

## MEETING NOTICE

### OSHKOSH MPO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Date: Monday, March 3, 2025

Time: 1:30 pm

Place: Winnebago County Highway Department, 901 W. County Road Y, Oshkosh

*Members-Please contact the East Central office to confirm your attendance.*

### AGENDA

1. Welcome
2. Roll Call - Introduction of Alternates, Staff and Guests
3. Public Comment
4. Discussion on Metropolitan Transportation Plan
  - A. Metropolitan Transportation Plan Goals, Objectives, Metrics
  - B. Metropolitan Transportation Plan Deficiency Network
  - C. Metropolitan Transportation Plan Project Prioritization Process and Criteria
  - D. Metropolitan Transportation Plan Timeline
5. Discussion on Functional Classification of Roadways
6. Next Meeting – Thursday, April 10, 2025, 3:00 pm, Winnebago County Highway Department—901 W. County Road Y
7. Adjourn

*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.*

**TO:** Oshkosh MPO Technical Advisory Committee  
**FROM:** Kate Blackburn, Associate Transportation Planner  
**DATE:** March 3, 2025  
**RE:** Metropolitan Transportation Plan Goals, Objectives, and Metrics

---

ECWRPC staff are continuing to make progress on the Oshkosh Vision2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan. The Oshkosh TAC has previously been presented with the Vision, Pillars, and a rough draft of the goals for the Vision2050 Plan. ECWRPC staff have refined the goals based on TAC feedback. Additionally, ECWRPC staff have been working to develop objectives and metrics. The following graphic shows how each of these are conceptually nested.



The vision provides an overarching direction for the region. Pillars are guiding principles for the region. Goals are focus areas for this particular Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). They are statements that guide the development of objectives, project evaluation, and programming in the plan. Objectives are specific action-oriented components that can, by in large, be measured using metrics. Where applicable, the metrics are aligned with federal performance measures. Additionally, many of the metrics are incorporated either directly or by proxy into the MTP Project Prioritization Criteria, to ensure that priority projects are advancing the desired metrics and therefore the objectives and goals. The goals, objectives, and measures are attached in the meeting packet.

TAC feedback is welcome on the refined goals, the objectives, and the metrics.

**Staff Recommendation:** This is an informational memo, with no action required by the TAC. Discussion and questions are encouraged and welcomed.

**Goal: Integrated Public Health** – Support active living and improved quality of life by creating connected, safe, and healthy communities through the alignment of transportation and land use policies and practices.

- **Objective:** Expand walking and biking connections to reduce network gaps
  - **Metric:** Total miles of bicycle and pedestrian facilities
- **Objective:** Engage historically underserved populations and non-traditional stakeholders in the planning process
  - **Metric:** Demographics of the population engaged with during public engagement efforts
- **Objective:** Provide equitable, safe, and accessible public transportation system while minimizing adverse impacts on environment and historically underserved populations
  - **Metric:** Public transit ridership
  - **Metric:** Percent of projects in relation to regionally identified tracts

**Goal: Safety** – Collaborate with communities and stakeholders to increase awareness of safety issues and to create greater understanding on safety skills and best practices.

- **Objective:** Reduce the number and rate of vehicular crashes
  - **Metric:** Number and rate of vehicular crashes (PM1)
- **Objective:** Reduce the number and rate of bicycle and pedestrian crashes.
  - **Metric:** Number and rate of bicycle and pedestrian crashes (PM1)
- **Objective:** Reduce the number and rate of serious injuries.
  - **Metric:** Number and rate of serious injuries (PM1)
- **Objective:** Improve quality of roadway surface and bridges
  - **Metric:** Percent of Interstate Pavement in Good condition (PM2)
  - **Metric:** Percent of Interstate Pavement in Poor condition (PM2)
  - **Metric:** Percent of Non-Interstate Pavement in Good condition (PM2)
  - **Metric:** Percent of Non-Interstate Pavement in Poor condition (PM2)
  - **Metric:** Percent of National Highway System Bridges in Good condition (PM2)
  - **Metric:** Percent of National Highway System Bridges in Poor condition (PM2)
- **Objective:** Increase % of schools participating in a SRTS program.
  - **Metric:** Percent of schools participating in SRTS program

**Goal: Coordinated Housing & Land Use** – Better connect land use and housing policies and practices to promote sustainable, safe, and more inclusive communities.

- **Objective:** Promote active, mixed-use developments through land-use and transportation decision-making
  - **Metric:** Connection to infill opportunities (i.e. developments occurring in areas with identified infill potential)
- **Objective:** Facilitate the efficient movement of people and goods through improved connection between regions and activity centers.
  - **Metric:** Truck travel time reliability (PM3)
  - **Metric:** Proximity to evacuation routes

- **Objective:** Create places people want to live, work, shop, and recreate.
  - **Metric:** \*This one will not have a metric

**Goal: Multimodal & Transit** – Support public transit and infrastructure, prioritize multimodal and active transportation opportunities, utilization of mode-share, and provide specialized and equitable transportation services to fill service gaps while meeting the needs of all residents.

- **Objective:** Improve bicycle and pedestrian level of stress and first/last mile access, increase total miles of bicycle and pedestrian facilities
  - **Metric:** Percentage of corridors with bicycle level of stress 1 and/or 4
  - **Metric:** Number of miles of bicycle and pedestrian
  - **Metric:** Private vehicle commute mode share
  - **Metric:** Percent of people living/ working within 1/2 mile of trail or bicycle lane
- **Objective:** Collaborate with transit agencies to meet transit performance measures
  - **Metric:** Advancing Transit Asset Management (TAM) and Public Transportation Agency Safety Plans (PTASP) targets
  - **Metric:** Increase in transit ridership
  - **Metric:** Public transit commute mode share
- **Objective:** Promote improvements and technology that increases the efficiency of existing transportation system
  - **Metric:** Percentage of roads that are Level of Service A-C
  - **Metric:** Number of projects on the Congestion Management Process (CMP) network
  - **Metric:** Track state project technology implementation

**Goal: Economic Development** – Support the economic development of the region through investment in transportation that supports tourism, commerce, economic activities, real estate development, and the efficient movement of goods.

- **Objective:** Improve freight reliability to support regional and national commerce
  - **Metric:** Truck Travel Time Reliability Index (PM3)
- **Objective:** Promote complete streets improvements in corridors that would see economic benefit
  - **Metric:** Increase in bicycle and pedestrian facilities
- **Objective:** Improve accessibility to regional employment centers through consistent traffic system performance
  - **Metric:** Number of Projects on Deficiency Network
  - **Metric:** Truck Travel Time Reliability Index (PM3)

**Goal: Environmental** – Avoid, minimize, and mitigate negative impacts on the environment and natural resources by implementing and promoting sustainable and environmentally-friendly policies and practices.

- **Objective:** Encourage use of alternative energy and cleaner burning fuels to improve the region's air quality

- **Metric:** Regional air quality
- **Objective:** Promote stormwater management planning as part of transportation decisions
  - **Metric:** Projects addressing stormwater management
  - **Metric:** Flooding roadways
- **Objective:** Limit transportation impacts to natural resources
  - **Metric:** Area of wetland or floodplain impacted by current projects

**TO:** Oshkosh MPO Technical Advisory Committee  
**FROM:** East Central Staff  
**DATE:** March 3, 2025  
**RE:** Metropolitan Transportation Plan Deficiency Network

---

East Central staff are refining the project prioritization process for the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) using a data-driven analysis to identify projects. The first step in this data-driven analysis is to identify the Deficiency Network, which determines areas of congestion, both for the base year of 2022 and for the future year of 2055.

The Deficiency Network consists of three elements:

1. **Northeast Region Travel Demand Model (NERTDM) Level of Service (LOS):** Measures roadway volume/capacity ratios, assigning letter grades (A-F). Roads graded D, E, or F are considered deficient.
2. **Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR):** Assesses travel time consistency on the state freight network. The Federal Highway Administration uses TTTR to track Performance Measure 3 (PM3) performance.
3. **Comprehensive Safety Action Plan (CSAP):** Evaluates crash data and environmental risk factors to define the High-Injury Network. For the Congestion Management Plan, the top 25 high-crash intersections and corridors from the CSAP analysis are included, as crashes contribute to non-recurring congestion.

East Central staff have developed a web-based platform to view the composite Deficiency Network: <https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/6367c75a856e46cb925b073e5a09ec07>

Note that locations not identified by the deficiency analysis or discussed and documented by the Committee will not be included in the final list of deficient locations as listed in the MTP. Projects must be listed in the MTP to qualify them for inclusion in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff request the Technical Advisory Committee review and discuss the deficiency analysis, and notify East Central staff of any additional locations of concern to be documented in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

**TO:** Oshkosh MPO Technical Advisory Committee  
**FROM:** Kate Blackburn, Associate Transportation Planner  
**DATE:** March 3, 2025  
**RE:** Metropolitan Transportation Plan Project Prioritization Process and Criteria

---

The Oshkosh Vision2050 Metropolitan Transportation plan is required to include a project prioritization process. ECWRPC staff have been working on developing criteria that meet the applicable requirements. The criteria, laid out below, incorporate the Northeast Region Travel Demand Model (NERTDM) congestion deficiency network and the Comprehensive Safety Action Plan (CSAP) as well as several other data-driven metrics. The prioritization criteria were designed to connect with the goals of the MTP and incorporate federal performance measures (or proxies for performance measures that are summed totals to allow for evaluation of individual projects). This ensures that prioritized projects can demonstrate how they are advancing particular performance measure targets, a federal requirement in the Transportation Improvement Program.

The process begins with a solicitation of projects. All communities that wish to apply for or receive federal funding must enter the applicable projects into the intake portal. A project automatically qualifies if it lies on the Northeast Region Travel Demand Model Level of Service deficiency network, Truck Travel Time Reliability deficiency network, or the Comprehensive Safety Action Plan deficiency network. A project that does not lie on any of these deficiency networks could qualify for inclusion in the illustrative table by meeting a score threshold on the overall MTP project prioritization criteria.

All projects, including the ones that automatically qualify based on deficiency network, will get fed through the project prioritization criteria, which can be found on the following pages. The process of evaluating/scoring the projects consists of a data-driven component and a narrative component. The data-driven component is automatically calculated based on the project line segment that is entered into the intake portal. The narrative component will be evaluated/scored independently by two ECWRPC staff. The scores will be averaged and reviewed by a separate ECWRPC staff member. After they are finalized, scores will be scale using the category weights, and ranked in order of score from highest to lowest.

\*Important to note is this project prioritization process is not a substitute for applying for local, state, or federal funding. Communities will still have to submit an application for specific funding programs, such as Surface Transportation Block Grant or Carbon Reduction.

East Central staff will use the following process for MTP project prioritization:

1. Local officials shall submit projects through the ArcGIS portal.
2. Projects will be assessed on the data-driven deficiency analysis via automatic calculation.
3. ECWRPC review committee will score the narrative portions of the project applications
4. A separate ECWRPC staff member will review the committee's score.
5. Results will be sent to submitting municipality/community.
6. Projects will be ranked by score, then presented and discussed with the Metropolitan Planning Organization TAC, and listed in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

**Staff Recommendation:** This is an informational memo, with no action required by the TAC. However, discussion and questions are encouraged.



## PROJECT PRIORITIZATION PROCESS

### Scoring Criteria

| Scoring Criteria                 | Assessment Scoring |             |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|-------------|
|                                  | Points             | Weighting   |
| Transportation Network Condition | 20                 | 20%         |
| Safety                           | 20                 | 20%         |
| Multimodal & Transit             | 25                 | 15%         |
| Housing                          | 20                 | 5%          |
| Equity (Public Health)           | 10                 | 10%         |
| Public Support                   | 15                 | 5%          |
| Access to Community Services     | 15                 | 10%         |
| Economic Development             | 15                 | 5%          |
| Environmental                    | 20                 | 10%         |
| <b>Total</b>                     | <b>XXX</b>         | <b>100%</b> |

### Transportation Network Condition (20%)

| Sub Criteria                        | Assessment Scoring |                                                                                                                                                                                       | Guidelines                                                                                                                                              |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                     | Points             | Description / Metric                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                         |
| Future-Year (2055) Level of Service | 10                 | LOS F                                                                                                                                                                                 | If project contains multiple segments with different LOS, worst LOS will be used                                                                        |
|                                     | 7                  | LOS E                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                         |
|                                     | 4                  | LOS D                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                         |
| PASER Rating                        | 10                 | <p>Inverse of the current PASER rating of the road(s) the project will upgrade</p> <p>Can also be represented as <math>(11 - x)</math> where <math>x =</math> current PASER score</p> | <p>Example: A current PASER rating of 3 will result in a score of 8 (<math>11 - 3 = 8</math>)</p> <p>If multiple segments, worst PASER will be used</p> |

**Safety (20%)**

| Sub Criteria             | Assessment Scoring |                                                                     | Guidelines                 |
|--------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
|                          | Points             | Description / Metric                                                |                            |
| CSAP High-Injury Network | 10                 | Project is on the CSAP High-Injury Network Intersection or Corridor | Yes / No                   |
| Crash Severity           | 10                 | Fatalities (>300)                                                   | Based on number thresholds |
|                          | 7                  | Results in injuries (150-299)                                       |                            |
|                          | 4                  | Non-injury crashes (50-150)                                         |                            |
|                          | 1                  | No significant crashes (<50)                                        |                            |

**Multimodal & Transit (15%)**

| Sub Criteria                                                                            | Assessment Scoring |                                                             | Guidelines                                                                                                              |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                                         | Points             | Description / Metric                                        |                                                                                                                         |
| Active Transportation: Addition<br><b>or</b> Improvement to infrastructure & facilities | Add: 1-10          | Project adds infrastructure where there was previously none | Base score on spacing, infrastructure type/safety, potential level of use, other narrative details as explained         |
|                                                                                         | Improve: 1-10      | Project improves existing infrastructure                    |                                                                                                                         |
| Location within transit buffer                                                          | 10                 | 0.25 mi                                                     | Projects closer to transit routes will be prioritized as they improve connectivity to the route                         |
|                                                                                         | 7                  | 0.50 mi                                                     |                                                                                                                         |
|                                                                                         | 4                  | 0.75 mi                                                     |                                                                                                                         |
|                                                                                         | 1                  | 1 mile                                                      |                                                                                                                         |
|                                                                                         | 0                  | Not in buffer                                               |                                                                                                                         |
| Coordination with Transit agency                                                        | 1-5                | Project demonstrates coordination with Transit agency       | Application shows evidence of communication, the project is consistent with transit priorities, and mutually beneficial |

**Housing (5%)**

| Sub Criteria             | Assessment Scoring |                                                            | Guidelines                                                                                                                                                                           |
|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                          | Points             | Description / Metric                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Access to Housing        | 10                 | Project occurs in an area of above-average housing density | Yes / No<br><br>Compared to the average density of the MPA                                                                                                                           |
| Positive Housing Impacts | 1-10               | Evaluation of narrative on positive housing impacts        | Narrative fully describes how the project will positively impact housing, including but not limited to TOD, infrastructure revitalization, affordability, surrounding infrastructure |

**Equity (Public Health) (10%)**

| Sub Criteria                                         | Assessment Scoring |                                                                           | Guidelines                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                      | Points             | Description / Metric                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Regional 65 <sup>th</sup> Percentile Equity Analysis | 10                 | Project occurs partially or completely within an identified tract         | Tracts will be identified according to the regional EJ index developed using data from ETC. A tract will be identified as disadvantaged if it exceeds the 65 <sup>th</sup> percentile threshold for the region according to ETC criteria. |
|                                                      | 1                  | Project does not occur partially or completely within an identified tract |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |

**Public Support (5%)**

| Sub Criteria                     | Assessment Scoring |                                           | Guidelines                                                                                                               |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                  | Points             | Description / Metric                      |                                                                                                                          |
| Letters of public support        | 1-5                | Narrative                                 | All involved municipalities are informed and onboard with the project, cooperation is evident                            |
| Evidence of community engagement | 1-5                | Narrative                                 | Narrative includes clear, concise documentation of community engagement; community support for project evident           |
| Alignment with other plans       | 5                  | Projects furthers 3+ other plans          | Other plans include a local Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan, Complete Streets Plan, Comp. Plan, Parks or Recreation Plan, etc. |
|                                  | 3                  | Project furthers 1-2 other plans          |                                                                                                                          |
|                                  | 1                  | Project does not apply to any other plans |                                                                                                                          |

**Access to Community Services (10%)**

| Sub Criteria                           | Assessment Scoring |                                                                                 | Guidelines                                                                                                                               |
|----------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                        | Points             | Description / Metric                                                            |                                                                                                                                          |
| Walkability Layers Buffer              | 10                 | >200 of facilities                                                              | This GIS analysis identifies the number of community facilities within walking distance of the project                                   |
|                                        | 7                  | Facilities between 100 - 200                                                    |                                                                                                                                          |
|                                        | 4                  | Facilities between 50 – 100                                                     |                                                                                                                                          |
| Access to Community Services Narrative | 1-5                | Narrative describes specific elements or locations that the project will impact | Narrative explains how the project will improve access, impact/improve public health or any other element listed from GIS layers, others |

**Economic Development (5%)**

| Sub Criteria         | Assessment Scoring |                                                                                           | Guidelines                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                      | Points             | Description / Metric                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| Economic Development | 1-10               | Narrative describes how the project furthers economic development for the area and region | Project is in a TIF or TID, businesses that exist in vicinity, how the project positively impacts those business, freight, the MPO, mitigation strategies during construction, any additional details |
| Freight Route        | 5                  | Project is on a designated freight route                                                  | Yes / No<br>Indicate in narrative for local freight routes                                                                                                                                            |

**Environmental (10%)**

| Sub Criteria           | Assessment Scoring |                                                  | Guidelines                                                                                  |
|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                        | Points             | Description / Metric                             |                                                                                             |
| Stormwater Management  | 1-5                | Project addresses stormwater concerns            | Narrative details the projects existing and/or proposed solutions for stormwater management |
| Floodplains / Wetlands | 5                  | Project is in a wetland or floodplain            | Yes / No                                                                                    |
| Evacuation Route       | 5                  | Is the project on/impacting an evacuation route? | Yes / No                                                                                    |
| Other                  | 1-5                | Other environmental or possible site concerns    |                                                                                             |

**TO:** Oshkosh MPO Technical Advisory Committee  
**FROM:** Kate Blackburn, Associate Transportation Planner  
**DATE:** March 3, 2025  
**RE:** Metropolitan Transportation Plan Anticipated Timeline

---

East Central Staff have laid out remaining steps and associated timeline for the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) has an important role to play in the final stages of the plan.

ECWRPC will be soliciting illustrative projects during the month of March. Submissions will be due on March 28, 2025 to ensure East Central Staff has the ability to feed projects through the Metropolitan Transportation Plan project prioritization criteria. East Central staff intends to finish the narrative for the plan by mid-April. However, as individual chapters are completed, they will be sent to WisDOT for initial review. Various components of chapters will be brought forward to the TACs as they are completed.

Revisions will then be implemented, an internal review of the overall plan will occur, and the plan will be formatted. These events are targeted for completion by early July. WisDOT, FHWA, FTA, and TAC review of the overall document is slated from July to mid-August. The plan will need to be sent out for public review at the end of August to complete the 30-day public review by the October 9, 2025 TAC meeting.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff request the Technical Advisory Committee submit illustrative projects for the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and review the components as they are sent out.

**TO:** Oshkosh Technical Advisory Committee  
**FROM:** East Central Staff  
**DATE:** March 3, 2025  
**RE:** Discussion on the Functional Classification Network for the Oshkosh MPO

---

Functional classification is a method to define and categorize the various roles that streets and highways play in the region’s transportation needs. Arterial, Collector, and Local classifications categorize roads based on the amount and types of traffic the roads carry, characteristics of the roadways, land uses in the vicinity of the roadways, and the development and population density of the surrounding area. These functional classification designations are important for performance measurement and reporting, federal and state funding programs, program budgeting and project prioritization, and more.

As part of the process to adjust the Urban Area Boundary (UAB) and the Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) for the Oshkosh MPO, the functional classification of the MPO’s transportation network must be adjusted to coincide with any boundary changes. Areas that are designated as inside the UAB are considered to be Urban, while areas that fall outside of the boundary are considered Rural.

Additionally, the criteria for functional classification designation require that only a particular percentage of an Urban Area’s roadway network can be classified under any given category. The current guidance is in the table below.

| Classification                   | Urban Guidance | MPO-Current |
|----------------------------------|----------------|-------------|
| Principal Arterial - Interstates | 1% - 3%        | 2.9%        |
| Principal Arterial               | 4% - 11%       | 8.9%        |
| Minor Arterial                   | 7% - 14%       | 11.6%       |
| Collector/Major Collector        | 3% - 16%       | 14.9%       |
| Local                            | 62% - 74%      | 61.6%*      |

\*approximately two miles of roadway would have to be added to bring the Local Roads into the threshold.

Based on current WisDOT estimates, the roadways in the Oshkosh MPO are within acceptable ranges with the exception of local roadways (61.6%), just short of the minimum threshold of 62%. Since all other classifications are within the acceptable ranges, WisDOT has indicated that it is acceptable to keep the local roadways as presented.

The following resources may be valuable in reviewing the functional classification network.

Communities can view the current functional classification network on an online dashboard here:  
<https://www.arcgis.com/apps/dashboards/0388116bf08f4a36b41f4b2a26785eda>

WisDOT criteria and guidance for functional classification updates can be found here:  
<https://wisconsindot.gov/Documents/projects/data-plan/plan-res/fc-criteria.pdf>

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends discussion and confirmation of the Functional Class Network. This will be brought to the next meeting for a vote.