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OVERVIEW AND PURPOSE

Federal transit law requires that any projects selected for funding under the Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities (formerly titled Elderly and Disabled Capital Assistance Program) must be derived from a "locally developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan". This requirement was implemented as part of the SAFETEA-LU legislation and the requirement continues under the new transportation legislation, MAP-21 (Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century). The purpose of the coordinated planning process is to have stakeholder involvement in the assessment of elderly and disabled transportation, and to provide strategies and goals to improve those transportation alternatives. These coordinated plans were last completed in 2008 and are due to be updated in 2013.

Under MAP-21, the Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC/WETAP) and New Freedom programs were repealed and eligible projects may be funded under either the expanded 5310 program (for New Freedom type projects) or the 5311 program (for JARC/WETAP type projects). Only those projects eligible to be funded under the 5310 program need to be included as part of the coordinated planning process. This would include the “traditional” 5310 vehicle purchase requests, and also the New Freedom-type projects for mobility management or other capital projects, or for operating assistance projects such as volunteer driver programs or voucher programs.

Development of the plan includes gathering demographic information, documenting the existing transportation services for the plan area, holding a public meeting to discuss elderly and disabled transportation services, and development of strategies for improving those services over the next five years. Plans may be developed on an individual county basis, a multi-county basis, or a region-wide basis. The planning process must be complete and the final report must be submitted prior to December 20, 2013 and will be for grant years 2014 - 2018.

Federal Requirements
FTA guidelines require a locally developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan that consists of, at a minimum:

- an assessment that identifies public, private, and non-profit entities that currently provide transportation services to persons with disabilities, older adults, and people with low incomes, and the availability of those services;

- an assessment of transportation needs for persons with disabilities, older adults, and persons with low incomes, and gaps in service; this assessment may be based on the experiences and perceptions of the planning partners or on more sophisticated data collection efforts;
• strategies activities and/or projects to address the identified gaps between current services and needs, as well as opportunities to improve efficiencies in service delivery; and

• priorities for implementation based on resources, time, and feasibility for implementing specific strategies/activities identified.

Recipients of 5310 funding must certify that projects selected for funding were derived from a coordinated plan, and the plan was developed through a process that included members of the public, including persons with disabilities.

Application to Wisconsin
Wisconsin's Specialized Transportation Assistance for Counties or "85.21" program application requires that 85.21 projects be identified in one of the strategies of the coordinated plan. WisDOT has determined that since these are county projects and the basis for the county elderly and disabled services, these projects should be referenced in the county's coordinated plan.

The purpose of this plan document is to achieve the above objectives by satisfying WisDOT minimum reporting-requirements as identified in the 2013 Locally Developed Transportation Coordination Plans Toolkit published online by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation. The Toolkit can be reviewed at http://www.dot.wisconsin.gov/localgov/transit/toolkit.htm.

OUTLINE OF COORDINATION PLANNING PROCESS

Based on guidance from WisDOT and its experience with development of the 2008 coordination plans, the NCWRPC developed a planning process for the 2013 transportation coordination plans as outlined below:

I. Plan for Planning
   A. WisDOT - MPO/RPC Planning Conference Briefing
   B. WisDOT - RPC Teleconference/Email Correspondence
   C. WisDOT 2013 Locally Developed Transportation Coordination Plans Toolkit
   D. NCWRPC Planning Process Established

II. County Contact
   A. WisDOT Email to Key County Officials
   B. NCWRPC Contact with 2008 "Plan Keeper"
      1. Confirm County or Sub-region Level for Plan
      2. Date, Time and Location Established

III. Meeting Participant Invitation List Development
   A. County Review and Update of 2008 Stakeholder List
B. County to Identify/Invite Users and Provide Transportation

IV. Notification of Planning Meeting
   A. Invitations Distributed to Stakeholder List
   B. Flyer Provided to County for Posting and Distribution
   C. Notice Placed in Local Newspaper

V. Public / Stakeholder Options for Participation / Comment
   A. Email / U.S. Mail
   B. Meeting Attendance

VI. Planning Meeting
   A. Welcome and Introductions
   B. Review Background and Purpose of Meeting
      1. Coordinated Planning Requirements
      2. Map-21 Program Changes
   C. Identify Needs and Gaps
      1. Review Inventory of Services
      2. Review Demographic Data
      3. Review 2008 Coordinated Plan
      4. Brainstorm Needs and Gaps
   D. Identify Strategies and Actions to Address Needs and Gaps
   E. Prioritize Strategies and Actions
   F. Plan Approval
   G. Wrap-up
      1. Confirm "Keeper of the Plan" Designation
      2. Meeting Evaluations

VII. Report Drafting
   A. NCWRPC Draft Report
   B. County Review
   C. Submission of Final to WisDOT

OVERVIEW OF PLANNING MEETING TO DEVELOP COORDINATION PLAN

Meeting Format
On August 22, 2013, Adams County transportation stakeholders met at the Adams County Courthouse to build their locally developed coordination plan. Meeting documentation is included in APPENDIX A. Approximately 10 transportation stakeholders attended this meeting, including representatives of public, private and non-profit transportation and human services providers and users including seniors and individuals with disabilities. Participants were asked to sign-in and given handouts including an agenda, meeting evaluation form, copies of MAP-21 background material, county transportation services inventory, county demographic information, and the needs & gaps and coordination strategies sections of the county 2008 plan.
The NCWRPC facilitated this session, presenting background material and guiding the group through the agenda. Highlights of the background provided by the NCWRPC include an overview of the locally developed plan requirements and grant funding programs. The Internet link to WisDOT's Coordination Plans Toolkit was provided to give participants additional information and resources on transportation coordination planning.

The format of the meeting centered around informal discussion and general consensus. The group brainstormed transportation service needs & gaps and strategies & actions to address the identified needs or gaps. The final list of strategies was prioritized by the group through weighted voting using color-coded dots. Refer to the sections titled Service Gaps and Needs & Strategies to Address Transportation Needs and Gaps in Adams County, below, for the outcomes of this session.

Meeting Invitation and Participant Lists
The stakeholder invitation list for the August 22 meeting included 22 individuals, see APPENDIX B. Approximately 10 people attended the planning meeting as follows:

Adams County 2013 Coordinated Transportation Plan Participant List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gail Schultz</td>
<td>Faith in Action</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Pisellini</td>
<td>County Board / Commission On Aging</td>
<td>Elected Official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John DeNasha</td>
<td>Midstate Independent Living Consultants</td>
<td>Disabled Client Services Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darcie Beckman</td>
<td>Central WI Community Action Counsel</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Skala</td>
<td>First Class Transportation/Taxi Counsel</td>
<td>Mobility Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renne Pinson</td>
<td>County Board / Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Djamadi</td>
<td>ADRC - Adams County</td>
<td>Elected Official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Richards</td>
<td>Central WI Community Action Counsel</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Gaetzke</td>
<td>FAAC</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Tarcany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Keeper of the Plan
The Aging and Disability Resource Center - Adams County will be the designated keeper of the plan. Donna Richards, Manager of the ADRC - Adams County, will be the primary staff contact.
**Summary of Participant Review**
The plan meeting participants were given the opportunity to complete an evaluation form rating the process, meeting, and implementation strategies. Most responses indicate a positive agreement regarding the process and the County’s status. Refer to APPENDIX C for copies of the completed participant evaluation forms.

**ANALYSIS OF SERVICE GAPS AND NEEDS**

**Assessment of Existing Service**
An inventory of what transportation services are currently available in Adams County was compiled in the APPENDIX D. There are several transportation services available, however, geographic and eligibility restrictions limit this service. A general assessment of the inventory data indicates the following:

- Evening and weekend services are limited,
- Employment needs are underserved, and
- More rural, inter-city and across-county services are needed.

**Demographic Information**
The NCWRPC provided demographic information in the form of countywide maps showing density of overall population and for target populations including seniors and individuals with disabilities, refer to APPENDIX E. This information is useful in assisting with defining gaps and needs.

**Identification of Gaps and Needs**
Based on their experience and perceptions, meeting participants identified the following gaps and needs in the current transportation system within Adams County:

- Transportation issues always seem to be part of providing services to citizens.
- Same day discharge (from medical facility / hospital) without transportation options (esp. wheelchair dependent).
- MA brokerage not working for people.
- Serving remote areas of the county: cost, etc.
- Transportation to work.
- Uncertainty regarding future of Ride-to-Work programs.
• Insurance issues.
• Finding and keeping qualified volunteers - need incentives.
• Funding limitations.
• Communicating needs to elected officials.
• Restrictions on use of vehicles based on funding sources.

STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS IDENTIFIED GAPS AND NEEDS

The following strategies establish the framework for a five-year work program from 2014 through 2018. The listed strategies and actions were generated to address the identified gaps between current services and needs, as well as opportunities to improve efficiencies in service delivery.

The strategies are ranked by scores assigned by stakeholder meeting participant voting based on resources from multiple program sources, time, and feasibility for implementing the strategies or actions identified.

Some of the strategies listed here ultimately may be not be implemented within the five-year time timeframe due to changing conditions (political, fiscal, etc.). Uncompleted strategies and actions should be rolled over to the next five-year plan as appropriate.

*Adams County 5-year Transportation Coordination Strategies, 2014 - 2018*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Strategy Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Explore new county models for rural services. (Examples include Bay Area Rural Transit and Menominee Rural Transit.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Look at ability to share / coordinate resources with adjacent counties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain existing services through support of program operations (inc. director/transportation coordinator position(s), driver salaries, volunteer reimbursements, equipment, supplies and training), maintenance, repair and scheduled replacement of vehicle fleet as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actions:
- Continue to make use of 85.21 Grants to maintain and expand the level of transportation service within the County.
- Continue to apply for 53.10 Capital Grants to maintain and expand the County's vehicle fleet.
3.  9 Promote available transportation services and provide education on how to access and use the services ("Public Transportation 101").

5.  8 Continue to work to share vehicles across departments, agencies and programs to increase use of vehicle fleet.

6.  2 Maintain volunteer driver program and coordinator.

    Actions:
    - Utilize 85.21 Grants to expand and maintain the volunteer driver program within the County.

7  0 Survey townships to identify their issues / problems.

7  0 Develop connections between transportation programs and the Promise Neighborhood Program.

**UPDATING / AMENDING THE COORDINATION PLAN**

The coordination plan establishes the framework for a five-year work program. However, should a strategy or project be identified that was not foreseen at the time of plan development, the plan can be amended through some form of stakeholder consensus process. The plan should be regularly reviewed and updated if major changes in any provisions of the plan are identified. At a minimum, the plan is required to be updated every five years.

**APPROVAL OF 2014 - 2018 ADAMS COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COORDINATION PLAN**

After the identified strategies and actions were reviewed by the planning group and consensus was reached that their work was complete, the NCWRPC meeting facilitator entertained a motion on the question of approving the established five-year strategy and action plan:

On a motion by Paul Pisellini, seconded by Lori Djumadi, the 2014 - 2018 Adams County Locally Developed, Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan was approved with all in favor.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>REPRESENTING</th>
<th>ROLE (Service Provider, User, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gail Schultz</td>
<td>Faith in Action</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Bielliemi</td>
<td>County Board</td>
<td>MTHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John DeNasha</td>
<td>Midstate Independent Living Consultants</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darcie Beckman</td>
<td>TIMES-REPORTER</td>
<td>REPORTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Skain</td>
<td>CWCAC</td>
<td>Mobility, Rep., Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renee Pinson</td>
<td>First Class Transportation</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori J. Djuamadi</td>
<td>ADC Board - HHS Committee Chair - Home Town Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Richardi</td>
<td>ADRC - Adams County</td>
<td>ADRC Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAIG GAETZKE</td>
<td>Cent. Wis. Community Action Council</td>
<td>Car loan Pgm. Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Turmanoy</td>
<td>FANIC</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Medical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADAMS COUNTY

2013 LOCALLY DEVELOPED COORDINATED PUBLIC TRANSIT-HUMAN SERVICES TRANSPORTATION PLAN MEETING

AUGUST 22, 2013

AGENDA

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

II. PURPOSE OF MEETING and BACKGROUND

III. IDENTIFICATION OF SERVICE NEEDS AND GAPS
   A. Review of Demographic Data
   B. Review of Service Inventory

IV. IDENTIFICATION AND PRIORITIZATION* OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS TO ADDRESS NEEDS AND GAPS
   * Based on consideration of resources, time and feasibility.

V. WRAP-UP
   A. Plan Approval
   B. Meeting Evaluation

For more information and resources on Locally Developed Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Planning visit:

NORTH CENTRAL WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
210 McClellan Street, Suite 210, Wausau, Wisconsin 54403
Telephone: (715) 849-5510  Fax: (715) 849-5110
Web Page: www.ncwrpc.org  Email: staff@ncwrpc.org
SERVING ADAMS, FOREST, JUENEA, LANGLADE, LINCOLN, MARATHON, ONEIDA, PORTAGE, VILAS AND WOOD COUNTIES

MEMORANDUM

DATE:   July 29, 2013
TO:     Parties with interest in Human Services Transportation in Adams County
FROM:  Darryl L. Landeau, AICP
RE:   Invitation to Meeting

NOTICE OF HUMAN SERVICES TRANSPORTATION MEETING

Please attend...

DATE:   August 22, 2013
TIME:   10:30 AM to 12:30 PM
LOCATION:  Community Center Rm 465B
           569 N. Cedar St., Adams WI

A county meeting is scheduled for stakeholders in public transit / human services transportation coordination for Adams County on Thursday, August 22 beginning at 10:30 A.M. The meeting will take place at the Community Center in Room 465B, 569 N. Cedar Street in Adams. This meeting will include an assessment of human services transportation needs and gaps within Adams County and identification of strategies to address these issues with emphasis on improving service coordination. Written comments may be submitted to: NCWRPC, 210 McClellan St. Ste. 210, Wausau WI 54403 or staff@ncwrpc.org.

If you have questions regarding this meeting, please contact me at dlandeau@ncwrpc.org or 715-849-5510 extension 308. If you need transportation assistance to this meeting or other accommodations, please contact the Adams County Aging & Disability Resource Center at 608-339-4324.

BACKGROUND ON MEETING

The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21), federal surface transportation program, requires applicants for the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Program (5310) grants, including the former "New Freedom" type projects as well as state 85.21 projects must be part of a "locally-developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan." This plan is required to be developed through a process that includes representatives of public, private, and non-profit transportation services, human services providers and the general public.

To maintain local eligibility for these grants, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation has developed a county meeting process to comply with MAP-21 requirements. Regional Planning Commission (RPC) planners are coordinating and conducting these meetings statewide on behalf of WisDOT and the counties as independent and objective entities. Your participation is critical for the development of a qualifying plan that will effectively serve Adams County.
ADAMS COUNTY ELDERLY & DISABLED TRANSPORTATION PLANNING MEETING

PLEASE ATTEND...

A county meeting will be held to assess transportation programs for the elderly and disabled and develop plans to improve transportation services for those in need. The meeting will provide the basis for Adams County's Coordinated Public Transit - Human Services Transportation Plan as required under federal and state regulations. The meeting will be facilitated by the North Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission on behalf of the Wisconsin Department of Transportation and Adams County.

DATE: August 22, 2013
TIME: 10:30 AM

LOCATION: Community Center
Room 465B
569 N. Cedar Street, Adams

For transportation assistance or other accommodations, please contact the County Aging & Disability Resource Center at (608) 339-4324. Written comments may be submitted to: NCWRPC, 210 McClellan St. Ste. 210, Wausau WI 54403 or staff@ncwrpc.org.
For information about the meeting contact NCWRPC at 715-849-5510 or email staff@ncwrpc.org.
NOTICE OF ELDERLY AND DISABLED TRANSPORTATION PUBLIC MEETING

A county meeting will be held on Thursday, August 22 beginning at 10:30 AM at the Community Center Room 465B, 569 N. Cedar Street, Adams to assess transportation programs for the elderly and disabled and develop plans to improve transportation services for those in need. The meeting will provide the basis for Adams County's Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan as required under federal and state regulations.

The North Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (NCWRPC) is coordinating the meeting on behalf of WisDOT and the County. Those persons unable to attend the meeting and would, like to submit comments in advance may send them to: NCWRPC, 210 McClellan St. Ste. 210, Wausau WI 54403 or email to staff@ncwrpc.org.

Seniors or persons with disabilities who would like to attend the meeting and require a ride or other accommodations should contact the Aging & Disability Resource Center at 608-339-4324. The meeting location is accessible.

Published: 8/7/13 WNAXLP

STATE OF WISCONSIN )
) SS.
ADAMS COUNTY )

NANCY PRICE, being duly sworn, doth depose and say that he (she) is an authorized representative of THE ADAMS-FRIENDSHIP TIMES-REPORTER, a legal newspaper of general circulation, published in the Village of Friendship, Adams County, Wisconsin, and that an advertisement of which the annexed is a true copy, taken from said paper, was published therein on

Aug 7, 2013

Signed

Nancy Price

(Title)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 15th day of August, 2013.

Linda Laskowski
Notary Public, Adams County, Wisconsin

My Commission expires May 22, 2015

No. Lines No. Times Publication Fees $ 23.47

Affidavit 1.00

Total $ 24.47
APPENDIX B

Meeting Invitation List
APPENDIX C

Meeting Evaluation Forms
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Meeting Evaluation Form

County/Region: Adams/Adams

Date: 8/27/13

Facilitator(s): Floryn L. Louden

Instructions: For each item below, please circle the number/response that best expresses your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Meeting Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The information covered in the group discussions, examples and explanations was understandable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The meeting provided a good forum for communication about public/human services transportation coordination.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participants at the meeting were from a broad stakeholder group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The county/region's prioritized action plan is comprehensive and realistic.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The county/region has a working coordination team.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The 2008 Coordination plan has been implemented.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Developing the prioritized action plan was meaningful and valuable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel the coordination process in the county/region will be improved based on the assessment, action plan and implementation strategies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facilitator Questions

| 9. Facilitator was knowledgeable about the meeting process. | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 10. The information was presented in a clear, logical format. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

10. The time allotted for the meeting was: too much about right not enough

11. List three key points/issues presented during the meeting that were the most valuable or useful.

Transportation education to citizens, finances, show vehicles across departments

12. List any information or meeting content you felt was omitted or needed further clarification.

13. Are you interested in participating on the team that will implement the coordination plan strategies? If yes, indicate your availability.

14. Other comments.
Meeting Evaluation Form

County/Region: Adams
Date: 8-22-2013
Facilitator(s): [Signature]

Instructions: For each item below, please circle the number/response that best expresses your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Meeting Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The information covered in the group discussions, examples and explanations was</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The meeting provided a good forum for communication about public/human services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transportation coordination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participants at the meeting were from a broad stakeholder group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The county/region's prioritized action plan is comprehensive and realistic.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The county/region has a working coordination team.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The 2008 Coordination plan has been implemented.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Developing the prioritized action plan was meaningful and valuable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel the coordination process in the county/region will be improved based on the</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment, action plan and implementation strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Facilitator was knowledgeable about the meeting process.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The information was presented in a clear, logical format.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. The time allotted for the meeting was: too much [ ] about right [ ] not enough [ ]

11. List three key points/issues presented during the meeting that were the most valuable or useful:

12. List any information or meeting content you felt was omitted or needed further clarification.

13. Are you interested in participating on the team that will implement the coordination plan strategies? If yes, indicate your availability.

14. Other comments.
# Meeting Evaluation Form

**County/Region:**

**Date:** 3/22/2013

**Facilitator(s):**

**Instructions:** For each item below, please circle the number/response that best expresses your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Meeting Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The information covered in the group discussions, examples and explanations was understandable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The meeting provided a good forum for communication about public/human services transportation coordination.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participants at the meeting were from a broad stakeholder group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The county/region's prioritized action plan is comprehensive and realistic.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The county/region has a working coordination team.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The 2008 Coordination plan has been implemented.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Developing the prioritized action plan was meaningful and valuable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel the coordination process in the county/region will be improved based on the assessment, action plan and implementation strategies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Facilitator Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitator was knowledgeable about the meeting process.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The information was presented in a clear, logical format.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. The time allotted for the meeting was: too much about right **not enough**

11. List three key points/issues presented during the meeting that were the most valuable or useful.

**All**

12. List any information or meeting content you felt was omitted or needed further clarification.

**Need more work**

13. Are you interested in participating on the team that will implement the coordination plan strategies? If yes, indicate your availability.

**Yes**

14. Other comments.


Meeting Evaluation Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/Region:</th>
<th>Adams County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>8/28/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator(s):</td>
<td>Darryl Landeau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructions: For each item below, please circle the number/response that best expresses your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Meeting Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The information covered in the group discussions, examples and explanations was</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The meeting provided a good forum for communication about public/human services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transportation coordination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participants at the meeting were from a broad stakeholder group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The county/region's prioritized action plan is comprehensive and realistic.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The county/region has a working coordination team.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The 2008 Coordination plan has been implemented.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Developing the prioritized action plan was meaningful and valuable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel the coordination process in the county/region will be improved based on the</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment, action plan and implementation strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Facilitator was knowledgeable about the meeting process.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The information was presented in a clear, logical format.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. The time allotted for the meeting was: too much [circle] about right not enough

11. List three key points/issues presented during the meeting that were the most valuable or useful.

- transportation
- funding
- outreach

12. List any information or meeting content you felt was omitted or needed further clarification.

None

13. Are you interested in participating on the team that will implement the coordination plan strategies? If yes, indicate your availability.

Yes! Some days, some evenings (early)

14. Other comments.

Lori J. Djumadi - Adams County Board Supervisor
lori.djumadi@gmail.com
Meeting Evaluation Form

County/Region: Adams County
Date: 3/24/23
Facilitator(s): Darrell Landolf

Instructions: For each item below, please circle the number/response that best expresses your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Meeting Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The information covered in the group discussions, examples and explanations was understandable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The meeting provided a good forum for communication about public/human services transportation coordination.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participants at the meeting were from a broad stakeholder group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The county/region's prioritized action plan is comprehensive and realistic.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The county/region has a working coordination team.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The 2008 Coordination plan has been implemented.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Developing the prioritized action plan was meaningful and valuable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel the coordination process in the county/region will be improved based on the assessment, action plan and implementation strategies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facilitator Questions

9. Facilitator was knowledgeable about the meeting process.                               | 1              | 2     | 3                 | 4          | 5          | 6          |

10. The information was presented in a clear, logical format.                             | 1              | 2     |                   | 4          | 5          | 6          |

10. The time allotted for the meeting was:                                                | too much       | about right | not enough      |

11. List three key points/issues presented during the meeting that were the most valuable or useful.

12. List any information or meeting content you felt was omitted or needed further clarification.

13. Are you interested in participating on the team that will implement the coordination plan strategies? If yes, indicate your availability.

14. Other comments.
# Meeting Evaluation Form

**County/Region:**

**Date:** 3/21/13

**Facilitator(s):**

**Instructions:** For each item below, please circle the number/response that best expresses your opinion.

## General Meeting Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The information covered in the group discussions, examples and explanations was understandable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The meeting provided a good forum for communication about public/human services transportation coordination.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participants at the meeting were from a broad stakeholder group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The county/region's prioritized action plan is comprehensive and realistic.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The county/region has a working coordination team.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The 2008 Coordination plan has been implemented.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Developing the prioritized action plan was meaningful and valuable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel the coordination process in the county/region will be improved based on the assessment, action plan and implementation strategies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Facilitator Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Facilitator was knowledgeable about the meeting process.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The information was presented in a clear, logical format.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. The time allotted for the meeting was: too much about right not enough

11. List three key points/issues presented during the meeting that were the most valuable or useful.

   *The most important point that I saw was we had county led members who are interested and our county other attendees are out are involved and committed to*

12. List any information or meeting content you felt was omitted or needed further clarification.

13. Are you interested in participating on the team that will implement the coordination plan strategies? If yes, indicate your availability. Yes

14. Other comments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Name or Sponsor Name</th>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Passenger Eligibility</th>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Hours of Service</th>
<th>Fleet Information</th>
<th>Use of Federal/State Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADRC</td>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>Disabled Elderly (60+)</td>
<td>Work route and nutrition sites with weekly grocery run and medical transportation</td>
<td>M-F 8-4:30 Some weekend use on request</td>
<td>2 -15/1 pass. 2-8 pass. wheelchair</td>
<td>5310 / 85.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADRC</td>
<td>Volunteer-escort</td>
<td>Medical Assistance</td>
<td>Transportation by volunteer drivers for Medicaid qualified medical trips.</td>
<td>24/7 - Dependant on driver availability.</td>
<td>Private vehicles</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Van</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td></td>
<td>Veterans transportation to Madison or Tomah VA Hospital.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Van</td>
<td>Veterans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Medical</td>
<td>Medi-van</td>
<td>Medical Assistance or Private Pay</td>
<td>Private firms w/ wheelchair accessible vans for transport to medical appointments.</td>
<td>vary</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith In Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Various services.</td>
<td>vary</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher Program</td>
<td>vary</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

Demographic Information
Population Density / By Block Group
Adams County, Wisconsin

Legend
Total Population Density
- 713 - 841
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- 1027.1 - 1234
- 1234.1 - 1660
- 1660.1 - 2591

Source: WI DNR, NCWRPC, US Census 2010
This map is neither a legally recorded map nor a survey and is not intended to be used as one. This drawing is a compilation of records, information and data used for reference purposes only. NCWRPC is not responsible for any inaccuracies herein contained.
Source: WI DNR, NCWRPC, US Census 2010

This map is neither a legally recorded map nor a survey and is not intended to be used as one. This drawing is a compilation of records, information and data used for reference purposes only. NCWRPC is not responsible for any inaccuracies herein contained.
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Persons With Disabilities
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- > 600

Source: WI DNR, NCWRPC, US Census 2000

This map is neither a legally recorded map nor a survey and is not intended to be used as one. This drawing is a compilation of records, information and data used for reference purposes only. NCWRPC is not responsible for any inaccuracies herein contained.