

About the Event

Wisconsin Non-Driver Advisory Committee (WiNDAC) members met virtually on June 12, 2025. The meeting ran from 9:00am to 2:30pm. This was an open/public meeting; observers could view the proceedings via a YouTube livestream.

The purpose of the meeting was to develop an understanding of emerging technologies and innovations in transportation and non-driver community engagement to form solutions.

Twenty-seven committee members participated in the meeting. See Appendix A for attendance information. There were two breakout discussions, during which time committee members were grouped with a WisDOT facilitator and notetaker.

June 12, 2025

Welcome Back and Preview of the Day – WisDOT Division of Budget & Strategic Initiatives (DBSI) Administrator Lea Collins-Worachek

- DBSI Administrator Lea Collins-Worachek thanked all members for their attendance and challenged them to expand their thinking into the realm of emerging technologies and innovations and the importance of engaging non-drivers in decision-making as these technologies and innovations continue to develop and advance. She continued by previewing the events of the day.

Biennium Budget Update – WisDOT DBSI, Bureau of Budget Director Jim Donlin

- Bureau of Budget Director Jim Donlin reviewed highlights from the 2025-2027 Governor's budget request.

Presenter Introductions – WisDOT DBSI Administrator and WiNDAC Co-Chair Lea Collins-Worachek introduced the Technology, Innovation, and Community Engagement guest presenters.

Technology, Innovation, and Community Engagement

Andi Bill is the UW Madison Director of the Wisconsin Local Technical Assistance Program, Associate Director of the UW Madison Traffic Operations and Safety (TOPS) Laboratory, and Associate Director of the Eastern Tribal Technical Assistance Program.

- Ms. Bill discussed transportation related emerging technology options, what's on the horizon and what's already being used: Technologies such as speed governors, safety features on vehicles, and adaptive cruise control have been adopted at different rates and in a variety of vehicles; an autonomous shuttle pilot study being conducted in WI expands current understanding of weather impacts; and mobility hubs could make a difference for non-drivers in food deserts. Possible solutions and options for non-drivers and the importance of involving non-drivers in all pilots and research was shared.

Yang Tao is the City of Madison, Division of Traffic Engineering Director.

- Dr. Tao discussed recent infrastructure improvements within the city of Madison that have included positive safety outcomes for the non-driver community. Dr. Tao discussed the importance of meeting community members where they are to encourage strong participation (such as "Let's Talk Streets") and generate feedback for addressing solutions that help solve barriers facing non-drivers.

Context Setting for Small Group Discussion #1 – WiNDAC Co-Chair Tami Jackson, Public Policy Analyst, Wisconsin Board for People with Developmental Disabilities

- Tami Jackson introduced the upcoming small group activity. WiNDAC members were asked to reflect on the presentations and identify takeaways.

Small group discussion questions included:

1. What are some key takeaways from the emerging technology/innovations presentation?
2. Were there possible applications of emerging technology/innovations to improve or change the non-driver experience?
3. Are there emerging technology/innovations that could be implemented now?
4. What did you hear that was important when considering emerging technology/innovations and how to use those things?
5. When considering emerging technology/innovations what do we need to do to keep the needs and problems that non-drivers are trying to solve, at the center?

Context Setting for Small Group Discussion #2 – WiNDAC Co-Chair Denise Jess, Executive Director, Wisconsin Council of the Blind and Visually Impaired

- Denise Jess introduced the second small group discussion and asked members to reflect upon engagement and solution building for non-drivers.

Small group discussion questions included:

1. How do we challenge our own assumptions that emerging technology/innovations will provide solutions to non-driver problems?
2. How do we shape emerging technology/innovation options so that they will solve non-driver problems? How do we test whether they solve real problems and don't create additional barriers?
3. What data can help make the case for uses of emerging or innovative technologies?
4. How can designing a process, at the front end, that includes non-drivers, help test an emerging technology/innovation project's assumptions, and develop solutions that address non-driver issues?
5. How do we build in meaningful and continuous engagement so that non-driver needs and problems influence project decisions?

Small Group Report Out

Following the discussion, each small group highlighted their breakout room conversation to the whole committee. Themes and takeaways from the small group discussions can be found in Appendix B.

Round Robin

Committee members were called on to share their main takeaways from the meeting and asked to respond to the questions below:

- What types of emerging technology/innovations do you see that would be applicable to solving the issues non-drivers face in your community?
- What non-driver problem could be better addressed in your community?

Closing Remarks – WisDOT DBSI Administrator Lea Collins-Worachek

- Administrator Lea Collins-Worachek provided closing remarks, thanking WiNDAC members for participating in the meeting. She closed the meeting by discussing the importance of the committee's insights and WiNDAC's work.

Members in attendance

| |
|--|
| Tami Jackson, Public Policy Analyst, Wisconsin Board for People with Developmental Disabilities |
| Denise Jess, Executive Director, Wisconsin Council of the Blind & Visually Impaired |
| Lea Collins-Worachek, Administrator, Division of Budget and Strategic Initiatives |
| LaTonya Johnson, Wisconsin State Legislature |
| Jennifer Jako, Director, Aging and Disability Resource Center of Barron, Rusk, and Washburn County |
| Ryan Hoel, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) Proxy |
| Holly Keenan, President, Wisconsin Association of Mobility Managers |
| Kirsten Finn, Executive Director, Wisconsin Bike Fed |
| Susan De Vos, Secretary/Treasurer, Wisconsin Transit Riders Alliance |
| Adam Lorentz, Transit Manager, La Crosse Municipal Transit |
| Michael Basford, Director, Interagency Council on Homelessness |
| Bobbi Craig-Hegna, Transportation Program Director, Center for Independent Living for Western Wisconsin |
| Patrick Daoust, Transit Manager, Bay Area Rural Transit |
| Nick Musson, Transportation Specialist, Greater Wisconsin Agency on Aging Resources (GWAAR) |
| Jeremy Lyon, Division Administrator, Wisconsin Department of Veteran Affairs |
| Iris Jacobson, Education Consultant, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction |
| Rebecca Smith, Transportation Director and Chair, Janesville Transit and Wisconsin Public Transportation Association |
| Susan Gaeddert, Community Programs Director, 1000 Friends of Wisconsin |
| KJ Hansmann, Assistant Professor, UW Madison School of Medicine and Public Health |
| Kerri Sabin, Transit Manager, Namekagon Transit |
| Dave Steele, Executive Director, Mobilize |
| Jenna Fogarty, Director, Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development |
| John Tuohy, Executive Director, Wisconsin County Human Service Association |
| Kevin Coughlin, Policy Initiatives Advisor, Wisconsin Department of Health Services |
| Claire Enders, Transportation Coordinator, Milwaukee County Division on Aging and Disability Services |
| Robert Schneider, Associate Professor, University of Wisconsin Milwaukee Department of Urban Planning |
| Tom Winker, Director for District 6, Wisconsin Towns Association |

Presenters

| |
|--|
| Andi Bill, Director of the Wisconsin Local Technical Assistance Program, Associate Director of the UW Madison Traffic Operations and Safety (TOPS) Laboratory, and Associate Director of the Eastern Tribal Technical Assistance Program |
| Yang Tao, Director, City of Madison Traffic Engineering Division |
| Jim Donlin, Bureau of Budget Director, WisDOT Division of Budget and Strategic Initiatives |

WisDOT staff in attendance

| |
|--|
| Andrew Levy, Wisconsin DOT Division of Transportation System Development |
| Kamden Stark, Wisconsin DOT Division of Budget and Strategic Initiatives |
| Matthew Glowacki, Wisconsin DOT Division of Budget and Strategic Initiatives |

| |
|---|
| Jeremy Kloss, Wisconsin DOT Division of Budget and Strategic Initiatives |
| Katherine Patterson, Wisconsin DOT Division of Transportation Investment Management |
| Brian Elliott, Wisconsin DOT Division of Budget and Strategic Initiatives |
| Joy Loomis, Wisconsin DOT Division of Budget and Strategic Initiatives |
| Evelyn Bromberg, Wisconsin DOT Division of Budget and Strategic Initiatives |
| Carter Angelo, Wisconsin DOT Division of Budget and Strategic Initiatives |
| Brad Basten, Wisconsin DOT Division of Budget and Strategic Initiatives |
| Ethan Severson, Wisconsin DOT Division of Budget and Strategic Initiatives |
| Johanna Schmidt, Wisconsin DOT Division of Budget and Strategic Initiatives |
| Maryne Taute, Wisconsin DOT Division of Budget and Strategic Initiatives |
| June Coleman, Wisconsin DOT Division of Budget and Strategic Initiatives |
| Mike Denruiter, Wisconsin DOT Office of Public Affairs |
| Jennifer Fedie, Wisconsin DOT Office of Public Affairs |

June 12, 2025: Wisconsin Non-Driver Advisory Committee

Appendix B: Small Group Discussions Addendum

Addendum

This addendum summarizes the small group discussions. The content of this addendum is based on the notes taken during the small group discussions and the small group report out sessions.

Small Group Discussion 1

WiNDAC members responded to a series of questions for discussion. Group responses are summarized below by question. Some responses may have been mentioned multiple times.

1. What are some key takeaways from the emerging technology/innovations presentation?

- There was a strong desire to seek out and hear the non-driver perspective when discussing technology (technology presentation).
- Appreciated hearing from a traffic engineer.
- CAV attitudes survey lacking non-driver feedback was a valuable discussion point – several members noted a desire for more engagement of the non-driver (technology presentation).
- Disappointed the shuttle was not accessible.
- Supporting older adults to be more independent (by using different technologies) is promising (technology presentation).
- Need to educate community members about tech opportunities/options as part of the regional planning process (both presentations).
- Recognize that communities have different needs and a solution that works in one place may not work in another place – need to be open to creating solutions that are flexible and responsive to the non-driver needs (community engagement presentation).
- Equity considerations need to be included in these conversations too (community engagement presentation).

2. Were there possible applications of emerging technology/innovations to improve or change the non-driver experience?

- Throughout the conversations there was some concern about adopting technology too fast without considerations of cost, long-term benefit, and access/equity.
- There was also discussion of the role of human interaction and how technology replacing those interactions is not always ideal.
- Appreciation of being able to patch transportation plan (from A to B) with different options.
- Communities need to understand the non-driver needs and then match the technology options to them.

3. Are there emerging technology/innovations that could be implemented now?

- Autonomous vehicle pilots are a positive place to start – allows for comfort and understanding of the technology. An introduction that feels low risk but has huge implications across the state if it becomes an option.

- A recommendation to work with app designers for transportation planning to create a daytrip planner that includes multiple modes of transportation so a non-driver can map their travel in one place with ease.
- Speed limiters are an option that could be implemented on individual vehicles to help keep roads safer for all.
- Safety/speed cameras can have positive effects on lowering the speed on traffic. This is not currently permitted within the state but members expressed interest to explore this as an option in Milwaukee and Madison.
- Improvement of intersections – curb cuts, pedestrian islands, and cross signal enhancements (audio, connected, protected crossings, etc.)
- Sidewalk additions, expansions, and enhancements.

4. What did you hear that was important when considering emerging technology/innovations and how to use those things?

- Technology is one tool but not one solution and non-drivers must be included in early conversations and before adoption. Safety will continue to need to be at the forefront as well.
- Interest in the possibility of replicating the CAV attitudes survey but focused on non-driver respondents to further understand non-driver attitudes and needs.

5. When considering emerging technology/innovations what do we need to do to keep the needs and problems that non-drivers are trying to solve at the center?

- An inclusive and community focused process, like Madison's example, is important.
- Demonstrations and testing technology with pilot programs can help the public adopt technology but also allows for valuable feedback to adapt the technology to work for specific areas and communities.
- Considerations of how technology can be a long-term solution especially around affordability and low-income communities is important to discuss.
- Collaboration between non-drivers and decision-makers remains central to solving issues – engagement is not just one and done but rather consistently addressed throughout the process.
- Transit solutions are not zero-sum thinking – when the transportation system improves for non-drivers, it improves for everyone.
- Interest in revisiting the CAV attitudes survey to focus on the needs and attitudes of non-drivers as an option for continued engagement.

Small Group Discussion 2

WiNDAC members responded to a series of questions for discussion. Group responses are summarized below by question. Some responses may have been mentioned multiple times.

1. How do we challenge our own assumptions that emerging technology/innovations will provide solutions to non-driver problems?

- The assumption that technology is a magic-wand solution is wrong.
- With technology, especially Artificial Intelligence, you get what you put into it, so you need to have quality input to get a quality output.

- There is a lot of excitement for new, but we have to ask is it affordable? accessible? does it fix a problem? Testing of new technology needs to be thorough and explored with different populations.
- Non-driver engagement is a challenge and non-drivers are a diverse group. Non-drivers need to be given a fair level of public notification and education to understand issues related to non-driver and tech and where we are headed.
- An additional assumption we constantly need to challenge is user affordability – many non-drivers (though not all) have limited income, and some live in poverty, so things like fully automated vehicles may not actually be accessible given their price. Technology may exist, but that doesn't mean most can access it.
- Planners who are planning transit should be using transit and pedestrian infrastructure to get firsthand experience, to make informed decisions.
- New and emerging technology may not solve some of the workforce and access issues – need more flexibility than systems are sometimes built to provide. Human factors have to be considered beyond the technology.

2. How do we shape emerging technology/innovation options so that they will solve non-driver problems? How do we test whether they solve real problems and don't create additional barriers?

- We need to use qualitative methods to understand the non-driver experience – what are the problems, according to non-drivers? Are we addressing them? We need to be clear about the problems first so that we can define success at the outset and have a shared understanding.
- Engagement is key – piloting with the right people is very important. Must seek out opportunities to do pilot programs and use participants that are non-drivers. For legislators and funding, pilots are proofs of concept and show legislators that this is working and a way to make people more independent. With pilot projects, the final product is designed for everyone.
- “More awareness and education at the beginning BEFORE the study/research/pilot program begins in addition to during the process” and limiting in-person committee meetings make it more accessible to get participants from around the state – need to have solutions where it allows for non-drivers, others to participate.
- Connections from state-to-state or nationally where we can learn about implementation strategies of emerging technologies to aid in Wisconsin's pilots and/or implementation. Exploring connections with Governor-appointed committees (associated with state agencies) to increase public awareness/education and spreading the word further and an emphasis on standing meeting/subcommittee on transit system communication on emerging technologies to get non-drivers involved from the beginning (buy-in).

3. What data can help make the case for uses of emerging or innovative technologies?

- Start with what existing data available and identify gaps.
- Use of data must be smart and well-thought out. Use data to make the case for what is best, which may not necessarily be something new/innovative.
- Access what other states are learning and use that data here to establish baselines.
- Crash data for understanding hotspots.
- Two sets of data: what exists that can inform where projects/products might be useful and what needs to be collected at the front end to see if the technology is

beneficial/what other impacts there are. How does data collected at the beginning compare to expectations – can inform decisions and lens on whether it is considering non-driver perspectives.

- Increased data from non-drivers (for example, low number in the CAV survey is a limitation and could be expanded) could also compare involvement/feedback across projects.
- Expand the Wisconsin Non-Driver Mapping Tool ArcGIS map on the WisDOT website to show non-driver maps and how users can add their own layers, which could help users assess how accessible their area is. Include connected sidewalk network and the distribution (for example, how does it compare across neighborhoods of different incomes?)
- Identify measures related to quality of life and safety. The goal is also to improve people's quality of life and safe access to transportation. Consider healthcare (appointments/missed appointments, healthy food access, prescription access), human interaction, etc. for additional data. What partnerships might be possible (for example, w/ DHS) to access data that WisDOT does not typically collect.

4. How can designing a process, at the front end, that includes non-drivers, help test an emerging technology/innovation project's assumptions and develop solutions that address non-driver issues?

- Include in regional planning or state effort to design this process. Planners, do this as part of normal planning activities – test assumptions, present results to stakeholders, decide from there how to move forward.
- Must be proactive in how to shape what that future outcome may be, also making sure public and stakeholders are involved. An example of this could be including a walk audit before redesigning a street – involving non-driver feedback from the get-go rather than getting their feedback after alternative designs have already been developed. This would make sure that getting involvement would be part of the design process.

5. How do we build in meaningful and continuous engagement so that non-driver needs and problems influence project decisions?

- Continue committees and stakeholder engagement (like WiNDAC) and continually recruit people with lived experience.
- Don't assume groups are connected to non-drivers and be wary of tokenism if going to the same non-drivers for advisement.
- Engaging non-drivers is not just "checking a box" but rather an intentional feedback opportunity that will frame options.
- Let impacted groups shape the priorities and tradeoffs and empower them to be the decisionmakers when possible. They are part of the decision, not just coming to a meeting to listen.
- Can't just rely on the people who show up, you need to go into communities and meet them.
- Creativity is an important element in engaging the public – meet people where they are and bring joy and fun into the process to allow for place making. Involvement isn't a chore, rather a connection. Success can be determined by the new people involved in an event (nonreturners).

- Social media outreach to get engagement – broadening communication pathways especially because people have time, transportation, family constraints.
- Be deliberate to get the appropriate feedback and buy-in from non-drivers.
- Implement what people are telling you and they will be more likely to come back and offer more feedback next time.
- Building trust and after project delivery there must be communication about those outcomes and success stories.