

Compass 2010 Data Analysis and Reporting

Teresa M. Adams, Ph.D. and Emil Juni

University of Wisconsin-Madison

WisDOT ID no. 0655-12-00

CFIRE ID no. 05-04

February 2012



RESEARCH & LIBRARY UNIT



NATIONAL CENTER FOR FREIGHT &
INFRASTRUCTURE RESEARCH & EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

WISCONSIN DOT
PUTTING RESEARCH TO WORK

Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No. CFIRE 05-04	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No. CFDA 20.701	
4. Title and Subtitle Compass 2010 Data Analysis and Reporting		5. Report Date February 2012	
		6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Author/s Teresa M. Adams, Ph.D. and Emil Juni, UW-Madison		8. Performing Organization Report No. CFIRE 05-04	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address National Center for Freight and Infrastructure Research and Education (CFIRE) University of Wisconsin-Madison 1415 Engineering Drive, 2205 EH Madison, WI 53706		10. Work Unit No. (TRAI5)	
		11. Contract or Grant No. 0655-12-00	
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address Wisconsin Department of Transportation 4802 Sheboygan Ave. Madison, WI 53707		13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report [1/1/11 – 12/31/11]	
		14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes Project completed for the Wisconsin Department of Transportation by CFIRE.			
16. Abstract The Compass Reports created in this project are issued annually to provide information on the maintenance condition of Wisconsin's highways. The information in these reports is being used to help understand trends and conditions, prioritize resources, and set targets for future condition levels of our highway system. As more information is gathered, the reports will also be used to illustrate and understand the consequences of funding and policy shifts, and to demonstrate accountability to decision-makers at Wisconsin DOT and in the legislature.			
17. Key Words Maintenance, operation, data analysis, shoulders, signs, pavement, bridges, winter, drainage, roadsides, Wisconsin		18. Distribution Statement No restrictions. This report is available through the Transportation Research Information Services of the National Transportation Library.	
19. Security Classification (of this report) Unclassified	20. Security Classification (of this page) Unclassified	21. No. Of Pages 78	22. Price -0-

DISCLAIMER

This research was funded by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation through the National Center for Freight and Infrastructure Research and Education at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors, who are responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the information presented herein. This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the Department of Transportation, University Transportation Centers Program, in the interest of information exchange. The U.S. Government assumes no liability for the contents or use thereof. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views of the National Center for Freight and Infrastructure Research and Education, the University of Wisconsin, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation, or the USDOT's RITA at the time of publication.

The United States Government assumes no liability for its contents or use thereof. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

The United States Government does not endorse products or manufacturers. Trade and manufacturers names appear in this report only because they are considered essential to the object of the document.



FINAL

Compass Report

Wisconsin State Highway 2010 Maintenance, Traffic, and Operations Conditions

Compass Advisory Team

Adam Boardman, WisDOT State Highway Program Development & Analysis Section Chief
Gary Brunner, WisDOT Northwest Region Operations Manager
Scott Bush, WisDOT Compass Program Manager
John Corbin, WisDOT Traffic Engineering Section Chief
Bob Hanifl, WisDOT Southwest Region Maintenance Project Engineer
Todd Hogan, WisDOT Southwest Region Engineering Technician
Ed Kazik, Brown County Patrol Superintendent
John Kinar, WisDOT Highway Maintenance & Roadside Management. Section Chief
Mike Ostrenga, WisDOT Northwest Region Maintenance Supervisor
Doug Passineau, Wood County Highway Commissioner
Mark Woltmann, WisDOT Highway Operations Program Management. Section Chief
Jack Yates, Marquette County Patrol Superintendent



Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Compass Annual Report.....	4
About this report.....	4
Background.....	4
Process.....	4
Maintenance Report Card.....	5
<i>Wisconsin 2010: Compass Report on Highway Maintenance Conditions</i>	10
<i>Wisconsin 2010: Targets for Highway Maintenance Conditions</i>	12
2010 Highway Maintenance Conditions: Report on Traffic, Shoulders, Drainage, Roadsides.....	14
Regions 2010: Summary of Highway Maintenance Conditions.....	16
<i>Regions 2010: Compass Report on Highway Maintenance Conditions</i>	17
<i>Regions 2010: Regional Trend</i>	18
2010 Signs: Compass Report on Routine Replacement and Age Distribution.....	23
<i>Wisconsin: Trend of Sign Condition</i>	24
<i>Regions 2010: Sign Condition</i>	24
<i>Regions 2010: Routine Replacement of Signs</i>	25
<i>Wisconsin and Regions 2010: Sign Face Material Distribution</i>	26
<i>Wisconsin and Regions: Sign Face Material Trends</i>	27
Wisconsin and Regions 2010: Sign Age Distribution.....	28
2010 Bridges: Compass Report on Condition, Maintenance, and Inspection Backlog.....	29
Wisconsin 2010: Bridge Condition Distribution.....	30
Region 2010: Bridge Condition Distribution.....	30
Wisconsin and Regions 2010: Bridge Condition.....	31
Wisconsin and Regions: Trend of Bridge Maintenance Needs.....	32
Wisconsin and Regions 2010: Bridge Special Inspection Backlog.....	33
Appendices.....	34
A. Program Contributors.....	35
B. Compass Feature Thresholds and Grade Ranges.....	37
C. Feature Contribution Categories.....	39
D. 2009 Highway Operations Targets.....	44
E. 2010 Compass Rating Sheet.....	47
F. County Data.....	49
Counties 2010: Shoulders and Drainage.....	49
Counties 2010: Roadsides and Traffic.....	58
Counties 2010: Sign Condition.....	67
Counties 2010: Bridge Maintenance Needs.....	72
Counties 2010: Bridge Special Inspection Backlog.....	75

Executive Summary

The “Compass” program collects rating data each year to help the department understand current infrastructure conditions and trends. The data also helps WisDOT managers set reasonable maintenance targets that reflect department priorities and respond to limited resources. To ensure that maintenance targets are consistently reflected in work programs around the state, these priorities are shared with the WisDOT regions to help structure the Routine Maintenance Agreements with counties. And to evaluate the maintenance target setting process, existing conditions are compared to their target levels to see if the annual goals were met or exceeded.

The 2010 Compass Annual Report has been completed based on the yearly field review process and current data from the WisDOT Sign Inventory Management System, WisDOT Annual Winter Maintenance Report and Highway Structures Information System. Below are the significant messages on the current condition of the state highway system and specific examples of how the Bureau of Highway Operations uses the information to manage the system:

- *Continued focus on reducing shoulder drop-off:* There has been continued emphasis on fixing drop-off along unpaved shoulders so that drivers who veer off the traveled way can safely get back onto the paved surface. More aggressive maintenance targets have been set over the last five years to deal with this problem. The actual amount of drop-off for unpaved shoulders increased three percentage points between 2009 and 2010 after a seven percent decrease last year. There will be a continued focus on improving safety by reducing shoulder drop-off. Drop-off on paved shoulders is a feature that was added back to the program in 2009. This feature has the same contribution category and deficiency threshold as drop-off on unpaved shoulders.
- *Removing hazardous debris on shoulders:* For several years the department has emphasized the safety benefits of removing hazardous debris from roadways. This year the backlog for hazardous debris is 8%, maintaining the backlog level in 2009, which is the lowest level recorded during the previous five-year period.
- *More visible, longer lasting traffic signs:* More than 16,000 new high-intensity signs were installed along the state highway system between 2009 and 2010. More than seventy two percent of the 289,000 signs on the state system now have high-intensity face material, providing better illumination to drivers during low light conditions and evenings. An added benefit is that the new signs last 72% longer than the older generation “engineering” grade signs.
- *Targeted replacement of regulatory and warning signs:* Almost 83,000 signs around the state are older than their suggested useful life. This is a reduction of almost 20,000 signs from the 2009 backlog level. With limited sign replacement funds, the routine replacement of regulatory and warning signs (such as stop signs and speed limit signs) has been prioritized over the replacement of other types of signs. Based on this policy, 17% of the regulatory and warning signs are beyond their recommended service life, a six percent improvement from the 2009 level. Forty-four percent of detour/object marker/recreation/guide signs are older than their suggested useful life. This is a seven percentage point drop from last year.

Compass Annual Report

About this report

The *Compass Annual Report* is issued each year to communicate the condition of Wisconsin's state highway network and to demonstrate accountability for maintenance expenditures. The primary audience for this report includes Maintenance Supervisors and Operations Managers at the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) and partner organizations including the 72 counties. Compass reports are used to understand trends and conditions, prioritize resources, and set future target condition levels for the state highway system. The condition data is also used to estimate the costs to reduce maintenance backlogs to varying levels of service.

This report *includes* data on traveled ways (paved traffic lanes), shoulders, drainage, roadsides, selected traffic devices, specific aspects of winter maintenance activities, and bridges. The report *does not include* measures for preventive maintenance, operational services (like traveler information and incident management), or electrified traffic assets (like signals and lighting). It is important to consider what is not in the report when using this information to discuss comprehensive investment choices and needs.

The first section of this report provides a program overview and scorecard based on current conditions. Subsequent sections of the report provide detailed information on each roadway feature. The document is available on the Compass website (http://dotnet/dtid_bho/extranet/compass/reports/index.shtm) from within WisDOT or https://trust.dot.state.wi.us/extntgtwy/dtid_bho/extranet/compass/reports/index.shtm from outside WisDOT.

Feedback on format, content, and other aspects of the report is welcome and should be sent to Scott Bush, Compass Program Manager, at Scott.Bush@dot.wi.gov or (608) 266-8666.

Background

Compass was implemented statewide in 2002 as WisDOT's maintenance quality assurance and asset management program for highway operations. The Compass report is intended to provide a comprehensive overview of highway operations by integrating information from field reviews with inventory data and other information sources.

Process

The Compass report is issued annually in cooperation with the research team from the Wisconsin Transportation Center (WTC) at University of Wisconsin – Madison. Starting in January of each year, WTC and the Compass Program Manager work on the analysis of each element. The project team presents the draft report at the Compass Advisory Team meeting and the WisDOT Operations Managers meeting in the spring. The report is revised based on feedback from these meetings. The report is then finalized and officially published by the end of each year.

This report uses inventory data for bridges, pavement, routine maintenance of signs, and winter storms. It uses sample data for highway maintenance features. The project team collected data from the WisDOT business areas between December 2010 and May 2011.

The highway maintenance data includes data sampled from the field. Two hundred and forty 1/10-mile segments are randomly selected in each of the five WisDOT regions. A WisDOT Maintenance Coordinator and a County Patrol Superintendent collect the field data in each county between August 15 and October 15 every year. The field survey includes a condition analysis of shoulders, drainage features, roadside attributes, pavement markings and signs.

Winter maintenance data is gathered from the winter season 2009-10 and includes Time to Bare Wet, Winter Severity Index, Winter VMT, and crash data. Figures and tables are taken directly from the 2009-10 WisDOT *Annual Winter Maintenance Report* prepared by WisDOT's Winter Operations unit, including the "Winter by the Numbers" table and the statewide snowfalls and Winter Severity Index figures.

Starting with the 2009 Compass Annual Report, pavement data was obtained directly from WisDOT's Pavement Maintenance Management System (PMMS). This completes the transition from the previous method. The transition started with the 2008 Compass Annual Report by reporting condition based on the deficiency thresholds and condition categories in the PMMS while still getting the pavement data from the Program Information Files (PIF). Pavement is not reported in the 2010 Compass Annual Report because of the unavailability of 2010 pavement data due to the reprogramming of PMMS.

The routine replacement needs for signs comes from the Sign Inventory Management System (SIMS) and the bridge data comes from the Highway Structure Information System (HSIS).

Compass identifies backlog percentages for each feature at the county, region and statewide level. Backlog percentages indicate what percent of that feature is in a condition where maintenance work is required, assuming available budget. Therefore, an increasing backlog percentage reflects fiscal constraints rather than inadequate work in the field.

Appendix B identifies when assets are considered backlogged for highway maintenance features. For pavement features, the backlog is determined based on logic in the PMMS. In the PMMS, each segment of road receives a rating for each distress type. The ratings include "excellent", "fair", "moderate", or "bad", depending on the extent and severity of distress. For the Compass report, a pavement segment that receives a rating other than "excellent" requires maintenance and is considered backlogged. Traffic signs are considered backlogged for maintenance if it is in use past its expected service life.

WisDOT Maintenance Supervisors and Operations Managers annually set the targets for backlog percentage levels for each feature. These targets are intended to reflect priorities and goals for the year in light of fiscal constraints. Appendix D provides the maintenance targets for 2010.

Maintenance Report Card

Compass uses predefined backlog percentage thresholds to assign a letter grade to the overall maintenance condition of each feature (from "A" to "F"). A feature grade declines as more of a feature is backlogged. These grading scales are curved to account for the importance of the feature to the motorist and roadway system. The contribution categories include "Critical Safety", "Safety", "Ride/Comfort", "Stewardship", and "Aesthetics". For example, a feature that contributes to critical safety would see its grade decline more rapidly than a feature that is primarily aesthetic in nature. A feature grade of "A" means that all basic routine maintenance needs have been met within the maintenance season and there is not a significant backlog.

Appendix B lists the grading curve for each Compass feature and Appendix C identifies the contribution category for each feature.

System Overview

Below is a summary of the 2010 condition grades for the 29 features that are evaluated in the field each year for the Compass program. The individual grades for the 29 features translate to an overall system condition grade point average of 2.79 or grade level C+. This is a big improvement over the grade point average of 2.5 from last year. The single failing grade this year is for drop-off/build-up on unpaved shoulders, which is targeted this way.

- A grade: 12 features (41%)
- B grade: 5 features (17%)
- C grade: 7 features (24%)
- D grade: 4 features (14%)
- F grade: 1 features (4%)

No roadway feature grades declined during the past year. The condition grade for most features stayed constant between 2009 and 2010. Out of 29 features surveyed, the condition grade remained unchanged for 22 roadway components (76%). Seven features (24%) had improved condition grades during the last year (*in bold below*).

Nineteen features (66%) met the target condition in 2010, which is defined as within five percentage points of the actual target level. Nine features (31%) exceeded the maintenance target, including three Safety features (delineators, special pavement markings and fences).

The following tables identify the five-year trend in Compass feature grades by contribution category. Key observations are also provided for each contribution category.

Critical Safety Features

The roadway features considered critical for safety are those that require immediate action, with overtime pay if necessary, to remedy a problem situation.

Feature	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	Element
Centerline markings	C	C	B	B	B	Traffic and safety devices
Drop-off/build-up (paved)	A	B	N/A	N/A	N/A	Shoulders
Drop-off/build-up (unpaved)	F	F	F	F	F	Shoulders
Hazardous debris	C	C	C	C	D	Shoulders
Regulatory/warning signs (emergency repair)	A	A	A	A	A	Traffic and safety devices

- The only Critical Safety feature that changed condition grade during the past year was Drop-off/build-up on paved shoulders, which improved to an “A” grade.
- All Critical Safety features met their condition target.
- Drop-off/build-up of unpaved shoulders continued to receive a grade of F, consistent with the targeted condition level.

- Removal of hazardous debris on roadway shoulders and the emergency repair of regulatory/warning signs received grades of C and A, respectively.

Safety Features

Safety features are highway attributes and characteristics that protect users against -and provide them with a clear sense of freedom from -danger, injury or damage.

Feature	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	Element
Delineators	C	C	D	C	C	Traffic and safety devices
Edgeline markings	B	C	A	A	B	Traffic and safety devices
Fences	A	A	A	A	A	Roadsides
Mowing	C	C	C	C	C	Roadsides
Mowing for vision	A	B	A	A	A	Roadsides
Protective barriers	A	A	A	B	A	Traffic and safety devices
Regulatory/warning signs (routine replacement)	C	C	C	D	D	Traffic and safety devices
Special pavement markings	B	B	B	B	A	Traffic and safety devices
Woody vegetation control	A	A	A	A	A	Roadsides
Woody vegetation control for vision	A	A	A	A	A	Roadsides

- For the third straight year, the 2010 condition grades for all safety features met or exceeded their targets.
- Edgeline markings improved from C to B in 2010 while mowing for vision improved from B to A.
- Fences, protective barriers, woody vegetation control, and control of woody vegetation for vision all maintained the A grades they received in 2009 and 2008. The targets for these features were C, A, B, and A, respectively.
- Delineators maintained the grade C it received in 2009, meeting the target.
- Special pavement markings maintained a B grade, exceeding the target of C.
- The backlog for routine replacement of regulatory and warning signs decreased from 23% in 2009 to 17%.

Ride/Comfort Features

The ride quality and comfort features provide a state of ease and quiet enjoyment for highway users. These features include proper signing and lack of obstructions.

Feature	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	Element
Cross-slope (unpaved)	B	C	B	B	C	Shoulders
Detour/object marker/recreation/guide signs (routine replacement)	D	D	D	D	D	Traffic and safety devices
Detour/object markers/ recreation/ guide/signs (emergency repair)	A	A	A	A	A	Traffic and safety devices
Potholes/raveling (paved)	A	A	A	A	A	Shoulders

- Cross-slope of unpaved shoulders improved from C to B in 2010, exceeding the target condition level of C.

- The routine replacement of detour/object marker/recreation/guide signs and potholes/raveling on paved shoulders both maintained the A grade level they have been getting for the past five years.
- The backlog for routine replacement detour/object marker/recreation/guide signs decreased from 51% in 2009 to 44%.

Stewardship Features

Stewardship captures performance on routine and preventive maintenance activities that preserve investments and ensure facilities function for their full expected service life or longer.

Feature	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	Element
Cracking (paved)	D	F	D	D	D	Shoulders
Culverts	C	C	C	C	B	Drainage
Curb & gutter	A	A	A	A	A	Drainage
Ditches	A	A	A	A	A	Drainage
Erosion (unpaved)	A	A	A	A	A	Shoulders
Flumes	D	D	D	C	C	Drainage
Noxious weeds	C	C	D	C	C	Roadsides
Storm sewer systems	B	C	B	B	B	Drainage
Under-drains/edge-drains	B	C	C	B	B	Drainage

- The condition grade for three Stewardship features improved during the last year. Cracking on paved shoulders improved from F to D, exceeding the target condition. Storm sewer systems improved back to B after its grade declined to C last year. This feature now meets the target. Under-drains/edge-drains improved to B this year, exceeding the target condition level.
- Curb & gutter, ditches, and erosion all continued to receive feature grades of A. These grades met or exceeded their target levels.
- Culverts received a feature grade of C and flumes received a D grade, both meeting their target.
- Noxious weeds maintained the grade C it received in 2009. This grade is much better than the targeted F grade.

Aesthetics Feature

Aesthetics concerns the display of natural or fabricated beauty along highway corridors including landscaping and architectural features.

Feature	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	Element
Litter	D	D	D	D	D	Roadsides

- Compass measures the presence of litter, which detracts from roadway sightlines. The grade for litter in 2010 is a D, consistent over the past five years, which meets the target.

Bridges:

- Thirty-two percent of bridge decks statewide are in “Fair” condition and in need of reactive maintenance, based on their NBI ratings of 5 or 6. This is an increase of 1% from the 31% level in 2009.
- Twenty-eight percent of bridge superstructures are in “Fair” condition and in need of reactive maintenance, based on their NBI ratings of 5 or 6. The percentage of bridge superstructures in “Fair” condition stayed the same between 2009 and 2010.
- Twenty-eight percent of bridge substructures are in “Fair” condition and in need of reactive maintenance, based on their NBI ratings of 5 or 6. The percentage of bridge superstructures in “Fair” condition stayed the same between 2009 and 2010.

Wisconsin 2010: Compass Report on Highway Maintenance Conditions

Element	What are we spending?					Feature	How much of the system still needs work at the end of the maintenance season?					How well maintained is the system?						
	Dollars spent (in millions) ¹						Condition change: 2009 to 2010 ²	% of system backlogged					2010 Feature grades					
	FY 06	FY 07	FY 08	FY 09	FY 10			2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	A	B	C	D	F	
Shoulders	8.20 8.87 0.26 0.28	9.80 10.31 0.31 0.32	8.20 8.30 0.26 0.26	8.99 9.14 0.28 0.29	13.28 13.28 0.41 0.41	Hazardous debris	-	13	9	9	8	8						
						Drop-off/build-up (paved)	↑	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	2						
						Cracking (paved)	↑	50	53	53	62	60						
						Potholes/raveling (paved)	↑	5	6	6	6	5						
						Drop-off/build-up (unpaved)	↓	40	40	44	34	37						
						Cross-slope (unpaved)	↑	25	18	18	22	18						
						Erosion (unpaved)	↑	3	1	2	3	1						
Drainage	5.10 5.52 0.16 0.17	7.20 7.57 0.23 0.24	8.00 8.10 0.25 0.25	9.84 10.00 0.31 0.31	9.13 9.13 0.28 0.28	Ditches	-	3	2	2	2	2						
						Culverts	↓	15	20	28	23	28						
						Under-drains/edge-drains	↑	13	20	30	24	21						
						Flumes	-	27	25	39	36	36						
						Curb & gutter	↓	8	8	5	5	6						
						Storm sewer system	↑	9	11	16	19	17						
Roadsides	21.90 23.69 0.69 0.75	24.00 25.24 0.76 0.80	19.40 19.65 0.61 0.62	20.29 20.62 0.63 0.64	16.48 16.48 0.51 0.51	Litter	↑	64	60	61	66	62						
						Mowing	↓	39	36	42	35	36						
						Mowing for vision	↑	2	2	3	5	3						
						Noxious weeds	↑	34	29	38	33	32						
						Woody vegetation	-	3	3	2	4	4						
						Woody veg. control for vision	↓	1	2	1	0.4	1						
Fences	↑	3	2	1	3	2												

¹ The dollar values listed in each column show the nominal dollars, constant dollars (base year 2010), nominal dollars per thousand lane miles, and constant dollars per thousand lane miles, respectively.

² Arrows indicate a condition change from 2009 to 2010 (↑ = improved condition/lower backlog, ↓ = worse condition/higher backlog). Double arrows indicate the backlog changed 8 or more percentage points.

Element	What are we spending?					Feature	How much of the system still needs work at the end of the maintenance season?					How well maintained is the system?						
	Dollars spent (in millions) ¹						Condition change: 2009 to 2010 ²	% of system backlogged					2010 Feature grades					
	FY 06	FY 07	FY 08	FY 09	FY 10			2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	A	B	C	D	F	
Traffic & safety (selected)	16.40 17.74 0.52 0.56	17.30 18.19 0.55 0.57	17.30 17.52 0.54 0.55	17.90 18.19 0.56 0.57	17.61 17.61 0.55 0.55	Centerline markings	-	4	3	3	7	7						
						Edgeline markings	↑	6	4	4	12	8						
						Special pavement markings	↓	3	10	7	10	11						
						Reg./warning signs (emergency repair)	-	1	1	1	1	1						
						Reg./warning signs (routine replacement)	↑	31	25	23	23	17						
						Detour/object marker/recreation/guide signs (emergency repair)	↓	1	0.3	0.4	0.3	1						
						Detour/object marker/recreation/guide signs (routine replacement)	↑	55	56	55	51	44						
						Delineators	↑	21	21	26	20	14						
						Protective barriers	↑	4	5	3	3	1						

Wisconsin 2010: Targets for Highway Maintenance Conditions

Targets are set annually, and are intended to reflect priorities for that year, given fiscal constraints. They are a measure of effective management, not system condition.

Contribution Category	Feature	Element	Actual % backlog 2010	Target % backlog 2010	On target ³	Statewide						Regions			
						Gap if target missed						Worse condition	On Target	Better condition	
						Worse condition			Better condition						
						20	10	0	0	10	20				
Critical Safety	Centerline markings	Traffic and safety devices	7%	5%	⊙							SE	NC, NE, NW, SW		
	Drop-off/build-up (paved)	Shoulders	2%	N/A	N/A										
	Drop-off/build-up (unpaved)	Shoulders	37%	35%	⊙							SW	NC, NE, NW, SE		
	Hazardous debris	Shoulders	8%	6%	⊙							SE, SW	NC, NE, NW		
	Regulatory/warning signs (emergency repair)	Traffic and safety devices	1%	0%	⊙								All		
Safety	Delineators	Traffic and safety devices	14%	25%						11				All	
	Edgeline markings	Traffic and safety devices	8%	8%	⊙							SE	NC, NE, NW, SW		
	Fences	Roadsides	2%	14%						12				All	
	Mowing	Roadsides	36%	40%	⊙							NE, SE	NC	NW, SW	
	Mowing for vision	Roadsides	3%	5%	⊙								All		
	Protective barriers	Traffic and safety devices	1%	3%	⊙								All		
	Regulatory/warning signs (routine replacement)	Traffic and safety devices	17%	25%						8				NE, SE	NC, NW, SW
	Special pavement markings	Traffic and safety devices	11%	23%						12				SE	NC, NE, NW, SW

³ ⊙ This symbol indicates that the percent backlogged for that feature is the same as the target, or within 5 percentage points.

Contribution Category	Feature	Element	Statewide						Regions					
			Actual % backlog 2010	Target % backlog 2010	On target ³	Gap if target missed						Worse condition	On Target	Better condition
						Worse condition			Better condition					
						20	10	0	0	10	20			
	Woody vegetation control	Roadsides	4%	5%	⊙								All	
	Woody vegetation control for vision	Roadsides	1%	3%	⊙								All	
Ride/Comfort	Cross-slope (unpaved)	Shoulders	18%	20%	⊙							NC	NW, SW	NE, SE
	Detour/object markers/recreation/guide signs (emergency repair)	Traffic and safety devices	1%	1%	⊙								All	
	Detour/object marker/recreation/guide signs (routine replacement)	Traffic and safety devices	44%	59%						15			NE	NC, NW, SE, SW
	Potholes/raveling (paved)	Shoulders	5%	10%	⊙								NC, NW, SE, SW	NE
Stewardship	Cracking (paved)	Shoulders	60%	70%						10			SE	NC, NE, NW, SW
	Culverts	Drainage	28%	30%	⊙								NE, NW, SE, SW	NC
	Curb & gutter	Drainage	6%	10%	⊙							NW		NC, NE, SE, SW
	Ditches	Drainage	2%	5%	⊙								All	
	Erosion (unpaved)	Shoulders	1%	5%	⊙								All	
	Flumes	Drainage	36%	35%	⊙							NE, SW		NC, NW, SE
	Noxious weeds	Roadsides	32%	61%							29			All
	Storm sewer system	Drainage	17%	15%	⊙								All	
Aesthetics	Under-drains/edge-drains	Drainage	21%	30%						9		SW	NW	NC, NE, SE
	Litter	Roadsides	62%	81%							19			All

2010 Highway Maintenance Conditions: Report on Traffic, Shoulders, Drainage, Roadsides

Data in this section comes from the field review of random road segments performed by WisDOT region Maintenance Coordinators and county Patrol Superintendents. No statistical analysis has been completed on the county level data in Appendix F. Readers should take the number of observations into account when reviewing the information. Extreme caution should be exercised when analyzing data that has less than 30 observations.

Below is a summary of the change between 2009 and 2010 in the percentage of roadways that are backlogged for maintenance. These changes didn't necessarily result in a new level of service grade. Refer to the "Maintenance Report Card" in the front part of the report for a complete summary of condition grade level changes between 2009 and 2010.

- Sixteen features (55%) had a reduction in the percentage of roadways that are backlogged for maintenance.
- Six features (21%) did not have a change in the amount of roadways that are backlogged for maintenance.
- Seven features (24%) had an increase in the percentage of roadways that are backlogged for maintenance.
- All of the changes in backlog levels were seven percentage points or less.

Shoulders:

- The individual grades for the seven Shoulder features translate to an overall condition grade point average of 2.6 or grade level C+.
- Five Shoulder features had a reduction in the percentage of roadways that are backlogged for maintenance. They are drop-off/buildup on paved shoulders (-2%), cracking on paved shoulders (-2%), potholes/raveling on paved shoulders (-1%), cross-slope on unpaved shoulders (-4%), and erosion on unpaved shoulders (-2%)
- One of the seven features (hazardous debris) did not have a change in the amount of roadways that are backlogged for maintenance.
- One feature (drop-off/build-up on unpaved shoulders, +3%) had an increase in the percentage of roadways that are backlogged for maintenance.
- Drop-off /buildup on unpaved shoulders received a feature grade of F for the sixth consecutive year. The percentage of roadways that are backlogged for maintenance increased from 34% in 2009 to 37% in 2009.

Drainage:

- The individual grades for the six Drainage features translate to an overall condition grade point average of 2.8 or grade level C+.
- Two of the six Drainage features had a reduction in the percentage of roadways that are backlogged for maintenance. These features include storm sewer system (-2%) and under-drains/edge-drains (-3%)

- Two features, ditches and flumes, did not have a change in the amount of roadways that are backlogged for maintenance.
- Culverts (+5%) and curb and gutter (+1%) were the two features that had an increase in the percentage of roadways that are backlogged for maintenance. These changes were not significant enough to change the level of service grades.

Roadsides:

- The individual grades for the seven Roadside features translate to an overall condition grade point average of 3.0 or grade level B.
- Four of the seven Roadside features had a reduction in the percentage of roadways that are backlogged for maintenance. These features include litter (-4%), mowing for vision (-2%), noxious weeds (-1%), and fences (-1%).
- Two features had an increase in the percentage of roadways that are backlogged for maintenance. These features include mowing (+1%), and woody vegetation control for vision (+1%).
- Woody vegetation is the only feature that did not have a change in the amount of roadways that are backlogged for maintenance.
- From all of the changes, only one change was significant enough to change the level of service grade. Mowing for vision improved from a B to an A.

Traffic Control and Safety Devices:

- The individual grades for the nine Traffic Control and Safety Devices translate to an overall condition grade point average of 2.8 or grade level C+.
- Five of the nine Traffic Control and Safety Devices features had a reduction in the percentage of roadways that are backlogged for maintenance. These features include edgeline markings (-4%), routine replacement of regulatory/warning signs (-6%), routine replacement of detour/object marker/recreation/guide signs (-6%), delineators (-6%), and protective barriers (-2%).
- Two of the features did not have a change in the amount of roadways that are backlogged for maintenance. These features include centerline markings, and emergency repair of regulatory/warning signs.
- Two features had an increase in the percentage of roadways that are backlogged for maintenance. These features include special pavement markings (+1%) and emergency repair of detour/object marker/recreation/guide signs (+1%). None of these changes were significant enough to change the level of service grades of the features.

Regions 2010: Summary of Highway Maintenance Conditions

Shoulders

- **Hazardous Debris:** The Southeast Region and the Northeast Region (12%) had a higher backlog level than the other three regions (2% to 8%).
- **Paved Shoulders:** The maintenance backlog for drop-off/build-up was low (2% to 3%) and evenly distributed between the five regions. The Southeast Region had the most cracking and potholes/raveling.
- **Unpaved Shoulders:** The North Central Region had the most cross-slope problems and the second highest backlog level of drop-off/build-up in the state. The Southwest Region had the largest amount of drop-off/build-up in the state at 44% (37% statewide average). There was a low level of erosion problems (1% to 2%) around the state.

Drainage

- **Ditches:** The Southeast Region (8%) had the highest backlog levels than the rest of the regions (1% to 2%).
- **Culverts:** The Northeast Region and Northwest Region (33%) had the highest amount of deficient culverts while the North Central Region had the fewest deficient culverts (22%).
- **Drains:** There was a wide disparity in conditions, with the Northeast Region (5%) and the North Central Region (15%) having the fewest deficient drains and the Southwest Region (42%) having the largest backlog.
- **Flumes:** There also was a wide disparity in flume conditions, with the Southwest Region (53%) and Northeast Region (43%) having the highest backlogs and the Southeast Region (14%) having the lowest backlog level.
- **Curb and Gutter:** The Northwest Region (25%) had the highest deficiency level while the other regions varied between 3% and 4%.
- **Storm Sewer Systems:** All of the regions had between a 15% and 20% backlog in storm sewer systems.

Roadsides

- **Litter:** The Southeast Region (72%) and Southwest Region (71%) had more problems with litter than the other three regions (53% to 58%).
- **Mowing:** The Southeast Region (56%) and the Northeast Region (50%) had the highest mowing backlog levels while the Southwest Region (24%) has the lowest backlog level.
- **Mowing for Vision:** The Southwest Region (7%) and the Southeast Region (6%) had backlog levels twice that of the other regions (0% to 3%).
- **Noxious Weeds:** There was a wide disparity in conditions, with the Northeast Region (51%) having the highest backlog, the Northwest Region (19%) having the fewest deficiencies, and the other three regions having backlog levels between 25% and 38%.

Traffic Control and Safety Devices

- **Pavement Markings:** The Southeast Region had the highest backlog levels of deficient centerline markings (18%), edgeline markings (21%) and special pavement markings (18%). The other regions had similar backlog levels for centerlines (4% to 8%), edgeline markings (5% to 8%), and special markings (3% to 10%).
- **The percentage of regulatory and warning signs backlogged for replacement varies widely, from a low of 12% in the Northwest and Southwest Region to a high of 29% in the Northeast Region. The percentage of other signs (i.e. detour/object marker/recreation/guide) backlogged for routine replacement varies from 36% in the North Central Region to 51% in the Northeast Region.**

Regions 2010: Compass Report on Highway Maintenance Conditions

Element	Feature	How much of the system needs work at the end of the season? What did it cost to achieve this condition?					
		Region Percent of System Backlogged					
		NC	NE	NW	SE	SW	Statewide
Shoulders	Hazardous debris	8%	6%	2%	12%	12%	8%
	Drop-off/build-up (paved)	2%	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%
	Cracking (paved)	59%	56%	59%	73%	58%	60%
	Potholes/raveling (paved)	5%	3%	5%	10%	6%	5%
	Drop-off/build-up (unpaved)	38%	30%	32%	33%	44%	37%
	Cross-slope (unpaved)	26%	14%	18%	10%	16%	18%
	Erosion (unpaved)	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
	Dollars spent on shoulders (millions)	3.17	1.60	3.93	1.41	3.17	13.28
Drainage	Ditches	2%	2%	1%	8%	1%	2%
	Culverts	22%	33%	33%	29%	26%	28%
	Under-drains/edge-drains	15%	5%	25%	22%	42%	21%
	Flumes	25%	43%	25%	14%	53%	36%
	Curb & gutter	3%	3%	25%	4%	4%	6%
	Storm sewer system	15%	15%	20%	18%	16%	17%
	Dollars spent on drainage (millions)	0.78	0.71	1.85	2.90	2.89	9.13
Roadsides	Litter	53%	58%	58%	72%	71%	62%
	Mowing	36%	50%	34%	56%	24%	36%
	Mowing for vision	0%	1%	3%	6%	7%	3%
	Noxious weeds	25%	51%	19%	38%	38%	32%
	Woody vegetation control	3%	1%	5%	3%	4%	4%
	Woody vegetation control for vision	2%	1%	1%	0.0%	1%	1%
	Fences	1%	0.0%	2%	4%	2%	2%
	Dollars spent on roadsides (millions)	2.87	2.35	3.34	3.87	4.04	16.48
Traffic and safety (selected devices)	Centerline markings	4%	6%	8%	18%	4%	7%
	Edgeline markings	5%	6%	8%	21%	8%	8%
	Special pavement markings	10%	3%	6%	18%	7%	11%
	Regulatory/warning signs (emergency repair)	2%	0.4%	1%	1%	0.3%	1%
	Regulatory/warning signs (routine replacement)	16%	29%	12%	22%	12%	17%
	Detour/object marker/recreation/guide signs (emergency repair)	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%
	Detour/object marker/recreation/guide signs (routine replacement)	36%	51%	39%	48%	46%	44%
	Delineators	6%	12%	15%	11%	18%	14%
	Protective barriers	0.3%	0.0%	1%	0.3%	1%	1%
	Dollars spent on traffic and safety (selected devices) (millions)	3.44	2.25	3.20	3.56	5.16	17.61

Regions 2010: Regional Trend

Element	Feature	Region	Year				
			2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Shoulders	Hazardous debris	NC	9%	8%	8%	5%	8%
		NE	15%	8%	8%	14%	6%
		NW	8%	5%	5%	2%	2%
		SE	8%	5%	5%	15%	12%
		SW	19%	18%	18%	9%	12%
	Drop-off/build-up (paved)	NC	-	-	-	2%	2%
		NE	-	-	-	5%	3%
		NW	-	-	-	4%	2%
		SE	-	-	-	6%	2%
		SW	-	-	-	6%	3%
	Cracking (paved)	NC	42%	47%	47%	57%	59%
		NE	54%	56%	56%	63%	56%
		NW	48%	44%	44%	66%	59%
		SE	69%	63%	63%	66%	73%
		SW	46%	53%	53%	59%	58%
	Potholes/raveling (paved)	NC	4%	4%	4%	5%	5%
		NE	2%	5%	5%	6%	3%
		NW	6%	6%	6%	3%	5%
		SE	6%	11%	11%	12%	10%
		SW	5%	4%	4%	9%	6%
	Drop-off/build-up (unpaved)	NC	35%	30%	38%	33%	38%
		NE	34%	45%	46%	38%	30%
		NW	43%	47%	35%	24%	32%
		SE	52%	39%	60%	30%	33%
		SW	42%	36%	44%	45%	44%
Cross-slope (unpaved)	NC	13%	19%	19%	24%	26%	
	NE	21%	17%	17%	27%	14%	
	NW	31%	24%	24%	18%	18%	
	SE	41%	14%	14%	10%	10%	
	SW	25%	15%	15%	24%	16%	
Erosion (unpaved)	NC	0%	1%	0%	2%	2%	
	NE	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	
	NW	3%	3%	1%	3%	1%	
	SE	5%	2%	2%	1%	1%	
	SW	6%	0%	4%	3%	1%	
Drainage	Ditches	NC	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%
		NE	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%
		NW	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%

		SE	8%	6%	5%	3%	8%
		SW	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%
	Culverts	NC	10%	14%	21%	14%	22%
		NE	23%	24%	23%	24%	33%
		NW	21%	25%	25%	30%	33%
		SE	5%	15%	36%	25%	29%
		SW	17%	24%	34%	22%	26%
	Under-drains/edge-drains	NC	1%	7%	7%	15%	15%
		NE	12%	11%	9%	9%	5%
		NW	6%	21%	0%	33%	25%
		SE	21%	16%	36%	43%	22%
		SW	32%	45%	76%	32%	42%
	Flumes	NC	36%	10%	32%	56%	25%
		NE	11%	21%	25%	22%	43%
		NW	45%	50%	33%	53%	25%
		SE	26%	24%	42%	36%	14%
		SW	17%	19%	67%	30%	53%
	Curb & gutter	NC	6%	11%	8%	6%	3%
		NE	3%	5%	3%	2%	3%
		NW	23%	12%	9%	10%	25%
		SE	3%	3%	3%	2%	4%
		SW	2%	10%	16%	8%	4%
	Storm sewer system	NC	0%	9%	15%	7%	15%
		NE	13%	7%	13%	17%	15%
		NW	8%	23%	26%	15%	20%
		SE	16%	9%	16%	22%	18%
		SW	10%	7%	21%	22%	16%
Roadsides	Litter	NC	68%	49%	49%	59%	53%
		NE	65%	69%	69%	71%	58%
		NW	58%	57%	57%	58%	58%
		SE	60%	57%	57%	77%	72%
		SW	68%	71%	71%	74%	71%
	Mowing	NC	29%	24%	32%	32%	36%
		NE	61%	52%	49%	44%	50%
		NW	32%	34%	41%	26%	34%
		SE	42%	46%	43%	58%	56%
		SW	42%	23%	45%	34%	24%
	Mowing for vision	NC	0%	3%	3%	2%	0.0%
		NE	0%	1%	2%	2%	1%
		NW	5%	0%	4%	6%	3%
		SE	3%	2%	0%	0%	6%

		SW	3%	7%	6%	11%	7%
	Noxious weeds	NC	29%	19%	38%	30%	25%
		NE	47%	39%	50%	38%	51%
		NW	15%	5%	9%	14%	19%
		SE	52%	38%	49%	36%	38%
		SW	43%	48%	45%	49%	38%
	Woody vegetation control	NC	2%	8%	1%	3%	3%
		NE	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%
		NW	1%	2%	4%	2%	5%
		SE	1%	2%	1%	7%	3%
		SW	6%	3%	4%	5%	4%
	Woody vegetation control for vision	NC	3%	3%	0%	0%	2%
		NE	0%	2%	0%	0%	1%
		NW	2%	0%	2%	0%	1%
		SE	2%	3%	1%	3%	0.0%
		SW	1%	2%	0%	0%	1%
	Fences	NC	0%	2%	4%	2%	1%
		NE	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.0%
		NW	7%	5%	0%	10%	2%
		SE	0%	1%	1%	0%	4%
		SW	5%	0%	4%	5%	2%
Traffic and safety (selected devices)	Centerline markings	NC	2%	1%	1%	7%	4%
		NE	5%	2%	2%	3%	6%
		NW	5%	5%	5%	8%	8%
		SE	1%	3%	3%	13%	18%
		SW	3%	3%	3%	6%	4%
	Edgeline markings	NC	6%	6%	6%	4%	5%
		NE	5%	1%	1%	4%	6%
		NW	8%	6%	6%	8%	8%
		SE	0%	5%	5%	20%	21%
		SW	6%	4%	4%	22%	8%
	Special pavement markings	NC	4%	23%	4%	0%	10%
		NE	5%	4%	6%	5%	3%
		NW	3%	11%	0%	12%	6%
		SE	2%	6%	7%	17%	18%
		SW	2%	5%	17%	8%	7%
	Regulatory/warning signs (emergency repair)	NC	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%
		NE	1%	1%	1%	0%	0.4%
		NW	3%	1%	1%	2%	1%
		SE	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%
		SW	3%	1%	1%	1%	0.3%

Regulatory/warning signs (routine replacement)	NC	35%	25%	18%	18%	16%
	NE	39%	39%	38%	36%	29%
	NW	26%	19%	16%	14%	12%
	SE	30%	28%	28%	28%	22%
	SW	31%	21%	18%	19%	12%
Detour/object marker/recreation/guide signs (emergency repair)	NC	1%	0%	0%	0%	2%
	NE	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
	NW	3%	0%	1%	0%	1%
	SE	1%	0%	1%	0%	2%
	SW	2%	1%	0%	1%	2%
Detour/object marker/recreation/guide signs (routine replacement)	NC	61%	60%	51%	40%	36%
	NE	60%	64%	65%	59%	51%
	NW	52%	54%	55%	48%	39%
	SE	48%	49%	51%	53%	48%
	SW	56%	56%	54%	51%	46%
Delineators	NC	12%	6%	15%	6%	6%
	NE	18%	10%	15%	18%	12%
	NW	29%	22%	12%	16%	15%
	SE	26%	14%	41%	39%	11%
	SW	20%	20%	34%	23%	18%
Protective barriers	NC	0%	1%	5%	4%	0.3%
	NE	13%	12%	3%	8%	0.0%
	NW	1%	2%	0%	4%	1%
	SE	10%	3%	3%	3%	0.3%
	SW	0%	8%	5%	2%	1%

Mowing

The following table shows the number of segments that are backlogged for Mowing and the statewide distribution of the deficiencies: ‘how’ (shown as columns) and ‘why’ (shown as rows). For the report, all of the segments shown are considered backlogged and contributed to the backlog percentage reported for Mowing. Note that multiple reasons for mowing deficiency are allowed; therefore the sum of percentages for each deficiency type can be more than 100%.

How roadway segments are backlogged for mowing is based on WisDOT policy for grass height and width. The following are the general components of the WisDOT mowing policy:

- Height: Grass should be between six inches and twelve inches.
- Outside shoulder width: Grass should be cut a maximum of fifteen feet in width or to the bottom of the ditch, whichever is less.
- Inside shoulder width (medians): Grass should be cut a maximum of five feet in width or one pass with a single unit mower. If the remaining vegetation width is ten feet or less, the entire median should be mowed.
- No-Mow Zones: Grass should not be cut in areas that have been designated and signed as “No-Mow” zones.

		How is it deficient?				
		# of segments with observed deficiency				
		% of segment				
		Too Wide	Too Short	Too High	In the No Mow Zone	
Why is it deficient?	Safety/Equipment	0	0	0	0	
		0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Mowed by Property Owner	193	387	191	5	
		94%	97%	26%	83%	
	Woody Vegetation Control	1	1	0	1	
		0%	0%	0%	17%	
	Maintenance Decision	103	193	741	4	
		50%	48%	99%	67%	
	Total		205	400	747	6

2010 Signs: Compass Report on Routine Replacement and Age Distribution

Data in this section comes from the Sign Inventory Management System (SIMS). This section covers only routine replacement, not emergency replacement of knocked-down signs and related work.

The analysis looks at the age distribution and service life of highway signs. The expected service life is determined relative to the date signs are manufactured rather than the date they are installed. It is possible that a sign is installed one year or more after it is manufactured.

Regulatory and warning signs on Wisconsin's highways are critically important for the safety of Wisconsin's motorists. As such, WisDOT prioritizes the routine replacement of regulatory and warning signs over the routine replacement of other signs, including detour, object marker, recreation and guide signs.

Key Observations in 2010:

- The backlog for routine replacement of regulatory and warning signs decreased from 23% in 2009 to 17%. Among regions, the percentage of regulatory and warning signs backlogged for replacement varies widely, from a low of 12% in the Northwest and Southwest Region to a high of 29% in the Northeast Region.
- The backlog for routine replacement of other signs (i.e. detour/object marker/recreation/guide signs) decreased from 51% in 2009 to 44%. By region, the percentage of other signs backlogged for routine replacement varies from 36% in the North Central Region to 51% in the Northeast Region.
- Regulatory and warning signs are being used for an average 5.3 years beyond their recommended service lives. On average, other signs remain in service for 7.7 years beyond their recommended service life.
- There are 16,932 regulatory or warning signs and 38,335 other signs in service more than five years beyond their recommended service life. This represents 10% and 31% respectively of the state highway signs in each category. These percentages are 2% and 3% less than what they were last year, respectively.
- WisDOT is migrating from engineering grade sign face material (i.e. grade 1) to more visible high intensity sign face material (grade 2). The percentage of high intensity signs on the state trunk highway system increased from 65% in 2009 to 72%. Over 16,000 high intensity signs were added to the state system in the last year.

Wisconsin: Trend of Sign Condition

	Regulatory/Warning/School Signs				Detour/object marker/recreation/guide Signs			
	Total Signs	%Backlog	Deficient Signs	Average Years Beyond Service Life ⁴	Total Signs	%Backlog	Deficient Signs	Average Years Beyond Service Life ⁴
2005	160,185	41%	65,092	5.7	113,693	59%	67,449	6.0
2006	157,742	31%	49,457	5.0	126,362	55%	69,051	5.9
2007	160,206	25%	40,548	4.8	125,891	56%	70,099	6.3
2008	163,215	23%	37,060	4.7	124,333	55%	68,430	6.3
2009	166,741	23%	37,839	4.9	128,953	51%	65,350	7.3
2010	168,653	17%	29,313	5.3	121,743	44%	53,561	7.7

Regions 2010: Sign Condition

Region	Regulatory/Warning/School Signs				Detour/object marker/recreation/guide Signs			
	Total Signs	%Backlog	Deficient Signs	Average Years Beyond Service Life ⁴	Total Signs	%Backlog	Deficient Signs	Average Years Beyond Service Life ⁴
NC	28851	16%	4506	4.4	18802	36%	6746	6.5
NE	25191	29%	7217	7.3	20063	51%	10185	8.9
NW	33988	12%	4046	5.0	27007	39%	10637	6.9
SE	39451	22%	8510	6.0	26287	48%	12491	7.6
SW	41172	12%	5034	5.1	29584	46%	13502	9.5

⁴ When comparing the 'Average years beyond service life column', please note that starting with the 2006 data the useful life standard for signs with high intensity face material changes from 10 years to 12 years. Useful life standard for engineer-grade signs remained at 7 years.

Regions 2010: Routine Replacement of Signs

Region	Regulatory/Warning/School Signs					Detour/object marker/recreation/guide Signs			
	Total Signs	%Backlog	Deficient Signs	Average Years Beyond Service Life	Total Signs	%Backlog	Deficient Signs	Average Years Beyond Service Life	
NC	2005	26,164	45%	11,746	6.1	18,480	66%	12,177	6.6
	2006	26,117	35%	9,097	5.4	20,152	61%	12,342	6.5
	2007	26,663	25%	6,660	4.5	19,226	60%	11,494	6.5
	2008	28,917	18%	5,272	4.5	18,477	51%	9,456	6.7
	2009	28,531	18%	5,243	4.5	19,733	40%	7,843	7.0
	2010	28,851	16%	4,506	4.4	18,802	36%	6,746	6.5
NE	2005	22,246	47%	10,346	5.4	20,367	62%	12,647	5.5
	2006	21,520	39%	8,463	5	21,517	60%	12,953	5.5
	2007	21,887	39%	8,459	5.3	21,776	64%	13,831	6.1
	2008	22,375	38%	8,426	5.4	22,138	65%	14,314	6.5
	2009	24,932	36%	8,939	6.8	23,959	59%	14,244	8.8
	2010	25,191	29%	7,217	7.3	20,063	51%	10,185	8.9
NW	2005	36,737	37%	13,606	5.4	29,848	59%	17,541	5.2
	2006	34,087	26%	8,883	4.7	31,874	52%	16,544	5.1
	2007	33,786	19%	6,372	4.4	31,566	54%	16,962	5.3
	2008	32,837	16%	5,321	4.3	29,798	55%	16,337	5.2
	2009	33,400	14%	4,795	4.6	28,522	48%	13,786	6.3
	2010	33,988	12%	4,046	5.0	27,007	39%	10,637	6.9
SE	2005	32,872	32%	10,533	4.9	21,077	50%	10,439	5.7
	2006	35,226	30%	10,426	4.7	26,987	48%	12,835	5.7
	2007	36,390	28%	10,234	5	27,341	49%	13,386	6.2
	2008	37,249	28%	10,461	4.7	27,477	51%	14,133	6.2
	2009	38,563	28%	10,807	5.3	27,203	53%	14,341	6.9
	2010	39,451	22%	8,510	6.0	26,287	48%	12,491	7.6
SW	2005	42,166	45%	18,861	6.3	23,921	61%	14,645	7.0
	2006	40,792	31%	12,588	5.1	25,832	56%	14,377	6.9
	2007	41,480	21%	8,823	4.7	25,982	56%	14,426	7.4

Region	Regulatory/Warning/School Signs				Detour/object marker/recreation/guide Signs			
	Total Signs	%Backlog	Deficient Signs	Average Years Beyond Service Life	Total Signs	%Backlog	Deficient Signs	Average Years Beyond Service Life
2008	41,837	18%	7,580	3.9	26,443	54%	14,190	7.4
2009	41,315	19%	8,055	4.4	29,536	51%	15,136	8.2
2010	41,172	12%	5,034	5.1	29,584	46%	13,502	9.5

Wisconsin and Regions 2010: Sign Face Material Distribution

Grade	Face Type	Region					Statewide	
		NC	NE	NW	SE	SW	Total	Percentage
1	Non-Reflective	6	65	284	88	32	475	0.2%
	Other or Varies	97	26	290	17	569	999	0.3%
	Reflective - Engineering Grade	10153	15799	14616	19125	19007	78700	27%
2	Type D - Diamond Grade	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Type F - Fluorescent	634	530	487	960	911	3522	1.2%
	Type H - High Intensity	13727	11984	21052	18354	24157	89274	31%
	Type HP - Prismatic High Intensity	22366	16619	24026	27071	25779	115861	40%
	Type SH - Super High Intensity	100	122	217	123	197	759	0.3%
Total		47083	45145	60972	65738	70652	289590	100%

Wisconsin and Regions: Sign Face Material Trends

Region	2007		2008		2009		2010	
	Engineering Grade	High Intensity	Engineering Grade	High Intensity	Engineering Grade	High Intensity	Engineering Grade	High Intensity
NC	20,112	25,777	14,956	32,438	12,701	35,013	10,256	36,827
NE	25,225	18,438	23,466	21,047	23,569	25,282	15,890	29,255
NW	32,395	32,957	24,987	37,648	18,617	43,287	15,190	45,782
SE	31,927	31,804	27,789	36,937	23,549	42,217	19,230	46,508
SW	29,962	37,500	24,910	43,370	23,638	47,096	19,608	51,044
Statewide	139,621	146,476	116,108	171,440	102,074	192,895	80,174	209,416
	49%	51%	40%	60%	35%	65%	28%	72%

Wisconsin and Regions 2010: Sign Age Distribution

Regulatory/warning/school signs

	Years prior to the end of service life							Years beyond service life						Total
	6-10	5	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	5-10	>10	
NC	15060	2346	2833	1404	828	747	1127	782	426	547	469	2054	228	28851
	52%	8%	10%	5%	3%	3%	4%	3%	1%	2%	2%	7%	1%	100%
NE	11080	842	2334	1494	903	716	605	403	743	710	860	3114	1387	25191
	44%	3%	9%	6%	4%	3%	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	12%	6%	100%
NW	18437	3476	3556	2288	897	590	698	379	390	486	649	1965	177	33988
	54%	10%	10%	7%	3%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	6%	1%	100%
SE	21274	2810	2771	1978	839	674	595	269	681	1209	1547	3488	1316	39451
	54%	7%	7%	5%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	3%	4%	9%	3%	100%
SW	21375	5554	3873	2397	1339	776	824	243	184	369	1035	2202	1001	41172
	52%	13%	9%	6%	3%	2%	2%	1%	0%	1%	3%	5%	2%	100%
State	87226	15028	15367	9561	4806	3503	3849	2076	2424	3321	4560	12823	4109	168653
	52%	9%	9%	6%	3%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	3%	8%	2%	100%

Detour/object marker/recreation/guide Signs

	Years prior to the end of service life							Years beyond service life						Total
	6-10	5	4	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	5-10	>10	
NC	8507	619	837	685	239	866	303	592	407	646	633	3560	908	18802
	45%	3%	4%	4%	1%	5%	2%	3%	2%	3%	3%	19%	5%	100%
NE	6739	368	949	599	429	587	207	356	597	863	731	4718	2920	20063
	34%	2%	5%	3%	2%	3%	1%	2%	3%	4%	4%	24%	15%	100%
NW	11589	1124	1130	1074	269	872	312	264	458	1053	1606	5786	1470	27007
	43%	4%	4%	4%	1%	3%	1%	1%	2%	4%	6%	21%	5%	100%
SE	7898	996	1440	842	1133	1171	316	485	820	1394	1327	4934	3531	26287
	30%	4%	5%	3%	4%	4%	1%	2%	3%	5%	5%	19%	13%	100%
SW	10317	938	1507	1574	725	738	283	258	340	667	1729	5362	5146	29584
	35%	3%	5%	5%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	6%	18%	17%	100%
State	45050	4045	5863	4774	2795	4234	1421	1955	2622	4623	6026	24360	13975	121743
	37%	3%	5%	4%	2%	3%	1%	2%	2%	4%	5%	20%	11%	100%

2010 Bridges: Compass Report on Condition, Maintenance, and Inspection Backlog

The Compass bridge report uses data from the Highway Structures Information System (HSI) online report. Data was taken during the period of one week from May 2nd to May 8th, 2011.

Key observations:

Bridge Deck Condition Distribution

- 32% of decks statewide are in Fair condition and need reactive maintenance, based on their NBI ratings of 5 or 6. These include 26% of concrete bridges and 43% of steel bridges.
- The NW region has the lowest percent of decks in good condition, only 52% of decks in good condition. The SE region however has the highest percentage of decks in poor condition at 4%. The SE region does have the largest deck area to maintain (14,620,127 ft²).
- The NE region (878 bridges) has the best bridge ratings in the state with 82% of decks in Good condition and an impressive 0% in Poor and Critical condition.

Bridge Maintenance Needs

- Maintenance actions are those recommended by bridge inspectors for each bridge at the time of inspection.
- The following maintenance actions are recommended as needed. As approaches settle, brush continually grows, decks eventually crack and drainage issues arise at wings, these actions become necessary:
 - Decks - Seal Surface Cracks
 - Expansion Joints – Clean
 - Miscellaneous - Cut Brush
 - Approaches - Seal Approach to Paving Block
 - Deck - Patching
 - Drainage - Repair Washouts / Erosion
 - Approach – Wedge Approach

Bridge Special Inspection Backlog

- Backlog for bridge inspection is calculated based on the mandatory inspection frequency for each inspection type. Bridges without a ‘Last Inspection Date’ are reported in HSI as ‘Unknown’ and are regarded as non-compliant (backlogged) for this report. All bridges require initial and biennial routine inspections. Initial inspections are the most up to date with 1% of backlogs statewide, while routine inspections is the next lowest with only 2% backlog.
- Nineteen bridges need Load Posting inspections (63% backlog), while the backlog for Underwater Probe/visual inspections is 18% (308 bridges still needs this inspection).

Wisconsin 2010: Bridge Condition Distribution

	Bridges	Deck Area (ft ²)	Component	% of bridges in condition			
				Good ¹	Fair ²	Poor ³	Critical ³
All	5,162	50,750,042	Decks	66%	32%	2%	0%
			Superstructures	71%	28%	1%	0%
			Substructures	71%	28%	1%	0%
Concrete	3,614	28,283,702	Decks	72%	26%	2%	0%
			Superstructures	79%	20%	1%	0%
			Substructures	80%	19%	0%	0%
Steel	1,548	22,466,340	Decks	53%	43%	4%	0%
			Superstructures	54%	44%	2%	0%
			Substructures	52%	46%	2%	0%

Region 2010: Bridge Condition Distribution

Region	Bridges	Deck Area (ft ²)	Component	% of bridges in condition			
				Good ¹	Fair ²	Poor ³	Critical ³
NC	653	5,085,004	Decks	71%	26%	3%	0%
			Superstructures	82%	17%	1%	0%
			Substructures	79%	20%	1%	0%
NE	878	9,210,874	Decks	82%	17%	0%	0%
			Superstructures	81%	18%	1%	0%
			Substructures	77%	22%	1%	0%
NW	1,061	9,365,013	Decks	52%	46%	2%	0%
			Superstructures	66%	32%	2%	0%
			Substructures	69%	29%	2%	0%
SE	1,063	14,620,127	Decks	55%	41%	4%	0%
			Superstructures	54%	45%	1%	0%
			Substructures	56%	43%	0%	0%
SW	1,507	12,469,024	Decks	70%	27%	3%	0%
			Superstructures	76%	23%	2%	0%
			Substructures	75%	24%	1%	0%

¹Good: Bridges with NBI rating 7-9 should receive Preventive Maintenance

²Fair: Bridges with NBI 5-6 should receive Reactive Maintenance. These bridges are considered backlogged for maintenance

³Poor and Critical: Bridges with NBI 0-4 should receive Rehabilitation or Replacement.

Wisconsin and Regions 2010: Bridge Condition

Region	Year	Percent of Bridges Feature in Fair condition			Number of state-maintained bridges	Dollar spent on bridges (in millions)
		Decks	Superstructures	Substructures		
NC	2006	19%	14%	17%	604	
	2007	21%	15%	17%	620	
	2008	21%	17%	18%	637	
	2009	22%	16%	18%	654	
	2010	26%	17%	20%	653	
NE	2006	23%	15%	27%	771	
	2007	21%	17%	25%	837	
	2008	19%	18%	24%	859	
	2009	19%	19%	22%	870	
	2010	17%	18%	22%	878	
NW	2006	44%	35%	34%	1040	
	2007	47%	32%	31%	1067	
	2008	45%	31%	29%	1067	
	2009	47%	33%	29%	1072	
	2010	46%	32%	29%	1061	
SE	2006	51%	52%	51%	1034	
	2007	48%	50%	50%	1023	
	2008	45%	47%	47%	1055	
	2009	41%	45%	45%	1052	
	2010	41%	45%	43%	1063	
SW	2006	24%	20%	16%	1451	
	2007	24%	22%	18%	1462	
	2008	24%	23%	22%	1466	
	2009	24%	23%	23%	1470	
	2010	27%	23%	24%	1507	
Statewide	2006	33%	29%	29%	4900	\$10.50
	2007	33%	28%	29%	5007	\$11.40
	2008	32%	28%	29%	5084	\$11.78
	2009	31%	28%	28%	5118	\$11.87
	2010	32%	28%	28%	5162	\$12.17

Wisconsin and Regions: Trend of Bridge Maintenance Needs

Region	Year	Percent of Bridges needing maintenance						# of Bridges needing maintenance							
		Maintenance Action													
		Deck – Seal Surface Cracks		Expansion Joints – Seal		Misc. – Cut Brush		Approach – Seal Approach to Paving Block		Deck – Patching		Drainage - Repair Washouts / Erosion		Approach - Wedge Approach	
NC	2006	24%	144	8%	48	2%	12	1%	4	10%	61	1%	8	2%	14
	2007	39%	241	11%	66	4%	24	1%	5	12%	75	2%	11	3%	17
	2008	45%	287	22%	141	7%	42	2%	11	16%	101	8%	48	4%	26
	2009	56%	364	30%	194	11%	71	2%	12	16%	102	9%	58	5%	31
	2010	63%	413	42%	277	14%	93	3%	20	18%	120	14%	89	6%	39
NE	2006	13%	102	22%	167	2%	18	2%	15	6%	48	7%	56	1%	5
	2007	18%	150	25%	209	4%	32	4%	37	9%	78	9%	78	1%	11
	2008	21%	182	28%	238	6%	53	12%	107	12%	103	13%	115	2%	13
	2009	28%	248	31%	268	7%	63	17%	147	15%	135	15%	127	1%	13
	2010	34%	300	33%	293	9%	79	24%	214	17%	150	16%	143	2%	19
NW	2006	8%	78	1%	11	8%	85	17%	175	4%	37	5%	50	3%	31
	2007	7%	77	2%	24	5%	57	16%	174	4%	37	4%	45	2%	25
	2008	2%	22	3%	28	1%	16	5%	51	3%	29	5%	49	1%	14
	2009	3%	35	3%	34	2%	21	9%	97	5%	52	6%	67	3%	28
	2010	4%	41	3%	37	4%	43	11%	121	7%	74	9%	93	3%	35
SE	2006	12%	122	15%	150	13%	138	6%	63	8%	87	11%	112	11%	109
	2007	14%	140	18%	181	17%	174	9%	89	9%	96	12%	121	12%	126
	2008	15%	153	19%	203	21%	226	14%	147	11%	121	13%	140	14%	147
	2009	16%	172	20%	213	23%	238	17%	177	14%	145	16%	164	15%	159
	2010	18%	192	22%	233	25%	268	21%	226	15%	155	19%	201	17%	176
SW	2006	8%	114	3%	39	5%	68	5%	74	2%	33	3%	46	4%	65
	2007	13%	188	4%	51	12%	174	10%	146	4%	65	6%	83	7%	95
	2008	18%	260	4%	61	18%	257	14%	203	6%	94	9%	131	9%	138
	2009	20%	293	4%	66	25%	369	21%	308	8%	112	12%	181	11%	162
	2010	23%	354	5%	69	29%	443	27%	400	9%	134	15%	229	13%	196
statewide	2006	11%	560	8%	415	7%	321	7%	331	5%	266	6%	272	5%	224
	2007	16%	796	11%	531	9%	461	9%	451	7%	351	7%	338	5%	274
	2008	17%	904	12%	671	11%	594	10%	519	8%	448	9%	483	6%	338
	2009	22%	1112	15%	775	15%	762	14%	741	11%	546	12%	597	8%	393
	2010	25%	1300	18%	909	18%	926	19%	981	12%	633	15%	755	9%	465

Wisconsin and Regions 2010: Bridge Special Inspection Backlog

Inspection backlogs are shown as 'percent of bridges in the county/region/state requiring this type of inspection'. Shown under the percentages are the numbers of bridges backlogged for that inspection type in the county/region/state. Data was extracted from WisDOT's Highway Structures Information System on-line reports.

The special inspection types have a mandatory inspection frequency. The inspection frequencies for each special inspection are as follows:

- Initial: After construction and major rehabilitations, or 48 months
- Routine: 24 months
- Load Posted: 12 months
- In-depth: 72 months
- Fracture Critical: 24 months
- Underwater Diving: 60 months
- Underwater Probe/Visual: 24 months

Region	Special Inspection Type						
	% of bridges backlogged for inspection type # of bridges backlogged for inspection						
	Initial	Routine	Load Posted	In-depth	Fracture Critical	Underwater Diving	Underwater Probe/Visual
NC	2%	0%	100%	5%	25%	3%	6%
	2	0	4	2	2	2	23
NE	0%	1%	--	8%	48%	3%	17%
	0	11	--	1	16	2	48
NW	0%	2%	100%	60%	38%	18%	20%
	0	16	2	9	6	17	105
SE	1%	3%	100%	16%	18%	11%	19%
	2	33	9	15	2	1	43
SW	1%	1%	27%	40%	6%	0%	26%
	2	20	4	8	2	--	89
Statewide	1%	2%	63%	19%	28%	6%	18%
	6	80	19	35	28	22	308

Appendices

- A. Program Contributors**
- B. Feature Thresholds and Grade Ranges**
- C. Feature Contribution Categories**
- D. 2010 Maintenance Targets**
- E. 2010 Compass Rating Sheet**
- F. County Data:**
 - 1. Field Review: Traffic, Shoulders, Drainage and Roadside**
 - 2. Signs (routine replacement needs)**
 - 3. Bridge Maintenance Needs**

A. Program Contributors

The Wisconsin Department of Transportation appreciates the significant contributions to the Compass program that were made by the following people:

2010 Compass Advisory Team

Adam Boardman, WisDOT State Highway Program
Development & Analysis Section Chief
Gary Brunner, Northwest Region Operations Manager
Scott Bush, WisDOT Compass Program Manager
John Corbin, WisDOT Traffic Engineering Section Chief
Bob Hanifl, WisDOT Southwest Region Maintenance
Project Engineer
Todd Hogan, WisDOT Southwest Region Engineering
Technician
Ed Kazik, Brown County Patrol Superintendent
John Kinar, WisDOT Highway Maintenance & Roadside
Management Section Chief
Mike Ostrenga, WisDOT Northwest Region
Maintenance Supervisor
Doug Passineau, Wood County Patrol Superintendent
Mark Woltmann, WisDOT Highway Operations
Program Management Section Chief
Jack Yates, Marquette County Patrol Superintendent

2010 Compass Training Team

Scott Bush, WisDOT Compass Program Manager
Jim Emmons, WisDOT Central Office
Leif Hubbard, WisDOT Central Office
Ed Kazik, Brown County
Jim Merriman, WisDOT Central Office

2010 Compass Quality Assurance Team

Lance Burger, WisDOT NW Region
Scott Bush, WisDOT Compass Program Manager (all
regions)
Jim Emmons, WisDOT (NC Region)
Bob Hanifl, WisDOT SW Region
Leif Hubbard, WisDOT Central Office (SE Region)
Jim Merriman, WisDOT Central Office (NE Region)

2010 Certified Compass Raters

Thad Ash, Door County
Dawonn Averhart, Milwaukee County
Kris Baguhn, Marathon County
Joe Baranek, Marinette County
Brent Bauer, Pepin County
Freeman Bennett, Oneida County
Casey Beyersdorf, Shawano County
Dale Bisonette, WisDOT
Dennis Bonnell, Waupaca County

Randy Braun, Brown County
Michael Burke, WisDOT NW Region
Chuck Buss, Green Lake County
Pat Cadigan, Columbia County
Russ Cooper, Jefferson County
Brandon Dammann, Wood County
Dan Davis, WisDOT NE Region
Jack Delaney, Walworth County
John Delaney, WisDOT SW Region
Bill Demler, Winnebago County
Jeff DeMuri, Florence County
Dennis Dickman, Monroe County
Christopher Elstran, Chippewa County
Jeffrey Fish, Vernon County
Greg Gordinier, WisDOT
Hank Graber, Washburn County
Don Grande, Ashland County
Susan Greeno-Eichinger, WisDOT NC Region
Gary Gretzinger, Taylor County
Mark Gruentzel, Menominee County
Tim Hammes, La Crosse County
Gus Hanold, WisDOT NE Region
Leo Hanson, Iron County
Jim Harer, St. Croix County
David Heil, Waukesha County
Robert Hill, Sawyer County
Ron Hintz, WisDOT NC Region
Todd Hogan, WisDOT SW Region
Marc Holsen, Kewaunee County
Mike Huber, Burnett County
Brandon Hytinen, WisDOT NE Region
Jason Jackman, Douglas County
Jerry Jagmin, Lincoln County
Paul Johanik, Bayfield County
Mike Keichinger, Juneau County
Kevin Kent, Milwaukee County
Brad Kimball, WisDOT
Joe Klingelhoets, Barron County
Jon Knautz, Grant County
Patrick Kotlowski, Adams County
Don Kreft, Walworth County
Michael Larson, WisDOT NW Region
Mark Leibham, Sheboygan County
Wayne Lien, Trempealeau County
Jarred Maney, Vilas County
Russ Marske, Barron County
Dick Marti, Green County
Andrea Maxwell, WisDOT SE Region
Hal Mayer, Rock County
Jeff McLaughlin, Waukesha County

Brenda McNallan, WisDOT NW Region
Carl Meverden, Marinette County
Randy Miller, Washington County
Michael Mischnick, Calumet County
George Molnar, Price County
Phil Montwill, Rusk County
Todd Myers, Crawford County
Gordy Nesselth, Barron County
Pat Nolan, Racine County
Emil "Moe" Norby, Polk County
Clair "Jeep" Norris, WisDOT SW Region
Charles Oleinik, WisDOT NC Region
Donnie Olsen, Jackson County
Al Olson, Oconto County
Shaun Olson, Dane County
Bill Patterson, Waushara County
Jon Pauley, Monroe County
Tim Pawelski, WisDOT NW Region
Lance Penney, Waupaca County
Dale Petersen, Portage County
Carl "Buzz" Peterson, Lafayette County
Gregg Peterson, Manitowoc County
Neil Pierce, Rock County
Patricia Pollock, WisDOT NW Region
Rick Potter, Juneau County
Dennis Premo, Adams County
Larry Price, Walworth County
Dan Raczkowski, Marathon County
Perry Raivala, WisDOT NW Region
Gale Reinecke, Dunn County
Randall Richardson, Richland County
Michael Roberts, WisDOT SW Region
Dave Rogers, WisDOT NC Region
Randy Roloff, Outagamie County
Dennis Schmunck, WisDOT SE Region
Joel Seaman, WisDOT
Stacy Shampo, Forest County
Charles Smith, WisDOT NW Region

Ken Stock, Dodge County
Pete Strachan, WisDOT SW Region
Randy Sudmeier, Iowa County
William Tackes, Ozaukee County
Michael Thompson, Buffalo County
Alan Thoner, Pierce County
Jarrod Turk, WisDOT SW Region
Paul Vetter, Dane County
Gail Vukodinovich, WisDOT
Don Walker, Clark County
Richard Walthers, Eau Claire County
Ken Washatko, Langlade County
Jim Weiglein, WisDOT
David Woodhouse, Walworth County
Jack Yates, Marquette County
John Zettler, Fond du Lac County
John Ziech, Sauk County

Additional Compass Resources

Mike Adams, WisDOT Central Office (winter)
Dr. Teresa Adams, University of Wisconsin – Madison
(data analysis, report)
Dave Babler, WisDOT Central Office (bridge)
Scott Erdman, WisDOT Central Office (segment data)
Julie Crego & Chuck Failing, WisDOT Central Office
(mapping)
Emil Juni, University of Wisconsin - Madison (data
analysis, report development)
Mary Kirkpatrick, WisDOT Central Office (desktop
publishing)
Mike Malaney, WisDOT Central Office (pavement)
Tim Nachreiner, WisDOT Central Office (database,
Rating Sheets)
Matt Rauch, WisDOT Central Office (signs)
Mike Sproul, WisDOT Central Office (winter)

B. Compass Feature Thresholds and Grade Ranges

Element	Feature	Threshold	Ranges for System Grades <i>Grade determined by percent backlogged shown: top of range</i>				
			A	B	C	D	F
Traffic control & safety devices (selected)	Centerline markings	Line with > 20% paint missing (by mile)	2%	5%	9%	15%	>15%
	Edgeline markings	Line with > 20% paint missing (by mile)	4%	9%	18%	30%	>30%
	Delineators	Missing OR not visible at posted speed OR damaged (by delineator)	5%	12%	23%	40%	>40%
	Detour/object marker/recreation/guide signs (emergency repair)	Missing OR not visible at posted speed (by sign)	4%	9%	18%	30%	>30%
	Detour/object marker/recreation/guide signs (routine)	Beyond recommended service life (by sign)	7%	18%	35%	60%	>60%
	Protective barriers	Not functioning as intended (linear feet of barrier)	4%	9%	18%	30%	>30%
	Regulatory/warning signs (emergency repair)	Missing OR not visible at posted speed (by sign)	2%	5%	9%	15%	>15%
	Regulatory/warning signs (routine)	Beyond recommended service life (by sign)	5%	12%	23%	40%	>40%
	Special pavement markings	Missing OR not functioning as intended (by marking)	5%	12%	23%	40%	>40%
Shoulders	Hazardous debris	Any items large enough to cause a safety hazard (by mile)	2%	5%	9%	15%	>15%
	Cracking on paved shoulder	200 linear feet or more of unsealed cracks > ¼ inch (by mile)	7%	18%	35%	60%	>60%
	Drop-off/build-up on paved shoulder	200 linear feet or more with drop-off or build-up > 1.5 inches (by mile)	2%	5%	9%	15%	>15%
	Potholes/raveling on paved shoulder	Any potholes OR raveling > 1 square foot by 1 inch deep (by mile)	6%	15%	29%	50%	>50%
	Cross-slope on unpaved shoulder	200 linear feet or more of cross-slope at least 2x planned slope with the maximum cross slope of 8% (by mile)	7%	18%	35%	60%	>60%
	Drop-off/build-up on unpaved shoulder	200 linear feet or more with drop-off or build-up > 1.5 inches (by mile)	2%	5%	9%	15%	>15%
	Erosion on unpaved shoulder	200 linear feet or more with erosion >2 inches deep (by mile)	7%	18%	35%	60%	>60%
Drainage	Culverts	Culverts that are >25% obstructed OR where a sharp object - e.g., a shovel-can be pushed through the bottom of the pipe OR pipe is collapsed or separated (by culvert)	7%	18%	35%	60%	>60%

Element	Feature	Threshold	Ranges for System Grades <i>Grade determined by percent backlogged shown: top of range</i>				
			A	B	C	D	F
	Curb & gutter	Curb & gutter with severe structural distress OR >1 inch structural misalignment OR >1 inch of debris build-up in the curb line (by linear feet of curb & gutter)	9%	22%	41%	70%	>70%
	Ditches	Ditch with greater than minimal erosion of ditch line OR obstructions to flow of water requiring action (by linear feet of ditch)	7%	18%	35%	60%	>60%
	Flumes	Not functioning as intended OR deteriorated to the point that they are causing erosion (by flume)	7%	18%	35%	60%	>60%
	Storm sewer system	Inlets, catch basins, and outlet pipes with >=50% capacity obstructed OR <80% structurally sound OR >1 inch vertical displacement or heaving OR not functioning as intended (by inlet, catch basin & outlet pipes)	7%	18%	35%	60%	>60%
	Under-drains/edge-drains	Under- and edge-drains with outlets, endwalls or end protection closed or crushed OR water flow or end protection is obstructed (by drain)	9%	22%	41%	70%	>70%
Roadsides	Fences	Fence missing OR not functioning as intended (by LF of fence)	4%	9%	18%	30%	>30%
	Litter	Any pieces of litter on shoulders and roadside visible at posted speed, but not causing a safety threat. (by mile)	10%	25%	47%	80%	>80%
	Mowing	Any roadside has mowed grass that is too short, too wide or is mowed in a no-mow zone (by mile)	10%	25%	47%	80%	>80%
	Mowing for vision	Any instances in which grass is too high or blocks a vision triangle (by mile)	4%	9%	18%	30%	>30%
	Noxious weeds	Any visible clumps (by mile)	7%	18%	35%	60%	>60%
	Woody vegetation control	Any instances in which a tree is present in the clear zone OR trees and/or branches overhang the roadway or shoulder creating a clearance problem (by mile)	4%	9%	18%	30%	>30%
	Woody vegetation control for vision	Any instances in which woody vegetation blocks a vision triangle (by mile)	4%	9%	18%	30%	>30%

C. Feature Contribution Categories

		<i>This Feature Contributes Primarily To:</i>				
Element	Feature	Critical Safety	Safety/Mobility	Ride/Comfort	Stewardship	Aesthetics
Asphalt Traveled Way	Alligator Cracking				✓	
	Block Cracking				✓	
	Edge Raveling				✓	
	Flushing				✓	
	Longitudinal Cracking				✓	
	Longitudinal Distortion			✓		
	Patch Deterioration			✓		
	Rutting	✓				
	Surface Raveling			✓		
	Transverse Cracking				✓	
	Transverse Distortion			✓		
Concrete Traveled Way	Distressed Joints/Cracks			✓		
	Longitudinal Joint Distress			✓		
	Patch Deterioration			✓		
	Slab Breakup			✓		
	Surface Distress				✓	
	Transverse Faulting			✓		

		<i>This Feature Contributes Primarily To:</i>				
Element	Feature	Critical Safety	Safety/Mobility	Ride/Comfort	Stewardship	Aesthetics
Traffic and Safety	Centerline Markings	✓				
	Delineators		✓			
	Edgeline Markings		✓			
	Detour/object marker/recreation/guide signs (emerg. repair)		✓			
	Detour/object marker/recreation/guide signs (routine repair)			✓		
	Protective Barriers		✓			
	Reg./Warning Signs (emerg.)	✓				
	Reg./Warning Signs (routine)		✓			
	Special Pavement Markings		✓			
Shoulders	Hazardous Debris	✓				
	Cracking (paved)				✓	
	Drop-off/Build-up (paved)	✓				
	Potholes/Raveling (paved)			✓		
	Cross-Slope (unpaved)			✓		
	Drop-off/Build-up (unpaved)	✓				
	Erosion (unpaved)				✓	

		<i>This Feature Contributes Primarily To:</i>				
Element	Feature	Critical Safety	Safety/Mobility	Ride/Comfort	Stewardship	Aesthetics
Drainage	Culverts				✓	
	Curb & Gutter				✓	
	Ditches				✓	
	Flumes				✓	
	Storm Sewer System				✓	
	Under-drains/Edge-drains				✓	
Roadside	Fences		✓			
	Litter					✓
	Mowing		✓			
	Mowing for Vision		✓			
	Noxious Weeds				✓	
	Woody Vegetation		✓			
	Woody Veg. Control for Vision		✓			

Category Definitions:

Critical safety: Critical safety features that would necessitate immediate action – with overtime pay if necessary - to remedy if not properly functioning.

Safety: Highway features and characteristics that protect users against – and provide them with a clear sense of freedom from – danger, injury or damage.

Ride/comfort: Highway features and characteristics, such as ride quality, proper signing, or lack of obstructions, that provide a state of ease and quiet enjoyment for highway users.

Stewardship: Actions taken to help a highway element obtain its full potential service life.

Aesthetics: The display of natural or fabricated beauty items, such as landscaping or decorative structures, located along a highway corridor. Also, the absence of things like litter and graffiti, that detract from the sightlines of the road.

WisDOT Highway Operations 2010 Target Service Levels

September 30, 2009

Issued by
David Vieth, Director of the Bureau of Highway Operations

Attached are the 2009 target service levels for highway operations. Highway operations managers expect these targets to provide guidance to central office and regional highway operations staff in selecting activities and expending resources. The 2010 targets are critical for structuring the 2010 Routine Maintenance Agreements (RMA). **The targets are consistent with the 2010 RMA guidance that I also sent to regions today.**

Targets are the conditions expected on state highways at the end of the summer maintenance season. They were selected by highway operations managers in the regions and BHO to set priorities within the budget, and to increase consistency across region and county lines.

The condition measure used is the percent of inventory with backlogged maintenance work. A measure greater than 0% backlogged reflects work left undone at the end of the summer season. Under full funding of operations needs, we would expect to see features at or close to 0%. The following chart provides historical service levels statewide and by region for 2008. Please remember targets have not yet been set for a portion of highway operations expenditures including winter operations, certain traffic devices and electrical operations.

Targets do not reflect an optimal maintenance condition for the highways, but instead reflect a continued commitment to fully fund winter operations, other organizational priorities, existing highway conditions, and most importantly, dollars available. Given constrained resources, these organizational priorities include:

- Focusing our resources on keeping the system safe and operating from day to day.
Highway operations will:
 - Decrease the amount of hazardous debris on shoulders.
 - Decrease drop-off on unpaved shoulders.
 - Continue routine replacement of regulatory and warning signs.
 - Repair damaged safety appurtenances and signs.
- Expending far fewer resources based on limited funding.
 - Litter control is limited to once in the spring and Adopt-A-Highway efforts continue to be encouraged.
 - Mowing is limited to one shoulder cut per season. The exception is for spot locations where vision is a safety issue for that specific area. Mowing for woody vegetation shall be accomplished with the normal shoulder cut and shall not be done as a standalone work activity.
 - Routine crack sealing and non-emergency concrete repair for preventive maintenance purposes should not be undertaken with routine maintenance funds.

- No maintenance of lane-line raised pavement markers and other wet reflective markings. Special pavement markings will only be addressed for the most critical safety needs. Some edgeline markings will be deferred.
- Leveraging improvement funding and better coordinating improvement work to decrease maintenance workload and funding demands.
 - Now and going forward, maintenance supervisors and engineers will put greater emphasis on working with the improvement program to decrease pavement rutting and to improve the condition of culverts.

Thank you to Scott Bush and the Compass program for coordinating this effort and preparing this report.


D. 2009 Highway Operations Targets

Element	Feature	2005 Target Percent Backlogged and Feature Grade - Statewide	2006 Target Percent Backlogged and Feature Grade - Statewide	2007 Target Percent Backlogged and Feature Grade - Statewide	2004 Actual Percent Backlogged and Feature Grade - Statewide	2005 Actual Percent Backlogged and Feature Grade - Statewide	2006 Actual Percent Backlogged and Feature Grade - Statewide*	2008 Target Percent Backlogged and Feature Grade - Statewide	2010 Target Percent Backlogged and Feature Grade - Statewide
Asphalt Traveled Way	Alligator Cracking	5=A	5=A	5=A	1=A	1=A	2=A	5=A	5=A
	Block Cracking	5=A	5=A	5=A	3=A	3=A	2=A	5=A	5=A
	Edge Raveling	15=B	18=B	20=C	15=B	15=B	17=B	20=C	20=C
	Flushing	1=A	1=A	1=A	0=A	0=A	0=A	1=A	1=A
	Longitudinal Cracking	25=C	28=C	30=C	26=C	26=C	62=F	30=C	65=F
	Longitudinal Distortion	1=A	1=A	1=A	0=A	0=A	0=A	1=A	1=A
	Patch Deterioration	10=B	10=B	10=B	9=B	9=B	7=B	10=B	10=B
	Rutting	15=D	13=D	10=D	9=C	9=C	7=B	7=B	7=C
	Surface Raveling	2=A	2=A	2=A	1=A	1=A	0=A	2=A	2=A
	Transverse Cracking	25=C	28=C	30=C	24=C	24=C	62=F	30=C	67=F
	Transverse Distortion	5=A	5=A	5=A	1=A	1=A	0=A	5=A	5=A
Concrete Traveled Way	Distressed Joints/Cracks	43=D	43=D	43=D	34=D	33=D	18=C	43=D	43=D
	Longitudinal Joint Distress	27=C	27=C	27=C	21=C	21=C	0=A	27=C	27=C
	Patch Deterioration	30=D	30=D	30=D	28=C	28=C	18=C	30=D	30=D
	Slab Breakup	45=D	45=D	45=D	45=D	44=D	29=C	45=D	45=D
	Surface Distress	25=C	25=C	25=C	20=C	20=C	8=B	25=C	25=C

	Transverse Faulting	75=F	75=F	75=F	74=F	74=F	61=F	75=F	88=F
Traffic and Safety	Centerline Markings	5=B	5=B	6=C	5=B	5=B	4=B	5=B	5=B
	Delineators	15=C	25=D	25=D	21=C	24=D	21=C	25=D	25=D
	Edgeline Markings	6=B	6=B	7=B	7=B	5=B	6=B	6=B	8=B
	Detour/object marker/recreation/guide signs (emerg. repair)	1=A	1=A	1=A	0=A	1=A	1=A	1=A	1=A
	Detour/object marker/recreation/guide signs (routine repair)	50=D	65=F	70=F	46=D	59=D	55=D	70=F	59=D
	Protective Barriers	3=A	3=A	3=A	3=A	4=A	4=A	3=A	3=A
	Reg./Warning Signs (emerg.)	0=A	0=A	0=A	1=A	1=A	1=A	0=A	0=A
	Reg./Warning Signs (routine)	40=D	35=D	30=D	36=D	41=F	31=D	25=D	25=D
	Special Pavement Markings	25=D	25=D	25=D	13=C	5=A	3=A	25=D	23=C
Shoulders	Hazardous Debris	6=C	6=C	6=C	13=D	12=D	13=D	6=C	6=C
	Drop-off/Build-up (paved)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Cracking (paved)	60=D	60=D	60=D	51=D	52=D	50=D	60=D	70=F
	Potholes/Raveling (paved)	10=B	10=B	10=B	5=A	7=B	5=A	10=B	10=B
	Cross-Slope (unpaved)	20=C	20=C	20=C	15=B	14=B	25=C	20=C	20=C
	Drop-off/Build-up (unpaved)	35=F	30=D	25=D	37=F	36=F	40=F	20=D	35=F
	Erosion (unpaved)	5=A	5=A	5=A	3=A	3=A	3=A	5=A	5=A

Drainage	Culverts	15=B	15=B	15=B	17=B	18=B	15=B	15=B	30=C
	Curb & Gutter	8=A	10=B	10=B	6=A	7=A	8=A	10=B	10=B
	Ditches	2=A	2=A	2=A	2=A	2=A	3=A	5=A	5=A
	Flumes	30=C	30=C	30=C	32=C	19=C	27=C	30=C	35=C
	Storm Sewer System	10=B	10=B	10=B	9=B	9=B	9=B	10=B	15=B
	Under-drains/Edge-drains	20=B	25=C	25=C	14=B	20=B	13=B	25=C	30=C
Roadside	Fences	14=C	14=C	14=C	4=A	2=A	3=A	14=C	14=C
	Litter	75=D	75=D	75=D	70=D	62=D	64=D	75=D	81=F
	Mowing	40=C	40=C	40=C	40=C	35=C	39=C	40=C	40=C
	Mowing for Vision	5=B	5=B	5=B	26=D	--	2=A	5=B	5=B
	Noxious Weeds	50=D	50=D	50=D	30=C	29=C	34=C	61=F	61=F
	Woody Vegetation	5=B	5=B	5=B	4=A	3=A	3=A	5=B	5=B
	Woody Veg. Control for Vision	5=B	3=A	3=A	1=A	1=A	1=A	3=A	3=A

E. 2010 Compass Rating Sheet

	2010 Compass Rating Sheet Wisconsin Department of Transportation	Date Survey Taken:	
Segment 1, Highway 002, NW, ASHLAND County, Region 5, Undivided Directions: From (MOCCASIN DR) go E for 0.3 miles		Start Time:	
Alternate Directions: From (BIRCH HILL RD) go W for 2.68 miles		Stop Time:	
		Reviewed by:	
If a segment is discarded for one of the reasons below, please check the appropriate box and add the next highest numbered "spare" segment for a similar roadway (divided or undivided) to your list of segments to be rated. Please enter the reject reason in the database.			
<input type="checkbox"/> A piece or all of the segment falls on a bridge. <input type="checkbox"/> A piece or all of the segment is currently under construction.			
<input type="checkbox"/> We believe it would be unsafe to rate this segment. <input type="checkbox"/> We cannot locate this segment.			
<input type="checkbox"/> An organization other than WisDOT is responsible for the maintenance of ANY of the four elements within this section.			
Shoulders	Standard	Value	Comments
Hazardous Debris (S-1)	Number of items large enough to cause a safety hazard		
Paved Shoulder <input type="checkbox"/> None (If none, skip to Unpaved Shoulder)			
Drop off/build-up (S-2)	Linear ft. of <u>paved-to-paved</u> drop-off/build-up greater than 1.5".....		
Cracking (S-3)	Linear ft. of unsealed cracks greater than ¼" (up to 150' on undivided or 300' on divided hwy).....		
Potholes/Raveling (S-4)	Total sq. ft. of BOTH potholes AND raveling greater than 1 ft ² x 1" deep.....		
Unpaved Shoulder <input type="checkbox"/> None (If none, skip to Drainage) Width _____			
Drop off/build-up (S-5)	Linear ft. of <u>paved-to-unpaved</u> drop-off/build-up greater than 1.5".....		
Cross Slope (S-6)	Linear ft. with unpaved cross slope greater than 2x planned angle.....		
Erosion (S-7)	Square ft. with ruts deeper than 2 inches.....		
Drainage		Value & Repair/Clean	
Ditches (D-1)	<input type="checkbox"/> None Total linear ft. of ditch Linear ft. with more than minimal erosion of ditch line OR obstructions to the flow of water requiring action	<input type="checkbox"/> Repair <input type="checkbox"/> Clean	Number of deficient culverts: _____ ≤4' in diameter _____ >4' in diameter
Culverts (D-2)	<input type="checkbox"/> None Total number of culverts Number and Size with more than 25% obstructed OR where a sharp object (a shovel) can be pushed thru bottom of pipe OR pipe is collapsing	<input type="checkbox"/> Repair <input type="checkbox"/> Clean	
Under/Edge Drain (D-3)	<input type="checkbox"/> None Total number of drains Number with outlets, endwalls or end protection closed or crushed OR where water flow or end protection is obstructed	<input type="checkbox"/> Repair <input type="checkbox"/> Clean	
Flumes (D-4)	<input type="checkbox"/> None Total number of flumes Number not functioning as intended OR deteriorated to the point that they are causing erosion	<input type="checkbox"/> Repair <input type="checkbox"/> Clean	
Curb & Gutter (D-5)	<input type="checkbox"/> None Total linear ft. of curb and gutter Linear ft. with severe structural distress OR more than 1" structural misalignment OR more than 1" of debris build up in the curb line	<input type="checkbox"/> Repair <input type="checkbox"/> Clean	
Storm Sewer (D-6)	<input type="checkbox"/> None Total number of inlets, catch basins and outlet pipes Number with more than 50% capacity obstructed OR less than 80% structurally sound OR more than 1" vertical displacement OR not functioning as intended	<input type="checkbox"/> Repair <input type="checkbox"/> Clean	

Roadsides		Value	Comments
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Litter (R-1)	Number of pieces (up to 15) of litter & non-natural encroachments on shoulders & roadside visible at posted speed, but not causing a safety threat.....		<input type="checkbox"/> Canada Thistle <input type="checkbox"/> Field Bindweed <input type="checkbox"/> Leafy Spurge
Mowing (R-2)	Mowing meets standard..... If NO, grass is mowed: <input type="checkbox"/> too wide <input type="checkbox"/> too short <input type="checkbox"/> too tall <input type="checkbox"/> in a no mow zone If NO, why: <input type="checkbox"/> safety/equipment <input type="checkbox"/> mowed by property owner <input type="checkbox"/> woody vegetation control <input type="checkbox"/> maintenance decision	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mowing Vision (R-2)	<input type="checkbox"/> None Grass blocks a vision triangle or sightlines.....	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	
Noxious Weeds (R-3)	Visible clumps of noxious weeds are present and type(s) of noxious weeds present.....	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	
Woody Vegetation (R-4)	Number of instances in which a tree > 4" in diameter is present in the clear zone OR trees and/or branches overhang the roadway or shoulder creating a clearance problem.....		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Woody Vegetation Vision (R-4)	Woody vegetation causes a vision problem.....	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	
Fences (R-5)	<input type="checkbox"/> None Total linear ft. of right-of-way fence..... Linear ft. missing OR not functioning as intended.....		

Traffic Control and Safety			Value	Comments
Centerline Markings (T-1)	<input type="checkbox"/> None	Over total segment, > 20% centerline material missing.....	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	
Edgeline Markings (T-1)	<input type="checkbox"/> None	Over total segment, > 20% edgeline material missing.....	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	
Special Pavement Markings (T-2)	<input type="checkbox"/> None	Total number of special pavement markings..... Number missing OR not functioning as intended.....		
Regulatory/Warning Signs (T-3)	<input type="checkbox"/> None	Total number of regulatory/warning signs..... Number missing OR damaged.....		
Other Signs (T-4)	<input type="checkbox"/> None	Total number of other signs..... Number missing OR damaged.....		
Delineators (T-5)	<input type="checkbox"/> None	Total number of delineators..... Number missing OR damaged.....		
Protective Barriers (T-6)	<input type="checkbox"/> None	Total linear ft. of beam guard, concrete barrier, and cable guard..... Linear ft. of protective barriers not functioning as intended and type of deficient protective barrier(s).....	<input type="checkbox"/> Beam Guard <input type="checkbox"/> Damaged Terminal <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete Barrier <input type="checkbox"/> Cable Guard	

Indicates some or all of feature rating must be completed while driving at posted speed OR rated through the eyes of a driver traveling at posted speed.

1/10-mile	528 ft
X2	1056 ft
X3	1584 ft
X4	2112 ft

Rating Sheets should be entered into the LAN database **by October 15, 2010**. Please send the hardcopy Rating Sheets Inter-D to Scott Bush, Hill Farms, Room 501 **by October 15, 2010**.

Questions? Please call Scott Bush, Compass Program Manager at 608-266-8666 or email him at Scott.Bush@dot.wi.gov

F. County Data

Counties 2010: Shoulders and Drainage

Region	County	Condition % backlogged # of observations												
		Shoulders							Drainage					
		Hazardous Debris	Paved Dropoff	Paved Cracking	Paved Potholes/Raveling	Unpaved Dropoff	Unpaved Cross slope	Unpaved Erosion	Ditches	Culverts	Under-drains/edge-drains	Flumes	Curb & Gutter	Storm Sewer
NC	ADAMS	20%	0%	78%	11%	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	--	0%	6%	0%
		10	9	9	9	10	10	10	10	2	--	2	2	1
	FLORENCE	0%	0%	71%	14%	43%	86%	0%	0%	100%	--	--	--	--
		7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	2	--	--	--	--
	FOREST	0%	0%	57%	0%	33%	27%	7%	0%	20%	--	--	7%	100%
		16	14	14	14	15	15	15	14	5	--	--	3	1
	GREEN LAKE	43%	0%	71%	14%	29%	14%	0%	1%	100%	--	100%	31%	--
		7	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	1	--	1	1	--
	IRON	17%	0%	38%	0%	25%	25%	0%	0%	0%	--	--	--	--
		12	8	8	8	12	12	12	12	4	--	--	--	--
	LANGLADE	0%	0%	75%	0%	27%	20%	0%	0%	0%	--	33%	5%	--
		15	12	12	12	15	15	15	15	2	--	2	2	--
	LINCOLN	25%	7%	73%	20%	38%	81%	6%	10%	40%	0%	0%	1%	25%

Region	County	Condition % backlogged # of observations												
		Shoulders							Drainage					
		Hazardous Debris	Paved Dropoff	Paved Cracking	Paved Potholes/Raveling	Unpaved Dropoff	Unpaved Cross slope	Unpaved Erosion	Ditches	Culverts	Under-drains/edge-drains	Flumes	Curb & Gutter	Storm Sewer
		16	15	15	15	16	16	16	16	4	3	1	1	3
	MARATHON	0%	7%	48%	4%	63%	52%	4%	10%	58%	8%	0%	1%	14%
		28	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	10	9	1	3	5
	MARQUETTE	0%	0%	89%	22%	67%	0%	0%	1%	0%	--	--	4%	0%
		9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	4	--	--	2	2
	MENOMINEE	0%	0%	100%	0%	25%	25%	0%	0%	0%	--	--	--	--
		4	1	1	1	4	4	4	4	1	--	--	--	--
	ONEIDA	0%	0%	69%	0%	38%	31%	6%	0%	14%	--	0%	0%	--
		17	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	5	--	1	4	--
	PORTAGE	13%	0%	40%	0%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%	80%	100%	0%	6%
		16	15	15	15	15	15	15	14	2	2	1	3	7
	PRICE	19%	0%	77%	0%	44%	19%	0%	0%	33%	0%	--	35%	--
		16	13	13	13	16	16	16	16	5	1	--	1	--
	SHAWANO	0%	12%	71%	0%	53%	47%	0%	0%	10%	19%	14%	0%	20%
		19	17	17	17	19	19	19	19	8	6	2	2	3
	VILAS	20%	0%	27%	13%	64%	14%	7%	1%	0%	--	0%	3%	--
		15	15	15	15	14	14	14	15	4	--	1	1	--

		Condition % backlogged # of observations												
		Shoulders							Drainage					
Region	County	Hazardous Debris	Paved Dropoff	Paved Cracking	Paved Potholes/Raveling	Unpaved Dropoff	Unpaved Cross slope	Unpaved Erosion	Ditches	Culverts	Under-drains/edge-drains	Flumes	Curb & Gutter	Storm Sewer
	WAUPACA	5%	0%	44%	0%	24%	5%	5%	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%
		21	18	18	18	21	21	21	21	7	2	1	2	1
	WAUSHARA	7%	0%	46%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	--	0%	0%
		14	13	13	13	14	14	14	14	4	2	--	2	1
	WOOD	0%	0%	73%	0%	28%	6%	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	--
		18	11	11	11	18	18	18	18	2	1	1	1	--
NE	BROWN	6%	6%	88%	0%	45%	27%	0%	2%	50%	--	--	--	8%
		16	16	16	16	11	11	11	16	5	--	--	--	5
	CALUMET	11%	0%	89%	0%	22%	0%	0%	1%	50%	--	100%	2%	--
		9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	2	--	1	1	--
	DOOR	9%	0%	9%	0%	18%	9%	0%	0%	0%	--	--	0%	0%
		11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	1	--	--	4	3
	FOND DU LAC	5%	0%	65%	5%	25%	10%	0%	3%	17%	10%	0%	0%	0%
		20	20	20	20	20	20	20	19	9	7	1	1	3
	KEWAUNEE	0%	0%	67%	17%	67%	17%	0%	1%	--	--	100%	44%	--
		6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	--	--	1	1	--
MANITOWOC	7%	0%	73%	0%	55%	45%	0%	3%	0%	--	0%	0%	--	

		Condition % backlogged # of observations													
		Shoulders							Drainage						
Region	County	Hazardous Debris	Paved Dropoff	Paved Cracking	Paved Potholes/Raveling	Unpaved Dropoff	Unpaved Cross slope	Unpaved Erosion	Ditches	Culverts	Under-drains/edge-drains	Flumes	Curb & Gutter	Storm Sewer	
		15	15	15	15	11	11	11	13	1	--	2	5	--	
		6%	0%	38%	0%	13%	13%	0%	0%	14%	--	67%	3%	0%	
	MARINETTE	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	15	7	--	1	1	1	
	OCONTO	0%	12%	53%	6%	24%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%	--	--	33%	
		17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	3	2	--	--	3	
	OUTAGAMIE	0%	0%	41%	0%	32%	16%	0%	2%	63%	--	50%	3%	27%	
		19	17	17	17	19	19	19	18	8	--	3	5	5	
	SHEBOYGAN	24%	6%	59%	6%	41%	29%	6%	4%	0%	0%	50%	5%	25%	
		17	17	17	17	17	17	17	16	4	1	1	2	2	
	WINNEBAGO	0%	0%	38%	0%	13%	0%	0%	6%	100%	0%	--	3%	0%	
		16	13	13	13	15	15	15	16	1	2	--	3	1	
	NW	ASHLAND	8%	0%	70%	10%	42%	25%	8%	2%	100%	--	--	--	--
			12	10	10	10	12	12	12	11	1	--	--	--	--
		BARRON	7%	0%	67%	7%	20%	0%	0%	0%	17%	--	50%	1%	0%
15			15	15	15	15	15	15	14	5	--	4	5	2	
BAYFIELD		6%	0%	55%	9%	31%	25%	0%	2%	33%	--	--	54%	--	
		17	11	11	11	16	16	16	16	6	--	--	2	--	

		Condition % backlogged # of observations												
		Shoulders							Drainage					
Region	County	Hazardous Debris	Paved Dropoff	Paved Cracking	Paved Potholes/Raveling	Unpaved Dropoff	Unpaved Cross slope	Unpaved Erosion	Ditches	Culverts	Under-drains/edge-drains	Flumes	Curb & Gutter	Storm Sewer
	BUFFALO	0%	0%	67%	22%	81%	63%	0%	2%	38%	0%	--	90%	0%
		16	9	9	9	16	16	16	13	10	1	--	1	1
	BURNETT	0%	0%	63%	0%	25%	8%	8%	4%	0%	--	--	--	--
		12	8	8	8	12	12	12	12	1	--	--	--	--
	CHIPPEWA	0%	10%	95%	0%	36%	9%	0%	0%	43%	50%	100%	3%	50%
		22	21	21	21	22	22	22	22	7	2	1	2	1
	CLARK	0%	6%	29%	0%	12%	12%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	--	--
		17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	3	3	1	--	--
	DOUGLAS	6%	0%	47%	7%	25%	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%	--	100%	100%
		16	15	15	15	16	16	16	16	1	1	--	1	1
	DUNN	0%	0%	52%	5%	33%	24%	0%	0%	0%	--	--	0%	25%
		21	21	21	21	21	21	21	20	6	--	--	1	2
	EAU CLAIRE	13%	0%	81%	13%	63%	6%	0%	0%	56%	100%	0%	25%	9%
		16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	6	2	1	4	2
	JACKSON	0%	0%	63%	0%	10%	0%	0%	0%	82%	--	33%	45%	0%
		20	16	16	16	20	20	20	20	9	--	1	4	1
	PEPIN	0%	0%	80%	0%	40%	60%	0%	9%	0%	--	--	--	--

		Condition % backlogged # of observations												
		Shoulders							Drainage					
Region	County	Hazardous Debris	Paved Dropoff	Paved Cracking	Paved Potholes/Raveling	Unpaved Dropoff	Unpaved Cross slope	Unpaved Erosion	Ditches	Culverts	Under-drains/edge-drains	Flumes	Curb & Gutter	Storm Sewer
		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	1	--	--	--	--
		0%	7%	80%	13%	29%	0%	6%	0%	13%	--	100%	15%	--
	PIERCE	17	15	15	15	17	17	17	17	6	--	1	2	--
		0%	0%	25%	6%	35%	12%	0%	0%	0%	--	0%	9%	0%
	POLK	17	16	16	16	17	17	17	17	6	--	1	4	1
		0%	0%	43%	0%	27%	36%	0%	2%	20%	--	0%	43%	33%
	RUSK	11	7	7	7	11	11	11	10	4	--	1	2	1
		6%	0%	31%	0%	12%	6%	0%	1%	25%	--	--	--	--
	SAWYER	17	13	13	13	17	17	17	16	4	--	--	--	--
		0%	0%	70%	0%	50%	35%	0%	3%	30%	--	0%	11%	31%
	ST. CROIX	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	9	--	2	3	6
		0%	0%	27%	0%	8%	0%	0%	6%	33%	--	0%	--	--
	TAYLOR	12	11	11	11	12	12	12	11	3	--	1	--	--
		0%	0%	81%	13%	16%	53%	5%	12%	30%	--	--	--	--
	TREMPEALEAU	19	16	16	16	19	19	19	16	7	--	--	--	--
		0%	15%	38%	0%	54%	8%	0%	0%	0%	--	--	22%	0%
	WASHBURN	14	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	4	--	--	1	1

		Condition % backlogged # of observations												
		Shoulders							Drainage					
Region	County	Hazardous Debris	Paved Dropoff	Paved Cracking	Paved Potholes/Raveling	Unpaved Dropoff	Unpaved Cross slope	Unpaved Erosion	Ditches	Culverts	Under-drains/edge-drains	Flumes	Curb & Gutter	Storm Sewer
SE	KENOSHA	0%	0%	44%	0%	63%	25%	0%	3%	--	0%	--	1%	17%
		11	9	9	9	8	8	8	10	--	3	--	7	5
	MILWAUKEE	24%	0%	80%	7%	67%	17%	0%	47%	50%	50%	50%	9%	27%
		17	15	15	15	6	6	6	8	1	2	1	12	13
	OZAUKEE	0%	29%	71%	29%	14%	14%	0%	0%	0%	--	--	0%	0%
		8	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	5	--	--	2	1
	RACINE	0%	0%	73%	9%	36%	45%	9%	7%	50%	8%	0%	1%	14%
		15	11	11	11	11	11	11	12	4	3	1	7	8
	WALWORTH	29%	0%	57%	14%	24%	0%	0%	3%	33%	42%	--	16%	100%
		21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	7	4	--	2	1
WASHINGTON	0%	0%	85%	8%	36%	0%	0%	2%	0%	25%	--	1%	10%	
	18	13	13	13	14	14	14	15	3	2	--	6	8	
WAUKESHA	15%	0%	88%	8%	26%	0%	0%	6%	50%	0%	0%	1%	7%	
	27	24	24	24	23	23	23	19	3	1	1	11	9	
SW	COLUMBIA	16%	10%	72%	7%	84%	56%	0%	4%	80%	100%	--	2%	--
		32	29	29	29	32	32	32	28	4	1	--	3	--
	CRAWFORD	0%	0%	59%	6%	0%	0%	5%	0%	0%	--	50%	0%	0%

		Condition % backlogged # of observations												
		Shoulders							Drainage					
Region	County	Hazardous Debris	Paved Dropoff	Paved Cracking	Paved Potholes/Raveling	Unpaved Dropoff	Unpaved Cross slope	Unpaved Erosion	Ditches	Culverts	Under-drains/edge-drains	Flumes	Curb & Gutter	Storm Sewer
		20	17	17	17	19	19	19	17	7	--	1	8	4
		32%	11%	78%	11%	55%	0%	0%	2%	27%	93%	60%	10%	55%
	DANE	41	37	37	37	40	40	40	40	11	5	5	7	10
	DODGE	25%	4%	61%	0%	70%	48%	0%	7%	55%	100%	50%	14%	29%
		24	23	23	23	23	23	23	22	8	1	2	6	2
	GRANT	0%	0%	54%	0%	15%	4%	0%	0%	0%	--	100%	4%	--
		27	24	24	24	26	26	26	25	10	--	1	4	--
	GREEN	0%	0%	45%	0%	15%	0%	0%	0%	0%	--	--	0%	0%
		13	11	11	11	13	13	13	13	9	--	--	2	1
	IOWA	6%	0%	69%	15%	72%	6%	6%	2%	0%	--	0%	0%	0%
		18	13	13	13	18	18	18	16	2	--	3	5	2
	JEFFERSON	0%	0%	67%	0%	7%	13%	7%	0%	14%	--	0%	0%	0%
		18	18	18	18	15	15	15	16	7	--	2	6	4
	JUNEAU	10%	5%	58%	11%	18%	6%	0%	0%	31%	25%	--	0%	0%
21		19	19	19	17	17	17	19	8	4	--	2	2	
LA CROSSE	43%	0%	78%	56%	79%	7%	0%	0%	67%	--	--	3%	11%	
	14	9	9	9	14	14	14	12	3	--	--	1	3	

Region	County	Condition % backlogged # of observations												
		Shoulders							Drainage					
		Hazardous Debris	Paved Dropoff	Paved Cracking	Paved Potholes/Raveling	Unpaved Dropoff	Unpaved Cross slope	Unpaved Erosion	Ditches	Culverts	Under-drains/edge-drains	Flumes	Curb & Gutter	Storm Sewer
	LAFAYETTE	0%	0%	25%	0%	46%	0%	8%	0%	50%	--	--	0%	0%
		14	12	12	12	13	13	13	13	4	--	--	1	2
	MONROE	8%	0%	38%	4%	20%	0%	0%	0%	22%	--	0%	3%	--
		25	24	24	24	25	25	25	19	8	--	1	4	--
	RICHLAND	13%	0%	36%	0%	13%	0%	0%	0%	50%	--	100%	11%	--
		16	14	14	14	16	16	16	13	7	--	2	4	--
	ROCK	0%	0%	59%	0%	15%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%	14%
		24	22	22	22	20	20	20	23	7	2	3	3	3
	SAUK	17%	0%	28%	0%	67%	63%	0%	0%	50%	--	83%	10%	100%
		24	18	18	18	24	24	24	23	7	--	2	3	1
	VERNON	14%	0%	73%	7%	84%	26%	0%	2%	25%	--	33%	2%	--
		22	15	15	15	19	19	19	20	14	--	3	3	--

Counties 2010: Roadsides and Traffic

Region	County	Condition % backlogged # of observations													
		Roadsides							Traffic						
		Litter	Mowing	Mowing for Vision	Noxious Weeds	Woody Vegetation Control	Woody Vegetation Control for Vision	Fences	Centerline Markings	Edgeline Markings	Special Pavement Markings	Regulatory/Warning Signs	Detour/object marker/recreation guide Signs	Delineators	Protective Barriers
NC	ADAMS	20%	60%	0%	0%	0%	0%	--	0%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		10	10	4	10	10	10	--	10	10	2	4	3	1	1
	FLORENCE	0%	29%	0%	29%	29%	0%	--	0%	0%	--	0%	0%	0%	--
		7	7	5	7	7	7	--	7	7	--	3	1	1	--
	FOREST	19%	31%	0%	13%	0%	13%	--	13%	0%	0%	0%	5%	--	--
		16	16	6	16	16	16	--	16	15	1	6	9	--	--
	GREEN LAKE	71%	43%	0%	86%	0%	0%	--	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		7	7	1	7	7	7	--	7	7	2	5	3	1	1
	IRON	92%	42%	0%	0%	0%	0%	--	8%	8%	--	8%	0%	--	--
		12	12	5	12	12	12	--	12	12	--	4	3	--	--
	LANGLADE	47%	20%	0%	47%	0%	0%	--	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	--	--
		15	15	6	15	15	15	--	15	15	1	4	7	--	--
	LINCOLN	81%	44%	0%	69%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%	--
		16	16	4	16	16	16	5	16	16	3	5	4	6	--
	MARATHON	57%	46%	0%	64%	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	12%	0%
		28	28	5	28	28	28	3	28	27	3	13	7	10	2

		Condition % backlogged # of observations													
Region	County	Roadsides							Traffic						
		Litter	Mowing	Mowing for Vision	Noxious Weeds	Woody Vegetation Control	Woody Vegetation Control for Vision	Fences	Centerline Markings	Edgeline Markings	Special Pavement Markings	Regulatory/Warning Signs	Detour/object marker/recreation guide Signs	Delineators	Protective Barriers
MARQUETTE		44%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	12%	2%
		9	9	3	9	9	9	2	9	9	2	3	5	4	1
MENOMINEE		50%	25%	--	0%	0%	0%	--	0%	100%	100%	0%	18%	--	0%
		4	4	--	4	4	4	--	4	4	1	2	4	--	1
ONEIDA		47%	12%	0%	6%	18%	12%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	--	--
		17	17	12	17	17	17	1	17	17	4	5	7	--	--
PORTAGE		69%	31%	0%	19%	0%	0%	0%	19%	13%	16%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		16	16	2	16	16	16	5	16	16	6	7	8	7	1
PRICE		69%	38%	0%	13%	13%	0%	--	0%	0%	--	0%	0%	--	--
		16	16	5	16	16	16	--	16	16	--	4	4	--	--
SHAWANO		37%	21%	0%	11%	0%	0%	--	11%	21%	14%	10%	0%	0%	0%
		19	19	3	19	19	19	--	19	19	2	6	9	6	3
VILAS		100%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	--	0%	0%	--	0%	0%	80%	0%
		15	15	7	15	15	15	--	15	15	--	6	4	1	1
WAUPACA		62%	33%	0%	33%	0%	0%	--	10%	10%	0%	0%	4%	0%	0%
		21	21	7	21	21	21	--	21	21	5	8	7	6	2
WAUSHARA		21%	36%	0%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	--	0%	0%	0%	--
		14	14	5	14	14	14	3	14	14	--	7	4	3	--

		Condition % backlogged # of observations														
Region	County	Roadsides							Traffic							
		Litter	Mowing	Mowing for Vision	Noxious Weeds	Woody Vegetation Control	Woody Vegetation Control for Vision	Fences	Centerline Markings	Edgeline Markings	Special Pavement Markings	Regulatory/Warning Signs	Detour/object marker/recreation guide Signs	Delineators	Protective Barriers	
		39%	67%	0%	22%	6%	6%	--	0%	6%	0%	8%	0%	--	0%	
	WOOD	18	18	3	18	18	18	--	18	18	3	5	4	--	1	
NE	BROWN	31%	56%	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		16	16	10	16	16	16	5	16	16	1	7	9	7	1	
	CALUMET	78%	33%	0%	44%	0%	0%	--	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	--	--	
		9	9	2	9	9	9	--	9	9	1	3	5	--	--	
	DOOR	64%	82%	0%	64%	9%	0%	--	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	--	0%	
		11	11	5	11	11	11	--	11	11	2	6	4	--	1	
	FOND DU LAC	80%	50%	25%	65%	0%	5%	0%	20%	20%	17%	0%	0%	11%	0%	
		20	20	4	20	20	20	4	20	20	3	8	5	6	5	
	KEWAUNEE	67%	33%	0%	33%	0%	0%	--	0%	0%	--	0%	0%	0%	0%	
		6	6	2	6	6	6	--	6	6	--	4	1	1	1	
	MANITOWOC	40%	40%	0%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	0%	29%	0%	
		15	15	15	15	15	15	5	15	15	3	9	12	6	1	
	MARINETTE	44%	25%	0%	25%	0%	0%	0%	20%	20%	0%	0%	0%	15%	0%	
		16	16	8	16	16	16	3	15	15	1	7	5	4	2	
	OCONTO	71%	59%	0%	65%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	--	0%	0%	0%	--	
		17	17	1	17	17	17	2	17	17	--	6	9	3	--	

		Condition % backlogged # of observations													
Region	County	Roadsides							Traffic						
		Litter	Mowing	Mowing for Vision	Noxious Weeds	Woody Vegetation Control	Woody Vegetation Control for Vision	Fences	Centerline Markings	Edgeline Markings	Special Pavement Markings	Regulatory/Warning Signs	Detour/object marker/recreation guide Signs	Delineators	Protective Barriers
	OUTAGAMIE	21%	63%	0%	37%	0%	0%	--	5%	5%	4%	0%	0%	--	--
		19	19	14	19	19	19	--	19	19	5	13	7	--	--
	SHEBOYGAN	71%	53%	0%	71%	0%	0%	0%	6%	6%	0%	0%	7%	20%	0%
		17	17	5	17	17	17	3	17	17	3	12	5	5	2
	WINNEBAGO	88%	44%	0%	75%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		16	16	4	16	16	16	3	16	16	2	10	6	3	1
NW	ASHLAND	67%	25%	50%	8%	42%	8%	--	33%	25%	0%	14%	0%	--	0%
		12	12	2	12	12	12	--	12	12	1	6	4	--	1
	BARRON	67%	7%	0%	20%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	0%	0%	56%	0%
		15	15	6	15	15	15	3	15	15	4	6	8	6	3
	BAYFIELD	47%	35%	0%	6%	29%	6%	--	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		17	17	3	17	17	17	--	17	17	1	9	7	2	1
	BUFFALO	56%	31%	0%	81%	0%	0%	--	25%	19%	--	8%	0%	17%	0%
		16	16	3	16	16	16	--	16	16	--	8	2	4	2
	BURNETT	25%	42%	0%	0%	0%	0%	--	0%	8%	--	0%	0%	0%	--
		12	12	2	12	12	12	--	12	12	--	4	5	1	--
	CHIPPEWA	55%	45%	0%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	0%	0%
		22	22	2	22	22	22	5	22	22	1	7	9	8	3

		Condition % backlogged # of observations													
Region	County	Roadsides							Traffic						
		Litter	Mowing	Mowing for Vision	Noxious Weeds	Woody Vegetation Control	Woody Vegetation Control for Vision	Fences	Centerline Markings	Edgeline Markings	Special Pavement Markings	Regulatory/Warning Signs	Detour/object marker/recreation guide Signs	Delineators	Protective Barriers
	CLARK	41%	6%	0%	12%	0%	0%	--	6%	0%	--	0%	0%	0%	--
		17	17	1	17	17	17	--	17	17	--	6	4	4	--
	DOUGLAS	69%	31%	33%	0%	0%	6%	--	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	--
		16	16	3	16	16	16	--	15	15	1	7	5	3	--
	DUNN	81%	38%	0%	0%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11%	0%
		21	21	2	21	21	21	1	21	21	1	9	4	6	6
	EAU CLAIRE	94%	25%	0%	19%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	24%	0%
		16	16	2	16	16	16	4	16	16	2	7	6	4	1
	JACKSON	45%	25%	0%	40%	0%	0%	48%	30%	15%	0%	4%	0%	13%	0%
		20	20	3	20	20	20	1	20	20	1	6	6	4	1
	PEPIN	60%	80%	--	40%	0%	0%	--	0%	0%	--	0%	--	0%	0%
		5	5	--	5	5	5	--	5	5	--	2	--	2	2
PIERCE	82%	65%	0%	0%	0%	0%	--	0%	0%	--	0%	0%	40%	11%	
	17	17	6	17	17	17	--	17	17	--	7	4	4	3	
POLK	53%	59%	0%	6%	0%	0%	--	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	--	
	17	17	10	17	17	17	--	17	17	3	9	7	2	--	
RUSK	27%	27%	0%	0%	0%	9%	--	9%	27%	0%	0%	0%	--	--	
	11	11	4	11	11	11	--	11	11	1	6	5	--	--	

		Condition % backlogged # of observations														
Region	County	Roadsides							Traffic							
		Litter	Mowing	Mowing for Vision	Noxious Weeds	Woody Vegetation Control	Woody Vegetation Control for Vision	Fences	Centerline Markings	Edgeline Markings	Special Pavement Markings	Regulatory/Warning Signs	Detour/object marker/recreation guide Signs	Delineators	Protective Barriers	
	SAWYER	41%	24%	--	0%	6%	0%	--	24%	24%	--	0%	0%	--	0%	
		17	17	--	17	17	17	--	17	17	--	1	1	--	1	
	ST. CROIX	85%	40%	0%	30%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		20	20	3	20	20	20	5	20	20	2	10	10	8	2	
	TAYLOR	33%	42%	0%	0%	0%	0%	--	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	--
		12	12	3	12	12	12	--	12	12	1	7	4	1	--	
	TREMPEALEAU	74%	32%	0%	95%	11%	0%	--	11%	42%	0%	0%	20%	50%	0%	
19		19	6	19	19	19	--	19	19	1	10	3	2	2		
WASHBURN	29%	14%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	--		
		14	14	1	14	14	14	2	14	14	2	4	5	6	--	
SE	KENOSHA	73%	91%	0%	82%	18%	0%	--	9%	0%	20%	4%	0%	0%	0%	
		11	11	3	11	11	11	--	11	10	5	9	6	1	1	
	MILWAUKEE	94%	41%	0%	41%	0%	0%	14%	29%	47%	34%	0%	5%	--	0%	
		17	17	10	17	17	17	7	17	15	15	10	15	--	9	
	OZAUKEE	63%	38%	0%	25%	13%	0%	0%	0%	13%	0%	0%	0%	15%	0%	
		8	8	2	8	8	8	1	8	8	2	4	2	3	3	
	RACINE	73%	67%	0%	80%	0%	0%	0%	13%	7%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
15		15	6	15	15	15	1	15	15	4	10	7	1	1		

		Condition % backlogged # of observations														
Region	County	Roadsides							Traffic							
		Litter	Mowing	Mowing for Vision	Noxious Weeds	Woody Vegetation Control	Woody Vegetation Control for Vision	Fences	Centerline Markings	Edgeline Markings	Special Pavement Markings	Regulatory/Warning Signs	Detour/object marker/recreation guide Signs	Delineators	Protective Barriers	
	WALWORTH	90%	48%	67%	52%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	19%	4%
		21	21	3	21	21	21	8	21	21	4	5	11	7	2	
	WASHINGTON	39%	78%	0%	17%	6%	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		18	18	9	18	18	18	3	18	16	5	12	5	4	1	
	WAUKESHA	67%	41%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	48%	52%	11%	0%	0%	9%	0%	
		27	27	1	27	27	27	10	27	27	11	21	7	7	9	
SW	COLUMBIA	66%	6%	11%	38%	16%	3%	0%	3%	22%	0%	0%	0%	14%	0%	
		32	32	9	32	32	32	3	32	32	3	19	11	6	4	
	CRAWFORD	40%	15%	0%	0%	0%	0%	--	0%	0%	--	0%	0%	41%	0%	
		20	20	2	20	20	20	--	20	20	--	7	3	10	11	
	DANE	93%	32%	0%	20%	0%	0%	0%	3%	3%	0%	0%	0%	10%	0%	
		41	41	14	41	41	41	19	40	40	7	10	17	11	12	
	DODGE	79%	13%	20%	63%	4%	4%	21%	8%	13%	60%	0%	0%	58%	0%	
		24	24	5	24	24	24	1	24	23	2	8	9	4	2	
	GRANT	26%	22%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	7%	7%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%	
		27	27	6	27	27	27	2	27	27	1	11	10	7	5	
GREEN	69%	23%	0%	92%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8%	0%	0%	40%	0%	0%		
	13	13	2	13	13	13	1	13	13	1	6	3	2	2		

Region	County	Condition % backlogged # of observations													
		Roadsides							Traffic						
		Litter	Mowing	Mowing for Vision	Noxious Weeds	Woody Vegetation Control	Woody Vegetation Control for Vision	Fences	Centerline Markings	Edgeline Markings	Special Pavement Markings	Regulatory/Warning Signs	Detour/object marker/recreation guide Signs	Delineators	Protective Barriers
IOWA		78%	39%	0%	61%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	--
		18	18	5	18	18	18	2	18	18	2	9	7	1	--
JEFFERSON		89%	67%	20%	56%	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		18	18	5	18	18	18	2	18	17	5	12	9	2	2
JUNEAU		57%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		21	21	6	21	21	21	4	21	20	1	4	3	5	1
LA CROSSE		71%	21%	0%	57%	7%	0%	17%	0%	0%	--	0%	14%	32%	0%
		14	14	5	14	14	14	4	14	14	--	6	6	5	2
LAFAYETTE		93%	7%	0%	86%	0%	0%	0%	36%	46%	--	0%	0%	0%	0%
		14	14	1	14	14	14	1	14	13	--	6	1	1	3
MONROE		88%	4%	0%	4%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		25	25	24	25	25	25	3	24	24	3	5	7	2	4
RICHLAND		44%	56%	0%	31%	6%	0%	--	0%	0%	--	0%	0%	0%	0%
		16	16	1	16	16	16	--	16	16	--	7	3	3	2
ROCK		71%	42%	0%	75%	0%	0%	0%	8%	22%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%
		24	24	6	24	24	24	5	24	23	6	12	7	4	3
SAUK		75%	17%	0%	50%	17%	0%	--	4%	8%	0%	5%	0%	--	--
		24	24	2	24	24	24	--	24	24	2	8	5	--	--

		Condition % backlogged # of observations													
Region	County	Roadsides							Traffic						
		Litter	Mowing	Mowing for Vision	Noxious Weeds	Woody Vegetation Control	Woody Vegetation Control for Vision	Fences	Centerline Markings	Edgeline Markings	Special Pavement Markings	Regulatory/Warning Signs	Detour/object marker/recreation guide Signs	Delineators	Protective Barriers
	VERNON	86%	32%	44%	45%	5%	5%	--	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	24%	13%
	VERNON	22	22	9	22	22	22	--	22	22	1	12	7	5	5

Counties 2010: Sign Condition

Region	County	Regulatory/Warning/School Signs				Detour/object marker/recreation/guide Signs			
		Total Signs	%Backlog	Deficient Signs	Average Years Beyond Service Life	Total Signs	%Backlog	Deficient Signs	Average Years Beyond Service Life
NC	ADAMS	920	18%	163	3.9	638	34%	217	6.1
	FLORENCE	481	1%	4	3.5	351	35%	122	8.9
	FOREST	1249	3%	34	4.7	827	20%	169	5.9
	GREEN LAKE	867	18%	159	3.9	703	40%	278	7.1
	IRON	1065	1%	13	3.5	575	12%	71	8.1
	LANGLADE	1217	13%	158	4.8	718	18%	126	6.9
	LINCOLN	1415	16%	220	4.1	1028	31%	315	7.0
	MARATHON	4053	16%	649	4.6	2737	38%	1034	5.8
	MARQUETTE	947	11%	103	3.8	901	58%	524	7.6
	MENOMINEE	678	13%	91	6.0	215	15%	32	5.4
	ONEIDA	1961	5%	95	4.0	1040	12%	120	4.8
	PORTAGE	2224	11%	236	4.7	1790	46%	832	7.0
	PRICE	1021	1%	12	4.5	815	27%	221	5.4
	SHAWANO	1964	55%	1084	5.3	1378	58%	799	5.3

Region	County	Regulatory/Warning/School Signs				Detour/object marker/recreation/guide Signs			
		Total Signs	%Backlog	Deficient Signs	Average Years Beyond Service Life	Total Signs	%Backlog	Deficient Signs	Average Years Beyond Service Life
	VILAS	1539	14%	208	7.1	954	16%	152	5.9
	WAUPACA	3121	17%	515	3.7	1791	43%	768	6.7
	WAUSHARA	1901	20%	384	4.1	1067	41%	439	6.7
	WOOD	2228	17%	378	3.9	1274	41%	527	5.9
NE	BROWN	3592	33%	1189	6.8	2951	62%	1833	9.0
	CALUMET	1327	20%	265	10.0	772	51%	395	9.6
	DOOR	2002	37%	740	6.6	776	52%	406	7.5
	FOND DU LAC	2577	22%	566	6.6	2187	34%	753	8.0
	KEWAUNEE	675	14%	95	6.6	390	48%	189	12.2
	MANITOWOC	2201	34%	746	7.0	2048	78%	1591	8.7
	MARINETTE	1714	37%	626	7.4	1304	42%	544	8.2
	OCONTO	2029	23%	468	5.6	1418	40%	571	6.6
	OUTAGAMIE	3566	20%	727	8.1	2875	29%	821	11.4
	SHEBOYGAN	2918	42%	1216	7.0	3123	74%	2304	8.3
	WINNEBAGO	2590	22%	579	8.2	2219	35%	778	8.6

Region	County	Regulatory/Warning/School Signs				Detour/object marker/recreation/guide Signs			
		Total Signs	%Backlog	Deficient Signs	Average Years Beyond Service Life	Total Signs	%Backlog	Deficient Signs	Average Years Beyond Service Life
NW	ASHLAND	1219	16%	193	5.3	871	47%	411	6.2
	BARRON	1756	14%	244	5.5	1641	49%	804	7.7
	BAYFIELD	1445	22%	312	5.2	1164	56%	651	5.9
	BUFFALO	1620	5%	74	4.1	1063	26%	279	9.8
	BURNETT	1181	20%	242	5.6	739	45%	334	6.9
	CHIPPEWA	2424	6%	137	4.6	2043	29%	594	6.9
	CLARK	1682	7%	118	4.2	1159	28%	330	5.9
	DOUGLAS	1908	28%	538	4.9	1563	53%	822	6.6
	DUNN	2030	9%	178	4.6	1992	47%	929	6.3
	EAU CLAIRE	2584	5%	130	6.1	1949	17%	337	7.3
	JACKSON	1550	7%	104	5.8	1421	26%	364	10.0
	PEPIN	571	6%	33	4.8	431	24%	103	5.4
	PIERCE	1754	12%	207	4.4	1465	43%	626	7.2
	POLK	2167	12%	255	5.2	1423	48%	689	6.7
	RUSK	1021	13%	136	4.9	761	39%	296	5.1

Region	County	Regulatory/Warning/School Signs				Detour/object marker/recreation/guide Signs			
		Total Signs	%Backlog	Deficient Signs	Average Years Beyond Service Life	Total Signs	%Backlog	Deficient Signs	Average Years Beyond Service Life
	SAWYER	1425	10%	149	4.2	1079	46%	499	5.5
	ST. CROIX	2771	12%	325	4.7	2444	41%	1005	6.3
	TAYLOR	984	6%	55	5.0	802	24%	189	6.7
	TREMPEALEAU	1947	9%	180	5.2	1556	36%	563	8.9
	WASHBURN	1949	22%	436	5.2	1441	56%	812	7.1
SE	KENOSHA	4045	28%	1115	6.6	3095	52%	1604	7.9
	MILWAUKEE	11787	22%	2619	6.7	8502	53%	4517	8.4
	OZAUKEE	1992	14%	287	4.4	1235	56%	690	7.7
	RACINE	4785	29%	1376	6.1	3265	55%	1802	7.5
	WALWORTH	3876	16%	626	5.8	2420	42%	1012	7.7
	WASHINGTON	3779	20%	748	6.0	2656	44%	1181	7.5
	WAUKESHA	9187	19%	1739	6.2	5114	33%	1685	6.4
SW	COLUMBIA	3003	4%	115	5.1	1812	36%	653	9.6
	CRAWFORD	2200	13%	275	4.5	1515	57%	860	8.4
	DANE	6509	33%	2165	9.7	4071	42%	1690	10.3

Region	County	Regulatory/Warning/School Signs				Detour/object marker/recreation/guide Signs			
		Total Signs	%Backlog	Deficient Signs	Average Years Beyond Service Life	Total Signs	%Backlog	Deficient Signs	Average Years Beyond Service Life
	DODGE	2862	6%	164	4.8	1849	46%	852	9.3
	GRANT	3045	8%	256	7.4	2081	45%	937	10.2
	GREEN	1332	5%	69	4.8	767	50%	383	9.9
	IOWA	2011	7%	143	5.5	1366	46%	630	10.0
	JEFFERSON	1920	5%	94	4.9	1254	49%	609	10.8
	JUNEAU	1758	9%	153	3.6	1706	46%	791	9.2
	LA CROSSE	2686	12%	313	3.6	2775	48%	1333	8.9
	LAFAYETTE	1307	8%	104	5.2	883	49%	431	12.4
	MONROE	2555	10%	266	3.3	2415	40%	958	8.7
	RICHLAND	1887	10%	185	4.3	1525	46%	695	7.9
	ROCK	2217	12%	271	6.3	1813	47%	844	10.3
	SAUK	3211	6%	198	3.4	1648	28%	465	7.4
	VERNON	2669	10%	263	4.7	2104	65%	1371	8.3

Counties 2010: Bridge Maintenance Needs

Region	County	Number of state bridges	% of bridges recommended for maintenance							
			Deck - Seal Surface Cracks	Approach - Seal Approach to Paving Block	Misc - Cut Brush	Expansion Joints - Seal	Drainage - Repair Washouts / Erosion	Deck - Patching	Approach - Wedge Approach	Misc - Other Work
NC	ADAMS	8	6			6	1		1	1
	FLORENCE	8	2					2	1	
	FOREST	11		1	1		1	1	1	
	GREEN LAKE	10	5		2	6			2	3
	IRON	18	2	1	4	1		4	1	
	LANGLADE	11	2	1	1					
	LINCOLN	52	16		5	2		3	3	4
	MARATHON	162	118	1	29	97	27	34	11	33
	MARQUETTE	37	21		7	33	12	6	9	10
	MENOMINEE	3	1	1	1					
	ONEIDA	14	7	4	1		1	4		1
	PORTAGE	91	71	3	15	52	12	34	1	40
	PRICE	21	5	1	1			1	1	2
	SHAWANO	53	54	5	10	1	10	1	2	22
	VILAS	13	9		1			2	1	1
	WAUPACA	67	34	1	2	46	15	5	1	31
	WAUSHARA	22	12			17	7	11	1	2
WOOD	55	48	1	13	19	4	12	4	9	
NE	BROWN	246	67	44	23	65	28	49	2	35
	CALUMET	13	2		1	5	7	2	1	2
	DOOR	19	10		1	4				4
	FOND DU LAC	80	45	30		16	12	3	3	6
	KEWAUNEE	17	1	1	1	2	2	3	1	
	MANITOWOC	90	24	20	5	27	7	13	2	6

Region	County	Number of state bridges	% of bridges recommended for maintenance							
			Deck - Seal Surface Cracks	Approach - Seal Approach to Paving Block	Misc - Cut Brush	Expansion Joints - Seal	Drainage - Repair Washouts / Erosion	Deck - Patching	Approach - Wedge Approach	Misc - Other Work
	MARINETTE	48	10	14	5	13		6	1	4
	OCONTO	46	17	3	1	21	7	3		
	OUTAGAMIE	80	32	19	13	53	26	10	6	9
	SHEBOYGAN	85	27	22	11	29	15	27	1	1
	WINNEBAGO	151	65	61	18	55	38	34	1	27
NW	ASHLAND	19		2			1	7	2	
	BARRON	65	5	5	6		3	14		1
	BAYFIELD	34		6	2		5	3	2	1
	BUFFALO	71	2	5	2	1	1			
	BURNETT	14	1	3			1	1	1	
	CHIPPEWA	135	8	5		20	13	5	6	2
	CLARK	43		22	1	1		2	3	
	DOUGLAS	60	1	4	4	1	3	7		
	DUNN	93		2	2		10	6	3	
	EAU CLAIRE	110	7	11	3	2	11	2	5	
	JACKSON	74	1	9	1	5	6	1	2	1
	PEPIN	16		2		1	2			
	PIERCE	57		6	6	2	11	1	3	1
	POLK	13	2				2	7	1	
	RUSK	28	2		8	1	2	4	1	
	SAWYER	19	1	7	2		1	5	2	
	ST. CROIX	97	5	8	3	3	13	2	3	1
	TAYLOR	20	3					3		2
TREMPEALEAU	73	2	18	1		7	2	1		
WASHBURN	20	1	6	2		1	2			

Region	County	Number of state bridges	% of bridges recommended for maintenance							
			Deck - Seal Surface Cracks	Approach - Seal Approach to Paving Block	Misc - Cut Brush	Expansion Joints - Seal	Drainage - Repair Washouts / Erosion	Deck - Patching	Approach - Wedge Approach	Misc - Other Work
SE	KENOSHA	56	13	14	2	19	10	3	6	18
	MILWAUKEE	528	89	90	170	154	53	82	46	269
	OZAUKEE	50	9	14	18	4	12	15	15	41
	RACINE	62	6	19	8	8	7	1	12	24
	WALWORTH	118	19	20	19	21	24	8	19	93
	WASHINGTON	74	3	18	4	7	5	1	8	27
	WAUKESHA	175	53	51	47	20	90	45	70	109
SW	COLUMBIA	97	21	27	52	2	17	10	7	21
	CRAWFORD	67	49	16	12	2	15	5	33	8
	DANE	281	19	116	162	18	70	18	24	101
	DODGE	64	11	13	19	3	9	1	5	9
	GRANT	70	24	10	9	1	10	4	14	6
	GREEN	28	7	4	6	1	2	4		5
	IOWA	57	10	9	19		8	6	5	9
	JEFFERSON	99	4	21	16	4	5	8		19
	JUNEAU	80	28	13		14	5	10	1	1
	LA CROSSE	109	42	37	31	5	16	18	13	12
	LAFAYETTE	40	4	7	14		13	5	5	1
	MONROE	154	57	37	17	6	12	20	31	14
	RICHLAND	78	40	18	19	3	5	13	19	5
	ROCK	121	15	38	39	6	14	6	9	23
	SAUK	89	13	28	10	1	7	3	1	13
VERNON	73	10	6	18	3	21	3	29	2	

Counties 2010: Bridge Special Inspection Backlog

Region	County	Special Inspection Type						
		Initial	Routine	Load Posted	In-depth	Fracture Critical	Underwater Diving	Underwater Probe/Visual
NC	ADAMS	0%	0%	--	--	--	0%	0%
		0	0	--	--	--	0	0
	FLORENCE	100%	0%	--	--	0%	0%	0%
		1	0	--	--	0	0	0
	FOREST	0%	0%	--	--	--	--	33%
		0	0	--	--	--	--	1
	GREEN LAKE	--	0%	--	--	--	--	0%
		--	0	--	--	--	--	0
	IRON	--	0%	--	--	--	0%	0%
		--	0	--	--	--	0	0
	LANGLADE	0%	0%	--	--	0%	--	50%
		0	0	--	--	0	--	2
	LINCOLN	0%	0%	--	0%	0%	0%	50%
		0	0	--	0	0	0	3
	MARATHON	0%	0%	--	7%	100%	0%	4%
		0	0	--	2	2	0	4
	MARQUETTE	0%	0%	--	--	--	0%	4%
		0	0	--	--	--	0	1
	MENOMINEE	0%	0%	--	--	--	--	100%
		0	0	--	--	--	--	1
	ONEIDA	0%	0%	--	--	--	0%	25%
		0	0	--	--	--	0	1
	PORTAGE	0%	0%	--	0%	--	0%	6%
		0	0	--	0	--	0	3
	PRICE	0%	0%	--	--	--	50%	0%
		0	0	--	--	--	2	0
	SHAWANO	0%	0%	--	--	0%	0%	25%
		0	0	--	--	0	0	2
VILAS	0%	0%	--	--	--	0%	25%	
	0	0	--	--	--	0	1	
WAUPACA	9%	0%	--	0%	--	0%	6%	
	1	0	--	0	--	0	3	
WAUSHARA	0%	0%	--	--	--	--	0%	
	0	0	--	--	--	--	0	
WOOD	0%	0%	--	0%	0%	0%	2%	
	0	0	--	0	0	0	1	
NE	BROWN	0%	0%	--	0%	13%	13%	2%
		0	1	--	0	1	2	1
	CALUMET	0%	0%	--	--	--	--	0%
		0	0	--	--	--	--	0

Region	County	Special Inspection Type						
		Initial	Routine	Load Posted	In-depth	Fracture Critical	Underwater Diving	Underwater Probe/Visual
	DOOR	0%	21%	100%	--	86%	0%	0%
		0	4	4	--	6	0	0
	FOND DU LAC	0%	0%	--	--	--	--	55%
		0	0	--	--	--	--	17
	KEWAUNEE	0%	0%	--	--	--	0%	6%
		0	0	--	--	--	0	1
	MANITOWOC	0%	2%	--	--	100%	--	10%
		0	2	--	--	1	--	3
	MARINETTE	0%	0%	--	--	0%	0%	6%
		0	0	--	--	0	0	1
	OCONTO	0%	0%	--	--	0%	--	7%
		0	0	--	--	0	--	2
	OUTAGAMIE	0%	0%	--	0%	--	0%	4%
		0	0	--	0	--	0	1
SHEBOYGAN	0%	0%	--	--	--	--	55%	
	0	0	--	--	--	--	16	
WINNEBAGO	0%	3%	--	33%	67%	0%	23%	
	0	4	--	1	8	0	6	
NW	ASHLAND	0%	0%	--	--	--	0%	25%
		0	0	--	--	--	0	2
	BARRON	0%	0%	--	--	--	0%	5%
		0	0	--	--	--	0	1
	BAYFIELD	0%	0%	--	--	--	0%	4%
		0	0	--	--	--	0	1
	BUFFALO	0%	0%	--	--	100%	36%	8%
		0	0	--	--	1	5	3
	BURNETT	0%	0%	--	--	--	0%	50%
		0	0	--	--	--	0	3
	CHIPPEWA	0%	10%	--	0%	100%	0%	18%
		0	14	--	0	1	0	10
	CLARK	--	0%	--	--	--	--	35%
		--	0	--	--	--	--	8
	DOUGLAS	0%	0%	--	--	0%	44%	4%
		0	0	--	--	0	8	1
	DUNN	0%	1%	--	100%	50%	0%	15%
		0	1	--	2	1	0	9
EAU CLAIRE	0%	0%	--	75%	--	0%	55%	
	0	0	--	3	--	0	17	
JACKSON	0%	0%	--	--	--	50%	42%	
	0	0	--	--	--	2	11	
PEPIN	0%	0%	--	--	--	0%	60%	
	0	0	--	--	--	0	9	
PIERCE	--	0%	--	100%	67%	33%	5%	
	--	0	--	1	7	3	1	

Region	County	Special Inspection Type						
		Initial	Routine	Load Posted	In-depth	Fracture Critical	Underwater Diving	Underwater Probe/Visual
		--	0	--	1	2	1	2
	POLK	0%	0%	--	0%	0%	0%	0%
		0	0	--	0	0	0	0
	RUSK	--	0%	--	100%	--	0%	16%
		--	0	--	1	--	0	3
	SAWYER	0%	0%	--	--	--	0%	0%
		0	0	--	--	--	0	0
	ST. CROIX	0%	1%	100%	0%	--	25%	32%
		0	1	1	0	--	1	19
	TAYLOR	0%	0%	--	100%	0%	--	0%
0		0	--	1	0	--	0	
TREMPEALEAU	0%	0%	100%	100%	100%	0%	29%	
	--	--	1	1	1	--	6	
WASHBURN	0%	0%	--	--	--	--	0%	
	0	0	--	--	--	--	0	
SE	KENOSHA	0%	0%	--	--	0%	--	0%
		0	0	--	--	0	--	0
	MILWAUKEE	1%	2%	100%	16%	20%	0%	29%
		1	12	2	14	2	0	17
	OZAUKEE	0%	2%	100%	--	--	100%	57%
		0	1	1	--	--	1	8
	RACINE	0%	0%	--	--	--	--	17%
		0	0	--	--	--	--	4
	WALWORTH	8%	17%	100%	50%	--	--	25%
		1	20	6	1	--	--	8
WASHINGTON	0%	0%	--	0%	--	0%	4%	
	0	0	--	0	--	0	1	
WAUKESHA	0%	0%	--	0%	--	--	9%	
	0	0	--	0	--	--	5	
SW	COLUMBIA	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	14%
		0	0	1	0	0	0	3
	CRAWFORD	17%	1%	67%	0%	0%	0%	18%
		1	1	2	0	0	0	3
	DANE	0%	1%	--	100%	0%	0%	32%
		0	2	--	1	0	0	8
	DODGE	0%	0%	--	--	--	0%	20%
		0	0	--	--	--	0	2
	GRANT	0%	0%	--	--	0%	0%	0%
		0	0	--	--	0	0	0
GREEN	0%	0%	--	--	--	0%	0%	
	0	0	--	--	--	0	0	
IOWA	25%	0%	--	100%	33%	0%	46%	
	1	0	--	1	1	0	6	

		Special Inspection Type						
		% bridges backlogged for inspection type # of bridges backlogged for inspection						
Region	County	Initial	Routine	Load Posted	In-depth	Fracture Critical	Underwater Diving	Underwater Probe/Visual
	JEFFERSON	0%	0%	--	--	--	0%	9%
		0	0	--	--	--	0	2
	JUNEAU	0%	21%	0%	--	0%	0%	74%
		0	17	0	--	0	0	37
	LA CROSSE	0%	0%	--	33%	0%	0%	0%
		0	0	--	2	0	0	0
	LAFAYETTE	0%	0%	--	--	--	0%	7%
		0	0	--	--	--	0	1
	MONROE	0%	0%	50%	100%	0%	--	0%
		0	0	1	1	0	--	0
	RICHLAND	0%	0%	0%	--	0%	0%	0%
		0	0	0	--	0	0	0
	ROCK	0%	0%	--	50%	50%	0%	43%
		0	0	--	2	1	--	13
	SAUK	0%	0%	--	100%	0%	0%	34%
		0	0	--	1	0	0	12
	VERNON	0%	0%	--	0%	0%	--	8%
		0	0	--	0	0	--	2



CFIRE

University of Wisconsin-Madison
Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering
1410 Engineering Drive, Room 270
Madison, WI 53706
Phone: 608-263-3175
Fax: 608-263-2512
cfire.wistrans.org

