

Highway and Bridge Condition and Performance

State Targets

Table 9 lists the federal performance measures for the National Highway Performance Program (NHPP) and the targets established by the Wisconsin and Minnesota DOTs. MnDOT's 2- and 4-year targets for 2022-2025 have been approved by the LAPC and are included in the table.

TABLE 9: WISDOT (2018-2021) & MNDOT (2022-2025) NATIONAL HIGHWAY PERFORMANCE PROGRAM TARGETS

Performance Measure	2-yr target		4-yr target	
	WisDOT (2019)	MnDOT (2023)	WisDOT (2021)	MnDOT (2025)
<i>Pavement Condition</i>				
Interstate – Percentage pavements in “Good” condition	NA ¹	60%	45%	60%
Interstate – Percentage pavements in “Poor” condition	NA	2%	5%	2%
Non-Interstate NHS ² – Percentage pavements in “Good” condition	20%	55%	20%	55%
Non-Interstate NHS – Percentage pavements in “Poor” condition	12%	2%	12%	2%
<i>Bridge Condition</i>				
Percentage of NHS bridges by deck area in “Good” condition	50%	30%	50%	35%
Percentage of NHS bridges by deck area in “Poor” condition	3%	5%	3%	5%
<i>Travel Time Reliability</i>				
Interstate – Percent of person-miles traveled that are reliable	94.0%	82.0%	90.0%	82.0%
Non-Interstate NHS – Percent of person-miles traveled that are reliable	NA	90.0%	86.0%	90.0%
Interstate – Truck travel time reliability index	1.40	1.4	1.60	1.40

¹ NA: Not required by Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) for the 2-year targets for 2018-2021.

² National Highway System.

Sources: Wisconsin and Minnesota Departments of Transportation.

The LAPC has committed to plan and program projects that support the states in achieving their targets.

Performance Monitoring

Table 10 reports the pavement and bridge condition and travel time reliability for the Minnesota and Wisconsin portions of the planning area.

Over 77% of Wisconsin and 76% of Minnesota Interstate pavements in the planning area are rated “good.” None of the Interstate pavement in the planning area is rated “poor.”

The percentage of pavements on the non-Interstate National Highway System (NHS) in the Minnesota and Wisconsin portions of the planning area that is rated “good” is 64.5% and 29.5%, respectively. None of the non-Interstate NHS pavement in the Minnesota portion of the planning area is rated “poor,” while 6.7% of the Wisconsin non-Interstate NHS pavement is rated “poor.”

Of the deck area of NHS bridges, 54.7% in the Minnesota portion and 37.4% in the Wisconsin portion of the planning area is rated “good.” None of the Minnesota bridges is rated “poor” and only 0.4% of the Wisconsin deck area is rated “poor.”

Travel time reliability in the Wisconsin portion of the planning area as calculated by the Wisconsin Traffic Operations and Safety Laboratory is 100% for the Interstate, 92.0% for the non-Interstate NHS, and 1.11

for the Interstate truck travel time reliability index. MnDOT calculated the measures for the Minnesota portion of the planning area, resulting in 100.0% for Interstate reliability, 95.1% for non-Interstate NHS reliability, and 1.12 for Interstate truck travel time reliability.

TABLE 10: PLANNING AREA PERFORMANCE: NATIONAL HIGHWAY PERFORMANCE PROGRAM MEASURES

Performance Measure	2020	
	WI MPA	MN MPA
<i>Pavement Condition</i>		
Interstate – Percentage pavements in “Good” condition	77.1	76.5
Interstate – Percentage pavements in “Poor” condition	0.0	0.0
Non-Interstate NHS – Percentage pavements in “Good” condition	29.5	64.5
Non-Interstate NHS – Percentage pavements in “Poor” condition	6.7	0.0
<i>Bridge Condition</i>		
Percentage of NHS bridges by deck area in “Good” condition	37.4	54.7
Percentage of NHS bridges by deck area in “Poor” condition	0.4	0.00
<i>Travel Time Reliability</i>		
Interstate – Percent of person-miles traveled that are reliable	100.0	100.0
Non-Interstate NHS – Percent of person-miles traveled that are reliable	92.0	95.1
Interstate – Truck travel time reliability index	1.11	1.12

Sources: Wisconsin and Minnesota Departments of Transportation; National Bridge Inventory; Traffic Operations and Safety (TOPS) Laboratory, UW-Madison.

Transit Asset Management (TAM)

49 CFR 625 establishes a National Transit Asset Management (TAM) System to monitor and manage the State of Good Repair (SGR) of public transportation capital assets to enhance safety, reduce maintenance costs, increase reliability, and improve performance. Tier II transit providers like our La Crosse Municipal Transit Utility (MTU) and Onalaska Shared Ride (OSR) must either develop their own TAM plan or participate in a group TAM plan. La Crosse MTU and OSR have both opted to join the Wisconsin group TAM plan. And having done so, the LAPC commits to plan and program projects that will support those targets. Performance measures relevant to our area include:

- **Rolling stock:** Percent of vehicles that have met or exceeded their useful life benchmark (ULB).
- **Equipment:** Percent of non-revenue service vehicles that have met or exceeded their ULB.
- **Facility:** Percent of facilities rated below “3” on the TERM condition scale.

Table 11 summarizes the performance for all bus, cutaway, and minivan vehicles (the types of vehicles used by MTU or OSR) assessed in the State TAM Plan. WisDOT established targets whose percentages are rounded down from the respective percentage of vehicles exceeding the ULB. Under these targets, the rolling stock performance for MTU and OHWSPT vehicles meets State targets.

The State targets for **Equipment** are 33 percent for automobiles and 29 percent for trucks or other rubber-tired vehicles. The State target for **Facilities** is 10 percent.

TABLE 11: STATE OF GOOD REPAIR FOR ROLLING STOCK FOR LA CROSSE MUNICIPAL TRANSIT UTILITY (MTU) AND ONALASKA SHARED RIDE (OSR), 2022

Vehicle Type	ULB ¹ (years)	2023 TAM ² Target	Wisconsin		MTU		OSR	
			# Vehicles	>ULB	# Vehicles	>ULB	# Vehicles	>ULB
Bus	12	44.00%	158	58.22%	23	39.13%	0	0.00%
Cutaway	7	47.00%	536	54.29%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
Minivan	4	51.00%	488	47.95%	0	0.00%	15	53.33%

¹Useful life benchmark.

²Wisconsin Department of Transportation Transit Asset Management (TAM) Plan updated November 2022.

Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP)

The targets developed through coordination between LAPC staff and the transit agencies, La Crosse Municipal Transit Utility (MTU) and Onalaska Shared Ride (OSR) are reported in Table 12.

The LAPC, having approved these targets at its September 21, 2022 meeting, hereby, commits to planning and programming projects that will support our transit agencies in meeting their targets.

TABLE 12: PUBLIC TRANSIT AGENCY SAFETY PLAN MEASURES AND TARGETS, 2023

Measure	La Crosse MTU		Onalaska Shared Ride
	Fixed-Route Target	Paratransit Target	Shared-Ride Target
Total number of reportable fatalities	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rate of reportable fatalities per 100K VRM	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total number of reportable injuries	0.0	0.0	0.6
Rate of reportable injuries per 100K VRM	0.0	0.0	0.2
Total number of reportable safety events	2.0	1.0	1.0
Rate of reportable safety events per 100K VRM	0.23	1.01	0.3
Average distance between major mechanical failures	10,282.37	5,495.39	322,848.9

How the TIP Supports State and Transit Agency Targets

The TIP must include to the maximum extent practicable a description of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving the performance targets and linking the area investment priorities to those targets [23 CFR 450.326(d)].

A total of 73 projects are programmed in this TIP. Sixteen of the projects are transit capital and/or operations projects; 11 are HSIP projects (4 are rail safety); 8 are TAP projects, which could be considered safety projects as they will provide safe options for bicycle and pedestrian travel; 21 are National Highway Performance Program (NHPP) projects (two are also HSIP projects); 14 are Surface Transportation Block