PECATONICA RAIL TRANSIT COMMISSION

20 S Court Street • PO Box 262 • Platteville, Wisconsin 53818
MEMBER COUNTIES: GREEN • IOWA • LAFAYETTE• ROCK

1:00 PM • Friday, October 25, 2013 • Green Co. Courthouse, 2nd Floor Courtroom, 1016 16th Ave • Monroe, WI

1. 1:05 PM **Call to Order** – *Harvey Kubly, Chair*

2. Roll Call. **Establishment of Quorum** – *Mary Penn, PRTC Administrator*

Commissioners present for all or part of the meeting:

	Commissioner	Position	Present		Commissioner	Position	Present
Green	Harvey W. Kubly	Chair	x	Iowa	Charles Anderson	Secretary	x
	Oscar Olson		x		William G. Ladewig		Excused
	Ron Wolter	Treasurer	x		Philip Mrozinski		x
Lafayette	Leon Wolfe		x	Rock	Ben Coopman	Alternate	
	Patrick Shea		Excused		Wayne Gustina		Excused
	Gerald Heimann	Alternate			Alan Sweeney	1st Vice Chair	Excused
	Ted Wiegel				Terry Thomas	2nd Vice Chair	x

Commission achieved quorum.

Other present for all or some of the meeting:

- Mary Penn, SWWRPC
- Ken Lucht, WSOR
- Troy Maggied, SWWRPC
- David Pantzlaff, Ayres Associates
-
- Eileen Brownlee, Kramer & Brownlee
- Frank Huntington, Kim Tollers, WDOT
- Jeff Wunschel, Green Co Hwy

3. Action Item. **Certification of Meeting's Public Notice** – *Noticed by Penn*
   - *Motion to approve notice of public meeting – Mrozinski/Thomas, Passed Unanimously*

4. Action Item. **Approval of Agenda** – *Prepared by Penn*
   - *Motion to approve agenda – Olson/Wolfe, Passed Unanimously*

5. Action Item. **Approval of July 2013 meeting minutes** – *Prepared by Penn*
   - *Motion to approve July 2013 meeting minutes –Thomas/Olson, Passed Unanimously*

6. Updates. **Public Comment** – *Time for public comment may be limited by the Chair*
No public comments.

7. Updates. **Correspondence & Communications** –*Discussion may be limited by the Chair*
No correspondence to report.

REPORTS & COMMISSION BUSINESS

8. PRTC Financial Report – *Ron Wolter, SCWRTC Treasurer*

- October Treasurer's Report and Payment of Bills

Ron Wolter gave the financial report including revenue and bills paid in the past quarter. Oscar Olson asked about CD renewal and how it increased the value of the CD.

Bills included

- SWWRPC Q3, 2013 - $1,038.65
- Johnson Block – $1100.00
- WSOR bridge F-84 - $123,000.00

- *Motion to approve Treasurer's Report – Anderson/Wolfe, Passed Unanimously*
- *Motion to pay bills – Wolfe/Anderson, Passed Unanimously*

Olson asked whether the $123,000.00 bill was the PRTC's contribution and Ken Lucht explained the match of the $123,000.00 and confirmed that the Commission had paid it in full. In response to Wolter, Lucht confirmed that this was for all seven bridges.

9. WSOR Operation's Report – *Ken Lucht, WSOR*

- Update on Maintenance Activities
- Update on Capital Projects
- Report of Business Development
- Other Continuing Issues/Topics

Ken Lucht spoke about the maintenance of the line since July, including ties, also noting WSOR had run the detector car on the line. He said WSOR was now looking at vendors for brushing and spraying maintenance, saying that WSOR was working on their maintenance budget and it looked to be aggressive as opposed to the last few years, particularly on the Madison and Prairie subdivisions due to higher traffic, an increase of 10% in this year's budget.

In capital projects, WSOR was continuing to invest in bridges. Lucht said one had been completed and three had been awarded with another three being completed within the next year.

In Business Development, Lucht said sand had picked up dramatically on the Prairie sub with unit trains of grain (100 cars or more) also moving out of Avalon thru Janesville. He said lumber is picking up and plastics are moving well. From a revenue standpoint WSOR will be maintaining the status quo.

10. WisDOT Report – Staff may include Frank Huntingdon, Kim Tollers, Roger Larson

Frank Huntington said there was a lot of activity going on at WDOT, noting that with the budget adopted in July It had been approved at $52M and while it was not what was requested it was a good increase from the past biennium. He said there were a number of projects going on including bridges (25 system wide) with most in the WSOR area as well as the NE corner of the state. Huntington said there was a pending application from WSOR for 65 bridges. He said that last February was the application deadline for the current budget and several projects had been put on hold until the Reedsburg acquisition was completed. He said progress was good but there was still work to do, including negotiating the price of the acquisition and once terms were agreed on it had to go to the Surface Transportation Board. Hopefully the acquisition would be done by the end of 2014.

In other projects there were some priority projects including the opening of the rail line between Madison and Oregon for the Lycon plant which would be under the WRRTC. He said that WSOR would be operating that line and hopefully

the work would get done by this spring. In another project, Huntington spoke of was the passing track of 8000' near Janesville, giving WSOR the ability to consolidate trains going to Chicago and to manage and maneuver cars.

In other projects, Huntington said there was work on the line between Janesville and the State line and this should begin next year. He also spoke of a project in the City of Baraboo for the City. There were other smaller projects as well but their priority would need to wait until the acquisition of the Reedsburg line from UP was completed.

In other parts of the state he said there are a couple of projects including service of a 1 mile line in Marinette for ship building; he said there were projects going on all over the state and WDOT was very busy.

11. Tri-County Trail Commission Report – *Leon Wolfe*

Leon Wolfe said the TCTC met the night before and discussed some flood damage that had occurred on the trail. He said that the WDNR had been prepared to approve $24,000.00 but in fact approved about $65,000.00. He said there was still work to be done but that the trail would be in pretty good shape.

Wolfe said that he had only three copies of the ATV survey left but they could be downloaded online. He said the trail was getting ready for winter, with brushing and grooming in progress and should be in good shape for the season. Harvey Kubly asked about the funding and Wolfe said he believed about 75% was from FEMA, 12.5% from Lafayette County, and 12.5% from TCTC.

In response to a question from Philip Mrozinski about the economic impact of the trail county-by-county, Wolfe said he did not believe it had been broken down to that level. He thought that it could be broken down like that but it had not been done in the study; he acknowledged it would be good information to know.

12. PRTC Administrator's Report –*Mary Penn, PRTC Admin.*

Mary Penn told the Commission she had completed the mailing of the final lease of Brewery Creek and asked Wolter to let her know when the lease check for same had been received. She then distributed the 2014 meeting dates to the Commission, reminding them that their second meeting was in May. Kubly reminded the Commission that that was to accommodate county elections and that the upcoming year would have them.

13. Discussion, commendations, and possible action, concerning Resolution to honor retiring Ben Meighan, WSOR – *Harvey Kubly, Chair*

Kubly spoke about Ben Meighan and his service to rail and Ken Lucht said that Ben had been one of the original 18 employees of WSOR, adding that Ben had worked for the Rock Island line before he went to WSOR and had brought tremendous value to railroads to the state. He said it had been Ben's idea to put welded rail on the PRTC sub. Lucht said that Ben was currently using his vacation, not working, and he said that Ben knew he was being recognized and said Ben had apologized for not being at the meeting and if the Commission wanted to recognize him he was very grateful. Kubly read a Resolution to the Commission honoring Ben Meighan's service.

- *Motion to approve Resolution honoring retiring Ben Meighan of WSOR- Thomas/Mrozinski, Passed Unanimously*

Charles Anderson volunteered to bring the Resolution to the November 2013 meeting and then he could present them both to Ben Meighan but Penn pointed out she could do that since she needed to frame them before presentation.

13. Discussion and Update regarding Patterson Road bridge – *Jeff Wunschel, Green Co. Highway Dept., Kim Johnson – K. Johnson Engineers*

Jeff Wunschel introduced himself and reminded the Commission of the last time they met in January and explained that Dave Pantzlaff of Ayeres Engineering would be presenting the work to date. Pantzlaff said this was an update on the

project and said there was a draft agreement that had been started. He explained the limits of the project and using a large map, showed the Commission the layout of the situation and explained that the bridge would be removed. He said the roadway would now be above trail grade which would require giving the trail a slight grade up, over the road, and down the other side. He said overall the design limit was about 1100'. He also showed a line drawing showing additional property along with the overlapping ROW's and pointed out a section that would need to be widened beyond the 66' and would be jointly owned. He said there would be a temporary easement in order to meet the needs of these overlaps and said the deadline was August of next year with a construction time of 2 to 2.5 months. Given the nature of the rock at the crossing, it was most likely that construction would be done in 2015. He said they would try to avoid Memorial Day, 4th of July, and Labor Day but the contract could be specific enough to allow traffic during holidays. Pantzlaff said their preferred construction time was early 2014. Wunschel said the contractor probably would not start until fall of 2014 and he asked the Commission if they thought the trail would be useable if it were covered with crushed rock during the winter. Wolfe said ATVs used the trail more than snowmobiles and Wunschel said users would have to run on gravel in the winter. Mrozinski asked if holding off would add to the cost of the project. Pantzlaff said there would be a December public information about the project. Wolfe asked about field access and would that possibly be a future roadway. Pantzlaff said that the project would not preclude a developer doing that but it would be dependent on the Town too. Wunschel said a developer would have to purchase a bit more of the ROW to get enough room. Wolter then asked about the drainage and Pantzlaff showed the line drawing, saying that drainage would move the general way it does now, to the east, but there would be some drainage towards the trail. He said the trail itself might dictate how or if there would be additional ditches. Overall, drainage would be pretty much in the same direction.

Wolfe said that October was about the 4th heaviest use time based on the survey and said starting in November would be preferable but Wunschel said that was not practical from a construction point. There was more discussion about the merits of doing the work in November. Pantzlaff said that perhaps spring of 2015 was the time to start and asked for confirmation of the busiest holiday. There was more discussion about the impact of construction during the summer and the summer holidays and Wunschel said it was inevitable there would be some downtime. Wolfe said they would need to get notification for the dates on when this would happen so the trail could be marked and users notified. There was more discussion about scheduling and how the contract might be modified to allow for certain dates. Wolfe explained that in Lafayette County each town would have to be notified with notification of a project like this; he reported that at the TCTC meeting last night used an approach of trying to develop access even with the construction. Pantzlaff said it sounded like October would need to be avoided but Wolfe said that if there were an alternate route set up they could get going in October. Pantzlaff said that at the December meeting they could ask for input.

Pantzlaff confirmed that Penn would be his contact to the PRTC and left copies of the draft agreement with the Commission and gave copies to Eileen Brownlee for her review. He asked for comments on the draft agreement by December. He said this was not a Section 4-F property, that is, recreational property, and because it might become a railroad in the future he said they might ask for a verification in the future on this as it related to environmental impacts. Huntington said that at this point neither WSOR nor WDOT had anything to contribute at this point and the Commission was the sole owner. Huntington said technically it was an active railroad and Kubly said the bottom line it was corridor for railroads.

14. Discussion and Possible Action regarding Five Corners bridge – *Jeff Wunschel, Green Co. Highway Dept.,, Kim Johnson – K. Johnson Engineers*

Wunschel reminded the Commission of the issue last talked about in January and their funding request for same. Brownlee said she had been asked if the Commission was allowed to use their resources for a project like this and the answer was yes. Wunschel said the design was nearing completion. Kim Johnson said Jewel was working on this project and primarily they had been going through alternatives solutions to the problem and found that the most cost effective solution to addressing the problem was a new bridge is the way to go. They type of bridge and how to pay for same was also being examined. Wunschel said they were looking at 2015 for beginning construction and asked that the Commission pay half of the local share which would be $180,000.00. Kubly said that with the total local share of $180,000.00 Wunschel was asking for $90,000.00 with the other half split between the counties and the two towns the

bridge lies in. Wolter asked if the two townships would pay the local share. Wunschel said the typical share is ½ county, ½ town and therefore the towns would each pay 10% and the county the other 10%. The current price of replacement was $900,000.00 with $720,000 from the federal bridge fund. Wunschel asked that the PRTC pay half of the local share with the other half paid for by the towns with the understanding that in the future the towns would pay for the maintenance. Kubly asked why the Commission was being asked to pay so much and Wunschel said there had been some past history of other bridges over local roads. Johnson explained that this was a first for this RTC. Huntington elaborated on the issue and said that there are some other examples in the state of a situation like this. He said there were situations where railroad bridges were handling road traffic, most needed replacement and that they could be covered by the federal bridge replacement program. Huntington said they had not yet accomplished it yet but they were working to getting them done. He said the advantage to getting the bridge replaced would be to fix the problem and by paying it would get the PRTC and the railroad out of having to pay for bridge maintenance, and the communities would get a new bridge and the towns would pay to the maintenance in future. Kubly asked for confirmation as to whether possibly WSOR would be willing to contribute some of the local match. Huntington would not commit for WSOR but said that currently the railroad was responsible for the maintenance but since it was not used for railroad traffic it was not a railroad maintenance priority. Kubly asked Brownlee if it were allowable for the PRTC to contribute to this request and she said there was no legal obligation to contribute a specific amount, but that there was some advantage to the Commission in the project moving forward. Wolter asked about th two towns contributing and the breakdown. Mrozinski asked why was the RPTC being asked the "lions share" of the local contribution and Johnson said that in the past the owner and the railroad was the same entity. Lucht confirmed this and said that WSOR understood the benefit to this bridge replacement. He said in the past the railroad had been asked to pay the local match and agreed that doing this work was to the public benefit. He also agreed that the railroad would be released from their responsibility but would want that all stake holders contribute equally. Wolter brought up the question of the county contribution and Kubly said that only Green County's contribution was coming to the PRTC. He said he sensed that the PRTC was interested in contributing but suggested that it be a more equitable share. Wunschel said he understood and wanted to keep the ball moving and could get together again when the final design was done by Jewel. Kubly said the PRTC's primary source of funding was from the counties and it was tax payer money. Olson asked if the money already contributed to the WSOR had been paid for this bridge and Lucht said no, money had already been appropriated for railroad bridges, not those for highway traffic. Wunschel conf rmed that an at grade rail crossing was not desirable and said all the alternatives were being looked at and they could have firmer numbers in time. Johnson said if the bridge went out it would lead to a 4-mi detour. Lucht asked Johnson about the sufficiency rating who said it was 19.9 and the ADT was not terribly high at 330. Lucht asked when applying for the federal money did the application consider the benefits. Johnson said that the ADT of this road was a major town road and said at grade was considerably more than a new bridge and therefore it was not a benefit/cost analysis but they were continuing to look at all alternatives.

15. Discussion and Possible Action regarding revised language to the PRTC/WSOR/WisDOT Grant and Operating Agreements – *Frank Huntington, WDOT*

Upon distribution of the draft language, Huntington explained the background on the issue and reminded the Commission that with WATCO the new owner of WSOR this was an effort to address some problems associated with reporting requirements. He said that there had been a number of substantial changes particularly as they related to the liability insurance. He noted that with WATCO the amounts were higher. He went through the document and noted that the changes in the dollars amount was due to WATCO's needs for greater insurance and therefore larger dollar amounts. Huntington said that in order to examine the financial stability of the railroad, the new language established a $10M line of credit to cover the self-insured retention and there was also language that stated that if the line of credit was drawn down they would require a Letter of Credit for at least $3M. He said that this gave them a reasonable amount of protection and also gave the railroad more protection in their financial reporting. Huntington continued to go through the draft language, pointing out changes and explaining them. He said they were not expecting action today but that this introduced the document to the Commission and they would like this to be on the agenda in future in order to have an action. Huntington said that this new agreement would allow the Commission and WDOT to review WSOR's financial records yet not reveal their financial situation to the public record. Brownlee said this was a work in progress and had been in progress for over a year. She said that this was getting close to a resolution and Huntington reminded

the Commission that in the acquisition of the Reedsburg line they were trying to get all the agreement language to be consistent for all the Commissions.

16. Consideration and Possible Action on 2014 PRTC draft Budget – *Mary Penn, PRTC Admin.*
Penn distributed the draft budget, noting that the draft budget included in the meeting packet had had an incorrect amount for the SWWRPC contract. She distributed the updated draft budget and explained the budget to the Commission.

- *Motion to approve 2014 draft PRTC budget – Wolter/Olson, Passed Unanimously*

17. Consideration and Possible Action on 2012 draft PRTC Audit with Johnson Block – *Mary Penn, PRTC Admin.*
Penn distributed the draft audit and explained that there were no recommendations other than that the Commission was so small there was a risk of mismanagement. Kubly pointed out that for some reason the SCWRTC Treasurer is bonded but the PRTC Treasurer was not. Penn asked if the Commission would want to discuss this at the January meeting and there was general agreement. Brownlee pointed out that the Charter required a bond. There was discussion about the history of the PRTC Treasurer and why there might never have been a bond.

- *Motion to approve the 2012 draft audit – Mrozinski/Wolfe, Passed Unanimously*

18. Consideration and Possible Action on 2014 Staff Services Agreement with SWWRPC – *Mary Penn, PRTC Admin.*
Penn gave Kubly the staff service agreement for 2014 and told him the amount noted from the budget needed to be penned in by him.

- *Motion to approve the 2014 staff services agreement with SWWRPC – Olson/Wolter, Passed Unanimously*

19. *Action Item* **- Adjournment**

- *Motion to adjourn at 2:47 PM – Wolfe/Thomas, Passed Unanimously*

DRAFT

PECATONICA RAIL TRANSIT COMMISSION

20 S Court Street • PO Box 262 • Platteville, Wisconsin 53818
MEMBER COUNTIES: GREEN • IOWA • LAFAYETTE• ROCK

PRTC/WRRTC FORMAL FUNDING AGREEMENT WORKING COMMITTEE

October 25, 2013

Immediately following 1:00 PM PRTC Meeting

Green Co. Courthouse 2nd Floor Courtroom, 1016 16th Ave • Monroe, WI

1. Call to Order – *Harvey W. Kubly, Chair*
The meeting was called to order by Chair Harvey W. Kubly at 2:57 PM

2. Establishment of Committee Members Present – *Mary Penn, PRTC Administrator*

Commissioner	*County*	*Present*
Harvey W. Kubly	*Green*	*x*
Ron Wolter	*Green*	*x*
Philip Mrozinski	*Iowa*	*x*
Charles Anderson	*Iowa*	*x*
Alan Sweeney	*Rock*	*Excused*
Wayne Gustina	*Rock*	*Excused*

Achieved quorum

Also attending: Ken Lucht, WSOR, Mary Penn, SWWRPC, Troy Maggied, SWWRPC, Frank Huntington, WDOT, Kim Tollers, WDOT, Eileen Brownlee, Corp. Counsel

3. Certification of Meeting's Public Notice – *Noticed by Penn*

- *Motion to approve notice of public meeting – Mrozinski/Anderson, Passed Unanimously*

4. Approval of Agenda – *Prepared by Penn*
Correct "Rob" to "Ron"

- *Motion to approve agenda with corrections – Anderson/Mrozinski, Passed Unanimously*

5. Approval of draft July 2013 Meeting Minutes – *Prepared by Penn*

- *Approval of draft July2013 Meeting minutes – Anderson/Mrozinski, Passed Unanimously*

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

6. Continued Discussion Regarding Funding Issue.
Harvey W. Kubly reminded the group they had discussed having Corp Counsel Eileen Brownlee attend the meeting. He said he had spoken with her and one of the things discussed was the ability of the Commission to levy or ask for a contribution from every county to support the budget. Brownlee said that each year the Commission was required to create a budget and the Commission should make a budget recommendation and each county should contribute but the amounts contributed did not need to be equal. She added that when the Commission submitted its budget to its counties it be a certain percentage and every county had the ability to say no or pay a different amount: the charter did not say what happened if counties did not pay or pay different amounts. She said that it might mean that other counties could make their payment contingent on other counties paying as well. Kubly said that in looking at the budget, the projected expenses to run the Commission was $14,300 but it seemed that at least that amount of money

should be divided four ways among the member counties to support the administration of the Commission. He said the "sticky" part was that Rock County gave their contributions to the WRRTC and Green contributed to the PRTC. However, if followed, it would be one way to receive money from Lafayette County. Ron Wolter said they were an equal partner and had an equal say in the Commission so they should pay an equal amount. Lafayette County had a voice in how the Commission funds were spent also. He added that since Lafayette had no connection to the WRRTC, their contribution would "stay here". Kubly said at least it would be a contribution to the overhead of running the Commission. Kubly asked Brownlee or Frank Huntington to comment. Huntington said that overall it was a Commission decision and noted that Lafayette County had gotten benefit from being in the Commission; being asked to pay could cause them to pull out of the Commission.

Charles Anderson said that he had noted that there was no income from the TCTC in the draft budget. He suggested that perhaps the PRTC should join the WRRTC and be one Commission. Kubly said that they had discussed this in earlier Committee meetings. Anderson confirmed and asked Kubly if he had visited with Lafayette County about the issue. Anderson asked who in the past benefitted from the ATV survey and if it were broke down by county. Phillip Mrozinski said he had glanced through the survey and saw that Darlington was the city which received the highest number of restaurant customers by far. Anderson said that the Badger State Trail came down through Monroe as well. Kubly said that was basically a bicycle trail. He noted that it should be somewhat obvious that everyone at the table should contribute to the Commission's overhead and for years that had not happened but there was a time when there was money left from salvage the PRTC used to get a decent amount of interest to pay for administration. He thought there was plenty of maintenance to be done, adding that he was not worried about the "bank getting too built up again" and that now was the appropriate time to address this issue.

Anderson asked if they should draft a letter or should Rock and Green split their money ($13K one way, $13K the other). Kubly said he was not thinking of the county contribution but rather money to operate the Commission. Mrozinksi asked if that were over what was already received. Kubly said that maybe the counties contribution could subtract it from that. That way the outlay would be the same for Rock and Iowa, with $3500 to PRTC and shorting WRRTC by that same amount. Anderson said there was some kind of agreement to provide the $26,500 and that was with the railroad. Mary Penn said that $26,500 was the county contribution. Wolter said that Lafayette County is on the Commission and they voted for the other counties to pay. He said somewhere along the line they needed to be made equal with the rest. He said to "start with equal" and see where it would go, particularly considering the $15M benefit of the trail.

Mrozinski asked about the possible repercussions if Lafayette walked away from the PRTC. Huntington said they could do that but they would lose their voice on the Commission and lose their participation. He did not know if there were any long term repercussions. Brownlee said that the Charter required they pay for 2 years prior to leaving the Commission. She did not know if that would lead to the corridor changing but Lafayette would not be able to cordon off "their" part of the trail. By losing their voice they would lose their ability to say what could happen. Wolter said the Commission could not see into the future, but if railroad were to go back in the corridor was necessary. Huntington said there would have to be a reason to justify it going back in and it would be sizeable based on the cost of reanimating track. Wolter said the PRTC is charged with maintaining the corridor and the ability of putting rail back in. Huntington said that one county could run the Commission. Brownlee said that it might be possible that municipalities be interested in joining the Commission, such as Darlington, if Lafayette County was not. She did not think that was desirable in the past but it could be possible today.

Kubly said it was unfortunate that the Commission wasn't getting any revenue from the trail, adding that the PRTC had contributed many times to trail projects. He said that this went back to dealing with trail issues in Lafayette County and therefore there should be some funding coming from them. The County received a benefit from the railroad although it did not have active rail and certainly the farmers in Lafayette County benefited because there was an outlet for corn. However it would probably be impossible to get the same amount of money from them. Huntington said that adding money to the budget was a tough thing to do and for the County, the PRTC would be a line item and probably a hard sell. Huntington asked if there were a Lafayette County person on the Committee. Kubly said no since another issue was contribution for rail projects and because Lafayette County had no rail and did not contribute they were not represented on the Committee. Mrozinski said he did not see the Committee moving ahead and asked whether they were going to approach somebody. Kubly said they were making progress because counsel had confirmed they could do something. Wolter said it was too late to send them a notice to add this to this year's county budget but they could work on it for next year. Mrozinski said that he thought they should request the entire amount because they had to be fair about the issue. He added that if the Committee wanted to negotiate they could but they should aim high and have it be a tiered opt-in by year until it hit where everyone else was. Wolter asked if they should draft a letter to the County Clerk. Kubly said first the Committee would have to pass something and then go to the full Commission because ultimately Lafayette County members needed to have their say too. Kubly asked Huntington if this was a unique situation with a county without rail being in a rail commission. Huntington said there are counties that had rail service but had not joined an RTC but the PRTC was the only one to have a county without service and did join. Anderson asked if they could request an item on the PRTC agenda to discuss the formalization of a draft to Lafayette

County with the Lafayette County Commissioners present, get a legal review of same and if so done, then discuss with the formulation of the draft and everyone would know ahead of time. Mrozinski said that he would prefer this Committee make a motion and vote and then send a recommendation to the Full Commission.

- *Motion to recommend to the full Pecatonica Rail Transit Commission requesting Lafayette County contribute the amount equal to the county contribution the other member counties of the PRTC contribute – Mrozinski/Wolter, Passed Unanimously*

Discussion: Mrozinski clarified that he wanted this motion be made to the full commission.

Kubly noted that he agreed but the reason he was looking at the budget before was that he believed that was all the Commission could request: a contribution to the overhead. Brownlee said they could ask for more and noted that the Charter talked about the budget but thought that they were not confined to that because from year to year they could have funds that needed to be expended or have been budgeted in the past.

Kulby said last time there seemed to be a desire at least from Al Sweeney that Green County become a member of the WRRTC but Kubly said he had not had an opportunity to pursue that question with the county and the full county board would have to consent to it. He asked that this issue be an agenda item for the January meeting.

Wolter asked if they would meet in January and Kubly said yes. At that time he could present what he would learn from the County Board Chair. Mrozinski asked if it would be ok for him to ask someone he knows at Lafayette County to find out where the request for funding would go but Kubly recommended he should until after the January meeting.

7. *Action Item* **- Adjournment**

- *Motion to adjourn meeting at 3:38PM – Anderson/Wolter, Passed Unanimously*

DRAFT