

Wisconsin Freight Advisory Committee Intermodal Subcommittee

Meeting Notes

July 10, 2018

1:00 PM - 4:15 PM

Host: Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP)

Subcommittee Members/Designees Attending In-Person:

- Dave Simon, Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) (co-chair)
- Cory Fish, Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce (WMC) (co-chair)
- Brian Buchanan, Canadian National Railway Company (CN)¹
- Bo DeLong, The DeLong Co., Inc.
- Jerry Deschane, League of Wisconsin Municipalities (LWM)
- Jack Heinemann, DATCP
- Peter Hirthe, Port of Milwaukee
- Danielle Jones, Wisconsin Economic Development Corporation (WEDC)
- Brad Peot, Watco/Wisconsin & Southern Railroad (WSOR; attending for Ken Lucht)
- Steve Rose, Logistics Council of Milwaukee

Subcommittee Members Attending by Phone:

- Tom Bressner, Wisconsin Agri-Business Association
- Dean Haen, Port of Green Bay / Wisconsin Commercial Ports Association
- Larry Krueger, Krueger Lumber/Lake States Lumber Association
- Kelli O'Brien, Union Pacific Railroad
- Dr. Ernie Perry, UW-Madison

Other Attendees:

- Andrea Gabel, WEDC
- Krista Knigge, DATCP
- Shirley Malski, UW-Oshkosh Small Business Development Center (SBCD)
- Jason Murphree, Watco/WSOR
- Mark Sericati, Schneider National (by phone)
- Dean Prestegaard, WisDOT
- Rich Kedzior, WisDOT
- Dave Leucinger, WisDOT
- Matt Umhoefer, WisDOT
- Paul Chellefold, SRF Consulting

Introductions and Review

¹ Canadian National Railway Company (CN) operates in Wisconsin as Wisconsin Central Ltd. (WCL), a wholly owned subsidiary operating company. CN is the ultimate parent company. The U.S. subsidiaries of CN such as WCL operate collectively under the CN brand name.

The fifth meeting of Wisconsin's Freight Advisory Committee's Intermodal Subcommittee was held in Madison on July 10, 2018 at the DATCP headquarters building. Dave Simon welcomed the attendees and offered a news story from North Carolina, where the North Carolina DOT agreed to provide \$118 million in funding towards construction of a new intermodal facility in that state. CSX will serve the facility and provide another \$40 million towards the roughly \$160 million cost to build the facility. This story shows that even though it is hard to quantify, the state of North Carolina expects a return-on-investment (ROI) for supporting intermodal transportation.

The story on the project's funding raised a few questions, including why the state didn't appear to seek to leverage federal funding for the project – which could have supplemented state costs or allowed the project to be larger. Could it be that the project managers didn't want to waste time waiting for a federal decision? Did they try for funding and fail?

The group did a quick round of self-introductions, including new member Dani Jones, who replaced Kathy Heady as a representative for WEDC. Also attending her first meeting was Shirley Malski, International Trade Consultant with the Small Business Development Center (SBCD) at the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh.

Dave Simon said that for new members, the notes from previous meetings were comprehensive and allowed readers to get 'up to speed' quickly. They covered all the material that has been discussed. The minutes from the previous meeting (June 8) have been completed; they are currently in the approval process and will be sent out very soon. In review, that June meeting included a recap of the May 30 Freight Advisory Committee (FAC) meeting – the larger oversight body to the Intermodal Subcommittee. The June meeting also included discussion of the introductory e-mail that will include the survey link. We want it to look good, with the look of a marketing piece. We want a high response rate and discussed how to have a 'hook' that would encourage that high completion rate. Then, we discussed the survey itself: how to word the introduction, beta testing (including those outside of the subcommittee), and how the questions will be good at capturing the inbound and outbound demand. The last meeting also included discussion on how to inform shippers of the survey, how long the survey should take to complete, the use of NAICS codes and drop-down boxes to allow survey recipients to select from brief set of fields, and how to avoid duplicate survey responses. Our subcommittee discussion also covered getting e-mail addresses from respondents for cross-checking and follow up.

Dave Simon said that today the subcommittee discussion will cover how much detail we will try to capture on the container contents, based on suggestions we have received. The subcommittee will also talk about the survey tool being developed amongst WMC, SRF, and WisDOT. It appears that the intermodal survey will use SurveyMonkey as the platform. There have been some discussions behind-the-scenes over the survey's logistics and delays. At today's meeting, the subcommittee will also discuss the other data (besides the survey) to be compiled, analyzed, and written into the intermodal study by WisDOT staff. WisDOT's goal is to have a draft report ready by fall, for presentation at the FAC meeting in mid-November. At that meeting, WisDOT will ask for feedback and for additional checking of content before the report is finalized. But the survey needs to get out and back so the researchers can collect the information and begin writing. Simon added that the day's meeting agenda will also discuss the content and appearance of the message with the survey link, including how WisDOT, WMC, and the subcommittee members will distribute that message. We will also go through the data matrix and the assignments and commitments made by subcommittee members, and spend time looking ahead to what the goals and recommendations of the subcommittee could be.

Survey Development

Next, Cory Fish presented an update of the development of the intermodal survey. He said that the initial development of the survey tool was done in-house (using software called Constant Contact), but soon found that software was not user-friendly – it would not allow the survey-taker to save and return later. That this fundamental flaw was found actually turned out to be good news – the company that owns Constant Contact announced right after WMC started working on the survey that it was being spun off, and the survey software would have been shut down right in the middle of the Subcommittee’s efforts. Consequently, WMC has started to build the survey in SurveyMonkey. At this point, there isn’t any skip logic built in, but the survey has up to 85 questions. It’s very unlikely anyone will come close to that number of questions, except for the most complex shippers. The questions will direct the survey taker to drop-down boxes for the contents.

Matt Umhoefer then displayed a table with two columns of similar commodity clusters. He explained one column was offered by David Ruehrdanz of Canadian Pacific (CP); the other column was generated by Brad Peot of WATCO/WSOR, who added some items and slightly modified others as his suggestions. Shirley Malski asked if Health Care and Aerospace should also be added to the list. Bo DeLong asked if Wisconsin has any significant aerospace businesses; Malski confirmed the state does. Brad Peot asked if consumer products would cover the health care sector; Malski said not really. Dani Jones said she had suggested aggregates; Peot noted that those move by rail domestically in bulk but are not sent overseas in shipping containers.

Matt Umhoefer asked the group for its thoughts on whether forest products and lumber/timber should be split. He also noted the field of container contents needed to be concluded at this meeting to allow the survey development to be completed. Jack Heinemann asked if there would be any problem with adding a category. Dean Prestegaard said the categories needed to be concise. Earlier, there was thought to asking businesses for STCC codes for their primary and other operations. But the list of potential codes there could be big, and that list could turn off potential survey responders. The survey needs to balance level of detail with the volume of responses. Dani Jones asked if we are already at a high level of granularity with 85 questions in the survey. Prestegaard said that number is misleading; that number of questions covers four areas of intermodal operation – international overseas imports, international overseas exports, inbound North American cargo, and outbound North American cargo. Most companies only operate within one or two of those areas, and as such will only answer questions for those areas. Bo DeLong confirmed those four categories, and said that he expects 85 to 90 percent of respondents will only answer 20 to 25 of those 85 questions.

Dani Jones raised her concern that the response rate on surveys she’s conducted tails off after ten questions. Brad Peot replied that puts a greater emphasis on how the survey will be presented – that it won’t be a ten-minute survey, and that the responder will need to be able to do a data dive into their supply chain.

Further discussions explored how to create and/or combine enough distinct categories for container contents. The content of ‘metals’ was suggested, given that it would also include tractors and small, non-automotive engines. Brad Peot said his list was an attempt to break out David Ruehrdanz’s list a bit more, so components are also listed. Bo DeLong mentioned that railroads are supposed to be the audience for the survey results, so including metals and machinery follows that. Peter Hirthe said the tone from the last meeting was that the survey only needs so many categories for railroads to be interested. It’s important to have categories, but at a broader level. The railroads don’t need details on content; they need to know how much is moving and where it’s moving between – that is what’s critical.

Matt Umhoefer said that the experience of SRF (the consultant helping build the survey) is that by allowing survey-takers to choose from simple options, you reduce the likelihood they will skip over an entire section. Another person asked if there could be a glossary or similar index to tell survey-takers into what category they should put their container contents. Bo DeLong said the list of contents should be kept as short as possible without the survey-taker defaulting to “other” for much of their loads. Dean Prestegaard mentioned that if we can identify the industry group in which the surveyed company operates, then we could go back later to get the content. Brian Buchanan said the most important items for the survey are where the loads are moving and what the volume is; there’s no need for specifics. Shirley Malski said we might be able to get content data from other sources. She also said there are seven promoted state business clusters, including forest products, agriculture, biotech, and water technology. If their reporting is consistent, the survey can pull data from other sources. Larry Krueger said we should use categories that are best for the railroads.

Someone asked how this information would be displayed. Matt Umhoefer replied that all four container categories (ISO imports, ISO exports, domestic inbound, domestic outbound) would each get their own heat map. Kelli O’Brien said the railroad classifications vary, but for UP, the categories are very broad for intermodal contents. There is a lot of mixed freight. She thought what was shared was good, but it would help to break the categories down a bit. Dave Simon asked if we needed to identify if any of the loads were hazardous material or refrigerated (temperature-controlled); Kelli O’Brien said yes, they should be. Simon said we should try to keep it basic; a high level of detail isn’t needed for the survey. Cory Fish suggested adding check-boxes to identify refrigerated or hazardous materials.

Additional discussion addressed separating paper from other forest products, and expanding the automobiles category to include parts and other items. Brad Peot said consumer products, labeled as “Freight of All Kinds,” or FAK, comprises almost 50 percent of inbound container loads. He would suggest combining paper and pulp as one category, and logs and lumber as a second category. The two have different issues, especially with weight. Other discussions mentioned furniture falling under consumer products. Brad Peot said a good broad category would be to combine automotive, machinery, and metals. Kelli O’Brien said she thought the combination would be fine. Dave Leucinger asked if scrap should be broken out separately. Brian Buchanan said that waste paper and other paper products are the same for railroads. Kelli O’Brien noted that the contents categories were becoming more concise. Peot asked if the “Other” category would give the survey-takers too much leeway and they would just answer “Other” for all their loads. Peter Hirthe said that it’s best to let the survey recipients have an out and move them along the survey.

Bo DeLong asked if there would be a category for refrigerated; Matt Umhoefer said there will be check-boxes for hazardous materials and for refrigerated (climate-controlled) items that fit into other categories. Cory Fish asked if some items were refrigerated and some were not, did that mean the recipient would need to enter that category twice? Dani Jones asked if there were some refrigerated items that would also be hazmat. Jack Heinemann said the basic idea would be to determine how many refrigerated containers would be needed by railroads. Umhoefer confirmed that would be important for generating heat maps. Brian Buchanan said that he could live without these distinctions; he needs to have volumes and where they’re moving. Jason Murphree questioned the removal of the categories. Kelli O’Brien said she thought that it was important to include hazardous materials and refrigerated products in the survey questions. Umhoefer said he was saving the recommended updates to the template – and the team would work with SRF and WMC to finalize the survey. Dave Leucinger

suggested changing “refrigerated” to “temperature-controlled” to reflect all the items requiring a specific temperature range be maintained while in-transit. The categories for container contents will be:

- Foodstuffs and Beverages
- Plastics and Rubber
- Chemicals
- Paper and Pulpwood
- Logs and Lumber
- Automotive, Machinery, & Metals
- Consumer Products
- Bulk Agriculture
- Other

There will also be boxes to check to affirm for hazardous material and for temperature-controlled.

After a break, the group resumed discussing the survey content. Jason Murphree asked the group for help in recalling why it was important to distinguish between 40’ and 20’ containers. Bo DeLong replied that it was to keep a clear idea of the volumes. Matt Umhoefer added that when making the heat maps, the conversion of loads to TEUs would mean a 40’ container would count for twice what a 20’ container would. Brad Peot asked if a company was shipping the same product along only three lanes, and all that shipping was domestic – will the company have to fill out three entries – one for each separate lane? Or will they have the option to just add lanes for the same commodity? Cory Fish replied that the survey construction will allow the respondent to “cycle” through the survey multiple times before being sent to the next section. So yes, that’s how it would work.

Jack Heinemann asked if anyone on the committee wanted to test this to see how big a problem it could be. Bo DeLong asked if corn and soybeans would be in separate cycles; Brad Peot said since they’re both grains, that they would be on one tally. Heinemann said that if some containers were going to Japan and others to China, that would be different tallies. Shirley Malski said that Bemis has 400 domestic lanes alone for its shipping, with 50 of those having intermodal potential. Are they expected to fill out 50 different entries? Someone replied yes. Bo DeLong said he thought when the survey was developed, it would just use a table that could be filled in. This will be far more time-consuming. Could it be made more generalized? Cory Fish asked if we needed both port of entry and origin. Heinemann said no company is going to fill out 400 responses. Malski agreed the companies would not do a survey of that length. DeLong said we need to be gearing the survey to people who need the data. If it’s coming in on the west coast, we don’t need the port of origin as well. Fish said that we can make the field closed to limit options. Further discussion indicated that general consensus was to separate the entry question into five options: U.S. west coast, Canadian west coast, U.S. east coast, Canadian east coast, and U.S. Gulf coast.

Someone asked how specific we needed to be with the Wisconsin ZIP. Matt Umhoefer said that the heat maps required that to be specific, so that the steamship companies know what railroads serve the areas that stand out. There was a question about the survey tool itself; someone replied that the tool adds complexity because of its limitations. Peter Hirthe said we should emphasize the lanes where railroads take and go with intermodal containers. Dave Simon agreed that we shouldn’t ask for any unnecessary information. There was some discussion of the U.S. regions that could be used for questions on domestic intermodal service. Dave Simon said that the U.S. DOT’s regions were not intuitive. More

discussion expressed concern over the loss of the ability to use a spreadsheet within the survey tool. Hirthe said the survey should focus on the Ports of Entry to establish the rail operators. Dave Leucinger asked if, given the limitations on the tool and the potential poor response rate, should consideration be made to send paper surveys to the largest shippers. After some group discussion, Matt Umhoefer said we don't have the manpower for analyzing 1,500 written surveys. Dean Prestegaard there were a lot of things in the hard copy that won't be in the final online version – we're not mailing out surveys.

Someone asked Peter Hirthe how the Port of Milwaukee survey was conducted. He replied that they sent out electronic surveys to the Port's current and past customers, and through the Milwaukee 7 / Milwaukee Metropolitan Association of Commerce (MMAC). MMAC compiled all the returns; there were more than 100 responses. As with the subcommittee survey, the MMAC/Port survey had four categories – inbound and outbound international, and inbound and outbound domestic. We also asked the respondents to give separate counts for 40' and 20' containers. The MMAC/Port survey identified 70,000 TEUs of international trade and 20,000 containers of domestic trade. The survey gave MMAC and the Port the "what" (how much is moving), but it didn't give the "where" – the trade lanes that the subcommittee survey is trying to identify. That will add a layer of detail for the railroads. Brian Buchanan asked if the survey had commodity data as well. Hirthe replied no; that the purpose of that survey was to document the volumes of potential container movement, should a yard reopen in southeastern Wisconsin. The previous numbers were five years old, and the Port wanted to show Union Pacific and Canadian Pacific the current volumes - that there is real demand. The railroads could then solicit responses from shippers with a little time and effort. Dave Simon noted that the MMAC/Port study didn't show where the shipments were originating, but we need that for the subcommittee study. Hirthe added that the subcommittee report would help the Port; when it was active it had intermodal connections from both Montreal and Vancouver; the Port would like to document if that trade activity and demand still exists.

Dean Prestegaard said that if the survey identified regions rather than specific locations for destinations, that should be adequate for showing where the containers are going. Brad Peot said the survey could create groupings for origins and destinations. He wondered if there was another tool or software package that could be used – one that would allow for tables to be used? Prestegaard said that there were some tools where a matrix could be included, but those were expensive. Dave Simon, Matt Umhoefer, and Bo DeLong exchanged clarifying questions and answers on how the electronic version would be presented; DeLong was concerned that with multiple categories, the survey taker will need to go through each entry on a one-at-a-time pace. Umhoefer noted that many imports would be consumer products and could be clustered. Shirley Malski said there are many sophisticated supply chains in the state. For example, she again noted that the Bemis company has 400 dominant lanes for freight – and perhaps 50 of those could use intermodal. That's an example of the companies that could do more if intermodal service was available.

There was some discussion about corporate anonymity and how data could be used to identify companies that don't choose to self-identify. Cory Fish said if a company just had one set of materials it shipped, that might be the way; otherwise, he wasn't sure how we would match it with one entry or one destination ZIP code. The subcommittee needs to find a way to prevent people from trying to re-enter data when more than one person at a company could submit the survey. He wasn't sure how to prevent that with SurveyMonkey.

Matt Umhoefer asked if we should sacrifice the trade lanes data to allow respondents to take less time and give us a greater number of reports. Rick Kedzior said if we have the Wisconsin ZIP codes we can

sacrifice the domestic destination yards – we don't need to worry about that. There was further discussion with Bo DeLong, Dean Prestegaard, and Matt Umhoefer on elements that could be removed. Umhoefer asked if any location data mattered for domestic freight. Brian Buchanan said it would be important to know from which direction freight arrives into the state, or to which direction it leaves – that helps determine the railroad company.

Kelli O'Brien said she had listened and had thoughts about how the subcommittee was going around on the survey and what to cut. She said she had been pleased with what had been developed with the survey up to the meeting. Peter Hirthe said he heard the concerns that the survey was too cumbersome – but he didn't want the subcommittee to cut it, either. O'Brien said the subcommittee needed to ask if simplifying the survey would get the data that is wanted or needed. Brad Peot said if the subcommittee took out the information on freight lanes, it would defeat the purpose of the survey, from the view of the railroads. O'Brien said that their company has tracks to the Pacific Northwest and to Long Beach, but it also extends to places on the Gulf Coast. And UP is also into all six Mexican ports. Brian Buchanan asked O'Brien and Peot if they cared which ports the containers came through and left from. Peot replied it mattered if the company could compete for that lane of traffic. Buchanan replied that for CN, if the load was going south, it didn't matter if it was going to Memphis or New Orleans – the destination wasn't relevant.

Jack Heinemann asked how much additional effort was required to complete the survey and beta test it with the group. He suggested that the survey team put a version together and send it out for testing – then, based on that testing, the subcommittee can come back with changes. If the group tests it and find out the survey needs to be redone, maybe that's not so bad. Cory Fish said it should take about two business days to redo it. Dean Prestegaard said the survey team needs to get together and determine what to include, with SRF, WMC, and WisDOT all involved. Dave Simon said that a smaller team would be used to create and test the survey, collect the comments on how it should be edited, and then adjust the survey. He added the subcommittee has an external outlet for testing through Aim Transfer's customers. The survey team has more work to do, but Simon said that he was glad the subcommittee had the discussion on the survey. It pointed out weaknesses that needed to be addressed.

Matt Umhoefer asked the subcommittee to give their opinion on how long to keep the survey active, and at what point should reminders be sent to the recipients. He said the survey group is hoping to close the survey around Labor Day. Dean Prestegaard asked that the survey team will learn from the initial responses how to better target shipping sectors or geographic regions if a sufficient number of responses is not forthcoming. Conducting the survey will be a learning process; we will know in real time how many surveys have been completed. Dave Simon said that the survey team is also going to develop the language for the introductory e-mail to the survey; the team will share that with the subcommittee at the same time as the beta test for the survey. Peter Hirthe asked for both to be sent as text.

Dave Simon said he could call on the expertise of subcommittee members to help with marketing the survey. Dean Prestegaard asked the group for a stock photo of intermodal shipping to use as a visual example of what "intermodal" should mean to the companies taking the survey. Simon added that such an image would be a 'hook' to encourage participation. He also noted that through the in-depth discussion of the survey, the subcommittee was now enlightened on the issues with the survey.

Report Matrix and Narrative Development

Next, the subcommittee transitioned to discussion of the final "shell" for the report. Matt Umhoefer displayed a table showing all the sections in the report. He said WisDOT had spoken with SRF, the

consultant hired to assist on the effort, and had set a goal to ‘flesh out’ the outline through July and August. He went through each of the sections, and noted that ArcGIS would be used to help visually identify key trade lanes and potential intermodal users. He also directed the subcommittee to Section VIII, “How can the state’s potential for intermodal development be improved?” He noted the subcommittee would be discussing that question over the next several meetings. Umhoefer then moved discussion to the data matrix and asked the subcommittee to confirm what they saw for topics and responsibilities. Bo DeLong mentioned the first/last mile segment section, and noted that his logistics operations use refuse permits to move agricultural products. Dave Leucinger added that the matrix assignments were compiled from comments at previous subcommittee meetings, and that several sub-sections were added to the outline based on comments. He further noted the absence of freight forwarders/third-party logistics firms and of steamship companies within the current subcommittee membership, identifying sections of the narrative where their perspectives on the global supply chain will greatly contribute to the subcommittee’s (and WisDOT’s) understanding of their roles and their expectations. DeLong said that through his contacts, he’s made his partners aware of the subcommittee’s efforts. With the matrix, if someone reached out to him and asked, ‘what do you want from us?’ – now, he’ll have this list to give to them.

Bo DeLong asked if the subcommittee members should start sending in the information from their assignments. Umhoefer said yes, they should. He noted that for freight forwarders, WisDOT reached out to ME Dey in Milwaukee but was not able to get them to commit to participate. Shirley Malski said she had other companies in mind and would reach out to them.

Improving the State’s Potential for Intermodal Development

Dave Simon began discussion of Section VIII, identifying ways the state’s potential for intermodal development can be improved. He said his vision would feature discussion of potential state government roles, local government roles, and private sector roles. He said that the department hopes that the survey will help spur private-sector investment in intermodal facilities. These facilities don’t just hatch; there are many conditions that can cause them to arise. In Duluth, it was the port and a warehouse company working with CN. In Chippewa Falls, Menards was the anchor; in Arcadia, it was Ashley Furniture. He rhetorically asked why the subcommittee members are attending, and what recommendations they had. Peter Hirthe replied that some sort of impactful funding would be welcome. Simon said that’s the problem with a successful interest in any program potentially funded by federal grants – the matching funds getting stretched over a large number of parties. The larger the number of applicants, the lower the payment to each applicant. So for stakeholders, this means that if the project is \$100 million, you shouldn’t ask the federal government for more than \$20 million. If the project is \$20 million, the request needs to be under \$10 million. That’s why these projects need to look for partners. The federal government also looks for projects it sees as having a high probability of success. That’s how the applications are scored. They also try to spread the funds out geographically, and give preference to projects with smaller needs. The applications need to be sponsored by a government entity, and WisDOT is interested in supporting qualified applications. The BUILD grants are a good opportunity; they have intermodal as a category on their applications.

Dean Prestegaard said there are other funding opportunities as well – such as the federal Economic Development Administration (EDA), administered through WEDC, and the Small Business Development Center programs. The subcommittee should think about joint public-private efforts, and pitch the benefits that way. It should look at how to find funds from other state agencies and other federal agencies. Bo DeLong asked if the low interest loan programs and grant programs that WisDOT offers for rail projects – could intermodal fall under those programs? Rich Kedzior said that it would qualify,

especially under the Freight Rail Infrastructure Improvement Program (FRIIP). Prestegaard added intermodal could also be eligible under the Transportation Economic Assistance (TEA) Program, which makes grants for road and rail infrastructure. Brad Peot said the subcommittee should be building on a schedule with all parties involved. DeLong said the subcommittee should look at overweight loads and the disadvantages of the permit limitations in Wisconsin. Illinois allows year-round operation with permits, but in Wisconsin there's about a 60-day period in the winter and spring when permits are suspended because of the freezing and thawing soils under the roads. It would be beneficial to designate an overweight zone or corridor to get products from a transload location or a manufacturer to the railroad. The state could help with that. Dave Simon said that's also a role for local government; sharing this information could also help direct roadway infrastructure investments for roads already scheduled for upgrades or rehabilitation. Information on freight needs could help move the project up in the schedule or increase its level of improvement.

Dave Simon then raised data-sharing, and using data to open a dialog. He asked if the subcommittee had other ideas. Brad Peot asked what data does WisDOT have – lane counts? Dean Prestegaard replied that there are traffic volumes and truck counts collected on the major highways, and that the department also purchases data sets and models to identify commodity flows. WisDOT is also beginning to work with WEDC to learn what data that agency has as part of a data-sharing initiative. Jerry Deschane said in his role representing local governments, he sees a role for intergovernmental facilitation. He would invite anyone to the table who could have ideas on how to help freight, and to identify who can address bottlenecks. The typical freight corridor will pass through towns, villages, and cities – crossing multiple boundaries along the way.

Peter Hirthe said he looked to have that section discuss leadership, coordination, and marketing of intermodal freight, in cooperation with WEDC. When we get the survey data, the subcommittee will have a heat map of the promising areas, and that will be like a home buyer's data sheet. It can also be used as a tool to recruit businesses – why should they locate in Wisconsin? The subcommittee can then take that information to the railroads. The information should be presented by a team made up of representatives from across the state, to promote intermodal opportunities at a state level. The cooperation of WEDC, WisDOT, and DATCP was used in Milwaukee County to preserve and regain an oversize route to and from the Port. The group held meetings, made a designation recommendation, and then worked with legislators to develop legislation to support preservation. The intermodal report could be an extension of the same effort – identify the promising regions, and see how they could team up to create “glide paths” for interest from Class I railroads. This model encompasses all roles and players.

Dean Prestegaard said that another agency to add to the group is the DNR; with the timber issues, they will need to be at the table. Jack Heinemann said that the collaborative process can be streamlined with the right people at the table. Jerry Deschane said the state will need to have a coordinated response as part of these efforts. Dave Leucinger mentioned brownfields redevelopment as an option. Deschane said that if the railroads need a large amount of land, they will need to go outside of cities, and brownfields options will be few. The group will need to look at the overweight corridors issue too, as well as year-round roads. But all opportunities should be examined, including Tax Increment Financing (TIF) and brownfields. Other options could be listed; whether they could be used depends on what's needed. That could include site assessment, corridor plans, and coordinating with city/village/town governments. Those local governments could be co-applicants for federal grants.

Brian Buchanan said that he's been party to several development opportunities over the years, and property owners are usually the biggest challenge. There's a limited universe of parcels that are along railroad lines. When you get near cities, housing and retail homes in on the available land and the project stalls. Dean Prestegaard asked what other interested parties would be interested – utilities? Other providers? The subcommittee should think about more than water, sewer, and electrical – think broadband. The subcommittee's efforts should target economic development opportunities. Jerry Deschane asked how the heat maps would show those opportunities. Matt Umhoefer replied if we get the responses we are looking to get, we will see the ZIP codes with the greatest activity and from that identify the closest railroad. Dave Simon said that through the heat maps, we will see where the data is showing the best opportunities by geographic areas – and what potential locations have proximity to the demand for containers. Umhoefer added that if we find that three locations around the state are promising, then the second step will be for local governments in those areas to explore partnerships. Prestegaard emphasized that this study won't get to the site selection stage. Deschane asked if that meant the results would not be a list of rail-ready sites, and Prestegaard said that was correct.

Bo DeLong said he looked at the question a bit differently. When you ask, "how can the potential for intermodal be improved?" – that's why we're here. The subcommittee is creating a data-driven report in a process that should bring respondents to the table. The question he had was how governments and organizations will work together to publicize what is going to be coming through the survey. Peter Hirthe said that the survey will start that communication, then the heat maps will show users, and from that the promising lanes will be identified. We need to publicize the survey to make sure the subcommittee gets the responses it needs. We also should share the report outline. It's already known to us, but we need to share the information for others to read.

Advance Promotion of the Survey

Matt Umhoefer said the subcommittee should send an e-mail to Freight Advisory Committee members and the state's 9 regional economic development groups to give them more information about the intermodal subcommittee survey and report. Dean Prestegaard added that WisDOT had a good meeting with these economic development groups recently; WisDOT gave a brief presentation on the subcommittee and the survey. Those economic development groups will be important to reaching out to the businesses in their regions that use containerized shipping. WisDOT won't be going out by ourselves to recruit survey-takers. We'll be using the connections of others. Umhoefer said that once the survey is ready for a beta test, the survey group will alert contacts outside of the subcommittee that they can be anticipating the survey coming to them shortly. Then one or two weeks later, we'll send the final survey out through those groups.

Bo DeLong said we need to have some sort of a public relations piece to help raise interest in the survey. He referenced Jack Heinemann and said that DATCP has a monthly e-mail news update that gives information – we could put that public relations piece in there so that the information on the survey could be shared with all the contacts that DATCP has. Heinemann said all of the agencies and organizations have some sort of newsletter they share, whether it's the small business development centers, the Wisconsin Technology Council, or other similar groups. The subcommittee should come up with one piece that can be shared with all – in partnership with WMC – to make the survey successful. Danielle Jones said the subcommittee should do this as soon as possible to alert the regional economic development managers. They can then start informing their members.

Jack Heinemann asked if there were any upcoming meetings that would be key for presentations or other information to be shared. Someone replied that the subcommittee members should talk to their

contacts – whether in the wood/timber sector, water technology, or other industries – and get information on their upcoming meetings. We can let them know that the subcommittee may ask to give a presentation at one of those meetings. We should look at all the economic development organizations and development centers as key contacts. Jack Heinemann asked if we should contact broadcast media to promote the survey and the subcommittee. Shirley Malski said her next BizTalk will be August 18, and she'd be glad to feature a segment with the subcommittee and survey. Danielle Jones said we could ask the Public Service Commission to reach out to its contacts, or even look to local TV stations. Dean Prestegaard said every state agency has a Public Affairs unit specifically tasked to do this kind of outreach. The subcommittee should get those units to ramp up their outreach and then share the information on the survey and the subcommittee.

Jack Heinemann suggested development of a press release. Brian Buchanan said he was going to be attending a meeting of the Northwoods Rail Transit Commission, and could talk with the attendees about the upcoming survey. At this point, Matt Umhoefer opened a PowerPoint presentation on his computer, and said that presentation was made to the regional economic development groups in June and could serve as a model for the members of the subcommittee to use in encouraging survey participation. Heinemann asked if that presentation could be shared with members of the subcommittee; Umhoefer replied that yes, he would, since that would help ensure consistency. Dave Simon said the subcommittee would need help marketing the survey; could any members help with ideas? Heinemann said the outreach didn't need to be flashy. Simon asked if it actually might need to have some flash. Umhoefer said the pitch should be that the survey results will only be as good as the data entered. Companies should be happy to spend 45 minutes on a survey that could save them \$100,000 in shipping costs.

Dave Simon said the introduction needs to be modified to remove the WisDOT emphasis. This subcommittee is a public/private group effort. Cory Fish said he and WMC would take the lead on reaching out to the private corporate members of WMC, noting that the survey will be providing a baseline of data from which to develop policies, as long as all the information shared is accurate. WMC will update its members twice per month on the efforts of the subcommittee. Jack Heinemann asked if WMC could put out a press release; Fish said yes, they will do that. Dean Prestegaard said that the cover letter could feature logos that include the Port of Milwaukee. Heinemann said the subcommittee needs to focus on doing the publicity now, to 'prime the pump' for the survey, when it is released. Cory Fish said he would draft an e-mail introduction for the survey.

Jack Heinemann asked how soon the survey will be launched. He said the survey marketing should begin next week (7/16-20) to give enough lead time for an August survey release. WMC will need to use its e-mail distribution list to push out the information to its members. Bo DeLong said that once the survey is released, WMC will need to push out another e-mail that says, "if you haven't received the WMC survey on intermodal freight, and you use intermodal shipping for your importing and/or exporting, you need to fill out the survey at this link..." Matt Umhoefer said that if we can get the final question structure in place by Friday (7/13), then could we say that the beta testing will happen next week (7/16-20). Dean Prestegaard said we should instead say the survey will be coming out 'soon.' Heinemann said the survey is likely to go live in early August, at the best. Shirley Malski agreed. Brad Peot confirmed that Cory Fish would draft an advance notification to potential survey recipients. Danielle Jones confirmed that recipients should include all the regular economic development organizations, international trade associations, and local economic development groups. Peot said that customers are asking WSOR for intermodal service on a regular basis. WSOR will provide the survey to its customers with the disclaimer that if you want the service, you need to fill out the survey.

Dave Simon said that the subcommittee should look for a pre-launch e-mail from WMC, and should also look for a beta test of the survey, along with the June minutes for review. We'll be working on language for the introduction of the survey. Brad Peot asked if we had his comments from the minutes; Umhoefer said we did. Simon thanked the group, noting there was a lot of great commentary.