. McCarville from the Fayette ATV club was present to discuss the CTH A and G routes. The committee by unanimous consent recommends approval of the CTH G and CTH A routes proposed by the Fayette ATV club, the routes are a portion of a Lafayette County to Livingston route proposal by the club and have permission of the Town of Mifflin for its' roads. Some discussion occurred with regards to the CTH DD, K, and F routes proposed near Hollandale. The Commissioner is to follow up with the village of Hollandale and Town of Waldwick to verify their agreement for the routes to the village. Some concerns were expressed with using CTH K near the village, but with state routes precluded by statute there would not be another suitable route to the village. Hardy is to also discuss the sponsorship of the routes with the requestor Mr. Cassidy. The committee agreed by unanimous consent to recommend approval of the CTH F route from the Lafayette County line to Berg Road, the route is currently a portion of the Lafayette County route from Fayette to Blanchardville.</p>	ATV/UTV Ordinance and Proposed Route reviews
#8	<p>Commissioner Hardy provided information to the committee with regards to the history of Special Events in the county and some of the issues surrounding them. As a result of issues surrounding a recent event within the county between participants and the sheriff's department officers; the County Transportation Committee has requested an ordinance be drafted to regulate and control the events. He informed the committee several counties issue general work in right-of-way permits to these groups for the events, but only Dane County has an ordinance in place to regulate the events. He requested any committee members with knowledge of other ordinances related to the regulation of the events to contact him with information.</p>	Special Events Ordinance discussion
#9	<p>Ryan Mayer discussed the STH 23 pavement replacement project between Lower Wyoming Road and the Wisconsin River bridge. Mayer summarized the history of the STH 23 project from CTH ZZ to Lower Wyoming Road which was completed this past summer, and the issues surrounding the balance of the project to the Wisconsin river. He summarized various meetings which have occurred related to the project impacts near to bridges (beamguard configurations) at the CTH T intersection. The Taliesin center is concerned about visual impacts to their facilities caused by additional right of way and road widening for the installation of safer beamguards. Due to the center being on the national historic register multiple parties are involved from the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation to the National Park system. WisDOT continues to review various options in an effort to address their concerns and achieve a least impact solution including analysis of the existing speed limits. Meetings continue to be held to achieve a solution, the project is currently scheduled for summer of 2014 construction.</p>	STH 23 pavement replacement project
#10	<p>Hardy commented the WisDOT was performing a project along USH 18-151 from CTH Z to CTH YZ just east of Dodgeville. The project is anticipated to start on August 19th and consist of concrete pavement joint removal and replacement, then an</p>	USH 18-151 Asphalt Overlay

zc-z

6

	asphaltic surface overlay. The project will consist of various single lane closures to accomplish the work.	
#10	<p>Matt Asleson covered the following state issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review of the traffic accident history in 2013 at the statewide and local levels. 2. Provided handouts of various illustrations for different methods to review accident data, such as accidents per capita by county. 3. Discussion of legislative issues update. <p>Bryant Russell asked for two clarifications on behalf of the village of Avoca officer Roberts related to :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Speed limit on STH 133 within the village limits. When reviewing other villages in the county speed limits vary from 30 MPH to 45 MPH along USH 18 for example, and the village wondered what the process would be for lowering the limit to 25MPH from the current 35 MPH. Mayer stated the village would contact his office for a speed limit study, an accident history review, review of statutes, and outlying jurisdictional authorities to determine what is necessary, required, and allowed to determine if lower limits are justified. 2. The village was also wondering about the process for sidewalk crossing installations. Again, the contact would be through Mayer with WisDOT to discuss and review locations. In addition, the village would be required to pay for installation and maintenance of those crossings, signage, and markings. Bryant will notify the village of the procedures. 	Comments from committee members
#11	Motion to set next meeting date and adjourn. Motion by Hardy, 2 nd by Pepper to set the next meeting date for Tuesday, November 12, 2013 at 9:30 AM. Meeting adjourned at 10:36 AM.	Adjourn.

Respectfully Submitted;
Highway Commissioner Hardy

20-3

7

Blank

204

MONDAY – AUGUST 5, 2013

State of
Wisconsin
County of
Iowa

**UN-APPROVED MINUTES OF THE
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING HELD
MONDAY, AUGUST 5, 2013
IOWA COUNTY AIRPORT TERMINAL BUILDING
MINERAL POINT, WISCONSIN**

2013-07

Item		
#1	Meeting called to order by committee Chair John Meyers at 6:00 PM in the terminal at the Iowa County Airport.	Call to Order
#2b	Roll Call – Supervisors Bauer, Benish, Bunker, DeLain, Demby, Meyers, Parman, and Walmer. Supervisor Peterson was absent. Others in attendance were Highway Commissioner Hardy, Airport Manager King and Administrator Kephart. Supervisors Deal and Iowa County Highway Department employee Vicki Evans.	Roll Call & Also Present
#2c & #2d	Motion by Benish, 2 nd by DeLain to approve the 8/5/2013 agenda and 7/1/2013 minutes. Motion carried.	Approval of Agenda & Minutes
#3	Motion by Bunker, 2 nd by Parman, to recess for a tour of the Iowa County Airport facilities by Airport Manager King. Approved at 6:05 pm. Motion by Parman, 2 nd by Bauer, to reconvene the Transportation Committee meeting. Approved at 6:47 pm.	Airport facility tour
#4	Vicki Evans spoke about her position at the Highway Department. She was informed that her position would be eliminated by the proposed budget and restructure. She informed the committee she believes her position should not be eliminated and that she stays busy and always has something to do. Supervisor Benish asked about the account software and wanted to make sure the numbers we review are correct.	Public Comment
#5	Airport Manager King presented his budget and plans. He also answered questions from the committee.	2014 Airport budget
#6	Commissioner Hardy presented his budget and plans. He also answered questions from the committee. He said there are some conflicting numbers coming from the state with regards to GTA, RMA and the potential for flood damage aids are unknown. Those numbers are budgeted at 2013 levels and are yet to be finalized. He stated departmental restructuring could occur, but he is in favor of a compensation/classification study being done to evaluate positions first. Commissioner Hardy provided a current department staffing outline illustrating all vacancies due to not being funded since 2009. He provided two proposed future structure outlines illustrating the positions to be held. He stated for the 2014 budget one position is to be eliminated related to the scaleperson job description. He recommends the other positions on the proposed charts be evaluated as a part of a classification study prior to discussions of reorganizing.	2014 Highway budget
#7	Commissioner Hardy updated the committee on CTH T Birch Lake. Soil borings were performed to determine the substructure of the existing road and provide recommendations for improvements. The borings illustrate the roadway is predominantly 6 to 8 inches fill consisting of gravel and pavement. Most of the soil borings indicate the subbase to be lean brown clays and sands with silt. These soil types are highly susceptible to frost heave action and are a poor soil type for	CTH T Birch Lake update

2e-1

3

	<p>pavement support. As a result, the materials are not a preferred subbase material and require select fill materials to improve the subgrade. Most borings were taken to a depth of 5 feet. Exploration boring at one location was extended to 10 feet due to the amount of peat organic material, which indicates additional excavation would be required for the location. Two borings indicated organic materials were present necessitating removal through EBS sections. The recommendations are to have a four foot separation between the highest groundwater table elevation or roadway ditch inverts and the road surface as a result.</p>	
#8	<p>A. Commissioner Hardy gave an update on construction projects. B & C. Commissioner Hardy reviewed the possible funding alternatives for the 2013 flood issues. Forms have been submitted to FEMA, if they include Iowa County in their funding, they will cover 75% of our costs associated with the flooding. WEM and WisDOT will only cover roads that were impassible during the event, which would be significantly less coverage than FEMA. Another possibility would be to use the money from preventative maintenance in the budget to cover the flooding repairs. Motion by Benish, 2nd by Parman to go forward with scheduled preventative maintenance as if we don't have an emergency and deal with the flood funding issues when or if they arise. Commissioner Hardy is to retain \$100,000 from the preventative maintenance budget to cover the 25% FEMA match. Motion carried with Walmer against. D. Commissioner Hardy reviewed the current staffing chart and answered questions from the committee with regards to current vacant positions. E. The committee reviewed the June 2013 R&E report. F. Commissioner Hardy gave an update on the ACS accounting software transition. The financial auditors were in the office and that went well. The financial reports were completed that day, and will be available for the next committee meeting. Commissioner Hardy, Administration, and Corporation Counsel met and discussed the ACS software, which continues to have issues. Issues with the software are related to two aspects; one being function of the original software itself and one being the support service agreements. The original goal of the software program update was to have a fully integrated system so the numbers reviewed by various parties were the same just a snapshot in time. Alternative options to make that a seamless function without utilizing and reconciling multiple programs are limited. Commissioner stated he has not paid for support services (which ACS has been providing) since the program has been operational (January 2012), due to issues related to its' function. The County is reviewing options related to software contracts and support service agreements. . G. Commissioner Hardy gave an update on the AWS Quarry/Plant scale automation progress. There were some issues with the phone line connection related to the modem at the quarry. IT replaced the modem, and the software is communicating with the main office. County Employees have been trained on the automated system and identification cards were being issued. The software system is now being utilized.</p>	Commissioner Report
#9	<p>Motion by Benish, 2nd by Parman to set next meeting for August 29, 2013 at 6:00 PM and adjourn. Motion carried, meeting adjourned at 8:41 PM.</p>	Next meeting and adjourn

Respectfully Submitted;
County Board Supervisor, Ryan Walmer

20-2

49

All-Terrain Vehicle _____

_____ of _____

AN ORDINANCE DESIGNATING _____

Section I - Intent

The _____ of _____
adopts the following all-terrain vehicle ordinance/route for the operation of all-
terrain vehicles upon the roadways listed in Section III.

Following due consideration of the recreational value to connect trail
opportunities and weighted against possible dangers, public health, liability
aspects, terrain involved, traffic density and history of automobile traffic, this
ordinance has been created.

Section II - Statutory Authority

This route is created pursuant to _____
authority under _____ as authorized by 23.33 (8) (b), Wis.
Stats.

● *Optional - the provisions of 23.33 are adopted.*

Section III - Routes

The following roads are designated as routes;

~~ATV~~

FAYETTE CSWB

Lee McCarville

- A. ^{1st} City Hwy G From City A To (N) Lower McFall Rd
- B. ^{3rd} City Hwy A From OGDEN Rd (E) to Cook McFall Rd
- C. Said routes are further described and identified by the attached map.

Section IV - Conditions

As a condition for the use of this route, the following conditions shall apply to all
operators (and passengers where applicable);

- A. _____
- B. _____
- C. Routes must be signed in accordance with NR 64.12, and NR 64.12(7)c.

4-1

9

Blank

IOWA COUNTY HIGHWAY
December 2012 vs. 2012 Budget
BUDGET SUMMARY

100.00%

	December	YTD	2012 Budget	Over/(Under) Budget	% Used
County Related					
REVENUE					
1 General Property Taxes (41110) Prorated-monthly and YTD	-	2,445,379.00	2,445,379.00	-	100.00%
2 Public Charges for Service (46310)	-	3,492.51	5,750.00	(2,257.49)	60.74%
3 State Salt Storage Reimbursement (47230-41)	-	4,049.78	5,400.00	(1,350.22)	75.00%
4 State Equipment Storage Reimbursement (47230-42)	-	58,110.67	55,429.00	2,681.67	104.84%
5 State of Wisconsin Transportation Aids (43531)	-	947,322.00	947,322.00	-	100.00%
6 Radio & GPL Reimbursement (47230-35/40)	-	15,531.18	11,785.00	3,746.18	131.79%
7 Rental Income (48213)	-	8,584.00	-	-	
8 Sale or Trade In of Assets (48310)	-	-	-	-	
9 Sale of Materials & Supplies (48330)	(984.45)	-	-	-	
10 Sale of Salvage & Waste Products (48340)	(5,839.02)	-	-	-	
11 Miscellaneous Revenue (48000, 48203, 48204,48400,48520)	-	37,446.54	2,000.00	35,446.54	1872.33%
12 LRIP Administration Fees	-	-	-	-	
13 Drug & Alcohol Testing (47230/43)	-	-	1,400.00	-	
14 Capital Projects Reserve Fund	-	-	-	-	
15 CHIP-D Reimbursement (43537)	-	372,930.34	407,689.00	-	
16 Fees Collected (44X00, 45220, 46121)	-	3,200.00	4,700.00	(1,500.00)	68.09%
17 TOTAL REVENUE	(6,823.47)	3,896,046.02	3,886,854.00	36,766.68	100.24%
18					
19 OPERATING EXPENDITURES:					
20 Administration (53100, 53110; 53120)	38,313.41	315,297.97	363,939.00	(48,641.03)	86.63%
21 Administration-Patrol Supt. (53190, 53191)	(1,148.89)	173,316.50	120,982.00	52,334.50	143.26%
22 Unallocated Fringe Benefits (53210-105,131,133,136)	(1,741.22)	77,737.91	61,216.00	16,521.91	126.99%
23 Allocated Fringe Benefits (53210, remaining)	154,591.77	1,148,555.57	1,198,874.00	(50,318.43)	95.80%
24 Small Field Tools (53220)	(6,310.78)	16,035.85	19,119.00	(3,083.15)	83.87%
25 Shop Operations (53230)	(130,818.77)	-	207,658.00	(207,658.00)	0.00%
26 Fuel Handling (53232)	15,185.86	21,248.11	14,790.00	6,458.11	143.67%
27 Machinery Operation (53240)	474,120.79	1,848,754.10	1,666,740.00	182,014.10	110.92%
28 Pit & Quarry Operation (53250)	1,444.59	82,486.23	231,150.00	(148,663.77)	35.69%
29 Bituminous Operation (53260)	12,277.32	126,947.00	361,676.00	(234,729.00)	35.10%
30 Buildings & Grounds (53270)	(139,769.31)	20,563.08	237,619.00	(217,055.92)	8.65%
31 County Maintenance (53311, 53314-215)	65,873.78	1,807,381.74	1,476,572.00	330,809.74	122.40%
32 County Snow Removal (53312)	81,496.12	798,222.14	1,282,852.00	(484,629.86)	62.22%
33 County Construction (53313)	1,909.77	1,205,843.94	1,146,928.00	58,915.94	105.14%
34 County Bridge Construction (53314, except 53314-215)	13,820.67	29,670.64	35,971.00	(6,300.36)	82.48%
35 Radio (53192)	624.37	1,654.36	1,750.00	(95.64)	94.53%
36 GPL (53193)	-	13,563.89	34,069.00	(20,505.11)	39.81%
37 Total Operating Expense:	579,869.48	7,687,279.03	8,461,905.00	(774,625.97)	90.85%
38					
39					

51

51

40 **INDIRECT COSTING**

41 Small field tools (53220-920)	-	(16,035.85)	(19,119.00)	3,083.15	83.87%
42 Fuel Handling (53232-931)	-	(21,248.11)	(14,790.00)	(6,458.11)	143.67%
43 Shop Operations (53230-930)	-	-	(207,658.00)	207,658.00	0.00%
44 Pit & Quarry (53250-1-960)	(2,391.35)	(86,100.62)	(186,750.00)	100,649.38	46.10%
45 Machinery (53240-940)	(438.62)	(1,836,790.32)	(2,400,000.00)	563,209.68	76.53%
46 Fringe Benefit Recovery (53210-910)	-	(1,224,208.08)	(1,227,536.00)	3,327.92	99.73%
47 Bituminous Operations (53260-XXXXX-970)	44,690.60	(66,685.57)	(90,800.00)	24,114.43	73.44%
48 Building and Grounds (53270-1-950)	-	-	(237,619.00)	237,619.00	0.00%

50 TOTAL INDIRECT COSTING	41,860.63	(3,251,068.55)	(4,384,272.00)	1,133,203.45	74.15%
----------------------------------	------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	---------------------	---------------

53 TOTAL EXPENDITURES Less Indirect Costing	621,730.11	4,436,210.48	4,077,633.00	358,577.48	108.79%
--	-------------------	---------------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------

56 Less Depreciation (XXXXX-541)	(495,746.63)	(495,746.63)	(418,680.00)	(77,066.63)	118.41%
57 Add Capital Expenditures (53280)	(220,092.87)	-	286,000.00	(286,000.00)	0.00%
	(715,839.50)	(495,746.63)	(132,680.00)	(363,066.63)	373.64%

60 TOTAL EXPENDITURES	(94,109.39)	3,940,463.85	3,944,953.00	(4,489.15)	99.89%
------------------------------	--------------------	---------------------	---------------------	-------------------	---------------

62 TOTAL COUNTY RELATED					
63 REVENUE OVER(UNDER) EXPENDITURES	87,285.92	(44,417.83)	(58,099.00)	41,255.83	

66 **State Related**

68 **REVENUE**

69 STHS-Routine Maintenance & Construction (47230/31,39)	(0.02)	924,248.41	502,500.00	421,748.41	183.93%
70 State Discretionary Maintenance (47230-33)	0.06	600,415.28	382,700.00	217,715.28	156.89%
71 State Roadside Maintenance (47230-37)	(0.01)	113,309.66	280,000.00	(166,690.34)	40.47%
72 State On-System Bridge (47230-34)	-	85,390.71	40,000.00	45,390.71	213.48%
73 STHS-Winter Maintenance (47230-32)	-	446,480.30	480,000.00	(33,519.70)	93.02%
74 State Overtime Reimbursement (47230-44)	-	-	58,099.00	(58,099.00)	0.00%
75 TOTAL REVENUE	0.03	2,169,844.36	1,743,299.00	426,545.36	124.47%

77 **OPERATING EXPENDITURES:**

78 STHS-Routine Maintenance & Construction (53321)	(15,789.26)	1,238,718.55	822,500.00	416,218.55	150.60%
79 STHS-Discretionary Maintenance - Paint (53328-0810,0820,0825)	71,094.26	259,455.16	382,700.00	(123,244.84)	67.80%
80 STHS-Winter Maintenance (53322)	1,015.96	411,448.29	538,099.00	(126,650.71)	76.46%
81 STHS-Local Force Accounts (53328 except DMA)	14,619.65	138,732.88	-	138,732.88	
82 Total Operating Expense:	70,940.61	2,048,354.88	1,743,299.00	305,055.88	117.50%

84 TOTAL STATE RELATED					
85 REVENUE OVER(UNDER) EXPENDITURES	(70,940.58)	121,489.48	-	121,489.48	

88 (5)

89	Special One-Time					
90						
91	REVENUE					
92						
93	Direct Pass-Through					
94						
95	REVENUE					
96	Local Bridge Aids (41120)	-	88,692.19	88,692.19	-	100.00%
97	Local Government (47330,47450)	(71.81)	449,817.21	707,000.00	(257,182.79)	63.62%
98	TOTAL REVENUE	(71.81)	538,509.40	795,692.19	(257,182.79)	67.68%
99						
100	OPERATING EXPENDITURES:					
101	50-50 Bridges (53182)	-	96,615.65	88,692.19	7,923.46	108.93%
102	Town of Arena	-	-	-	-	
103	Town of Clyde	-	-	-	-	
104	Town of Pulaski	-	-	-	-	
105	Other Local Governments (53330, 53340, 53350, 53360)	2,369.80	433,934.59	707,000.00	(273,065.41)	61.38%
106	Total Operating Expense:	2,369.80	530,550.24	795,692.19	(265,141.95)	66.68%
107						
108	TOTAL DIRECT PASS-THROUGH RELATED					
109	REVENUE OVER(UNDER) EXPENDITURES	(2,441.61)	7,959.16	-	7,959.16	
110						
111						
112						
113						
114	TOTAL REVENUE	(6,895.25)	6,604,399.78	6,425,845.19	206,129.25	102.78%
115						
116	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	(20,798.98)	6,519,368.97	6,483,944.19	35,424.78	100.55%
117						
118	TOTAL REVENUE OVER(UNDER)					
119	EXPENDITURES	13,903.73	85,030.81	(58,099.00)	170,704.47	

5
7
25

12

BLANK

5-4



Wisconsin Department of Transportation

www.dot.wisconsin.gov

Scott Walker
Governor

Mark Gottlieb, P.E.
Secretary

Office of the Secretary
4802 Sheboygan Avenue, Room 120B
P O Box 7910
Madison, WI 53707-7910

August 14, 2013

Telephone: 608-266-1113
FAX: 608-266-9912
E-mail: sec.exec@dot.wi.gov

Daniel J. Fedderly, Executive Director
Wisconsin County Highway Association
N9387 330th Street
Boyceville, Wisconsin 54725

Dear Dan,

Thanks to you and the executive leadership of WCHA for taking the time to meet with Deputy Secretary Berg and me to discuss the Memorandum of Understanding between WCHA, WTBA and WisDOT. The MOU draft that your organization previously saw and approved has been updated for increased clarity and to be consistent with the provisions of the recently adopted state budget. I'm writing this letter to explain the updated sections of the MOU and to clarify the department's position on several items that were addressed at the meeting.

Structure of the Maintenance Appropriation

We have removed references to the department requesting changes in the appropriation structure for maintenance, because those changes were included in the budget exactly as the department proposed them. It is important to note that state law now provides for a separate appropriation for the county routine maintenance contracts. The department no longer has flexibility to move funds between the county RMAs and other maintenance related activities. Every dollar in that appropriation must be used for that purpose.

Local Force Agreements (LFAs)

The previous draft identified that no new LFAs will be entered into after July 1, 2015. We have clarified this provision to conform to the intent that it apply only to agreements for "pavement or bridge improvement" projects. This clarification will retain the department's ability to use LFAs for minor projects that don't involve paving or structures.

Crackfilling

The updated agreement retains crackfilling as a routine maintenance activity to be primarily performed by county forces. However, it does provide for the ability to contract for crackfilling in the event of insufficient resources in the RMA appropriation to complete the level of work needed. This is being done so that we can continue to efficiently use federal funds, where allowable, for maintenance activities. While it is very important for us to retain that flexibility, keep in mind that the MOU clearly states in two different locations that routine maintenance and crackfilling are primarily county functions, and that will be WisDOT's policy as we implement this MOU. It is our intent that as we get caught up with the significant backlog of crackfilling needs, and if the legislature maintains adequate RMA funding, the need for contracted crackfilling will be significantly diminished.

6-1

15

Daniel J. Fedderly, Executive Director
August 14, 2013
Page Two

While the MOU provides the broad policy framework for future maintenance roles, we understand that it will be implemented through the development of new work plans and performance-based maintenance provisions. WisDOT will continue to work with you in a cooperative way on that implementation.

We believe this version of the MOU is substantially equivalent to the version you have previously reviewed and approved, and we ask that you execute it. WTBA has given their final approval.

The department looks forward to working with WCHA and other transportation stakeholders to make sure the new funding and policy changes made available in the state budget are used to efficiently meet the maintenance needs of the state highway system. We appreciate your partnership and cooperation in that effort.

Sincerely,



Mark Gottlieb, P.E.
Secretary

Memorandum of Understanding

between

Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Wisconsin County Highway Association, and Wisconsin Transportation Builders Association

The Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT), the Wisconsin County Highway Association (WCHA), and Wisconsin Transportation Builders Association (WTBA) are entering into this Memorandum of Understanding for the purpose of documenting their general agreement on certain matters of mutual interest.

DEFINITIONS

The terms "routine maintenance", "corrective maintenance", and "preventative maintenance" have the meanings set forth in Appendix A.

The term "improvement" has the meaning set forth in Sec. 84.06(1) of the Wisconsin Statutes.

The term "level of service model" refers to a model developed by WisDOT to determine the level of investment required on the state highway system to achieve the minimum desired level of routine maintenance service.

The parties agree that:

1. **ADEQUACY OF FUNDING.** The level of service model is the best measure of the funding needed for state highway maintenance. Recognizing that budgetary decisions are made by the Legislature and Governor, WisDOT will continue to seek to fund maintenance at that level.
2. **PERFORMANCE OF ROUTINE STATE HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE.** Routine maintenance, as defined in Appendix A, should primarily be performed by counties under their Routine Maintenance Agreements.
3. **PERFORMANCE OF OTHER STATE HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE WORK.** Corrective and preventative maintenance, as defined in Appendix A, should primarily be performed by private contractors. However, WisDOT should retain the option of having this work performed by counties where (a) the projects are small (e.g. < \$100,000), (b) a contractor is unavailable, or (c) the project is an emergency requiring timely response.
4. **PERFORMANCE OF CRACK SEALING WORK.** Crack sealing, in general, is a routine maintenance activity as defined in Appendix A and should primarily be performed by the counties. However, in instances where there is insufficient resources available to complete this work and the Department believes there is a benefit from an asset management perspective, this work can be performed by private contractors.

5. **PERFORMANCE-BASED MAINTENANCE.** WisDOT and WCHA will establish a working group to recommend changes in the state maintenance manual and routine maintenance agreements that will ultimately replace the actual cost reimbursement requirement with language and procedures that support performance based or unit price reimbursement where appropriate.
6. **STATE HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS.** Section 59.52(30) of the Wisconsin Statutes limits the authority of counties to perform highway improvements in another county. Unless agreed to by both parties, WTBA and WCHA will not seek any modification to either strengthen or relax that limitation.
7. **LOCAL SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS.** Section 62.15 (1d) of the Wisconsin Statutes limits the authority of counties to perform highway improvements in a city with a population over 5,000. Unless agreed to by both parties, WTBA and WCHA will not seek any modification to either strengthen or relax that limitation.
8. **LOCAL ROADS IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.** Section 86.31(2)(d) of the Wisconsin Statutes describes the circumstances under which counties may perform highway improvements under the Local Roads Improvement Program. Unless agreed to by both parties, WTBA and WCHA will not seek any modification to either broaden or narrow that description.
9. **LOCAL FORCE AGREEMENTS ON STATE/FEDERAL FUNDED PROJECTS.** WisDOT will not enter into new local force agreements for pavement or bridge improvement projects using state and/or federal funding on or after July 1, 2015. This provision is subject to renegotiation at any time that WisDOT determines that the state budget does not fund at least 90 percent of the level of service maintenance model.
10. **BEST EFFORTS TO SUPPORT THIS AGREEMENT.** The parties will make their best efforts to support the terms of this agreement publicly, with their members (in the case of WCHA and WTBA), and with the state legislature. WisDOT is an agency of the state. Nothing in this memorandum shall be construed to create an obligation on the part of WisDOT to do anything inconsistent with the state budget or with any provision of state law or the Wisconsin Administrative Code.

APPENDIX A

Classification of Maintenance Activities

Travel Way

The table below defines travel way maintenance activities by category.

Routine Maintenance	Corrective Maintenance	Preventative Maintenance
Travel Way related work to include: Crack-sealing Patching alligator cracking Rut filling/wedging for safety Overlays to restore rideability (overlays not to exceed total average depth of 2"), and not to exceed 500' on length Seal coats Concrete joint repair limited to less than 10 locations (for instance) per lane mile Concrete crack repair limited to less than 10 locations (for instance) per lane mile Urgent repair of blow-ups, potholes and punchouts Sweeping pavement Traffic control (routine & emergency) Hazardous debris removal Surveillance Installation and replacement of long line and special pavement markings Routine sign replacements *Note: 500' does not include transitions	Travel Way related work to include: Overlays not to exceed an average depth of 2" to extend service life to the next improvement project Concrete Joint Repair Concrete patching and slab replacement Milling Diamond grinding Urgent repair of blow-ups, potholes and punchouts Asphaltic patching-full depth Patching alligator cracking and high severe cracking	Travel Way related work to include: Resurfacing PCC dowel bar retrofitting w/diamond grinding Asphaltic patching-full depth Concrete joint repair Concrete patching - partial and full depth Concrete Joint Repair Milling Diamond grinding

Shoulder

The table below defines maintenance activities by category for shoulders.

Routine Maintenance	Corrective Maintenance	Preventative Maintenance
<p>Shoulder related work to include:</p> <p>Maintaining gravel shoulders by regrading the existing shoulder material to correct grade and cross slope</p> <p>Adding material as needed to correct gravel shoulder grade and/or cross slope</p> <p>Repair washouts to gravel shoulders</p> <p>Patching potholes in asphalt shoulders</p> <p>Filling cracks in asphalt shoulders</p> <p>Seal coating asphaltic and shoulders</p> <p>Spot repair removal and repaving of asphalt shoulders limited to 500' in length</p> <p>Spot repair of concrete shoulder joints limited to less than 10 locations per mile</p>	<p>Shoulder related work to include:</p> <p>Maintaining gravel shoulders by regrading the existing shoulder material to correct grade and cross slope</p> <p>Adding material as needed to correct gravel shoulder grade and/or cross slope</p> <p>Repaving of asphalt shoulders to serve adequately until permanent improvement made</p> <p>Milling and repaving of asphalt shoulders</p> <p>Patching asphalt shoulders</p> <p>Slab replacement</p> <p>Grinding and asphalt overlay of concrete shoulders</p> <p>Spot repair of concrete shoulder joints</p> <p>Concrete patching – partial and full depth</p>	<p>Shoulder related work to include:</p> <p>Resurfacing of asphalt shoulders</p> <p>Removal and replacement of concrete shoulders</p> <p>Milling and repaving of asphalt shoulders</p> <p>Grinding and asphalt overlay of concrete shoulders</p> <p>Concrete patching – partial and full depth</p> <p>Slab replacement</p> <p>Patching asphalt shoulders</p>

Roadside and Roadside Facilities

The table below defines roadside and roadside facilities maintenance activities by category.

Routine Maintenance	Corrective Maintenance	Preventative Maintenance
Roadside and Roadside Facilities related work to include: Maintenance and operation of rest areas, picnic areas, historical markers, and scenic views Painting and cleaning of buildings Cleaning restrooms Litter removal Mowing and control of unwanted vegetation Repair of guard rails and end terminals Removal and treatment of roadside hazards Crack sealing ramps and parking Areas Patching ramps and parking areas Patching potholes	Roadside and Roadside Facilities related work to include: Overlays of ramps and parking areas not to exceed an average depth of 2" to extend service life to the next improvement project Patching ramps and parking areas Concrete Joint Repair of ramps and parking areas Milling and repaving of ramps and parking areas Grinding and asphalt overlay of ramps and parking areas	Roadside and Roadside Facilities related work to include: Milling and repaving Resurfacing Concrete joint repair of ramps and parking areas Concrete slab replacement of parking areas Patching ramps and parking areas

Drainage

The table below defines maintenance activities by category for drainage.

Routine Maintenance	Corrective Maintenance	Preventative Maintenance
Drainage related work to include: Spot replacement and repair of curb, gutter limited to 500' in length Riprap Cleaning, lining, repairing, of culverts Urgent repair or replacement of culverts/drainage structures Clean and minor repair to storm sewers Erosion Repair or establishment of erosion controls Reshaping drainage ditches and channels Clean or repair of catch basins or inlets Debris removal Repair of washouts Repair and restoration of slope and embankment failure Small culvert repair or replacement (under 5 ft diameter)	Drainage related work to include: Constructing new drainage channels or modification of drainage structures to increase drainage capacity Concrete Box Culvert replacement Concrete Box Culvert extensions Culvert lining Emergency culvert repair and/or replacement	Drainage related work to include: Large culvert pipe replacement (5 ft. diameter or larger)

Structures

The table below defines maintenance activity by category for structures.

Routine Maintenance	Corrective Maintenance	Preventative Maintenance
<p><i>Bridge deck work to include:</i></p> <p>Repair of epoxy overlays</p> <p>Spot deck repair</p> <p>Approach slab foam jacking or mud jacking</p> <p>Crack sealing</p> <p>Concrete deck sealing</p> <p>Minor joint repair or replacement</p> <p>Approach slabs repair</p> <p>Railing repair</p> <p>Deck sweeping and power washing of decks</p> <p><i>Superstructure and substructure work to include:</i></p> <p>Minor repair of substructures and superstructures, including spot painting</p> <p>Power washing of superstructure and substructure units</p> <p>Bearing repair or replacement</p> <p><i>Channel, waterway, and other structure related work to include:</i></p> <p>Operation and maintenance of movable bridges</p> <p>Ferry operations and maintenance including approaches</p> <p>Traffic control for structure/bridge inspection</p> <p>Clearing brush and unwanted vegetation around structures</p> <p>Debris removal from waterway</p> <p>Placing rip-rap (small quantity or shallow channel)</p>	<p><i>Bridge deck work to include:</i></p> <p>Approach slab replacement</p> <p>Thin deck overlays and membrane installation</p> <p>Asphalt overlays without membrane installation</p> <p>Major joint replacement</p> <p>Epoxy overlays</p> <p><i>Superstructure and substructure work to include:</i></p> <p>Wing wall replacement</p> <p>Emergency bridge repair</p> <p>Bearing repair or replacement</p> <p><i>Channel, waterway and other structure related work to include:</i></p> <p>Slope protection installation and repair</p> <p>Slope paving repair</p>	<p><i>Bridge deck work to include:</i></p> <p>Concrete deck repair, patching and concrete overlays</p> <p>Asphalt overlays with membrane installation</p> <p>Epoxy and polymer overlays</p> <p>Expansion joint replacement when done in conjunction with an overlay or expansion joint elimination</p> <p>Chloride extraction</p> <p>Installation of a cathodic protection system</p> <p><i>Superstructure and substructure work to include:</i></p> <p>Steel structure cleaning and repainting, including complete repainting, zone painting, and spot painting with overcoat</p> <p>Structural repairs (except vehicle damage)</p> <p>Bearing repair or replacement</p> <p><i>Channel, waterway, and other structure related work to include:</i></p> <p>Rip placement (large quantity or deep channel)</p>

Slope paving repair		
---------------------	--	--

Winter

The table below defines maintenance activities by category for winter.

Routine Maintenance	Corrective Maintenance	Preventative Maintenance
Winter related work to include: All activities, equipment and materials related to snow and ice control Plowing Applying deicers Cleaning up after storms and benching Erecting snow fences Equipment preparation and calibration Thawing culverts and inlets Loading, cleaning, maintenance, and inspection of salt sheds Clearing drainage ways Clearing snow covered signs Emergency assistance Training personnel		

2013-15 Highway Maintenance and Traffic Operation Program Plan

Item 1: Setting the Routine Maintenance Levels for CY 2014 and CY 2015

Fiscal Year	Budget Amount	CY13 RMA	CY 14 RMA	CY15 RMA
2014	\$ 122,500,000	\$ 62,500,000	\$ 60,000,000	-
2015	\$ 170,000,000	-	\$ 85,000,000	\$ 85,000,000
2016	?	-	-	-
Subtotal			\$ 145,000,000	

The table above provides a recommended distribution of the 2013-15 biennial budget amounts for routine maintenance. FY 2014 provides funding for the second half of the CY 2013 RMA and the first half of the CY 2014 RMA and so forth for FY 2015.

The imbalance in the fiscal year funding levels necessitates an imbalancing of the CY 2014 RMA and suggests that expanded routine maintenance work would need to be scheduled for June 2014 and beyond. The first portion of CY 2014 would be confined to winter maintenance activities and to a constrained level of non-winter activities (sign replacement, beam guard repair, culvert inspection, etc).

A budget of \$145 M is proposed for the CY 2014 routine maintenance program with funding used as follows:

- (1) Provide \$132 M (about a 10% across-the-board increase) to the LOS Model and distribute this amount through the existing LOS model allocation methodology;
- (2) Establish a \$ 4 M contingency fund for discretionary distribution by the individual regions to address urgent or unforeseen emerging needs; and,
- (3) Create a \$ 9 M fund to finance new initiatives under a performance-based contracting method or through an expanded use of a regional county service provider.

A suggested allocation of the \$ 9 M budget is to devote \$ 1.0 M to winter initiatives (like expanded anti-icing efforts under either a regionalized approach or a performance-based contract or both).

A second component would be to employ a \$2.0 M budget to pilot specific performance-based initiatives either in each region or for a defined set of routine maintenance treatments or both.

Lastly, a \$ 6.0 M budget would be assigned to the financing of a number of regionalized service delivery efforts (like increased pavement marking and sweeping; specialized bridge maintenance crews; culvert inspection teams; pavement treatment – crack filling/seal coating).

CY 2014 Performance-Based Maintenance Illustration

This document further explains how \$ 9M set aside to finance pilot projects employing either a performance-based contract or an expanded use of regionalized routine maintenance service delivery could be structured. The table below offers suggested levels of effort for candidate activities.

Routine Maintenance Activity (General Priority)	Range of Dollar Amount
<u>Bridge/Structure Maintenance</u> → More existing structure maintenance → Initiate an ancillary structure inventory/inspection effort → Culvert repair, lining & replacement → Bridge deck sealing → Steel girder pressure washing	\$ 1.0 to \$ 2.0 M
<u>Pavement Maintenance</u> → More seal coats & crack filling → High performance	\$ 2.0 to \$ 3.0 M
<u>Winter Maintenance</u> → Initiate anti-icing for critical corridors	Up to \$0.5 M
<u>Pavement Marking</u> → More regionalized pavement marking	\$ 1.0 to \$ 2.0 M
<u>Sign Replacement</u> → Expand effort through regionalized approach	\$ 1.0 to \$2.0 M
<u>Other</u> → Noxious Weeds → Invasive Species (regional rapid-response)	\$ 0.1 to \$0.2 M

The objectives are to offer better value for the investment by providing an equivalent or better service level than current practice and to contain or reduce the total cost of routine highway maintenance. **General** measures of effectiveness to be applied to each project will include cost per unit, timeliness of repair/response, quality of project reporting & cost accounting, and system condition. More specific measures of effectiveness will be developed for each individual project.

To illustrate, the table below provides more details on the *specific* activities envisioned to be a part of this larger pilot project effort and includes a description of the activity, a listing of the related pilot project goals and specific details related to the pilot projects implementation or delivery, and a preliminary listing of the measures of effectiveness to be applied to the project results.

Asphalt Pavement Seal Coats

Description	Pilot Goals/Detail	Measurement
Coatings to protect further oxidation and environmental effects to low volume asphalt highways.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance based contract • Lane mile payment method • Transport/Field Manager • Follow standard specifications • May follow crack seal application • Limited to specific road classification with specific (lower) ADT threshold • Specific PCI number to ensure the treatment is applied at the correct time of the pavement service life. • Explore alternative/innovative materials and application techniques (double seal, oil types, slag/aggregate materials) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost/Lane Mile • Field Verification/Inspection upon completion of work and one year following completion (Model after COI—Construction Quality Index) • Compare to private delivered in both cost and quality.

Bridge/Structure Maintenance

Description	Pilot Goals/Detail	Measurement
Implement a culvert inventory/inspection (condition assessment) program.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance based contract • Cost per structure (culvert) • Lump Sum /Yearly Contract • Trailing requirement • Payment after inspections are completed and data entered into DOT system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall goal is to improve the condition of culverts • On-Time Inspections – Consider Incentive/disincentive • DOT staff verification of inspections similar to COMPASS program.
Bridge repair of inspection maintenance recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure follow through of bridge inspector repair recommendations • Prioritized list of list provided along with repair due dates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall goal is to increase responsiveness and accountability of bridge repairs • Track on-time/delinquent repairs • Percentage of repairs on-time based on priority category.

Winter Anti-Icing

Description	Pilot Goals/Detail	Measurement
Anti-icing is the practice of spraying brine or other liquid onto the pavement in advance of a frost, ice or winter event. Currently we have an inconsistent patchwork of anti-icing applied to the statesystem.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance based contract • Cost structure TBD • Consider Regional/Route Approach • Set operational expectations/specifications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall goal is to improve winter safety and service and reduce overall winter costs, • Compare crash rates

2013-15 Highway Maintenance and Traffic Operation Program Plan

Item 2: Performance-based Study Effort and Timetable

The underlying premise of the Performance-based study structure and outreach plan is a desire to employ as many existing forums and committees to support the effort which in turn offers the opportunity for the broadest participation from the counties. As a complement to this structure, an active outreach program is proposed. This outreach would involve regular attendance and occasional status reports or presentations at monthly WCHA Board of Director meetings as well as at monthly meetings held at the regional level.

An oversight group composed of both department and county managers is proposed. Suggested DOT participants include: John Corbin, Russ Habeck, Rory Rhinesmith, and a regional operations manager. WCHA will appoint its four members. Dave Vieth will serve as the project manager.

Three separate work groups will report to the project manager: (1) Operations (team lead: Todd Matheson); (2) Administration (team lead: Mark Woltmann); and, (3) Evaluation (team lead: Scott Bush). The work groups will be supported by an existing WCHA or DOT committee or advisory team (WCHA – Level of Service Committee; WCHA – Machinery Management Committee; and, COT's Compass Advisory Team).

A suggested timetable for establishing and conducting the effort is as follows:

July 2013	Make Overview Presentation at WCHA Board Meeting
August 2013	Convene first meeting of the Oversight Team (Agenda Topics: Timeline; Study Goals; Workgroup Role and Responsibilities; Findings from Literature Search and Other State Contacts; Initial Committee Reactions and Concerns)
Sept. 2013	Provide Overview at Maintenance Conference and Patrol Superintendent Conference and at scheduled Machinery Management Committee Meeting Convene Operations and Administration Workgroup and establish meeting schedule
Oct. 2013	Oversight Group Meeting Status Report to WCHA Board; Commission Training; Machinery Mgmt
Nov. 2013	
Dec. 2013	Oversight Group Meeting Status Report to WCHA Board and Machinery Management
Jan. 2014	Presentation at WCHA Conference

Convene Evaluation Workgroup and establish meeting schedule

Feb. 2014	Oversight Group Meeting
	Commissioner Training Presentation (?)
March 2014	Commissioner Training Presentation (?)
April 2014	Oversight Group Meeting
May 2014	Compass Advisory Team Meeting Presentation
June 2014	Presentation at WCHA Conference

7-5

	GENERAL TRANSPORTATION AIDS (GTA)					ROUTINE MAINTENANCE AGREEMENTS (RMA)					TOTAL TWO YEAR INCREASE (CY14 & CY15) OVER CY 2013 AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)**
	CY 2013 GTA ALLOCATION	CY 2014 GTA ALLOCATION AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)*	CY 2015 GTA INCREASE AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)*	CY 2015 GTA ALLOCATION AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)*	PERCENTAGE CHANGE OVER 2014 AS APPROVED BY JFC	CY 2013 RMA CONTRACT ALLOCATION	CY 2014 RMA CONTRACT ALLOCATION AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)**	INCREASE OVER CY 2013 CONTRACTS AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)**	CY 2015 RMA CONTRACT ALLOCATION AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)**	INCREASE OVER CY 2014 CONTRACTS AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)**	
Adams	\$1,389,345	\$1,389,345	\$55,574	\$1,444,919	4.0%	\$608,200	\$733,359	\$125,159	\$845,227	\$111,868	\$362,186
Ashland	\$420,761	\$420,761	\$16,830	\$437,591	4.0%	\$811,580	\$978,591	\$167,011	\$1,127,868	\$149,277	\$483,299
Barron	\$1,023,292	\$1,023,292	\$40,932	\$1,064,224	4.0%	\$1,337,280	\$1,612,473	\$275,193	\$1,858,443	\$245,970	\$796,356
Bayfield	\$588,760	\$588,760	\$23,550	\$612,310	4.0%	\$961,560	\$1,159,435	\$197,875	\$1,336,298	\$176,863	\$572,613
Brown	\$3,743,420	\$3,743,420	\$149,737	\$3,893,157	4.0%	\$2,978,800	\$3,591,794	\$612,994	\$4,139,695	\$547,901	\$1,773,888
Buffalo	\$680,631	\$680,631	\$27,225	\$707,856	4.0%	\$957,560	\$1,130,496	\$192,936	\$1,302,945	\$172,449	\$558,321
Burnett	\$485,721	\$485,721	\$19,429	\$505,150	4.0%	\$684,740	\$825,650	\$140,910	\$951,596	\$125,947	\$407,766
Calumet	\$839,157	\$839,157	\$33,566	\$872,723	4.0%	\$628,300	\$757,595	\$129,295	\$873,160	\$115,565	\$374,155
Chippewa	\$1,408,944	\$1,408,944	\$56,358	\$1,465,302	4.0%	\$2,152,300	\$2,595,212	\$442,912	\$2,991,092	\$395,880	\$1,281,704
Clark	\$620,833	\$620,833	\$24,833	\$645,666	4.0%	\$1,188,420	\$1,432,980	\$244,560	\$1,651,570	\$218,590	\$707,709
Columbia	\$1,362,670	\$1,362,670	\$54,507	\$1,417,177	4.0%	\$3,484,100	\$4,201,077	\$716,977	\$4,841,919	\$640,842	\$2,074,797
Crawford	\$610,851	\$610,851	\$24,434	\$635,285	4.0%	\$1,217,100	\$1,467,562	\$250,462	\$1,691,427	\$223,865	\$724,788
Dane	\$3,481,967	\$3,481,967	\$139,279	\$3,621,246	4.0%	\$5,888,900	\$7,100,759	\$1,211,859	\$8,183,915	\$1,083,165	\$3,506,866
Dodge	\$2,852,472	\$2,852,472	\$114,099	\$2,966,571	4.0%	\$1,911,390	\$2,304,618	\$393,228	\$2,656,170	\$351,552	\$1,138,187
Door	\$993,376	\$993,376	\$39,735	\$1,033,111	4.0%	\$1,507,200	\$1,817,360	\$310,160	\$2,094,584	\$277,224	\$897,544
Douglas	\$908,352	\$908,352	\$36,334	\$944,686	4.0%	\$1,505,060	\$1,814,779	\$309,719	\$2,091,610	\$276,831	\$896,270
Dunn	\$1,494,522	\$1,494,522	\$59,781	\$1,554,303	4.0%	\$1,721,600	\$2,075,880	\$354,280	\$2,392,540	\$316,660	\$1,023,220
Eau Claire	\$2,191,162	\$2,191,162	\$87,646	\$2,278,808	4.0%	\$1,843,080	\$2,222,359	\$379,279	\$2,561,363	\$339,004	\$1,097,562
Florence	\$213,196	\$213,196	\$8,528	\$221,724	4.0%	\$424,500	\$511,856	\$87,356	\$589,936	\$78,080	\$252,792
Fond du Lac	\$1,780,904	\$1,780,904	\$71,236	\$1,852,140	4.0%	\$1,961,200	\$2,364,786	\$403,586	\$2,725,517	\$360,730	\$1,167,903

9-2

*NOTE: These are estimates only and are intended ONLY to provide a general indication of what counties may experience over a two year funding period. These numbers have not been confirmed by WisDOT. Additionally, because GTA payments are distributed using a cost-based formula, each county's specific allocation may change year over year despite no change in total state funding. Therefore, the actual dollar amount GTA increase a county receives in both CY14 and CY15 may deviate from these estimates. These estimates are based on action by the Legislature's Joint Finance Committee, which calls for level GTA funding in CY14 and an approximately 4.0% increase in CY15. The full Legislature must still act on the budget prior to these provisions taking effect.

**NOTE: These are estimates only and are intended ONLY to provide a general indication of what counties may experience over a two year funding period. These numbers have not been confirmed by WisDOT. Additionally, because RMA contracts are calculated using a cost-based formula, each county's specific allocation may change year over year despite no change in total state funding. As a result, the 2013 LOS model can not necessarily be assumed to serve as an accurate predictor of 2014 LOS calculations. Further, because contracts are based on a calendar year basis and the funding increases provided for by the Joint Finance Committee's action are allocated on a fiscal year basis, there are numerous ways to allocate the \$52.5 million RMA increase over a two year period. This distribution assumes an increase of \$2.5 million in FY13 and \$50 million in FY14 for total funding of \$147.5 million in CY14 and \$170 million in CY15; however, the specific allocation of the funding may deviate from these estimates. Additionally, while these increases have been approved by the Joint Finance Committee, the full Legislature must still act on the budget prior to them becoming effective.

	GENERAL TRANSPORTATION AIDS (GTA)					ROUTINE MAINTENANCE AGREEMENTS (RMA)					TOTAL TWO YEAR INCREASE (CY14 & CY15) OVER CY 2013 AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)**
	CY 2013 GTA ALLOCATION BY JFC (EST.)*	CY 2014 GTA ALLOCATION AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)*	CY 2015 GTA INCREASE AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)*	CY 2015 GTA ALLOCATION AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)*	PERCENTAGE CHANGE OVER 2014 AS APPROVED BY JFC	CY 2013 RMA CONTRACT ALLOCATION BY JFC (EST.)**	CY 2014 RMA CONTRACT ALLOCATION AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)**	INCREASE OVER CY 2013 AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)**	CY 2015 RMA CONTRACT ALLOCATION AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)**	INCREASE OVER CY 2014 AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)**	
Forest	\$275,838	\$275,838	\$11,034	\$286,872	4.0%	\$934,100	\$1,126,324	\$192,224	\$1,298,136	\$171,812	\$556,261
Grant	\$1,360,272	\$1,360,272	\$54,411	\$1,414,683	4.0%	\$1,756,400	\$2,117,842	\$361,442	\$2,440,902	\$323,061	\$1,045,944
Green	\$934,727	\$934,727	\$37,389	\$972,116	4.0%	\$868,400	\$1,047,104	\$178,704	\$1,206,832	\$159,728	\$317,136
Green Lake	\$786,938	\$786,938	\$31,478	\$818,416	4.0%	\$469,500	\$566,116	\$96,616	\$652,473	\$86,357	\$279,589
Iowa	\$909,426	\$909,426	\$36,377	\$945,803	4.0%	\$1,317,400	\$1,588,502	\$271,102	\$1,830,816	\$242,314	\$784,517
Iron	\$316,387	\$316,387	\$12,655	\$329,042	4.0%	\$931,400	\$1,123,069	\$191,669	\$1,294,384	\$171,316	\$554,653
Jackson	\$767,929	\$767,929	\$30,717	\$798,646	4.0%	\$1,554,740	\$1,874,683	\$319,943	\$2,160,652	\$285,969	\$925,854
Jefferson	\$1,560,008	\$1,560,008	\$62,400	\$1,622,408	4.0%	\$1,794,700	\$2,164,023	\$369,323	\$2,494,128	\$330,105	\$1,068,752
Juneau	\$788,119	\$788,119	\$31,525	\$819,644	4.0%	\$1,570,000	\$1,893,083	\$323,083	\$2,181,859	\$288,775	\$934,942
Kenosha	\$2,552,405	\$2,552,405	\$102,096	\$2,654,501	4.0%	\$2,804,000	\$3,381,022	\$577,022	\$3,896,772	\$515,749	\$1,669,794
Kewaunee	\$811,561	\$811,561	\$32,462	\$844,023	4.0%	\$379,700	\$457,837	\$78,137	\$527,676	\$69,840	\$226,113
La Crosse	\$1,523,354	\$1,523,354	\$60,934	\$1,584,288	4.0%	\$1,703,900	\$2,054,538	\$350,638	\$2,367,942	\$313,404	\$1,014,680
Lafayette	\$615,252	\$615,252	\$24,610	\$639,862	4.0%	\$836,300	\$1,008,398	\$172,098	\$1,162,222	\$153,823	\$498,020
Langlade	\$612,085	\$612,085	\$24,483	\$636,568	4.0%	\$854,800	\$1,030,705	\$175,905	\$1,187,932	\$157,226	\$509,037
Lincoln	\$1,025,949	\$1,025,949	\$41,038	\$1,066,987	4.0%	\$1,268,700	\$1,529,780	\$261,080	\$1,763,136	\$233,356	\$755,516
Manitowoc	\$1,357,726	\$1,357,726	\$54,309	\$1,412,035	4.0%	\$1,610,800	\$1,942,279	\$331,479	\$2,238,559	\$296,280	\$939,238
Marathon	\$2,914,009	\$2,914,009	\$116,560	\$3,030,569	4.0%	\$3,047,000	\$3,674,028	\$627,028	\$4,234,473	\$560,445	\$1,814,502
Marquette	\$1,159,060	\$1,159,060	\$46,362	\$1,205,422	4.0%	\$1,575,100	\$1,899,233	\$324,133	\$2,188,946	\$289,713	\$937,979
Marquette	\$692,872	\$692,872	\$27,715	\$720,587	4.0%	\$787,700	\$949,797	\$162,097	\$1,094,682	\$144,884	\$469,079
Menominee	\$175,776	\$175,776	\$7,031	\$182,807	4.0%	\$246,800	\$297,588	\$50,788	\$342,983	\$45,395	\$146,970

*NOTE: These are estimates only and are intended ONLY to provide a general indication of what counties may experience over a two year funding period. These numbers have not been confirmed by WisDOT. Additionally, because GTA payments are distributed using a cost-based formula, each county's specific allocation may change year over year despite no change in total state funding. Therefore, the actual dollar amount GTA increase a county receives in both CY14 and CY15 may deviate from these estimates. These estimates are based on action by the Legislature's Joint Finance Committee, which calls for level GTA funding in CY14 and an approximately 4.0% increase in CY15. The full Legislature must still act on the budget prior to these provisions taking effect.

**NOTE: These are estimates only and are intended ONLY to provide a general indication of what counties may experience over a two year funding period. These numbers have not been confirmed by WisDOT. Additionally, because RMA contracts are calculated using a cost-based formula, each county's specific allocation may change year over year despite no change in total state funding. As a result, the 2013 LOS model can not necessarily be assumed to serve as an accurate predictor of 2014 LOS calculations. Further, because contracts are based on a calendar year basis and the funding increases provided for by the Joint Finance Committee's action are allocated on a fiscal year basis, there are numerous ways to allocate the \$52.5 million RMA increase over a two year period. This distribution assumes an increase of \$2.5 million in FY13 and \$50 million in FY14 for total funding of \$147.5 million in CY14 and \$170 million in CY15; however, the specific allocation of the funding may deviate from these estimates. Additionally, while these increases have been approved by the Joint Finance Committee, the full Legislature must still act on the budget prior to them becoming effective.

	GENERAL TRANSPORTATION AIDS (GTA)					ROUTINE MAINTENANCE AGREEMENTS (RMA)					TOTAL TWO YEAR INCREASE (CY14 & CY15) OVER CY 2013 AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)**
	CY 2013 GTA ALLOCATION	CY 2014 GTA ALLOCATION AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)*	CY 2015 GTA INCREASE AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)*	CY 2015 GTA ALLOCATION AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)*	PERCENTAGE CHANGE OVER 2014 AS APPROVED BY JFC	CY 2013 RMA CONTRACT ALLOCATION	CY 2014 RMA CONTRACT ALLOCATION AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)**	INCREASE OVER CY 2013 AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)**	CY 2015 RMA CONTRACT ALLOCATION AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)**	INCREASE OVER CY 2014 AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)**	
Milwaukee	\$3,465,998	\$3,465,998	\$138,640	\$3,604,638	4.0%	\$12,304,600	\$14,836,708	\$2,532,108	\$17,099,935	\$2,263,227	\$7,327,443
Monroe	\$1,000,379	\$1,000,379	\$40,015	\$1,040,394	4.0%	\$1,979,000	\$2,386,249	\$407,249	\$2,750,254	\$364,004	\$1,178,503
Oconto	\$1,014,629	\$1,014,629	\$40,585	\$1,055,214	4.0%	\$1,505,200	\$1,814,948	\$309,748	\$2,091,805	\$276,857	\$896,353
Oneida	\$901,681	\$901,681	\$36,067	\$937,748	4.0%	\$1,374,000	\$1,656,749	\$282,749	\$1,909,474	\$252,724	\$818,223
Outagamie	\$2,503,957	\$2,503,957	\$100,158	\$2,604,115	4.0%	\$1,753,700	\$2,114,586	\$360,886	\$2,437,150	\$322,564	\$1,044,336
Ozaukee	\$1,262,652	\$1,262,652	\$50,506	\$1,313,158	4.0%	\$1,164,500	\$1,404,137	\$239,637	\$1,618,328	\$214,190	\$693,465
Pepin	\$334,577	\$334,577	\$13,383	\$347,960	4.0%	\$391,000	\$471,462	\$80,462	\$543,380	\$71,918	\$232,842
Pierce	\$882,580	\$882,580	\$35,303	\$917,883	4.0%	\$1,407,320	\$1,696,926	\$289,606	\$1,955,779	\$258,853	\$838,065
Polk	\$1,235,868	\$1,235,868	\$49,435	\$1,285,303	4.0%	\$1,106,960	\$1,334,756	\$227,796	\$1,538,363	\$203,607	\$659,199
Portage	\$1,577,234	\$1,577,234	\$63,089	\$1,640,323	4.0%	\$1,888,500	\$2,277,126	\$388,626	\$2,624,484	\$347,358	\$1,124,610
Price	\$678,182	\$678,182	\$27,127	\$705,309	4.0%	\$1,036,900	\$1,250,279	\$213,379	\$1,440,999	\$190,721	\$617,478
Racine	\$2,198,008	\$2,198,008	\$87,920	\$2,285,928	4.0%	\$2,720,400	\$3,280,219	\$559,819	\$3,780,591	\$500,372	\$1,620,010
Richland	\$568,372	\$568,372	\$22,735	\$591,107	4.0%	\$1,008,600	\$1,216,155	\$207,555	\$1,401,670	\$185,515	\$600,626
Rock	\$1,872,749	\$1,872,749	\$74,910	\$1,947,659	4.0%	\$2,123,700	\$2,560,727	\$437,027	\$2,951,346	\$390,619	\$1,264,673
Rusk	\$595,447	\$595,447	\$23,818	\$619,265	4.0%	\$613,160	\$739,339	\$126,179	\$852,120	\$112,781	\$365,139
Saint Croix	\$1,675,094	\$1,675,094	\$67,004	\$1,742,098	4.0%	\$2,235,500	\$2,695,533	\$460,033	\$3,106,717	\$411,183	\$1,331,250
Sauk	\$1,293,074	\$1,293,074	\$51,723	\$1,344,797	4.0%	\$1,771,400	\$2,135,928	\$364,528	\$2,461,748	\$325,820	\$1,054,876
Sawyer	\$779,240	\$779,240	\$31,170	\$810,410	4.0%	\$1,058,080	\$1,275,818	\$217,738	\$1,470,34	\$194,616	\$630,091
Shawano	\$1,231,063	\$1,231,063	\$49,243	\$1,280,306	4.0%	\$1,494,500	\$1,789,989	\$305,489	\$2,063,038	\$273,049	\$884,026
Sheboygan	\$2,484,907	\$2,484,907	\$99,396	\$2,584,303	4.0%	\$1,794,400	\$2,163,661	\$369,261	\$2,493,712	\$330,050	\$1,066,573

*NOTE: These are estimates only and are intended ONLY to provide a general indication of what counties may experience over a two year funding period. These numbers have not been confirmed by WisDOT. Additionally, because GTA payments are distributed using a cost-based formula, each county's specific allocation may change year over year despite no change in total state funding. Therefore, the actual dollar amount GTA increase a county receives in both CY14 and CY15 may deviate from these estimates. These estimates are based on action by the Legislature's Joint Finance Committee, which calls for level GTA funding in CY14 and an approximately 4.0% increase in CY15. The full Legislature must still act on the budget prior to these provisions taking effect.

**NOTE: These are estimates only and are intended ONLY to provide a general indication of what counties may experience over a two year funding period. These numbers have not been confirmed by WisDOT. Additionally, because RMA contracts are calculated using a cost-based formula, each county's specific allocation may change year over year despite no change in total state funding. As a result, the 2013 LOS model can not necessarily be assumed to serve as an accurate predictor of 2014 LOS calculations. Further, because contracts are based on a calendar year basis and the funding increases provided for by the Joint Finance Committee's action are allocated on a fiscal year basis, there are numerous ways to allocate the \$52.5 million RMA increase over a two year period. This distribution assumes an increase of \$2.5 million in FY13 and \$50 million in FY14 for total funding of \$147.5 million in CY14 and \$170 million in CY15; however, the specific allocation of the funding may deviate from these estimates. Additionally, while these increases have been approved by the Joint Finance Committee, the full Legislature must still act on the budget prior to them becoming effective.

25

27

	GENERAL TRANSPORTATION AIDS (GTA)					ROUTINE MAINTENANCE AGREEMENTS (RMA)					TOTAL TWO YEAR INCREASE (CY14 & CY15) OVER CY 2013 AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)**
	CY 2013 GTA ALLOCATION	CY 2014 GTA ALLOCATION AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)*	CY 2015 GTA INCREASE AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)*	CY 2015 GTA ALLOCATION AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)*	PERCENTAGE CHANGE OVER 2014 AS APPROVED BY JFC	CY 2013 RMA CONTRACT ALLOCATION	CY 2014 RMA CONTRACT ALLOCATION AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)**	INCREASE OVER 2013 CONTRACTS AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)**	CY 2015 RMA CONTRACT ALLOCATION AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)**	INCREASE OVER CY 2014 CONTRACTS AS APPROVED BY JFC (EST.)**	
Taylor	\$609,099	\$609,099	\$24,364	\$633,463	4.0%	\$655,600	\$790,513	\$134,913	\$911,100	\$120,587	\$390,413
Trempealeau	\$820,334	\$820,334	\$32,813	\$853,147	4.0%	\$1,306,420	\$1,575,262	\$268,842	\$1,815,557	\$240,294	\$777,979
Vernon	\$1,221,939	\$1,221,939	\$48,878	\$1,270,817	4.0%	\$1,285,500	\$1,550,037	\$264,537	\$1,786,484	\$236,446	\$765,521
Vilas	\$897,578	\$897,578	\$35,903	\$933,481	4.0%	\$1,043,500	\$1,258,237	\$214,737	\$1,450,172	\$191,934	\$621,409
Walworth	\$2,028,172	\$2,028,172	\$81,127	\$2,109,299	4.0%	\$2,381,300	\$2,871,337	\$490,037	\$3,309,338	\$438,001	\$1,418,074
Washburn	\$878,039	\$878,039	\$35,122	\$913,161	4.0%	\$1,177,440	\$1,419,740	\$242,300	\$1,636,311	\$216,571	\$701,171
Washington	\$2,005,086	\$2,005,086	\$80,203	\$2,085,289	4.0%	\$2,179,500	\$2,628,009	\$448,509	\$3,028,892	\$400,883	\$1,297,902
Waukesha	\$4,449,344	\$4,449,344	\$177,974	\$4,627,318	4.0%	\$4,631,000	\$5,583,993	\$952,993	\$6,435,788	\$851,795	\$2,757,781
Waupaca	\$1,581,530	\$1,581,530	\$63,261	\$1,644,791	4.0%	\$1,740,900	\$2,099,132	\$358,232	\$2,419,362	\$320,210	\$1,036,714
Waushara	\$791,757	\$791,757	\$31,670	\$823,427	4.0%	\$1,023,300	\$1,233,880	\$210,580	\$1,422,099	\$188,219	\$609,380
Winnebago	\$1,866,226	\$1,866,226	\$74,649	\$1,940,875	4.0%	\$2,630,800	\$3,413,338	\$582,538	\$3,934,016	\$520,679	\$1,685,754
Wood	\$1,680,780	\$1,680,780	\$67,231	\$1,748,011	4.0%	\$1,286,000	\$1,550,640	\$264,640	\$1,787,178	\$236,538	\$765,819

*NOTE: These are estimates only and are intended ONLY to provide a general indication of what counties may experience over a two year funding period. These numbers have not been confirmed by WisDOT. Additionally, because GTA payments are distributed using a cost-based formula, each county's specific allocation may change year over year despite no change in total state funding. Therefore, the actual dollar amount GTA increase a county receives in both CY14 and CY15 may deviate from these estimates. These estimates are based on action by the Legislature's Joint Finance Committee, which calls for level GTA funding in CY14 and an approximately 4.0% increase in CY15. The full Legislature must still act on the budget prior to these provisions taking effect.

**NOTE: These are estimates only and are intended ONLY to provide a general indication of what counties may experience over a two year funding period. These numbers have not been confirmed by WisDOT. Additionally, because RMA contracts are calculated using a cost-based formula, each county's specific allocation may change year over year despite no change in total state funding. As a result, the 2013 LOS model can not necessarily be assumed to serve as an accurate predictor of 2014 LOS calculations. Further, because contracts are based on a calendar year basis and the funding increases provided for by the Joint Finance Committee's action are allocated on a fiscal year basis, there are numerous ways to allocate the \$52.5 million RMA increase over a two year period. This distribution assumes an increase of \$2.5 million in FY13 and \$50 million in FY14 for total funding of \$147.5 million in CY14 and \$170 million in CY15; however, the specific allocation of the funding may deviate from these estimates. Additionally, while these increases have been approved by the Joint Finance Committee, the full Legislature must still act on the budget prior to them becoming effective.

Blank

7-50

	A	B	C	G
1	IOWA COUNTY HIGHWAY	CRH		
2				
3	BUDGET SUMMARY	Adopted 2013 0%	Proposed 2014	2014-2013 Difference
4				
5	REVENUE			
6	Local Bridge Aids -50-50 Bridge Program	118,640.20	75,000.00	(43,640.20)
7	CRP Payments	-	-	-
8	General Transportation Aids	947,322.00	909,426.00	(37,896.00)
9	Flood Damage Aids	-	?	#VALUE!
10	STHS-Routine Maintenance & Construction	412,500.00	412,500.00	-
11	State AVL/GPS Maintenance	-	-	-
12	State AVL/GPS Communicatons	2,500.00	2,500.00	-
13	State Roadside Maintenance	280,000.00	280,000.00	-
14	State Road & Bridge Construction	-	-	-
15	State Supervision	90,000.00	90,000.00	-
16	State On-System Bridge	40,000.00	40,000.00	-
17	State Discretionary Maintenance - Paint	425,000.00	390,000.00	(35,000.00)
18	State Local Force Accounts	-	-	-
19	STHS-Winter Maintenance	540,000.00	540,000.00	-
20	State Overtime Reimbursement	-	-	-
21	State Salt Storage Reimbursement	4,400.00	4,400.00	-
22	State Equipment Storage Reimbursement	55,500.00	55,500.00	-
23	Local Government	675,000.00	675,000.00	-
24	Department of Justice Radio Grant	-	-	-
25	Radio & GPL Reimbursement	10,800.00	10,800.00	-
26	LRIP Administration Fees	-	-	-
27	Drug & Alcohol Testing	1,400.00	1,400.00	-
28	Rental Income	8,800.00	8,800.00	-
29	Sale or Trade In of Assets	-	-	-
30	CHIP Money Reimbursement - CTH G #11486	-	-	-
31	CHIP-D CTH B Project	-	-	-
32	CHIP Money Reimbursement - CTH W	-	-	-
33	CHIP-D Money Reimbursement - CTH T #11804	-	-	-
34	CHIP Money Reimbursement - CTH DD # 10287	142,971.89	-	(142,971.89)
35	DCOMM EECBG Grant	-	-	-
36	Capital Projects Fund - Insulation	-	-	-
37	Capital Projects Fund - Windows	-	-	-
38	Windows Carryforward	-	-	-
39	Fees Collected	4,700.00	4,700.00	-
40	Indirect Cost Revenues - Health Department	-	-	-
41	Vendor Refunds & Credits	-	-	-
42	Sale of Salvage & Waste Product	-	-	-
43	Insurance Recoveries	-	-	-
44	Donations - Fill/Concrete/Blacktop Chunks	-	-	-
45	Retained Fees Transfer	-	-	-
46	Transfers In	-	-	-
47	Capital Projects Reserve Fund (Bridges)	178,250.00	-	(178,250.00)
48				
49	TOTAL REVENUE	3,937,784.09	3,500,026.00	(437,758.09)
50				
51	EXPENDITURES			
52				
53	OPERATING EXPENDITURES:			
54	Administration	352,000.00	355,000.00	3,000.00
55	Administration-Patrol Supt.	180,000.00	175,000.00	(5,000.00)
56	Unallocated Wage and Benefit Increases	-	-	-
57	Fringe Benefits	1,300,000.00	1,200,000.00	(100,000.00)
58	Small Field Tools (Compressor, Tranny Flusher)	31,500.00	32,000.00	500.00
59	Shop Operations	250,000.00	225,000.00	(25,000.00)
60	Fuel Handling	17,500.00	17,500.00	-
61	Machinery Operation	1,700,000.00	1,800,000.00	100,000.00
62	Administration			-
63	Administration - Supt.			-
64	Small Field Tools			-
65	Shop Operations			-
66	Machinery Operation			-
67	Maintenance			-
68	Winter			-
69	Construction			-
70	County Bridge			-
71	State			-
72	Pit & Quarry			-
73	Bituminous Plant			-

SA-1

75

	A	B	C	G
1	IOWA COUNTY HIGHWAY	CRH		
2				
3	BUDGET SUMMARY	Adopted 2013 0%	Proposed 2014	2014-2013
4				Difference
74	Buildings & Grounds			-
75	Pit & Quarry Operation	205,000.00	205,000.00	-
76	Bituminous Operation	300,000.00	330,000.00	30,000.00
77	Buildings & Grounds	250,000.00	250,000.00	-
78	Major Repairs & Betterments	-	-	-
79	STHS-Routine Maintenance & Construction	825,000.00	825,000.00	-
80	STHS-Discretionary Maintenance - Paint	425,000.00	390,000.00	(35,000.00)
81	STHS-Winter Maintenance	540,000.00	540,000.00	-
82	STHS-Local Force Accounts	-	-	-
83	County Maintenance - Routine	638,000.00	640,000.00	2,000.00
84	Preventative Maintenance	697,400.00	875,000.00	177,600.00
85	Crackfilling (18 miles)	60,000.00	95,000.00	35,000.00
86	Sealcoating (26.8 miles @ 14,000/Mi)	325,600.00	375,000.00	49,400.00
87	Wedging (5000 ton)	240,000.00	330,000.00	90,000.00
88	Shouldering (30 miles @ \$2500/mi)	71,800.00	75,000.00	3,200.00
89	County Snow Removal	1,000,000.00	1,000,000.00	-
90	County Construction	524,000.00	-	(524,000.00)
91	County Bridge Maintenance	-	65,000.00	65,000.00
92	County Bridge Construction	352,480.00	330,000.00	(22,480.00)
93	** CTH K Williams' Creek Bridge Construction	234,000.00	76,000.00	(158,000.00)
94	** CTH E Bridge Design	50,880.00	25,000.00	(25,880.00)
95	CTH F Design	-	95,000.00	95,000.00
96	** CTH HK Bridge Design	14,200.00	134,000.00	119,800.00
97	** Clay Hill Road Design	3,400.00	-	(3,400.00)
98	50-50 Bridges	118,640.20	75,000.00	(43,640.20)
99	Other Local Governments	675,000.00	675,000.00	-
100	Radio	1,750.00	1,750.00	-
101	GPL	34,069.00	34,200.00	131.00
102	Total Operating Expense:	10,417,339.20	10,040,450.00	(376,889.20)
103	Purchase of Capital Items-see note 1 below			
104	DEPRECIATION	(512,149.00)	(403,000.00)	109,149.00
105	DEPLETION	-	-	-
106	TOTAL EXPENDITURES: CAPITAL ITEMS	(512,149.00)	(403,000.00)	109,149.00
107	Capital Items Purchases	382,450.00	553,000.00	170,550.00
108	Automated Scale	-	-	-
109	Fleet Management & Fuel System Upgrade	-	5,000.00	5,000.00
110	Bar Code Scanner	15,000.00	-	(15,000.00)
111	Quarry Fuel tank Replacement	-	-	-
112	Infra-structure Inventory tracking software	10,000.00	-	(10,000.00)
113	Salt Shed Roof Replacements	-	25,000.00	25,000.00
114	Asphalt Plant Repairs	-	-	-
115	Shop Heavy Duty Rotary Lift (Pickups)	6,500.00	-	(6,500.00)
116	Additional Shop Tools (Diagnostics, Welder)	-	5,000.00	5,000.00
117	Radio Upgrade Project	56,950.00	-	(56,950.00)
118	Rear & Side Mower (\$18,000/Set)	36,000.00	18,000.00	(18,000.00)
119	Front Vee Plow	-	-	-
120	Tractor Loader/Backhoe	-	105,000.00	105,000.00
121	Single axle truck	-	160,000.00	160,000.00
122	Dodgeville Shop Lighting	-	40,000.00	40,000.00
123	Tri-axle Truck Replacement	180,000.00	195,000.00	15,000.00
124	Autoflagger(s) / Message Boards	-	-	-
125	Agricultural Tractor (Replace #217)	78,000.00	-	(78,000.00)
126	TOTAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURES	(129,699.00)	150,000.00	279,699.00
127				
128	Less indirect costing			
129	Small field tools	(22,000.00)	(22,000.00)	-
130	Fuel Handling	(17,500.00)	(17,500.00)	-
131	Shop Operations	(250,000.00)	(225,000.00)	25,000.00
132	Pit & Quarry	(65,000.00)	(185,000.00)	(120,000.00)
133	Machinery	(1,700,000.00)	(1,800,000.00)	(100,000.00)
134	Fringe Benefit Recovery	(1,300,000.00)	(1,200,000.00)	100,000.00
135	Bituminous Operations	(300,000.00)	(330,000.00)	(30,000.00)
136	Building and Grounds	(250,000.00)	(250,000.00)	-
137				
138	TOTAL INDIRECT COSTING	(3,904,500.00)	(4,029,500.00)	(125,000.00)
139				
140				
141				
142	TOTAL EXPENDITURES Less Indirect Costing	6,383,140.20	6,160,950.00	(222,190.20)

8A-2

36

	A	B	C	G
1	IOWA COUNTY HIGHWAY	CRH		
2				
3	BUDGET SUMMARY	Adopted 2013 0%	Proposed 2014	2014-2013
4				Difference
143	Proposed by Department			-
144	Expenditures less Revenues = Tax Levy	2,445,356.00	2,660,924.00	215,568.00
145				-
146				-
147	ADOPTED BY COUNTY BOARD			-

8A-3

37

Blank

8A-4

REQUEST BY WCHA/WCA FOR REVISIONS TO CURRENT STATE HIGHWAY MOWING POLICY

BACKGROUND: The underfunding of State Highway Maintenance the past several years has forced the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) to make some very tough choices. One of those choices has been to severely cut back on maintaining vegetation in the State Highway right of way. The Wisconsin County Highway Association (WCHA) has expressed concern and communicated many of the consequences related to the current mowing policy to WisDOT.

It is our view that the decision to mow once per year is penny wise and pound-foolish. For example instead of mowing with turf grass equipment, highway departments now are forced to mow with large tractors that counties, in turn, bill to the state at four times the turfgrass equipment rate. Mowing this tall vegetation can be dangerous as operators are no longer able to see debris hidden in the grass and could be launched in an unpredictable manner. This situation poses a possible safety risk to both motorist and to our operators. Additionally, this debris can cause damage to county mowing equipment, causing local government to accrue additional costs to repair. Taller grass also hides from the operator's vision utility pedestals and vaults and, therefore, some have been hit and damaged by mowing operations. As a result, both the mowing operators and motoring public is put at additional risk of injury. Further more, the cut blades of grass become very long and difficult to manage. Counties often have to return to remove the cut grass that clogs drainage basins after a heavy rain.

Highway departments are permitted to mow vision triangles and areas within 300 feet of intersections and median openings more than once per season for safety reasons. In many cases, this creates a false sense of safety. Roadway geometry allows the un-mowed portions of medians to block vision. In this case, a one-size fits all policy is ineffective. County Highway Departments should be given the discretion to mow additional areas beyond what is prescribed for safety, at intervals consist with maintaining the height of the grass at less than 12 inches.

The other detrimental part of the mowing for only vision and safety is the viewpoint of the taxpayer. This policy leaves the public with the impression that local highway departments are not doing their jobs. Seeing mower tractors transiting from one intersection to another, past tall vegetation hardly demonstrates efficiency to the travelling public.

The decision to maintain right of way areas once per year with one pass does not allow counties the opportunity to address the spread of noxious weeds or invasive species within the right of way; reforestation of the right-of-ways; or eliminating tall grass in the fall of the year, which creates snow windrows. The invasive species and noxious weeds cause County Highway Departments to receive notices from the local weed commissioners requesting removal. WisDOT has always claimed that they are exempt from those local ordinances, which leave local

8E-1

39

Highway Departments with the responsibility to field the complaint calls and try to remedy the situation. Invasive species are not being mowed at a time that would hinder proliferation. Many rural right-of-ways become overrun with trees and brush that hinder a driver's ability to avoid collisions with wildlife. Evergreen trees shade highways during the winter season requiring additional salt usage to clear roads. Windstorms result in dead and diseased trees to drop on the highways making them impassable at times.

While the mowing policy is concerning to the WCHA statewide, there are greater concerns in urban areas. For the purposes of the mowing policy, we would define an urban area as any stretch of highway that has curb and gutter, or the entrance to an urban area. WCHA has long argued that a one size fits all policy often does not work. For example, WCHA has argued that it makes sense to require a higher standard of storm water management, thereby increasing costs, in urban areas. WisDOT's mowing policy needs to be tailored to serve the interests of taxpayers in urban and rural areas. It should not be a policy that attempts to fit a rural solution on an urban environment or vice versa.

We believe the state's decision to only mow the state's medians once per year has resulted in countless complaints from our citizens in urban areas and poses safety concerns. Since urban sections of highway are traditionally more compact and have more motorists and pedestrians in close proximity, the safety risk increases during the mowing process. In curb and gutter areas with storm sewer, the extremely long cut grass will wash into and clog the storm sewer systems. Once the grass gets into the storm sewer and clogs it, the rate for the sweeper truck to clean it out is \$70.50 an hour, another cost increase. Additionally, the impact of roadway floods can become a safety concern. Under the present DOT mowing policy, additional costs for traffic control and debris removal are being incurred. Finally the entrance to an urban area provides motorists with the first impression of that area; therefore the care taken at that entrance has the ability to affect the tourism economics of that area.

POSITION: WCHA supports a WisDOT policy that, at a minimum, would mow urban sections of highway once per month or when the vegetation reaches a height of 12 inches, whichever occurs first. Rural sections of the state highway system should be mowed a minimum of twice per year. Right-of-way to right-of-way mowing of rural sections should be done at least every third year to manage noxious weeds, invasive species and woody vegetation.