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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Under MAP-21, the Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC/WETAP) and New Freedom programs were repealed and eligible projects may be funded under either the expanded 5310 program (for New Freedom type projects) or the 5311 program (for JARC/WETAP type projects).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 27, 2013, Wood County transportation stakeholders met at the Wood County Courthouse to build their locally developed coordination plan. Meeting documentation is included in APPENDIX A. Approximately 17 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 Wood County, below, for the outcomes of this session.

Meeting Invitation and Participant Lists
The stakeholder invitation list for the August 27 meeting included 57 individuals, see APPENDIX B. Approximately 17 people attended the planning meeting as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Haydock</td>
<td>Opportunity Development Center (ODC)</td>
<td>Disabled Employment Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Haugh</td>
<td>ODC</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Schulein</td>
<td>Community Care of Central WI</td>
<td>Mobility Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Vruwink</td>
<td>Wood Co. Human Human Services Dept.</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Larsen</td>
<td>Wood Co. Veterans Services</td>
<td>Service Provider / Advocate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty Branton</td>
<td>NC WI Workforce Development</td>
<td>Employment Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JoAnn Grode</td>
<td>Wis. Rapids Housing Authority</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Housing Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Scheer</td>
<td>Opportunity Inc.</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Potter</td>
<td>Opportunity Inc.</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Adamczak</td>
<td>Portage County ADRC</td>
<td>Adjacent Co. Mobility Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance Jacobson</td>
<td>Wood County Transportation Program</td>
<td>Mobility Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance Pliml</td>
<td>Chair, Wood County Board</td>
<td>Elected Official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Clark</td>
<td>Wheels of Independence / River City Cab</td>
<td>Service User - Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary LaVake</td>
<td>Aging &amp; Disability Resource Center of Central WI</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Services Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Ironside</td>
<td>Parents Information and Education Resource (PIER)</td>
<td>Family Support Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Keeper of the Plan
The Wood County Transportation Program will continue to be the designated keeper of the plan. Connie Jacobson the Program's Mobility Manager 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 Wood 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 Wood County:

- Lack of service for non-medical personal needs.
- Transportation barriers to successful employment.
- Cost of service.
• Declining ridership on current programs / routes.
• Program barriers to pooling resources.
• Client awareness.
• Expectations for one-on-one service.
• Difficult to plan for diverse needs and interests of client group members.
• Difficulty in getting the word out and reaching people outside assisted living situations, such as family care givers, etc.
• Client's fear of asking.
• Decreasing funding levels.
• Lack of incentive to coordinate across counties.
• Medical scheduling bottle necks.
• Identify service thresholds for other trip functions such as personal and recreational.

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 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.
Wood County 5-year Transportation Coordination Strategies, 2014 - 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Promote available services and provide education on how to use the service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Explore methods of outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Develop a centralized dispatch system / call center (1-call; single point of contact) to handle all requests for transportation services from agencies and individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Work with state and federal representatives to break down program barriers and create incentives to coordinate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Work to develop (expand) and maintain volunteer driver program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Apply for 85.21 Grants to expand and maintain the volunteer drive program within the County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Increase the number of wheel-chair accessible vehicles available in the County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Apply for 53.10 Capital Grants to expand the number of wheel-chair accessible vehicles in the County's vehicle fleet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Maintain existing services through support of program operations (inc. mobility manager/transportation coordinator position, driver salaries, volunteer reimbursements, equipment and training), maintenance, repair and scheduled replacement of vehicle fleet as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Continue to apply for 85.21 Grants to maintain and expand the level of transportation service within the Counties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Continue to make use of 53.10 Capital Grants to maintain and expand the Counties' vehicle fleet(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Improve link between County Transportation Program and the Aging and Disability Resource Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work with Incourage Community Foundation (and other foundations as appropriate) to address the County's transportation issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. 2 Explore Travel Trainer / Travel Buddies program options.

11. 1 Work with event coordinators to include transportation information program information in their promotions, event brochures and other materials.

12. 0 Continue Transportation Coordinator Position.

    Actions:
    - Apply for 85.21 and 53.10 funding as appropriate to continue funding for the position.

12. 0 Develop a rideshare program.

12. 0 Work on establishing a volunteer time bank system.

**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 WOOD 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 Carolyn Schulein, seconded by Jim Brown, the 2014 - 2018 Wood 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>John Haysbeck</td>
<td>ODC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Haugh</td>
<td>ODC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Schaulin</td>
<td>Community Care of Central Wisconsin</td>
<td>Funder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Larson</td>
<td>Wood County Wisc. office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Vruwinkel</td>
<td>Wood County Human Services Dept.</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty Branton</td>
<td>NCWWDB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Ann Grode</td>
<td>WIS. Rapids Housing Authority</td>
<td>SERVICE PROVIDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Scheck</td>
<td>OPPTUNITY Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Potter</td>
<td>OPPTUNITY Inc.</td>
<td>SERVICE PROVIDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Adamczyk</td>
<td>AORC of Powis County</td>
<td>Mobility Management Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance Jacobson</td>
<td>Wood County Transportation</td>
<td>Transportation Coordinator/Mobility Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance Prine</td>
<td>Wood Co. Board</td>
<td>CHAIRMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Clark</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Bradbury</td>
<td>Park Place Adult Day Services</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>REPRESENTING</td>
<td>ROLE (Service Provider, User, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Brown</td>
<td>Wheels of Independence &amp; River City Cab</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary LaValle</td>
<td>Aging &amp; Disability Resource Center of Central WI</td>
<td>Director of Admin Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Invisible]</td>
<td>Parenting Information + Education Resource PERR</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WOOD COUNTY

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

AUGUST 27, 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:

MEMORANDUM
DATE: August 5, 2013
TO: Parties with interest in Human Services Transportation in Wood County
FROM: Darryl L. Landeau, AICP
RE: Invitation to Meeting

NOTICE OF HUMAN SERVICES TRANSPORTATION MEETING

Please attend...

DATE: August 27, 2013
TIME: 9:30 to 11:30 AM
LOCATION: Auditorium (1st Floor, to right as you enter)
Wood County Courthouse
400 Market Street, Wisconsin Rapids WI 54495
Public Entrance in Front. Parking on South Side / Overflow North Side.

A county meeting is scheduled for stakeholders in public transit / human services transportation coordination for Wood County on Tuesday, August 27, beginning at 9:30 A.M. The meeting will take place at the Wood County Courthouse in the Auditorium, 400 Market Street in Wisconsin Rapids. This meeting will include an assessment of human services transportation needs and gaps within Wood 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 Wood County Transportation Program at 715-421-8989.

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 Wood County.
WOOD 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 Wood 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 Wood County.

DATE: August 27, 2013
TIME: 9:30 AM

LOCATION: Auditorium (1st Floor, to right as you enter)
Wood County Courthouse
400 Market Street, Wis. Rapids
Public Entrance in Front. Parking on South and North Sides.)

For transportation assistance or other accommodations, contact the Wood County Transportation Program at 715-421-8989

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 Tuesday, August 27 beginning at 9:30 AM at the Wood County Courthouse Auditorium, 400 Market Street, Wisconsin Rapids 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 Wood 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 Wood County Transportation Program at 715-421-8989. The meeting location is accessible.
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Zach Vruwink, Mayor  
444 West Grand Avenue  
Wisconsin Rapids, WI  54495

Abby Vans, Inc.  
Mark Jones  
W5621 Todd Road  
Neillsville, WI  54456

Lance Pliml  
Wood County Board Chair  
4030 Woodhaven Ct.  
Wisconsin Rapids, WI  54494

North Central CAP  
Jeff Sargent  
P.O. Box 1141  
Wisconsin Rapids, WI  54495

Wood Co. Veterans Service  
Wade Maki  
630 S. Central Avenue, Suite 322  
Marshfield, WI  54449

Wood Co. Veterans Service  
Rock A. Larson  
P.O. Box 8095  
Wisconsin Rapids, WI  54495

Radio Cab  
Darrell Gates  
PO Box 602  
Marshfield, WI  54449-0602

Wheels of Independence, Inc.  
River City Cab  
Jim Brown  
2703 Industrial Street  
Wisconsin Rapids, WI  54495

Gary LaVake  
ADRC-CW  
220 Third Avenue South, Suite 1  
Wisconsin Rapids, WI  54495

Wood County Human Services  
Stephanie Gudmunsen  
604 E. 4th  
Marshfield, WI  54449

Janice Wegner  
WI Job Center-Wisconsin Rapids  
320 W. Grand Ave, Ste 102  
Wisconsin Rapids, WI  54495

Specialized Transport  
7384 County Highway N  
Arpin, WI  54410

Wood County Human Services  
Kathy Roetter, Director  
P.O. Box 8095  
Wisconsin Rapids, WI  54495-8095

Alan K. Marcoux, Mayor  
951 Market Street  
Nekoosa, WI  54457

Linda Larson-Schlitz  
DWD Disability Navigator  
364 Grand Avenue  
Wausau, WI  54403

Division of Vocational Rehab.  
630 South Central Avenue, # 303  
Marshfield, WI  54449

Division of Vocational Rehab.  
2810 9th Street South  
Wisconsin Rapids, WI  54494

Midstate Independent Living Consultants, Inc.  
3262 Church Street, Suite 1  
Stevens Point, WI  54481

Gary Popelka, Director  
Wood Co. Planning Dept.  
P.O. Box 8095  
Wisconsin Rapids, WI  54495

Yeng Vang  
DWD Disability Navigator  
1109 6th Street  
Wausau, WI  54403

Adams Cty Health & Human Serv.  
Diane Cable, Director  
108 East North Street  
Friendship, WI  53934-9943

Marion Hokamp  
181 20th Avenue So.  
Wisconsin Rapids, WI  54495

Renee Daniels, Executive Director  
North Central Wisconsin WDA  
1121 W. Grand Avenue  
Wisconsin Rapids, WI  54495

Opportunity Development Center  
Ann Lepak  
1191 Huntington Avenue  
Wisconsin Rapids, WI  54495

Jon Greedeer, President  
Ho-Chunk Nation  
P.O. Box 667  
Black River Falls, WI  54615

Marjorie Hock  
1340 Oak Street  
Wisconsin Rapids, WI  54494

Katie Clark  
1041 14th St. No.  
Wisconsin Rapids, WI  54494

Progressive Travel, Inc.  
B3872 State Highway 13  
Spencer, WI  54479

Connie Jacobson, Mobility Manager  
Wood County Transportation  
220 3rd Ave S, Ste 4  
Wisconsin Rapids, WI  54495

Mid-State Technical College  
Ann Marie Krause, Ph. D.  
500 32nd Street N.  
Wisconsin Rapids, WI  54494
APPENDIX C

Meeting Evaluation Forms
Meeting Evaluation Form

County/Region: Wood County  
Date: 8/17/13  
Facilitator(s): Barry Landeau

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.                                 | 1              | 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.

Promote education of services  
Break down service barriers

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 Availability is limited

14. Other comments.
Meeting Evaluation Form

County/Region: [W] [O] [R] [K] [E] [N] [D] [A] [E] [R]
Date: 8-27-13
Facilitator(s): Dacrell

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</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was 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>0</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>0</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>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The county/region has a working coordination team.</td>
<td>0</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>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel the coordination process in the county/region will be improved based on the</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</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>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The information was presented in a clear, logical format.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</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.

   1. Education (Information on Services
   2. Need for Additional Coordination of Providers
   3. Work with State for Federal Funding

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.

\[ N/A \]
### Meeting Evaluation Form

**County/Region:** Wood  
**Date:** August 27, 2013  
**Facilitator(s):** Darryl

**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.  
10. The information was presented in a clear, logical format.

10. The time allotted for the meeting was: too much  
11. List three key points/issues presented during the meeting that were the most valuable or useful.

   Simply process & encourage incentivize cooperation between agencies; improve/maintain infrastructure.

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

   Just to repeat that it is confusing that we added separate/limit opportunities based on program eligibility.

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

   Yes, availability.

14. Other comments.

   I would love to be at the table to participate in these discussions.
Meeting Evaluation Form

| County/Region: | Wood Co. |
| Date:         | 8/27/13  |
| 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

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   | 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.

   LACK OF COORDINATION NEEDS FOR COMMUNICATION MULTIPLE FUNDING SOURCES/CONFLICTS

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

   DISCUSSION PRODUCED PARTICIPANTS ABOUT SERVICES PROVIDED BY EACH PROVIDER, BENEFICIENCY TO COORDINATION BUT PRECISES PRIORITED AND FUNDING BARRIERS/LIMITATIONS

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:** WOOD  
**Date:** 9-17-13  
**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**

| 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 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

11. The time allotted for the meeting was:

   - too much
   - about right
   - not enough

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: W  ood  c o
Date:  8/27/2013
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></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></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The county/region has a working coordination team.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The 2008 Coordination plan has been implemented.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Developing the prioritized action plan was meaningful and valuable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></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></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 | | | 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.

Family is complicated. Residential programs and the clients have communication issues.

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. Already participating.

14. Other comments.
Meeting Evaluation Form

| County/Region: | Wisco |
| Date: | 1-27-13 |
| Facilitator(s): | LAMAGU | DARCY |

**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. | 1 | 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.
   1. Need for a regional timeline for employment/educational purposes
   2. Funding requirements for training and disincentives, collaborative/partnering
   3. Communication about  matter is difficult to achieve

12. List any information or meeting content you felt was omitted or needed further clarification.
   1. How works on the plan? How does it work?

13. Are you interested in participating on the team that will implement the coordination plan strategies? If yes, indicate your availability.
   Yes - can we be on work schedule
   Joanne Groes WHA joanne@wisirpha.org (715) 723-7288 Ext. 14

14. Other comments.
   speaker talked too fast and was gobbled (hard to understand)
Meeting Evaluation Form

County/Region: 
Date: 8-27-
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 Questions</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: 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: [Wood]
Date: [13]
Facilitator(s): [Blank]

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. | 1 | 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.

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: | Wood | Date: | 8/27/2013 | Facilitator(s): | Darrell |

**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 Questions</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 ![Circle] about right ![Circle] not enough ![Circle]

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

   Coordinator: Lode at Ford & County Mobility Manager: Dave R. Baxin

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

   Take ownership for these programs.

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:**

**Facilitator(s):**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Meeting Questions**

1. The information covered in the group discussions, examples and explanations was understandable.

2. The meeting provided a good forum for communication about public/human services transportation coordination.

3. Participants at the meeting were from a broad stakeholder group.

4. The county/region's prioritized action plan is comprehensive and realistic.

5. The county/region has a working coordination team.

6. The 2008 Coordination plan has been implemented.

7. Developing the prioritized action plan was meaningful and valuable.

8. I feel the coordination process in the county/region will be improved based on the assessment, action plan and implementation strategies.

**Facilitator Questions**

9. Facilitator was knowledgeable about the meeting process.

10. The information was presented in a clear, logical format.

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.

   - [Handwritten notes]

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

   - [Handwritten notes]

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

14. Other comments.

- [Handwritten notes]
<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><strong>Wood County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood County Transportation Program (Wis. Rapids &amp; Marshfield)</td>
<td>Demand Response</td>
<td>Seniors (aged 55&gt;) Persons with disabilities</td>
<td>Demand Response and fixed-route; Prioritized by medical, nutritional, shopping and quality of life</td>
<td>Weekdays 7 am – 5 pm; Bus is at 9 am; Volunteer drivers as available</td>
<td>6 minibus; 2 buses and 2 vans – all accessible</td>
<td>85.21; 5310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River City Cab (Wisconsin Rapids)</td>
<td>Shared-ride Taxi</td>
<td>General public</td>
<td>Shared-ride taxi - $3.25 one-way within Wisconsin Rapids; mileage based outside. Seniors and disabled-reduced-fare ($1.75)</td>
<td>Mon – Thurs. 5 am – midnight; Fri &amp; Sat 5 am – 3 am Sun 7:30 am – 4:30 pm</td>
<td>2 minibus and 6 mini-vans accessible 6 sedans</td>
<td>5311; 85.20; Medicaid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Cab (Marshfield)</td>
<td>Shared-ride Taxi</td>
<td>General public</td>
<td>Shared-ride taxi - $4.85 one-way within Marshfield; mileage based outside. Seniors and Disabled reduced-fare ($2.75)</td>
<td>24 hours/day; 7 days per week</td>
<td>3 mini vans 7 sedans 2 mini buses-accessible</td>
<td>5311; 85.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheels of Independence</td>
<td>NEMT plus some specialized</td>
<td>General public</td>
<td>Demand response</td>
<td>24 hours/day; 7 days per week</td>
<td>6 mini buses 1 mini van all accessible</td>
<td>Medicaid; 5310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Van</td>
<td>Demand Response</td>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>Free Transportation for Veterans to Medical appointments at VA Clinics in Wisconsin</td>
<td>Mon. – Fri.</td>
<td>1 – 4 pass. van</td>
<td>VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lames Bus Lines</td>
<td>School Bus Routes; Charter</td>
<td>General public</td>
<td>Fixed school bus routes; School Bus Charters; Motor Coach Charters; Line runs</td>
<td>24 hours/day; 7 days per week</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
<td>Fees; Contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe-Way Bus Co.</td>
<td>School Bus Routes</td>
<td>School Students</td>
<td>Fixed school bus routes</td>
<td>Mon. – Fri.; some weekends</td>
<td>79 school buses</td>
<td>Contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood County Human Services</td>
<td>Demand Response; Court order</td>
<td>&lt;60</td>
<td>Transportation for Family and Child Services connected to Human Services Programs</td>
<td>7 days a week</td>
<td>Volunteer drivers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 - 94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95 - 137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138 - 188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189 - 260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261 - 454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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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