



State of Wisconsin

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU

Appendix A ... segment I

LRB BILL HISTORY RESEARCH APPENDIX

 The drafting file for

2011 LRB-2764 (For: Rep. Petrowski)

has been transferred to the drafting file for

2013 LRB-0934 (For: Rep. Petrowski)



RESEARCH APPENDIX -
PLEASE KEEP WITH THE DRAFTING FILE

Date Transfer Requested: 01/04/2012 (Per: ARG)

 The attached draft was incorporated into the new draft listed above. For research purposes the attached materials were added, as a appendix, to the new drafting file. If introduced this section will be scanned and added, as a separate appendix, to the electronic drafting file folder.

2011 DRAFTING REQUEST

Bill

Received: **08/30/2011**

Received By: **agary**

Wanted: **As time permits**

Companion to LRB:

For: **Jerry Petrowski (608) 266-1182**

By/Representing: **Tim Fiocchi**

May Contact:

Drafter: **agary**

Subject: **Transportation - highways**

Addl. Drafters:

Extra Copies: **EVM**

Submit via email: **YES**

Requester's email: **Rep.Petrowski@legis.wisconsin.gov**

Carbon copy (CC:) to: **aaron.gary@legis.wisconsin.gov**

Pre Topic:

No specific pre topic given

Topic:

Local bridge grant program

Instructions:

See attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/P1	agary 10/13/2011	kfollett 10/18/2011	rschluet 10/18/2011	_____	ggodwin 10/18/2011		S&L
/P2	agary 10/25/2011	kfollett 10/25/2011	rschluet 10/26/2011	_____	mbarman 10/26/2011		S&L
/P3	agary 02/29/2012	kfollett 03/02/2012		_____			S&L
/1			jfrantze	_____	mbarman	mbarman	S&L

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
			03/02/2012 _____		03/02/2012	03/05/2012	

FE Sent For:

<END>

2011 DRAFTING REQUEST

Bill

Received: **08/30/2011**

Received By: **agary**

Wanted: **As time permits**

Companion to LRB:

For: **Jerry Petrowski (608) 266-1182**

By/Representing: **Tim Fiocchi**

May Contact:

Drafter: **agary**

Subject: **Transportation - highways**

Addl. Drafters:

Extra Copies: **EVM**

Submit via email: **YES**

Requester's email: **Rep.Petrowski@legis.wisconsin.gov**

Carbon copy (CC:) to: **aaron.gary@legis.wisconsin.gov**

Pre Topic:

No specific pre topic given

Topic:

Local bridge grant program

Instructions:

See attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/P1	agary 10/13/2011	kfollett 10/18/2011	rschluet 10/18/2011	_____	ggodwin 10/18/2011		S&L
/P2	agary 10/25/2011	kfollett 10/25/2011	rschluet 10/26/2011	_____	mbarman 10/26/2011		S&L
/P3	agary 02/29/2012	kfollett 03/02/2012		_____			S&L
/1			jfrantze	_____	mbarman		S&L

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
			03/02/2012 _____		03/02/2012		

FE Sent For:

<END>

2011 DRAFTING REQUEST

Bill

Received: **08/30/2011**

Received By: **agary**

Wanted: **As time permits**

Companion to LRB:

For: **Jerry Petrowski (608) 266-1182**

By/Representing: **Tim Fiocchi**

May Contact:

Drafter: **agary**

Subject: **Transportation - highways**

Addl. Drafters:

Extra Copies: **EVM**

Submit via email: **YES**

Requester's email: **Rep.Petrowski@legis.wisconsin.gov**

Carbon copy (CC:) to: **aaron.gary@legis.wisconsin.gov**

Pre Topic:

No specific pre topic given

Topic:

Local bridge grant program

Instructions:

See attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/P1	agary 10/13/2011	kfollett 10/18/2011	rschluet 10/18/2011		ggodwin 10/18/2011		S&L
/P2	agary 10/25/2011	kfollett 10/25/2011	rschluet 10/26/2011		mbarman 10/26/2011		S&L

FE Sent For:

<END>

2011 DRAFTING REQUEST

Bill

Received: **08/30/2011**

Received By: **agary**

Wanted: **As time permits**

Companion to LRB:

For: **Jerry Petrowski (608) 266-1182**

By/Representing: **Tim Fiocchi**

May Contact:

Drafter: **agary**

Subject: **Transportation - highways**

Addl. Drafters:

Extra Copies: **EVM**

Submit via email: **YES**

Requester's email: **Rep.Petrowski@legis.wisconsin.gov**

Carbon copy (CC:) to: **aaron.gary@legis.wisconsin.gov**

Pre Topic:

No specific pre topic given

Topic:

Local bridge grant program

Instructions:

See attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/P1	agary 10/13/2011	kfollett 10/18/2011	rschluet 10/18/2011		ggodwin 10/18/2011		S&L

FE Sent For:

1 P2 5 f S
10/25
10/25/11

<END>

2011 DRAFTING REQUEST

Bill

Received: **08/30/2011**

Received By: **agary**

Wanted: **As time permits**

Companion to LRB:

For: **Jerry Petrowski (608) 266-1182**

By/Representing: **Tim Fiocchi**

May Contact:

Drafter: **agary**

Subject: **Transportation - highways**

Addl. Drafters:

Extra Copies: **EVM**

Submit via email: **YES**

Requester's email: **Rep.Petrowski@legis.wisconsin.gov**

Carbon copy (CC:) to: **aaron.gary@legis.wisconsin.gov**

Pre Topic:

No specific pre topic given

Topic:

Local bridge grant program

Instructions:

See attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/P1	agary	1/11/11 10/18/11		_____	_____		S&L

FE Sent For:

<END>

Gary, Aaron

From: Gary, Aaron
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 2:50 PM
To: Fiocchi, Tim
Subject: RE: Draft for Rep. Petrowski

I am also a little confused about the purpose of the program. The bottom of the description suggests a grant program where county and local governments would be the eligible applicants for grant funds. Presumably the grant funds would be used on local (county and municipality) bridge projects. However, the initial description of the program also refers to state bridges. Can DOT use money from the program directly for DOT state bridge projects? Or is the intent that money would only go to local govts. (for bridge projects constructed by the local govt.? To help the local govt. cover its matching costs on a DOT-constructed bridge project?) If some money is to be used by DOT and some money parceled out by DOT as grants to local govts., what kind of allocation did you envision and do you want to ensure in the statute that DOT doesn't retain all but a nominal amount for itself?

Aaron

Aaron R. Gary
Attorney, Legislative Reference Bureau
608.261.6926 (voice)
608.264.6948 (fax)
aaron.gary@legis.state.wi.us

From: Gary, Aaron
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 1:34 PM
To: Fiocchi, Tim
Cc: Kreye, Joseph
Subject: RE: Draft for Rep. Petrowski

Tim,

I have entered this as LRB-2764.

I have never seen anything quite like this before. Are these bonds going to be repaid only from the sales tax revenues, or partly from the sales tax revenues? When a revenue stream is identified for repayment of bonds, I believe they are by definition revenue bonds and not G.O. (general obligation) bonds. There is a different way of drafting G.O. bonding and revenue bonding. Can you give me any more information on which this would be?

Is funding for this program limited to bond proceeds, i.e. no state, federal, or local appropriations would need to be created?

Will these bridge projects also be eligible for other project funding under existing programs (current law)?

Thanks. Aaron

Aaron R. Gary
Attorney, Legislative Reference Bureau
608.261.6926 (voice)
608.264.6948 (fax)
aaron.gary@legis.state.wi.us

From: Fiocchi, Tim
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 9:58 AM
To: Gary, Aaron

Subject: Draft for Rep. Petrowski

Hi Aaron,

We would like to get a preliminary draft of a bill as described below as quickly as possible. I'll give you a call momentarily.

Tim

Draft: Priority Route State and Local Bridge Improvement Program

The DOT shall create a Priority Route State and Local Bridge Improvement Program to provide funding for state and local bridge projects on contiguous routes identified by the department and local governments as high priorities for freight transportation. Greatest weight in the program shall be given to routes which could be or are being used by trucks transporting loads exceeding 80,000 pounds.

The program will be supported by \$400 million in GO bonding, the debt service for which shall be supported by the designation \$30 million of sales tax revenue from the sale of automobiles and parts starting in 2014.

Local and county governments could apply for funding in the form of grants from the program and could prioritize their application list to best facilitate the shortest available routes.

Tim Fiocchi
Clerk, Assembly Transportation Committee
Office of Representative Jerry Petrowski
(608) 266-1182

Mc for Tin

8/31

- designated route along which
(80,000 pounds)

- DOT → own projects

+ → grants to local govts.

• just GO bonds → not sales tax

(paid from general fund)

Gary, Aaron

From: Fiocchi, Tim
To: Gary, Aaron
Subject: Re: Local Priority Bridge Program

Yes, GPR.

Sent from my Verizon Wireless Phone

----- Reply message -----
From: "Gary, Aaron" <Aaron.Gary@legis.wisconsin.gov>
Date: Tue, Oct 11, 2011 9:34 am
Subject: Local Priority Bridge Program
To: "Fiocchi, Tim" <Tim.Fiocchi@legis.wisconsin.gov>

OK. I might have a few more questions as a draft, but just as an initial matter, I wanted to confirm that you did mean \$5 M GPR, not SEG (from transportation fund). Thanks. Aaron

Aaron R. Gary
Attorney, Legislative Reference Bureau
608.261.6926 (voice)
608.264.6948 (fax)
aaron.gary@legis.state.wi.us

From: Fiocchi, Tim
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2011 9:05 AM
To: Gary, Aaron
Cc: Punches, Derek
Subject: Local Priority Bridge Program
Importance: High

Good morning Aaron,

Attached is a memo providing more detail on the Local Priority Bridge Program we had been working on. As you will see in the memo, the funding has changed (this would be \$5 million GPR - not bonding) and we've flushed out more details. After reviewing the memo and talking with Jerry about it, we would like to order a P draft that reflects the details of the memo with the exception of item 5 on page 2. For item 5, we do not want to require the locals to deal with describing the truck configuration.

If possible we would like to have a draft to review by October 28th. Let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Tim

From: Donald Ludlow [mailto:dludlow@camsys.com]
Sent: Monday, October 10, 2011 2:59 PM
To: Fiocchi, Tim
Cc: Krieser, Steven - DOT; Lynch, Peter G - DOT
Subject: Local Truck Access / Bridge Improvement Program
Importance: High

Tim,

Please find attached a draft document outlining potential parameters for grant application and evaluation under the proposed local bridge program. This is not scripted in legalese, so I'll leave it up to your drafting staff to change the "woulds" to "shalls". This was developed quickly and has not yet been reviewed by the Department, so they may have comment too. For now, it should get you started and hopefully moving in the right direction. Let me know if you have any questions. I am in the office most of the week.

Regards, Donald

Donald B. Ludlow, AICP
Cambridge Systematics, Inc.
4800 Hampden Lane, Suite 800
Bethesda, MD 20814
dir 301 347 9106
tel 301 347 0100
fax 301 347 0101
e-mail dludlow@camsys.com
www.camsys.com

Wisconsin Truck Access Program

Background

To improve the competitiveness of freight-intensive industries in Wisconsin, the State Assembly is considering legislation that would increase truck weight limits to 90,000-pounds gross vehicle weight (GVW) on 6-axes for motor carriers currently using 80,000-lb. five-axle or larger truck configurations¹. Higher-weight trucks increase the transportation productivity of freight-hauling industries by lowering the per-truck cost of shipment, affecting the intermediate and final prices of goods produced in the State. As demonstrated in the Wisconsin Truck Size and Weight Study, broad use of the 90,000-lb. 6-axle truck configuration could lower the costs of transport shipment, safety, congestion, and pavement damage statewide. These savings are realized because the 90,000-lb. configurations move more freight in fewer trucks, resulting in less vehicle miles traveled (VMT) than the typical 80,000-lb. five-axle truck. Because the 90,000-lb. six-axle (90-6) truck spreads weight over an additional axle versus the 80,000-lb. five-axle truck, it damages pavements less intensively. However, because the GVW is higher, some bridge structures may require upgrade or replacement to accommodate heavier trucks.

As part of the proposed legislation to allow the 90-6 truck, the State Assembly would enact a local bridge grant program administered by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT). The local bridge grant program would provide \$4 to \$5 million annually to counties or municipalities through a competitive grant process. The grant monies would be used to upgrade or rebuild deficient bridges on 90-6 truck access routes to freight-generating businesses, including agricultural, forestry, or manufacturing facilities. The funding could also be used to improve bridges on routes used by other heavy configurations currently allowed by State Statute including 98,000-lb. 6-axle trucks (98-6) carrying raw forest products. Without the bridge improvement program some trucks would be forced to divert circuitously around deficient or obsolete bridges, potentially increasing the overall VMT in some local jurisdictions. For example, some 98-6 trucks currently divert miles around deficient bridges in rural timber-producing counties and municipalities.

Grant Application

To obtain grant monies, a county or municipality would submit a grant application to WisDOT with justification for the funding request. Applicants would meet basic program requirements, including demonstration of a local match of at least ten percent of the bridge improvement cost. To evaluate and prioritize grant awards, WisDOT would also require specific information about the trucking operations affected with and without proposed bridge improvements. To collect this information, the grant applicant would work closely with local industries and carriers to populate the application.

Once enacted, WisDOT would develop standardized grant application and submittal procedures. The grant application would contain, at a minimum, the following:

¹ The State already allows a 98,000-lb. six-axle truck configuration for raw forestry products.

1. Applicant information (e.g., county, municipality), the sponsoring agency (e.g. public works), and primary contact (e.g. chief engineer, county executive);
2. Description of the current truck route under existing law, including the location of the freight-generating facility (e.g. milk processing plant, grain elevator) and a description of the route indicating road/route name/number, mileage between key points, and total mileage between the freight-generating facility and the closest common point on the existing versus detour route (see 6 below);
3. Information on the types of trucks that currently use the route, including average gross vehicle and axle weights, if available, from inspection reports or traffic data;
4. Description of the type of existing trucks that shippers / carriers expect to divert to the higher-weight truck, including axle spacings, average gross vehicle and axle weights;
5. Description of how the shippers / carriers expect truck configurations would change under the higher weight limits, including a description of the configuration (axle spacings, average gross vehicle and axle weights), and a five-year projection of future truck volumes on the route under the higher weight allowances;
6. Description of the detour route the heavier trucks would utilize if bridge repairs are not made, with a comparison to the current truck route described in the application. The description should indicate road/route name/number, mileage between key points, and total mileage between the freight-generating facility and the closest common point on the existing versus detour route.
7. Identification of bridge(s) on the route that require repair or replacement to accommodate the heavier loads expected on the route;
8. Elaboration on the type(s) of improvement, estimated cost, construction time period, potential start date (with funds and without funds), and other pertinent engineering details; and

Contents of the final grant application and the process of submitting and evaluating the grant applications will be determined by the Department of Transportation through regulation. As part of the rulemaking process, WisDOT may engage the private sector and bill sponsors to refine the grant program parameters and evaluation methodology.

Grant Evaluation

The Department of Transportation would develop a process for evaluating and awarding the grant applications on a case-by-case basis. At a minimum, the process would consider the following:

1. Changes in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and truck payload-ton miles from the conversion to heavier trucks;
2. The difference in mileage (VMT) and payload ton-miles under two scenarios:

- 2.1. With heavier truck weights allowed but route access restricted because of deficient or obsolete bridge(s), and
- 2.2. With heavier truck weights allowed and no route access restrictions;
3. Estimates of system user benefits and impacts, public agency benefits and impacts, and net benefits and impacts following the general methodology of the Wisconsin Truck Size and Weight Study and using the VMT and payload-truck miles estimates derived from the grant applications,
 - 3.1. System user benefits and impacts may include changes in transportation costs (e.g. carrier and shipper costs) and highway safety;
 - 3.2. Public agency benefits and impacts may include changes in pavement wear and bridge improvement costs attributable to the trucks (existing and higher-weight); and
 - 3.3. Net benefits and impacts expressed as a ratio of all benefits (savings) to impacts (costs) from 3.1 and 3.2 including bridge improvement costs; and
4. Other criteria as determined by WisDOT, including the impacts on freight-intensive industries and facilities, local need, local economic impacts, environmental impacts, and other factors as determined by the Department.



in 10/13
wanted
by 10/20



PRELIMINARY DRAFT - NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

D-note

Gen

1 AN ACT ...; **relating to:** creating a local bridge grant program, providing an
2 exemption from emergency rule procedures, granting rule-making authority,
3 and making an appropriation.

Analysis by the Legislative Reference Bureau

This bill creates a local bridge grant program administered by the Department of Transportation (DOT). Under the program, DOT awards grants to counties, cities, villages, and towns (political subdivisions) for the improvement, rehabilitation, or reconstruction of local bridges on highway routes that provide access, for heavy vehicles transporting freight, between state trunk highways and freight origin or destination points off the state trunk highway system. Under the bill, a "heavy vehicle" is a vehicle that is legally operating at a gross vehicle weight exceeding 80,000 pounds. Grants are awarded from a new DOT appropriation from the general fund and grant recipients must make a matching local contribution of at least ten percent of the total cost of the local bridge project. DOT must, by rule, prescribe the form of the grant application, establish the process for submitting applications, and establish the procedures and criteria for evaluating applications and awarding grants. However, these rules must contain specified provisions. Until permanent rules are promulgated, DOT may operate the program using emergency rule authority.

X

10

1 (c) "Local bridge" means a bridge that is not on the state trunk highway system
2 or on routes of the state trunk highway system designated as connecting highways
3 under s. 86.32.

4 (d) "Local bridge project" means a project for the improvement, rehabilitation,
5 or reconstruction of a local bridge and may include planning, design, and engineering
6 work as well as necessary approach work for the bridge.

7 (e) "Political subdivision" means any city, village, town, or county.

8 (2) PROGRAM. The department shall administer a local bridge grant program
9 to award grants to political subdivisions for the improvement, rehabilitation, or
10 reconstruction of local bridges on highway routes that provide access, for heavy
11 vehicles transporting freight, between the state trunk highway system and freight
12 origin or destination points off the state trunk highway system.

13 (3) GRANTS. (a) The department shall award grants under this section to
14 political subdivisions from the appropriation under s. 20.395 (2) (ec).

15 (b) Each political subdivision that receives a grant under this section shall
16 provide a local contribution toward the costs of the local bridge project in an amount
17 equal to at least 10 percent of the total project costs.

18 (4) APPLICATIONS. (a) Any political subdivision may apply to the department
19 for a grant under this section.

20 (b) The department shall, by rule, prescribe the form of the application, except
21 that the application shall require the applicant to provide all of the following
22 information as it relates to the proposed local bridge project identified in the
23 application:

24 1. A description of the local bridge project for which the application is made,
25 including identification of any local bridge to be improved, rehabilitated, or

1 reconstructed as part of the project and the type of work to be performed, a statement
2 as to whether the proposed local bridge project would allow the bridge to
3 accommodate heavier vehicles, identification of any access route for which the local
4 bridge is relevant, an estimate of the total cost of the local bridge project, and an
5 estimate of the timeline for the local bridge project with alternative scenarios
6 depending on whether or not a grant is awarded under this section for the project.

7 2. A description of the applicable access route used, at the time of the
8 application, by vehicles transporting freight, including identification of the
9 applicable origin or destination of the freight, identification of highway names or
10 numbers, mileage between key points along the access route, and the total mileage
11 of the access route.

12 3. A description of the applicable access route that heavy vehicles would utilize
13 if the proposed local bridge project were not completed, with a comparison to the
14 access route described in subd. 2. This description shall include the same types of
15 information specified in subd. 2., but as it pertains to the different route identified
16 under this subdivision.

17 4. A description of the applicable access route that heavy vehicles would utilize
18 if the proposed local bridge project were completed, with a comparison to the access
19 route described in subd. 2. This description shall include the same types of
20 information specified in subd. 2., but as it pertains to the different route identified
21 under this subdivision.

22 5. Information about the types of vehicles that use the access route described
23 in subd. 2., as of the time of the application, including average gross vehicle weight
24 and axle weights, if available, as obtained from inspection reports or traffic data.

1 5. A description of the types of vehicles that are expected to be replaced by
2 heavy vehicles if the proposed local bridge project were completed and a description
3 of these replacement heavy vehicles, including average gross vehicle weight and axle
4 weights as well as axle spacing.

5 6. A 5-year projection of future vehicle volumes on the access route described
6 in subd. 4. if the proposed local bridge project were completed.

7 7. A demonstration of the applicant's ability to satisfy the requirement under
8 sub. (3) (b).

9 (5) PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA. (a) The department shall, by rule, establish the
10 process for submitting applications under this section and the procedures and
11 criteria for evaluating applications and awarding grants under this section. Subject
12 to par. (b), in evaluating applications and awarding grants under this section, the
13 department may consider any criteria determined to be pertinent by the department,
14 including impacts on freight-intensive industries and facilities, local needs, local
15 economic impacts, environmental impacts, and other factors.

16 (b) The rules under par. (a) shall require the department, in evaluating
17 applications and awarding grants, to consider all of the following:

18 1. The extent to which, if heavy vehicles are expected to replace other vehicles
19 on any applicable access route, there would be a resulting change in the number of
20 vehicle miles traveled and vehicle payload-ton miles on the access route.

21 2. Assuming heavy vehicles will replace other vehicles as described in subd. 1.,
22 the difference in the number of vehicle miles traveled and vehicle payload-ton miles
23 on the applicable access route if the proposed local bridge project is completed in
24 comparison to the same information if the local bridge project is not completed.

1 3. Estimates of highway system user benefits and impacts, public agency
 2 benefits and impacts, and net benefits and impacts following the general
 3 methodology of the department's Wisconsin Truck Size and Weight Study, dated June
 4 15, 2009, and using the information described in subds. 1. and 2. For purposes of this
 5 subdivision, the department may consider benefits in terms of monetary savings and
 6 impacts in terms of monetary expenditures. Highway system user benefits and
 7 impacts may include changes in transportation costs for motor carriers, shippers,
 8 and others, as well as highway safety considerations. Public agency benefits and
 9 impacts may include changes in pavement wear and bridge improvement costs
 10 attributable to the vehicles, including heavy vehicles. The department shall
 11 calculate net benefits and impacts as a ratio of all highway system user and public
 12 agency benefits to all highway system user and public agency impacts, including
 13 local bridge project expenditures.

SECTION 4. Nonstatutory provisions.

15 (1) The department of transportation shall submit in proposed form the rules
 16 required under section 84.182 (4) (b) and (5) (a) of the statutes, as created by this act,
 17 to the legislative council staff under section 227.15 (1) of the statutes no later than
 18 the first day of the 4th month beginning after the effective date of this subsection.

19 (2) Using the procedure under section 227.24 of the statutes, the department
 20 of transportation shall promulgate rules required under section 84.182 (4) (b) and (5)
 21 (a) of the statutes, as created by this act, for the period before the effective date of the
 22 permanent rules promulgated under section 84.182 (4) (b) and (5) (a) of the statutes,
 23 as created by this act, but not to exceed the period authorized under section 227.24
 24 (1) (c) of the statutes, subject to extension under section 227.24 (2) of the statutes.
 25 Notwithstanding section 227.24 (1) (a), (2) (b), and (3) of the statutes, the department

lps:
check
spacing

1 is not required to provide evidence that promulgating a rule under this subsection
2 as an emergency rule is necessary for the preservation of public peace, health, safety,
3 or welfare and is not required to provide a finding of an emergency for a rule
4 promulgated under this subsection.

5 **SECTION 5. Effective dates.** This act takes effect on the first day of the 4th
6 month beginning after publication, except as follows:

7 (1) The treatment of SECTION 4 (1) and (2) of this act take effect on the day after
8 publication.

9 (END)

D-note

**DRAFTER'S NOTE
FROM THE
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU**

LRB-2764/P1dn

ARG: *kgf*

Date

ATTN: Tim Fiocchi

Please review the attached draft carefully to ensure that it is consistent with your intent.

This bill provides money, from the general fund, to be used exclusively for making grants to local governments. The bill does not include any federal or local funds appropriations and does not provide any additional money to DOT for the cost of administering the program. Please advise if this is not consistent with your intent.

Making the proposed language consistent with statutory style involved some modification and interpretation of the instructions provided. I also omitted from the requirements of the grant application contents that are axiomatic and that DOT will certainly require by rule.

I note that DOT already provides local bridge assistance and has a local bridge program. However, the program in this draft is significantly different from programs under current law.

Please let me know if you would like any changes made to the attached draft or if you have any questions. If the attached draft meets with your approval, let me know and I will convert it to an introducible "1" draft.

Aaron R. Gary
Legislative Attorney
Phone: (608) 261-6926
E-mail: aaron.gary@legis.state.wi.us

**DRAFTER'S NOTE
FROM THE
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU**

LRB-2764/P1dn
ARG:kjf:rs

October 18, 2011

ATTN: Tim Fiocchi

Please review the attached draft carefully to ensure that it is consistent with your intent.

This bill provides money, from the general fund, to be used exclusively for making grants to local governments. The bill does not include any federal or local funds appropriations and does not provide any additional money to DOT for the cost of administering the program. Please advise if this is not consistent with your intent.

Making the proposed language consistent with statutory style involved some modification and interpretation of the instructions provided. I also omitted from the requirements of the grant application contents that are axiomatic and that DOT will certainly require by rule.

I note that DOT already provides local bridge assistance and has a local bridge program. However, the program in this draft is significantly different from programs under current law.

Please let me know if you would like any changes made to the attached draft or if you have any questions. If the attached draft meets with your approval, let me know and I will convert it to an introducible "/1" draft.

Aaron R. Gary
Legislative Attorney
Phone: (608) 261-6926
E-mail: aaron.gary@legis.state.wi.us

Gary, Aaron

From: Fiocchi, Tim
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2011 8:55 AM
To: Gary, Aaron
Subject: RE: LRB 11-2764/P1 Topic: Local bridge grant program

Hi Aaron,

Sorry for the delay. Per item 7, let's delete the language and do a P2 draft.

Thank you,

Tim

From: Gary, Aaron
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2011 3:57 PM
To: Fiocchi, Tim
Subject: RE: LRB 11-2764/P1 Topic: Local bridge grant program

Hi Tim,

It's been a really busy week, so I am just getting to this.

I've made changes 1. to 3., 5. and 6. As to 4. and 7., specific changes aren't described, but I wanted to reply to the comments.

On item 4., "connecting highways" are STHs that locals maintain - they are not eligible for funding under the program. The language at p. 3, line 2 is an exclusion for connecting highways from the program.

On item 7., I tried to copy the instruction language as best as I could. I find it very confusing and I really have no idea how it would be carried out by DOT "in the real world." These provisions are just guidelines for DOT in its rulemaking, and these rules will still be subject to legislative approval. So to the extent you are not comfortable with that language at the end of 3. on p. 6, I don't see any downside in taking it out.

I'm ready to put the /P2 into editing, whenever you give me the green light. Call or e-mail if you have other questions or want to discuss further.

Thanks. Aaron

Aaron R. Gary
Attorney, Legislative Reference Bureau
608.261.6926 (voice)
608.264.6948 (fax)
aaron.gary@legis.state.wi.us

From: Fiocchi, Tim
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2011 4:28 PM
To: Gary, Aaron
Subject: LRB 11-2764/P1 Topic: Local bridge grant program

Hi Aaron,

Thank you for getting us the draft so quickly. I have a few changes and would like to get a P2 draft as I think we'll want to get some feedback before we're ready to go with this.

1. The appropriation should start in 2012-13.
2. I don't know an amount but there should be (per your note) a small appropriation and partial position authority for

- administration. .2 FTE? Like I say we'll want a P2 to share with DOT and others.
3. On Page 2 Line 15 – I'm not sure how to phrase this but I don't want to require that the route be "between any part of the state trunk highway system" and the destination. I guess I'm not sure if the language needs to be changed or not, but I'm thinking of examples like Goldn Plump Poultry where the bridge may be between several large farms and their processing plant, but might not include any state highway. The same language is included on page 3 line 11. Let me know if you think this needs to be clarified.
 4. On Page 3 Line 2 we include "connecting highways" as eligible for funding under the program. I'm going to check with LFB about how those roads are funded to see if we want to include this. My concern is that these are state funded roads and that allowing them to be eligible will take away from the local bridges.
 5. Page 4 Line 24 – we specifically want local governments to consult with their local businesses so we should probably include a phrase on the end of that sentence like ", as obtained from inspection reports, traffic data, or from local industry officials."
 6. Page 5 Line 5 I would like to delete item 7. I don't want the locals to be spending a ton of money trying to come up with projected estimates they won't be able to figure out themselves.
 7. Finally on page 6 line 11 I am concerned that the phrase "net benefits and impacts as a ratio of all highway system user and public agency benefits" takes away from the focus of the program. We want to keep the program solely focused on funding bridges to allow for the 80,000+ pound truck traffic.

Thanks again for getting this to us so quickly. I'll talk with LFB tomorrow and if you have time maybe we can talk later in the day/week.

Tim

Tim Fiocchi
Clerk, Assembly Transportation Committee
Office of Representative Jerry Petrowski
(608) 266-1182