

1997-98 SESSION  
COMMITTEE HEARING  
RECORDS

Committee Name:

Joint Committee on  
Finance (JC-Fi)

Sample:

Record of Comm. Proceedings ... RCP

- 05hrAC-EdR\_RCP\_pt01a
- 05hrAC-EdR\_RCP\_pt01b
- 05hrAC-EdR\_RCP\_pt02

➤ Appointments ... Appt

➤ \*\*

➤ Clearinghouse Rules ... CRule

➤ \*\*

➤ Committee Hearings ... CH

➤ \*\*

➤ Committee Reports ... CR

➤ \*\*

➤ Executive Sessions ... ES

➤ \*\*

➤ Hearing Records ... HR

➤ \*\*

➤ Miscellaneous ... Misc

➤ 97hrJC-Fi\_Misc\_pt117\_LFB

➤ Record of Comm. Proceedings ... RCP

➤ \*\*

# Transportation

## State Highway Program

(LFB Budget Summary Document: Page 593)

### LFB Summary Items for Which Issue Papers Have Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
3	Major Highway Development -- Project Enumeration (Paper #845)
--	Major Highway Project Selection Process (Paper #846)
6(part)	State Highway Maps (Paper #847)
--	Reduce Capacity to Design Future Projects (Paper #848)
--	Savings from Instituting Changes in Contaminated Site Remediation (Paper #849)
--	Streamline Materials Acceptance Process (Paper #850)
--	Eliminate Production of Certain Highway Signs (Paper #851)
--	Discontinue Mailing Letting Reports (Paper #852)
7	Highway Landscaping by DOC and WCC Work Crews (see Paper #583)

To: Joint Committee on Finance  
From: Bob Lang, Director  
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

## ISSUE

### **Major Highway Development -- Project Enumeration (DOT -- State Highway Program)**

[LFB Summary: Page 595, #3]

## CURRENT LAW

Major highway projects are defined as projects that have an estimated cost exceeding \$5,000,000 and consist of at least one of the following: (a) construction of a new highway of 2.5 miles or more in length; (b) relocation of 2.5 miles or more of existing roadway; (c) the addition of one or more lanes at least five miles in length; or (d) the improvement of 10 miles or more of an existing divided expressway to freeway standards.

Major highway projects must be enumerated in the statutes before the Department of Transportation can begin construction. There are currently over 30 highway segments that are enumerated, but that have not been completed. Over \$1 billion of construction costs remain before these projects can be completed. The projects have anticipated completion dates that range from this year to 2008, based on the funding level in the bill.

## GOVERNOR

Enumerate the following six major highway projects (listed in order of highway number), as recommended by the Transportation Projects Commission (TPC).

<u>Highway</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Estimated Cost in 1996 Dollars (In Millions)*</u>
STH 11	Burlington Bypass	Walworth and Racine	\$66.0 to \$71.7**
USH 12	I-90/94 to Ski Hi Road	Sauk	50.0
USH 53	I-90 to USH 14/61	La Crosse	67.1
STH 57	CTH A to STH 42	Kewaunee and Door	42.9
USH 141	Lemere Road to 6th Road	Oconto and Marinette	40.3
USH 151	Dickeyville to Belmont	Grant and Lafayette	65.0
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$331.3 to \$337.0</b>

\*Excludes design cost.

\*\*Cost depends upon which route is chosen.

## DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The total cost of the six projects, excluding design costs, is estimated between \$331.3 million and \$337.0 million in 1996 dollars.

2. The bill would provide \$162.0 million annually for the major highway development program. In order to compare the level of funding available under the bill with the cost of the proposed projects, it is necessary to convert the appropriated amounts into 1996 program dollars. Appropriations exceed the program budget because the appropriated amounts must also cover the cost of design and contract change orders. Therefore, while the bill would appropriate \$324 million over the biennium, this translates to only \$246.1 million in 1996 program dollars. Thus, if these projects are enumerated, and the funding for the major highway program stays as it is in the bill, the total cost of outstanding projects would be \$85 million greater at the end of the 1997-99 biennium.

3. Given the existing backlog of projects and the limited resources available, some have questioned whether these projects should be enumerated this biennium. When asked this question during his testimony before the Committee, the DOT Secretary responded that enumeration would bring the selection process to closure for projects that have been in the study mode for several years and that enumeration gives some answer to the communities that would be affected by the projects. In addition, businesses or residents near the highway routes want to know whether their land will be taken, and unless the projects are enumerated, DOT cannot proceed with the engineering needed to determine the precise route of the highway. The DOT Secretary also indicated, however, that he would support a moratorium on further enumerations.

4. A moratorium has also been suggested by several legislators and the Legislative Audit Bureau. In addition, the Transportation Finance Study Commission, which was established by the 1995 transportation budget, recommended that after the six projects in the bill are enumerated, a four-year moratorium should be placed on further enumerations. A

moratorium on future enumerations would gradually reduce the size of the major highway project backlog.

5. If the TPC were prevented from recommending projects to the Governor and Legislature until 2002 (a two-cycle moratorium), DOT's base budget (\$5,000,000) for performing the analysis customarily done before projects are brought to the TPC could be removed.

6. While the full \$5,000,000 could be removed each year, it may be appropriate to complete the work that is already in progress. DOT has already started an environmental impact statement for one potential project (USH 41 in Marinette and Oconto counties). Completing this work would require \$2,800,000 over the biennium. If funding is maintained to complete this work, \$2,200,000 could be removed in 1997-98 and \$5,000,000 could be removed in 1998-99.

7. These savings would not be permanent. DOT would need to begin work on draft environmental impact statements in the 1999-2001 biennium in preparation for the TPC process in 2002.

## ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

### Six Recommended Projects

1. <sup>Pass</sup> Approve the Governor's recommendation to enumerate the six projects.
2. Take no action.

### Future Major Projects

1. Prohibit the Transportation Projects Commission from recommending any projects to the Governor and Legislature until 2002. Delete \$5,000,000 SEG annually to reflect savings from not doing environmental impact statements or other work customarily done to prepare projects for consideration by the TPC.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>SEG</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	- \$10,000,000
[Change to Bill	- \$10,000,000]

2. <sup>Pass</sup> Prohibit the Transportation Projects Commission from recommending any projects to the Governor and Legislature until 2002. Delete \$2,200,000 SEG in 1997-98 and

\$5,000,000 SEG in 1998-99 to reflect savings from not doing environmental impact statements or other work customarily done to prepare projects for consideration by the TPC, except to complete environmental impact statements already in progress.

Alternative 2	SEG
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	- \$7,200,000
[Change to Bill]	- \$7,200,000]

3. Take no action.

Prepared by: Jon Dyck

MO# Alt #2  
*Future Major Projects*

2 JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
1 BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS     

MO# Alt #1  
*Recommended Projects*

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
1 OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
2 GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

AYE 10 NO 6 ABS

TRANSPORTATION

Secondary Land-Use Impacts of STH 57 Improvement

Motion:

Move to require that DOT address the impacts of the proposed major highway project on STH 57 between CTH A in Kewaunee County and STH 42 in Door County on land-use patterns in the area of Door County north of Sturgeon Bay in preparing the final environmental impact statement for this project.

Note:

The bill would enumerate a major highway project on STH 57 in Kewaunee and Door Counties, roughly between Dykesville and Sturgeon Bay. This project would upgrade a two-lane highway to four lanes. The draft environmental impact statement (EIS) for this project has already been completed, and the Department is currently working on the final EIS.

The motion would require that DOT address the secondary land-use impacts of completing the project on the area of Door County north of Sturgeon Bay. DOT indicates that the draft EIS contains a section addressing secondary land-use impacts within the highway corridor. The report finds that residential and commercial development is currently occurring, and would not be impacted significantly by the completion of the highway project.

MO# 2018

JENSEN	Y	<del>N</del>	A
OURADA	Y	<del>N</del>	A
HARSDORF	Y	<del>N</del>	A
ALBERS	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GARD	Y	<del>N</del>	A
KAUFERT	Y	<del>N</del>	A
LINTON	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COGGS	<del>Y</del>	N	A

1 BURKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
DECKER	<del>Y</del>	N	A
GEORGE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
JAUCH	<del>Y</del>	N	A
WINEKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
2 SHIBILSKI	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COWLES	<del>Y</del>	N	A
PANZER	<del>Y</del>	N	A

Motion #2018

AYE 10 NO 6 ABS

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director  
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

## ISSUE

### Major Highway Project Selection Process (DOT -- State Highway Program)

## CURRENT LAW

Major highway projects are defined as projects that have an estimated cost exceeding \$5,000,000 and consist of at least one of the following: (a) construction of a new highway of 2.5 miles or more in length; (b) relocation of 2.5 miles or more of existing roadway; (c) the addition of one or more lanes at least five miles in length; or (d) the improvement of 10 miles or more of an existing divided highway to freeway standards.

Major highway projects must be enumerated in the statutes before the Department of Transportation can begin construction. The Transportation Projects Commission (TPC) biennially reviews a list of projects recommended by DOT and then recommends a list of projects to the Governor and Legislature. The Governor, then, may or may not include that list in the executive budget bill. The TPC is composed of the Governor, three public members appointed by the Governor, three members from the majority party in each house, two members from the minority party in each house and the Secretary of Transportation (who is a nonvoting member). The legislative members are appointed in the same manner as committee appointments are made in their respective houses.

## GOVERNOR

No provision.

## DISCUSSION POINTS

1. In recent months, several legislators and the Legislative Audit Bureau have questioned whether the process for selecting major highway projects is adequate.

2. The following concerns with the process have been identified by various parties:

a. The TPC has never failed to recommend for enumeration one of the DOT-recommended projects.

b. The TPC is not required to consider funding availability and thus can approve more projects than is prudent given the budget for major improvements. Although the Governor and Legislature could scale back the TPC's recommendations, this has not happened. (In some years, additional projects have been added.) Consequently, the time between when a project is enumerated and when it can be started has increased to over ten years.

c. Once it has recommended a project for enumeration, the TPC plays no ongoing role in reexamining its value or priority, despite the fact that it may not be built for many years.

d. The long time between enumeration and construction is frustrating to the people who would be affected by the project.

e. Legislators who seek appointment to the TPC may do so because the projects under consideration affect their districts. The membership, therefore, may have a strong interest in voting to recommend the projects.

3. Since the TPC has not rejected any projects recommended by DOT, one alternative to simplify the process would be to include proposed projects as part of the Department's budget request. The Governor and Legislature could then make the decision whether to enumerate them or not.

4. During the most recent TPC cycle, DOT estimates that the Department incurred costs of \$45,200 to staff the project selection process. This included \$42,000 for DOT staff (an estimated 10.8 months of work spread over five employees) plus an additional \$3,200 for costs related to TPC meetings. It is possible that some, or perhaps all, of these costs would be borne under an alternative project selection process.

5. Even if the TPC has not rejected any of DOT's recommended projects, it may serve a useful purpose. Having the Department's recommendations formally reviewed, including the holding of public hearings, may have a positive impact on the process DOT uses to decide which projects to advance to the TPC. In addition, having minority party representation on the TPC may help to ensure that project selection is being done on a bipartisan basis.

6. If DOT recommended projects as part of its budget request, this would eliminate one stage in the process, but it may not prevent expensive additions to the list at later stages. In 1989, projects costing over \$500 million (in 1989 dollars) were added to the list of \$280 million worth of projects recommended by the TPC. These added projects account for much of the current delay between enumeration and construction.

7. Even after the extensive list that was enumerated in 1989, the TPC recommended an additional \$295.8 million in projects in 1991 (more than it had recommended in 1989), including a \$17.5 million project that was not included on DOT's list of recommendations.

7. To increase the consideration of the fiscal impact of adding projects and to weigh additions to the major highway program against other transportation priorities, it may help to reconstitute the membership of the TPC. One alternative would be to have the Commission be composed of the Co-Chairs of the Joint Finance Committee, as well as the chairs and ranking minority members of the highway standing committees in each house.

9. An additional step to increase the consideration of available funding would be to require the TPC (or DOT, if the TPC is eliminated), to only recommend projects that can be started in a reasonable amount of time. Typically, it takes six years to complete the final design, purchase real estate, arrange for the movement of utility facilities and prepare for the bidding of the project. Therefore, one alternative would be to specify that it must be possible to start all recommended projects within six years after they are enumerated, assuming that the program is maintained at a constant real-dollar level.

10. In order to allow for program expansion, it could also be specified that the TPC (or DOT) could make a separate recommendation for the enumeration of additional projects, on the condition that the additional projects be accompanied by a specific recommendation for the additional funding increases (above inflation) needed to ensure that these also could be started in six years.

11. Although these recommendations would not be binding on the Legislature or Governor, they would at least give members a better idea of the which projects could be done within available funding and how much additional funding would be needed to do more projects.

## **ALTERNATIVES TO BASE**

### **A. Transportation Projects Commission**

1. Reconstitute the membership of the TPC as follows: (a) the Governor; (b) two public members appointed by the Governor; (c) the two Co-Chairs of the Joint Finance Committee; (d) the chair and ranking minority member of the Assembly Highways and Transportation Committee or its successor; (e) the chair and ranking minority member of the

Senate Labor, Transportation and Financial Institutions Committee or its successor; and (f) the Secretary of Transportation, as a nonvoting member.

2. Eliminate the Transportation Projects Commission and specify that DOT recommend projects for enumeration to the Governor and Legislature as part of its biennial budget request.

<sup>3</sup> 3. Eliminate the Transportation Projects Commission and specify that DOT recommend projects for enumeration to the Governor and Legislature as part of its biennial budget request. Delete \$22,600 SEG annually to remove funding for staffing the project selection process.

Alternative 3	SEG
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	- \$45,200
[Change to Bill]	- \$45,200]

4. Take no action.

**B. Enumeration of Projects**

<sup>Pass</sup> 1. Specify that projects cannot be recommended for enumeration unless all projects can be started in six years or less after being enumerated, assuming a constant, real-dollar program size. Establish an exception to this requirement if any additional project recommendations are accompanied by a specific recommended funding increase that would allow them to be started in six years or less.

2. Take no action.

MO# AH#A3

JENSEN	<del>Y</del>	N	A
OURADA	Y	<del>N</del>	A
HARSDORF	Y	<del>N</del>	A
ALBERS	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GARD	Y	<del>N</del>	A
KAUFERT	Y	<del>N</del>	A
LINTON	Y	<del>N</del>	A
COGGS	Y	<del>N</del>	A
BURKE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
DECKER	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GEORGE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
JAUCH	<del>Y</del>	N	A
WINEKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	<del>N</del>	A
COWLES	<del>Y</del>	N	A
PANZER	<del>Y</del>	N	A

AYE 6 NO 10 ABS \_\_\_\_\_

MO# AH#B1

JENSEN	<del>Y</del>	N	A
OURADA	<del>Y</del>	N	A
HARSDORF	<del>Y</del>	N	A
ALBERS	<del>Y</del>	N	A
GARD	<del>Y</del>	N	A
KAUFERT	<del>Y</del>	N	A
LINTON	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COGGS	<del>Y</del>	N	A
BURKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
DECKER	<del>Y</del>	N	A
GEORGE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
JAUCH	<del>Y</del>	N	A
WINEKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COWLES	<del>Y</del>	N	A
PANZER	<del>Y</del>	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS \_\_\_\_\_

Prepared by: Jon Dyck

TRANSPORTATION

Major Highway Project Scoring

Motion:

Move to require DOT to promulgate rules establishing a scoring system to evaluate potential major highway projects. Provide that the rules must specify a minimum score that a project must have before DOT can recommend it for enumeration. Require the submission of the initial rules under this provision to the rules clearinghouse by January 1, 1998.

Note:

Currently, DOT uses a scoring system for major projects based on the following goals: (a) enhance Wisconsin's economy (40%); (b) improve highway service (20%); (c) improve highway safety (20%); (d) minimize undesirable impacts (10%); and (e) serve community objectives (10%). The goals and the relative weights given these goals are established by DOT policy, rather than by administrative rule.

This motion would require DOT to establish the scoring criteria by administrative rule. In addition, the motion would require that potential projects obtain a score above a minimum level before the Department can recommend them for enumeration.

MO# 2016

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
1 DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
2 WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

AYE 15 NO 1 ABS \_\_\_\_\_

TRANSPORTATION

Membership of Transportation Projects Commission

Motion:

Move to reconstitute the membership of the Transportation Projects Commission to remove two of the three public members appointed by the Governor and add two county highway commissioners, one appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly and one appointed by the majority leader of the Senate.

Note:

The Transportation Projects Commission (TPC) biennially reviews a list of major highway projects recommended for enumeration by DOT and then recommends a list of projects to the Governor and Legislature. The Governor, then, may or may not include that list in the executive budget bill. Currently, the TPC is composed of the Governor, three public members appointed by the Governor, three members from the majority party in each house, two members from the minority party in each house and the Secretary of Transportation (who is a nonvoting member). The legislative members are appointed in the same manner as committee appointments are made in their respective houses.

This motion would replace two of the public members appointed by the Governor with two county highway commissioners, one appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly and one by the majority leader in the Senate.

MC# 2002

JENSEN	Y	<del>N</del>	A
OURADA	Y	<del>N</del>	A
HARSDORF	Y	<del>N</del>	A
ALBERS	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GARD	Y	<del>N</del>	A
KAUFERT	Y	<del>N</del>	A
LINTON	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COGGS	<del>Y</del>	N	A

<sup>2</sup> BURKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
<sup>1</sup> DECKER	<del>Y</del>	N	A
GEORGE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
JAUCH	<del>Y</del>	N	A
WINEKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COWLES	<del>Y</del>	N	A
PANZER	<del>Y</del>	N	A

Motion #2002

AYE 7 NO 9 ABS \_\_\_\_\_

TRANSPORTATION

Composition of the Transportation Projects Commission

Motion:

Move to modify Alternative A1 of LFB Paper #846 to include the chair of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Environmental Resources and the chair of the Assembly Committee on Environment, or their successor committees dealing with the environment.

MO# 1596

JENSEN	Y	<del>N</del>	A
OURADA	Y	<del>N</del>	A
HARSDORF	Y	<del>N</del>	A
ALBERS	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GARD	Y	<del>N</del>	A
KAUFERT	Y	<del>N</del>	A
LINTON	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COGGS	<del>Y</del>	N	A

BURKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
DECKER	<del>Y</del>	N	A
GEORGE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
JAUCH	<del>Y</del>	N	A
WINEKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COWLES	Y	<del>N</del>	A
PANZER	Y	<del>N</del>	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS \_\_\_\_\_

FAIL

TRANSPORTATION

Enumeration of Major Highway Projects and  
the Transportation Projects Commission

Motion:

Move to require the Transportation Projects Commission (TPC) to meet in 1998 to consider an order of priority for currently enumerated projects that are not under construction in 1998 or within one year of construction in 1998. Specify that the TPC must make a recommendation to the Governor and Legislature by December 15, 1998, on the priority to be given these projects and a mechanism to implement this order of priority.

Note:

The TPC recommends potential major highway projects to the Legislature and Governor for enumeration. Major highway projects are required to be enumerated in the statutes before DOT can begin construction. DOT is not required to construct any of the enumerated projects, nor is it required to follow any order of priority. Typically, however, the Department begins construction on projects in the same order as they were enumerated.

This motion would require the TPC to examine projects that are currently enumerated, but are not yet under construction or within one year of construction, to develop an order of priority and to make a recommendation to the Governor and Legislature as to how to implement this order of priority.

MO# 2027

JENSEN	Y	<del>N</del>	A
OURADA	Y	<del>N</del>	A
HARSDORF	Y	<del>N</del>	A
ALBERS	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GARD	Y	<del>N</del>	A
KAUFERT	Y	<del>N</del>	A
LINTON	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COGGS	<del>Y</del>	N	A

BURKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
DECKER	<del>Y</del>	N	A
GEORGE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
JAUCH	<del>Y</del>	N	A
WINEKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	<del>N</del>	A
COWLES	<del>Y</del>	N	A
PANZER	Y	<del>N</del>	A

Motion #2027

AYE 7 NO 9 ABS \_\_\_\_\_

To: Joint Committee on Finance  
From: Bob Lang, Director  
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

## ISSUE

### State Highway Maps (DOT -- State Highway Program)

[LFB Summary: Page 596, #6(part)]

## CURRENT LAW

The Department of Transportation is required, by statute, to produce folded highway maps for free distribution to the public. In addition, DOT is required to distribute 500 maps to each officer and member of the Legislature and 300 to the Legislative Reference Bureau. Legislators may request additional maps at no charge.

Base funding for maps is \$60,000 annually.

## GOVERNOR

Provide \$250,000 SEG annually to increase the number of folded highway maps produced by DOT to two million annually. Prior to the current biennium, DOT printed approximately two million maps per year, but will produce fewer than one million annually in 1996 and 1997.

## DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Prior to the 1995-97 biennium, DOT printed about two million maps per year at an annual cost of about \$240,000, which was covered out of the budget of the Division of Business Management (DBM). In response to funding reductions in the 1995-97 biennium, DBM stopped funding the printing of maps and the funding was instead provided from other sources, including the state highway program and the Secretary's office. The bill would provide \$250,000

annually, which, when added to base funding of \$60,000, would be sufficient to again produce two million maps annually.

2. Of the four million 1993-94 edition maps printed over a two-year period, 582,000 were distributed to the Legislature, 1.5 million were distributed by the Division (now Department) of Tourism and 1.9 million were distributed by the Department of Transportation. In 1994-95, almost 2.5 million maps were printed, but only 760,000 were printed in 1995-96 and 920,000 were printed in 1996-97. Due to this reduction, Tourism was given fewer maps to distribute and DOT has limited distribution at rest areas.

3. If increasing the funding for maps by \$250,000 annually is considered to be too high, one alternative would be to produce just one million maps per year and limit distribution, which was DOT's suggestion in its budget request to DOA. In its budget request, DOT estimated that printing one million maps would require an increase of \$100,000 annually, but based on a reestimate of the printing cost per map, only \$95,000 annually would be required.

4. Printing one million maps each year would require that distribution again be limited. In its budget request, DOT proposed to eliminate distribution of maps to the Department of Tourism and free distribution at rest areas. This may be considered appropriate since the demand for the maps is determined in part by their availability. If maps are made available for free at rest areas, for instance, travelers tend to pick them up whether they need them or not.

5. In addition, some have raised the concern that one of the largest users of maps are for-profit businesses, who use them to attract customers. Car rental companies, automobile dealerships, gas stations and convenience stores are some of the largest users. Limiting the number of maps printed would likely require DOT to limit its distribution for bulk requests from these and other businesses.

6. If the number of maps printed is cut back, private companies that print and sell their own maps may pick up much of the demand. These companies argue that the state should stop printing so many maps because it hurts their business.

7. During the current biennium, in addition to limiting distribution to Tourism and at rest areas, DOT originally proposed limiting members of the Legislature to 1,000 maps each. Due to opposition, however, DOT abandoned this policy and reserved enough maps to meet expected demand. In its budget request, DOT also proposed limiting the number of maps for legislators at 1,000 each.

8. Since the Department of Tourism received fewer maps this year than it has received in the past, it has had to limit the number it distributes, particularly in the case of bulk requests from businesses. In addition, Tourism tried to make greater use of a less-detailed map that was printed on the back of a brochure donated to the Department by an association of tourism-related businesses. The Department indicates that the maps are one of the most-requested

items that it distributes to potential visitors, and therefore, that not having any maps would harm the tourism business.

9. Another alternative would be to provide funding sufficient to produce 1.5 million maps annually. At this level, distribution to Tourism and to the Legislature would not need to be so severely limited. An increase of \$172,500 annually would be required to produce this many maps.

10. DOT has explored the issue of advertising or selling the maps to recover some of the printing cost. A bill provision that was removed for consideration as separate legislation would establish a committee to study this issue further and make recommendations to the Legislature and the Governor by July 1, 1998.

**ALTERNATIVES TO BASE**

1. Provide \$250,000 SEG annually for the production and printing of folded highway maps. This would be sufficient to print about two million maps annually.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>SEG</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$500,000
[Change to Bill]	\$0

2. Provide \$172,500 SEG annually for the production and printing of folded highway maps. This would be sufficient to print about 1.5 million maps annually.

<u>Alternative 2</u>	<u>SEG</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$345,000
[Change to Bill]	- \$155,000

3. Provide \$95,000 SEG annually for the production and printing of folded highway maps. This would be sufficient to print about one million maps annually.

<u>Alternative 3</u>	<u>SEG</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$190,000
[Change to Bill]	- \$310,000

4. Take no action.

<u>Alternative 4</u>	<u>SEG</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$0
[Change to Bill	- \$500,000]

Prepared by: Jon Dyck

MO# AH\*2

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<del>N</del>	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<del>N</del>	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<del>N</del>	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
AYE <u>13</u>	NO <u>3</u>	ABS	

TRANSPORTATION

State Highway Maps

Motion:

Move to limit the free distribution of folded state highway maps to 500 annually for each member of the Assembly and 1,500 annually for each member of the Senate. Require DOT to charge a fee based on its costs of production for additional maps.

Note:

This motion would limit the number of free maps provided to each member of the Assembly to 500 and to each member of the Senate to 1,500. Additional copies of the maps could be purchased by a legislator through his or her legislative office account.

MO# 3014

JENSEN	<del>Y</del>	N	A
OURADA	<del>Y</del>	N	A
HARSDORF	<del>Y</del>	N	A
ZALBERS	<del>Y</del>	N	A
GARD	<del>Y</del>	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	<del>N</del>	A
LINTON	Y	<del>N</del>	A
COGGS	Y	<del>N</del>	A
BURKE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
DECKER	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GEORGE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
JAUCH	Y	<del>N</del>	A
WINEKE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	<del>N</del>	A
COWLES	<del>Y</del>	N	A
PANZER	<del>Y</del>	N	A

AYE 7 NO 9 ABS \_\_\_\_\_

TRANSPORTATION

Eliminate Folded Highway Map Production

Motion:

Move to delete the requirement that DOT publish folded highway maps for free distribution to the public and delete requirements that DOT distribute maps to each officer and member of the Legislature and to the Legislative Reference Bureau. Delete \$60,000 SEG annually to reflect this change.

Note:

DOT is required to produce highway service maps and distribute 50 to each officer and member of the Legislature, and any additional service maps upon request for a fee not less than the cost. In addition, DOT is required to print folded highway maps and distribute them free to the public. DOT is required to distribute 500 folded highway maps to each officer and member of the Legislature and 300 to the Legislative Reference Bureau. Legislators may request additional maps at no charge.

This motion would eliminate the requirement that DOT produce the folded maps and the requirements that DOT distribute them free to the public and to the Legislature.

Base funding for maps is \$60,000 SEG annually. The bill would provide an additional \$250,000 SEG annually to increase the number of folded highway maps produced by DOT to two million annually. This motion would delete the base funding for maps and, if offered as an alternative to the increase in the bill, would reduce funding for maps by \$310,000 SEG annually compared to the bill.

[Change to Base: -\$120,000 SEG]

[Change to Bill: -\$620,000 SEG]

MO# 3011

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2 PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

AYE 5 NO 11 ABS \_\_\_\_\_

Motion #3011

To: Joint Committee on Finance  
From: Bob Lang, Director  
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

## ISSUE

### Reduce Capacity to Design Future Projects (DOT -- State Highway Program)

## CURRENT LAW

In the state trunk highway (STH) rehabilitation program, DOT uses its own engineers and hired consultants to design projects. The base budget for this activity in 1996-97 is \$42,200,000.

## GOVERNOR

No provision.

## DISCUSSION POINTS

1. DOT's November 8, 1996, 3.5% state operations base reduction budget submission to DOA included an item proposing to reduce the amount of contracts with design consultants to prepare future rehabilitation projects, at a savings of \$539,900 SEG in 1997-98 and \$540,000 SEG in 1998-99. Typically, DOT maintains a pool of designed projects which is slightly larger than available funding would allow to be constructed in a given fiscal year. Reducing design contracts would cause this pool of projects to decline.

2. DOT indicates that this reduction would be done through reducing contracts with consulting firms rather than through reducing its own staff because it is advantageous to retain in-house engineering expertise.

3. At any particular time, DOT maintains between \$50 million and \$60 million worth of projects for which the design is complete, but that are not being let immediately. In addition,

there may be another \$100 million of extra projects for which design could be completed within three months.

4. The pool of extra projects is maintained so that if a scheduled project is delayed unexpectedly before it is put up for bidding, another project can be advanced to take its place. If the size of the extra pool is reduced, the chances that some available funding will be unused in a fiscal year is increased. If this happens, the funding would not lapse, since the rehabilitation appropriations are continuing, but the amount of rehabilitation that could be done in a given construction season would be reduced. Year-to-year variations in the size of the construction program have been a concern of the road building industry.

5. Another possible impact to reducing the size of the extra pool would be that it would be more difficult to maintain a balance between different types of work and between different areas of the state. For instance, with extra projects available, if an asphalt repaving project in one area of the state is delayed, another similar project in the same part of the state could take its place. If the pool of extra projects is small, a different type of project or a project in another area may have to be substituted.

6. Having a pool of extra projects allows the program to be expanded to a certain extent without any lag time to do more design work. If, for instance, the Legislature adopts a funding increase for the rehabilitation program in the 1997-99 biennium, the number of projects that can be done can be increased immediately. This also allows DOT to respond to unexpected increases in federal aid, such as the \$14.4 million increase for STH rehabilitation that occurred last December. If there were no extra projects, an increase in the program would not result in an immediate increase in the number of projects constructed because new projects would need to be designed first.

7. Any savings from reducing consulting contracts would be one-time savings. Once the size of the extra pool of projects is drawn down, a funding increase to restore the current level of design effort would be required (perhaps in the 1999-2001 biennium) to prevent the size of the extra pool from decreasing further. If it were decided to then restore the size of the extra pool to its previous level, an additional funding increase for design would be required.

8. Periodically, DOT makes internal adjustments to the design budget in order to maintain what it considers to be an appropriate size for the design pool. If the rehabilitation program were decreased, for instance, fewer projects could be let, and so the size of the extra pool would increase. DOT may then transfer some resources from design to construction until the design pool was reduced. The alternative under consideration would remove funding in order to reduce the size of the design pool below what may be considered the normal equilibrium point.

9. Whether a decrease in the pool of extra projects is acceptable or not may depend on the importance assigned to each of the following relative to the temporary savings from reducing it:

- managing the highway program to use all available funds each construction season
- maintaining a year-to-year balance between project types and geographic areas
- responding immediately to future increases in program size

10. A smaller decrease than the one included in DOT's base reduction budget submission would reduce the impact on the Department's flexibility in managing the highway program. For example, a \$270,000 annual decrease would result in a drop in the size of the extra pool, but the consequences for the flexibility of the program would not be as great.

**ALTERNATIVES TO BASE**

1. Delete \$540,000 SEG annually to reflect a reduction in the number of design consultants hired to design future rehabilitation projects.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>SEG</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	- \$1,080,000
[Change to Bill]	- \$1,080,000]

2. Delete \$270,000 SEG annually to reflect a reduction in the number of design consultants hired to design future rehabilitation projects.

<u>Alternative 2</u>	<u>SEG</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	- \$540,000
[Change to Bill]	- \$540,000]

3. Take no action.  
*to Default*

MO#	<i>Alt #1</i>			<i>Alt #2</i>		
JENSEN	Y	<del>N</del>	A	Y	<del>N</del>	A
OURADA	Y	<del>N</del>	A	Y	<del>N</del>	A
HARSDORF	Y	<del>N</del>	A	Y	<del>N</del>	A
ALBERS	Y	<del>N</del>	A	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GARD	Y	<del>N</del>	A	Y	<del>N</del>	A
KAUFERT	Y	<del>N</del>	A	Y	<del>N</del>	A
LINTON	<del>Y</del>	N	A	<del>Y</del>	N	A
2 COGGS	<del>Y</del>	N	A	<del>Y</del>	N	A
BURKE	Y	<del>N</del>	A	Y	<del>N</del>	A
DECKER	Y	<del>N</del>	A	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GEORGE	<del>Y</del>	N	A	<del>Y</del>	N	A
JAUCH	Y	<del>N</del>	A	Y	<del>N</del>	A
WINEKE	Y	<del>N</del>	A	Y	<del>N</del>	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	<del>N</del>	A	Y	<del>N</del>	A
COWLES	Y	<del>N</del>	A	Y	<del>N</del>	A
PANZER	Y	<del>N</del>	A	Y	<del>N</del>	A
AYE	<u>3</u>	NO	<u>13</u>	ABS		

Prepared by: Jon Dyck

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director  
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

## ISSUE

**Savings from Instituting Changes in Contaminated Site Remediation (DOT -- State Highway Program)**

## CURRENT LAW

DOT must follow established administrative rules, as promulgated by the Department of Natural Resources, with regard to remediation of contaminated soil on its property.

## GOVERNOR

No provision.

## DISCUSSION POINTS

1. DOT's November 8, 1996, 3.5% state operations base reduction budget submission to DOA included an item identifying possible savings resulting from proposed DNR rule changes that would allow greater flexibility in remediating contaminated soil to meet groundwater-protection standards. DOT estimated that \$131,500 SEG could be saved annually if these rule changes were adopted.

2. The proposed changes would allow more flexibility in meeting acceptable standards for a contaminated site ("closure flexibility") by increasing the range of acceptable clean-up techniques. One change would allow for the greater use of natural attenuation, which utilizes naturally occurring biological, chemical and physical mechanisms to degrade, disperse, absorb, volatilize and transform soil contaminants. Another change would allow for land-

spreading, which reduces the concentration of contaminants and allows natural attenuation techniques to be used to gradually reduce the threat from contaminants.

3. Since November, when DOT suggested that these savings may be possible, the rules allowing greater closure flexibility through the utilization of natural attenuation have been adopted. The rules allowing for land-spreading, however, are still being considered.

4. Even though the land-spreading rules have not yet been adopted, DOT indicates that the savings that were originally proposed can still be realized. In part, this is possible since DNR has indicated to DOT that land-spreading could already be used on DOT-owned property as a remediation strategy, because the technique is consistent with DNR's interpretation of existing statutory authority.

5. No statutory changes or further rule changes are required to realize these savings.

**ALTERNATIVES TO BASE**

1. Delete \$131,500 SEG annually to reflect new DNR rules allowing for natural attenuation for remediation of contaminated sites, as well as the use of the land-spreading process, consistent with existing administrative rules.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>SEG</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	- \$263,000
[Change to Bill	- \$263,000]

2. Take no action.

MO# AH#1

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
2 OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

Prepared by: Jon Dyck

BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
1 DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director  
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

## ISSUE

### **Streamline Materials Acceptance Process (DOT -- State Highway Program)**

## CURRENT LAW

The Department of Transportation's district offices review the quality and amount of construction materials purchased for highway projects.

## GOVERNOR

No provision.

## DISCUSSION POINTS

1. DOT's November 8, 1996, 3.5% state operations base reduction budget submission to DOA included an item proposing to accelerate the implementation of an initiative designed to streamline the process by which construction materials are reviewed and approved. The new process is expected to eliminate unnecessary forms, which would save time and money. In this proposal, DOT indicated that additional savings of \$131,000 SEG annually could be realized if the process were accelerated. The materials acceptance process is used to monitor the purchase of materials to ensure their quality.

2. DOT now indicates that since this item was prepared, the revised process has been implemented in all its district offices. As the new forms and procedures are used, however, district staff will be reviewing the process and making any needed modifications. This review will also be used to determine whether the anticipated savings have actually been realized.

3. If the potential savings projected by DOT in its 3.5% base reduction submission exceeds the actual savings, there would be a need to reallocate funding within the highway program to make up the difference.

**ALTERNATIVES TO BASE**

1. Delete \$131,000 SEG annually to reflect the implementation of new procedures for review and acceptance of construction materials.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>SEG</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	- \$262,000
[Change to Bill	- \$262,000]

2. Take no action.

Prepared by: Jon Dyck

MO# AH #1

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ZOURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS \_\_\_\_\_

To: Joint Committee on Finance
From: Bob Lang, Director Legislative Fiscal Bureau

## ISSUE

### **Eliminate Production of Certain Highway Signs (DOT -- State Highway Program)**

## CURRENT LAW

The Department of Transportation produces some highway signs and contracts with private vendors for the production of others. Typically, the replacement of worn-out or destroyed signs on state trunk highways is done by county maintenance crews under contract with the state. The base budget for the production of signs is approximately \$1.1 million.

## GOVERNOR

No provision.

## DISCUSSION POINTS

1. DOT's November 8, 1996, 3.5% state operations base reduction budget submission to DOA included an item proposing the elimination of the production of certain highway signs. The following types of signs would no longer be produced: (a) supplemental information ("Toilet", "Boat Landing", "Picnic Table" and "Drinking Water"); (b) lake and river name; (c) seatbelt law; (d) litter fine; (e) farm machinery; (f) driver licensing/State Patrol/district office; and (g) veterans memorial highway.

2. A total of \$100,000 SEG and 0.5 SEG positions could be saved annually if production of these signs is terminated. Under this proposal, these signs would not be removed, but instead would simply not be replaced when the existing sign wears out or is destroyed. DOT indicates that about 10% of these signs are typically replaced each year.

3. Some of these signs provide reminders to drivers about laws affecting them (seatbelt law and litter fine signs). In addition to signs, other public information activities are used to increase awareness of these laws.

4. Other signs provide information about the location of amenities along the highway (supplemental information signs) or various DOT offices (driver licensing/State Patrol/district office signs). Without these signs, locating these amenities or offices may not be as easy.

5. Lake and river name signs may provide a benefit to travelers who are unfamiliar with an area, such as tourists. Farm machinery signs are intended to alert drivers to locations with a higher level of slow-moving and/or large-size vehicles. Veterans memorial highway signs are posted to comply with statutory requirements designating various highway segments in honor of selected groups of veterans.

6. If some types of signs are considered to be more important than others, one alternative would be to continue producing those, but discontinue producing the less important ones.

7. Since the veterans memorial highway signs are statutorily required, these requirements would have to be repealed in order to implement the base budget reduction proposal. Given the relatively small savings associated with these signs (about \$3,000 per year), this may not be viewed as significant enough to repeal the current law provisions.

## ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Delete \$27,000 SEG and 0.1 SEG position annually to reflect the termination of the production and installation of seatbelt law and \$500 litter fine signs.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>SEG</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	- \$54,000
<i>[Change to Bill</i>	<i>- \$54,000]</i>
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Base)	- 0.10
<i>[Change to Bill</i>	<i>- 0.10]</i>

2. Delete \$10,400 SEG and 0.1 SEG position annually to reflect the termination of the production and installation of supplemental information and DMV/State Patrol/district office signs.

<u>Alternative 2</u>	<u>SEG</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	- \$20,800
[Change to Bill]	- \$20,800]
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Base)	- 0.10
[Change to Bill]	- 0.10]

3. Delete \$54,800 SEG and 0.3 SEG position annually to reflect the termination of the production and installation of lake and river name signs.

<u>Alternative 3</u>	<u>SEG</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	- \$109,600
[Change to Bill]	- \$109,600]
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Base)	- 0.30
[Change to Bill]	- 0.30]

4. Delete \$4,700 SEG annually to reflect the termination of the production and installation of farm machinery warning signs.

<u>Alternative 4</u>	<u>SEG</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	- \$9,400
[Change to Bill]	- \$9,400]

5. Delete \$3,000 SEG annually to reflect the termination of the production and installation of veterans memorial highway signs. Delete statutory provisions requiring DOT to post signs identifying those highways.

<u>Alternative 5</u>	<u>SEG</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	- \$6,000
[Change to Bill]	- \$6,000]

6. Take no action.

MO# AH# 1,2,3,4

JENSEN	<del>Y</del>	N	A
1 OURADA	<del>Y</del>	N	A
HARSDORF	<del>Y</del>	N	A
2 ALBERS	<del>Y</del>	N	A
GARD	<del>Y</del>	N	A
KAUFERT	<del>Y</del>	N	A
LINTON	Y	<del>N</del>	A
COGGS	Y	<del>N</del>	A

BURKE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
DECKER	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GEORGE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
JAUCH	Y	<del>N</del>	A
WINEKE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
SHIBILSKI	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COWLES	<del>Y</del>	N	A
PANZER	<del>Y</del>	N	A

AYE 10 NO 6 ABS \_\_\_\_\_

Prepared by: Jon Dyck

TRANSPORTATION

Replacement of State Highway Signs

Motion:

Move to establish a process by which an interested party can petition DOT for the replacement of a sign on the state trunk highway system that has been damaged or destroyed or is in need of replacement due to age. Require DOT to promulgate administrative rules outlining the petition process and providing construction and placement specifications for replacement signs. Provide that, if DOT accepts the petition, the interested party can either pay a private firm to produce and place the replacement sign or can pay DOT for the replacement cost. Create a new, PR appropriation to receive payments from interested parties for replacement costs and allow DOT to expend all monies received for those costs.

MO# 3013

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

AYE 14 NO 2 ABS

<p>To: Joint Committee on Finance</p> <p>From: Bob Lang, Director Legislative Fiscal Bureau</p>
---

## ISSUE

### **Discontinue Mailing Letting Reports (DOT -- State Highway Program)**

## CURRENT LAW

The Department prepares monthly letting reports, which are summaries of all bids received on every project put up for bidding. Contractors use these reports to compare the competitiveness of their bids. To receive the reports, a contractor or interested party can go to a district office, get them electronically through an on-line, bulletin board service or obtain them through the mail by request.

## GOVERNOR

No provision.

## DISCUSSION POINTS

1. DOT's November 8, 1996, 3.5% state operations base reduction budget submission to DOA included an item proposing to eliminate the mailing of letting reports at an annual savings of \$48,000 SEG. These savings result from reductions in both printing and mailing costs.
2. DOT currently provides letting reports for free by mail or to individuals who pick them up at district offices. Contractors who use the reports off the electronic bulletin board, which is operated by a private firm, pay \$25 per month for the service.

3. DOT estimates that each month there are about 100 subscribers to the bulletin board service and about 450 reports are mailed. There are no records of how many are distributed at district offices, but DOT believes the number is smaller than the number mailed.

4. Discontinuing the mailing of letting reports would require contractors to use either the electronic bulletin board service or walk-in service. Those who do not have electronic capability or can not easily get to a DOT district office may be put at a disadvantage if the mailing service is eliminated.

5. Eliminating the mailing service may increase the demand for walk-in or electronic service, but it may also decrease the number of reports distributed. If the reports are important in offering competitive bids, it is likely that contractors who are now getting them by mail will obtain them in one of the other two ways.

6. An alternative to eliminating the mailing service would be to direct DOT to charge a fee to cover the costs of postage and printing. The charge for printing could be extended to reports that are distributed at district offices. Currently, DOT charges for other documents, such as the highway plans sent to contractors, which range in price from between \$1 and \$20.

7. DOT estimates that the cost to print 450 reports for 12 months is \$34,500, which is about \$6.40 per report. The cost to mail the reports is \$13,500, which is about \$2.50 per report. In order to cover these costs, as well as the costs of administering the fee, DOT could be given the authority to set the fee. DOT indicates an annual subscription for the mailed reports would range between \$107 to \$150. For walk-in service, the fee may depend upon the size of the report.

#### ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Delete \$48,000 SEG annually to reflect the termination of mailing letting reports.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>SEG</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	- \$96,000
[Change to Bill	- \$96,000]

2. Direct DOT to charge a fee to cover the costs of printing and mailing letting reports, plus the cost of administering the fee. Estimate increased transportation fund revenue at \$36,000 in 1997-98 (reflecting nine months of collections) and \$48,000 in 1998-99.

<u>Alternative 2</u>	<u>SEG</u>
1997-99 REVENUE (Change to Base)	\$84,000
[Change to Bill]	\$84,000]

3. Take no action.

Prepared by: Jon Dyck

MO# Alt #1

JENSEN	<del>Y</del>	N	A
1 OURADA	<del>Y</del>	N	A
2 HARDSORF	<del>Y</del>	N	A
ALBERS	<del>Y</del>	N	A
GARD	<del>Y</del>	N	A
KAUFERT	<del>Y</del>	N	A
LINTON	Y	<del>N</del>	A
COGGS	<del>Y</del>	N	A

BURKE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
DECKER	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GEORGE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
JAUCH	Y	<del>N</del>	A
WINEKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COWLES	<del>Y</del>	N	A
PANZER	<del>Y</del>	N	A

AYE 11 NO 5 ABS \_\_\_\_\_

TRANSPORTATION

Designation of STH 64 for Long Vehicles

Motion:

Move to add State Trunk Highway 64 between Merrill in Lincoln County and Medford in Taylor County to the list of highways designated as approved routes for vehicles or vehicle combinations that exceed the length normally allowed on highways within the state. Specify that this provision shall not apply after December 31, 1998.

Note:

Aside from a few exceptions, single vehicles in excess of 40 feet or vehicle combinations (tractor-trailer, for instance) in excess of 65 feet are limited to highways designated for long trucks. There are approximately 5,000 miles of designated long-truck routes within the state. These routes are normally designated through the administrative rules process, but this motion would designate this route for long trucks through a nonstatutory provision that would expire on December 31, 1998.

DOT expects to begin the process of reviewing this segment for inclusion as a long-truck designated route, which typically takes six or seven months, within the next few weeks. If the rule is not adopted by the end of 1998, the designation would expire, but this should allow sufficient time to complete the rules process.

Designating the segment in the budget bill would result in its inclusion as a long-truck route on the effective date of the bill. Including the segment in the budget, therefore, would likely open it for long trucks a few months sooner than the administrative rules process would allow. During the rules process, those who are in favor of this designation and those who are opposed will be given a chance to formally express their views. Also, as part of this process, DOT determines whether the geometrics of the highway are appropriate for long trucks.

MO# <u>1110</u>		BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
		DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
		GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
		JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
		WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
		SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
		COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
		PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A		
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A		
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A		
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A		
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A		
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A		
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A		
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A		
		AYE <u>15</u>	NO <u>1</u>	ABS	

Motion #1110

TRANSPORTATION

Extending the Sunset Date for the Disadvantaged Business  
Demonstration and Training Program

Motion:

Move to create an exception to the September 30, 1997, sunset provision for the disadvantaged business enterprise demonstration and training program. Specify that this exception would continue the program to the extent that federal law requires, as a condition of using federal funds, that a state establish goals for the participation of disadvantaged businesses, or the employment of disadvantaged individuals, in federally-funded projects.

Note:

The disadvantaged business enterprise demonstration and training program sets aside \$4,000,000 worth of construction projects each year for which only contractors certified as disadvantaged business enterprises can bid. In addition, the program offers training seminars for disadvantaged businesses and individuals.

The statute authorizing the program was found to be unconstitutional except to the extent that it is a strategy to comply with federal requirements for disadvantaged business participation. Without federal authorization, which expires September 30, 1997, the state would not be allowed to single out certain firms for special treatment. DOT indicates, however, that it is likely that the federal authorization will be extended. The sunset date cannot simply be extended in the absence of federal reauthorization, however, because this would violate a federal court injunction. The motion, therefore, would allow the program to continue contingent upon federal reauthorization, and would, in that event, put the state in compliance with certain conditions for the use of federal highway aid.

MO# <u>2005</u>		BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
		DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
		GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
		JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
		WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
		SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
		COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
		PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A		
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A		
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A		
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A		
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A		
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A		
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A		
2 COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A		
		AYE <u>16</u>	NO <u>0</u>	ABS	

TRANSPORTATION

Traffic-Control Authority Related to Golf Carts

Motion:

Move to allow any city, village or town, by ordinance, to regulate the operation of a golf cart to and from a golf course for a distance not to exceed one mile upon a highway under its exclusive jurisdiction.

Extend the current law registration exemption and vehicle equipment applicability provisions for a golf cart that is crossing a highway, as authorized by a municipal ordinance, to golf carts being operated under an ordinance that regulates the operation of a golf cart to and from a golf course.

Extend current law requirements for placing a sign to mark a golf cart crossing point to golf cart travel routes designated by an ordinance.

Note:

Current law allows a city, village or town, by ordinance, to establish a golf cart crossing point upon a highway within its limits. Such an ordinance must require that a golf cart stop and yield the right-of-way to all vehicles approaching on the highway before crossing the highway. The ordinance may require that a golf cart be equipped with reflective devices. The municipality must place a sign that is approved by DOT to mark the crossing point on both sides of the highway. Current law exempts a golf cart being operated under a municipal ordinance for crossing a highway from registration.

MO# 2012

JENSEN	<del>Y</del>	N	A
ZOURADA	<del>Y</del>	N	A
HARSDORF	<del>Y</del>	N	A
ALBERS	<del>Y</del>	N	A
GARD	Y	<del>N</del>	A
KAUFERT	Y	<del>N</del>	A
LINTON	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COGGS	<del>Y</del>	N	A

BURKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
DECKER	<del>Y</del>	N	A
GEORGE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
JAUCH	<del>Y</del>	N	A
WINEKE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
SHIBILSKI	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COWLES	<del>Y</del>	N	A
PANZER	<del>Y</del>	N	A

Motion #2012

AYE 13 NO 3 ABS \_\_\_\_\_

TRANSPORTATION

Designation of STH 77 for Long Vehicles

Motion:

Move to add State Trunk Highway 77 between Hayward to Hurley to the list of highways designated as approved routes for vehicles or vehicle combinations that exceed the length normally allowed on highways within the state. Specify that this provision shall not apply after December 31, 1998.

Note:

Aside from a few exceptions, single vehicles in excess of 40 feet or vehicle combinations (tractor-trailer, for instance) in excess of 65 feet are limited to highways designated for long trucks. There are approximately 5,000 miles of designated long-truck routes within the state. These routes are normally designated through the administrative rules process, but this motion would designate this route for long trucks through a nonstatutory provision that would expire on December 31, 1998.

DOT expects to begin the process of reviewing this segment for inclusion as a long-truck designated route, which typically takes six or seven months, within the next few weeks. If the rule is not adopted by the end of 1998, the designation would expire, but this should allow sufficient time to complete the rules process.

Designating the segment in the budget bill would result in its inclusion as a long-truck route on the effective date of the bill. Including the segment in the budget, therefore, would likely open it for long trucks a few months sooner than the administrative rules process would allow. During the rules process, those who are in favor of this designation and those who are opposed will be given a chance to formally express their views. Also, as part of this process, DOT determines whether the geometrics of the highway are appropriate for long trucks.

MO# 3017

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

AYE 15 NO 1 ABS \_\_\_\_\_

Motion #3017

**TRANSPORTATION**  
**State Highway Program**

**LFB Summary Item for Which No Issue Paper Has Been Prepared**

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
5	Milwaukee Freeway Traffic Operations Center

MO# Item #5

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

**LFB Summary Items to be Addressed in Subsequent Papers**

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
1	State Highway Rehabilitation -- Funding Level
2	Major Highway Development -- Funding Level
4	State Trunk Highway Maintenance Inflation

BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS     

**LFB Summary Item for Introduction as Separate Legislation**

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
6(part)	State Highway Maps