LA CROSSE AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING THE LA CROSSE (WI)/LA CRESCENT (MN) URBANIZED AREA

DATE:	**MARCH 4, 2026**
FROM:	**TRAVIS KEY, TRANSPORTATION PLANNER**
TO:	**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**
SUBJECT:	**MARCH 11, 2026, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

The meeting of the La Crosse Area Planning Committee TAC will be held on **Wednesday, March 11, at 2:30 p.m.** as a virtual meeting only**.** Please use the information provided below to join the Teams meeting.

AGENDA

1. **Approval of minutes of the January 14, 2026, meeting.**
2. **Recommendation to approve amending the 2025-2028 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) List.**
3. **Recommendation to approve City of La Crescent Carbon Reduction Program application.**
4. **Recommendation to approve Wisconsin 2026 Transit Asset Management Targets (TAM).**
5. **2025 federal obligated projects list update.**
6. **Online TIP – EcoInteractive update.**
7. **Bridges and Safety Infrastructure for Community Success (BASICS) Act (H.R. 7437) overview.**
8. **SS4A Project Prioritization overview.**
9. **Other grant program updates: RCE, etc.**
10. **March 2026 agenda items:** 2025-2028 TIP amendment.
11. **Other business; Adjourn; Next meeting to be announced.**

Public Access: Any person may access the meeting utilizing the following options.

MEETING ACCESS/MONITORING INSTRUCTIONS:
Option 1: Use the link below to join the TEAMS meeting on your desktop/laptop/phone to stream audio, video or both. If you do not have TEAMS on your desktop/laptop/phone, after you activate the link "Click here to join the meeting" you will have to follow several prompts to join the meeting.

Join the meeting now
Meeting ID: 266 034 759 709 90
Passcode: uD2jb3Fs

Dial in by phone
+1 262-683-8845,,668683628# United States, Allenton
Find a local number

Technical Advisory Committee

Voting Members: Chris Dahl, Matt Gallager, Ken Harwood, Jarrod Holter, Jim Krueger, Chelsey Bolden, Joe Langeberg, Christina Peterson, Bryan McCoy, Loren Schwier, Andrea Trane, Lauren Koss, Bill Waller, Kurt Wayne
Non-voting Members: Jason Nordberg, Evan Gross, Matthew Sorensen, Francis Schelfhout

Phone conference ID: 668 683 628#

If you need assistance participating in this meeting, please contact Travis Key at 608-789-8548 or at tkey@lacrossecounty.org in advance of the meeting.

Technical Advisory Committee

Voting Members: Chris Dahl, Matt Gallager, Ken Harwood, Jarrod Holter, Jim Krueger, Chelsey Bolden, Joe Langeberg, Christina Peterson, Bryan McCoy, Loren Schwier, Andrea Trane, Lauren Koss, Bill Waller, Kurt Wayne
Non-voting Members: Jason Nordberg, Evan Gross, Matthew Sorensen, Francis Schelfhout

Minutes of Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, January 14, 2026

Minutes of the meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee held at 2:30 pm on Wednesday, January 14, 2026, in room 1107 of the La Crosse County Administrative Center and by Microsoft Teams.

Members Present/On Call: Voting: Chris Dahl, Stephanie Sward, Ken Harwood, Jarrod Holter, Jim Krueger, Chelsey Boldon, Loren Schwier, Andrea Trane

Members Excused: Joe Langeberg, Christina Peterson, Jason Gottfried, Lauren Koss, Tyler Benish, Kurt Wayne

Guests and Staff: Bob Gollnik, Erin Duffer, Travis Key, Francis Schelfhout, Matthew Sorensen, Cory Mikshowsky.

Bob Gollnik called the meeting to order at 2:30 pm.

1. **Approval of minutes of the November 12, 2025, meeting.**
   Jim Krueger motioned to approve the minutes of the November 12 meeting; Chris Dahl seconded. All were in favor.

2. **Recommendation to approve amending the 2025-2029 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).**
   Erin Duffer provided an overview of the items being amended including 3 transit projects and changes to state funding IDs for 2 projects.

   Jim Krueger motioned to recommend to the Policy Board to approve the amendment to the 2025-2029 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) List; Stephanie Sward seconded. All were in favor.

3. **Recommendation to approve Wisconsin 2026 Safety Performance Targets (PM1).**
   2026 safety performance targets established by the State of Wisconsin. LAPC is adopting state targets this year. Though in subsequent years LAPC will explore establishing our own safety targets.

   Jim Krueger motioned to recommend to the Policy Board to approve the 2026 Wisconsin Safety Performance Targets; Andrea Trane seconded. All were in favor.

4. **Recommendation to approve Minnesota 2026 Safety Performance Targets (PM1).**
   2026 safety performance targets established by the State of Minnesota. LAPC is adopting state targets this year. Though in subsequent years LAPC will explore establishing our own safety targets.

   Jim Krueger motioned to recommend to the Policy Board to approve the 2026 Minnesota Safety Performance Targets; Chris Dahl seconded. All were in favor.

5. **Online TIP – EcoInteractive Update**
   Erin Duffer gave attendees a virtual tour of the public TIP website and features of the new E-TIP platform.

Technical Advisory Committee

Voting Members: Chris Dahl, Matt Gallager, Ken Harwood, Jarrod Holter, Jim Krueger, Paula Silha, Joe Langeberg, Christina Peterson, Bryan McCoy, Loren Schwier, Andrea Trane, Jeffrey Tripp, Voni Vegar, Bill Waller, Brian McCoy
Non-voting Members: Jason Nordberg, Evan Gross, Matthew Sorensen, Dena Ryan, Francis Schelfhout

6. **Grant program updates: SS4A, RCE, etc.**
   RCE: Obligation of grant funds received for the Town of Onalaska. RFP is drafted for that project and a small consultant selection team is planned to assist in selection.
   SS4A: Project is progressing well. Crash data chapter is nearing completion per Bolton & Menk and the High Injury Network is also nearing finalization with input from the project Task Force.
   RTA Study: Existing conditions report is finished. SRF is now looking at governance structure and developing the next two briefing paper deliverables. Recently, RTA legislation was proposed in the Wisconsin state legislature and some of these details are being included in draft documents to reflect the most recent trends in Wisconsin RTA legislation.

7. **January 2026 agenda items: 2025-2029 TIP amendment.**
   Bob asks the committee to share any updates or requests for the next TAC meeting.
   More grant updates to come in the next meeting.

8. **Other business; Adjourn; Next meeting to be announced.**
   Round robin for member updates:
   - Jarrod Holter shared details about the safety project near the Harley Shop on 12th Ave S.
   - Francis Schelfhout: TAP applications are still in review at this time.
   - Matthew Sorensen: Q1 directors meeting is coming up on January 27th. Important information regarding the TIP is to be shared at this meeting.
   - Jim Krueger: 4 buses were supposed to be delivered in late December/early January. However, because of component backorder, delivery is still pending.

   Next meeting is scheduled for March 11th.

   Jim Krueger motioned to adjourn at 2:57 pm; Jarrod Holter seconded. All were in favor.

2025-2028 Transportation Improvement Program Amended Projects - March 18, 2026

***NOTE:** Total Improvement Cost idicates past and future project phases which may be outside the four-year TIP cycle and is for illustrative purposes only.

ID	Agency	Plan Revision	Title	Narrative Description of Changes	State ID	Description	Type	County	Fund Types (All)	Total Cost	Prior	2025	2026	2027	2028	Future	Federal	State	Local	CAPT	Const	Non Infr.	OA	PE	ROW
243-09-015	City of La Crescent	2026-03	C La Crescent Transit Operating Assistance (5307)	Illustrative Year 2029 Funding Updated / Update Adjust existing projects for revised cost estimates	TRF-3780-24, TRF-3780-25, TRF-3780-26, TRF-3780-27	SECT 5307: City of La Crescent Transit Operating Assistance	Transit		5307, Local	$2,062,058		$ 390,636	$399,736	$411,636	$423,736	$436,314	$431,680	$0	$1,630,378	$0	$0	$0	$2,062,058	$0	$0
243-22-018	State of Wisconsin	2026-03	USH 53, La Crosse - Galesville (Old Hwy 93 to Black River) Resurface	New State ID / Updated Funding	1630-03-03, 1630-03-23, 1630-03-25, 1630-03-73, 1630-03-75, 1630-03-77	USH 53, La Crosse - Galesville (Old Hwy 93 to Black River), Resurface, Design Obligated in 2022, Real Estate Anticipated in 2026, Construction Anticipated in 2030 (Advanceable to 2028-2029)	System Preservation		State-WI	$44,000		$ 0	$44,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$44,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$44,000
243-22-019	State of Wisconsin	2026-03	USH 53, La Crosse - Galesville (Sand Lake Rd to Holmen Dr) Pavement Repl	Project Limits and (2031) Estimate Changes	1630-03-04, 1630-03-74	USH 53, La Crosse - Galesville (Sand Lake Rd to Holmen Dr), Pavement Replacement, Design Obligated in 2022, Construction Anticipated in 2031-2032 (Advanceable to 2029)	Pavement Replacement			$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
243-23-020	State of Wisconsin	2026-03	STH 16, La Crosse - Sparta (STH 35 to IH 90), Pavement Repl	Added Municipal Utility Project	7575-09-01, 7575-09-21, 7575-09-71, 7575-09-72	STH 16, La Crosse - Sparta (USH 53 to STH 35), Preliminary Engineering/NEPA, Pavement Replacement, Design Obligated in 2024, Real Estate Anticipated in 2026, Construction Anticipated in 2028, Master Group TIP #: 243-22-021	Pavement Replacement		Local, MAJORS - WI, STBG	$4,162,940		$ 0	$27,500	$0	$4,135,440	$0	$2,581,152	$672,788	$909,000	$0	$4,135,440	$0	$0	$0	$27,500
243-23-022	State of Wisconsin	2026-03	STH 35, La Crosse - Trempealeau (USH 14/61 to USH 53), Reconstr	Schedule / Funding / Scope- Update New State ID / Added Real Estate Project	5221-09-00, 5221-09-01, 5221-09-22, 5221-09-72, 5221-09-73, 5221-09-74, 5221-09-75, 5221-09-76, 5991-09-23, 5991-09-24, 5991-09-25, 5991-09-26	STH 35, La Crosse - Trempealeau (USH 14/61 to USH 53), Reconstruct, Design Obligated 2023 & 2024, Master Group TIP #: 243-22-021, Real Estate Anticipated 2026-2027, Construction Anticipated 2028-2030	Reconstruction		MAJORS - WI, STBG	$50,880,740		$ 0	$183,000	$240,900	$23,979,685	$26,477,155	$40,365,472	$10,515,268	$0	$0	$50,456,840	$0	$0	$0	$423,900
243-23-036	City of La Crosse	2026-03	C La Crosse, Two Hybrid Buses	Project Added to correct previously listed project as 243-23-012 in all previous TIP cycles		MTU Two (2) Hybrid Replacement Buses. NOTE: Was incorrectly listed as 243-23-012 project number in previous TIP cycles.	Transit		5307, Local	$580,232		$ 580,232	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,280	$0	$578,952	$580,232	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
243-24-038	State of Minnesota	2026-03	MN 16, MnDOT ELLE, Mill & Overlay	Change Federal Fund Type from NHPP to STP	2805-75	**ELLE** ON MN 16 FROM 0.37 MI. W. TH 61 TO TH 61, ON TH 61 FROM 0.3 MI E TH 16/61 TO 4TH ST. LT, BITUMINOUS MILL AND OVERLAY	Pavement Replacement		Local, State-MN, STP	$2,500,000		$ 0	$0	$0	$2,500,000	$0	$1,954,100	$445,900	$100,000	$0	$2,500,000	$0	$0	$0	$0
243-25-027	State of Wisconsin	2026-03	USH 53, La Crosse - Galesville (SH 35 to Clinton St), Reconstr	Schedule / Funding / Scope- Update New State ID	1630-09-02, 1630-09-70, 1630-09-71, 1630-09-72, 1630-09-73, 1630-09-74, 1630-09-75, 1630-09-76, 1630-09-77, 1630-09-78	USH 53, La Crosse - Galesville (STH 35 to Clinton Street), Reconstruct, Design Obligated 2026, Construction Anticipated 2028-2032, Master Group TIP #: 243-22-021	Reconstruction		MAJORS - WI, NHPP	$117,667,360		$ 0	$10,900,000	$0	$1,746,080	$105,021,280	$94,133,888	$23,533,472	$0	$0	$106,767,360	$0	$0	$10,900,000	$0
243-26-015	State of Wisconsin	2026-03	IH 90 (MN State Ln - La Crosse) Round Lake Br to Black River Br, LFA/Mill Shouldering	New Project	1071-05-72	IH 90 (MN State Ln - La Crosse) Round Lake Br to Black River Br, LFA/Mill Shouldering, Construction Anticipated in 2026	Other		State-WI	$149,100		$ 0	$149,100	$0	$0	$0	$0	$149,100	$0	$0	$149,100	$0	$0	$0	$0
243-26-016	State of Wisconsin	2026-03	USH 53, La Crosse - Galesville (STH 157 to Sand Lake Rd) Pavement Repl	New Project - Split Existing Project 243-22-019 into two segments	1630-03-08, 1630-03-76, 1630-03-78	USH 53, La Crosse - Galesville (STH 157 to Sand Lake Rd) Pavement Replacement, Design Anticipated in 2026, Construction Anticipated in 2031-2032, Construction Advanceable to 2029	Pavement Replacement		HSIP, NHPP, State-WI	$9,640,500		$ 0	$578,000	$0	$0	$9,062,500	$7,798,650	$1,841,850	$0	$0	$9,062,500	$0	$0	$578,000	$0
243-26-017	State of Wisconsin	2026-03	US 14, La Crosse - Westby (CTH M to Cemetery Ln), Pav'd Shldr/Rumbles	New HSIP Project	1640-03-32, 1640-03-62	US 14, La Crosse - Westby (CTH M to Cemetery Ln), Pav'd Shldr/Rumbles, Design Anticipated 2026, Construction Anticipated 2029	Safety		HSIP, NHPP, State-WI	$550,750		$ 0	$93,141	$0	$0	$457,609	$486,361	$64,389	$0	$0	$457,609	$0	$0	$93,141	$0
243-26-018	City of Onalaska	2026-03	12th Ave, City of Onalaska (Oak Forest Drive Intersection), Roundabout	New Locally Sponsored HSIP Project	5991-02-79, 5991-02-80	12th Ave, City of Onalaska (Oak Forest Dr Intersection), Roundabout, Design Anticipated 2026, Construction Anticipated 2029	Safety		HSIP, Local	$972,909		$ 0	$27,700	$0	$0	$945,209	$850,688	$0	$122,221	$0	$945,209	$0	$0	$27,700	$0
243-26-019	State of Wisconsin	2026-03	STH 16, La Crosse - Sparta (Wagon Dr Intersection), Median Changes	New HSIP Project	7570-05-01, 7570-05-71	STH 16, La Crosse - Sparta (Wagon Drive Intersection), Median Changes, Design Anticipated 2026, Construction Anticipated 2029	Safety		HSIP, State-WI, STBG	$651,917		$ 0	$152,114	$0	$0	$499,803	$571,514	$80,403	$0	$0	$499,803	$0	$0	$152,114	$0
243-26-020	City of La Crescent	2026-03	C La Crescent, TH 16 and Chestnut St Multiuse Trail	New Project	236-090-006	CITY OF LA CRESCENT TRAIL EXTENSION ALONG CHESTNUT ST AND HWY 16.	Other		Local, TAP	$2,100,000		$ 0	$0	$0	$0	$2,100,000	$1,575,000	$0	$525,000	$0	$2,100,000	$0	$0	$0	$0

2029-2030 CRP Application

LAPC, the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the La Crescent, MN – La Crosse, WI urbanized area is soliciting for use of the direct suballocation of Minnesota DOT's CRP funds for the federal fiscal years (FFY) 2029 and 2030. Eligible public government entities must be located on the Minnesota-side of LAPC's Urban Area.

Instructions:

To apply for LAPC's CRP funds made available, please fill out this application and submit to LAPC staff by **January 9, 2026, at 5:00pm**. To do so, please email Erin Duffer at eduffer@lacrossecounty.org and/or Bob Gollnik at rgollnik@lacrossecounty.org.

Prior to submittal, please review all applicable material on MnDOT's Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) website: Carbon Reduction Program (state.mn.us).

Questions:

If you have any questions about the Carbon Reduction Program and/or the solicitation, please contact the Carbon Reduction Program Coordinator, Anna Pierce at 651-366-3793 or anna.m.pierce@state.mn.us. Specific local questions can be directed to Erin Duffer, Transportation Planner at LAPC, 608-785-5597 or eduffer@lacrossecounty.org.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Table of Contents

CRP Application

Applicant information

Name of applicant organization: City of La Crescent

Name of contact: Jason Ludwigson

Contact address: 315 Main Street

City: La Crescent **State:** MN **Zip:** 55947

County: Houston

Phone: 507-313-9633 **Email:** jludwigson@cityoflacrescent-mn.gov

Project information

1. **Title of project: Amount of funding requested: $Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon Redwood Street East and South 11th Street**
2. **Project location:** 43.81806, -91.31205
3. **One sentence description of the work for which you are seeking support:** The City of La Crescent is seeking support for the install of a RRFB at the mid-block crossing of Redwood Street East and South 11st Street.

Project readiness

4. **Provide the project timeline and milestones, including any relevant planning or engineering studies (250 words maximum).**

   The City of La Crescent has experience installing RRFB's on other city streets and in partnership with Houston County on county roads that traverse the city. The city is reconstructing Redwood Street East in 2026. As a part of that reconstruction the city will install the wiring and pedestrian ramps for the RRFB which will be installed in 2029.

5. **Describe how the project can be completed in the given timeframe (250 words maximum).**

   The City of La Crescent will have the wiring and pedestrian ramps installed as a part of the Redwood Street East reconstruction in 2026. This will set the city up to order the RRFB in late 2028 for install in 2029.

Project funding

6. **Amount of funding requested:** $12,000 in 2029 and $12,000 in 2030
7. **Total project budget:** $30,000
   Briefly explain the total estimated amount of funding needed for the project. Include the amount requested through this application and other sources.
   We are requesting $24,000 for the project. This would be the 80% covered by the CRP funds.

   Identify the local match amount: $Local match amount would be $6,000.
8. **Identify the source of the local funds committed to the project (100 words maximum):**

   Local match would come from the city's general fund.
9. **Total amount of additional federal funds obligated to the project already, if applicable:**

   None

   Source of additional federal funds obligated to the project already, if applicable (100 words maximum): None
10. **Which fiscal year(s) is the project interested in applying for?**

    Projects may submit for one or multiple funding years during this solicitation period.
    Check the fiscal year box or boxes in which you are submitting for funding.
    Carbon Reduction Program ☒ FY2029 ☒ FY2030

Alignment with the Carbon Reduction Strategy

11. **Category of project from the Minnesota Carbon Reduction Strategy:**

    ☐ Electrification ☒ Travel options ☐ Low carbon infrastructure and system management
12. **Strategy associated with the project from the Minnesota Carbon Reduction Strategy:**
    Travel options
13. **Project type in the Minnesota Carbon Reduction Strategy that the project falls under:**
    Install and maintain infrastructure network improvements for walking, rolling, and bicycling.
14. **Describe the work and how it reduces emissions (250 words maximum):**
    The work of installing a RRFB at the mid-block crossing on Redwood Street East and South 11th Street would increase the availability, safety, reliability and convenience of travel options, such as walking, rolling, bicycling. This new active transportation infrastructure will encourage people to shift or swap trips previously taken by car. Having travel options also reduces individual travel costs and supports more equitable access to amenities, since these travel options do not require owning a private vehicle. This new RRFB serves to improve the connection between the La Crescent-Hokah Middle School, La Crescent-Hokah High School, and Kistler Park. More students biking and walking to school reduces VMT and congestion.

Co-benefits of the project

15. Which co-benefits are relevant to your project (check all that apply):

☐ Economic opportunities ☒ Safety ☒ Access ☒ Resilience

Co-benefit: Economic opportunities

Describe how the project creates jobs and stimulates local economies. Highlight efforts to hire a diverse workforce and provide training and career development opportunities for all individuals. Showcase initiatives that improve access to commercial areas, making it easier for people to shop, dine and access services in their communities. Discuss efforts to prioritize projects that address historical disparities in economic opportunities and improve access to underserved areas. Provide any support data available that identify economic improvements in relationship to the project location.

500 words maximum

RRFBs make crossings safer and more visible, which encourages more walking, makes it easier for people to reach shops, restaurants, schools, and services, and increases foot traffic for nearby businesses. RRFB's create safer and more walkable streets which are attractive to homebuyers, developers, and small business owners. Safer communities can boost local property values leading to higher local tax revenue over time. The construction and install of the RRFB supports local manufacturing, construction and engineering jobs.

Co-benefit: Safety

Describe how the project will improve real or perceived safety concerns in the community. These can be identified in a safety study or plan. If the safety concerns are not identified in a plan, they may be identified with an alternative approach, such as providing an aerial photo of the safety concern. Describe whether the project occurs in an area with high rates of motor vehicle serious injury or fatal crashes and/or areas with high rates of non-motorized serious injury or fatal crashes and whether the project has a safety component that addresses these challenges (See Appendix A).

The mid-block crossing at South 11th Street and Redowood East is a frequent connection between the schools and Kistler Park. It also serves as an important connection to Abnet Field and the La Crescent Community Ice Arena. According to the US Department of Transportation an RRFB is applicable to many types of pedestrian crossings but is particularly effective at multilane crossings with speed limits less than 40 miles per hour. The speed limits on Redwood East and South 11th Street are 30 mph. RRFBs can increase motorist yielding rates up to 98% and reduce pedestrian crashes by 47%. The mid-block crossing where the RRFB will be installed with have a marked crosswalk. The marked crosswalk improves the effectiveness of the RRFB. The project supports MnDOT's Safe System Approach (SSA) by providing safe mobility for all road users.

Co-benefit: Access

Describe how the project improves non-motorized access and transit or shared mobility access to key destinations. This can include improvements that encourage these modes through both infrastructure and land use. Describe how the project improves travel efficiency (via driving, carpool or other methods) to key destinations and how the project improved traveler comfort. Focus on making transportation accessible to all, including individuals with disabilities, older adults, and families with young children. Highlight efforts to improve accessibility features, such as ramps, elevators, and tactile paving. If possible, include or attach a map identify key destinations the project will increase access to.

The mid-block crossing and RRFB installation will improve accessibility for all by installing an ADA compliant crossing. It will include new ramps, marked crosswalk and RRFB. The project would have travel efficiency benefits. Providing additional safe pedestrian crosswalks will reduce the need for vehicle trips. The mid-block crossing at South 11th Street and Redowood East is a frequent connection between the schools and Kistler Park. It also serves as an important connection to Abnet Field and the La Crescent Community Ice Arena. Map of key destinations included.

Co-benefit: Resilience

Describe how the project includes resilient infrastructure that can withstand climate change impacts. Emphasize how this project will protect all communities from extreme weather events and ensure long-term sustainability. Highlight the environmental benefits of reducing emissions and improving air quality for everyone. Also describe how this project supports active transportation.

The proposed mid-block crossing and RRFB installation represents a resilient infrastructure investment, designed to remain functional during climate change impacts such as extreme heat, heavier rainfall, and increased storm intensity, while preserving safe pedestrian access. The project fits in with the city's reconstruction of Redwood East where the city is upsizing the existing stormwater pipe to handle more frequent larger rainfall events.

Cost-Effectiveness of Emissions Reduction

The amount of CO_2e reduced and the cost-effectiveness are estimated using the Carbon Emissions Tool (CET) and associated CET Instructions and Tips. The total project cost is determined by the applicant. Further details regarding calculating the total costs of a project can be found in the CET. Similarly, the total emissions reduced is calculated for the whole project, not just a portion funded by the CRP. List your value for cost-effectiveness below in the units of Dollars/Metric Ton CO_2e reduced.

Dollars/metric ton CO2 reduced is 81,081.08

Which project types were used to calculate the cost-effectiveness of emissions reduction and what were the Year 1 and cumulative emissions reductions for the project?

Applicant should attach a table or screenshot of the 'Results Summary' tab to the project application.

Project type: T2 Bike&Ped Network tab

Year 1 emissions reduced: 90 miles

Cumulative emissions reduced: .37 CO2e MT/per year

	Strategy	Year 1 emissions reduction (CO2 e MT per year)	Cumulative emissions reduction (CO2 e MT)	Total Costs ($) USER INPUT REQUIRED	Cost Effectiveness ($/MT)
E1	Expand public EV charging infrastructure network for light duty vehicles				
E2	Deploy charging infrastructure for medium- and heavy-duty freight vehicles				
E3	Purchase or lease battery electric transit buses				
E4	Purchase or lease battery electric school buses				
E5	Transition public fleet through purchase & lease of ZEVs				
T1	Construct standalone pedestrian/bicycle network				
T2	Construct or improve pedestrian/bicycle network	0.03	0.37	30,000.00	81,081.08
T3	Establish or expand micromobility programs				
T4	Improve street connectivity				
T5	Implement Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) systems with dedicated lanes and stations				
T6	Implement bus transit priority treatments				
T7	Add or expand bus service				
T8	Enhance bus frequency or hours of service				
T9	Establish or expand intercity bus services				
T10	Develop or improve intercity passenger rail services				
T11	Construct, expand, or enhance park and ride facilities				
T12	Construct roundabout to improve traffic flow				
T13	Construct left turn lane to improve traffic flow				
T14	Synchronize traffic signals to reduce delay time				
T15	Reduce vehicle miles traveled				
TDM1	Commuter benefits ordinance (CBO)				
TDM2	Carshare				
TDM3	E-Bike incentives				
TDM4	Discounted or subsidized transit				
TDM5	Carpool program				
TDM6	Commute trip reduction (CTR) program for employers				
TDM7	Flexible work schedule and workplace				
TDM8	Vanpool program				
TDM9	Household-based trip reduction program				
LU1	Increase residential density				
LU2	Increase employment density				
LU3	Mixed-use transit oriented development				
LC1	Use low carbon materials in road construction and maintenance				
LC2	Used recycled pavement on construction sites				
LC3	Replace street lighting and traffic control devices with LEDs				
RE1	Implement renewable energy projects in highway right-of-way				
RE2	Install solar panels on transit stations, rest stops, parking, and other facilities				
	Total	0.03	0.37	30,000.00	81,081.08

Project type: Click here to enter text.

Year 1 emissions reduced: Click here to enter text.

Cumulative emissions reduced: Click here to enter text.

Appendices

Appendix A: Definition of high crash locations

High crash locations are generally defined and identified in local planning documents (e.g., roadway safety plans). There are online tools for identifying high-risk crash locations. Below are a few options, but others may be used as well with justification.

- Minnesota Crash Mapping Analysis Tool provides several analytical tools that allow users to assess crashes with 10-year rolling crash data. Applicants may need to coordinate with MnDOT District traffic staff to access the data.
- Suitability for the Pedestrian and Cycling Environment (SPACE) Tool combines many indicators, both sociodemographic and transportation related, that indicate the extent to which a community is suitable for active transportation (e.g., walking and bicycling). This tool is scored on a scale of 0 to 100, with 1 indicating the least suitable and 100 indicating the most suitable. One of the criteria for this tool is the safety risk of intersections for active transportation users. As an example, this can be used to showcase an area of high crash risk for non-motorized users. More details on SPACE tool use and score methodology can be found here.
- Safe System Approach Implementation Plan outlines an approach for MnDOT to integrate the Safe System Approach (SSA) into state programming and project delivery processes. The goal of SSA is to provide safe mobility for all road users based on the following six principles:
    1. *Death and serious injuries are unacceptable* – The SSA prioritizes eliminating fatal and serious injury crashes.
    2. *Humans make mistakes* – The transportation system can be designed, operated, and maintained to accommodate human mistakes.
    3. *Humans are vulnerable* – Transportation systems should accommodate the human body's vulnerability.
    4. *Responsibility is shared* – All stakeholders (including government agencies, transportation industry partners, and the public) are vital.
    5. *Safety is proactive* – Tools should be used to identify and address safety issues before crashes occur.
    6. *Redundancy is crucial* – If one part of the transportation system fails, the other parts still protect people.

    Five complimentary elements provide a holistic SSA to prevent and minimize harm caused by crashes: safe people, safe roads, safe speeds, safe vehicles and post-crash care. Serious injuries and death typically result when all five of those layers fail, so SSA looks to address one or more of those elements to prevent the loss of life or a serious injury if a crash does occur. More information can be found in the MnDOT Safe Systems Approach: Implementation Plan.

Appendix B: Funding targets

Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Targets

Fiscal Year	MIC	GFGEF	APO	Metro COG	ROCOG	MAPO	LAPC	Met Council	Met Council - D3
2027	$225,000	$18,000	$270,000	$108,000	$261,000	$144,000	$9,000	$6,480,000	$190,000
2028	$210,000	$20,000	$270,000	$110,000	$280,000	$140,000	$12,000	$6,600,000	$200,000
2029	$210,000	$20,000	$270,000	$110,000	$280,000	$140,000	$12,000	$6,600,000	**
2030*	$210,000	$20,000	$270,000	$110,000	$280,000	$140,000	$12,000	$6,600,000	**

* Fiscal Year 2030 are not fully approved as of September 4, 2025. These values are a projection until Transportation Programming and Investment Committee (TP&IC) approves the targets later in 2025.

** Beginning in Fiscal Year 2029, Met Council and Central Area Transportation Partnership has agreed to spend funds across the area eliminating the need for the specific callout in Fiscal Year 2029 and Fiscal Year 2030.

2026 – WisDOT TAM Performance Targets

WISDOT 2026 TRANSIT ASSET MANAGEMENT (TAM) PERFORMANCE TARGETS

Measure		2026 Target
Rolling Stock: The percentage of revenue vehicles by type that exceed the useful life benchmark (ULB)	Automobile	80.6%
	Bus	18.5%
	Cutaway	40%
	School Bus	66.7%
	SUV	1%
	Minivan	56.1%
	Van	35.5%
Equipment: The percentage of non-revenue service vehicles by type that exceed the ULB	Automobiles (non-revenue)	40.5%
	Trucks/other Tiered vehicles (non-revenue)	39.6%
Facilities: The percentage of facilities by group rated less than 3.0 on the Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) scale	Administrative/maintenance facilities	10%

STATE OF GOOD REPAIR FOR ROLLING STOCK FOR LA CROSSE MUNICIPAL TRANSIT UTILITY (MTU) AND ONALASKA SHARED RIDE (DRIFTLINK), 2024

Vehicle Type	ULB[1] (years)	2026 TAM[2] Target	Wisconsin (2023)[3]		MTU		DriftLink	
			# Vehicles	>ULB	# Vehicles	>ULB	# Vehicles	>ULB
Bus	12	18.5%	27	18.5%	8	39.1%	0	0.0%
Cutaway	7	40.0%	208	40.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Van	4	35.5%	38	35.5%	0	0.0%	4	21.1%

[1]Useful life benchmark.

[2]Wisconsin Department of Transportation Transit Asset Management (TAM) Plan 2023-2026, updated September 2025.
Source: Federal Transit Authority, NTD; 2024 TAM Performance Tool.

[3]State of Wisconsin only available for 2023 at this time.

NATIONAL TRANSIT DATABASE (NTD) DEFINITIONS:

Bus – Transit mode comprised of rubber-tired passenger vehicles operating on fixed routes and schedules over roadways. Vehicles are powered by diesel, gasoline, battery, and alternative fuel engines contained within the vehicle.

Cutaway – A vehicle in which a bus body is mounted on the chassis of a van or light-duty truck. The original van or light-duty truck chassis may be reinforced or extended. Cutaways typically seat 15 or more passengers and typically may accommodate some standing passengers.

Van – An enclosed vehicle having typical seating capacity of 8 to 18 passengers and a driver. A van is typically taller and with a higher floor than a passenger car, such as a hatchback or station wagon. Vans normally cannot accommodate standing passengers.

Useful Life Benchmark (ULB) – The expected lifecycle of a capital asset for a particular transit agency's operating environment, or the acceptable period of use in service for a particular transit agency's operating environment.

State of Good Repair – A condition sufficient for capital assets to operate at a full level of performance. This means the asset: 1. Is able to perform its designed function, 2. Does not pose a known unacceptable safety risk, and 3. Has met or recovered lifecycle investments.

BASICS – Bridges And Safety Infrastructure for Community Success Act (H.R. 7437)

America's transportation system depends on a safe and reliable network of roads and bridges in every region of the country. **The BASICS Act** focuses federal transportation investment on core infrastructure needs by ensuring funding reaches communities efficiently and is used where it delivers the greatest public benefit.

What this bill does:

- **INVESTS IN REPAIRING BRIDGES**: Builds on the Bridge Formula Program to continue fixing the nation's most deficient bridges, with a focus on both state- and locally owned infrastructure. Unlike prior approaches, the BASICS Act ensures that funding for locally owned bridges is proportional to the number of locally owned bridges in each state, directing resources to the worst-condition bridges regardless of ownership.
- **DELIVERS REGIONAL PRIORITY PROJECTS FASTER**: Metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) are responsible for developing Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) that identify local priority projects that meet federal performance goals. The BASICS Act accelerates delivery of these regionally supported projects by increasing funding for the Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) program. As the most flexible federal transportation formula program, STBG allows states and regions to move projects forward efficiently and deliver tangible benefits for local businesses, workers, and communities in every congressional district.
- **FOCUSES ON ROAD SAFETY**: Nearly 100 people lose their lives on America's roads every day. The BASICS Act strengthens the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) to confront this crisis head-on by increasing overall safety funding and preventing states from transferring HSIP dollars away from safety priorities. The bill also ensures that 25 percent of HSIP funding is delivered regionally in both urban and rural areas, giving local governments direct access to capital for proven safety projects and building on the success of the Safe Streets and Roads for All program.
- **ENSURES TRANSPARENCY AND COLLABORATION**: Federal transportation dollars must be accountable to taxpayers. The BASICS Act improves transparency around how funding flows, what resources are available to regions, and how projects advance from planning to delivery. By reinforcing collaboration across federal, state, regional, and local partners, the bill helps ensure projects move efficiently and deliver real results on the ground.
- **BUILDS STRONG PLANS FOR RURAL AND URBAN REGIONS:** The BASICS Act invests in planning capacity by strengthening Rural Transportation Planning Organizations (RTPOs) and increasing Metropolitan Planning (PL) funding. Strong planning leads to better project selection, faster delivery, and smarter investments, ensuring both rural and metropolitan regions can advance projects that reflect local priorities and long-term needs.