NOTICE OF MEETING

COMMITTEE OR BOARD: SUSTAINABLE LA CROSSE COMMISSION

DATE OF MEETING: THURSDAY, JUNE 20, 2019

MEETING PLACE: COUNTY ADMIN CENTER, CONF ROOM 1107
212 6th STREET N, LA CROSSE, WI 54601

TIME OF MEETING: 4:30 P.M.

PURPOSE OF MEETING: AGENDA

1. Call to Order and Roll Call/Introductions
2. Public Comment
3. Approve Minutes of May 16, 2019
4. Reports/Informational Updates
5. New Appointment from City/Common Council – Rick Cornforth
6. Discussion on Open Community-County Vacancy – Rick Cornforth
7. Annual Indicators Report Update – Anders Olson
8. Strategic Plan Rewrite Funding for Activities – Nick Nichols
9. DRAFT Resolution Re: A Resolution of the Sustainable La Crosse Commission Express Support for the Availability of Community-Based Solar Energy for Use By Its Residents, Businesses, and Other Constituents – Nick Nichols
10. Next Meeting: July 18, 2019, 4:30 p.m.
11. Future Agenda Items
12. Adjourn
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Cynthia Shireman-Healthcare
Rick Diermeier-Business
Larry Sleznikow-City Elected?
Cathy VanMaren-City Community
Kim Smith-City Onalaska Elected
Carolyn Jenkins-City Education
Vacant-Community County

PUBLIC COMMENT: The Committee may receive information from the public, but the Committee reserves the right to limit the time that the public may comment and the degree to which members of the public may participate in the meeting.

MEMBERS: If unable to attend, call Alice Sorenson at 785-9563. PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES: If you need accommodations to attend this meeting, please call 785-9563 as soon as possible.

DATE POSTED: June 19, 2019
SUSTAINABLE LA CROSSE COMMISSION
Thursday, May 16, 2019
Administrative Center, Conference Room 1107, 212 6th St. No
La Crosse, WI
4:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Rick Cornforth, Cathy Van Maren, Kim Smith, Rick Diermeier, Carolyn Jenkins, Cinthia Shireman, Mike Giese
MEMBERS EXCUSED: Justice Weaver
MEMBERS ABSENT: None
OTHERS PRESENT: Nick Nichols, Lewis Kuhlman, Dorothy Leonard, Charlie Handy, Karl Green, Beth Piggush, Kathy Allen, Roz Schnick, John Madole, Alice Sorenson

CALL TO ORDER
Chair Cornforth called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

APPROVE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 18, 2019 SUSTAINABLE LA CROSSE COMMISSION:
MOTION by Diermeier/Van Maren to approve the minutes of April 18, 2019.
Motion carried with one excused – Weaver.

PUBLIC COMMENT:
Beth Piggush introduced herself as the new Integral Ecology Director for the Franciscan Sisters. Beth’s role is the Sustainability Coordinator working with St. Rose Convent in La Crosse, The Villa on St. Joseph’s Ridge and the Land Use Plans that are in place there.

REPORTS/INFORMATIONAL UPDATES:
• Chair Cornforth was contacted by a 6th grader from Onalaska asking about picking up litter along Highway 53 between Main Street and CTH OT. After reaching out to the Highway Department and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation, he was informed that because that section of road is a 4-lane highway, you have to be 16 years of age to pick up litter on that highway. Chair Cornforth reached out to Adopt-a-Highway to see if there were any other roads in the County or Onalaska where the 6th graders could participate. Other options are being looked into as well.
• Nick Nichols stated that he was invited to give a presentation at the Green New Deal event on May 7, 2019. Nick and Roz Schnick will be meeting with the State Treasurer on Monday, May 20, 2019 to talk about the COWS Report, which is a report that talks about eliminating the state’s energy deficit.
• Cathy Van Maren indicated that Dairyland Power is planning to build a new gas fired generator and she has been contacted by the Sierra Club about coordinating letters to the PSC to ask them to build a renewable plant rather than the new gas plant. More information to follow as it is received.

NEW APPOINTMENT FROM CITY/COMMON COUNCIL (PENDING APPROVAL) – RICK CORNFORTH
Pending approval from the Common Council, the Sustainable La Crosse Commission will have a new city representative, Larry Slesnikow, beginning in June.
DISCUSSION ON OPEN COMMUNITY-COUNTY VACANCY – RICK CORNFORTH
Chair Cornforth asked for any updates on the open community-county vacancy for the commission. There were none. Any suggestions can be referred to the Chair.

RECAP OF READY FOR 100 – LEWIS KUHLMAN
Lewis Kuhlman updated on the Ready for 100 draft resolution. The City made some revisions and the draft was resent to the Energy Subcommittee for their review. The Energy Subcommittee felt the resolution was strengthened with the changes that were made and they were in support to go final with it. Kuhlman will submit the amendment to the legislative file.

INDICATORS REPORT UPDATE – RICK CORNFORTH
a. June Presentation: Anders Olson will be available in June to present the results of the Indicators Report to the Commission.
b. July City Council and County Presentations: In July, the report will be presented to the City of La Crosse and Onalaska’s Councils.

UPDATE ON STRATEGIC PLAN REWRITE – CHARLIE HANDY
A staff level discussion was held with the County Administrator, Steve O’Malley, concerning the Strategic Plan rewrite. He was supportive of the County Planning Department putting this Strategic Plan for Sustainability into their work plan and doing a significant amount of the work. He was not supportive of paying a consultant to do a Plan. Also, he felt it was important to do some collaboration conferences, as was done in the past, to educate staff as well as the public on sustainability. If there are specific requests during the planning process for speakers, room rentals, etc., for these educational forums, a budget will need to be put together to request that specific amount of money for approval by the County Administrator and the County Board by July for the 2020 budget process. It will also be key to present the report before the Planning Resource & Development (PRD) Committee for land use and Public Works & Infrastructure (PWI) Committee for facilities. Discussion ensued.

NEXT MEETING DATE: June 20, 2019, 4:30 p.m.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:
• Discussion on Strategic Plan Specific Budget Items
• Indicators Report
• Update on City Resolution Ready for 100

ADJOURNMENT
MOTION by Giese/Jenkins to adjourn. Motion carried with one excused – Weaver.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Disclaimer: This report may be approved, amended or corrected at the next committee meeting. Alice Sorenson, Recorder
City of La Crosse & La Crosse County
Sustainability Indicators
2018 Report

June 13, 2019

Prepared by Anders Olson

La Crosse, Wisconsin
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Introduction
In early 2009 the La Crosse County Board and La Crosse Common Council adopted the *City of La Crosse & La Crosse County Strategic Plan for Sustainability*. The plan identified multiple sustainability indicators to be monitored on an ongoing basis. Some have since been added to or removed, so the set of indicators tracked in this report differs somewhat from the original. Some of these indicators apply to government operations only, while others apply to the City and/or County as a whole. In this report, most indicators are measured and reported separately for the City of La Crosse and La Crosse County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Sustainability Indicators Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City/County Government Operations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity Usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas Usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Energy Use Intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Fuel Usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Dioxide Emissions from Energy Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Product Purchasing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Community-Wide**                           |
| Electricity Usage                            |
| Natural Gas Usage                            |
| Carbon Dioxide Emissions from Energy Use     |
| Water Usage*                                 |
| Solid Waste Generation & Diversion**         |
| Municipal Recycling Collection               |
| MTU Bus System Ridership                     |
| Bicycle Route/Trail Lengths                 |
| Alternative Commuting Rates                  |
| Land Use**                                   |
| Education Attainment                         |
| Median Household Income                      |
| Poverty Rates                                |
| Unemployment Rates                           |

*: Tracked for City of La Crosse only
**: Tracked for La Crosse County only

For most indicators, 2007 was the earliest year for which reliable data could be gathered. The year 2007 was therefore designated as the “base year” against which future values would be compared. According to the *Strategic Plan for Sustainability*, a report was to be generated on an annual basis to monitor and highlight improvements or setbacks in the pursuit toward sustainability. This report summarizes the status of those indicators through the end of 2018.
City of La Crosse Government Operations

Facility Energy Usage

The City of La Crosse government utilizes energy in two forms to operate facilities: electricity and natural gas. Each is examined separately below. The Strategic Plan for Sustainability includes two long-term goals related to energy usage at City facilities:

- Goal 1A: By 2025, the City will reduce overall energy consumption as measured per square foot within City facilities from 2007 by a minimum of 25%.
- Goal 1B: By 2025, at least 25% of the City’s energy needs in City facilities will be generated from renewable resources.

Electricity

The City of La Crosse government used 22.4 million kWh of electricity during 2018 – down from 23.7 million kWh in 2007 (-5.7%), but up from 21.5 million kWh in 2017 (+3.8%; see Figure 1)\(^1\). At $0.11 per kWh, the City government spent $147,513 less for electricity in 2018 than if usage had remained at the 2007 level.\(^2\)

\(^1\) Some values have been revised from previous reports, as minor errors/omissions were discovered.

\(^2\) $0.11 per kWh was the average commercial price for electricity in WI during 2017, the most recent information available (data source: US EIA).
Cooling degree days (CDD) measure the difference between outdoor temperature and the base indoor temperature of air-conditioned facilities. The annual CDD values shown in Figure 1 represent an index of overall summer heat levels. Higher electricity consumption for air conditioning is expected in years with higher annual CDD values.

Among City departments, the Waste Water Utility used the largest amount of electricity in 2018 (28% of the City total), followed by the Water Department, La Crosse Center and Grounds & Buildings -- which includes City Hall (see Figure 2).

Regarding Goal 1B of the Strategic Plan for Sustainability, 28.5% of the electricity that the City government purchased from Xcel Energy in 2018 was produced using renewable sources, primarily wind and hydro (see Figure 11). The City government does not currently operate renewable energy generation equipment. Opportunities to add renewable energy generation equipment may include installation of solar photovoltaic panels on suitable City facility rooftops, and/or utilizing anaerobic digester gas from the Waste Water Treatment Plant to produce electricity.³

³ For more information about how the City’s waste water treatment facility could generate significant amounts of electricity, see Focus on Energy’s 2003 report, Anaerobic Digester Methane to Energy: A Statewide Assessment.
Natural Gas

The City of La Crosse government consumed 539,743 therms of natural gas during 2018 – up from 514,468 therms in 2007 (+4.9%) and up from 502,522 therms in 2017 (+8.1%; see Figure 3).\(^4\) At $0.62 per therm, the City government spent $15,691 more on natural gas in 2017 than if usage had remained at the 2007 level.\(^5\)

Heating degree days (HDD) measure the difference between outdoor and indoor temperatures. The annual HDD values shown in Figure 3 represent an index of overall winter coldness. Higher natural gas consumption is expected in years with higher HDD values.

Among City departments, the La Crosse Center used the largest amount of natural gas in 2018 – 37% of the City government total (see Figure 4). Other departments using significant amounts of natural gas were Buildings & Grounds (includes City Hall), Libraries, and the Waste Water Utility.

---

\(^4\) Some values have been revised from previous reports, as minor errors/omissions were discovered.

\(^5\) $0.62 per therm was the average commercial price for natural gas in WI during 2018 (data source: US EIA).
Energy Use Intensity (EUI)

A facility’s annual energy usage per square foot, or energy use intensity (EUI), is a measure of its total annual energy usage (in units of kBtu), standardized by its size (in units of ft²). Goal 1A of the Strategic Plan for Sustainability aims to reduce EUI of City facilities 25% from 2007 by 2025. This analysis tracks EUI for two of the largest City government facilities – City Hall and the La Crosse Center – from 2007-2018.

City Hall

City Hall’s 2018 EUI was 130.5 kBtu/ft² – down from 164.0 kBtu/ft² in 2007 (-20.4%) and down from 138.9 kBtu/ft² in 2017 (-6.7%; see Figure 5). The U.S. EPA Energy Star Portfolio Manager program publishes median EUI values by facility type among its participating facilities. In early 2016, the median site EUI value for offices was 67.3 kBtu/ft², suggesting that City Hall uses significantly more energy than most office facilities in the Portfolio Manager program. However, the ages, geographical locations, and specific usage patterns of participating facilities are undisclosed.

Change in EUI can have significant financial implications. At $0.11/kWh and $0.62/therm, the energy cost to operate City Hall in 2018 was $34,178 less than if the EUI had remained at 2007 levels.

![Figure 5: City Hall Annual Energy Use Intensity](image-url)
La Crosse Center

The La Crosse Center’s 2018 EUI was 306.5 kBtu/ft² – up from 238.8 kBtu/ft² in 2007 (+28.4%) and up from 274.1 kBtu/ft² in 2017 (+11.8%; see Figure 6). In early 2016 the Portfolio Manager median site EUI value for convention centers was 45.3 kBtu/ft², indicating that the La Crosse Center uses more energy than most convention centers in the Portfolio Manager program. However, the ages, geographical locations, and specific usage patterns of participating facilities are undisclosed.

Change in EUI can have significant financial implications. At $0.11/kWh and $0.62/therm, the energy cost to operate the La Crosse Center in 2018 was $38,555 more than if the EUI had remained at 2007 levels.

Figure 6: La Crosse Center Annual Energy Usage Intensity
Vehicle Fuels

The City government’s vehicle fleet uses three fuel types: diesel fuel, gasoline and propane. Usage of each type is examined separately below. The City government has set two long-term goals related to fuel usage in its vehicle fleet:

- Goal 1D: By 2025, the City will consume at least 25% less fossil fuel for its vehicle fleet.
- Goal 1E: By 2025, at least 25% of the fuel consumed for the City’s fleet will come from renewable sources and alternative fuels.

With respect to Goal 1D, the City fleet’s total fossil fuel usage in 2018 was 3.2% lower (by energy content) than in 2008. Diesel fuel and propane are purely fossil fuel sources. Most gasoline is formulated as a blend of 90% petroleum gasoline (fossil) and 10% ethanol (renewable). With respect to Goal 1E, renewable and/or alternative fuels accounted for 11.8% of the City fleet’s total fuel usage (by energy content) in 2018. These included propane – an alternative fossil fuel – and the ethanol component of gasoline.

**Figure 7: City of La Crosse Government Annual Vehicle Fuel Usage**

![Fuel Usage Chart](chart.png)

**Diesel Fuel**

Diesel fuel is typically utilized by heavy-duty vehicles such as buses, snow plows and construction vehicles. Therefore, diesel fuel usage is influenced by variables including snowfall amounts during winter and construction activity during other seasons.

The City fleet used 245,328 gallons of diesel fuel in 2018 – down from 264,878 gallons in 2008 (-7.4%) and down from 247,724 gallons in 2017 (-1.0%; see Figure 7).

---

6 Fuel used by the Library Department has been removed from analysis, as information is no longer available.

7 The Strategic Plan for Sustainability reported the City government’s 2007 diesel usage to be 418,500 gallons - including usage by Western Technical College and the La Crosse School District.
departments, the MTU (bus system) used the largest quantity of diesel in 2018 (60% of the City total), followed by the Street Department (20%; see Figure 8).

Gasoline
Gasoline is typically utilized by light-duty vehicles such as passenger cars and pickup trucks. The City fleet used 91,424 gallons of gasoline in 2018 – down from 125,522 gallons in 2008 (-27.2%), but down from 83,089 gallons in 2017 (+10.0%; see Figure 7).8,9 The Police Department’s use of propane as an alternative option to gasoline explains part of the City government’s gasoline usage reduction.

The Police Department was the largest user of gasoline among City departments (25% of the City total; see Figure 9). The Water, Parks & Recreation, Police Parking, and Street departments also used relatively large proportions of the City government’s total.

Propane
In 2018 the Police Department’s squad vehicles used 52,202 gallons of propane – up from 51,672 gallons in 2017 (+1.0%; see Figure 7). In 2009, the Department began outfitting new squad vehicles for using propane in addition to gasoline, so they can utilize either throughout the year depending on fuel costs. Police department gasoline usage and propane usage are therefore expected to be inversely related to each other.

---

8 Fuel used by the Library Department has been removed from analysis, as information is no longer available.
9 The Strategic Plan for Sustainability reported the City government’s 2007 gasoline usage to be 134,720 gallons but this quantity also includes usage by Western Technical College and the La Crosse School District.
CO₂ Emissions from Facility Energy Usage & Vehicle Fuels

Combustion of fossil fuels to produce energy emits carbon dioxide (CO₂) into the atmosphere. The City government’s 2018 energy usage resulted in an estimated 14,677 metric tons of CO₂ emissions – down from 20,060 metric tons in 2008 (-26.8%), but up from 14,178 metric tons in 2017 (+3.5%; see Figure 10).\textsuperscript{10,11} The electricity component was the largest driver of reduced emissions from 2008 to 2018, having decreased by 37.6%.

![Figure 10: City of La Crosse Government Annual CO₂ Emissions from Energy Usage](image)

The City government’s CO₂ emissions from electricity are influenced by two factors: the City government’s electricity usage quantities and Xcel Energy’s electricity emission rates – i.e., CO₂ quantities emitted per unit of electricity produced. Both factors declined from 2008-2018, but reductions in Xcel’s emission rate were primarily responsible for the declining trend in the City government’s CO₂ emissions. Xcel produced less electricity with coal and more with natural gas and wind energy sources (see Figure 11), resulting in a 35.2% lower emission rate in 2018 than in 2008. Though natural gas is a fossil fuel, it produces much less CO₂ than coal.

\textsuperscript{10} City fleet vehicle fuel usage data are not available for 2007, so 2008 is used as a baseline instead.

\textsuperscript{11} Some values revised from previous reports, based on revisions to underlying energy use/emission factor values.
Water Usage

This indicator tracks City-sourced water used by major City government facilities, including City Hall, La Crosse Center, Libraries, Fire Stations, Swimming Pools & Erickson Ball Fields, Airport, Municipal Service Center, MTU Transit Center, Waste Water Treatment Utility, and the Water Utility’s Myrick Park Pump Station. A number of smaller end uses are excluded. Also excluded is water sourced from on-site wells serving City Hall and the La Crosse Center.

The City’s government’s water usage in 2018 was 45.0 million gallons – down from 62.6 million gallons in 2007 (-28.2%), and down from 116.5 million gallons in 2017 (-61.4%; see Figure 12). Among City departments, the Waste Water Treatment Utility accounted for 64% of the City total (see Figure 13). Increased usage at City Hall and the La Crosse Center accounts for most of the total increase between 2016 and 2017. Both of these facilities used City-sourced water while problems were being resolved with their on-site wells. The abnormally high water usage in 2010 resulted from flushing of the digester and storage tanks at the Waste Water Treatment Utility.
Paper Usage

The City government purchased 318 cases of white paper in 2016 – down from 460 cases in 2007 (-30.9%), and down from 322 cases in 2015 (-1.2%; see Figure 14). A large purchase of paper late in 2008 probably explains the abnormally high value for that year and the abnormally low value for 2009. In Goal 3B of the Strategic Plan for Sustainability, the City government aimed to reduce paper consumption by at least 10% each year for five years. On average, the City government’s paper usage has declined by 4.0% per year from 2007-2016. At $0.05 per printed sheet, the City government spent $35,500 less on paper in 2016 than in 2007.

For 2017 and 2018, purchase records indicate that the City government purchased 669 cases and 945 cases of white paper, respectively. However, the large difference between this quantity and those from previous years likely reflect changes in data collection procedures resulting from personnel changes. The discrepancy is under review but remains unresolved as of the completion of this report.

![Figure 14: City of La Crosse Government Annual Paper Usage](image)

Data Source: City of La Crosse Government

Green Product Purchasing

In Strategic Plan for Sustainability Goal 2A, the City government set a goal to replace 50% of purchased products with environmentally preferred products. Examples of environmentally preferred products include post-consumer content paper products, chlorine-free paper, and chemical products containing low Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) levels. As of 2013, the City government’s product purchase database contained a relatively small number of environmentally preferred products (see Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status:</th>
<th>Green Product</th>
<th>Green Potential</th>
<th>No Green Potential</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Items:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: City of La Crosse Gov’t Purchase Item Count by Environmentally Preferred Status

12 A case of paper is equivalent to 5,000 sheets.
La Crosse County Government Operations

Facility Energy Usage

The La Crosse County government utilizes electricity and natural gas energy sources to operate facilities; each is examined separately below. The County government implemented several facility changes in 2016 and 2017 that impacted subsequent energy usage levels:

- A new Lakeview Health facility opened late in 2016, replacing the old facility.
- The Administration Center was relocated to another existing facility – smaller in area – in La Crosse. After renovations were completed, the new facility opened early in 2017.
- A boiler replacement and major expansion at the Health & Human Services facility were completed in late 2016.

Electricity

The La Crosse County government consumed 8.56 million kWh of electricity during 2018 – down from 10.61 million kWh in 2007 (-16.1%), but up from 8.47 million kWh in 2016 (+1.0%; see Figure 15). \(^{13}\) At $0.11 per kWh, the County government spent $178,687 less in 2017 than if electricity usage had remained at 2007 levels. \(^{14}\)

\(^{13}\) Data from previous years was updated in this report as some information had previously been omitted.

\(^{14}\) $0.11 was the average commercial price for electricity in WI during 2017, the most recent information available (data source: US EIA).
Cooling degree days (CDD) measure the difference between outdoor temperature and the base indoor temperature of air-conditioned facilities. The annual CDD values shown in Figure 15 represent an index of overall summer heat levels. Higher electricity consumption for air conditioning is expected in years with higher annual CDD values.

Among County facilities, the Law Enforcement Center used the largest amount of electricity in 2018 (32% of the City total; see Figure 16). Health and Human Services, Lakeview Health Center, and Hillview Health Care Center also used relatively large quantities.

**Natural Gas**

The La Crosse County government consumed 325,763 therms of natural gas during 2018 – down from 478,918 therms in 2007 (-32.0%), and down from 327,912 therms in 2017 (-0.7%; see Figure 17). At $0.62 per therm, the County government spent $95,081 less for natural gas in 2018 than if usage had remained at the 2007 level.16

---

15 Data from previous years was updated in this report as some information had previously been omitted.
16 $0.62 per therm was the average commercial price for natural gas in WI during 2018 (data source: US EIA).
Heating degree days (HDD) measure the difference between outdoor and indoor temperatures. The annual HDD values shown in Figure 17 represent an index of overall winter coldness. Higher natural gas use is expected in years with higher HDD values.

Among County facilities, the Law Enforcement Center used the largest amount of natural gas in 2018 (34% of the County total; see Figure 18). Hillview Health Care Center and Lakeview Health Center also used relatively large quantities.

**Energy Use Intensity**

A facility’s annual energy usage per square foot, or energy use intensity (EUI), is a measure of its total annual energy usage (in units of kBtu), standardized by its size (in units of ft²). EUI is useful for comparing energy use among facilities of different sizes. This analysis examines EUI of two La Crosse County government facilities -- Health and Human Services and the Law Enforcement Center.

**Health and Human Services Facility**

La Crosse County replaced the boiler and completed an expansion in its Health and Human Services facility in 2016, increasing the total area of conditioned space from 90,000 ft² to 114,000 ft². The facility’s EUI in 2018 was 47.5 kBtu/ft² – down from 76.7 kBtu/ft² (-38.0%) in 2015 -- the most recent year prior to replacement of the boiler and facility expansion -- and down from 90.6 kBtu/ft² in 2007 (-47.5%; see Figure 19). For comparison, U.S. EPA’s Energy Star Portfolio Manager publishes median EUI values by facility type. As of March 2016, the median site-level EUI value for offices was 67.3 kBtu/ft².

Change in EUI can have significant financial implications. At $0.11/kWh and $0.62/therm, the energy cost to operate the Health and Human Services facility in 2018 was $87,096 less than if the EUI had remained at 2007 levels.
Law Enforcement Center

The La Crosse County Law Enforcement Center underwent a major expansion in 2010, increasing its total area from 169,000 ft² to 315,000 ft². The Law Enforcement Center’s EUI in 2018 was 66.3 kBtu/ft²—up from 65.0 kBtu/ft² in 2017 (+1.9%), but down from 75.3 kBtu/ft² in 2007 (-12.0%, see Figure 20). For comparison, the Portfolio Manager’s median EUI value for incarceration facilities in March 2016 was 93.2 kBtu/ft².

Change in EUI can have significant financial implications. At $0.11/kWh and $0.62/therm, the energy cost to operate the Law Enforcement Center in 2018 was $145,758 less than if the EUI had remained at 2007 levels.
Vehicle Fuels

The County government’s vehicle fleet uses three fuel types: diesel fuel, gasoline and compressed natural gas (CNG). Usage of each type is examined separately below. Overall, the County’s total vehicle fuel usage in 2018 was 3.0% higher (by energy content) than in 2007.

Diesel

Diesel fuel is typically utilized by heavy-duty vehicles such as buses, snow plows and construction vehicles. Therefore, diesel fuel usage is influenced by variables including snowfall amounts during winter and construction activity during other seasons. The County government used 144,580 gallons of diesel fuel in 2018 – down from 133,348 gallons in 2007 (-12.4%) and up from 126,542 gallons in 2017 (+14.3%; see Figure 21). The Highway Department accounted for 99% of diesel usage in 2018, and the Facilities Department for 1%.

Gasoline

Gasoline is typically utilized by light-duty vehicles such as passenger cars and pickup trucks. The County government used 66,151 gallons of gasoline in 2018 – down from 75,550 gallons in 2007 (-47.5%), but up from 62,355 gallons in 2017 (+6.1%; see Figure 21). The Sheriff’s Department accounted for 74% of gasoline usage in 2018, and the Highway Department for most of the remainder.

Compressed Natural Gas (CNG)

In 2014, the Highway Department began operating two full-size pickup trucks that were converted to use compressed natural gas (CNG) rather than gasoline. CNG quantities are typically measured in gallons of gasoline equivalent (GGE), which represents a quantity of CNG whose energy content is equal to that of a gallon of gasoline. Total CNG usage in 2018 was 3,265 GGE, which was up from 2,833 GGE in 2017 (+15.2%; see Figure 21).

---

17 Gasoline usage by the Sheriff’s department had been omitted from County fuel usage values in previous reports, but has been included in this report.
Combustion of fossil fuels to produce energy emits carbon dioxide (CO$_2$) into the atmosphere. The County government’s 2018 energy usage resulted in an estimated 6,899 metric tons of CO$_2$ emissions – down from 10,733 metric tons in 2007 (-35.7%), and down from 6,705 metric tons in 2017 (+2.9%; see Figure 22).$^{18}$ The electricity component was the largest driver of reduced emissions from 2007 to 2018, having decreased by 49.4%.

The County government’s CO$_2$ emissions from electricity are influenced by two factors: the County government’s electricity usage quantities and Xcel Energy’s electricity emission rates – i.e., the amount of CO$_2$ emitted per unit of electricity produced. Both factors declined from 2007-2018, but reductions in Xcel’s emission rate were primarily responsible for the declining trend in the County government’s CO$_2$ emissions. Xcel produced less electricity with coal and more with natural gas and wind energy sources (see Figure 23), resulting in a 37.4% lower emission rate in 2018 than in 2007.

$^{18}$ Some values revised from previous reports, based on revisions to underlying energy use/emission factor values
Water Usage

This indicator includes water usage only at County government facilities that are located within the City of La Crosse and served by the City Water Utility: Administration Center, Health & Human Services, Law Enforcement Center, Hillview Health Care Center, Carroll Heights and the Highway Department facility on Park Lane Dr. A number of facilities located in other municipalities are excluded; e.g., Lakeview Health Center, Highway Department Headquarters. Also excluded is water sourced from on-site wells at the Administrative Center, Health and Human Services, and Law Enforcement Center facilities.

The County government’s water usage in 2018 was 18.1 million gallons – down from 21.8 million gallons in 2007 (-17.2%), and down from 30.9 million gallons in 2017 (-41.6%; see Figure 24). Among included County facilities, the Law Enforcement Center and Hillview health care facilities used the largest proportions 47% and 35% of total, respectively; see Figure 25). High water usage levels in 2016 and 2017 resulted from temporary stoppages of on-site wells at the Law Enforcement Center (2016) and the Health and Human Services facility (2017). The facilities used City-sourced water while on-site wells were not operating.
Paper Usage
In 2018, the County government used 833 cases of paper – down from 1,492 cases in 2009 (-44.2%), and down from 987 cases in 2017 (-15.7%; see Figure 26). A case of paper includes 5,000 sheets. At $0.05 per printed sheet of paper, the County spent $164,869 less on paper in 2018 than in 2009.

Green Product Purchasing
In August of 2008, the County Board passed a resolution to incorporate a sustainability provision into its purchasing policy. The resolution, established priority for purchasing products, equipment and services that meet sustainability standards. Examples include paper products (paper towels, toilet paper, etc.) with 100% recycled content, biodegradable hand soaps and environmentally friendly cleaning products. As of 2009, all Request for Proposals received from vendors for $20,000 or more must include sustainability criteria.

---

19 2009 is the earliest year for which County paper usage data is available.
Community-Wide Indicators

Electricity Usage
Community-wide, the City of La Crosse used 715 million kWh of electricity during 2017 – down from 729 million kWh in 2016 (-1.9%; see Figure 27). La Crosse County used 1.05 billion kWh of electricity during 2017 – down from 1.08 billion kWh in 2016 (-2.4%). Note that year-to-year differences may fall within the margin of error (+/-3%) specified by Xcel Energy.

In the City of La Crosse, 78% of the total electricity used in 2017 was used by businesses and 22% by residences. In La Crosse County, 70% of the total electricity used in 2017 was used by businesses and 30% by residences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>City (MWh)</th>
<th>County (MWh)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>1,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>1,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>1,055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 27: La Crosse Community-Wide Annual Electricity Usage

Natural Gas Usage
Community-wide, the City of La Crosse used 39.0 million therms of natural gas during 2017 – up from 36.5 million therms in 2016 (+7.0%; see Figure 28). La Crosse County used 53.5 billion therms of natural gas during 2017 – up from 50.3 million therms in 2016 (+6.3%). Note that year-to-year differences may fall within the margin of error (+/- 3%) specified by Xcel Energy.

In the City of La-Crosse, 75% of the total natural gas used in 2017 was used by businesses and 25% by residences. In La Crosse County, 65% of the total natural gas used in 2017 was used by businesses and 35% by residences.
Carbon Dioxide Emissions from Energy Usage

Community-wide, electricity and natural gas usage in the City of La Crosse during 2017 was responsible for 472,681 metric tons of carbon dioxide emissions – up from 459,347 metric tons in 2016 (+2.9%), but down from 498,650 tons in 2015 (-5.2%; see figure 29). Electricity and natural gas usage in La Crosse County was responsible for 676,183 metric tons of carbon dioxide emissions – up from 661,558 metric tons in 2016 (+2.2%), but down from 720,676 metric tons in 2015 (-6.2%). Note that year-to-year differences may fall within the margin of error (+/- 3%) specified by Xcel Energy.

In the City of La Crosse, businesses were responsible for 77% of the total carbon dioxide emitted in 2017, and residences for 23%. In the La Crosse County, businesses were responsible for 68% of the total carbon dioxide emitted in 2017, and residences for 32%.
Water Usage

This indicator tracks the total amount of water pumped annually by the City Water Utility’s wells. It includes both metered usage and unmetered usage/losses such as main breaks, service leaks, system flushing, and fire suppression. Community-wide, the City of La Crosse used 3.36 billion gallons of water in 2018 – down from 3.95 billion gallons in 2007 (-15.1%), and down from 3.45 billion gallons in 2017 (-2.8%; see Figure 30). Total water usage is influenced by growing-season rainfall amounts, as more pumped water is used for landscape irrigation during periods of low rainfall.

Figure 30: City of La Crosse Annual Water Usage

Data Source: WI Public Service Commission
Solid Waste Generation & Diversion

Solid waste managed by La Crosse County enters one of three waste streams: deposition in the La Crosse County Landfill, incineration at the Xcel Energy Waste-to-Energy facility on French Island (which generates electricity), or recycling. Recycled quantities include both materials collected by municipalities (see following section), and materials diverted for recycling at the landfill. The latter include shingles, concrete, tires, scrap metal, yard waste and wood waste.

In total, La Crosse County handled 121,952 tons of solid waste in 2018 – down from 123,274 tons in 2007 (-1.1%), and down from 130,926 tons in 2017 (-6.9%; see Figure 31). Solid waste generation is influenced by trends in economic activity. In particular, more construction activity generates more solid waste. Economic recession may explain the relatively low quantity of solid waste generated in 2009 and the subsequent increasing trend.

Of the total solid waste handled in 2018, 68.2% was deposited into the landfill, 25.1% was incinerated to produce electricity, and 6.7% was recycled. The 2018 total diversion rate (i.e., the sum of the percent incinerated and the percent recycled) was 31.8%, down from 32.4% in 2017 and down from 41.4% in 2007. Incinerated waste from La Crosse County was used to produce an estimated 20.0 million kWh of electricity in 2018, enough to supply approximately 2,195 households.
Municipal Recycling Collection

This indicator tracks quantities of recyclable materials, collected through curbside and drop off collection methods, by all municipalities within La Crosse County. Materials include paper products (newspaper, corrugated, magazines), containers (aluminum, steel, bi–metal, plastic, glass) and polystyrene foam packaging.

Recycling collection quantities have increased significantly since 2007. Together, the County’s municipalities collected 7,488 tons of materials for recycling in 2017 –up from 3,160 tons in 2007 (+137.0%), but down from 7,639 tons in 2016 (-2.0%; see Figure 32). The increase in recycled quantities between 2013 and 2014 for the Cities of La Crosse and Onalaska coincide with the initiation of a “single stream” collection process and distribution of much larger storage containers to residents in both communities.

---

20 Data for 2018 were not available as of the completion of this report.
Transportation
This report tracks three indicators related to alternative forms of transportation: ridership on the La Crosse Municipal Transit Utility (the City bus system), the total length of bicycle routes and trails within the City and the County, and residents’ usage of alternative methods for commuting to work. In Goal 1G of the Strategic Plan for Sustainability, the City set a general goal to “enhance our community’s transportation system.”

La Crosse Municipal Transit Utility Ridership
The La Crosse Municipal Transit Utility provided 980,681 million passenger trips in 2018 – down from 1,043,403 million trips in 2007 (-4.4%), and down from 1,025,609 million trips in 2017 (-6.0%; see Figure 33).

Bicycle Accommodations
This indicator includes on-road and off-road accommodations for bicycle transportation. On-road accommodations include designated bicycle lanes and streets marked with “sharrow” symbols. Off-road accommodations include paved trails that are at least eight feet wide, and also state trails. Trails with grass or earth surfaces are not included.

The City of La Crosse had 27.0 lane-miles\(^{21}\) of on-road bicycle accommodations at the end of 2018 – up from 2.3 lane-miles at the end of 2009 (+1,058.2%), and up from 25.8 lane-miles at the end of 2017 (+4.9%; see Figure 34).\(^{22}\) The City had 18.6 lane-miles of off-road bicycle accommodations at the end of 2018 – up from 12.0 lane-miles at the end of 2009 (+55.1%), and up from 18.4 lane-miles at the end of 2017 (+0.8%; see Figure 32).

\(^{21}\) defined as the centerline length multiplied by the number of lanes
\(^{22}\) 2009 is the earliest year for which bicycle accommodation data is available.
The La Crosse Area Planning Committee (LAPC) Planning Area\textsuperscript{23} contained 49.0 lane-miles of on-road bicycle accommodations at the end of 2018 – up from 15.1 lane-miles at the end of 2009 (+224.7%), and up from 47.0 lane-miles at the end of 2017 (+4.2%; see Figure 35). The Planning Area contained 55.4 lane-miles of off-road bicycle accommodations at the end of 2018 – up from 39.9 lane-miles at the end of 2009 (+39.1%), and up from 55.3 lane-miles at the end of 2017 (+0.3%; see Figure 33).

\textsuperscript{23} The LAPC Planning Area includes the city of La Crescent, MN as well as all of La Crosse County except for the towns of Farmington, Washington, Rockland, Burns, and Bangor. See www.lapc.org/content/about/map.htm
Alternative Commuting Rates
This indicator examines percentages of workers who travel to work in ways other than driving alone in an automobile: bicycling or walking, public transportation or carpooling. Data are collected as part of the US Census Bureau’s American Community Survey (ACS). ACS results are published as 5-year averages; this analysis examines alternative commute rates in two periods: 2007-2011 and 2012-2016.

In both periods, a higher percentage of City residents than County or state residents walked or bicycled to work (see Figure 36). The City’s relatively compact spatial arrangement with short travel distances between residential and commercial areas make walking/bicycling practical. Although many students also walk or bike to school in the City, students are not included in the analysis. Also in both periods, a lower percentage County residents than City or state residents used public transportation, presumably because fewer public transportation options are available. Carpooling percentages appeared higher among state residents than City or County residents, but this is not statistically significant when margins of error are considered.

The percentage of residents who walked or bicycled to work in the City and the County apparently increased from the 2008-2012 period to the 2013-2017 period, but this is not statistically significant when margins of error are considered. Percentages of workers who carpooled apparently declined in all three geographies, but this also is not statistically significant. The apparent decline in carpooling may be a result of declining fuel prices. Percentages of workers using public transportation were nearly unchanged between periods.
Land Use

This indicator tracks land use change across La Crosse County. Land classification categories include: residential, agricultural, forest, commercial/manufacturing, public (i.e., local/state/federally owned), undeveloped and other. Most of the County’s land area is classified as agriculture or forest (see Figure 37). Public and residential uses make up most of the remainder.

Public, residential, undeveloped and other land use types gained area between 2007 and 2018. Agricultural was the only type that lost area. Transition of agricultural land into “undeveloped” land may occur with Conservation Reserve Program enrollment, or loss of access for a season because of high water. Of perhaps greater concern is conversion of agricultural land into residential areas. The increase in public land may result from WI DNR stewardship grants in within the County, or from any road building or expansion projects that increase right of way.
Socio-Economic Indicators
Socio-economic indicators specified by the Strategic Plan for Sustainability include educational attainment, median household income, poverty rate and unemployment rate. Values for each are compared among the City of La Crosse, La Crosse County and the state of Wisconsin.

For all socioeconomic indicators, data for 2018 were not yet available to include in this report. For all but the unemployment rate, the source of these data is the US Census Bureau’s American Community Survey (ACS). ACS results are now published as 5-year averages, but were previously published as 3-year averages.

Education Attainment
For all three time periods examined – 2005-2007, 2008-2012 and 2013-2017 – a higher percentage of both City and County residents than state residents apparently held high school diplomas (see Figure 38) and bachelor’s degrees (see Figure 39). However, only the bachelor’s degree category in the 2013-2017 period is statistically significant when margins of error are considered. In general, County rates appeared to be slightly higher than City rates. None of these differences are statistically significant, however, when margins of error are considered.

Both high school diploma and bachelor’s degree indicators reveal apparent trends toward higher education levels among City, County and state residents over the time periods examined. The trends are not statistically significant, however, when margins of error are considered.
Median Household Income

For all three periods examined – 2005-2007, 2008-2012, and 2013-2017, median household income (MHI) in the City of La Crosse was significantly lower than County and statewide MHI values (see Figure 40). Since the City of La Crosse is included within La Crosse County, it follows that MHI among households in other municipalities within the County must be higher than the County-wide MHI value.

MHI for City, County and state all appear to have increased over time, concurrent with economic recovery from the “great recession” across the nation. However, for the City and County, the apparent differences were statistically significant only between the 2005-2007 and 2013-2017 periods.

Poverty Rate

This analysis examines the percentage of residents whose income in the past twelve months was below poverty level. For all three periods examined – 2005-2007, 2008-2012 and 2013-2017, that percentage was much higher in the City of La Crosse than in the County and the state (see Figure 41). One factor that likely contributes to the City’s relatively high poverty rate is its large college student population, since college students living off campus are included in poverty measures.

At City, County and State levels, poverty rates appear to have increased over time. However, the apparent changes were not statistically significant for the City or for the County, when margins of error are considered.
Unemployment Rate

This indicator tracks trends in annual average unemployment rate, as measured by the Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development. The City, County and state all experienced a large jump from low unemployment rates in 2007 and 2008 to much higher rates in 2009, as a result of the “great recession” (see Figure 42). Rates then slowly declined as the economy gradually recovered, and by 2015 rates had returned to 2007-08 levels. Unemployment rates continued to decline through 2018. Throughout the analysis period, annual average unemployment rates in La Crosse County have been consistently lower than those in the City of La Crosse. Both have been consistently lower than the rates in the state overall.

Figure 42: La Crosse Annual Average Unemployment Rates

Values for 2018 are considered preliminary as of publication of this report; final values may vary slightly.
RE: A resolution of the Sustainable La Crosse Commission express support for the availability of community-based solar energy for use by its residents, businesses, and other constituents.

WHEREAS, the Commission seeks to promote a healthy sustainable economic development environment to ensure prosperity and opportunity for all its residents; and

WHEREAS, the Commission considers clean renewable energy as a sustainable source of energy needed to promote and encourage strong economic development and vitality in the County; and

WHEREAS, the Commission is committed to doing its part to share information to all community members of the County using its ability to communicate with constituents using its web domain and other outreach and promotional channels; and

WHEREAS, the Commission seeks to recognize Xcel Energy for opening a second Solar*Connect community solar garden May 31, 2019 located in Cashton, Wisconsin, which now offers subscriptions to homeowners, businesses and nonprofits that are Xcel Energy customers in the County access to clean solar energy powered by the one-megawatt community solar garden located in Cashton, WI.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the commission agrees as follows:

1. To assist County residents, businesses and others the County hereby resolves to provide access to information about Xcel Energy’s Solar*Connect Community Program.
2. To assist County constituents’ access additional information relating to solar PV energy programs, incentives, financing, and local solar installer using a new County website, located at (insert website address)

FISCAL NOTE: The implementation steps necessary will be authorized individually within the Sustainability and Solid Waste Department budgets of the years 2019 - 2024.

Date: _______________________________ Date: _______________________________