East Central builds relationships and cooperative, visionary growth strategies that keep our region beautiful, healthy, and prosperous.

October 25, 2019

Bridgewood Resort Hotel and Conference Center
1000 Cameron Way
Neenah, WI 54956
MEETING NOTICE

QUARTERLY COMMISSION MEETING

East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission

Place: Bridgewood Resort Hotel & Conference Center
1000 Cameron Way, Neenah, WI 54956

Date: Friday, October 25, 2019

Time: 1:15 p.m.

Please contact the East Central office if you are unable to attend and arrange for an alternate to be present.

AGENDA

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. MOMENT OF SILENT MEDITATION

III. ROLL CALL

A. Introduction of Alternates, and Guests

IV. STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH WIS. STATS. SEC. 19.84 REGARDING OPEN MEETING REQUIREMENTS

V. PUBLIC & GUEST COMMENT

VI. APPROVAL OF AGENDA / MOTION TO DEVIATE

VII. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE JULY 26, 2019 QUARTERLY MEETING

VIII. SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS – GUEST SPEAKERS

A. Mr. Lee Shirey, Economic Development Representative - U.S. Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration

B. Ms. Mary Forlenza, Team Leader, Program Development – U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration

C. Ms. Barb LaMue, Executive Director - New North, Inc.
IX. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS

A. Commissioner / Commission Announcements
B. Staff Announcements
C. Media Reports / Upcoming Events
D. 3rd Quarter Accomplishments Report
E. Other Announcements

X. BUSINESS

A. Steering Committee
   1. Acceptance of the Summaries of Proceedings for the June 27, 2019 Meeting
   2. Acceptance of the Summaries of Proceedings for the July 22, 2019 Meeting
   3. Acceptance of the Summaries of Proceedings for the August 28, 2019 Meeting
   5. 3rd Quarter 2019 Work Program Progress Report
   6. Update on 2020 Budget & Work Program Development
   7. Summary of 2020 Technical Assistance Project Requests

B. Economic Development Committee
   1. Acceptance of the Summary of Proceedings for the July 17, 2019 Meeting

C. Open Space and Environmental Management Committee
   1. Chairman’s Report

D. Community Facilities Committee
   1. Acceptance of the Summary of Proceedings for the June 12, 2019 Meeting

E. Transportation Committee
   1. Acceptance of the Summary of Proceedings for the July 9, 2019 Meeting
   2. Acceptance of FHWA Fox Cities/Appleton TMA Federal Certification Review
3. Proposed Resolution 26-19: Amending the Transportation Improvement Program for the Fox Cities Transportation Management Area - 2019

4. Proposed Resolution 27-19: Amending the Transportation Improvement Program for the Oshkosh Urbanized Area - 2019

5. Proposed Resolution 28-19: Approval of the Transportation Improvement Program for Fox Cities (Appleton) Transportation Management Area-2020
   Document can be viewed here: https://www.ecwrpc.org/programs/fox-cities-and-oshkosh-mpo/transportation-improvement-program/

6. Proposed Resolution 29-19: Approval of the Transportation Improvement Program For Oshkosh Urbanized Area-2020
   Document can be viewed here: https://www.ecwrpc.org/programs/fox-cities-and-oshkosh-mpo/transportation-improvement-program/


F. Regional Comprehensive Planning Committee

1. Acceptance of the Summary of Proceedings for the July 17, 2019 Meeting

XI. 2020-2023 ECWRPC STRATEGIC PLANNING

   A. Update on Strategic Planning Process
   B. Brief Overview of Standing Committee Workshop & Survey Results
   C. ECWRPC Work Program Element & Activity Prioritization Exercise

XII. ESTABLISH TIME AND PLACE FOR NEXT COMMISSION MEETING

   The next meeting will be 10:00 a.m. on Friday, January 31, 2020, at a location TBD in the Fox Cities/Oshkosh area.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

Any person wishing to attend this meeting or hearing, who, because of a disability, requires special accommodations should contact the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission at (920) 751-4770 at least three business days prior to the meeting or hearing so that arrangements, within reason, can be made.
DRAFT – SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

QUARTERLY COMMISSION MEETING

East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission

Place: New London Municipal Building – Council Chambers
215 N. Shawano Street
New London, Wisconsin

Date: Friday, July 26, 2019
Time: 10:00 a.m.

AGENDA

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. MOMENT OF SILENT MEDITATION

III. ROLL CALL

Roll call was taken showing the following attendance:

Commission Members Present:

Alice Connors ................................................................. Calumet County
Rick Jaeckels ................................................................. Calumet County
Merlin Gentz ................................................................. Calumet County
James Lowey .................................................................... Menominee County
Ruth Winter ...................................................................... Menominee County
Kevin Sturn ...................................................................... Outagamie County
Kara Homan (Alt. for Thomas Nelson) ......................... Outagamie County
Dave Kress (Alt. for Tim Hanna) ................................. Outagamie County
Jeff Nooyen ................................................................ Outagamie County
Michael Thomas ............................................................ Outagamie County
Jerry Erdmann ............................................................... Shawano County
Dick Koeppen ................................................................ Waupaca County
DuWayne Federwitz ..................................................... Waupaca County
Donna Kalata ................................................................. Waushara County
Larry Timm ................................................................ Waushara County
Neal Strehlow ................................................................ Waushara County
Mark Harris ................................................................ Waukesha County
Allen Davis (Alt. for Lori Palmiri) .............................. Winnebago County
Robert Schmeichel ...................................................... Winnebago County
Ernie Bellin ................................................................ Winnebago County
Martin Farrell ............................................................ Fond du Lac County
A. Introduction of New Commissioners, Alternates, and Guests

IV. STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH WIS. STATS. SEC. 19.84 REGARDING OPEN MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Compliance with Wisconsin’s open meeting requirements was acknowledged.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no members of the public present.

VI. APPROVAL OF AGENDA / MOTION TO DEViate

Mr. Federwitz motioned to approve the agenda/deviate, Mr. Bellin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
VII. MINUTES OF THE APRIL 26, 2019 QUARTERLY & ANNUAL MEETINGS

Mr. Fowle noted that there was a typographical error that had been corrected in the summary of proceedings.

Ms. Connors motioned to approve the minutes as corrected, Mr. Erdmann seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

VIII. SPECIAL ORDERS OF BUSINESS

A. Welcome from City of New London

Mr. Lou Leone, City Administrator, welcomed the Commission to the City of New London.

IX. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS

A. Commissioner Announcements

Mr. Fowle provided changes and updates regarding Commissioners and standing committee changes.

B. Staff Announcements

Mr. Fowle provided updates on staff changes, transitions, and anniversaries.

C. Media Reports

Mr. Fowle highlighted and summarized the media reports provided in in the packet materials.

D. Upcoming Events and Announcements

1. 2020 Technical Assistance Request Process / Schedule

Mr. Fowle provided an update of the technical assistance request process and schedule. The process began earlier this year, approximately 20 projects have been submitted. An open house was held earlier this year and another will be held in September. The deadline to submit projects is in October.

There was discussion regarding projected 2020 workload, timelines, and forecasting potentially to 2021 project timelines.

2. Other

Mr. Fowle provided an overview of the on-site meeting handouts and other announcements, including: Amtrak Busline service, reminder of state biennial budget, grant application for the FTA rural transit management program, disaster declaration and disaster recovery microloan program, and update of the strategic plan.
There was brief discussion regarding the facilitation of the strategic planning process and the Amtrak busline experience.

X. BUSINESS

A. Steering Committee

1. Acceptance of the Summaries of Proceedings for the April 18, 2019 Meeting

Mr. Koeppen motioned to approve the summary of proceedings, Mr. Nooyen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Acceptance of the Summaries of Proceedings for the May 29, 2019 Meeting

Ms. Kalata motioned to approve the summary of proceedings, Ms. Connors seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.


Ms. Scheibe-Johnson provided an overview of the second quarter financial report. Items included in the overview were as follows: cash position, accounts payable, accounts receivable, fixed assets, statement of revenue and expenses, comparison to prior annual budget, transportation billing, local contracts, expenses, salaries, wages, employee fringe benefits, direct grant expenses, general program expenses, pass through expenses, overhead expenses, and bottom line.

There was brief discussion regarding the Winnebago County loan payment, projected surplus, estimate of cash flow position over the next 6 months, contracts and contract changes, and 2019 forecasted performance.

Mr. Gentz motioned to receive the report and place on file. Mr. Bellin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. 2019 Second Quarter Work Program Progress Report

Mr. Fowle provided an overview of the work program progress report. Items included in the overview were as follows: workforce time allocation, variables, project management, project completion, outstanding/in-progress items, overage, overall workload and timelines, improvements, and efficiencies.

There was brief discussion regarding the formatting of the handout and clarification sought regarding the color coding used in the handout.

Mr. Erdmann motioned to receive the report and place on file, Mr. Schmeichel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
5. **Proposed Resolution 16-19: Requesting to Update the Resolution for Participation in the Wisconsin Public Employers Group Health Insurance Program for 2020**

Ms. Scheibe-Johnson provided an overview of the resolution. The Commission participates in the group health insurance plan that is administered by the Department of Employee Trust Funds. This resolution is required by them as a technicality as they have moved all of the governing documents for the group health insurance plan which were originally part of the contracts with the various providers into a single document. As a result, they are requiring the resolution; the verbiage is taken from the Department of Employee Trust Funds. It is a requirement to pass a resolution as a technicality to show that the Commission approves that the governing documents are now located elsewhere.

Ms. Kalata motioned to approve the resolution, Ms. Connors seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

6. **Proposed Resolution 20-19 – Adoption of the Preliminary Year 2020 Budget & Final Tax Levy for the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission**

Mr. Fowle provided an overview of the resolution. The annual process has been initiated of updating the budget and tax levy in the Steering Committee. The committee did approve the results presented today with a 4 to 2 vote for an overall increase of 2 percent. The Steering Committee discussed in detail the staffing plan for 2020, while final action was not taken by the Steering Committee, the committee is looking at 1.75 percent staff salary increase. Action was held until the October Steering Committee meeting.

There was clarification provided that the budget can still be changed, however the tax levy if approved today will be set as-is.

Mr. Sturm provided reason for his vote of nay prior to the hand vote.

A vocal approval followed by a hand vote was conducted for clarity. The results were as follows:

Mr. Koeppen motioned to approve the resolution, Mr. Kolstad seconded the motion.

The motion passed by a hand vote of 20 ayes, 5 nays (Mr. Sturm, Ms. Kalata, Mr. Nooyen, Ms. Connors, and Ms. Homan), and 1 abstention (Mr. Kress).

7. **Proposed Resolution 21-19 – Amending the Bylaws of the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission**

Mr. Fowle provided an overview of the resolution and noted the following amendments to the bylaws: quorum; references to execution of instruments, checks, and drafts; and added language to formally outline East Central’s role of the TMA and MPO responsibilities.
There was brief discussion regarding the model used to create Article XI and that the submittal and approval was received from the Federal Highway Administration.

Mr. Bellin motioned to approve the resolution, Mr. Connors seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

8. **Proposed Resolution 22-19 – Amending Resolution No. 08-90 and Subsequent Resolutions Specifying the Personnel Policies for Persons Employed by the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission.**

Mr. Fowle provided an overview of the resolution and summary of the proposed changes to the personnel policies such as: moonlighting, out of office work, benefit language update, change in legal holidays, professional development opportunities, grievance policy updates, and addition of a whistleblower policy.

Brief discussion occurred regarding the change in holidays.

Mr. Gentz motioned to approve the resolution, Mr. Jaeckels seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

9. **Proposed Resolution 23-19 – Approving the Amended and Updated 2020 Schedule of Fees for Services of the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission**

Mr. Fowle explained that this schedule is prepared annually, after the inception of the schedule of fees in 2018, updates needed to be made for future implementation. Updates to the fee schedule included: text updates, project costs to be determined by road miles, addition of bicycle and pedestrian plans, and changes made by the counties regarding the NR-135 and Sewer Service Area programs.

Ms. Connors motioned to approve the resolution, Mr. Kolstad seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

10. **Proposed Resolution 24-19 – Approving a Whistleblower Policy for the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission**

Mr. Fowle stated that this was referenced in the personnel policies and that it is important to initiate in the event it is needed.

Mr. Bellin motioned to approve the resolution, Mr. Schmeichel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
B. Economic Development Committee

1. Acceptance of the Summary of Proceedings for the April 3, 2019 Meeting

   Mr. Buechel motioned to approve the summary of proceedings as corrected, Ms. Winter seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Update on Initiative 41 Activities

   Mr. Fowle provided a summary of Initiative 41 activities which included: recent meetings, meeting outcomes, representation, grant debrief, I-41 economic development strategy, implementation, formation of a talent council, future planning meetings, and East Central’s role in the process.

   There was discussion regarding creation of a timeline handout for these activities for the strategic plan process and it was noted that additional input from stakeholders would be needed, however something for the strategic plan could be implemented.

3. Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) Update

   Mr. Baron provided an overview of the CEDS update. Items included in the update were as follows: background and process of the CEDS, timeline of work, Economic Development Administration (EDA) update, and outreach to Tribal communities.

C. Open Space and Environmental Management Committee

1. Acceptance of the Summary of Proceedings for the April 10, 2019 Meeting

   Mr. Federwitz motioned to approve the summary of proceedings, Mr. Timm seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

D. Community Facilities Committee

1. Acceptance of the Summary of Proceedings for the March 13, 2019 Meeting

   Mr. Bellin motioned to approve the summary of proceedings, Mr. Hornung seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Acceptance of the Summary of Proceedings for the April 26, 2019 Meeting

   Mr. Bellin motioned to approve the summary of proceedings, Mr. Hornung seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
E. Transportation Committee

1. Acceptance of the Summary of Proceedings for the April 9, 2019 Meeting

Mr. Strehlow motioned to approve the summary of proceedings, Mr. Nooyen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Proposed Resolution 17-19: Amending the Transportation Improvement Program for the Fox Cities Transportation Management Area - 2019

Mr. Moesch explained that there are a number of amendments for the Transportation Improvement Program, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) – Green Bay requested that a number of projects be advanced. Mr. Moesch provided an overview of the table of projects to be approved. The request for advancement will allow the projects to begin this year through early 2020.

Ms. Homan motioned to approve the resolution, Ms. Connors seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Proposed Resolution 18-19: Amending the Transportation Improvement Program for the Oshkosh Urbanized Area – 2019

Mr. Moesch explained that there are amendments for the Oshkosh Urbanized Area Transportation Improvement Program, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) – Green Bay requested that a number of projects be advanced. The request is for advancement of design projects so that the projects can begin this year through early 2020.

Ms. Kalata motioned to approve the resolution, Mr. Jaeckels seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.


Mr. Musson explained that East Central and the City of Oshkosh Go Transit applied for a Wisconsin Statewide Transit 5304 Planning Grant to assist Go Transit with the development of a site selection plan for their future transit center. The total funds for this request are $67,604. The $10,141 local match will be provided by Go Transit, and the MPO will provide the match of $3,380 to secure the grant. WisDOT is prepared to approve the project and will be sending official notification in the next couple of weeks. The resolution amends the work program and budget to add this project pending final approval to the work program.

Mr. Bellin motioned to approve the resolution, Mr. Strehlow seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
F. Regional Comprehensive Planning Committee

1. Acceptance of the Summary of Proceedings for the April 18, 2019 Meeting

Mr. Gentz commented that the committee was pleased that the strategic planning process will be started and spoke to the value of strategic planning.

There was also discussion regarding the early meetings of the strategic planning process, recommendations for looking at other RPC provided services, and structure of the first strategic planning meetings to be held later this summer.

Mr. Gentz motioned to approve the resolution, Mr. Sturn seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

XI. ESTABLISH TIME AND PLACE FOR NEXT COMMISSION MEETING

Quarterly Commission Meeting, 1:15 p.m., Friday, October 25, 2019, Bridgewood Resort Hotel and Conference Center, Neenah, WI. There will be a mini-conference held prior to the Quarterly Commission Meeting.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Koeppen motioned to adjourn, Mr. Strehlow seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 11:27 a.m.
Getting connected

I-41 commuter feasibility study underway

With more people moving between the cities of Fond du Lac, Oshkosh, Appleton and Green Bay along Interstate 41, a commuter feasibility study is underway to identify ways to reduce congestion and move people who may not have their own transportation.

Led by the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, the project’s partners include the Bay-Lakes Regional Planning Commission, Brown County, Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Green Bay Metro, the City of Appleton’s Valley Transit, City of Oshkosh’s GO Transit and Fond du Lac Area Transit. The study, which SRF Consulting is conducting, will produce suggestions on how to improve commuting along I-41.

One of the goals of the commuter project is to possibly connect all four transit agencies to create a regional transportation network.

Nick Musson, principal transportation planner with the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, says the time is right to take on such an ambitious project.

“Two years ago, Fond du Lac Area Transit completed their transit development plan, Oshkosh completed theirs last year and Valley Transit is working on theirs now,” he says.

The most important reason to connect the cities: Employers need a larger pool of workers to recruit from but are limited to those who live nearby or have their own car.

“The area has such a low unemployment rate and we keep hearing from employers that they need better access to quality employees,” Musson says.

SRF Consulting Group and the planning commission are collecting data related to employers and workers to help develop future commuter service design concepts. As for what’s being considered, Musson says what works elsewhere, for example bus rapid transport, may not work in the I-41 corridor.

“We have four metropolitan areas separated by some rural areas. That’s unique,” he says. “We may be looking at multiple solutions and more focused on that ‘first mile’ and ‘last mile’ concept where traditional public transit can get an employee only so far and something else is needed to make that final connection. That could open the door to some kind of public-private partnership.”

Another idea is creating a smaller bus service connecting one side of a community to another with limited stops. Route 10 already connects Valley Transit with GO Transit.

While transporting employees is important, those are not the only commuters the study looks at. It will also look at seniors who want to travel beyond their municipal boundaries for either medical appointments or social events but don’t have the means to do so as well as university and college students who are looking for reliable transportation to school.

“Connecting the communities is not a want but a need. We want the plan to increase access to jobs, education and the arts and enhance regional economic development,” Musson says.

Once the research is completed, SRF Consulting will present several ideas to the stakeholders.

“We want to keep the door open to whatever ideas the consultant may have,” Musson says. “Our coverage area is so large, we will need multiple solutions. The communities along I-41 are all so different, with each one having different needs.”

As the study moves along, more information and updates will be shared.
Health link to walking, biking, transit explored

Focus groups reveal how they view transportation

Fox Valley Thrives' transportation team recently examined the impact of transportation journeys on health for those living in and around Oshkosh. "Linking Health and Transportation: Voices of Oshkosh Walkers, Cyclists and Transit Users" is based off five focus group conversations with those who rely on walking, bicycling or transit as their primary way to get to work, school, grocery store, medical appointments and social activities.

The transportation team of Thrives, an alliance that includes the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, ESTHER, and Winnebago and Outagamie county public health departments, conducted focus groups to understand user perceptions of the Oshkosh area. The groups, moderated by trained UW-Oshkosh faculty, were composed of youth, seniors, people with lower incomes and the members of the higher education community. Participants shared about how each link in their transportation chain interacts.

Participants of the focus groups saw connections between health and transportation in three primary ways: direct connection between transportation and access to health-related services, including medical care, pharmacy and medication pickup, and healthy foods; mental and physical health; and improving or maintaining health through physical activity.

"The transportation system plays an important role in ensuring that people can reach destinations safely, reliably and conveniently," said Emily Dieringer, Community Health strategist with the Winnebago County Health Department. "The ability for people to access grocery stores that provide healthy food, health care services for preventive care, and jobs and educational opportunities that contribute to economic well-being are critical to improving and maintaining health."

Participants identified how the current transportation infrastructure both helps and impedes access to services, destinations and employment. While it was noted that the Oshkosh area has a relatively robust transit system that services the entire city and beyond, concerns were raised about the limited hours of service and the accessibility at some of the stops.

When asked about getting to medical appointments, participants felt resources were available but there was limited knowledge of these resources and they were less convenient and harder to navigate.

"People going to the hospital or doctor appointments are already feeling frail and don’t want to deal with the additional stress of riding the bus," one participant stated. "They will take a cab. People don’t know about the ADVOCAP (Work-N-Wheels) program, and if they do they have to go through a process of filling out paperwork. It’s a good resource, but not enough people are taking advantage of it.

And they need more drivers."

For those walking and bicycling, the consensus was that Oshkosh is bicycling- and walking-friendly, however, the current system can be improved by better maintaining sidewalks, enhancing crosswalks, and prioritizing all modes of transportation when reconstructing or building new roads.

A follow up event with area employers explored how they might serve as partners in supporting the infrastructure changes needed to increase the use of active transportation.

"This study makes it clear that not everyone in Oshkosh has access to a car to help them get around," said Bill Van Looy, ESTHER community organizer. "Effective public transportation is needed so that there is equitable access for all residents to enjoy the services and resources that the city has to offer."

Details on the report can be found on the Winnebago County Health Department’s Facebook page. Funding for the project was provided by the Healthier Wisconsin Partnership Program, a component of the Advancing a Healthier Wisconsin Endowment and administered by the Medical College of Wisconsin.

Fox Valley Thrives’ stated goal is to advance health equity through aligned efforts, relationship and capacity building, co-learning, and strategic action. The transportation team called the report a stepping stone in furthering the discussion on health and transportation. Community members with a transportation story to share or anyone interested in improving the transportation system can contact foxvalleythrives@gmail.com.

Catch-A-Ride runs on drivers

The Winnebago Catch-A-Ride program, a workforce development initiative facilitated by the Greater Oshkosh Economic Development Corp., continues to look for volunteer drivers.

The long- and short-term employment transportation program helps individuals who do not qualify or have access to existing programs throughout Winnebago County. It has subsidized 188 employment rides from April 1 through June 30.

The program is subsidized through a Commute to Careers grant funded by the state departments of Workforce Development and Transportation, which decreases the direct cost of the ride to the individual. Program partnerships include Make the Ride Happen, a program of Lutheran Social Services of Wisconsin and Upper Michigan and the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, and powered by the nonprofit organization Peninsula-Mobility Raising.

Rides are provided by a team of volunteers who are reimbursed for their mileage. Any ride not covered by volunteers will be provided through a third-party cab or Lyft service.

Learn more at economobilityraising.org/Wisconsin or call 920-225-1719.
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Executive Summary

This report provides an introduction to metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) for those who want to influence regional planning to benefit health, active transportation, and equity. The report details the structure of MPOs, the relationship between MPOs and other agencies and organizations, and the roles that MPOs play, with a focus on how MPOs can support equitable communities. The report describes key processes that MPOs manage and participate in, ways to get involved, and strategies for health and equity stakeholders to influence MPOs. A companion report, Metropolitan Planning Organizations & Health 201: Best Practices & Promising Opportunities for Health, delves into detail regarding innovative strategies and promising practices that MPOs are taking to advance health.
Section 1
INTRODUCTION

In this report, we provide an introduction to metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), agencies that play a key role in regional transportation planning and investments. Creating healthier communities requires both bold vision and a firm grasp on how to make change. In order to understand how to create a healthy and sustainable transportation system, we need a detailed understanding of the intricate maze of agencies, policies and rules, and funding flows that can either trap neighborhoods in an unhealthy quagmire or transform them into vibrant and healthy places.

By demystifying the role of and processes overseen by MPOs, we aim to enable community members, advocates, and stakeholders to influence regional planning to benefit health, active transportation, and equity. This report describes the structure of MPOs, the relationship between MPOs and other agencies and organizations, the roles that MPOs play, and how MPOs affect health and equity in our communities.

What are MPOs? The short answer is that MPOs are urban regional planning entities that are mandated by federal law but established by the states. The longer answer is provided by the remainder of this report. Section 2 of the report sets out what MPOs are, how they are established, and what role they play in relation to the variety of other regional entities that exist. Section 2 also provides background on the origins of MPOs, and the role that MPOs have played in relation to transportation planning decisions that tore apart many urban communities of color in the fifties and sixties. Section 3 describes the structure and governance of MPOs, noting the decision-making role of the MPO policy board and the roles of staff and advisory committees, and providing an overview of bylaws and funding for MPOs. Section 4 explains what MPOs' duties and activities are. This section describes the core transportation planning requirements that are assigned by federal law and the key documents that must be produced by MPOs as a function of those duties.

The section also explains additional duties that MPOs serving larger population regions must comply with, as well as a number of additional federal duties imposed upon all MPOs. The section finishes with a description of duties that may be imposed upon MPOs by state law or that an MPO may choose to take upon itself. Section 5 concludes the report, describing how stakeholders can influence MPOs.

Why try to understand MPOs? More than 70 percent of people in the United States live in urban areas that are within the jurisdiction of MPOs. Each MPO plays an essential role in planning for its region's future and in investing transportation funds to achieve those plans. MPOs direct investment of billions of dollars annually. Not only are MPOs involved in major decisions about large-scale transportation projects such as highways and light rail that may have significant impacts on transportation in a region, but they also have the potential to encourage and lead regional and local decisions that prioritize walking and biking. MPOs oversee processes that affect not only transportation decisions, but also economic growth, land use patterns, preservation of natural areas and farmland, air quality, racial and economic equity for community members, safety, and more. This report seeks to remove the mystery from MPOs, enabling advocates and stakeholders who care about healthy communities to engage with and influence these immensely important entities.
Section 2

WHAT IS A METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION?

MPOs are a type of regional planning organization. Federal law requires that states establish MPOs for any urbanized area with a population of over 50,000 people. As a result, MPOs are federally mandated and funded, and receive many of their roles and duties through federal statutes or regulations, but the actual establishment or designation of MPOs occurs through state action.

Federal law distinguishes between MPOs in larger areas and smaller areas. MPOs in larger regions with populations over 200,000 people (regions known as Transportation Management Areas) have more duties, whereas MPOs in areas with populations between 50,000 and 200,000 have fewer duties. There are currently approximately 404 MPOs in the United States, of which around 150 MPOs serve larger Transportation Management Areas and 254 MPOs serve smaller areas. The area within the boundaries of an MPO varies significantly depending upon the size and nature of the metropolitan area. Some MPOs’ jurisdictions are smaller than a county, covering only the more populous area within a county; other MPOs’ regions consist of multiple counties. In areas with a multicity metropolitan region, an MPO’s jurisdiction may contain several major cities. In addition, an MPO may be an interstate entity, when an urban area lies on the border of more than one state and the metropolitan area has a significant presence in multiple states. There are around 40 MPOs with jurisdiction in multiple states, and there are five MPOs that have jurisdiction in three states.

Significantly, 71 percent of the US population lives within an urbanized area and thus is under the jurisdiction of an MPO, but less than five percent of US land area lies within MPO boundaries.
A. How MPOs Are Established

Every ten years, following the completion of the decennial census, the Census Bureau uses the updated data to designate a new list of urbanized areas. Urbanized area is an official term that refers to densely settled areas with at least 50,000 residents. Because federal transportation legislation mandates an MPO for each urbanized area of more than 50,000 people, when new urbanized areas are added to the census’s list, new MPOs must be established or the jurisdiction of existing MPOs must be expanded. For example, the 2010 updates resulted in 36 new urbanized areas and 27 new Transportation Management Areas requiring MPOs with the additional responsibilities described above. Based upon the 2010 designations, there are 486 urbanized areas requiring MPOs, and 150 MPOs that serve Transportation Management Areas. There are fewer than 486 MPOs because many MPOs have jurisdictions that encompass multiple urbanized areas.

MPOs have planning jurisdiction within the area that is designated the metropolitan planning area. That area is determined by agreement between the MPO and the state governor, and must include at least the entire existing urbanized area, as well as contiguous areas that are expected to become urbanized within the next 20 years. For convenience and consistency, many metropolitan planning areas receive the same boundaries as the relevant metropolitan statistical area.

Origin of MPOs

The entities we now know as MPOs evolved over the course of a number of federal efforts to encourage coordinated regional planning in the fifties and sixties. Before midcentury, states and cities undertook transportation planning separately and focused on different goals. State and federal transportation investments prior to the sixties were focused on rural connectivity and highway development. In the fifties, desperate to steer federal funding investments to urban areas, cities joined highway planning efforts, but had little say in the investment of funds, largely allowing state officials to control decision making, including determining placement of urban highways.

However, the federal government began to see regional planning as crucial to meet massive regional transformations that were in motion: the mandate to build the Interstate Highway System, the need to coordinate highway planning in urban areas, and the unfolding development of rural areas into suburbs. Early Congressional action took place through the Housing Act of 1954, which made federal grants available for areas to engage in regional planning. In response to these grants, around 100 disparate metropolitan planning bodies formed in different regions during the fifties.

Regional transportation planning took a decisive step forward under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962, which created a federal requirement for urban transportation planning by conditioning federal funding for urbanized areas with more than 50,000 people upon the stipulation that they must conduct a regional planning process with their local jurisdictions. In order to meet the requirements of the Federal Aid Highway Act and receive funding from the federal Highway Trust Fund to advance regional transportation needs, these areas worked to form regional planning committees that included state and local representation. The required planning process was to be continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive, a set of requirements known as three-C planning.

By 1970, 270 urbanized areas were engaged in three-C planning, but requirements were vague and efforts were inconsistent. As a result, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 provided clearer requirements for local decision making and set out a formal definition of MPOs. The numerous established regional planning entities generated by earlier efforts were generally able to take on the new designation of MPO.
The Racially Charged Origins of MPOs

Racial stratification and oppression have been ongoing features of governance and lived experience in the United States. It comes as no surprise that the vision of a more modern, scientific, clean, and segmented world that drove federal highway and urban policy in the fifties and sixties was racialized from the start.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962, regarded as the genesis of MPOs, occurred in the context of an array of federal programs aimed at remaking urban areas, including urban renewal. Federal policies during the fifties and sixties both pushed and reflected national trends, including not only racial segregation in housing and education, but also related developments such as suburbanization, concentration of poverty, and increasing car ownership. The tools of blight removal and federal interstate highway placement were powerful mechanisms used to destroy many existing communities of color, often decimating vibrant thriving neighborhoods that were African American, Latino, or multiracial and multiethnic.

Threats to destroy urban neighborhoods generated ferocious opposition, sometimes successful. By the late fifties, coalitions of community members, elected officials, civic groups, and academics were increasingly organized and vociferous in their opposition to such efforts. By the time of the proposal of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962, President Kennedy had expressed concern that 15,000 families and 1,500 businesses were being displaced by interstate highway construction each year. One effect of this consciousness was a provision in the new transportation bill for relocation assistance for displaced families and businesses.

The destruction of communities of color sometimes occurred as part of a deliberate effort to remove them, but other times occurred simply because these communities were seen as expendable and deemed to lack sufficient political power to resist the adamant determination of the powerful highway industry and local officials to create highways through densely populated urban areas.

Over the course of the sixties, efforts to build highways and expressways through urban communities generated increasing opposition by local communities and business owners. While many highways cut thriving neighborhoods in half, separated communities by race, or displaced enormous numbers of residents of color, other similar proposals were defeated. As efforts mounted to resist displacement and to obtain equitable access to the benefits of metropolitan development, MPOs and regional planning efforts came to be seen in a complex light: as both solution-oriented reaction to, but also sometimes contributor to, the challenges of segregation, metropolitan fragmentation, lack of community input, and inequitable access to opportunity.

Today, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act and a 1994 Executive Order on environmental justice require that MPOs ensure that their actions avoid putting a disproportionate burden on low-income communities and communities of color, a goal that is unevenly achieved.
B. Understanding MPOs in Relation to Other Regional Entities

When an MPO is established in a state, it may occur through: (1) creation of a new standalone agency, (2) assigning an existing agency to provide some level of hosting and perhaps staffing for the MPO within its existing structure, or (3) designating an existing entity as the MPO. For this reason, some MPOs have the phrase “metropolitan planning organization” in their name, but many other MPOs have names that reflect their history or the other agency roles that they play (“regional planning commission,” “council of governments,” etc.).

Almost 70 percent of MPOs are hosted by another entity, which has the power to hire and fire MPO employees. The remaining 31 percent of MPOs are stand alone or independent entities. Generally, larger MPOs are more likely to be independent. A 2017 study describes a continuum of independence for MPOs, ranging from MPOs that are fully merged with a host to MPOs that are fully independent, with three intermediate stages. Of hosted MPOs, 39 percent are hosted by a regional council, 35 percent by a municipal government, and 17 percent by a county government.
In understanding the roles and nature of MPOs, it is useful to also understand the variety of other types of government agencies that work in the regional planning and regional transportation arena. Because states vary greatly in how they structure regional planning and responsibilities, there is significant variation in what regional agencies look like and how their roles are allocated in different states. Key types of regional agencies include:

- **Metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs):** Federally mandated entities tasked with transportation planning in urbanized areas with populations over 50,000. MPOs develop policies for federal transportation spending. In areas with 200,000 people or more (Transportation Management Areas), MPOs administer federal transportation dollars.

- **Regional transportation planning organizations (RTPOs or TPOs):** Federal law provides states with the option of establishing regional transportation planning organizations to ensure that the needs of non-metropolitan areas are fully incorporated into statewide long range transportation plans and transportation improvement programs. (See sidebar on page 9 for further description.) In some states, these are known as rural transportation planning organizations. Some variation of rural or regional transportation planning agencies exists in many states to support state departments of transportation with rural transportation planning.

- **Regional DOT offices:** In some states, the state department of transportation divides the state into regions and/or districts. Regional and district offices implement projects within the appropriate boundaries, which may or may not align with MPO and RTPO boundaries.

- **Councils of government (COGs):** COGs are agencies whose membership comprises most or all of the local governments in a region. COGs are also often called associations of governments, regional councils, or other names. A COG enables cities, towns, and counties to work together to plan across a region. COGs may address areas such as transportation, planning, economic development, senior services, or other topics that benefit from regional governmental cooperation. COGs and MPOs are often co-located or function as a combined entity to coordinate planning for a region. MPOs that are also COGs include the Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments in Connecticut and the Tulare County Association of Governments in California.

- **Transit agencies:** Transit agencies are special purpose agencies or public benefit corporations that have authority to address needs related to public transportation. Powers of transit agencies may include owning and operating buses, light rail lines, subways, and the like, obtaining property through purchase or eminent domain, managing property, imposing taxes, and operating transit police. The jurisdiction of transit agencies is usually established by state law or compact, and can be coterminous with a county, several counties, several cities, or other geographies. Transit agencies often overlap geographically with other regional entities, but rarely function as a combined entity with other types of regional entities. An exception to this rule can be seen in the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority, a department of the City and County of San Francisco that is responsible for all ground transportation in San Francisco, including public transit, taxis, parking, traffic citations, transportation planning, and street design, including use by walking, bicycling, and motor vehicles. However, it is far more common for transit agencies to function as standalone agencies that are focused simply on public transportation.

- **Counties:** All states are divided into counties or county equivalents (Louisiana uses the term parish and Alaska uses borough). Counties have different powers in different states, but generally regulate and serve unincorporated areas within their boundaries, and may exercise some more general powers over incorporated areas. County planning offices may engage in regional planning activities within a county; county departments of transportation and/or public works may build and maintain streets within the county.

- **Other regional agencies:** Many other types of regional agencies with various powers exist. State law or interstate agreements can establish additional types of intrastate or interstate regional agencies. An example of state law introducing an additional type of regional agency can be seen in California where, beginning in the early nineties, each county was required to establish a congestion management agency to coordinate land use, air quality, and transportation planning. Various types of multistate regional authorities also exist, often with federal involvement, such as the Delta Regional Authority or Appalachian Regional Commission.
Transportation Planning for Rural Areas

In contrast to MPOs, which are required for all urbanized areas with populations over 50,000, federal law gives states the option of establishing regional transportation planning organizations, with duties that are somewhat similar to MPOs, but also have some differences. The point of establishing a regional transportation planning organization is to ensure that the needs of rural areas are fully incorporated into state transportation planning and that nonmetropolitan local jurisdictions have an opportunity for public input and coordination on their regional transportation planning needs. Regional transportation planning organizations have a somewhat similar structure to MPOs, with a policy committee consisting primarily of local officials and including other stakeholders, and duties that include developing regional long-range transportation plans and regional transportation improvement programs, as well as other duties to foster cooperation and support public participation.

A variety of models for structure have been used by regional transportation planning organizations in different states.

In states that do not institute regional transportation planning organizations, federal law calls for state consultation with affected nonmetropolitan local officials. States that do not designate official regional transportation planning organizations may use other regional planning agencies to meet similar goals, such as regional divisions of the state DOT or other regional planning commissions. Nonmetropolitan and rural areas contain less than 30 percent of the population of the United States, but account for more than 95 percent of the land mass, meaning that thoughtful planning and coordination for transportation needs in these areas is crucial.
Section 3
STRUCTURE AND GOVERNANCE OF MPOS

MPOs are governed by a board of directors, known as the policy board, which is generally comprised of local elected officials and representatives of transit agencies and state government. Membership of the policy board is established through the bylaws, statute, or compact that established the MPO, with some guidance in the federal statute. To make informed decisions, board members often rely on technical committees and staff to provide them with relevant research and information. The size of an MPO’s staff can range from two to hundreds of employees. In this section, we review the structures and roles that govern decision making by MPOs.

A. Governance and MPO Policy Boards

Because an MPO’s jurisdiction encompasses the entire urbanized area in a metropolitan region as well as contiguous areas that are likely to become urbanized within the next 20 years, MPOs necessarily include within their boundaries one or more larger cities and any number of nearby suburban and rural cities and towns, and generally also include some unincorporated areas. Coordinating regional transportation decision-making involves not only these cities, towns, and counties, but also affects nearby communities, as well as special purpose regional agencies, such as public transportation agencies. Determining how to share decision-making among these different actors is no easy task.

Limited Federal Requirements Regarding Structure or Membership of MPO Policy Boards

Emphasizing flexibility and decision making driven by local and state considerations, federal law provides only very general guidelines regarding the membership of a policy board, leaving key aspects of decision making power to the negotiations that produce an MPO’s governing bylaws, statute, or compact. Federal statute provides that the policy board of MPOs that serve as Transportation Management Areas (those with 200,000 or more inhabitants) must include not only local elected officials and “appropriate State officials,” but also public transportation providers. Other MPOs are encouraged to also include similar representation. The requirement that the larger MPOs must include representation by providers of public transportation on their policy boards and must provide them with equal decision making rights and authorities to other members was added by the 2012 federal transportation bill Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21), as part of a shift to a performance management framework requiring a more multimodal focus. However, significant local authority remains to determine how many representatives of public transportation providers will be included and how voting weight will be allocated.
Taking advantage of the flexibility offered by federal law, and reflecting local and state power struggles, policy boards for MPOs around the country have very different structures, membership, and voting allocations. A 2017 Federal Highway Administration report found that MPO policy board size ranged from three to 105 voting members.\textsuperscript{33, 34} The median was 17 members, with MPOs representing larger regions and populations tending to have more board members.\textsuperscript{35} Federal law requires that voting membership on MPO boards serving Transportation Management Areas must include local elected officials, transit agencies, and state officials. The state officials that are included are generally state department of transportation representatives (found on 76 percent of MPO boards) and more rarely gubernatorial appointees (on four percent of MPO boards).\textsuperscript{36} MPO boards may include a wide range of other voting members, such as representatives of toll authorities, airport or port authorities, school boards, tribal governments, colleges, military sites, and additional nearby jurisdictions not within the MPO area.\textsuperscript{37} Boards often also include non-voting board members. These may commonly be additional local government representatives, federal representatives such as regional Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) or Federal Transit Administration (FTA) officers, or any of a wide variety of other types of non-voting members.\textsuperscript{38}

An inherent challenge in MPO board structure and decision making is the need to balance the voice of one or more highly populated cities with the voices of the more numerous smaller cities, suburbs, and rural towns in an MPO region. Allocating votes based simply on population might utterly drown out the influence of smaller cities, suburbs, and rural areas; allocating equal voting to each jurisdiction regardless of size grossly underweights the needs of large urban populations. This challenge is further complicated by the voting members on MPO boards who don't have such geographic restrictions, such as state officials or regional transit providers.

Although there is great variation in MPO board structure, a few different approaches to the challenge described above emerge: some boards provide at least one seat for each local government, regardless of size; others provide a certain number of seats to groupings of smaller local governments, with rotating membership, while providing permanent seats for representatives of major cities. Methods for allocating the rotating seats vary widely, from formal rotation among jurisdictions, to casual agreement, and more.

Most MPOs provide one vote per seat and count votes equally.\textsuperscript{40} Where the population of different cities is factored in to MPO decision making structures, it is usually reflected in additional seats for larger jurisdictions.\textsuperscript{41} A 2018 straw poll found that approximately 27 percent of MPOs provided additional seats for some jurisdictions, usually simply allocating additional seats to larger population jurisdictions.\textsuperscript{42} Analyses indicate that 13 percent of all MPOs use weighted votes – allocating more voting weight to the votes of some members than others – to account for population, but that in MPOs with populations of more than one million, 26 percent used weighted voting.\textsuperscript{43, 44}
A 2006 Brookings Institution analysis found that in many metropolitan regions, MPO boards “simply are not structured to adequately represent the needs of central city residents.”\(^6\) The analysis found that urban jurisdictions received 29 percent of MPO board votes, but contained 56 percent of the MPO area population, significantly under-representing the urban populations of large MPOs, and leading to high underrepresentation of the interests and needs of residents of color.\(^7\) Related analyses showed that the imbalance is correlated with priorities for investment of transportation funds, with each additional suburban vote on an MPO board leading to up to nine percent more funding allocated to highways rather than transit.\(^8\) Examples of MPOs with voting structures that balance between urban and suburban areas show around 50 percent of investments going to transit; MPOs with suburban dominated voting show only nine to 18 percent of funds allocated to transit.\(^9\)

One implication of this analysis is that one of the most effective changes that advocates for multimodalism could execute would be to change the voting structure of MPOs. Federal law permits some modifications of policy board membership and voting without need for re-designation of an MPO.

**Greater Portland’s MPO**

Greater Portland’s MPO, known as Portland Metro or Metro, has the only directly elected MPO policy board in the country. The MPO’s region covers urban portions of the three counties in the Portland region: Multnomah County, Clackamas County, and Washington County. The policy board is known as Metro Council, and it has a president, who is elected by voters on a region-wide basis, and six councilors, who each represent a district within the region and are elected by voters in their district.

The MPO also has a highly powerful Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), which recommends priorities and develops plans for the region. The Metro Council must adopt the recommendations before they become transportation policies. JPACT has 17 members who are elected officials or representatives of transportation agencies across the region. Each county has a representative, as do the cities of Portland and Vancouver; the remaining cities in each county jointly have a representative. JPACT is chaired by a Metro Council member, and there are two additional Metro Council representatives on JPACT. Other members represent both Oregon and Washington State DOTs, public transit agencies, and others. There is also a technical advisory committee (TPAC), which provides input to JPACT.
B. Bylaws, Metropolitan Planning Agreements, and Resolutions

MPO activities may be directed and constrained by specific agreements. Federal regulations call for the MPO, state, and public transportation providers to develop a Metropolitan Planning Agreement (or agreements) to summarize their respective responsibilities with regard to the planning processes, as well as to provide for the development of financial plans, long range transportation plans, and transportation improvement programs. Additional agreements may be required for MPOs with air quality challenges or under other circumstances. MPO boards may also adopt their own bylaws. MPOs may also adopt board resolutions or board policies. Such resolutions may simply operate as the mechanism by which the MPO policy board executes its core duties, or may be means of taking specific optional policy positions, such as adopting a Complete Streets resolution that commits staff to developing street design standards that accommodate all users.

C. Staff

Most MPOs have a director and a variety of staff people. The size of MPO staff ranges from one staff person to 105 staff people. Twenty-five percent of MPOs have fewer than three staff people, 50 percent of MPOs have between three and 12 staff people, and the remainder have more than 12. MPOs are permitted to use staff resources of other agencies to carry out selected elements of the planning process. MPOs also frequently rely upon consultants for a variety of services, with MPOs spending 30 percent of their budgets on consulting firms for services such as engineering, planning, or public engagement.

D. Advisory Committees

Advisory commitments are another common feature of MPOs. These committees often work with staff to provide recommendations, expert input, draft MPO deliverables and advise the policy board. Advisory commitments are not required by federal law, but may be set out in state law. For example, Ohio requires its MPOs to each appoint a technical advisory committee (TAC). These committees are the most common type of advisory committee around the nation, with 92 percent of MPOs having TACs. TACs include local transportation engineers and planners and provide technical expertise to inform the policy board’s decision making.

Other types of advisory committees are also relatively common: a 2017 analysis found that 35 percent of MPOs have bicycle/pedestrian/multimodal advisory committees, and 32 percent have citizen advisory committees. Other than the TAC, these percentages are lower than they were in the 2010 study. Some MPOs have equity-focused advisory committees. Other committees may also be established. For example, the Oahu Metropolitan Planning Organization has a technical advisory committee, a citizen advisory committee, and a citizen advisory committee subcommittee on pedestrian safety.

Equity Advisory Committee

Metropolitan Council, the MPO for the Twin Cities region of Minnesota, formed an Equity Advisory Committee in 2015 with the intent to “create more equitable outcomes for the people who live and work in the region.” Members of the Equity Advisory Committee represent eight geographic divisions of the region and special attention is made to ensure there is representation from the following groups: African Americans, Asian Americans, Native Americans, Latinos, immigrants and new Americans, low-wealth residents, and people with disabilities. The advisory committee gives input in a wide range of cross cutting issues.
E. Funding

Funding for MPO operations and activities come from a variety of places. All MPOs receive a share of their state’s federal funding from the Metropolitan Planning set-aside, commonly referred to as “PL” funds, which forms at least half of MPO funding for most MPOs.64,65 Most MPOs also receive federal Metropolitan Transit Planning funds, known as section 5305 funds, which are intended to support transit planning in metro areas. These two types of funding may be combined into a single Consolidated Planning Grant.

MPOs also receive federal funds under the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program-Urban Allocation (STBGP), with MPOs that serve TMA directly receiving a special set aside from the STBGP.66 The other primary source of federal funding for MPOs is available for MPOs in areas that do not meet air quality standards. Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds can be applied to a variety of uses to improve air quality, such as project implementation, public education, and MPO planning.67 Other sources of funding for MPOs include funding or operational support from state and local governments. Local funds may go to meet federal match requirements, supplement federal money to comply with federally required duties, or support additional activities outside core federal duties.68 MPOs may also obtain competitive grants or engage in contract work.
MPO-Related Definitions

**Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO):** Federally mandated entity created by state and regional agreement tasked with transportation planning for urbanized area with population over 50,000.

**Regional Transportation Planning Organization (also known as Rural Transportation Planning Organization) (RTPO or TPO):** Entity that may optionally be established under federal law to assist states with ensuring that the needs of non-metropolitan areas are fully incorporated into state**wide long range transportation plans (SLRTPs)** and state transportation improvement programs (STIPs).

**Transportation Management Area (TMA):** Urbanized area with populations of more than 200,000.

**Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP):** Long-term transportation plan for the MPO region with at least a 20-year horizon, revised every three to five years.

**Transportation Improvement Program (TIP):** Fiscally constrained list of transportation infrastructure projects that are prioritized for funding in the short term, usually within four years.

**Statewide Long Range Transportation Plans (SLRTPs):** State plan that provides long-range planning for the statewide multimodal transportation system and incorporates MPO LRTP.

**State Transportation Improvement Programs (STIPs):** State list of prioritized short-term transportation projects that incorporates TIPs developed at the MPO level.

**State Improvement Program (SIP):** Federally required state air quality plan developed by state environmental or air quality agency.

**Policy Board:** The decision making body for an MPO.

**Unified Work Planning Program:** Work plan required of MPOs describing funds and planning activities intended for implementation over the next one to two years.

**Congestion Management Process:** Federally mandated process requiring that an MPO systematically assesses performance of regional transportation system and develops strategies to mitigate traffic congestion.

**Technical Advisory Committee (TAC):** Type of advisory committee established by most MPOs to get technical input from members, generally engineers, planners, and others working for local jurisdictions in the MPO service area.

**Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC):** Type of advisory committee often established by MPOs to obtain input from nonprofits and committee members concerned with safe and accessible walking, bicycling, and micromobility within the MPO boundaries.

**Urbanized area:** Densely settled area with at least 50,000 residents.
Federal law designates a number of roles for MPOs generally, and sets out a variety of additional roles for the larger MPOs that serve Transportation Management Areas. All MPOs must engage in specified planning, evaluation, and funding activities. MPO roles are guided and supplemented by regulations and practices at the state, regional, or local level, and MPOs may have additional roles assigned to them by state government.

A. Core Transportation Planning Duties

The central responsibility for an MPO is to engage in coordinated short- and long-term transportation planning processes. These processes determine which projects receive federal and state transportation funding. Under federal law, MPOs’ planning processes must comply with three-C planning requirements: continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive planning. These core regional transportation planning functions occur through a process that includes: visioning and scenario exploration; community engagement; regular development and updating of both long-term plans and short-term lists of infrastructure projects to implement; and monitoring, data collection, and reporting. The FHWA and FTA provide funding toward these planning processes. Although exact processes differ from MPO to MPO, all MPOs engage in a planning process with regular opportunities for input by local jurisdictions and the public.

As part of their ongoing and extensive planning process, MPOs develop and update three key regional planning documents, which provide for transportation planning and schedule the allocation of federal dollars toward regional projects. Although these three documents are technically required of all MPOs, MPOs serving areas that are not Transportation Management Areas may submit streamlined documentation under some conditions.

Long Range Transportation Plans Ensure Continuous Long-Term Regional Planning

MPOs must engage in long range planning for their regions by developing and regularly updating long range transportation plans (LRTPs). LRTPs are known by different names in different jurisdictions, including metropolitan area plans, metropolitan transportation plans (MTPs), regional transportation plans (RTPs), and others. These plans must have time frames (horizons) of at least 20 years, and must be regularly updated; at least every five years, and every four years for areas that have not met certain air quality standards. As a practical matter, this means that once an MPO adopts its plan looking 20 or 30 years into the future, it will more or less immediately begin to work on its next long-range plan, since the new plan will be adopted in three to five years and the community engagement, data analysis, and adoption process can all be lengthy. As a result, although each plan considers a 20 plus year horizon, it only holds sway for four or five years, and opportunities for influencing the direction of the LRTP regularly arise.

Although a long range transportation plan sets out and plans for goals, objectives, and projects over at least a 20-year time frame, any given plan only holds sway for four or five years before a new or revised plan is adopted. As a result, opportunities for influencing the direction of the LRTP regularly arise.
LRTPs generally begin with a vision, developed through public involvement, and a variety of goals and objectives that flow from that vision. As part of the LRTP process, MPOs may, but are not required to, engage in a best practice known as scenario planning, in which performance measures for multiple scenarios are compared with one another to identify pros and cons of different planning directions. As of 2017, almost 60 percent of MPOs used scenario planning in developing plans.75

A variety of specific components are required for an LRTP:

- LRTPs must identify all of the core transportation facilities, including transit and multimodal facilities, that need to function together as part of the integrated transportation system for the region.

- The LRTP must describe the performance measures and targets, and provide a baseline and updated evaluation of the transportation system with respect to these.

- The LRTP must also include a financial plan demonstrating how the plan can be implemented, with available and necessary resources. The projects included in an LRTP must be fiscally constrained, meaning that the proposed projects cannot cost more than available funding, although additional desired projects can be included.

- The LRTP must also include a number of additional categories of information, including: operational/programming strategies for improving performance; proposed capital investments; transit enhancement activities; and environmental mitigation measures.76

Role for State Departments of Transportation

In a process that follows and incorporates the regional MPO planning processes, state DOTs prepare state-wide long range transportation plans (SLRTPs), which provide long-range planning for the state-wide multimodal transportation system, as well as state transportation improvement programs (STIPs). SLRTPs and STIPs incorporate LRTPs and TIPs developed at the MPO level.

Air Quality Conformity

If an MPO contains areas that have poor air quality related to specific pollutants (nonattainment areas) or areas that previously had poor air quality (maintenance areas), additional requirements apply to ensure that the MPO’s activities do not undermine air quality goals. The MPO’s transportation activities, specifically the LRTP, TIP, and federally funded projects, must conform with the State Improvement Plan (SIP) for achieving air quality standards. Under the federal Clean Air Act, states must develop SIPs, a task usually implemented by state environmental or air resources agencies.77 The SIP sets out how the state will ensure that air quality complies with national standards for specific pollutants.78 SIPs must be approved by the federal Environmental Protection Agency. The core goal of transportation air quality conformity requirements is to ensure that activities and funding overseen by the federal government are consistent with air quality goals. Thus, conformity for nonattainment and maintenance areas requires that plans such as LRTPs, funding determinations such as TIPs, and projects are consistent with air quality goals as set out in the SIP, and will not cause new violations, increase the severity of violations, or delay attainment of air quality goals.79
Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) Select and Prioritize Projects for Shorter Term Funding

MPOs also create lists of projects that are prioritized for funding in the short term by creating documents known as transportation improvement programs (TIPs). TIPs must contain projects that are consistent with the LRTP, reflect the investment priorities of the LRTP, and are designed to take steps toward the goals set out in the performance targets. These documents must be fiscally constrained, and must be updated at least every four years.

TIPs must include:

- A priority list of projects and strategies to be developed within the following four years.
- A financial plan that demonstrates how the projects can be implemented and identifies costs and funds.
- A description sufficient to identify each proposed project.
- A description of how the TIP will contribute to achieving the performance targets from the LRTP.

Projects must be contained within the TIP in order to receive FHWA and FTA funds, and the same is generally true for state transportation funds. The approval process for a TIP is convoluted. Generally, projects included in the TIP have been coordinated with the state DOT to ensure that they are consistent with the state transportation improvement program (STIP). After approval by the MPO board, the TIP must be approved by the state governor. It is then incorporated into the STIP without revisions. The STIP requires joint approval from the FHWA and FTA, after which federal funds may be released for approved state and regional projects.

The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Provides a Yearly Workplan

A final product that MPOs must regularly develop is the unified planning work program (UPWP), an annual or biennial work plan identifying the planning work to be carried out by the MPO within the next one to two years. Work must be identified by activity and task, indicating who is responsible for performing the work, the schedule, the deliverables, and the proposed funding divided out by funding sources. The UPWP must identify planning tasks and studies to be conducted, air quality planning tasks, federally funded studies, and so on. UPWP provides a snapshot of the budget for an MPO’s planning activities, as well as an overview of work being done by consultants for the MPO.
B. Additional Duties for MPOs Serving Transportation Management Areas

MPOs in urbanized areas with more than 200,000 people (Transportation Management Areas) have additional duties that are not required of MPOs in areas with 50,000 to 200,000 people. As noted above, somewhere around half of MPOs serve such areas.

The duties of MPOs serving Transportation Management Areas include:

- **Competitively award Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funds:** Since 2012, MPOs serving Transportation Management Areas have been responsible for competitively allocating a portion of their state’s federal TAP funds. These funds are to be used for walking and bicycling infrastructure projects as well as for infrastructure and programs supporting Safe Routes to School. MPOs run TAP competitions, award funding, and ensure proper use of funds for implementation. The amount received by each MPO is based upon the population within its boundaries.

- **Directly fund projects with Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP) funds:** MPOs serving TMAs receive a suballocation from federal Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP) funds provided to the state. The amount of the suballocation is based upon the MPO’s share of the population of the state. In consultation with the DOT, the MPO has direct authority to fund projects from its approved TIP with these funds. Other STBGP funds may optionally be provided to smaller MPOs by the state DOT.

- **Manage congestion:** MPOs serving TMAs are required by law to undertake a Congestion Management Process (CMP), which must systematically assess the performance of a transportation system in a region, and devise strategies to mitigate traffic congestion, including travel demand reduction, job access projects, and operational management approaches. MPOs often see non-motorized transportation improvements as a strategy to mitigate traffic congestion. Although CMPs must be integrated into the transportation planning process, there is flexibility regarding how they are structured and implemented, meaning that the CMP process may be entirely incorporated into other planning processes such as the LRTP and TIP, or may occur as a standalone process that influences other processes.
C. Additional Federal Requirements

MPOs have a range of additional duties under federal law. These duties are intended to increase collaboration, public input, transportation equity, and coordination toward public goals. Some MPOs treat these duties as compliance requirements to check off; others engage deeply in an effort to implement the spirit of the requirements.

- **Public/stakeholder consultation, outreach, and involvement**: MPOs operate under a variety of public involvement requirements. Despite this, MPO processes tend to be quite opaque and confusing for the public. The specialized nature of MPO duties and the long lapse between input and implementation may contribute to the sense of low levels of public engagement.

  Federal regulations require that MPOs develop a documented public involvement process. All MPOs must conduct proactive public engagement around TIPs, LRTPs, and other activities, which must commence early and be ongoing and collaborative. MPOs that serve TMAs must memorialize their practices in a formal written Public Involvement Plan. The process must provide opportunities for involvement in the transportation planning process for a range of listed stakeholders, from individuals, to transit and freight interests, to representatives of people who bicycle, walk, use transit, and have disabilities. Plans must set out how various requirements will be addressed, such as:

  - Providing timely information & access to background information
  - Holding public meetings at convenient times and locations
  - Seeking out and considering the needs of traditionally under-served populations
  - Demonstrating consideration of and reporting on response to comments received

Other requirements also support transparency and accountability. For example, each year, MPOs are required to publish a listing of all projects, including bicycle and pedestrian investments, for which federal funds have been obligated in the preceding year.
• **Equity requirements:** MPOs are required to comply with environmental justice mandates and with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which states: “No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.” MPOs must develop regular Title VI Program Plans that spell out how they will assure compliance with nondiscrimination mandates. Among other requirements, MPOs must consider, and take steps to reduce, how transportation improvements (or lack thereof) disproportionately burden low-income populations and communities of color.

• **Air quality:** Under the Clean Air Act, there are requirements to ensure that MPOs avoid decisions or actions that may worsen poor or borderline air quality. For MPOs that contain areas determined to have inadequate air quality, known as nonattainment areas, MPOs must ensure that their LRTPs, TIPs, and projects comply with State Improvement Plans (SIPs) to attain improved air quality. MPOs in areas that were previously nonattainment areas (maintenance areas) must also demonstrate transportation conformity. SIPs set out “budgets” for on-road mobile source emissions. Affected MPOs must conduct detailed conformity analyses for plans and projects, in compliance with very specific requirements. MPO policy boards must make an initial transportation conformity determination for their LRTPs and TIPs, showing that total projected emissions are within the SIP’s allotted budget for their region. Final conformity is determined by the FHWA. If conformity is not properly established or has expired, following a grace period, an area will be found to suffer a conformity lapse. During a conformity lapse, most FHWA or FTA federal funding cannot be used, with limited exceptions.

• **Measure performance goals:** Federal law requires MPOs to set performance goals. For example, as part of Highway Safety Improvement Program safety targets, MPOs must establish goals regarding the number of fatalities, rate of fatalities, number of serious injuries, rate of serious injuries, and number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries. MPOs use data to inform the prioritization and selection of transportation projects in a region.

• **Administer federal transportation funds:** As noted above, MPOs may also have authority over distinct pots of federal transportation funds. In addition to those noted above, other federal funds may also be provided to or coordinated with MPOs, including specific public transportation funds (FTA section 5307 funds) and funds to improve mobility for people with disabilities and seniors (section 5310).
D. Additional MPO Activities

MPO Duties Under State Law

Because states create MPOs, they can also establish additional roles and responsibilities for them beyond those established by federal law. As a result, a particular MPO may play additional important roles beyond those that most MPOs have.

Examples of additional responsibilities of this nature include:

• **In Texas, House Bill 20, passed in 2015**, requires each MPO to develop a 10-Year Plan of projects. The first four years of the plan qualifies as the TIP, and the remainder allows mid-range planning by the region and state.

• **In California, state law (SB 375)** requires MPOs to develop Sustainable Communities Strategies (SCSs) as part of LRTPs. Each region is provided with collaboratively determined climate emission reduction targets, and the Sustainable Communities Strategy must demonstrate how the region will meet those targets, or must set out alternative planning strategies that would do so. The SCS must address housing needs and transportation emissions, and must quantify the climate emission reductions projected by the SCS. Transportation funding decisions in the LRTP must be consistent with the SCS; that also means that TIPs must be consistent with the SCS.

• **In Oregon, a comprehensive state land use planning regulatory framework** imposes specific requirements on MPOs, among others. Oregon’s Transportation Planning Rule requires that MPOs plan for reduced automobile reliance and an increase in transportation mode choices. The rule also requires consistency between MPOs’ LRTPs and local jurisdictions’ required transportation system plans, which introduces new requirements for consultation, coordination, and negotiation.
Additional Roles for MPOs

Where MPOs have funding and are not precluded by state restrictions, they may choose to engage in a variety of additional areas of activity. Because regional transportation planning is deeply interconnected with other state, regional, and local challenges and goals, there are many additional areas where MPOs have the relationships, structure, and know-how to play a key role.

A few examples include:

- **Regional agreements to work together**: MPOs can enter into agreements with each other or with other entities to work in a larger regional capacity on areas of interest—climate change, economic development, housing, and more.

- **Awarding regional funding**: MPOs can work with stakeholders and local jurisdictions to plan and structure local taxes or other mechanisms to raise new local funding for transportation projects. MPOs may be designated as responsible for the administration of such funds.\(^\text{111}\)

- **Resources, templates, and technical assistance to local member governments**: MPOs often provide assistance to their member communities, particularly on emerging issues beyond the immediate expertise of local communities. For example, the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission in Pennsylvania developed a series of model ordinance frameworks on alternative energy, to assist municipalities in easily tailoring ordinances for adoption that would provide for solar deployment throughout the region.\(^\text{112}\)

- **Maps and analyses**: MPOs have access to enormous amounts of data, and are required by federal law to make transportation data meaningful to the public and stakeholders through a variety of visualization methods. This means that MPOs also have the capacity to translate data in related arenas. MPOs develop maps and analyses to assist other agencies and decision makers in understanding data and resources. Some MPOs also develop maps to help residents to access available resources.

- **Policy decisions**: MPOs can adopt a wide array of policies to spell out how they will conduct their activities. For example, many MPOs have adopted Complete Streets policies. MPOs can adopt policies committing to specific objectives or supporting issues such as Vision Zero or Safe Routes to School.
Many MPOs have not historically considered health, active transportation, or equity as key goals or targets, and have not factored these considerations into their activities beyond a cursory compliance with legal requirements. Over the past ten years, many MPOs have begun to engage with these concerns more significantly. In looking to influence MPOs, in some communities, stakeholders may need to focus on establishing relationships with staff and MPO board members, working to lay the groundwork for changes. In some communities, stakeholders will be able to work with staff on early actions and small modifications to existing processes. And in some communities, stakeholders will be able to work with MPOs to create more significant alternations to ongoing processes and structural changes that will center health and equity in a meaningful way.
How can you get started on engaging and influencing your MPO?

1. **First, educate yourself.** Understand the basics about your MPO – what region does it serve, how is decision making structured on its policy board, what advisory boards and other structures are there, and what opportunities exist to influence the board? Talk to advocates and political leaders who can provide perspective on the competing currents and priorities within your MPO’s leadership.

2. **Begin to build relationships.** Meet with MPO staff and identify allies. Determine whether the MPO policy board member representing your jurisdiction is likely to be friendly to your general goals, and cultivate a relationship with that member, their staff, and other members who are supportive of health.

3. **Determine a feasible yet ambitious goal.** Now that you understand the roles that MPOs can play generally and how your MPO works and leans specifically, select one or several goals that you would like to see your MPO implement. Maybe this is including funding for a protected bike lane or sidewalks on a school route in the transportation improvement program (TIP), or the prioritization of walking and biking routes to healthy food venues.

4. **Build good will and influence.** Becoming appointed to an advisory committee can be a good way to begin to influence internal processes for your MPO, strengthen relationships with staff, and advocate for your goals. There are other opportunities for public input as well.

5. **Work toward short-term and long-term goals.** Advocate for short-term wins while also supporting structural changes that will create more community voice and higher prioritization of health and equity.

As this report sets out, MPOs play a crucial role in influencing health and regional investments in bicycling, walking, and Safe Routes to School. By understanding the responsibilities and activities of MPOs, health and active transportation stakeholders can develop a clearer conception of the significance of this arena of regional decision making, and can better understand how and why to get involved to advance health for their region’s children, families, and communities.

For more insight and ideas regarding how MPO staff advance health and some promising and innovative practices seen in MPOs around the country, explore our companion report, *Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Health 201: Best Practices & Promising Opportunities for Health*. 
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Date: Thursday, June 27, 2019
Time: 1:30 p.m.
Place: ECWRPC Offices, 400 Ahnaip Street, Suite 100 Menasha, WI

Committee Members Present:
Martin Farrell (Chair) ................................................................. Fond du Lac County
Jerry Erdmann .......................................................................................... Shawano County
Jeremy Johnson (Perm. Alt. for Laure Pecore) ........................................ Menominee County
Jeff Nooyen (Vice Chair) ........................................................................ Outagamie County
Dick Koeppen .............................................................................................. Waupaca County
Alice Connors .............................................................................................. Calumet County
Donna Kalata ................................................................................................. Waushara County
Dave Albrecht (Perm. Alt. for Shiloh Ramos) ............................................. Winnebago County

Staff /Others Present:
Eric Fowle ................................................................................................. Executive Director
Walt Raith .................................................................................................. Assistant Director
Pam Scheibe-Johnson ............................................................................... Controller

1) Welcome & Introductions

   Mr. Farrell welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2) Statement of Compliance with Wis. Stats. Sec. 19.84 Regarding Open Meetings Requirement

   Mr. Fowle noted that the amended agenda was posted/distributed as required and that a quorum of members was present.

3) Pledge of Allegiance

4) Approval of Agenda

   Ms. Connors motioned to deviate from the agenda as posted and move all items in section 9, with the exception of 9-d, prior to discussion of item 8-a. Ms. Kalata seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
There was brief discussion regarding the decision to deviate from the agenda to discuss the strategic plan and budget items prior to items related to staffing.

Ms. Kalata motioned to approve the agenda as amended, Mr. Erdmann seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

5) Public Comment

There was no public comment.

6) Approval of May 29, 2019 Meeting Summary of Proceedings (REMOVED AS SOPS ARE NOT YET COMPLETE)

7) Announcements

a) Update on AWRPC June 21 Annual Meeting, Green Bay

Mr. Fowle provided a synopsis of the annual AWRPC meeting. Items included were as follows: overview of state agency presentations, adoption of budget and plan of work, and 2020 Regional Planning Summit.

b) Other

There was brief discussion regarding Commissioner updates as several have had health issues.

8) New Business/Action Items:

a) CLOSED SESSION: The Committee will convene into closed session pursuant to section 19.85(1) of the Wisconsin Statutes to: 1) discuss personnel matters pertaining to the 2019 and 2020 ECWRPC Staffing Plan, and; 2) discuss matters pertaining to staff succession planning for the agency.

Mr. Johnson motioned to move into closed session, Mr. Erdmann seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

b) RECONVENE INTO OPEN SESSION: The Committee will reconvene into open session pursuant to section 19.85(2) of the Wisconsin Statutes to take action, if necessary, on the above matters.

Mr. Albrecht motioned to reconvene into open session, Ms. Connors seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

9) Informational/Discussion Items:

a) Update on Outagamie County Membership Issues

Mr. Fowle and Mr. Farrell guided discussion regarding the progress of the agenda item since the last Steering Committee meeting. Items included in the discussion were as follows: results of meeting between East Central and Outagamie County staff on June 20,
county representation on the Commission Board, local assistance projects and funding, regional functioning of the agency, potential impacts on the regional community, comparison of other RPC functionality and funding, Outagamie County membership continuance, role of East Central as a planning agency and the need for strategic planning. It was noted that the information that the County mentioned they put together for RPC comparisons should be sought and be reviewed as it may be the crux of the issue.

b) Review of Preliminary 2020 Budget & Discussion on 2020 Levy

Mr. Fowle provided a review of the preliminary budget and levy for 2020. Items included in the review were as follows: funding assumptions, health insurance, other benefits, staffing, local contracts, and budget/levy scenarios.

Discussion took place regarding: individual county levy increase, budget scenarios, wage and health insurance increases, necessary levy increases, level of work and balanced budget, staffing and services, history of levy, current adopted budget and projected surplus, transportation carryover, county levies and budgets, Commission services, technical assistance and fee schedule change, impact of county withdrawal, project priority of paying vs. non-paying members, and closing discussion on levy increase with Shawano, Waupaca, Menominee and Fond du Lac Counties suggesting support for an increase of up to 2%.

c) Review of Draft Bylaws Changes

Mr. Fowle guided an overview and discussion of the draft changes to the bylaws. Items included in the overview and discussion were as follows: modifying the language pertaining to quorum; clarification on meeting notices; clarifications linking the bylaws to the financial procedures manual such as signing of text, and drafts; the addition of Article XI for compliance with federal and State of Wisconsin law; and an update to formalize the role of the MPO as per the request of Federal Highway Administration.

d) Review of Draft Personnel Policies Changes

Mr. Fowle noted that a number of edits were remaining, position descriptions have been completed, however a number of previously discussed edits still need to be completed. This will be presented for action at the next meeting.

e) ECWRPC Strategic Planning Update

Mr. Fowle noted that he has scheduled a meeting with Mr. Romenesko, Calumet County, to look at the process he used for the county’s strategic plan and if he would be interested in being involved in East Central’s strategic planning. Additionally, a schedule and process for the agency’s strategic planning will be established. Mr. Fowle also provided a summary of the I-41 meeting held on June 26th, discussion took place regarding the role of NewNorth’s leadership initiative, communication, and projected end date.

f) Review of Draft ECWRPC Fee Schedule Changes
Mr. Fowle provided an overview of the fee schedule changes. Items included in the overview were as follows: review of previous discussion on this item, updates, road sign inventory changes, MIOVISION camera data additions/updates, waiving MIOVISION fee when applicable conditions are met, bicycle and pedestrian plan costs, comprehensive plan public process changes, 2019 fees, and 2020 fees to be determined.

g) 2020 Technical Assistance Program Update

Mr. Fowle provided an update for the 2020 Technical Assistance Program. Items included in the update were as follows: summary of open house event, submitted applications, deadline to submit applications, additional open house, and technical assistance and the fee schedule.

10) County Issue Sharing / Roundtable Discussion

Items included in the roundtable discussion were as follows: Outagamie County Board and Calumet County jail project.

11) Next Meeting Dates & Agenda

After some discussion Mr. Fowle said that staff would prepare and distribute an online poll for the next Committee meeting date.

12) Adjourn

Ms. Kalata motioned to adjourn; Mr. Koeppen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.
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Date: Monday, July 22, 2019
Time: 1:00 p.m.
Place: ECWRPC Offices, 400 Ahnaip Street, Suite 100 Menasha, WI

Committee Members Present:
Martin Farrell (Chair)........................................................................................................Fond du Lac County
Jerry Erdmann .......................................................................................................................Shawano County
Ruth Winter (Alt. for Jeremy Johnson (Perm. Alt. for Laure Pecore))................................Menominee County
Jeff Nooyen (Vice Chair) .....................................................................................................Outagamie County
Dick Koeppen .......................................................................................................................Waupaca County
Alice Connors .......................................................................................................................Calumet County
Bob Sivic (Alt. for Donna Kalata)........................................................................................Waushara County

Committee Members Unexcused:
Dave Albrecht (Perm. Alt. for Shiloh Ramos) .................................................................Winnebago County

Staff/Others Present:
Eric Fowle .........................................................................................................................Executive Director
Walt Raith ............................................................................................................................Assistant Director
Pam Scheibe-Johnson .........................................................................................................Controller
Kevin Sturn ..........................................................................................................................Outagamie County
Craig Moser ........................................................................................................................Outagamie County
Kara Homan ........................................................................................................................Outagamie County
Joseph Guidot ......................................................................................................................Outagamie County
Thomas Nelson ....................................................................................................................Outagamie County

1) Welcome & Introductions

Chair Farrell welcomed committee members and guests to the meeting. Roundtable introductions were conducted.

2) Statement of Compliance with Wis. Stats. Sec. 19.84 Regarding Open Meetings Requirement

Mr. Fowle noted that the amended agenda was posted/distributed as required and that a quorum of members was present.

3) Pledge of Allegiance
4) Approval of Agenda

Mr. Erdmann motioned to approve the agenda, Ms. Connors seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

5) Public Comment

There was no public comment.

6) Approval of May 29, 2019 Meeting Summary of Proceedings

Ms. Connors motioned to approve the summary of proceedings, Mr. Koeppen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

7) Approval of June 27, 2019 Meeting Summary of Proceedings

Ms. Connors motioned to approve the summary of proceedings, Mr. Erdmann seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

8) Announcements

Mr. Fowle announced that the Quarterly Commission Meeting would be on July 26th in New London at the City Hall.

Mr. Fowle also noted that a letter was received from the Economic Development Administration (EDA) regarding the indirect rate; they reviewed the audit and approved the indirect rate.

Mr. Fowle also noted that the Fire Department did an inspection of the offices, which was passed.

9) Informational/Discussion Items:

a) 2nd Quarter Financial Report

Ms. Scheibe-Johnson provided an overview of the financial report. Items in the overview were as follows: balance sheet, cash position, accounts receivable, accounts payable, cash comparison to previous fiscal year, related liabilities, Winnebago County loan, statement of revenue and expenses, budget comparison, total federal and state grants, billing to WisDOT, WEDC Business Disaster Microloan Program, state grant programs, local contracts, revenue, annual budget, expenses, employee fringe benefits, direct grant expenses, overhead, and surplus.

Mr. Koeppen motioned to receive the report and place on file. Mr. Erdmann seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

b) 2nd Quarter Project Status Report
Mr. Fowle provided an overview of the project status report. Items included in the overview were as follows: work effort, percent of hours spent, hours invested per project, completion of projects, budget of projects, and underperforming projects.

There was discussion regarding the budget of projects, working with communities regarding completion of projects, project efficiencies, estimation of hours, and number of projects.

Mr. Erdmann motioned to receive and place on file, Ms. Winter seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

c) Update on Outagamie County Membership Issues

Chair Farrell provided an update regarding Outagamie County membership issues and initiated the discussion. Items included in the discussion were as follows: county concerns regarding membership, establishment of levy among counties, level and structure of service, value of county membership, member vs. non-member fees, voting decisions and prioritization of projects, county membership value in terms of services received, core of Commission service, role of the Commission, scope of service, summary of outcomes from Outagamie County Board and Finance Committee meetings, comparison of functionality of regional planning commissions (RPCs), agency service fees of RPCs, agency restructuring, agency efficiencies, geographic and jurisdictional diversity amongst and within regional planning commissions, involvement and choice of work of regional planning commissions, base statutes, development of work based on Commissioner feedback, reduction of levy, impact of county membership loss, interconnectivity of work, update of strategic plan, importance of communication to the Commission, internal county discussions regarding the topic, interest in county to have some of core services of the Commission, Commissioner ambassadorship, Outagamie County structure and reporting, and Outagamie County’s desire to have MPO services in the event of withdrawal.

The Committee concurred that strategic planning is necessary and that the Commission should be allowed time to develop an update, with the input of Outagamie County. Outagamie County representatives stated that they will review the strategic plan prior to making decisions regarding the potential withdrawal of the County.

d) ECWRPC Strategic Planning Update

Mr. Fowle provided an update regarding strategic planning. Mr. Fowle explained that he did have time to meet with Todd Romenesko, Calumet County, and based on the meeting a preliminary outline was drafted. The update will take time and there are many stakeholders involved. There was an I-41 Stakeholders Committee that was held in June and an August date has been suggested for the Steering Committee to meet regarding the strategic plan to perform a SWOT analysis, and assessing big picture trends affecting the Commission. In September, a special meeting of the standing committees would be called to review the results of the August Steering Committee Meeting and then begin developing the vision and priorities associated with those trends and their areas of work on the standing committees. Priorities would also be set by the standing committees. There will also be an online targeted survey to local units of government within the region: towns, cities, and villages to obtain feedback on what they use East Central for
and what they value. In October, individual county engagements with key department heads, staff members, and the county Commissioners would be held to review the results of the committee meetings and survey results and begin identifying action items. Later in October, these results would be shared with the standing committees at their regular meetings to review those items and identify action items. Staff will work to coalesce everything through November including a partnering charter – which is key for communication and ambassadorship. The Steering Committee will meet in December and a draft plan can be reviewed and revised in January and approved by the full Commission. Afterwards, an effort will need to be made to keep this plan active and implemented.

Mr. Nooyen asked for clarification regarding targeted units of government and added that included in the online survey should also be what the entities do not use, why haven’t they used it, and are they willing to pay for it. Mr. Fowle also noted that the survey would be shared with the Steering Committee before it is released.

There was discussion regarding the importance of strategic planning, the need to plan for dedicated lengths of time to meet and thoroughly focus on the planning process, and ensuring an effective timeline and structure of the planning process.

e) 2020 Technical Assistance Program Update

Mr. Fowle provided an overview of the 2020 Technical Assistance Program. An open house was held earlier this year and another open house is scheduled to be held in September. Approximately 20-24 projects have been submitted, approximately half of them are from Outagamie County communities. The projects are currently being assessed, preliminary scopes of work are being developed, and funding examined. The deadline to submit projects is in October. The list and ranking of projects will be sent to Steering Committee for final decisions and approval at a later date.

There was brief discussion regarding the potential for project carryover.

10) New Business/Action Items:

a) CLOSED SESSION: The Committee will convene into closed session pursuant to section 19.85(1) of the Wisconsin Statutes to: 1) discuss personnel matters pertaining to the 2019 and 2020 ECWRPC Staffing Plan, and; 2) discuss matters pertaining to staff succession planning for the agency;

Ms. Connors motioned to move into closed session, Ms. Winter seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

b) RECONVENE INTO OPEN SESSION: The Committee will reconvene into open session pursuant to section 19.85(2) of the Wisconsin Statutes to take action, if necessary, on the above matters.

Mr. Erdmann motioned to reconvene into open session, Ms. Connors seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
Mr. Nooyen motioned to approve the overall 2020 salary adjustment percentage, Mr. Koeppen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Koeppen motioned to approve the 3 promotions discussed in closed session, Mr. Farrell seconded the motion.

Mr. Fowle commented that the promotions have been included in the preliminary budget. This is being done earlier in the year than normal and it will be a priority to meet that. If the promotions are not approved, there is the risk of losing key staff. No major changes in federal and state funding are expected.

There was discussion regarding approval of the budget and timing of promotion planning.

Mr. Nooyen motioned to postpone the decision on the 3 promotions until the October Steering Committee meeting, Mr. Erdmann seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

c) Proposed Resolution 20-19 – Adoption of the Preliminary Year 2020 Budget & Final Tax Levy for the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission

Mr. Fowle summarized the results of the prior Steering Committee meeting and noted that there was mixed interest in a 2 percent increase. Mr. Fowle provided an example of what a 2 percent increase would be and noted that the committee can decrease the amount as they see fit. Mr. Fowle noted that it would be difficult to move forward without an increase, particularly in regard to staffing.

There was discussion regarding items that could be cut in overhead expenses such as postage and printing of meeting materials, building rent, staff development, staff travel, and outside printing and publishing. Total membership levy increase scenarios were also discussed. It was decided to further discuss moving the outside printing and publishing of the annual report and newsletter to digital format with the full Commission at the July Quarterly Commission Meeting.

Mr. Koeppen motioned to approve the resolution, Mr. Erdmann seconded the motion. The motion passed with 4 ayes and 2 nays (Ms. Connors and Mr. Nooyen).

d) Proposed Resolution 21-19 – Amending the Bylaws of the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission

Mr. Fowle provided an overview of the amendments to the bylaws which included: clarification on quorum, modification on execution of instruments, checks and drafts, and recognition of role as the MPO Policy Board.

Mr. Nooyen asked if there was a definition of membership included in the MPO portion of the bylaws. Mr. Fowle replied that the metropolitan planning area is referenced as portions of Calumet, Outagamie, and Winnebago County in terms of the area that it covers regardless of membership. Mr. Raith confirmed that was decided at the federal level. There was also discussion of local cost-sharing and funding agreement for the MPO. Mr. Fowle reaffirmed that this addition to the bylaws was requested by the FHWA during the federal certification process. There was discussion of the template and
language used as it was a new piece. Mr. Fowle responded that no template was provided, the language came from the MPO document, resolutions, partnership agreements, and standard language on what the MPO Policy Board is. Mr. Fowle also noted that the Federal Highway Administration approved the document language. There was also discussion to verify that the included counties, should they become non-members, would still be a recipient of MPO services. The language provided in the amendment indicated that to be so. There was also brief discussion regarding sub-committees and whether or not the MPO Policy Board had formed any in the past.

Mr. Erdmann motioned to approve the resolution, Mr. Koeppen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

e) Proposed Resolution 22-19 – Amending Resolution No. 08-90 and Subsequent Resolutions Specifying the Personnel Policies for Persons Employed by the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission.

Mr. Fowle summarized the changes made to the personnel policies: addition of the definition of moonlighting, addition of a whistleblower policy, update of the office hour change, update of the table of authorized positions and salary schedule, benefit changes, special development opportunities, change in holidays, additions and enhancements to the outside employment language, changes to the grievance policy, and work from home updates.

Discussion took place regarding the definition of moonlighting. The definition was put in place to prevent staff from taking competitive work away from other RPCs on personal work time. Mr. Fowle replied that employees would only be allowed to do similar work in another regional planning commission’s territory with both the East Central RPC and respective RPC Executive Directors’ approval.

Mr. Erdmann motioned to approve the resolution, Mr. Koeppen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

f) Proposed Resolution 23-19 – Approving the Amended and Updated 2020 Schedule of Fees for Services of the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission

Mr. Fowle provided an overview of the resolution. Mr. Fowle noted that this will be reviewed annually. The Sewer Service Area and NR-135 Programs have been integrated as well noting that the 2020 fee for NR-135 is adopted by the county.

Ms. Connors asked if with the increase in the levy if member counties could expect to receive technical assistance for free or if there would still be a fee associated with it. Mr. Fowle replied that the levy increase does not correlate with the fee schedule. The fee schedule was implemented to leverage additional revenue and make it easier to get contract work. This is beginning to generate interest in services and is offering lower costs than a private consultant. Mr. Fowle also noted that this list is not complete, these are the more common project requests that East Central receives.

Ms. Connors asked if the cost of the comprehensive plan was a yearly rate. Mr. Fowle replied that the cost listed was to update one of the nine elements of a comprehensive plan.
Mr. Koeppen motioned to approve the resolution, Mr. Erdmann seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

g) Proposed Resolution 24-19 – Approving a Whistleblower Policy for the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission

Ms. Connors motioned to approve the resolution, Mr. Koeppen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

11) County Issue Sharing / Roundtable Discussion

Items included in roundtable discussion were as follows: county increases and county board changes.

12) Next Meeting Dates & Agenda

The next meeting of the Steering Committee is to be determined for late August.

13) Adjourn

Mr. Koeppen motioned to adjourn, Ms. Connors seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
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Date:  Wednesday, August 28, 2019
Time:  9:00 A.M. – Approx. 12:00 Noon
Place:  ECWRPC Offices, 400 Ahnaip Street, Suite 100 Menasha, WI

Committee Members Present:
Martin Farrell (Chair).................................................................Fond du Lac County
Jerry Erdmann ..............................................................Shawano County
Jeremy Johnson (Perm. Alt. for Laure Pecore) ..................................................Menominee County
Jeff Nooyen (Vice Chair) ......................................................Outagamie County
DuWayne Federwitz (Temp. Alt. for Dick Koeppen) ........................................Waupaca County
Alice Connors ........................................................................Calumet County
Dave Albrecht (Perm. Alt. for Shiloh Ramos) ..............................................Winnebago County
Donna Kalata ...........................................................................Waushara County

Committee Members Unexcused:
None

Staff /Others Present:
Eric Fowle ..........................................................Executive Director
Walt Raith ...............................................................Assistant Director
Pam Scheibe-Johnson ................................................Controller
Melissa Kraemer-Badtke ................................................Principal Transportation Planner
Dave Tebo .................................................................WI2 Consulting

1) Welcome & Introductions

The meeting was called to order at approximately 9:00 a.m.

2) Statement of Compliance with Wis. Stats. Sec. 19.84 Regarding Open Meetings Requirement

Mr. Fowle noted that the amended agenda was posted/distributed as required and that a quorum of members was present.

3) Pledge of Allegiance

4) Approval of Agenda
Mr. Erdmann motioned to approve the agenda, Mr. Albrecht seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

5) Public Comment

There was no public comment.

6) Approval of July 22, 2019 Meeting Summary of Proceedings

Ms. Connors motioned to approve the summary of proceedings, Mr. Nooyen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

7) Announcements

Mr. Fowle announced that he was invited to attend the September 17th, 2019 meeting of the Outagamie County Finance Committee after having a discussion with the Committee Chair. His meeting will focus on the general and specific values associated with the Commission’s work.

8) Special Order of Business – Strategic Planning Workshop

Mr. Fowle introduced Mr. Dave Tebo with WI2 Consulting who will be leading the facilitation of the Standing Committees with respect to the 2020-2023 Strategic Plan Update. Introductions were made and Mr. Tebo assumed the lead for this item, working with the Committee to address a number of specific exercises in order to generate information which will be considered during the plan’s development. Staff left the room for this session and upon their return Mr. Fowle shared a set of draft surveys with the Committee which will be used for targeted input from local governments and county departments within the eight member counties.

9) County Issue Sharing / Roundtable Discussion (as time permits.)

None

10) Next Meeting Dates & Agenda

The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, October 9th, 2019 at 10:00 a.m. at East Central’s offices.

11) Adjourn

Mr. Erdmann motioned to adjourn, Mr. Johnson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 11:59 a.m.
## EAST CENTRAL WI REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

### Balance Sheet

**As of 9/30/2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSETS</th>
<th>9/30/2019</th>
<th>9/30/2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASH &amp; CASH EQUIVALENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-01</td>
<td>CASH-AssocBank Main Checking AI</td>
<td>$12,456.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-03</td>
<td>CASH-Associated Benefit Account</td>
<td>11,165.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-05</td>
<td>CASH-AssocBank Money Market</td>
<td>75,955.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010-00</td>
<td>STATE TREASURER-LOCAL GOVT PL</td>
<td>165,631.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1020-00</td>
<td>PETTY CASH</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total CASH &amp; CASH EQUIVALENTS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>265,308.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECEIVABLES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100-00</td>
<td>ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE</td>
<td>345,690.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130-00</td>
<td>DEFERRED REVENUE/1R135 CARRYOVER</td>
<td>-59,196.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1140-00</td>
<td>OTHER DEFERRED REVENUE</td>
<td>-4,148.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total RECEIVABLES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>282,344.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PREPAIDS &amp; DEPOSITS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200-00</td>
<td>PREPAID &amp; DEPOSITS</td>
<td>17,033.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210-00</td>
<td>DEFERRED OUTFLOWS</td>
<td>454,261.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total PREPAIDS &amp; DEPOSITS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>471,294.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPITAL EQUIPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1410-00</td>
<td>COMPUTERS, AUTO &amp; OTHER EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>172,386.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1415-00</td>
<td>ACCUM. DEPRE. COMPUTER</td>
<td>-153,331.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420-00</td>
<td>CAPITAL LEASE ASSET</td>
<td>23,451.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1425-00</td>
<td>ACCUM. DEPRE. CAPITAL LEASE ASSET</td>
<td>-12,696.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total CAPITAL EQUIPMENT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>29,608.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500-00</td>
<td>NET PENSION ASSET</td>
<td>247,501.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total ASSETS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,296,058.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-00</td>
<td>ACCOUNTS PAYABLE</td>
<td>$42,818.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total ACCRUED LIABILITIES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>537,707.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOTES PAYABLE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300-00</td>
<td>WINN.CO.-UPL 2010-2020</td>
<td>16,946.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2305-00</td>
<td>CAPITAL LEASE PAYABLE</td>
<td>11,232.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total NOTES PAYABLE:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>28,179.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400-00</td>
<td>NET OTHER POST-EMPLOYMENT BENEFIT</td>
<td>154,333.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total LIABILITIES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>763,037.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET POSITION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2900-00</td>
<td>Retained Earnings-Current Year</td>
<td>124,348.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2900-00</td>
<td>RETAINED EARNINGS - PRIOR</td>
<td>399,013.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2910-00</td>
<td>INVESTMENT/FIXED ASSETS</td>
<td>9,659.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total NET POSITION:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>533,020.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total LIABILITIES &amp; NET POSITION:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,296,058.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
<td>Approved Budget 2019</td>
<td>YTD 9/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intergovernmental</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grants</td>
<td>$1,370,614</td>
<td>$942,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Grants</td>
<td>1,250,974</td>
<td>882,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intergovernmental Charges for Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local districts membership levy</td>
<td>1,039,618</td>
<td>865,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local districts (secured/expected contracts)</td>
<td>771,753</td>
<td>650,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR-135 Program (Operator fees)</td>
<td>133,985</td>
<td>69,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR-135 Program (WDNR fees)</td>
<td>116,350</td>
<td>127,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Charges for Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous Revenue</strong> (interest earned, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,417,832</td>
<td>$1,816,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salaries and wages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>$1,217,753</td>
<td>$909,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioners (meeting payments)</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>10,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee fringe benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Insurance</td>
<td>487,299</td>
<td>352,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA, Wknn's Comp, Life, Retirement, etc.</td>
<td>306,126</td>
<td>222,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA, Wknn's Comp, Life, Retirement, etc.</td>
<td>181,173</td>
<td>130,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct grant expenses (contracts/programs)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Expenses (general)</td>
<td>336,432</td>
<td>237,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through - NR-135 Expenses (WDNR fees)</td>
<td>107,299</td>
<td>104,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through - Regional SRTS Service Contracts</td>
<td>17,530</td>
<td>17,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through - Commuter Service Study Subaward</td>
<td>116,393</td>
<td>50,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through - Transit Subawards</td>
<td>59,721</td>
<td>38,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through - EasterSeals</td>
<td>3,810</td>
<td>3,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through - EasterSeals</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>18,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through - Economics of Bike/Ped Consultant</td>
<td>12,679</td>
<td>3,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through - Initiative 41 Subawards</td>
<td>347,750</td>
<td>9,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overhead Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting expenses &amp; Staff Development</td>
<td>32,060</td>
<td>25,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>4,692</td>
<td>4,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office space and equipment</td>
<td>152,336</td>
<td>112,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference materials, subscriptions and dues</td>
<td>6,595</td>
<td>5,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and publishing</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>10,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage (EC costs only)</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>2,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff expenses (EC costs only)</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>1,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance, legal, audit</td>
<td>21,756</td>
<td>18,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>1,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Purchases/Depreciation</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>9,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,302,774</td>
<td>$1,691,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected Surplus / (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$115,058</td>
<td>$124,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjustments for Cash Flows</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Winnebago Cty principal payment</td>
<td>(16,142)</td>
<td>(16,142)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between capital purchases &amp; depreciation</td>
<td>(8,000)</td>
<td>(5,244)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Budgeted Hours</td>
<td>Hours Spent to Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1115-019: Waushara Co. - Demographic Data for Comp. Plan Updates</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>143.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2442-019: FDL Co Niagara Escarp Mapping</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>207.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1411-019: C Menasha CORP Update</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>204.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1390-019: Workshops</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2429-019: New Holstein Comp Plan Update</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2439-019: T Eldorado Comp Plan (complete for '19, still work/$ for '20)</td>
<td>195.5</td>
<td>289.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833-019: WI Public Health Assoc Board Involvement</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2430-019: V. Winneconne Comp Plan Update</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>84.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2433-019: T. of Oakfield Comp Plan Update (complete for '19, still work/$ for '20)</td>
<td>150.5</td>
<td>211.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1386-019: Youth Engagement Program</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>328.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2441-019: Kiel Comp Outdoor Rec Plan</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2445-019: C of Shawano Comp Outdoor Rec Plan</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1232-019: Sewer Service Area Plan Continuing Management</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5110-019: Agency Management</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>630.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5120-019: GIS Management</td>
<td>142.5</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1418-019: Winn Co Phase 3 Parks Econ Study</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>107.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2427-019: Greenville Comp Plan Update &amp; Bike/Ped Plan</td>
<td>100.5</td>
<td>104.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712-019: Oshkosh Subdivision Regulation Update Assistance</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1233-019: Sewer Service Area Plan Updates</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1311-019: FC/Osh Program Administration and Support</td>
<td>352.5</td>
<td>348.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630-019: Niagara Escarpment Resource Network Participation/Coordination</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1323-019: FC/Osh Multi-modal/Transportation Alternatives Program</td>
<td>2130</td>
<td>2006.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3011-019: Clintonville Custom GIS for ED Marketing</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3050-019: Wisconsin Land Information Association (WLIA) Activities</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>94.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1324-019: FC/Osh Transit</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730-019: Neighborhood Partners Network</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>131.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1105-019: Regional Comprehensive Planning Committee Coordination &amp; Admin</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>79.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1419-019: Shawano Co CORP Update</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>238.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2420-019: Valley Transit TDP</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>447.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1312-019: FC/Osh Fox Cities/Oshkosh LRTLUP</td>
<td>3907.5</td>
<td>3423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1341-019: FDL- Prgm Administration and Support</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1346-019: FDL Travel Model Improvement Program</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1505-019: EDA Administration/Economic Development Committee Coordination</td>
<td>153.5</td>
<td>129.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1344-019: FDL Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>317.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621-019: NR-135 Non-Metallic Mine Reclamation Program</td>
<td>1542</td>
<td>1210.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111-019: Fox Cities Visioning Team</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554-019: Initiative 41 Econ Devel StoryMap</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1381-019: Regional SRTS</td>
<td>3488</td>
<td>2651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1332-019: Reg Transportation Tech Assistance</td>
<td>528.5</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1623-019: Winnebago Co. Extraction Ordinance Inspections</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8200-019: Staff Development</td>
<td>547.5</td>
<td>400.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1511-019: CEDS Implementation</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2443-019: Kaukauna Wayfinding Inventory</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>64.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640-019: Winn Pool Lakes Support Activities</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>67.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540-019: Annual Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy Update</td>
<td>487.5</td>
<td>335.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1518-019: ESRI Business Analyst Services</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552-019: Initiative 41 Coord Activities</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805-019: Health in Planning Admin &amp; Implement</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1342-019: FDL LRTLUP</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Budgeted Hours</td>
<td>Hours Spent to Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1343-019: FDL Short Range/Congestion Mngmt</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>132.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2437-019: V. No FDL Comprehensive Plan Update</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>117.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1533-019: Shawano Co Demographic Info for County/Twn</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1322-019: FC/Osh - Transportation Improvement Program</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>469.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3020-019: GIS Information Processing &amp; Data Center</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>170.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2438-019: T Alto Comp Plan Update</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>57.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1517-019: Support/Participation in Local/Regional/State Ec. Dev. Orgs</td>
<td>172.5</td>
<td>89.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1333-019: Regional Comprehensive Planning</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656-019: Lake Michigan Stakeholders Participation</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3040-019: Wisconsin Regional Orthophotography Consortium</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1231-019: Sewer Service Area Plan Promotion, Implementation, &amp; Administration</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>23.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2422-019: Commuter Service Study</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>149.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1514-019: Global Trade Strategy Implementation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1516-019: EMSI Analysis Services</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625-019: Waupaca Co. Extraction Ordinance Inspections</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599-019: WEDC Business Disaster Microloan Pgm</td>
<td>127.5</td>
<td>41.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1116-019 V Hortonville Cooper Boundary</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1535-019: Technical Assistance - To be Determined Projects</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>71.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2428-019: Twn Algoma Comp Plan Update</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326-019: FC/Osh - Sustainability/Livability/Energy Conservation/Air Quality</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1321-019: FC/Osh - Short Range/Congestion Management Process</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>257.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030-019: Regional Land Information Systems (RLIS)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1140-019: Regional Comprehensive Plan Update</td>
<td>547.5</td>
<td>146.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2436-019: Statutory Housing Reports</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>43.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1331-019: Regional Transportation Admin</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>27.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832-019: WI Active Communities Alliance</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1141-019: Residential Devel Policies Update</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1205-019: Community Facilities Committee Coordination &amp; Administration</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>22.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1405-019: Open Space &amp; Environmental Management Committee Coordination</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>22.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1515-019: NN Gold Shovel Ready Pgm Site Verif</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3005-019: County Land Information Committee Meetings &amp; Coordination</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1443-019: RNSA Property Committee</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1112-019: Waushara Co Land Use Committee</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1345-019: FDL - Transit</td>
<td>292.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553-019: Initiative 41-Smart Communities</td>
<td>127.5</td>
<td>13.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811-019: Winniebago Co. Re:THINK Pgm.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1522-019: T. Neenah Parcel Assessment</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3015-019: T Algoma Map Package</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821-019: Regional CHIP Involvement</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1113-019: Waushara Co. Communities - Future Land Use Plan map Updates</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1524-019: Hortonville East Village TID Concept Plan</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3012-019: Hortonville Cartoon Map</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1528-019: Shawano Cty Econ Development &quot;Storymap&quot;</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1523-019: Brillion RDA Revitalization Assist-Dwntn Housing</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525-019: City of Weyauwega Downtown Visioning</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | **29,536.00** | **21,853.00** | **7,683.00** | **74%**
**2020 Technical Assistance Program Requests (DRAFT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calumet</td>
<td>Calumet County</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>CORP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calumet County</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>County Hwy Sign Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Brillion</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Kiel</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Kiel</td>
<td>Comprehensive Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Update (schedule for 2022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of New Holstein</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tecumseh Site Redevelopment Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of New Holstein</td>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Memorial Bench Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Harrison</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Recreation Registration Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fond du Lac</td>
<td>City of Fond du Lac</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Facility Evaluation for electric busses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Waupun</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wayfinding Signage Study/Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Metomen</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local road/traffic counts &amp; repair priority (CIP?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Brandon</td>
<td>Comprehensive Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outagamie</td>
<td>Town of Grand Chute</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Road Sign Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Black Creek</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td>CORP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Bonduel</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td>CORP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Hortonville</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td>CORP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Little Chute</td>
<td>GIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>GIS Web Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outagamie/Waupaca</td>
<td>City of New London</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>CORP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outagamie/Winnebago</td>
<td>UW-Extension</td>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>Community Garden map/Storymap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawano</td>
<td>City of Shawano</td>
<td>Comprehensive Planning</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wayfinding Signage Study/Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Shawano</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bike / Ped Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Lessor</td>
<td>Comprehensive Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Mattoon</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td>CORP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Mattoon</td>
<td>Comprehensive Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waupaca</td>
<td>City of Waupaca</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>CORP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town of Caledonia</td>
<td>Comprehensive Planning</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town of Waupaca</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>MIOVISION Counts / Discussion on Jurisdictional Transfer - Constance Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town of Waupaca</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>MIOVISION Counts - Elm Valley Road/Quarry Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waushara</td>
<td>Waushara County</td>
<td>Comprehensive Planning</td>
<td>Waushara Co. Land Use Committee Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waushara County</td>
<td>Comprehensive Planning</td>
<td>Land Use Map Changes for Municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Berlin</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Housing Market Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Berlin</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Market Flyer(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winnebago County</td>
<td>Health In Planning</td>
<td>Clear Impact Results Based Accountability Data Dashboard - Bike/Ped Data Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Neenah</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Fair Housing Report Update/Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Neenah</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>CORP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Oshkosh</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Housing Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Oshkosh</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>I-41 Pedestrian Overpass Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town of Oshkosh Sanitary District</td>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>Codification of Sanitary District Ordinances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town of Neenah</td>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Online GIS/Webmapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town of Neenah</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Specialized Trail Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town of Neenah Sanitary District</td>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>Codification of Sanitary District Ordinances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town of Nepeuskun</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Mascoutin Trail Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town of Nepeuskun</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Farmland Preservation Information / Tax Credit Outreach Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V. Fox Crossing/C. Menasha</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Trail Kiosk Updates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY:**

45 total project requests
26 Potential Contracts
Committee Members Present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Dallas, Vice-Chair</td>
<td>Shawano County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Connors</td>
<td>Calumet County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Nygaard</td>
<td>Waupaca County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Harris</td>
<td>Winnebago County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Winter</td>
<td>Menominee County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Abitz for Thomas Nelson</td>
<td>Outagamie County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Hanna</td>
<td>Outagamie County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Members Not Present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen Buechel, Chair</td>
<td>Fond du Lac County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff Present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eric Fowle, AICP</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Baron, AICP</td>
<td>Principal Economic Development Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Pfefferle</td>
<td>GIS Specialist II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Welcome and Introductions

   Mr. Dallas called the meeting to order at 1:30 PM.

2. Statement of compliance with Wis. Stats. Ch. 19, Subchapter V, Sec. 19.84 regarding Open Meetings requirements

   The meeting was found to be in compliance with Open Meetings requirements.

3. Pledge of Allegiance

4. Approval of Agenda / Motion to Deviate

   A motion was made by Mr. Nygaard and seconded by Ms. Winter. The motion passed unanimously.
5. Action Item: Nomination & Election of Committee Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson

A motion to nominate Mr. Buechel as Chair and Mr. Dallas as Vice Chair was made by Ms. Connors and seconded by Ms. Winter. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Public Comment

No public comments were received.

7. News & Announcements

a. July Quarterly Commission Meeting - July 26, 2019

Mr. Fowle provided a reminder about the upcoming full commission meeting to be held at the New London Municipal Center. Quorum is critical as the 2020 levy will be established.

b. New North leadership transition

Mr. Fowled informed the group that Barb LaMue is transitioning into the New North Executive Director role and replacing Jerry Murphy. Mr. Murphy will be taking on a project management position.

c. Other

Mr. Fowle reported that EDA is focusing on tribes in Wisconsin and will be conducting an upcoming tribal tour to build awareness of tribal activities along with awareness of economic development tools. He also discussed the process for developing the 2020 Economic Development Work Program.

ACTION ITEMS:

8. Approval of April 3, 2019 Economic Development Committee Summary of Proceedings (Attachment #1)

A motion was made by Ms. Connors and seconded by Ms. Winter. The motion passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

9. WEDC Disaster Recovery Microloan Program update (Tom)

Mr. Baron provided an update for the program including the submission of one loan application from a business in the Montello. The application will be reviewed by external financial experts for a decision on funding or not funding the loan. There was additional discussion about fires being an eligible event for loan opportunities within this program.

10. Regional Economic Development Planning Efforts
a. Initiative 41 Update / Summary of June 26, 2019 Stakeholder Meeting (Eric)

Mr. Fowle recapped the June 26th Stakeholder Meeting and discussed next steps for the work.

b. Global New North/FDI Update (Tom)

Mr. Baron provided updates about the USMCA (NAFTA replacement), the China Trade War and high water levels on the Great Lakes and its negative impact on shipping. There was additional discussion about ginseng and hemp farming in the ECWRPC region.

c. EMSI Services - Talent attraction report from Emsi Blog and the Emsi ECWRPC user stats for the year. (Adam) (copies will be provided at meeting)

Mr. Pfefferle provided a summary of the talent attraction scorecard and user stats for year to date. There was a broader discussion about maintaining population levels and preparing for the Appleton and Green Bay MSAs and MPOs coming in the future and the planning that is starting for that event.

d. Recent and Potential EDA potential grant projects (Tom)

Mr. Baron provided an update on EDA projects, EDA University Centers and an update to EDA Investment Priorities to include Opportunity Zones. There was discussion about responses to layoff announcements and the presence of the aerospace as a cluster in the region.

11. ECWRPC Steering Committee Report (Eric)

Mr. Fowle talked about strategic planning and Outagamie County membership concerns.

12. County Roundtable Discussion/Updates

The group provided various updates in their counties. There was a discussion about staff transitions and strategies for retaining key staff.

13. Next meeting – 1:30 pm on Wednesday, October 2nd, 2019, ECWRPC offices

14. Adjourn

The motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Connors, with a second by Mr. Hanna. The motion passed unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned at 2:48 PM.

Any person wishing to attend this meeting or hearing, who, because of a disability, requires special accommodations should contact the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission at (920) 751-4770 at least three business days prior to the meeting or hearing so that arrangements, within reason, can be made.
PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 25-19

ADOPTING THE 2019 COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY (CEDS) ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

WHEREAS, the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (Commission) and its planning jurisdiction were designated as an Economic Development District (EDD) on August 6, 1984 by the Economic Development Administration (EDA); and

WHEREAS, the Commission has continued to conduct and keep current an economic development planning program designed to create employment opportunities, foster stable and diversified local economies, improve local conditions, and provide a mechanism for guiding and coordinating the efforts of local individuals and organizations concerned with the economic development of the EDD; and

WHEREAS, the 2019 CEDS Annual Performance Report provides updated socio-economic data, and a report of 2019 completed activities to update the 2018 CEDS Update which served as the 5-year CEDS update pursuant to EDA requirements; and

WHEREAS, recognition of the EDD’s CEDS Annual Performance Report by the EDA regional office will enable continued participation by eligible counties and communities in the EDA grant and loan programs; now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE EAST CENTRAL WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION:


Section 2. That the Commission submit the 2019 CEDS Annual Performance Report to the Regional Office of EDA requesting approval of the document and continued designation as an Economic Development District.

Effective Date: October 25, 2019
Submitted By: Economic Development Committee
Prepared By: Tom Baron, Principal Economic Development Planner

Allen Buechel (Fond du Lac County) Alice Connors (Calumet County)
Chuck Dallas (Shawano County) Mark Harris (Winnebago County)
Kara Homan (Outagamie County)

Tim Hanna (Outagamie County)

James Nygaard (Waupaca County)

Ruth Winter (Menominee County)
Committee Members Present:
Ernie Bellin ................................................................................................... Winnebago County
Brenda Schneider ....................................................................................... Fond du Lac County
Chuck Hornung ........................................................................................... Fond du Lac County
James Lowey ............................................................................................... Menominee County

Committee Members Unexcused:
David Albrecht ............................................................................................... Winnebago County

Staff Present:
Kathy Thunes ...................................................................................................... ECWRPC Staff
Todd Verboomen. ................................................................................................ ECWRPC Staff
Tanner Russell .................................................................................................... ECWRPC Staff

Others Present:

1) Welcome & Introductions

Mr. Bellin called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. Everyone was welcomed and introductions were made.

2) Statement of Compliance with Wis. Stats. Ch. 19, Subchapter V, Sec. 19.84 Open Meetings

Ms. Thunes stated that the agenda was posted in compliance with the open meeting law.

3) Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

4) Approval of Agenda / Motion to Deviate

Ms. Schneider made a motion to approve the Agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lowey. Motion Carried.

5) Action Items: Nomination & Election of Committee Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson.

Mr. Horning nominated Mr. Bellin as Committee Chair. Nomination was seconded by Mr. Lowey. Motion carried.
Mr. Hornug nominated Ms. Schneider as Committee Vice-Chair. Nomination was second by Mr. Lowey. Motion carried.

6) Approval of March 13, 2019 Summary of Proceedings.

Motion made by Mr. Hornung. Motions was seconded by Ms. Schneider. Motion carried, Mr. Lowey abstained.

7) Approval of the April 26, 2019 Summary of Proceedings.

Motion made by Ms. Schneider. Motion seconded by Mr. Hornung. Motion carried, Mr. Lowey abstained.

8) Public/Guest Comment

None

9) Announcements

Ms. Thunes provided an update on the 2020 Technical Assistants Program requests.

10) Action Items:

a) Approval of the 2019-2020 Community Facilities Committee

The Committee agreed to hold the CFC meetings the second Wednesday of the Month prior to the Full Commission meeting.

11) Program/Project Updates and Discussion

a) Updates on Potential & Pending SSA Amendments

Mr. Verboomen informed the committee has submitted an SSA Amendment request and East Central staff provided a preliminary review and submitted a letter to the City request more information.


Mr. Verboomen updated the Committee on the status of the Fox Cities Sewer 2040 Service Area Plan.

12) ECWRPC Steering Committee Report

Ms. Thunes provided the Committee with a one page summary of recent activities.

13) Roundtable Discussion/Sharing on County/Local issues & Activities.

Mr. Bellin proved the Committee members Wisconsin Clean Cities handouts.
14) Next Meeting & Agenda

   Next meeting is set for September 11, 2019

15) Adjourn

   A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Hornung. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lowey. Motion carried.
SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS
Transportation Committee
East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
ECWRPC Office
Tuesday, July 9, 2019

Committee Members Present
Tom Kautza ..................................................................................... Shawano County
Marty Farrell ..................................................................................... Fond du Lac County
Jeff Nooyen ...................................................................................... Outagamie County
Dick Koeppen .................................................................................. Waupaca County
Neal Strehlow .................................................................................. Waushara County
Ron McDonald ................................................................................ Valley Transit
Jill Michaelson ................................................................................ WisDOT – NE Region

Other WisDOT Members Present
Matt Halada ................................................................................ WisDOT – NE Region
Alex Gramovot (via phone) ................................................................. WisDOT – Central Office

Committee Members Excused
Jerry Erdmann ................................................................................ Shawano County
Ken Robl ........................................................................................….. Winnebago County
Brian Smith ...................................................................................... Waupaca County
Donna Kalata ................................................................................... Waushara County

Staff Members Present
Eric Fowle ...................................................................................... ECWRPC
Walt Raith ......................................................................................... ECWRPC
Melissa Kraemer Badtke ................................................................... ECWRPC
Nick Musson .................................................................................... ECWRPC
David Moesch ................................................................................ ECWRPC
Kolin Erickson ................................................................................ ECWRPC

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Strehlow at 1:34 p.m.

1. Introductions, Statement of compliance with Wis. Stats. Ch. 19, Subchapter V, Sec. 19.84 regarding Open Meetings

2. Public Comment (None)

3. Pledge of Allegiance & Moment of Silence

4. Election of Chair & Vice Chair

    Farrell motioned for Strehlow as Chair; Nooyen seconded; motion carried. Koeppen motioned for Nooyen as Vice Chair; Kautza seconded; motion carried.

5. Discussion and action on April 9, 2019 Transportation Committee Summary of Proceedings

    Farrell motioned to approve summary of proceedings, Nooyen seconded; motion carried.

6. Discussion and action on Proposed Resolution 19-19: Amending the 2019 Work Program to include Work Program Element 2435: GO Transit Center Site Selection Study

Musson noted staff applied for a Wisconsin DOT Statewide Transit Planning (Section 5304) Program grant to assist Oshkosh (GO Transit) with a planning study to redevelop their transit center. The grant requires a 20% local match which GO Transit will contribute $10,141 and ECWRPC will contribute $3,380; total grant funds requested were $67,604. The MPO/Transportation Program work program requires an amendment, pending formal approval and announcement of the grant in July, 2019.
Kautza motioned to approve Proposed Resolution 19-19; Farrell seconded; motion carried.

7. Discussion and action on Proposed Resolution 17-19: Amending the Transportation Improvement Program for the Fox Cities Transportation Management Area (TMA) 2019

Moesch stated an amendment was needed from WisDOT to advance several federal and state funded projects for the design phase. Projects included: Wisconsin Ave (WIS 96), WIS 114, College Ave (WIS 125), WIS 76 and WIS 441 of the current transportation improvement program.

McDonald motioned to approve Proposed Resolution 17-19; Nooyen seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

8. Discussion and action on Proposed Resolution 18-19: Amending the Transportation Improvement Program for the Oshkosh Urbanized Area 2019

Moesch stated an amendment was needed from WisDOT to advance several federal and state funded projects for the design phase. Projects included: WIS 21, WIS 76, WIS 44 and WIS 91 of the current transportation improvement program.

Farrell motioned to approve Proposed Resolution 18-19; Koeppen seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

9. Update on Long Range Transportation Land Use Plan

Raith noted the draft plans for both Fox Cities and Oshkosh urbanized areas are available on the transportation program webpage; more details to follow at future meetings as the plans will be approved October 2020.

10. WisDOT Regional Projects Update

Halada provided an update on WisDOT North-East projects:
1. WIS 116 bridge and approaches in the village of Winneconne (2019 work includes construct two new fishing platforms in the location of existing bridge that extend out roughly 220 feet from each river bank.)
2. WIS 441 Tri-County Expansion Project: US10/WIS 441 Mainline/Oneida Street Interchange (This contract in 2019 consists of the reconstruction of US 10/WIS 441 from Appleton Road to one mile west of Telulah Avenue, increasing the highway from two lanes in each direction to three lanes.)
3. WIS 441 Tri-County Expansion Project: Midway Road (County AP) Interchange (This contract consists of removals, grading, breaker run, base aggregate dense, concrete pavement, concrete curb and gutter, hot mix asphalt pavement, mill and overlay, storm sewer, erosion control, pavement marking, permanent signing)

Raith also provided an update on the WisDOT North-Central projects:
1. STH 22 Resurfacing (City of Montello, Marquette County)
2. USH 10 Median Barrier Project (Waupaca County, Erickson Road to STH 22/CTH A)
3. STH 49 Mill & Overlay Project (Waupaca County, Peterson Road to Cedar Road)
4. STH 49 Pavement Replacement Project (Green Lake County, STH 23 to South St)
5. STH 23/STH 82 Mill & Overlay Project (Marquette County, Adams County line to Village of Oxford)
6. STH 23 Reconstruction Project (City of Montello, Marquette County)
7. STH 156 Resurfacing & Bridge Rehab Project (Waupaca County, including City of Clintonville)
8. STH 22 to Shawano County line
9. STH 91 Resurfacing Project (Green Lake County, City of Berlin to Winnebago County line)
10. STH 22 Bridge Rehab Projects (Waupaca County)
11. STH 49 Resurfacing Project (Waupaca County, Anderson Road to Peterson Road)
12. USH 10 Bridge Replacement (Waupaca County, eastbound bridge over CTH E)
13. STH 22 Resurfacing Project (Shawano County, City of Shawano)

11. Transit & Specialized Transportation Update

Musson noted staff is wrapping up the Appleton Valley Transit-Transit Development Plan contract this fall. A draft plan is available on ECWRPC’s website. Additionally, staff will start the final public outreach for the transit
development plan this summer with a variety of pop-up style events, surveys and maps to gather feedback. As part of the I-41 Commuter Service Feasibility Study, the project consultant (SRF) is putting together service design alternatives for the next steering committee meeting. Fowle also noted staff is in the process of applying for WisDOT Section 5310 Mobility Management funds. These funds would help staff to focus on employment transportation assistance within the rural portions of the region.

12. **Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Program Update**

Kraemer Badtke noted staff has numerous bike/pedestrian trail counters out in Fond du Lac and Winnebago Counties this summer. An intern shared with Winnebago County Health Department is helping with the fieldwork. ECWRPC also helped design/develop new wayfinding signage for the Wiouwash State Trail; project was funded through an Ascension Health community grant.

13. **Regional Safe Routes to School Program Updates**

Kraemer Badtke noted staff secured $7k (private grant/funds) to go towards their Regional Safe Routes to School educational campaign; part of this work will be to work with area bus companies and police departments on safety and enforcement issues. International Walk to School Day will take place on October 2. For fall 2019, 12 schools are participating in the Walking School Bus Program for their students.

14. **ECWRPC Steering Committee Report**

Fowle noted in an effort to better inform all commissioners/committees, routine reports from the Steering Committee activities will be shared at each standing committee meeting. Updates included: future levy and financial strategy, strategic plan update, update of personnel policies, update of bylaws, update of fees schedule, succession planning for personnel, and county membership/levy discussions with Outagamie County. The next steering committee meeting will be July 22.

15. **County Roundtable Discussion/Updates**

Koeppen provided update from Waupaca County.

16. **Adjourn**

Farrell motioned to adjourn; Koeppen seconded; motion carried; and committee adjourned at 2:18 p.m.
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1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On May 30-31, 2019, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) conducted the certification review of the transportation planning process for the Appleton urbanized area. FHWA and FTA are required to jointly review and evaluate the transportation planning process for each urbanized area over 200,000 in population at least every four years to determine if the process meets the Federal planning requirements.

1.1 Previous Findings and Disposition

The Appleton urbanized area was designated by the FHWA and FTA as a Transportation Management Area on July 18, 2012 based on the 2010 Census, which found the urbanized area (UZA) population greater than 200,000 persons.¹ The first and only certification review for the Appleton urbanized area was conducted in 2015. The previous Certification Review findings and their disposition are provided in Appendix B and summarized as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certification Topic</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Corrective Actions/Recommendations</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Re-examine transportation committee representation to ensure it is well aligned with the policy board and demonstrates population-proportional representation for the TMA.</td>
<td>The MPO has examined committee membership and determined that the existing committee structure in coordination with TAC and the Pedestrian/Bicycle committee well represent the TMA communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>The MPO should better inform the public so they understand the organizational structure, how they are represented and how they can provide input to their representatives.</td>
<td>The MPO has worked to improve the public’s understanding of the organizational structure by providing explanations of its structure in numerous reports such as the MTP and UPWP. Significant updates to the UPWP were recently completed to address this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Clarify the roles of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee and Transit decision-making structures and the relationship reporting upward. Include this in the chart and narrative by-laws.</td>
<td>Identified as a recommendation in the 2019 certification review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certification Topic</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Corrective Actions/Recommendations</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreements, Contracts and Operating Procedures</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>WisDOT, the MPOs and FHWA-FTA should agree on a basic review and update cycle for this and all MPO cooperative agreements to assure consistency with current requirements, relationships and procedures (e.g. review every 5 years and update within 10 years). The MPO recently updated the cooperative agreement between WisDOT and Valley Transit in 2017. WisDOT and member MPO’s are also updating the Memorandum of Understanding that defines the roles and responsibilities for the maintenance and use of the Northeast Region Travel Demand Model.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreements, Contracts and Operating Procedures</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Clarify the language in all agreements to reflect the TMAs authority.</td>
<td>Identified as a recommendation in the 2019 certification review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Planning Process</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Consider having the steering committee approve minutes so they can be published more quickly. Steering Committee typically meets no more than the Transportation Committee, but a special meeting can and has been used due to project timing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Planning Process</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Bring transit decision-making into MPO committee structure. The MPO has developed a close relationship with Valley Transit and collaborated during the preparation of the Transit Development Plan and Title VI plan and has assisted with various FTA funding programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Planning Process</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Consider STP-U prioritization criteria for transit projects. The MPO is working on expanding its STBG (STP-U) criteria to include transit considerations, along with performance measures and targets, but have not finalized or implemented the criteria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Planning Process</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Identify transit system needed to support regional goals and identify unmet needs. The MPO is working with three transit agencies to support regional needs, including a commuter service study that would connect the systems along the I-41 corridor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Planning Process</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Consider a more detailed study of Access to Jobs. The MPO undertook the Initiative 41 project that emphasized connecting people to jobs and diversifying industries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified Planning Work Program</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Consider modifying the work program format to make the document easier to read and more relatable to the public. Significant changes have been made to the work program to better organize the document. The MPO color coded and separated each MPO area and the regional program to improve the document’s clarity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification Topic</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Corrective Actions/Recommendations</td>
<td>Disposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified Planning Work Program</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Include brief descriptions of the planning priorities facing the region.</td>
<td>Identified as a recommendation in the 2019 certification review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Management Process</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Establish a conservative list of projects that can be reasonably implemented. Also use as a strong consideration in prioritization of Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding.</td>
<td>Identified as a recommendation in the 2019 certification review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Plan Development</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Keep committees informed about implementation of plan recommendations.</td>
<td>The MPO has added a section on each agenda to discuss MTP implementation and current projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Plan Development</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>For EJ analysis, verify comprehensive access to services, and use accessibility analysis to identify transportation system needs in the planning process.</td>
<td>The MPO has shown that EJ analysis has become an important part of their work effort as they have created an Equity and Opportunity Work Group to identify transportation needs and develop solutions that improve transportation and access to employment options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Plan Development</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Consider more grassroots efforts to plan development, including visioning to validate the direction MPO staff is moving with livability.</td>
<td>The visioning process is being used more frequently within several communities in the MPO and the products of those visioning activities will be used in the MTP update scheduled in 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program Development &amp; Project Selection</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Each transit capital project listing in the TIP should include the Federal, State, and Local funding amounts.</td>
<td>Funding sources and amounts have been added to the TIP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program Development &amp; Project Selection</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>TMA STP-Urban criteria should account for exclusive bicycle/pedestrian or transit capital projects.</td>
<td>The MPO has expanded STBG (STP-U) criteria to consider pedestrian and bicycle accommodations and is working to expand those criteria further to include transit and additional pedestrian/bike considerations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification Topic</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Corrective Actions/Recommendations</td>
<td>Disposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program Development &amp; Project Selection</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Projects must be programmed to support grouped project funding. If there are no underlying projects, the TIP must show $0 programmed for the group.</td>
<td>The MPO continues to work with WisDOT to correctly identify grouped projects, if any.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Certifications</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Develop documentation explaining what each self-certification requirement entails and how it addresses the requirement to support the self-certification. The signers need to understand what these provisions require and what the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (ECWRPC) is doing to meet them.</td>
<td>In the UPWP, the Appleton/Fox Cities MPO includes descriptions of how the MPO complies with Federal requirements in support of their self-certification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Certifications</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Consider a brief explanation to commission when discussing TIP approval to ensure they understand what the commission is asserting with self-certification.</td>
<td>The MPO includes descriptions of how the MPO complies with Federal requirements in the UPWP in support of their self-certification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Planning</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Demonstrate better consistency with WisDOT statewide revenue estimates.</td>
<td>The MPO works with WisDOT to better estimate future revenue that considers the entire transportation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Planning</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Financial plan should identify transit and bicycle/pedestrian project implementation needed to implement regional goals and objectives and identify unmet needs.</td>
<td>Identified as a recommendation in the 2019 certification review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Planning</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Highway system preservation needs exceed current revenues based on pavement condition trends. The plan should identify the gap between system preservation needs and funding level.</td>
<td>The MPO plans to work with WisDOT during the MTP update to identify the gap between transportation needs and funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Planning</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Seek access to Wisconsin Information System for Local Roads (WISLR) data to enable evaluation of pavement condition and use of pavement management tools for discrete geographies (e.g. MPA’s municipalities and portions thereof) to consistently evaluate the system preservation/improvement costs</td>
<td>The MPO works with WisDOT to use the WISLR to identify local road needs within the MPA. Staff uses WISLR on a regular basis including assisting with pavement ratings and inputting ratings into the state system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification Topic</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Corrective Actions/Recommendations</td>
<td>Disposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Outreach and Public Involvement</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Continue to consider new approaches to engage resource and land management agencies.</td>
<td>The Appleton/Fox Cities MPO has become a model for public involvement within the state. The MPO actively searches for new opportunities to engage the public, which has led to significant improvements in their multi-media approach (social media, video, website, print), data visualization, and in-person events. The MPO has embraced the concept of disseminating information at local social events and community functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title VI and Non-Discrimination</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>The Title VI plan is a good product for exclusive Title VI responsibilities, however, statements about what ECWRPC will not do should be modified because they are too broad.</td>
<td>The Title VI document was updated in 2019 and this language was adjusted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title VI and Non-Discrimination</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>MPO, WisDOT, FHWA should develop a template for Non-Discrimination Plan as companion to Title VI Plan, to document assurances concerning ADA, disabled, etc.</td>
<td>MPO staff will address ADA specifically in future updates of Title VI and associated documents including the MTP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title VI and Non-Discrimination</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Update current complaint form beyond Title VI.</td>
<td>MPO staff is working to prepare and vet a basic complaint form in addition to the Title VI complaint form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title VI and Non-Discrimination</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Add a link to express comments about transportation system and planning to ECWRPC’s website.</td>
<td>MPO staff is working on several interactive web applications to provide opportunity to comment on the MTP, TIP, and Title VI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Safety Planning</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Further develop relationship with WisDOT HSIP program – evaluating crash data and analyzing potential HSIP projects.</td>
<td>MPO staff have developed relationships with WisDOT staff, and are typically involved in HSIP projects, including identification of high crash locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security of the Transportation System</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>In the RTP, consider including security policies for transportation infrastructure that would include strategies to consider for vulnerable infrastructure and services.</td>
<td>The MPO is considering security policies and will likely include policies in updates to MPO plans and regional plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification Topic</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Corrective Actions/Recommendations</td>
<td>Disposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security of the Transportation System</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Consider documenting the Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) for staff awareness.</td>
<td>The ECWRPC is in the process of preparing a COOP for the agency, including cross training for specific skills. Discussions are underway and documented regarding a succession plan for management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating Freight in the Transportation Planning Process</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>There is lots of data and knowledge about freight operations in the region. Articulate a vision for freight in the region and next steps in the regional plan.</td>
<td>Freight analysis and discussion is expected to be expanded in the 2020 MTP update, and potentially include a cooperative effort to establish an intermodal freight facility at the Port of Green Bay that would serve all northeast Wisconsin, upper Michigan and beyond, providing better access to world markets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating Freight in the Transportation Planning Process</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>The MPO should continue to participate in the statewide freight planning process and make use of local commodity data and contacts WisDOT has established with the freight and business communities.</td>
<td>MPO staff are involved in freight planning and MPO leadership encourages participation in events that are meant to advance freight transportation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.2 Summary of Current Findings

As a result of this review, FHWA and FTA are certifying the transportation planning process conducted by Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT), Appleton/Fox Cities Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and Valley Transit meet Federal requirements. There are recommendations in this report that warrant close attention and follow-up, along with areas that MPO is performing very well in that are to be commended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Area</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPO Structure and Agreements 23 U.S.C. 134(d) 23 CFR 450.314</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>1. The MPO and ECWRPC should consider revising the ECWRPC’s by-laws to clarify the MPO’s purpose, the MPO’s relation to the ECWRPC, and the membership structure, decision making authority, roles, and responsibilities of the MPO Policy Board and committees. 2. Once the MPO structure has been updated in the by-laws, updates should be made to the website, MTP, and all other documents referring to the MPO’s structure to ensure consistency and clarity. Inclusion of an improved discussion regarding the MPO structure in the appropriate planning documents should be made no later than the document’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Area</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next scheduled update (i.e. the upcoming 2020 MTP update). 3. The review team encourages WisDOT and the MPO, along with other TMAs, to coordinate and create a written plan or agreement that reflects the agreed upon estimated amounts of STBG obligation limitation to be made reasonably available. This plan should cover the entire 5-year period of the FAST Act and be updated to reflect actual obligation limitation amounts made available for the most recently completed fiscal year. It should also be updated to reflect more accurate obligation limitation estimates for the future fiscal year(s). The state and appropriate TMAs should sign the plan and submit it to the FHWA Wisconsin Division Office for review to evaluate if the WisDOT is on track to fulfill its section 133(e) and 134(k)(4) requirements of 23 U.S.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Area Boundaries</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>The establishment of the MPO’s boundaries are in accordance with federal requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 U.S.C. 134(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 CFR 450.312(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified Planning Work Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Determine the MPO’s planning priorities and document them in the UPWP. 2. Ensure that tasks in the UPWP support Federal requirements and/or MPO priorities. 3. Ensure that tasks in the UPWP are descriptive so that the reader can determine if a task is a routine annual task, or a task that has a definite conclusion. Include expected planning products so that FHWA, FTA, WisDOT, and the public can easily determine the MPO’s progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 CFR 450.308 &amp; 420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. It is encouraged that the MPO find opportunities to improve the MTP’s readability through document formatting and data visualization improvements. Although the MTP is an extremely thorough and useful reference document, it is challenging to read the document and ascertain the long-term vision for transportation in the MPA. 2. Financial plan should identify transit and bicycle/pedestrian projects needed to implement regional goals and objectives and identify unmet needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 U.S.C. 134(c),(h) &amp; (l)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 CFR 450.324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Planning</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>The MPO coordinates with Valley Transit and considers transit needs as part of the planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 U.S.C. 5303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 U.S.C. 134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 CFR 450.314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Area</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Transportation Improvement Program              | Recommendations | 1. Improve financial plan by providing a narrative that explains the key data, assumptions, and conclusions in support of the summary of Federal funds programmed and available (as shown in Table 2 of the MPO’s 2019 TIP).  
2. Improve financial plan by providing system-level estimates of costs and revenue sources that are reasonably expected to be available to adequately operate and maintain Federal-aid highways and public transportation. |
| Public Participation                             | Commendation | 1. The Federal Review Team commends the MPO for their innovative approach to educating the public about the MPO, its planning initiatives, and the area’s transportation assets. |
| Civil Rights                                     | Recommendation | 1. It is recommended that the MPO inventory ADA transition plans within its MPA and assist or coordinate training for communities yet to develop an ADA transition plan. |
| Consultation and Coordination                    | Commendation | 1. The Federal Review Team commends the MPO and ECWRPC’s on its comprehensive and creative coordination and networking efforts. |
| Freight                                          | Recommendation | 1. Continue to support freight related activities including the Oshkosh transload and Port of Green Bay intermodal projects. |
| Environmental Mitigation/Planning                | Recommendation | 1. It is recommended that the MPO address stormwater goals in their next MTP update. |
| Transportation Safety and Security Planning      | Recommendations | 1. The MPO should consider the development of an ITS plan for the MPA.  
2. The MPO should consider the development of a vulnerability study that may include flood plain mapping and stormwater management, evacuation procedures, and infrastructure resiliency. |
<p>| Nonmotorized Planning/Livability                 | None | The MPO meets Federal laws and regulations for providing the MPA with comprehensive transportation planning and developing plans that consider all roadway users and their safety. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Area</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integration of Land Use and Transportation</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>The MPO has integrated land use related objectives into numerous transportation planning goals within its MTP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 U.S.C. 134(g)(3)&amp;(h)(1)(E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 CFR 450.306(b)(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Demand Forecasting</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>The MPO is meeting the requirements set forth in 23 CFR 450.324(f)(1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 CFR 450.324(f)(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Management Process / Management and</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>1. Notwithstanding the current absence of congestion in the region, development and implementation of a comprehensive CMP is still a requirement for TMAs and, absent any legislative changes, the upcoming update of the CMP must include a framework for tracking the implementation of strategies and measuring their effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 U.S.C. 134(k)(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 CFR 450.322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 CFR 450.324(f)(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Based Planning and Programming</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>1. It is recommended that the MPO periodically issue a summary or report identifying adopted performance measures, their baseline when adopted, how the measures are incorporated into project selection, and progress to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 U.S.C 134(h)(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 CFR 450.306(d), 450.314(h),450.324(f),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450.326(d) &amp; 450.340.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details of the certification findings for each of the above items are contained in this report.
2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Background/Preface

Pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 134(k) and 49 U.S.C. 5303(k), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) must jointly certify the metropolitan transportation planning process in Transportation Management Areas (TMAs) at least every four years. A TMA is an urbanized area, as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau, with a population of over 200,000. After the 2010 Census, the Secretary of Transportation designated 183 TMAs – 179 urbanized areas over 200,000 in population plus four urbanized areas that received special designation. In general, the reviews consist of three primary activities: a site visit, a review of planning products (in advance of and during the site visit), and preparation of a Certification Review Report that summarizes the review and offers findings. The reviews focus on compliance with Federal law and regulations, challenges, successes, and experiences of the cooperative relationship between the MPO(s), the State DOT(s), and public transportation operator(s) in the conduct of the metropolitan transportation planning process. Joint FTA/FHWA Certification Review guidelines provide agency field reviewers with latitude and flexibility to tailor the review to reflect regional issues and needs. Consequently, the scope and depth of the Certification Review reports will vary significantly.

The Certification Review process is only one of several methods used to assess the quality of a regional metropolitan transportation planning process, compliance with applicable statutes and regulations, and the level and type of technical assistance needed to enhance the effectiveness of the planning process. Other stewardship and oversight activities provide opportunities for this type of review and comment, including Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) approval, the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), metropolitan and statewide Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) findings, air-quality (AQ) conformity determinations (in nonattainment and maintenance areas), as well as a range of other formal and less formal interactions provide both FHWA/FTA an opportunity to comment on the planning process. The results of these other processes are considered in the Certification Review process.

While the Certification Review report itself may not fully document those many intermediate and ongoing checkpoints, the “findings” of a Certification Review are, in fact, based upon the cumulative findings of the entire review effort.

The review process is individually tailored to focus on topics of significance in each metropolitan planning area. Federal reviewers prepare Certification Reports to document the results of the review process. The reports and final actions are the joint responsibility of the appropriate FHWA and FTA field offices, and their content will vary to reflect the planning process reviewed, whether they relate explicitly to formal “findings” of the review.

To encourage public understanding and input, FHWA/FTA will continue to improve the clarity of the Certification Review reports.
2.2 Purpose and Objective

Since the enactment of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991, the FHWA and FTA are required to jointly review and evaluate the transportation planning process in all urbanized areas over 200,000 population to determine if the process meets the Federal planning requirements in 23 U.S.C. 134, 49 U.S.C. 5303, and 23 CFR 450. In 2005, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), extended the minimum allowable frequency of certification reviews to at least every four years.

The Appleton/Fox Cities Metropolitan Planning Organization (The MPO) is the designated MPO for the Appleton urbanized area. The Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) is the responsible state agency and Valley Transit is the responsible public transportation operator. Current membership of the Appleton/Fox Cities MPO consists of elected officials, officials of public agencies, public transportation representation, and state officials from the political jurisdictions in the Appleton urbanized area.

Certification of the planning process is a prerequisite to the approval of Federal funding for transportation projects in such areas. The certification review is also an opportunity to provide assistance on new programs and to enhance the ability of the metropolitan transportation planning process to provide decision makers with the knowledge they need to make well-informed capital and operating investment decisions.

3.0 SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Review Process

The Appleton/Fox Cities MPO’s previous certification review was conducted in 2015. A summary of the status of findings from the last review is provided in Section 1.1. This report details the most recent review, which consisted of a formal site visit and a public involvement opportunity, conducted in October 2015.

Participants in the 2019 review included representatives of FHWA, FTA, WisDOT, Valley Transit, and Appleton/Fox Cities MPO staff. A full list of participants who attended the on-site meeting held May 30-31, 2019 is included in Appendix A.

A desk audit of current documents and correspondence was completed prior to the site visit. In addition to the formal review, routine oversight mechanisms provide a major source of information upon which to base the certification findings.

The certification review covers the transportation planning process conducted cooperatively by the MPO, State, and public transportation operators. Background information, current status, key findings, and recommendations are summarized in the body of the report for the following subject areas selected by FHWA and FTA staff for on-site review:

- Metropolitan Planning Area Boundaries
3.2 Documents Reviewed

The following MPO documents were evaluated as part of this planning process review:

- Wisconsin DOT, Appleton/Fox Cities, Valley Transit Transportation Planning Cooperative Agreement, 2017
- CY 2019 Transportation Work Program & Budget for the Appleton/Fox Cities MPO
- Appleton (Fox Cities) Transportation Management Area: Long Range Transportation/Land Use Plan, October 2015
- 2019-2022 MPO Transportation Improvement Program and Self-Certification
- Congestion Management Process (CMP) Plan, October 2013
- Public Participation Plan, October 2018
- Title VI Non-Discrimination Plan & Limited English Proficiency Program Plan, October 2017
- Draft PlanWorks Case Study: Coordinated Approach to Integrating Health in Corridor Planning, 2019
• East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission By-Laws, As amended, January 30, 2015.
• East Central Wisconsin Trail Wayfinding Guidebook, 2017
• East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission Annual Report, 2018-2019
• APHA Case Study, Planning with a Public Health Focus: Connecting the Dots in the East Central Region of Wisconsin
• Appleton (Fox Cities) TMA and Oshkosh MPO Complete Streets Policy, October 2018
• Appleton (Fox Cities) TMA and Oshkosh MPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, 2014
• Safe Routes to School: State of the Region, 2019

4.0 PROGRAM REVIEW

4.1 MPO Structure and Agreements

4.1.1 Regulatory Basis

23 U.S.C. 134(d) and 23 CFR 450.314(a) state the MPO, the State, and the public transportation operator shall cooperatively determine their mutual responsibilities in carrying out the metropolitan transportation planning process. These responsibilities shall be clearly identified in written agreements among the MPO, the State, and the public transportation operator serving the MPA. Further, 23 CFR 450.314(h) states that the MPO, the State, and the public transportation operator shall jointly develop specific written provisions for cooperatively developing and sharing information related to transportation performance data, the selection of performance targets, the reporting of performance targets, the reporting of performance to be used in tracking progress toward attainment of critical outcomes for the region of the MPO, and the collection of data for the State asset management plans for the National Highway System.

4.1.2 Current Status

The Appleton/Fox Cities MPO was designated by Governor Patrick Lucey in December of 1973. The MPO is housed within the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (ECWRPC), who acts as the MPO’s fiscal agent. The ECWRPC was created as a regional planning commission by Executive Order No. 41, issued by Governor Lucey in 1972.

The ECWRPC Policy Commission serves as the MPO Policy Board. The ECWRPC commission is comprised of 36 commissioners representing nine counties, along with two ex-officio members
representing WisDOT Northeast Region Office and the local transit operator (Valley Transit).\(^2\) The basic representation on the Commission’s policy body consists of a minimum of three commissioners from each county as follows:

1. The chairman of the county board serves on the Commission because of his or her elective office.
2. A second member is appointed by the county board. This individual must hold executive or legislative elective office within town, village, city or county governmental bodies within the appointing county. This member is automatically the county executive, if the county has one.
3. A third member is appointed by the Governor from a list of two persons nominated by the county board. At least four of these nominees must be private citizens.
4. Additional representatives are provided to counties with a population of 50,000 or greater, one for each attained increment of 50,000. The first additional representative is the mayor or council president of the largest city in the county, while subsequent additional members are appointed in a manner similar to the second member appointment procedures noted above.

ECWRPC commissioners are scheduled to meet quarterly throughout the calendar year, and host an additional annual meeting. Special meetings can also be called at any time by the Chairman or at the request of three or more commissioners. The Commission is informed of MPO business by MPO staff and committees. Information and recommendations from staff and committees is provided to commissioners electronically ahead of commission meetings. Information sharing has been streamlined by furnishing computer tablets to commissioners that are to be used strictly for commission proceedings. The following committees are described by the MPO in its MTP\(^3\):

- **Transportation Committee:** The Transportation Committee is comprised of five to six Commission members and two ex-officio members from WisDOT and Valley Transit. This committee directs and monitors the transportation program element and maintains liaison with the Transportation Policy Advisory Committees and the Transportation

---

\(^2\) East Central Regional Planning Commission. Roster of East Central Counties and Commissioners. 

Technical Advisory Committee. This committee is responsible for overseeing the transportation element of the regional plan.

- **Transportation Policy Advisory Committee (TPAC):** The Transportation Policy Committee (TPAC) facilitates regional participation and consensus building on transportation-related issues through a continuing, comprehensive, and coordinated planning process. The TPAC is composed of local municipal and county staff, elected officials and board members of local governments, and transportation agencies within the East Central Wisconsin Region, plus representatives from the FHWA and WisDOT. The TPAC serves as an advisory body to the Transportation Committee and the Commission on transportation related issues.

- **Technical Advisory Committee (TAC):** The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) facilitates regional participation and consensus building on transportation-related issues through a continuing, comprehensive, and coordinated planning process. The TAC is composed of planners, engineers, public health, and operators of local governments and transportation agencies within the East Central Wisconsin Region, plus representatives from the Federal Highway Administration and Wisconsin Department of Transportation. The TAC serves as an advisory body to the TPAC.

The MPO indicated that they also staff a pedestrian and bicycle transportation committee and rely on a transit commission to discuss non-motorized transportation and transit related issues. However, the structure, roles, and responsibilities are not described on the MPO’s website, or in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), or the ECWRPC’s by-laws.

**4.1.3 Findings**

Review of the MPO’s website, MTP, and the ECWRPC’s by-laws revealed a lack of consistency and clarity when explaining the membership structure, decision making authority, roles, and responsibilities of the MPO Policy Board (ECWRPC Commission) and committees. It is also challenging to understand how the MPO informs the Policy Board (ECWRPC Commission) of transit commission and pedestrian and bicycle committee discussions and their role within Policy Board decisions.

The establishment of the MPO’s agreements with Valley Transit and WisDOT are in accordance with federal requirements. However, there have been concerns by the MPO and other TMAs in the state regarding WisDOT’s administration of the Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) suballocated funds that are due to TMAs. A State with STBG funds suballocated to urbanized areas with over 200,000 in population must make formula obligation limitation available to each of these areas based on the criteria set forth in 23 U.S.C. 133(e) and 23 U.S.C. 134(k)(4). WisDOT and the TMAs are encouraged to explore the need to address the expectations of the STBG program within a plan or agreement between WisDOT, the TMAs, and associated transit providers.
Recommendations:

1. The MPO and ECWRPC should consider revising the ECWRPC’s by-laws to clarify the MPO’s purpose, the MPO’s relation to the ECWRPC, and the membership structure, decision making authority, roles, and responsibilities of the MPO Policy Board and committees.

2. Once the MPO structure has been updated in the by-laws, updates should be made to the website, MTP, and all other documents referring to the MPO’s structure to ensure consistency and clarity. Inclusion of an improved discussion regarding the MPO structure in the appropriate planning documents should be made no later than the document’s next scheduled update (i.e. the upcoming 2020 MTP update).

3. The review team encourages WisDOT and the MPO, along with other TMAs, to coordinate and create a written plan or agreement that reflects the agreed upon estimated amounts of STBG obligation limitation to be made reasonably available. This plan should cover the entire 5-year period of the FAST Act and be updated to reflect actual obligation limitation amounts made available for the most recently completed fiscal year. It should also be updated to reflect more accurate obligation limitation estimates for the future fiscal year(s). The State and appropriate TMAs should sign the plan and submit it to the FHWA Wisconsin Division Office for review to evaluate if the WisDOT is on track to fulfill its section 133(e) and 134(k)(4) requirements of 23 U.S.C.

4.2 Metropolitan Planning Area Boundaries

4.2.1 Regulatory Basis

23 U.S.C. 134(e) and 23 CFR 450.312(a) state the boundaries of a Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) shall be determined by agreement between the MPO and the Governor. At a minimum, the MPA boundaries shall encompass the entire existing urbanized area (as defined by the Bureau of the Census) plus the contiguous area expected to become urbanized within a 20-year forecast period for the MTP.

4.2.2 Current Status

The Appleton urbanized area was designated by FHWA and FTA as a Transportation Management Area on July 18, 2012 based on the 2010 Census, which found the population of the Appleton UZA, shown in Figure 1, to be greater than 200,000 persons. Figure 1 also illustrates the Appleton Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) boundary that was approved by the MPO in April 2013, and by WisDOT in June 2014.
Figure 1: Appleton Metropolitan Planning Area
4.2.3 Findings

The establishment of the MPO’s boundaries are in accordance with federal requirements. The MPO is expecting significant expansion of the urbanized area once the 2020 Census data is released. It is possible that the Appleton, Oshkosh, and Fond du Lac urbanized areas may become one contiguous urbanized area. All three MPOs are currently housed within the ECWRPC, essentially mitigating any issues that could occur if MPO consolidation was ever considered in the future. However, transit services within the three MPOs have started discussing the implication of boundary conglomeration through development of a commuter service study that considers the Fond du Lac, Oshkosh, Appleton, and Green Bay urbanized areas.

4.3 Unified Planning Work Program

4.3.1 Regulatory Basis

23 CFR 450.308 and 420 set the requirement that planning activities performed under Titles 23 and 49 U.S.C. be documented in a Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The MPO, in cooperation with the State and public transportation operator, shall develop a UPWP that includes a discussion of the planning priorities facing the MPA and the work proposed for the next one- or two-year period by major activity and task in sufficient detail to indicate the agency that will perform the work, the schedule for completing the work, the resulting products, the proposed funding, and sources of funds.

4.3.2 Current Status

The MPO’s UPWP is developed on an annual basis in coordination with the MPO technical and policy committees and includes discussions with Valley Transit and WisDOT on planning needs and activities. Development and implementation of the work program is reviewed by WisDOT, FHWA, and FTA during annual work program development meetings and midyear MPO reviews. The UPWP provides information needed to support Federal eligibility and costs, and is consistent with Federal requirements.

4.3.3 Findings

Review of the UPWP shows that the MPO has made improvements to the UPWP regarding its organization and readability. Due to the MPO’s organizational structure under the ECWRPC, the Appleton/Fox Cities MPO UPWP is included with the Oshkosh MPO, Fond du Lac MPO, and the ECWRPC work programs in one document. In the past, it had been difficult to determine which tasks applied to each planning entity.

Despite the organizational improvements, the review of the UPWP also revealed the need for the MPO to develop a discussion of the MPO’s planning priorities. In addition, many of the activities within the UPWP have not changed over the past three to five years. Although some activities occur each year, it is expected that some activities will be accomplished within the UPWP’s period of performance and be replaced with new activities in the following year.
**Recommendations:**

1. Determine the MPO’s planning priorities and document them in the UPWP.
2. Ensure that tasks in the UPWP support Federal requirements and/or MPO priorities.
3. Ensure that tasks in the UPWP are descriptive so that the reader can determine if a task is a routine annual task, or a task that has a definite conclusion. Include expected planning products so that FHWA, FTA, WisDOT, and the public can easily determine the MPO’s progress.

### 4.4 Metropolitan Transportation Plan

#### 4.4.1 Regulatory Basis

23 U.S.C. 134(c), (h) & (j) and 23 CFR 450.324 set forth requirements for the development and content of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). Among the requirements are that the MTP address at least a 20-year planning horizon and that it include both long and short range strategies that lead to the development of an integrated and multi-modal system to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of people and goods in addressing current and future transportation demand.

The MTP is required to provide a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive multimodal transportation planning process. The plan needs to consider all applicable issues related to the transportation system’s development, land use, employment, economic development, natural environment, and housing and community development.

23 CFR 450.324(c) requires the MPO to review and update the MTP at least every 4 years in air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas, and at least every 5 years in attainment areas, to reflect current and forecasted transportation, population, land use, employment, congestion, and economic conditions and trends.

Under 23 CFR 450.324(f), the MTP is required, at a minimum, to consider the following:

- Projected transportation demand
- Existing and proposed transportation facilities
- Operational and management strategies
- A description of the performance measures and performance targets used
- A system performance report
- Congestion management process
- Capital investment and strategies to preserve transportation infrastructure and provide for multimodal capacity
- Design concept and design scope descriptions of proposed transportation facilities
- Potential environmental mitigation activities
- Pedestrian walkway and bicycle transportation facilities
Transportation and transit enhancements
A financial plan

4.4.2 Current Status

The Appleton/Fox Cities MPO adopted their current MTP\textsuperscript{4} in October 2015 and are currently working on the development of a minor plan update to be completed by October 2020.

4.4.3 Findings

Review of the current MTP and discussion with the MPO indicates that the MTP follows planning rules at the time of adoption. The existing MTP provides a significant amount of data that is particularly useful for the transportation planner but may be considered cumbersome for the general public. It is recommended that the 2020 update focus on document formatting that promotes readability while ensuring compliance with new FAST Act planning rules. Of significant importance will be the development of a system performance report that describes the performance measures and performance targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system [23 CFR 450.324(f)(3)].

Additionally, the MPO indicated that the 2020 MTP update will include standard data updates and consider public health in all sections of the MTP. The MPO is looking to better align the MTP with City of Appleton public health initiatives that were reinforced with the recent passing of legislation that requires the consideration of public health in all city policies. Public health has also become a significant priority for the MPO as seen in many of their planning products and coordination efforts that are further highlighted in Section 4.9. Other potential emphasis areas include connected and automated vehicles and multimodal transportation.

The MPO is planning to encourage public involvement through several agency relationships they have created, not only through their health initiatives but through faith-based and minority community organizations. The MTP update will also be discussed at community events, such as farmers markets, Latino Fest, and MPO sponsored events like “Tacos and Transportation” to encourage public participation. In addition, the MPO is considering working with local radio stations to provide a forum to discuss long-range transportation planning and provide the public opportunity to call-in to the show to describe their transportation needs and experiences. It is anticipated that the MPO will utilize the extensive knowledge of the MPO’s policy board and committees in the development of the MTP update.

Recommendations:

1. It is encouraged that the MPO find opportunities to improve the MTP’s readability through document formatting and data visualization improvements. Although the MTP is an extremely thorough and useful reference document, it is challenging to read the document and ascertain the long-term vision for transportation in the MPA.

2. The financial plan should identify transit and bicycle/pedestrian projects needed to implement regional goals and objectives and identify unmet needs.

4.5 Transit Planning

4.5.1 Regulatory Basis

49 U.S.C. 5303 and 23 U.S.C. 134 require the transportation planning process in metropolitan areas to consider all modes of travel in the development of their plans and programs. Federal regulations cited in 23 CFR 450.314 state that the MPO in cooperation with the State and operators of publicly owned transit services shall be responsible for carrying out the transportation planning process.

4.5.2 Current Status

Valley Transit, the transit provider for the Fox Cities Region is actively involved in the planning process. Ronald McDonald, Valley Transit General Manager, is an ex-officio member of the Policy Board. Valley Transit and the MPO are currently working together to update the Transit Development Plan, which is a 5-year Plan that sets priorities for the transit agency based on identified community needs. Valley Transit and the MPO worked together along with other local agencies to update the Public Transportation/Human Service Transportation Coordination Plan, which is a requirement of FTA’s Section 5310 (Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities) Program.

4.5.3 Findings

Valley Transit’s ridership increased 1.5 percent from 2017 to 2018. Valley Transit’s goal is “Regionalization” of the Fox Cities. To accomplish this, they are working with Go Transit (Oshkosh) to better coordinate transit service. In addition, Valley Transit is in the process of purchasing new buses. They received funding through FTA’s Section 5339 (Bus & Bus Facilities) Discretionary Program. This funding, combined with state funding through the Volkswagen Settlement Funds, will allow Valley Transit to replace their bus fleet within five years. As part of the Transit Asset Management (TAM) Plan, Valley Transit will stagger future vehicle replacement purchases. This will be incorporated into the TIP.

ECWRPC is serving as the lead agency on a commuter service feasibility study that will analyze the potential and need for a transit service from Green Bay to Fond du Lac. Design scenarios from the study should be completed by the end of 2019.
4.6 Transportation Improvement Program

4.6.1 Regulatory Basis

23 U.S.C. 134(c), (h) & (j) set forth requirements for the MPO to cooperatively develop a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Under 23 CFR 450.326, the TIP must meet the following requirements:

- Cover at least a four-year horizon and be updated at least every four years.
- Surface transportation projects funded under Title 23 U.S.C. or Title 49 U.S.C., except as noted in the regulations, are required to be included in the TIP.
- Make progress toward achieving the performance targets.
- Provide a description of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving the performance targets (to the maximum extent practicable).
- List project description, cost, funding source, and identification of the agency responsible for carrying out each project.
- Projects need to be consistent with the adopted MTP.
- Must be fiscally constrained.
- The MPO must provide all interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed TIP.

4.6.2 Current Status

The TIP is a staged multi-year program of both capital and operating projects designed to implement both the long-range element of the MPO’s MTP and the shorter-range transportation system management (TSM) element. It is prepared annually by the MPO for projects within the Fox Cities / Appleton TMA, covering a period of four years. Future year projects are listed as illustrative. In preparing the TIP, the MPO works with the WisDOT Northeast Region, transit operators, and local governmental jurisdictions to compile a list of projects from their capital improvement programs and budgets for the four-year period that is covered by the TIP. The list of programmed and candidate projects are reviewed for consistency with the MPO’s MTP, prioritized, and recommended by transportation Technical Advisory Committees for the urbanized area. TAC recommendations are in turn reviewed by the Policy Board, who provide final action by recommending these projects to WisDOT for inclusion in the STIP.

4.6.3 Findings

The 2019 TIP for the Fox Cities / Appleton TMA substantially meets the requirements in 23 CFR 450.326. However, it was found that improvements can be made to the financial plan and project listing that will provide greater clarity. The financial plan for the 2019 TIP includes a table that summarizes the Federal funds programmed and available through the life of the TIP, but does not include a narrative to describe key data and assumptions or provide conclusions that
should be considered by the reader. Additionally, the financial plan lacks information regarding system-level estimates of costs and revenue sources that are reasonably expected to be available to adequately operate and maintain Federal-aid highways and public transportation, as required in 23 CFR 450.326(j).

Regarding the project listing, it is challenging to understand the source of Federal funds for Federally assisted projects. This is particularly true for state sponsored projects and bridge projects where funding programs are identified as “STP” and “BR”, respectively. FHWA has indicated to the MPO that WisDOT needs to provide the Federal-aid program identified to fund the project at the time of the TIP amendment/update prior to the MPO’s approval of the TIP amendment/update. The MPO is currently working with WisDOT Northeast Region staff to update their TIP to accurately identify the expected Federal funding source for each Federally assisted project listed in the TIP.

**Recommendations:**

1. Improve financial plan by providing a narrative that explains the key data, assumptions, and conclusions in support of the summary of Federal funds programmed and available (as shown in Table 2 of the MPO’s 2019 TIP).
2. Improve financial plan by providing system-level estimates of costs and revenue sources that are reasonably expected to be available to adequately operate and maintain Federal-aid highways and public transportation.

## 4.7 Public Participation & Visualization

### 4.7.1 Regulatory Basis

Sections 134(i)(6), 134(j)(1)(B) of Title 23 and Section 5303(i)(5) and 5303(j)(1)(B) of Title 49, United States Code, require a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to provide adequate opportunity for the public to participate in and comment on the products and planning processes of the MPO. The requirements for public involvement are detailed in 23 CFR 450.316, which requires the MPO to develop and use a documented participation plan that includes explicit procedures and strategies to include the public and other interested parties in the transportation planning process.

Specific requirements include giving adequate and timely notice of opportunities to participate in or comment on transportation issues and processes, employing visualization techniques to describe metropolitan transportation plans and TIPs, making public information readily available in electronically accessible formats and means such as the world wide web, holding public meetings at convenient and accessible locations and times, demonstrating explicit consideration and response to public input, and periodically reviewing the effectiveness of the participation plan.
4.7.2 Current Status

The MPO continues to incorporate innovative techniques into their public participation efforts. The Public Participation Plan was updated in 2018 and includes the utilization of social media and better visual depiction of data collection. The MPO has developed two videos that demonstrate these innovative efforts. The first video was developed in collaboration with the Oshkosh High School Football Team to invite the public to the MPO’s “Bike Rodeo” events where MPO staff teach the importance of bicycle safety. The second video was developed to promote the new Winnebago Catch-A-Ride Transit service. The videos were played at local movie theaters and promoted through social media outlets. In addition, tent cards were placed on tables at local restaurants to promote the catch-a-ride transit service. The videos have been useful in educating the public and increasing participation at MPO sponsored events.

The MPO is currently in the process of making information interactive on their website using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and tailored online dashboards that can be filtered to provide easily understood data and visualizations. The MPO’s updated and reorganized website will create a one-stop shop for all data and documents. It is anticipated that each planning project will have a webpage that will keep a history of meetings, documents, and decisions.

The MPO has also been using geo-located data collection software that has allowed the MPO to collect real-time data that can be analyzed during the data collection process. Specifically, geo-located data collection and analysis has been beneficial to the MPO during bike and walk audits and when collecting data and sharing data with the public at public involvement events. The MPO is also incorporating crash/accident data into a Geographic Information System (GIS) map to create an interactive tool for the public.

4.7.3 Findings

Commendation:

1. The Federal Review Team commends the MPO for their innovative approach to educating the public about the MPO, its planning initiatives, and the area’s transportation assets.

4.8 Civil Rights (Title VI, EJ, LEP, ADA)

4.8.1 Regulatory Basis

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, prohibits discrimination based upon race, color, and national origin. Specifically, 42 U.S.C. 2000d states that “No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.” In addition to Title VI, there are other nondiscrimination statutes that afford legal protection. These statutes include the following: Section 162(a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 (23 U.S.C. 324), the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973/Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990. The ADA specifies that
programs and activities funded with Federal dollars are prohibited from discrimination based on disability.

Executive Order #12898 (Environmental Justice) directs federal agencies to develop strategies to address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs on minority and low-income populations. In compliance with this Executive Order, USDOT and FHWA issued orders to establish policies and procedures for addressing environmental justice in minority and low-income populations. The planning regulations, at 23 CFR 450.316(a)(1)(vii), require that the needs of those “traditionally underserved” by existing transportation systems, such as low-income and/or minority households, be sought out and considered.

Executive Order # 13166 (Limited-English-Proficiency) requires agencies to ensure that limited English proficiency persons can meaningfully access the services provided consistent with and without unduly burdening the fundamental mission of each federal agency.

4.8.2 Current Status

As the MPO is housed within the ECWRPC, the MPO follows the policies within the ECWRPC’s Title VI Non-Discrimination Plan & Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Program (Title VI Plan) that was adopted in October 2017.

4.8.3 Findings

The Title VI Plan contains the ECWRPC’s nondiscrimination policy and procedures used to identify the mobility needs of minority and low-income populations in its region. In addition, the document discusses its public participation plan’s goals, objectives, and techniques including outreach to populations with limited-English proficiency. An Equity and Opportunity and Outreach Tracker table summarizes an extensive array of outreach activities including topics addressed, staff involved, dates, and time committed. The Plan also lists external partners it engages to enhance equity and community engagement.

The Title VI Plan also summarizes related training that is provided to staff concerning the nondiscrimination responsibilities, available language assistance available to the public, and how to handle complaints. Notably staff also received training on unintentional bias which can be considered an exemplary practice for ensuring nondiscrimination in all activities.

In 2016, ECWRPC created the Equity and Opportunity Work Group, which is comprised of transportation, economic development, community development, planning, and GIS staff. The vision of the work group is to ensure that all residents and organizations have equitable access to all work programs, plans, and activities that ECWRPC is associated with. The purpose of this work group is to:

1. Follow and implement ECWRPC’s Title VI Non-Discrimination Plan and Limited English Proficiency Program
2. Continue the development of public outreach methods
3. Continuous improvement of environmental justice analysis tools
4. Continue to improve outreach to agencies and organizations to network and share ideas
5. Improve our policies and procedures to provide for better interaction between the public and the ECWRPC

Asset mapping is another activity the Equity and Opportunity Work Group conducts to better understand community connections to underserved populations. Asset mapping provides information on current connections to people and physical capital and to then determine where gaps exist. The intended outcome is to create new relationships that are necessary to addressing community needs.

Every year the Equity and Opportunity Work Group prepares an annual report that is included in the Work Program for ECWRPC. Training and outreach activities, Title VI complaints, annual accomplishments, future goals and objectives, and any amendments to this plan are included in the annual report.

Finally, it is noted that ECWRPC has adopted the best practice of expanding its nondiscrimination certification statement to reference specific activities that demonstrate compliance with the various laws.

**Recommendation:**

1. It is recommended that the MPO inventory ADA transition plans within its MPA and assist or coordinate training for communities yet to develop an ADA transition plan.

**Commendation:**

1. The Federal Review Team commends ECWRPC on its external and internal efforts to ensure nondiscrimination.

### 4.9 Consultation and Coordination

#### 4.9.1 Regulatory Basis

23 U.S.C. 134(g) & (i)(5)-(6) and 23 CFR 450.316(b)-(e) set forth requirements for consultation in developing the MTP and TIP. Consultation is also addressed specifically in connection with the MTP in 23 CFR 450.324(g)(1)-(2) and in 23 CFR 450.324(f)(10) related to environmental mitigation.

In developing the MTP and TIP, the MPO shall, to the extent practicable, develop a documented process that outlines roles, responsibilities, and key decision points for consulting with other governments and agencies as described below:

- Agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities (State, local, economic development, environmental protection, airport operations, or freight)
• Other providers of transportation services
• Indian Tribal Government(s)
• Federal land management agencies

4.9.2 Current Status

Transportation planning is a collaborative process that involves government agencies, non-profit organizations, elected officials, advocacy and special interest groups, the business community and the public. Federal requirements are intended to ensure that transportation decision-making is based on a continuing, comprehensive, urban planning process undertaken cooperatively by the states, local governments and other interested parties — the so-called 3C, “continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative” planning process.

The MPO is part of the ECWRPC which covers a 10-county area including two other MPOs in the region and engages in a broad array of planning areas including land use, water/sewer, and transportation. As a regional planning commission, the ECWRPC and the MPO are uniquely positioned to facilitate integrated and comprehensive planning on a regional scale and this is demonstrated in the MPO’s documented activities concerning its planning products and public involvement efforts.

4.9.3 Findings

The MPO and ECWRPC have developed and implemented an exemplary 3-C planning process. This is particularly true of their efforts to integrate planning efforts of all kinds with the promotion of healthy communities. The MPO and ECWRPC are national leaders in that area. Relationship building with regional partners is a strong emphasis area in planning efforts. Below are examples of MPO/ECWRPC activities:

• In 2018, ECWRPC/MPO staff completed the 3-year Healthy Wisconsin Leadership 5 — Coach (Collaborating, Organizing and Advocating for Community Health) Program to strengthen skills and implement policy, systems, and environmental change that improves community health.
• With technical assistance from Smart Growth America, ECWRPC and partner organizations created Complete Street policies for the Fox Cities/Appleton MPO, Oshkosh MPO, City of Appleton, the City of Oshkosh and the Region.
• Implementation of a Regional Safe Routes to School Program (SRTS) in the Region started in 2009. Through the SRTS program, collaboration with health care advocacy groups grew to where now the MPO/ECWRPC is recognized as a national leader in incorporating health

into planning activities. Conversely, health care advocates have a greater appreciation for how the built environment impacts health.

- ECWRPC and MPO staff participated in Fox Valley Thrives\(^6\) (FVT), a regional alliance working to advance health equity through aligned efforts, relationship and capacity building, co-learning and strategic action that recognizes the need to engage the community in defining transportation access needs in the region and empowering those community members to help drive change. This project engaged transit users, pedestrians, and bicyclists in focus groups to identify factors that impact their transportation journey resulting in a summary report and long-term strategic plan that FVT will use to engage the community to advocate for improved transit access to advance health outcomes in the region.

- Participation in the University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute’s Mobilizing Action Toward Community Health\(^7\) (MATCH) program. MATCH develops and deploys programs and resources and engages in collaborative partnerships that support strategic community-driven efforts to ensure that all people have a fair chance to be healthy in their homes, schools, workplaces, and neighborhoods. MATCH aims to change practice, focus priorities, and shift power to support shared action on root causes of health and equity. MATCH does this through training; supporting data-to-action; developing and sharing scholarship, frameworks, and tools for change; and convening and growing alliances for shared action.

- Participation in healthTIDE\(^8\), which is a network of statewide and place-based community partners who work together to create bigger change faster around nutrition and physical activity. The network works to connect, align, and unite multi-sector partners across Wisconsin who are working to make the healthy choice the easy choice, and reduce health disparities so that everyone can thrive. The goal is to bring partners together to create lasting policy, system, and environmental changes related to nutrition and physical activity.

- The Weight of the Fox Valley\(^9\) is a three-county initiative (Calumet, Outagamie, and Winnebago) to reduce obesity and chronic disease through several strategies, including

\(^6\) Fox Valley Thrives. [https://ahwendowment.org/AHW/Policy-Systems--Culture-Change/Fox-Valley-Thrives-Transportation-Team-Strategic-Planning.htm](https://ahwendowment.org/AHW/Policy-Systems--Culture-Change/Fox-Valley-Thrives-Transportation-Team-Strategic-Planning.htm)

\(^7\) Mobilizing Action Toward Community Health. [https://uwphi.pophealth.wisc.edu/match/](https://uwphi.pophealth.wisc.edu/match/)

\(^8\) healthTIDE. [https://www.healthtide.org/about](https://www.healthtide.org/about)

active transportation and healthcare. This program includes individuals from over 25 organizations covering a variety of disciplines. Weight of the Fox Valley is directly supported in Outagamie County’s 2014 Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP). This CHIP identifies “physical activity and active living” as a primary objective; recommendations towards this end include building more bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, building public health and transportation partnerships, and encouraging employers to incentivize the use of public transportation.

**Commendation:**

1. The Federal Review Team commends the MPO and ECWRPC’s on its comprehensive and creative coordination and networking efforts.

### 4.10 Freight Planning

#### 4.10.1 Regulatory Basis

MAP-21 established in 23 U.S.C. 167 a policy to improve the condition and performance of the national freight network and achieve goals related to economic competitiveness and efficiency; congestion; productivity; safety, security, and resilience of freight movement; infrastructure condition; use of advanced technology; performance, innovation, competition, and accountability, while reducing environmental impacts.

In addition, 23 U.S.C. 134 and 23 CFR 450.306 specifically identify the need to address freight movement as part of the metropolitan transportation planning process.

#### 4.10.2 Current Status

The MPO’s MTP includes a general discussion of truck, rail, water and air freight, with goals and strategies for policymakers to consider. These goals and strategies align with the State’s most recent Long-Range Transportation Plan, *Connections 2030* and Wisconsin’s State Freight Plan. Highway freight movements are also modeled using truck count data and are considered in the MPO’s CMP. The CMP also considers rail and airport freight and acknowledges its impact on the highway system.

#### 4.10.3 Findings

The MPO has significant interest in two freight initiatives just outside its planning boundaries. The MPO sees the development of an Oshkosh, WI transload facility and a Port of Green Bay intermodal facility providing great freight benefits throughout the Fox Valley. The MPO has been coordinating with the Green Bay MPO and internally within the ECWRPC (who also host the Oshkosh MPO) to support these freight initiatives, which also supports FHWA’s regional models of cooperation concept.
Recommendation:

1. Continue to support freight related activities including the Oshkosh transload and Port of Green Bay intermodal projects.

4.11 Environmental Mitigation/Planning Environmental Linkage

4.11.1 Regulatory Basis

23 U.S.C. 134(i)(2)(D) and 23 CFR 450.324(f)(10) requires environmental mitigation be set forth in connection with the MTP. The MTP is required to include a discussion of types of potential environmental mitigation activities for the transportation improvements and potential areas to carry out these activities, including activities that may have the greatest potential to restore and maintain the environmental functions affected by the plan.

23 U.S.C. 168 and Appendix A to 23 CFR Part 450 provide for linking the transportation planning and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) processes. A Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) study can incorporate the initial phases of NEPA through the consideration of natural, physical, and social effects, coordination with environmental resource agencies, and public involvement. This will allow the analysis in the PEL study to be referenced in the subsequent NEPA document once the project is initiated, saving time and money with project implementation.

4.11.2 Current Status

The MPO is engaged in project environmental planning as requested by the project sponsor. Typically, the MPO’s involvement extends through scoping discussions and public involvement activities. However, there have not been many major environmental actions within the MPA.

4.11.3 Findings

ECWRPC was involved in a Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) study for the Highway 23 Project. Currently, the only planning project that may be incorporated into a project’s environmental review is the Interstate 41 traffic engineering study. ECWRPC held meetings in the past with resource agencies to discuss upcoming projects and will consider more meetings as part of the upcoming long-range plan update. The MPO acknowledges the need for more storm water analysis/data to assist in the planning of the larger corridor studies.

Recommendations:

1. It is recommended that the MPO address stormwater goals in their next MTP update.
4.12 Transportation Safety and Security

4.12.1 Regulatory Basis

23 U.S.C. 134(h)(1)(B) and (h)(2) require MPOs to consider safety as one of ten planning factors. As stated in 23 CFR 450.306(b)(2), the planning process needs to consider and implement projects, strategies, and services that will increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users.

In addition, SAFETEA-LU established a core safety program called the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) (23 U.S.C. 148), which introduced a mandate for states to have Strategic Highway Safety Plans (SHSPs). 23 CFR 450.306(d) requires the metropolitan transportation planning process to be consistent with the SHSP, and other transit safety and security planning.

23 U.S.C. 134(h)(1)(C) requires MPOs to consider security as one of ten planning factors. As stated in 23 CFR 450.306(b)(3), the Metropolitan Transportation Planning process provides for consideration of security of the transportation system.

The regulations state that the degree and consideration of security should be based on the scale and complexity of many different local issues. Under 23 CFR 450.324(h), the MTP may include emergency relief and disaster preparedness plans and strategies and policies that support homeland security, as appropriate.

4.12.2 Current Status

Transportation safety and security is considered in many of the MPO’s planning documents and processes. Safety is a common theme throughout the MTP and is discussed in multiple sections of the report, such as the plan’s vision, goals, and objectives and in discussions regarding health and livability, the existing transportation system, freight, performance measures, and safe routes to school. The MTP also includes a chapter on security that considers county hazard mitigation plans, recommendations for intelligent transportation systems infrastructure improvements, and transit system security.

The MPO also strongly considers safety in the development of its CMP, complete streets policy, safe routes to school initiative, and Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) project selection process.

4.12.3 Findings

A significant focus of the MPO and the ECWRPC is its Regional Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Program that started in 2009. This program was jump-started by national SRTS legislation that was approved by Congress in 2005 and provided funding to all 50 states. Although dedicated funding is no longer provided for SRTS, the MPO/ECWRPC has continued this initiative and expanded their SRTS Program from 40 participating schools in 2009 to 184 schools in 2019. The program has leveraged over $4 million of Federal funds into the region since 2009, allowing for
nearly 200 bike and walk audits and 1,300 walk and bike to school events. This program has resulted in safety benefits through education, enforcement, and identification of safety hazards. In addition, the program supports the MPO’s health initiatives.

Schools are also starting to invest in ITS related improvements on their buses. Certain school districts have installed cameras on the outside of their buses to give the driver a 360-degree view around the bus to ensure no cars are driving around the bus when children are trying to cross the road. Buses can also be tracked by parents to inform them of when their children have arrived at school. WiFi internet access is also being provided on buses to allow children without broadband access at home to complete homework assignments on the way to school.

The MPO coordinates with WisDOT regarding ITS infrastructure on the State Highway Network and with the State’s Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) in identifying locations in need of safety improvements. The MPO is also considering LiDAR asset mapping through a third-party vendor to improve transportation safety and security analysis.

**Recommendations:**

1. The MPO should consider the development of an ITS plan for the MPA.
2. The MPO should consider the development of a vulnerability study that may include flood plain mapping and stormwater management, evacuation procedures, and infrastructure resiliency.

### 4.13 Nonmotorized Planning/Livability

#### 4.13.1 Regulatory Basis

23 U.S.C. 217(g) states that bicyclists and pedestrians shall be given due consideration in the comprehensive transportation plans developed by each MPO under 23 U.S.C. 134. Bicycle transportation facilities and pedestrian walkways shall be considered, where appropriate, in conjunction with all new construction and reconstruction of transportation facilities.

23 CFR 450.306 sets forth the requirement that the scope of the metropolitan planning process will increase the safety for motorized and non-motorized users; increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users; and protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life. 23 CFR 450.324(f)(2) states the MTP shall include existing and proposed transportation facilities, including nonmotorized facilities, that should function as an integrated metropolitan transportation system.

#### 4.13.2 Current Status

The MPO meets Federal laws and regulations for providing the MPA with comprehensive transportation planning and developing plans that consider all roadway users and their safety.
This is apparent in the MPO’s MTP, bicycle and pedestrian plan, trail wayfinding guidebook, Complete Streets policy, and Safe Routes to School Program.

4.13.3 Findings

The MPO has been proactive in their approach to promoting non-motorized transportation into the planning process. Although there are limited funding options, and the State of Wisconsin has a prohibition on eminent domain for pedestrian and bicycle facilities, the MPO is analyzing data to show local jurisdictions that pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure is worth the return on investment. The MPO is planning to develop a feasibility study with subsequent case studies using local data to educate local leaders. During the development of the economic impact study, the MPO will use a phased approach that will identify and address the gaps to the existing data, collect needed data to strengthen the analysis, and lastly develop case studies from existing data and the data to be collected. The MPO is considering how to better track pedestrian and bicycle facility use. Data is currently collected by portable tube counters and Safe Routes to School participation.

The MPO continues to offer technical assistance to all jurisdictions that are developing pedestrian and bicycle plans. The pedestrian/bicycle planning process includes identification of underserved populations, and gaps between those populations and necessities such as a medical care and food. The MPO’s existing pedestrian and bicycle plan covers 30 jurisdictions. A Complete Streets Policy was adopted in 2018. Municipalities are starting to buy in to this policy, but it is too early to measure the success of the Complete Streets Policy.

The MPO participated in ten bike rodeos to promote the Safe Routes to School Program and active transportation. This is part of an ongoing effort to educate the public and increase the visibility of non-motorized transportation options within the region.

4.14 Integration of Land Use and Transportation

4.14.1 Regulatory Basis

23 U.S.C. 134(g)(3) encourages MPOs to consult with officials responsible for other types of planning activities that are affected by transportation in the area (including State and local planned growth, economic development, environmental protection, airport operations, and freight movements) or to coordinate its planning process, to the maximum extent practicable, with such planning activities.

23 U.S.C. 134 (h)(1)(E) and 23 CFR 450.306(b)(5) set forth requirements for the MPO Plan to protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns.
4.14.2 Current Status

The MPO has integrated land use related objectives into numerous transportation planning goals within its MTP. These land use objectives consistently describe the need to develop a transportation system that supports current and desired patterns of land use development, while making land use decisions in consideration of existing transportation facilities. They also suggest the promotion of compact land use patterns and mixed-used site designs to aid in the development of an efficient transit system and convenient bicycle and pedestrian system. Aside from the transportation planning goals, the MTP also discusses land use-specific goals and objectives focused on growth management, urban service delivery, environmental resources, and open space.

4.14.3 Findings

During the on-site meeting, the MPO expressed that the community is starting to seek-out the MPO’s and ECWRPC’s transportation and land use planning expertise. This is a testament to the MPO’s work to integrate land use and transportation planning. The coordination is mutually beneficial as the community and MPO both strengthen their understanding of the link between land use and transportation. The MPO has also been able to help communities understand their transportation assets and communicate the benefits to employers who may be considering relocating into, or out of the area. The MPO is also considering mapping potential redevelopment areas and measuring potential impacts to the transportation system if redeveloped.

4.15 Travel Demand Forecasting

4.15.1 Regulatory Basis

23 CFR 450.324(f)(1) requires that the Metropolitan Transportation Plan include the projected transportation demand of persons and goods in the Metropolitan Planning Area over the period of the transportation plan. Travel demand forecasting models are used in the planning process to identify deficiencies in future year transportation systems and evaluate the impacts of alternative transportation investments. In air quality non-attainment and maintenance areas, they are also used to estimate regional vehicle activity for use in mobile source emission models that support air quality conformity determinations.

4.15.2 Current Status

The MPO cooperatively maintains the travel demand model for northeast Wisconsin with WisDOT and four other MPOs located within the region. The Northeast Region Model is a standard four-step model that considers trip generation, trip distribution, traffic assignment and mode choice, as the model includes transit services operating in the region. The model utilizes data from the US Census, National Household Travel Survey, collected traffic counts, and existing and projected socio-economic data from various sources to develop a base model that represents
the existing transportation network and future year travel forecasts that consider committed and planned transportation projects.

The governance of the Northeast Region Model is outlined in the WisDOT Northeast Region Travel Demand Model MOU that was adopted in May 2009. WisDOT and the associated MPOs have nearly completed an update to the MOU that better reflects current practices and Chapter 9 of WisDOT’s Transportation Planning Manual (Traffic Forecasting, Travel Demand Models and Planning Data) published in May 2018.

4.15.3 Findings

Major model updates are scheduled in 10-year increments to coincide with the release of the decennial US Census. Minor updates to the model occur continuously as outdated or missing data is identified by using the model for various transportation planning tasks. Minor updates to the model in the Appleton MPA are typically coordinated between WisDOT and the MPO to develop concurrence with the proposed changes. FHWA observed this collaborative approach at a Northeast Region Travel Demand Model User Group meeting that occurs on an as-needed basis and is used as a forum to provide modeling related updates and as a workshop to improve the model. WisDOT and the MPO have described their relationship as mutually beneficial as their collaboration has improved planning for both MPO and State projects.

The model is frequently used by the MPO for corridor scenario planning, traffic impact analysis, development and analysis of performance measures, and determining long-range transportation strategies. The MPO has also considered using the model to test emergency management scenarios.

The model’s transit component has allowed the MPO to test headways, frequencies, and route changes. Transit ridership is based on households and calibrated with actual ridership data. Transit modeling outputs have also been used in conjunction with geospatial environmental justice data to identify potential impacts to disadvantaged communities.

The MPO is meeting the requirements set forth in 23 CFR 450.324(f)(1).

4.16 Congestion Management Process / Management and Operations

4.16.1 Regulatory Basis

23 U.S.C. 134(k)(3) and 23 CFR 450.322 set forth requirements for the congestion management process (CMP) in TMAs. The CMP is a systematic approach for managing congestion through a process that provides for a safe and effective integrated management and operation of the multimodal transportation system. TMAs designated as non-attainment for ozone must also provide an analysis of the need for additional capacity for a proposed improvement over travel demand reduction, and operational management strategies.

23 CFR 450.324(f)(5) requires the MTP include Management and Operations (M&O) of the transportation network as an integrated, multimodal approach to optimize the performance of
the existing transportation infrastructure. Effective M&O strategies include measurable regional operations goals and objectives and specific performance measures to optimize system performance.

4.16.2 Current Status

The MPO has a documented CMP which was adopted in October 2013, shortly after the MPO was designated as a TMA in July 2012. As the CMP document is the first edition, it did not include a framework for tracking implementation of strategies or measuring their effectiveness. The MPO has stated that the CMP will be updated in conjunction with future MTP update due in October 2020.

4.16.3 Findings

As the CMP document was the first edition for the recently designated Appleton TMA, it did not formerly adopt a framework for the tracking of implemented strategies or an evaluation of their effectiveness. The CMP did discuss two evaluation options it could pursue in the future:

- **Option 1:** Conduct or fund evaluation studies (before and after data collection of a CMP strategy that was implemented to gauge its effectiveness). The evaluation case studies by MPO staff would document the implementation of one or more congestion management strategies; and

- **Option 2:** Develop guidance for evaluation studies (an ideal option if partnering with agencies/municipalities on congestion management strategies/issues). MPO staff may choose to develop guidance for evaluation studies that could be used by partnering agencies to monitor the effectiveness of congestion management strategies. For example, staff could partner with Valley Transit to help them monitor transit strategies; or staff could partner with regional freight partners to monitor freight strategies All other elements of a CMP are present in the current document. The MPO noted that congestion is not currently a problem in the region.

**Recommendation:**

1. Notwithstanding the current absence of congestion in the region, development and implementation of a comprehensive CMP is still a requirement for TMAs and, absent any legislative changes, the upcoming update of the CMP must include a framework for tracking the implementation of strategies and measuring their effectiveness.

The FHWA is bringing a CMP technical assistance webinar to the TMAs in Wisconsin on October 17, 2019. The webinar will focus on tracking implementation and evaluation of CMP strategies. The webinar will also provide an overview of dynamic shoulder running as an operations strategy.
4.17 Performance Based Planning and Programming

4.17.1 Regulatory Basis

23 U.S.C. 150(b) identifies the following national goals for the focus of the Federal-aid highway program: Safety, Infrastructure Condition, Congestion Reduction, System Reliability, Freight Movement and Economic Vitality, Environmental Sustainability, and Reduced Project Delivery Delays. Under 23 U.S.C. 134(h)(2), the metropolitan planning process shall provide for the establishment and use of a performance-based approach to transportation decision-making to support the national goals, including the establishment of performance targets.

23 CFR 450.306(d) states that each MPO shall establish performance targets to support the national goals and track progress towards the attainement of critical outcomes. Each MPO shall coordinate with the relevant State to ensure consistency, to the maximum extent practicable, and establish performance targets not later than 180 days after the State or provider of public transportation establishes its performance targets. The selection of performance targets that address performance measures described in 49 U.S.C. 5326(c) and 49 U.S.C. 5329(d) shall be coordinated to the maximum extent practicable, with public transportation providers to ensure consistency with the performance targets that public transportation providers establish under 49 U.S.C. 5326(c) and 49 U.S.C. 5329(d). Additionally, each MPO shall integrate the goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets from other performance-based plans and programs integrated into the metropolitan transportation planning process.

23 CFR 450.314(h) states that the MPO, the State, and the public transportation operator shall jointly develop specific written provisions PBPP, which can either be documented as part of the metropolitan planning agreements or in some other means. See section MPO Structure and Agreements for more information.

23 CFR 450.324(f) states that MTPs shall include descriptions of the performance measures and performance targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system, a system performance report evaluating the condition and performance of the transportation system with respect to the performance targets, and progress achieved in meeting the performance targets in comparison with system performance recorded in previous reports.

23 CFR 450.326(d) states that the TIP shall include, to the maximum extent practicable, a description of the anticipated effect of the programmed investments with respect to the performance targets established in the MTP, the anticipated future performance target achievement of the programmed investments, and a written narrative linking investment priorities to those performance targets and how the other PBPP documents are being implemented to develop the program of projects.

23 CFR 450.340 states that MPOs have two years from the effective dates of the planning and performance measures rule to comply with the requirements.
4.17.2 Current Status

The MPO has formally adopted the targets set by WisDOT for the National Performance Measures and its TIP does include a discussion of programmed projects that are related to the targets.

4.17.3 Findings

In addition to the National Performance Measures, the MPO’s MTP and CMP references locally adopted performance measures such as the percentage of the workforce that commute alone, percentage with a long (> 30 minutes) commute, percentage of population within quarter mile of public transportation, and LOS C for congestion. Adopted non-motorized measures include trail user counts, schools in SRTS, number of student participants, bike or pedestrian crashes, number of miles of trails and bike lanes, percentage of funding (federal, state, local and private) for bike or pedestrian facilities and programs, etc. Transit measures include bike rack usage and number of bus passengers.

Recommendation:

1. It is recommended that the MPO periodically issue a summary or report identifying adopted performance measures, their baseline when adopted, how the measures are incorporated into project selection, and progress to date.
5.0 CONCLUSION

The FHWA and FTA review found that the metropolitan transportation planning process conducted in the Appleton urbanized area meets Federal planning requirements. A summary of the review’s findings can be found in Section 1.2 of this report.
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APPENDIX B – PUBLIC COMMENTS

A public listening session was held on May 30, 2019 at 5:00 pm in the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission Offices at 400 Ahnape Street in Menasha, WI. The meeting was advertised in the local newspaper (see media affidavit below) and through social media and the MPO’s standard contact list. There were no attendees at the listening session and no comments received from the public through mail or e-mail.

STATE OF WISCONSIN
BROWN COUNTY

EAST CENTRAL WI PLANNING COMM
400 AHNAIP ST STE 100
MENASHA WI 54952-3388

I, being duly sworn, doth depose and say I am an authorized representative of the Appleton Post Crescent, a newspaper published at Appleton, Wisconsin and that an advertisement of which the annexed is a true copy, taken from said paper, which was published therein on:

Account Number: GWM-N5251
Order Number: 600753125
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Total Ad Cost: $130.77
Published Dates: 05/05/19, 05/19/19

(Signed) Kevin Yang (Date) 5/22/19
Legal Clerk

Signed and sworn before me

My commission expires 11/4/19
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ADA: Americans with Disabilities Act
AMPO: Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations
CAA: Clean Air Act
CFR: Code of Federal Regulations
CMP: Congestion Management Process
CO: Carbon Monoxide
DOT: Department of Transportation
EJ: Environmental Justice
FAST: Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act
FHWA: Federal Highway Administration
FTA: Federal Transit Administration
FY: Fiscal Year
HSIP: Highway Safety Improvement Program
ITS: Intelligent Transportation Systems
LEP: Limited-English-Proficiency
M&O: Management and Operations
MAP-21: Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century
MPA: Metropolitan Planning Area
MPO: Metropolitan Planning Organization
MTP: Metropolitan Transportation Plan
NAAQS: National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NO2: Nitrogen Dioxide
O3: Ozone
PBPP: Performance Based Planning and Programming
PM10 and PM2.5: Particulate Matter
SHSP: Strategic Highway Safety Plan
STIP: State Transportation Improvement Program
TDM: Travel Demand Management
TIP: Transportation Improvement Program
TMA: Transportation Management Area
TPM: Transportation Performance Management
UPWP: Unified Planning Work Program
USDOT: United States Department of Transportation

WHEREAS, the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Fox Cities Transportation Management Area, approved the 2019 Transportation Improvement Program for the Fox Cities Transportation Management Area, at the October 26, 2018 quarterly Commission meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Transportation Improvement Program was prepared to meet the requirements of the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act: (FAST), as prescribed by federal regulations; and

WHEREAS, all projects that use federal funds must appear in an adopted Transportation Improvement Program; and

WHEREAS, WisDOT has requested the MPO advance the attached highway projects in the Fox Cities Area:

WHEREAS, the MPO staff will prepare the appropriate documentation to meet federal and state requirements for any transportation project appearing in the TIP, Now Therefore;

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE EAST CENTRAL WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION:

SECTION 1. That the Commission approves the amendment as presented to include the projects on I 41, WIS 76, and Canadian National Railroad Crossings in the approved 2019 Transportation Improvement Program for the Fox Cities Transportation Management Area.

Effective Date: October 25, 2019

Prepared for: Transportation Committee

Prepared By: David J. Moesch, Associate Transportation Planner

__________________________  ____________________________
Neal Strehlow, Chair        Jeff Nooyen, Vice Chair

__________________________  ____________________________
Jerry Erdmann               Brian Smith

__________________________  ____________________________
Ken Robl                   Dick Koeppen

__________________________  ____________________________
Ron McDonald               Jill Michaelson

__________________________  ____________________________
Martin Farrell             Donna Kalata

__________________________
Thomas Kautza
Funds are listed in Year of Expenditure $.
Funds are obligated to projects approximately 6 weeks prior to LET date.

*Amended 10/25/19*

**Table 1: Fox Cities Transportation Management Area - Project Listing (2019-2022) ($000)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT</td>
<td>IH 41/Appleton-DePere</td>
<td>DESIGN</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outagamie</td>
<td>STH 96- CTH F</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252-19-069</td>
<td>1130-63-00 ENVR STUDY</td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NHPP 23.596 miles (P)</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT</td>
<td>IH 41/Appleton-Green Bay</td>
<td>DESIGN</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outagamie</td>
<td>STH 15-CTH J</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252-19-070</td>
<td>1130-72-30,60 REHAB</td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NHPP 11.99 miles (P)</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT</td>
<td>STH 76/STH 15 - CTH JJ</td>
<td>DESIGN</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outagamie</td>
<td>Everglade Rd - CTH JJ</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252-19-071</td>
<td>6517-16-00 RECST</td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FLX 1.93 miles (P)</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT</td>
<td>East Franklin Street</td>
<td>DESIGN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C of Appleton</td>
<td>CN Xing Signal 179942A</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252-19-072</td>
<td>4984-15-51 RECST</td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HSIP 0.07 miles (P)</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT</td>
<td>North Appleton Street</td>
<td>DESIGN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C of Appleton</td>
<td>CN Xing Signal 179945V</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outagamie</td>
<td>4984-14-51 RECST</td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252-19-073</td>
<td>0.08 miles (P)</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT</td>
<td>Memorial Drive</td>
<td>DESIGN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C of Appleton</td>
<td>CN Xing Signal 179939B</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outagamie</td>
<td>4984-13-51 RECST</td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252-19-074</td>
<td>HSIP 0.05 miles (P)</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Amended 10/25/19*
PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 27-19


WHEREAS, the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Oshkosh Urbanized Area, approved the 2019 Transportation Improvement Program for the Oshkosh Urbanized Area, at the October 26, 2018 quarterly Commission meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Transportation Improvement Program was prepared to meet the requirements of the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act: (FAST), as prescribed by federal regulations; and

WHEREAS, all projects that use federal funds must appear in an adopted Transportation Improvement Program; and

WHEREAS, WisDOT has requested the MPO advance the attached highway projects in the Oshkosh Area:

WHEREAS, the MPO staff will prepare the appropriate documentation to meet federal and state requirements for any transportation project appearing in the TIP, Now Therefore;

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE EAST CENTRAL WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION:

SECTION 1. That the Commission approves the amendment as presented to include the projects on USH 45, and Main Street in the approved 2019 Transportation Improvement Program for the Oshkosh Urbanized Area.

Effective Date: October 25, 2019

Prepared for: Transportation Committee
Prepared By: David J. Moesch, Associate Transportation Planner

Neal Strehlow, Chair                                Jeff Nooyen, Vice Chair

Jerry Erdmann                                      Brian Smith

Ken Robl                                          Dick Koeppen

Ron McDonald                                      Jill Michaelson

Martin Farrell                                    Donna Kalata

Thomas Kautza
**Funds are listed in Year of Expenditure $.  *Amended 10/25/19* **Funds are obligated approximately 6 weeks prior to LET date.

Table 1: Oshkosh Urbanized Area - Project Listing (2019-2022) ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Type of Cost</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT</td>
<td>USH 45, Main Street Bridge</td>
<td>DESIGN</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C of Oshkosh</td>
<td>B-70-56-001-3</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnebago</td>
<td>4110-33-00 BRRHB</td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253-19-038</td>
<td>FLX .12 miles (P)</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT</td>
<td>USH 45 / Oshkosh - New London</td>
<td>DESIGN</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnebago</td>
<td>I 41-USH 10</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6200-18-00 RESURF</td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253-19-039</td>
<td>FLX 12.42 miles (P)</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Amended 10/25/19*
PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 28-19

APPROVAL OF THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR FOX CITIES (APPLETON) TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT AREA-2020

WHEREAS, the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission has been designated by the Governor as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the purpose of carrying out cooperative, comprehensive and continuing urban transportation planning in the Fox Cities Transportation Management Area; and

WHEREAS, all transportation projects in the Fox Cities Transportation Management Area which are to be implemented with federal funds must be included in the annual elements of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and approved by the MPO as a prerequisite for funding approval; and

WHEREAS, the urban area transit systems are required by the Federal Transit Administration to publish a biennial program of projects; and

WHEREAS, a completed and approved TIP is also a prerequisite for continued transportation planning certification, and

WHEREAS, the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) must work with Valley Transit to establish 2020 calendar year targets for transit performance measures addressed in the Transit Asset Management Plan (TAM) and incorporate them into the TIP; and

WHEREAS, metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) must annually establish calendar year targets for each of the five HSIP performance measures by either adopting their State DOT targets or commit to establishing quantifiable HSIP target(s) for the metropolitan planning area. Adopting the WisDOT 2020 targets means agreeing to plan and program projects so that they contribute to the accomplishment of WisDOT’s HSIP target(s) and incorporate into the TIPs; and

WHEREAS, the Commission affirms the validity of the transportation plan for the urbanized areas; and

WHEREAS, this organization’s staff has worked with principal elected officials of general purpose local governments, their designated staffs, and private providers to solicit their input into this TIP; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Highway Program Manual requires the evaluation, review, and coordination of federal and federally-assisted programs and projects in accordance with clearinghouse review requirements of the Project Notification and Development Review Process; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act: (FAST Act), coordination has occurred between the MPO, the state and transit operators in programming multimodal projects; and

WHEREAS, all required public participation procedures have been followed; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE EAST CENTRAL WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION:
PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 28-19

Section 1: That the Commission, as the designated MPO, approve the Transportation Improvement Program for the Fox Cities (Appleton) Transportation Management Area - 2020.

Section 2: That the Commission certifies that the metropolitan planning process is addressing the major transportation issues in these areas in conformance with all applicable requirements.

Section 3: That the Commission further certifies that the TIP contains only projects that are consistent with the metropolitan plans for the urbanized areas.

Effective Date: October 25, 2019
Prepared for: Transportation Committee
Prepared By: David J. Moesch, Associate Transportation Planner

Neal Strehlow, Chair
Jerry Erdmann
Ken Robl
Martin Farrell
Ron McDonald
Brian Smith

Jeff Nooyen, Vice Chair
Tom Kautza
Dick Koeppen
Jill Michaelson
Donna Kalata
PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 29-19

APPROVAL OF THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR OSHKOSH URBANIZED AREA-2020

WHEREAS, the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission has been designated by the Governor as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the purpose of carrying out cooperative, comprehensive and continuing urban transportation planning in the Oshkosh urbanized area; and

WHEREAS, all transportation projects in the Oshkosh urbanized area which are to be implemented with federal funds must be included in the annual elements of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and approved by the MPO as a prerequisite for funding approval; and

WHEREAS, the urban area transit systems are required by the Federal Transit Administration to publish a biennial program of projects; and

WHEREAS, a completed and approved TIP is also a prerequisite for continued transportation planning certification, and

WHEREAS, the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) must work with GO Transit to establish 2020 calendar year targets for transit performance measures addressed in the Transit Asset Management Plan (TAM) and incorporate them into the TIP; and

WHEREAS, metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) must annually establish calendar year targets for each of the five HSIP performance measures by either adopting their State DOT targets or commit to establishing quantifiable HSIP target(s) for the metropolitan planning area. Adopting the WisDOT 2020 targets means agreeing to plan and program projects so that they contribute to the accomplishment of WisDOT’s HSIP target(s) and incorporate into the TIPs; and

WHEREAS, the Commission affirms the validity of the transportation plan for the urbanized areas; and

WHEREAS, this organization's staff has worked with principal elected officials of general purpose local governments, their designated staffs, and private providers to solicit their input into this TIP; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Highway Program Manual requires the evaluation, review, and coordination of federal and federally-assisted programs and projects in accordance with clearinghouse review requirements of the Project Notification and Development Review Process; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act), coordination has occurred between the MPO, the state and transit operators in programming multimodal projects; and

WHEREAS, all required public participation procedures have been followed; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE EAST CENTRAL WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION:
PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 29-19

Section 1: That the Commission, as the designated MPO, approve the Transportation Improvement Program for the Oshkosh Urbanized Area - 2020.

Section 2: That the Commission certifies that the metropolitan planning process is addressing the major transportation issues in these areas in conformance with all applicable requirements.

Section 3: That the Commission further certifies that the TIP contains only projects that are consistent with the metropolitan plans for the urbanized areas.

Effective Date: October 25, 2019
Prepared for: Transportation Committee
Prepared By: David J. Moesch, Associate Transportation Planner

Neal Strehlow, Chair
Jerry Erdmann
Ken Robl
Martin Farrell
Ron McDonald
Brian Smith

Jeff Nooyen, Vice Chair
Tom Kautza
Dick Koeppen
Jill Michaelson
Donna Kalata
PROPOSED RESOLUTION 30-19

ADOPTING THE 2020 UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION WORK PROGRAM AND THE ANNUAL MPO SELF CERTIFICATION AND THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM SELF CERTIFICATION FOR THE EAST CENTRAL WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

WHEREAS, the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission has been designated by the Governor as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Appleton (Fox Cities) and Oshkosh, Wisconsin, Urbanized Areas; and

WHEREAS, the Appleton (Fox Cities) TMA and the Oshkosh MPO Policy Board, with representation from all jurisdictions within the Urbanized Areas, has the responsibility to direct, coordinate, and administer the transportation planning process in the urbanized areas; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration, under 23 CFR and 49 CFR 616, requires the development of a Unified Planning Work Program; and

WHEREAS, the Policy Board has reviewed the transportation planning activities outlined in the 2020 Unified Planning Work Program and finds them consistent with the transportation planning process and desires of the MPOs, WisDOT, and FHWA; and

WHEREAS, the Regional Planning Commissions (RPC) will formulate, and submit for annual approval, a Transportation Planning Work Program (TPWP), which identifies all transportation-related planning activities to be funded. In performing the activities and receiving Federal and State funding for the TPWP, the Regional Planning Commission hereby self-certifies their compliance with CFDA 20.205 Federal Funding Requirements; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Appleton (Fox Cities) Transportation Management Area and Oshkosh Metropolitan Planning Organization adopts the 2020 Unified Planning Work Program and directs staff to submit the document to the Wisconsin Department of Transportation, the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that in accordance with 23 CFR 450.336 the Appleton (Fox Cities) and Oshkosh MPOs hereby certifies that the metropolitan transportation planning process is addressing major issues facing the metropolitan planning area and that these efforts are being conducted in accordance with all the applicable requirements of:

1. 23 U.S.C 134 and 49 U.S.C 5303, and this subpart;
2. In non-attainment and maintenance areas, Sections 174 and 176 (c) and (d) of the Clean Air Acts as amended (42 U.S.C. 7504, 7506 (c) and (d)) and 40 CFR part 93;
3. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2000d-1) and 49 CFR part 21;
4. 49 U.S.C. 5332, prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, sex, or age employment or business opportunity;
5. Sections 1101(b) of the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act) (P.L. 112-141) and 49 CFR Part 26 regarding the involvement of disadvantaged business enterprises in the US DOT funded projects;
6. 23CFR part 230, regarding the implementation of an equal employment opportunity program on Federal and Federal-aid highway constructions contracts;
8. The Older Americans Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6102), prohibiting discrimination on the basis of age in program or activities receiving Federal financial assistance;
9. Section 324 of title 23, U.S.C. regarding the prohibition of discrimination based on gender; and discrimination against individuals with disabilities.

Effective Date: October 25, 2019
Submitted By: Transportation Committee
Prepared By: Melissa A. Kraemer Badtke, Principal Transportation Planner

_____________________________                                  ______________________________
Neal Strehlow, Chair       Jeff Nooyen, Vice Chair
_____________________________                                  ______________________________
Jerry Erdmann               Brian Smith
_____________________________                                  ______________________________
Ken Robl                      Dick Koeppen
_____________________________                                  ______________________________
Ron McDonald                Jill Michaelson
_____________________________                                  ______________________________
Martin Farrell                Donna Kalata
_____________________________                                  ______________________________
Thomas Kautza
SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

Regional Comprehensive Planning Committee
East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
10:00 a.m. – 440 Ahnape Street, Suite 100, Menasha, WI

July 17, 2019

Committee Members Present
Merlin Gentz, Chair ........................................................................................................... Calumet County
Mike Thomas, Vice Chair ................................................................................................. Outagamie County
Rick Jaeckels ...................................................................................................................... Calumet County
Brian Kolstad ..................................................................................................................... Fond du Lac County
Kevin Sturn ........................................................................................................................ Outagamie County
Lori Palmeri ......................................................................................................................... Winnebago County

Staff Present
Eric Fowle ......................................................................................................................... ECWRPC Staff
Kathy Thunes ...................................................................................................................... ECWRPC Staff
Tom Baron ........................................................................................................................ ECWRPC Staff
Mike Zuege ....................................................................................................................... ECWRPC Staff

1. Welcome & Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. by Mr. Gentz. Mr. Gentz welcomed everyone to the meeting. Introductions were made.

2. Statement of Compliance with Open Meetings Law

Mr. Fowle affirmed that the meeting notice was posted in accordance with requirements and that a quorum of members is present.

3. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

4. Approval of Agenda / Motion to Deviate

A motion was made by Mr. Jaeckels and seconded by Mr. Sturn to approve the agenda as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

5. Action Item: Nomination & Election of Committee Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson

Mr. Sturn moved to nominate Mr. Gentz for Committee Chairperson; Mr. Thomas seconded the motion. Mr. Jaeckels motioned to close the nomination for Committee Chairperson; Ms. Palmeri seconded the motion. Mr. Sturn motioned to cast a unanimous ballot for election; Ms. Palmeri seconded the motion. The motion to cast the unanimous ballot passed unanimously.

Mr. Sturn moved to nominate Mr. Thomas for Committee Vice-Chairman; Mr. Jaeckels seconded the motion. Mr. Jaeckels motioned to close the nomination for Committee Vice-
Chairman and to cast a unanimous ballot; Mr. Kolstad seconded the motion. The motion to cast the unanimous ballot passed unanimously.

6. Approval of April 17, 2019 Summary of Proceedings

A motion was made by Mr. Thomas and seconded by Mr. Sturn to approve the April 17, 2019 summary of proceedings. Motion passed.

7. Public/Guest Comment

None

8. Announcements/Informational Items

a) July Quarterly Commission Meeting – July 26, 2019

Mr. Fowle mentioned that the July Quarterly Commission meeting will be held next week Friday at the City of New London. He said that the Commission will be approving the budget and levy and that a quorum is needed.

b) Other

Mr. Fowle distributed a handout showing a listing of the 1100, 1700, 1800, 2000 and 3000 work programs. He mentioned that this did not make it into the meeting materials but that he wanted to share it with the Commissioners. He provided an overview of the work program stating that he feels that EC’s work program is essentially full for next year. We are still looking for more technical assistance projects for the coming year, but that we are currently not seeking any additional contracts. About 1/3 of technical assistance requests to date came from Outagamie County communities. The Housing Report will go under the “To Be Determined Contracts” item. Currently, we are about where we need to be in terms of the budget.

It was noted that an agenda item for ECWRPC’s support for accessory dwelling unit (ADU) was missing from this agenda. Ms. Thunes stated that this item was inadvertently missed and that it would be included on the October agenda.

9. Action Items

a) Discussion & Approval of the 2019-2020 Regional Comprehensive Planning Committee Meeting Schedule

Ms. Thunes stated that the Regional Comprehensive Planning Committee has been meeting on the third Wednesday during the same month as the Quarterly Commission Meeting. It was agreed that this would work out well for committee members. Mr. Kolstad made a motion to keep the meeting the third Wednesday of the months of July, October, January and July. Mr. Sturn seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

b) Agreement for Assisting Select Communities with New Statutory Housing Affordability and Housing Fee Reports
Mr. Fowle distributed an amended contract for the Agreement for Assisting Select Communities with the New Statutory Housing Affordability and Housing Fee Reports. He stated that the contract was amended to reflect a change in the number of communities participating in the contract. This contract will be completed by November 15, 2019. If the Commission continues to provide this service to member communities, then perhaps more communities will decide to join the effort.

Additional reports housing reports that the Commission has prepared in the past and have become outdated will be updated either this year or next. Residential Development Policies will also be updated this year. While Overcoming Barriers to Affordable Housing in the Region and the Guide to Housing Providers will be updated next year.

Ms. Palmeri made a motion to approve the contract to Assist Select Communities with the New Statutory Housing Affordability and Housing Fee Reports. Mr. Kolstad seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

10. Informational Items

a) GIS & Technology Updates

i) City of Clintonville Online Zoning App

Mr. Zuege mentioned that the City of Clintonville wanted to be able to revise the zoning map themselves, as zoning changes occurred. They also wanted to provide the public with a method to view the zoning information online. Mr. Zuege illustrated the capabilities of the app that was developed for Clintonville. A discussion ensued. It was suggested that the Commission look at more intensive marketing to communities and commissioners at the next commission meeting in order to raise awareness of services that the Commission can provide. It was also suggested that GIS products could be a topic of the October mini-conference. Mr. Baron shared a marketing brochure that the Commission developed for the former Tecumseh site in New Holstein. He said that the City of New Holstein had a number of interested parties for the former site, following the distribution of the marketing brochure.

b) Update on Health & Planning Program Activities

i) Wisconsin Public Health Association (WPHA) Board

Mr. Baron mentioned that he recently attended the WPHA annual conference. He felt that the key benefit of the conference was to network. He made four new connections from people within our region.

ii) ECWRPC discussions with UW Madison MATCH staff and City of Oshkosh

Mr. Baron said that the City of Oshkosh has completed a quality of life analysis in which data is overlaid to create a compost score. He shared a copy of the maps, illustrating that the red areas have the lowest quality of life.

Mr. Baron said that all though the City of Oshkosh was not successful on the recent grant through UW Madison MATCH (Mobilizing Action Toward Community Health), discussion continue and there may be opportunities for technical assistance support.

c) Neighborhood Partners / Gappers Network
i)  July 25, 2019 Lunch ‘n Learn Event

Mr. Fowle mentioned that the Gappers Network has been holding Lunch ‘n Learn events quarterly in order to educate and inform those individuals working in the Gap between the institutions they work for and neighborhoods. The topic of the next lunch ‘n learn will be asset based community development. There are 30 registered participants and more are welcome. Mr. Thomas questioned the use of Commission dollars for this type of activity.

Ms. Palmeri shared that Rock the Block will be in the Oshkosh Congress Fields neighborhood next. She said that Rebuilding Together, Rock the Block and Neighborhoods are seeing measurable results. The next Rock the Block will encompass 60 houses and has a number of sponsors.

d)  Comprehensive Plan Updates (Attachment #4 – Eric F, Kathy T., Tom B.)

i)  C. Clintonville

iii) C. New Holstein

v)  T. Algoma

vi)  T. Oakfield

vii) T. Eldorado

viii) V. North Fond du Lac

ix)  T. Alto

Mr. Fowle mentioned that a staff report has been prepared for this agenda item. He said that the Town of Algoma is about halfway through the process. Mr. Krumenauer, town administrator has accepted a position in Osceola, WI. The Town of Greenville is holding a public hearing on the adoption of the comprehensive plan on July 22, 2019.

x)  Other Pending

Mr. Fowle said that he is in communication regarding potential contracts with the towns of Caledonia and the village of Combined Locks for the preparation of comprehensive plans.

12. ECWRPC Steering Committee Report

Mr. Fowle directed everyone’s attention to the handout in the packet. He outlined the Strategic Plan Update, issues with Outagamie County and Initiative 41 debrief. Regarding the Initiative 41 debrief he said that about 30 stakeholders attended the event. He said that the conversation went well and there is interest in moving forward with implementation. He said there is a challenge in obtaining local support but that there is a desire to work together. Another meeting will take place in October. A request was made as to if it would be possible to allow people, who cannot attend the next meeting, to participate remotely.

13. County Roundtable Discussion / Updates

- The Outagamie County sales tax will be implemented on January 1, 2020. Revenue will be shared with municipalities and the schools districts.
- Calumet County is remodeling the space where the old jail was located.
- City of Fond du Lac has had an increase on emergency calls in the 35 to 55 age cohort. They are looking at possibly hiring 6 new paramedics to fill need.
- City of Oshkosh is discussing the potential to initiate a transportation utility fee.

14. Next Meeting

a) Wednesday, October 16, 2019 at 10:00 a.m.

15. Adjourn

A motion was made by Mr. Kolstad and seconded by Ms. Palmeri to adjourn. At approximately 12:15 p.m. the meeting ended by consensus.