



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873
Email: fiscal.bureau@legis.wisconsin.gov • Website: <http://legis.wisconsin.gov/lfb>

2017

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #610

Local Roads Improvement Program (Transportation -- Local Transportation Assistance)

Base Agency

[LFB 2017-19 Budget Summary: Page 438, #1]

CURRENT LAW

The local roads improvement program (LRIP) provides formula-based and discretionary grants of state funds on a biennial basis for capital improvements on existing county, town, and municipal (city or village) roads, and for feasibility studies for such improvements. For the purposes of the program, a capital improvement is defined as a project with a projected design life of at least 10 years. Grants may cover up to 50% of the total project cost, with the balance being provided, generally, by the local recipient. All costs of improvements are initially the responsibility of the local government. Upon completion of a project, a local government can apply to the Department of Transportation (DOT) for reimbursement of up to 50% of the project costs.

GOVERNOR

Provide \$7,000,000 SEG annually for LRIP and \$6,067,200 SEG-L annually to reflect the local government share of project costs. Specify that the SEG funding be allocated as follows: (a) \$2,336,000 annually for the formula-based component of the program; and (b) \$4,664,000 annually for the discretionary grant component of the program. Of the \$4,664,000 annual funding increase for the discretionary component of the program, \$373,000 would be provided to counties, \$4,023,500 would be provided to municipalities (cities and villages), and \$267,500 would be provided to towns.

The bill would increase the annual statutory distribution of discretionary LRIP funding in 2017-18, and thereafter as follows: (a) the amount provided to counties from \$5,127,000 to \$5,500,000; (b) the amount provided to municipalities from \$976,500 to \$5,000,000; and (c) the

amount provided to towns from \$5,732,500 to \$6,000,000. In addition, increase the allowable reimbursement amount for program applicants under the discretionary portion of the program by specifying that applicants would instead be eligible for reimbursement of not more than 60% of eligible costs (compared to 50% under current law). Applicants under the entitlement portion of the program would continue to be reimbursed for not more than 50% of eligible project costs. Specify that these modifications related to the share of project cost to be reimbursed would first apply to a project commenced on the effective date of the bill.

DISCUSSION POINTS

Background

1. LRIP is one of several DOT local assistance programs intended to function as a mechanism to assist local governments in the funding of substantial capital improvements on their transportation systems. In the case of LRIP, eligible projects must be designed to last at least 10 years. The program is divided into a formula-based component and a discretionary grant component, each with its own appropriation. Both of these components are further divided into county, town, and municipal subcomponents.

2. In general, the formulas for awarding these funds are based on proportionate share of population and road mileage. Of the funds appropriated for the formula-based component, the statutes specify that 43% are to be allocated to county projects, while towns and municipalities are each allocated 28.5%. The LRIP formula component generally provides funding for a large number of smaller projects across the state.

3. The discretionary component is designed to fund a smaller number of higher-cost projects. Of the funds appropriated for the discretionary grant component, the Department is required to fund a statutorily-specified amount each year. As with project selection for towns and small municipalities under the LRIP formula component, committees of local government representatives are established to choose projects for the discretionary programs. In the case of the town and municipal discretionary programs, the respective committees choose projects from applications received on a statewide basis. The DOT Secretary makes appointments to these committees from representatives of the local government associations. For the county discretionary program, the funding allocated for discretionary projects is distributed in blocks to eight different regions in proportion to the total funding the counties in each region receive in the formula-based component of the program.

4. Historical funding allocations for these program components are shown in the following table.

TABLE 1**LRIP Funding Allocations Since 2007-09
(\$ in Millions)**

<u>Biennium</u>	<u>Formula</u>	<u>% Change</u>	<u>Discretionary</u>	<u>% Change</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>% Change</u>
2007-09	\$34.2		\$14.4		\$48.6	
2009-11	32.4	-5.3%	13.7	-4.9%	46.1	-5.1%
2011-13	32.0	-1.2	23.7	73.0	55.7	20.8
2013-15	32.0	0.0	23.3	-1.7	55.3	-0.7
2015-17	32.0	0.0	23.7	1.7	55.7	0.7
2017-19*	<u>36.7</u>	14.6	<u>33.0</u>	39.2	<u>69.7</u>	25.2
Total	\$199.3		\$131.8		\$331.1	

*Governor's recommendation.

Funding Level

5. The following table reflects biennial funding for LRIP for 2015-17 and under the recommended 2017-19 funding level for these program components. In total, the Governor's LRIP recommendations for the 2017-19 biennium would provide a 25.2% increase to the overall program funding. This funding increase is part of the administration's focus on maintaining and rehabilitating the existing highway system in the state. [Alternative A1]

TABLE 2**Current Law and Governor's Recommended Biennial LRIP Funding**

	<u>2015-17*</u>	<u>Governor 2017-19</u>	<u>Difference</u>	<u>% Change</u>
Formula-Based Allocation				
Counties (43%)	\$13,756,732	\$15,765,692	\$2,008,960	14.6%
Municipalities (28.5%)	9,117,834	10,449,354	1,331,520	14.6
Towns (28.5%)	<u>9,117,834</u>	<u>10,449,354</u>	<u>1,331,520</u>	14.6
Total Formula Funds	\$31,992,400	\$36,664,400	\$4,672,000	
Discretionary Allocation				
Counties	\$10,254,000	\$11,000,000	\$746,000	7.3%
Municipalities	1,953,000	10,000,000	8,047,000	412.0
Towns	<u>11,465,000</u>	<u>12,000,000</u>	<u>535,000</u>	4.7
Total Discretionary Funds	\$23,672,000	\$33,000,000	\$9,328,000	
Biennial Program Total	\$55,664,400	\$69,664,400	\$14,000,000	25.2%

*Total, biennial LRIP funding is equal to \$56,066,000. Of this amount, \$401,600 from the formula-based allocation supports 3.0 positions in DNR for the environmental review of local road projects under current law and under the bill. This amount is deducted from the total prior to calculating the percentage-based formula allocations shown in the top section of the table.

6. Although all local government types would receive an increase under the Governor's recommendation, these increases would have disparate effects relative to the proportionate share of LRIP funding that each local government would receive. As shown in the following table, each local government's share of LRIP funding has changed over time. Counties' proportionate share of total LRIP funding declined from 52.5% in 2007-09 to 43.1% in 2015-17, and would decline again to 38.4% under the Governor's recommendations. For municipalities, the share of total LRIP funding declined from 24.3% in 2007-09 to 19.9% in 2015-17, but would increase to 29.4% under the recommendation. The town share of total LRIP funding increased from 23.2% in 2007-09 to 37.0% in 2015-17, but under the Governor's recommendation, this share would decrease to 32.2%.

TABLE 3

Proportionate Share of LRIP Funding by Government Type

Government Type	<u>2007-09</u>	<u>2009-11</u>	<u>2011-13</u>	<u>2013-15</u>	<u>2015-17</u>	<u>2017-19*</u>
Counties	52.5%	52.5%	43.1%	42.7%	43.1%	38.4%
Municipalities	24.3	24.3	19.9	20.0	19.9	29.4
Towns	23.2	23.2	37.0	37.2	37.0	32.2

*Governor's recommendation.

7. Wisconsin has 72 counties, 600 municipalities (cities and villages) and 1,253 towns. Population and transportation cost-related information related to these local governmental units is shown below.

TABLE 4

Local Government Population and Transportation-Related Metrics

	<u>Estimated Population (In Millions)</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>Centerline Miles</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>Average Transportation-Related Costs (\$ in Millions)</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Counties	--	--	19,900	19.5%	\$561.4	26.9%
Municipalities	4.11	71.5	20,200	19.8	1,171.1	56.2
Towns	<u>1.64</u>	<u>28.5</u>	<u>61,800</u>	<u>60.6</u>	<u>351.4</u>	<u>16.9</u>
Total	5.75	100.0	101,900	100.0%	\$2,083.9	100.0%

8. On the basis of share of total population (71.5%) and total, transportation related costs (56.2%), some may contend that municipalities should receive a larger percentage of LRIP funding than they would receive under the Governor's budget recommendations (29.4%). On a share of total centerline miles basis, others may argue that towns (60.6%), with their comparably smaller tax base, should continue to receive a relatively high percentage of overall LRIP funding. Alternatively, supporters of providing additional funding for counties may point to the fact that counties have

experienced an ongoing decline in their share of overall LRIP funding since 2007-09. Any change to the funding allocation under the Governor would require a decrease in the Governor's recommended funding for one local government type in order to increase the recommended funding to another local government type.

Targeting Aid

9. The attachment provides 2015 local highway condition data by county, based on rated concrete and asphalt roads in the state. The basis for this data was presented by the Legislative Audit Bureau, as part of the recent audit of DOT's state highway program. Approximately 6,230 miles of the 70,770 rated miles (8.8%) were rated as in poor and below condition. However, some counties contained a significantly higher percentage of miles in poor and below condition than others. As an illustration of this point, 12 of the 72 counties listed in the attachment have a percentage of rated highway miles in poor and below condition that is equal to at least 1.5 times the statewide average of 8.8%.

10. Recognizing the differences in local road conditions among counties, the Committee could specify that \$2.5 million annually of the recommended increase for the municipalities' discretionary component instead be used to target projects on local highways in poor and below condition. This would reduce the recommended funding increase to the municipal discretionary program component by \$5.0 million in the biennium, from \$8.0 million to approximately \$3.0 million (a more than 150% increase over the base level funding \$2.0 million). This funding could be provided to a separate discretionary allocation for use only on local highways in poor and below condition, as defined by DOT, in the counties of state with percentages of local highways in poor and below conditions equal to at least 1.5 times the statewide average (8.8% in 2015) each year. Using the local highway conditions listed in the attachment, projects in the following 12 counties would have met the 1.5 times the statewide average test (13.2% or more of roads in poor and below conditions) and been eligible for the supplemental LRIP funding in that year: (a) Eau Claire; (b) Monroe; (c) Douglas; (d) Price; (e) Dunn; (f) Green Lake; (g) Bayfield; (h) Jackson; (i) Dodge; (j) Crawford; (k) Ashland; and (l) Washburn. To facilitate the implementation of this alternative, the Committee could require DOT to promulgate administrative rules that would determine the supplemental funding application process, applicant eligibility, and funding award timeline for each biennium. Funding awarded under this supplemental program could not exceed \$500,000 for an individual project, but in order to assist financially constrained localities, the reimbursable local share of total project cost would equal a minimum of 20% (as compared to the 50% current law maximum), with the remainder of the costs paid by the state. [Alternative A2].

11. However, some may contend that poor highway conditions in a given local jurisdiction may, to an extent, reflect the political and fiscal decisions made by that jurisdiction. Supporters of this position may perceive the provision of additional state funds to these units of government as subsidizing local decisions to disinvest in infrastructure.

12. Some have indicated that local businesses or private sector interests are willing to contribute private funds to assist local governments with infrastructure investments that also benefit those private entities. These projects may not be the highest ranking need of local governments, but funding them could encourage private investment in public infrastructure. If the Committee is

interested in encouraging such investment, it could adopt an alternative that would require LRIP project selection committees within the discretionary program component to give preference to LRIP applications that include matching funds equal to at least 10% of total, estimated project costs from one or more private entities. Under this alternative, the local share of reimbursable costs for such projects would be equal to 50% of total project costs, with the remainder paid by the state and private funds. DOT could be required to promulgate administrative rules to implement this program change. [Alternative A3]

Discussion on State and Local Transportation Infrastructure Demands

13. Given demands on both state and local transportation infrastructure and the limited state resources currently available to meet those needs, one policy discussion that confronts the state is whether it can afford to increase funding for local roads at time when the state is having difficulty funding the state's transportation infrastructure needs. Whether or not the state should provide local governments with additional flexibility to generate the needed revenues at the local level to maintain their roads and/or retain statewide transportation fund revenues to meet state infrastructure needs is the significant policy question associated with the Governor's recommendation on local road funding. The next several points provide further discussion of this policy concern.

14. During the Committee's public hearings on the budget bill, a number of municipal officials offered testimony on the difficulty of funding road improvements. In addition, it has been stated in the past that some municipalities have difficulty funding LRIP's 50% local match requirement. Counties and municipalities generally use tax levies, related assessments, intergovernmental revenue (state and federal aid), and debt proceeds to fund their transportation related-infrastructure. Debt can only be issued to carry out capital improvement or construction-related projects. Like counties, municipalities are subject to a levy limit program that limits their year-to-year levy increases. Some testified at Committee's public hearings on the budget bill that the local levy limit is one of the reasons local governments are having difficulty funding road improvements. To assist local governments with this dilemma, the budget bill would provide an additional combined state funding amount of \$75.9 million for the LRIP, general transportation aid, and local bridge improvement assistance programs.

15. One exclusion from the local levy limit is the amount of annual debt service associated with debt issued after July 1, 2005. As a result, counties and municipalities can borrow to meet their transportation infrastructure needs or for the local match without running afoul of the levy limit restrictions. As an example, in 2015, municipalities funded over half of their road construction and maintenance expenditures with long-term debt, while counties funded less than 20% of such expenditures with long-term debt. If there is concern with the amount of funding the Governor is recommending for local roads, as well as the amount of debt at the local level, the Committee could consider a limited exclusion to the municipal levy limit for transportation infrastructure construction projects in lieu of the recommended increase. See LFB Paper #585 for a discussion of such an exclusion.

16. Over the past decade, limited transportation fund revenue growth and the consequential extensive use of transportation fund-supported debt to finance highway infrastructure have contributed to an increasing percentage of transportation fund revenue being used to pay debt

service on that debt. In addition, over the past several biennia, DOT has identified substantial current and future program needs in the state highway improvement program that continue to demand significant resources from the transportation fund. Although at Secretary Ross's directive, the Department has recently begun the process of redefining the program's need, the extent to this process will succeed in reducing the future scope and cost of the highway improvement program remains unclear.

17. Nonetheless, one concern with the Governor's budget recommendations is that it would commit a significant additional amount of transportation fund "cash" resources (SEG) to local transportation programs, including LRIP (totaling \$75.9 million in the 2017-19 biennium). This funding would be an ongoing commitment of state resources to local roads. Although the recommended increase may be warranted, this commitment of SEG funding to the local program in the 2017-19 biennium, and beyond, could compel the state to borrow for an even greater percentage of state highway improvement funding by diminishing the state's cash resources available in the future. Changes to SEG appropriations for the major components of the state highway improvement program for a five-biennium period (including the Governor's 2017-19 recommendations) are shown in the following table.

TABLE 5
SEG Appropriations for Major Components of
State Highway Improvement Program
(\$ in Millions)

<u>SEG Appropriations</u>	<u>2009-11</u>	<u>2011-13</u>	<u>2013-15</u>	<u>2015-17</u>	<u>2017-19</u>
Major Highway Development	\$162.1	\$222.6	\$167.2	\$131.1	\$152.9
Southeast Wisconsin Freeways	128.2	78.7	36.9	36.5	27.2
State Highway Rehabilitation	<u>499.8</u>	<u>614.7</u>	<u>845.0</u>	<u>627.3</u>	<u>557.9</u>
Total	\$790.2	\$916.0	\$1,049.1	\$795.0	\$738.0
		15.9%	14.5%	-24.2%	-7.2%

Note: Transfers from the general fund and petroleum inspection fund have increased the amount of SEG available for appropriation in each of the biennia shown, as follows: \$40.4 million in 2009-11; \$211.7 million in 2011-13; \$250.7 million in 2013-15; and \$135.3 million in 2015-17. Under the Governor's recommendation, this equivalent transfer amount would equal \$141.9 million. Some totals do not add due to rounding.

18. As shown in the table, the amount of SEG funding in this program peaked in 2013-15 at \$1,049.1 million and would decline for the second consecutive budget under the Governor's recommendations to \$738.0 million. Specifically, SEG funding in the state highway rehabilitation program would be reduced by \$69.4 million in the biennium compared to 2015-17. This funding is replaced with general obligation bonding. Depending on what other commitments of SEG funding are made, declining levels of SEG funding in the state highway improvement program could lead to a higher need to bond in order to maintain the recommended state highway improvement program size in the future. Deleting the Governor's recommendation to increase LRIP funding would somewhat alleviate this concern. [Alternative A4]

Local Match Requirement

19. The Governor's recommendations would increase the allowable reimbursement amount for LRIP applicants under the discretionary portion of the program only by specifying that applicants would instead be eligible for reimbursement of not more than 60% of eligible costs (compared to 50% under current law). Applicants under the entitlement portion of the program would continue to be reimbursed for not more than 50% of eligible project costs. This is same statutory change that DOT requested in its 2017-19 agency budget request. DOT indicates it requested this increase for several reasons, including: (a) to increase flexibility for local government representatives in selecting projects; and (b) to make participation more financially viable for communities that have difficulty meeting the current match rate.

20. In recent years, the demand for LRIP funding has consistently exceeded available program resources. As shown in Table 6, in 2013-15, \$56.2 million, including carryover funding, was awarded to fund 26.3% of total project costs equal to \$213.9 million. In 2015-17, \$57.5 million, including carryover funding, was used to fund 24.3% of total project costs equal to \$236.5 million.

TABLE 6
LRIP Funds Awarded and Project Costs
(\$ in Millions)

	<u>Funds Awarded*</u>	<u>Total Project Costs</u>	<u>% of Project Costs Funded</u>
2013-15 Biennium			
<i>Formula-Based Allocation</i>			
Counties (43%)	\$13.9	\$59.1	23.5%
Municipalities (28.5%)	9.2	57.4	16.0
Towns (28.5%)	<u>8.8</u>	<u>35.2</u>	25.0
Subtotal	\$31.9	\$151.7	21.0%
<i>Discretionary Allocation</i>			
Counties	\$9.9	\$33.0	30.0%
Municipalities	2	4.2	47.6
Towns	<u>12.4</u>	<u>25</u>	49.6
Subtotal	\$24.3	\$62.2	39.1%
Total	\$56.2	\$213.9	26.3%
2015-17 Biennium			
<i>Formula-Based Allocation</i>			
Counties (43%)	\$13.9	\$57.5	24.2%
Municipalities (28.5%)	9.1	56.9	16.0
Towns (28.5%)	<u>9.1</u>	<u>35.6</u>	25.6
Subtotal	\$32.1	\$150.0	21.4%
<i>Discretionary Allocation</i>			
Counties	\$10.3	\$55.4	18.6%
Municipalities	2.1	4.4	47.7
Towns	<u>13</u>	<u>26.7</u>	48.7
Subtotal	\$25.4	\$86.5	29.4%
Total	\$57.5	\$236.5	24.3%

*Includes carryover funding.

21. Although the maximum state share of project costs is 50% for both the formula and discretionary program components, only the discretionary program components for municipalities and towns approached this cost share threshold: 47.6% in 2013-15 and 47.7% in 2015-17 for municipalities; and 49.6% in 2013-15 and 48.7% in 2015-17 for towns; and 30.0% in 2013-15 and 18.6% in 2015-17 for counties. Under the formula program component, share of total project costs did not exceed 26% for any of the local government types.

22. The Department indicates that it has not documented any instances in 2013-15 or 2015-17 in which a local government was unable to provide matching funds in order to receive an LRIP grant. However, it could be that local governments considering an LRIP application would be aware of the match requirement and that those unable to provide matching funds would be deterred from application. In light of this concern and the Department's request, the Committee could decide to approve the Governor's recommendation to increase to the allowable state share of project costs for the discretionary component of LRIP from 50% to 60%. [Alternative B1]

23. Increasing the state's maximum allowable share of discretionary project costs from 50% to 60% could, potentially, reduce the total amount of LRIP programming funded. For instance, on a project by project basis, if the share of state costs were to increase by an average of 10%, this would have the effect of reducing the amount of state funding that could have otherwise been used to partially fund additional LRIP projects. If concern exists that this policy change could reduce the overall amount of discretionary LRIP programming, deleting the Governor's recommendation in this regard may be preferable. [Alternative B2]

ALTERNATIVES

A. Funding Levels

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation and provide \$7,000,000 SEG annually for LRIP and \$6,067,200 SEG-L annually to reflect the local government share of project costs. Specify that the SEG funding be allocated as follows: (a) \$2,336,000 annually to fund a 14.6% increase in the formula-based component of the program; and (b) \$4,664,000 annually for the discretionary grant component of the program.

Set the statutory distribution of discretionary LRIP funding in 2017-18, and thereafter as follows to reflect the increased funding: (a) \$5,500,000 for counties (7.3% increase); (b) \$5,000,000 for municipalities (412.0% increase); and (c) \$6,000,000 for towns (4.7% increase).

ALT A1	Change to	
	Base	Bill
SEG	\$14,000,000	\$0
SEG-L	<u>12,134,400</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	\$26,134,400	\$0

2. Approve the Governor's recommendation, but specify \$2,500,000 SEG annually from the municipal discretionary funding increase would instead be provided to a new, separate targeted aid program component created under this alternative. Specify that this funding could be

used only for projects on local highways in poor and below condition as defined by DOT, in the counties of the state with percentages of local highways in poor and below conditions equal to at least 1.5 times the statewide average (8.8% in 2015). Require DOT to promulgate administrative rules related to the program, including the application process, applicant eligibility, and funding award timeline for each biennium. Specify that no funding award could exceed \$500,000 for an individual project and that the minimum local share of project cost would be 20%. [This would reduce the recommended funding increase to the municipal discretionary program component under the bill by \$5,000,000 in the biennium, from \$8,047,000 to \$3,047,000 (these municipalities would be eligible for the targeted aid program component and would receive a 156.0% increase over the base level funding for the existing LRIP discretionary program).]

ALT A2	Change to	
	Base	Bill
SEG	\$14,000,000	\$0
SEG-L	<u>12,134,400</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	\$26,134,400	\$0

3. Require LRIP project selection committees within the discretionary program component to give preference to LRIP applications that include matching funds equal to at least 10% of total, estimated project costs from one or more private entities. Under this alternative, the local share of reimbursable costs for such projects would be equal to 50% of total project costs, with the remainder paid by the state and private funds. Require DOT to promulgate administrative rules to implement this requirement.

4. Delete provision.

ALT A5	Change to	
	Base	Bill
SEG	\$0	- \$14,000,000
SEG-L	<u>0</u>	<u>- 12,134,400</u>
Total	\$0	- \$26,134,400

B. Match Requirement

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to increase the allowable reimbursement amount for program applicants under the discretionary portion of the program by specifying that applicants would instead be eligible for reimbursement of not more than 60% of eligible costs (compared to 50% under current law). Applicants under the entitlement portion of the program would continue to be reimbursed for not more than 50% of eligible project costs. Specify that these modifications related to the share of project cost to be reimbursed would first apply to a project commenced on the effective date of the bill.

2. Delete provision.

Prepared by: John Wilson-Tepeli
Attachment

ATTACHMENT

Highway Conditions on Rated Local Highways (Concrete and Asphalt)

County	Fair and Above Conditions				Poor and Below Conditions				Total Miles Rated
	Miles	Rank	Percent	Rank	Miles	Rank	Percent	Rank	
Adams	821	36	88.5%	55	106	22	11.4%	18	927
Ashland	301	68	86.4	62	47	53	13.6	11	349
Barron	1,379	7	91.8	40	123	15	8.2	33	1,503
Bayfield	553	59	84.9	66	98	26	15.1	7	651
Brown	1,824	2	92.2	37	154	10	7.8	36	1,979
Buffalo	666	46	94.1	20	41	58	5.8	53	707
Burnett	858	34	92.2	36	73	39	7.8	36	930
Calumet	651	48	92.4	33	54	48	7.6	39	705
Chippewa	1,485	6	94.4	17	88	30	5.6	55	1,573
Clark	468	63	93.4	24	33	61	6.6	48	501
Columbia	1,252	15	87.6	60	177	7	12.4	14	1,429
Crawford	307	67	86.2	63	49	51	13.8	10	356
Dane	2,312	1	94.4	18	137	12	5.6	56	2,449
Dodge	1,263	13	85.4	64	216	3	14.6	9	1,479
Door	1,040	29	97.7	2	24	67	2.3	71	1,064
Douglas	598	54	75.9	70	191	6	24.2	3	789
Dunn	1,100	27	81.3	68	253	1	18.7	5	1,353
Eau Claire	604	53	74.9	71	203	4	25.2	1	808
Florence	177	71	92.1	38	15	69	7.8	36	192
Fond du Lac	1,200	21	88.5	55	156	9	11.5	17	1,356
Forest	366	66	88.8	51	46	56	11.2	20	413
Grant	650	49	93.3	26	47	54	6.8	47	698
Green	971	30	95.2	13	49	52	4.8	59	1,020
Green Lake	487	61	83.6	67	96	28	16.5	6	583
Iowa	597	55	88.9	50	75	37	11.2	20	673
Iron	187	70	87.6	59	27	65	12.4	13	214
Jackson	595	56	85.0	65	104	25	14.9	8	699
Jefferson	899	31	88.8	52	113	18	11.2	20	1,012
Juneau	624	50	92.3	35	53	49	7.9	35	678
Kenosha	734	41	88.5	55	96	27	11.6	16	830

County	Fair and Above Conditions				Poor and Below Conditions				Total Miles Rated
	Miles	Rank	Percent	Rank	Miles	Rank	Percent	Rank	
Kewaunee	573	57	95.6%	10	26	66	4.4%	64	600
La Crosse	873	33	88.3	58	116	17	11.7	15	989
Lafayette	666	47	93.0	28	54	47	7.5	40	719
Langlade	696	44	95.7	9	32	63	4.4	63	728
Lincoln	622	51	95.9	7	27	64	4.2	65	649
Manitowoc	1,143	26	94.7	16	63	42	5.2	57	1,205
Marathon	1,649	4	95.4	12	78	36	4.5	61	1,727
Marquette	1,282	12	90.8	45	129	13	9.1	28	1,411
Marquette	748	40	99.0	1	6	71	0.8	72	754
Menominee	78	72	95.1	14	4	72	4.8	59	82
Milwaukee	1,252	14	93.4	24	87	32	6.5	49	1,339
Monroe	676	45	74.7	72	228	2	25.2	1	903
Oconto	1,359	9	92.4	34	110	19	7.5	41	1,470
Oneida	836	35	88.6	54	108	21	11.4	18	943
Outagamie	1,550	5	88.8	52	195	5	11.2	20	1,745
Ozaukee	760	38	92.8	31	60	44	7.3	43	820
Pepin	298	69	97.3	3	8	70	2.7	70	306
Pierce	732	42	89.3	48	88	31	10.7	25	820
Polk	1,379	8	96.6	5	47	55	3.3	68	1,426
Portage	1,202	20	90.6	46	125	14	9.4	27	1,327
Price	416	65	79.4	69	108	20	20.6	4	524
Racine	893	32	93.6	23	61	43	6.4	50	954
Richland	491	60	96.6	6	18	68	3.5	67	509
Rock	1,338	10	89.2	49	162	8	10.8	24	1,500
Rusk	558	58	93.2	27	41	57	6.9	45	599
Sauk	1,210	18	93.8	21	80	35	6.2	52	1,290
Sawyer	702	43	93.0	28	52	50	6.9	45	754
Shawano	1,234	16	95.8	8	54	46	4.2	65	1,288
Sheboygan	1,165	25	91.7	42	105	23	8.3	32	1,271
St. Croix	1,303	11	94.8	15	70	41	5.1	58	1,373
Taylor	478	62	92.9	30	37	60	7.1	44	515
Trempealeau	769	37	91.2	43	74	38	8.8	30	843
Vernon	444	64	91.7	41	41	59	8.4	31	484
Vilas	749	39	89.9	47	84	33	10.1	26	834
Walworth	1,191	23	95.5	11	56	45	4.5	61	1,247

<u>County</u>	<u>Fair and Above Conditions</u>				<u>Poor and Below Conditions</u>				<u>Total Miles Rated</u>
	<u>Miles</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Miles</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Rank</u>	
Washburn	613	52	86.6%	61	96	29	13.5%	12	709
Washington	1,208	19	91.2	43	118	16	8.9	29	1,326
Waukesha	1,786	3	92.6	32	143	11	7.4	42	1,929
Waupaca	1,179	24	91.9	39	105	24	8.2	33	1,284
Waushara	1,058	28	97.1	4	33	62	3.0	69	1,091
Winnebago	1,224	17	93.7	22	82	34	6.3	51	1,306
Wood	<u>1,192</u>	22	94.2	19	<u>72</u>	40	5.7	54	<u>1,264</u>
Total	64,544		91.2%		6,229		8.8%		70,773

Note: Some totals do not add due to rounding.