

Wisconsin Freight Advisory Committee (FAC)

Appendix to Meeting Minutes from Thursday, November 9, 2017

Part I: WisDOT Local Programs: Local Bridges - Tabletop Discussions (11:25 a.m.)

The information below reflects the results of the morning tabletop discussion session at the November 9, 2017 FAC meeting. Five specific questions were asked (bold text). Primary bullet-points reflect WisDOT staff's attempt to group responses by topic; secondary and tertiary bullet-points reflect language directly provided by FAC members.

Question 1

What industry sectors are most reliant on local bridges for day-to-day operations?

- **Are those sectors concentrated in specific geographic areas, or are they dispersed?**
- **In what ways do limitations - whether weight, width, height, or otherwise - affect companies' business models?**

- Forestry and forest products
 - Raw timber
 - Lumber processing
 - Paper industry
 - Pulp
 - Finished products
- Agri-business
 - Farm equipment
 - Implements of Husbandry
- Agriculture
 - Vegetable crops (including potatoes)
 - Bulk milk
 - Grains
 - Agricultural loads come to elevators by truck
 - Manure spreaders
- Aggregates and ores
 - Sand
 - Gravel
 - Mining – if re-established
 - Frac sand was a rush to permit; mining may be slower (WisDOT staff understanding of comment: the speed at which frac sand mines were permitted and opened left many towns unable to plan for the road and bridge degradation; should metallic mining return to the state, the permitting process is likely to be slower, thereby giving towns and counties time to plan for the use of local roads)
- Manufacturing
 - Heavy equipment
 - Small engines
 - Metal fabrication
- Construction (including landscaping)
 - Special use vehicles

- Emergency response
- Other bulk commodities
 - Fuel suppliers
 - Propane
 - Road salt
 - Cement
 - Municipal waste
 - Septic trucks
- Locations
 - Mostly in rural areas*
 - Concentrated in cities and villages (84% of commercial and manufacturing property is in municipalities)*
 - 70 percent of population is in cities and villages
 - 10 percent of the bridges are on these local systems
 - Last mile from ports and rail connections
 - Geographically-dispersed, but industries like timber are more in the north
 - Timber harvesting all over north; paper mills and lumber yards are also dispersed
 - Food products in central WI
 - Bulk loads from Port of Milwaukee move north to Fox Valley; west to Mississippi River; and south to the northern suburbs of Chicago
 - Situations within state borders
- Impacts from limits
 - Businesses will go where they have low cost transportation (fewer obstacles and restrictions)
 - Complex factors in siting a business (example: soybean processor)
 - Lack of consistent weight standards from community to community
 - Weight limits can affect how a project is done
 - e.g., rebuilding a levee from dredged material rather than trucking it in
 - Light-loading of cement mixers – three yards of material instead of the full load of seven yards
 - Width and height issues as well as weight
 - Height of bridges over roads
 - Rail clearance (intermodal double-stacks) for roads over rails
 - Immediate need to help existing businesses but also need to attract new business with good infrastructure
- Signage variability and inconsistency
 - Sometimes bridges are posted after contracts are signed (projects/harvests, e.g., to haul timber or construction equipment – contract could be signed months before work begins, but in-between, the bridge gets posted)
 - Leads to expensive modifications; costs get passed along
 - Other states vary weights based on axle number/distance
 - Short trucks vs. long trucks
 - Is there technology to show bridge postings as an app?

****Note – these two statements from different tables/members contradict each other***

Question 2

What are the minimum standards these sectors need on local bridges? Why?

- Identify “economically significant bridges” (those with greater “significance” should be built to handle higher weights)
- Jurisdictional uniformity
 - Be consistent between roads and bridges
 - Consult with County Highway Commissioners, industry sectors, local associations
 - Varies by industry, product, and configuration of load
 - Dairy – 4 semis/day of feed needed – may not be any other way to get to farm
 - Milk trucks are ongoing problem
 - Offer postings that vary based on truck length, axle loads, and bridge configuration
 - Also post to allow only one truck at a time
 - Increase standards; don’t lower weight or width
- Legal weights as a minimum
 - In general – non-posted
 - Commercial vehicle standards
 - 80,000 pounds
 - Unrestricted legal access
 - How do you justify building bridges to a lower standard than elsewhere?
- Larger weights
 - Allow larger weights where it makes sense with axle configurations and the structure
 - 92,000 pounds for timber industry on frozen roads; otherwise 80,000 pounds
 - Design and build to AASHTO standards
 - Exceptions need to be justified
 - For bridges that last 100 years, how can you be sure that future demand will be at the same weight limits?
 - Will there ever be commercial activity across the bridge?
 - Standards need to be connected to industry needs and costs
 - Should bridges be stronger than roads? Yes – safety issue
 - Bridges should be able to handle the weight that the road itself is rated for
- Bridge widths should be uniform
 - Bridge widths should match road widths (including shoulders)
 - Review each project to determine if width is/isn’t needed
 - Design bridges to allow for low-cost widening opportunity in the future rather than a more expensive replacement
- Can bridge designs be standardized to streamline design and minimize construction costs?
 - Reduce specialty engineering
- Curious what other states use as standards
 - Michigan allows more weight and axles

Question 3

Are the existing restrictions on local bridges an occasional or seasonal problem, or are they routine/ongoing?

- What is being done to “work around” these restrictions, and what costs are involved with those efforts?

- All of the above – everyone is affected differently
 - Seeing more bridges posted
 - Ongoing problem
- Not just seasonal
 - Spring planting and summer or fall harvest for vegetables/grains
 - Dairy – year-round
 - Timber – through the spring thaw
 - Cut in winter; fumigated after that
 - Frozen roads don’t help bridge capacity
 - Urban areas – year-round (construction)
 - Can’t just look at bridge capacity, though (also: width and height)
 - Many impacts in northern part of state
- Time and fuel are costs
 - Extra axles
 - Detours to unposted routes
 - Lighter loads
 - Illegal crossings/damage to infrastructure
 - Risks and citations
 - Overall capital and ongoing costs to companies
 - Costs to taxpayers to resolve issues
 - Someone ultimately pays
- Routes and road restrictions
 - Routes optimized based on published data (WisDOT posted highway maps)
 - Local determination of postings and routes can be problematic
 - A pinch point is a pinch point
 - Local “NIMBY” efforts can impact the routes and be problematic
 - Capacity should be dependent on the functional class of the road
 - Recommendation for bridge treatment based on current and projected future function level
 - Flooding and resiliency
 - Prioritization
 - Asset management/inventory
- Work-arounds
 - Jump bridges are drastic temporary solutions
 - Companies are coming to agreements with locals to rebuild local roads
 - Maintenance funding reserves

- Industry-specific impacts
 - Locations can be less valuable to some industries – unless they can rely on rail or accept system limitations
 - Seasonal food production challenges at harvest time
 - Ag equipment operates year-round in some cases
 - Tiered needs based on business size
- Solutions
 - Ask industry if WI is falling behind on standards
 - Need collaboration and innovation
 - Are there bridges of local/regional economic significance? Target those first
 - Small cost improvements on bridges in good condition but with design issues
 - Review bridge approaches
 - Examine use of box culverts and varied axle loading configurations
 - Plans: good to look at, but need a reality-check as part of setting priorities
 - More concerned about lack of rail

Question 4

Have local bridge restrictions been a factor in business location decisions? If so, how?

- Without a doubt
- Businesses just won't locate where they can't get to markets or facilities
 - If you can't deliver – build elsewhere
 - Foxconn's choice based on location for getting/delivering products
 - Decision also based on agreement to update local infrastructure
 - Aqua-culture farming killed due to weight restrictions
 - Site selection process considers infrastructure in locating their business
 - Many companies evolve and produce different products
 - Food production and timber
 - New dairy – Montchevre (cheese)
 - Food production sites limited by capacity of nearby bridges
 - Restrictions may impact what time of year timber cutting occurs due to capacity
 - Access to Interstate highways
 - Depends on the type of business
- Not just business attraction is affected
 - Business expansion and investment has been directed to other states because of road/bridge capacity
 - Packaging Corporation of America (PCA) mentioned as example
 - Dairy operations will look at infrastructure before planning expansions
 - Timber harvesters identify routes as they plan the harvest
- Bridge issues include capacity (weight) as well as overhead clearance
 - Main routes / connectors
 - Also local road condition
- Good infrastructure as business retention/expansion tool
 - Attracting businesses because of willingness to invest
 - Municipalities sell access/location as part of business recruitment/marketing
 - Willingness to accommodate upgrades
 - Cost to repair/replace spans reduces viability of projects

- Economic Development Organizations have not been discussing local road/bridge issues
 - Regional leadership council / WHEDA / WEDC platforms
 - Rural counties around Dane County have manufacturing and other industries and they haven't raised this (bridge restrictions) as an issue
- Have local governments define/defend the engineering judgment for their posting decisions – rather than posting to just avoid heavy trucks on their roads
- Important to OS/OW
 - Important to get the loads out of the manufacturing facility
 - Lack of routes impacts facility location decisions
 - Minnesota Superloads routes – similar to WisDOT OS/OW corridor preservation efforts

Question 5

What factors should be considered in prioritizing local bridge projects?

- What information could your sector provide that would help WisDOT in a benefit-cost analysis regarding bridges?

- Economics
 - Monetize the amount of goods moving over a bridge to determine its value
 - Also identify the bridges that are the lowest cost to bring up to standards
 - Bring together the bridges of highest economic value and lowest cost to repair – fix those first.
 - Identify commodity corridors (including across state borders)
 - Identify high value trucks (loads)
 - End-to-end
 - Project complexity
 - Return on investment
 - Locations of consistent demand
 - Agricultural routes
 - Costs of rerouting
 - Iowa is studying rerouting costs
 - Model is based on crossing delay
- Economic development
 - Expedite projects connected with business developments
 - Are there factors other than bridge limits that restrict development?
 - How many companies/jobs are impacted?
 - Conduct a lost sales survey of local businesses
 - Has any development happened to increase freight traffic?
 - Job retention and creation
 - Engage with economic development organizations to help identify the priorities in each county
 - Could help with prioritization/conducting local business surveys
 - Counties ultimately organize the projects
 - Use traffic counts to help demonstrate economic impact
 - Freight-specific usage/tonnage numbers/value of products moving
 - Local traffic criteria
 - Overall usage
 - Use EMSI (NOTE: EMSI is a private/proprietary economic modeling package) to help identify sites where development is expected to occur

- Traffic impacts
 - Dependency - if there are bridges that provide the only way in and out of an operation, those critical bridges should be priorities
 - Identify pinch points
 - Locations of posted bridges
 - Can be in rural and urban areas
 - Distance to alternative route
 - Ability to use local road as alternate route to state highways
 - Also consider creating/improving lower-cost redundancy routes
 - Industry groups and local governments can identify future location-based needs
- Infrastructure condition
 - Worst first
 - Does WisDOT use electronic monitoring of bridges?
 - Sensors for bridges
 - Match methods and needs to the specific application
 - Match bridge fix to the lifespan of the roadway
 - Project streamlining
- Environmental impact
 - DNR is using business priority process as part of permitting
- Safety
 - Important to preserve/improve public safety
 - Access for fire/emergency response
 - Speeds
 - Traffic volumes
 - Population centers
- Stakeholder voices
 - Local feedback is important to identify priorities
 - Private sector can help drive discussion on priorities and needs, but is not participating in the larger discussion – how do we get them to share information?
 - Should loads be smaller to address weight issues?
 - Public/private partnerships could be a solution
 - 60% of local bridges are community projects
 - Protections to ensure equitable decisions

Part II: Inward Focus: FAC - Future Directions - Tabletop Discussions (2:45pm)

The information below reflects the results of the afternoon tabletop discussion session at the November 9, 2017 FAC meeting. Five questions were asked (bold text). Primary bullet-points reflect WisDOT staff's attempt to group responses by topic; secondary and tertiary bullet-points reflect language directly provided by FAC members.

Question 1

What does the Freight Advisory Committee do well?

- From WisDOT's perspective, successes include the elevation of freight as an important policy issue in Wisconsin, and confirming the importance and challenges associated with specific modal issues, such as preservation of Oversize-Overweight corridors.

- Talking with/listening to the private sector
 - It's a broad coalition – important voices are here
 - Inclusive
 - Diversity of stakeholders, interests
 - Allows connections/discussions across sectors, industries
- Key stakeholders who have interest in roles
 - Multiple stakeholders from multiple disciplines
 - Conduit to share information with association members
 - Important voices
 - Open to new ideas
- Process to receive feedback
 - WisDOT listens to private sector through FAC
 - Opportunity for WisDOT to get input on specific topics from various stakeholders
 - Good at identifying issues and opportunities
 - Committee is able to work with an agency
 - Assumes feedback is incorporated into WisDOT practices and plans
- WisDOT takes feedback seriously
 - Top-down support
 - Responds to and acts upon recommendations of committee
 - Intermodal subcommittee is example
- Facilitated/focused table-top discussions are very useful
 - Cover complex issues
 - Small discussions include everyone
 - Lots of time available to discuss issues in depth; not superficial
 - Get a diverse perspective – stakeholders from various backgrounds
 - Thought-provoking process
 - Emphasis on identifying issues and opportunities
 - Minnesota FAC does not do group discussions – information is one-way

- Educational component
 - Great agendas and presentations
 - Covering valuable new topics at every meeting
 - Educates on issues within specific sectors, and on Freight Plan
 - Examines alternative modes of transportation - multimodal
 - Diverse range of topics covered in-depth
 - Information exchange
 - Allows WisDOT staff to gain better perspective
 - Allows WisDOT to show/explain their practice
 - Gathering of data on topic background, then incorporating it into materials
 - Industry brings its expanded knowledge from its participants
 - Good at packaging information to non-experts
- Informed decision-making
 - Committee makes for a better understanding and provides an information basis with which to base investments
 - Problem-solving, or at least problem identification
 - Brought multimodal issues into the State Freight Plan
 - Trying to get to 'yes'
- Good job of looking at entire transportation system for freight from beginning to end
 - Multimodal – covered rail, truck, and ships
 - Good perspective of multi-regional players
 - Statewide perspective representing all levels of government and constituents
 - Coordination of state and local issues
- Seating assignments mix people
 - Have a cross-section from various areas (industries, other governmental units, etc.)
 - Good cross-functioning between groups
 - Breaks down barriers by bringing in all freight-dependent industries
- Common goals – get things in and out
 - Won't solve all problems – but good forum to start taking them on
 - Strongly recommended by federal law
- Networking
 - Access to a variety of WisDOT staff
 - Decision-makers
 - Area experts
 - Humanize and address issues
- Longevity and continuity
 - FAC started in WI before many other states
 - 3 years and 6 meetings shows collective support
 - Commitment to an ongoing process

Question 2

What opportunities are there to improve the Freight Advisory Committee, or what would you like to see the FAC do differently?

- Authority of the FAC
 - Could the FAC have a role in the funding of projects?
 - Could we create a budget that assigns funds to specific freight projects?
 - Give FAC the power to implement ideas
 - Ensure FAC is able to make policy recommendations
- Setting the agenda
 - Actively seek topics of interest from participants
 - Ask members for agenda topics 1 to 2 months in advance
 - Need subcommittees to drive the agenda of the FAC
 - Follow the schedule of the agenda better
- Pre-meeting information
 - Send agenda/white papers out farther in advance of meeting
 - Give questions in advance to follow up with field experts
 - Give members the chance to bring the 'Voice of Customers' to the meetings with advanced distribution of the questions – feedback from organizations
- Subcommittees
 - Create more subcommittees to focus on specific issues
 - Take a deeper dive into topics – some issues need more time
 - Use subcommittees to get you closer to implementation
 - Subcommittee to improve rail service and lower cost – some container shipping is \$700 more expensive (because of the cost to dray it elsewhere)
 - Have a subcommittee set up to review FASTLANE applications, similar to the process for reviewing Harbor Assistance Program applications
 - Would require meetings outside of scheduled FAC meetings
 - Potentially more drill-down subcommittee activities
 - Rail service issues and cost
- Tabletop process
 - Review questions better to ensure they better apply to attendees
 - Be judicious in what questions are in the tabletop – don't choose easy or obvious questions
 - Take a step back and see if questions being asked can be answered by data versus the expertise at the table
 - Tabletop exercises need to be well-curated
- Informational presentations
 - Have a process to bring in other/new voices
 - Provide more information about what WisDOT is doing
 - Agency report-outs (from other state/federal agencies)
 - Have legislators give updates to FAC (often, there can be a disconnection)
 - Bring in other voices
 - Specific businesses
 - Other states
 - Identify problems and have the opportunity to address and report

- Post-meeting information
 - Need quicker turn-around on minutes/meeting notes, with executive summary to provide to management
 - Use info-graphics to show outcomes – a “dashboard”
 - Allow for expert follow-up after meetings to clarify/provide accurate information and context for anything stated during the meeting
- Decision-making process
 - Can decision-making for projects be less centralized?
 - Address state transportation budget versus needs
 - Timing of budget decisions and conduit to decision-makers
 - Practical recommendations for policy/project selections
- Show where FAC makes a difference
 - Report back on how FAC feedback affected actual policy decisions at WisDOT and in the WI State Legislature
 - Concrete projects
 - Policy changes
 - Legislation
 - Funding
 - Identify specific changes to the State Freight Plan that were made due to FAC feedback
 - Concentrate on creating non-commodity-specific weight laws that are infrastructure-friendly (92,000 pounds on 6 axles)
- FAC membership
 - Broaden groups at the FAC – more input from private sector companies
 - Make sure shippers/carriers are well-represented, in addition to agencies, trade groups, and municipalities
 - Improve process to bring in outer voices
 - Solicit productive participants – have an ongoing process for continuous improvement / evolution of group
 - What about specific carriers – Schneider, JB Hunt, large shippers – could provide benefit for intermodal discussion
 - Have more/consistent rail participation, including Class 1 reps
 - Voices from other states
 - Minnesota FAC is largely private sector businesses
- Legislative presence
 - Need legislators from Standing Committee on Transportation to be present – what would get legislators to show up?
 - Disconnection in process because they are not here
 - Are our key legislators seeing what the FAC is doing?
 - Legislative presence needed to hear about issues (participation in moderation – don’t let FAC become their forum)
 - Need more elected officials involved
- FAC identity
 - Develop a branding/identify for the FAC

- Meeting location/coordination
 - Parking/logistics/location issues downtown
 - Return to Lussier Center
 - Have FAC meetings back-to-back with annual rail meeting
 - Desserts!
 - More potato chips and big chocolate chip cookies
- No change needed
 - I like it just the way it is

Question 3

Where would you like to see the Freight Advisory Committee focus its efforts in the future? What opportunities do you see to move forward?

- Are there specific modal topics that should be covered or re-addressed?
- Are there less-tangible freight-related issues that should be covered?

- Budget and other legislation
 - Funding picture that the legislature is considering for the transportation budget
 - Legislative updates
 - Legislative/policy changes that may affect freight transportation
 - Bring in legislators at least once per year
 - Have WisDOT legislative liaison report out to legislature
- Freight plan implementation
 - Narrow the focus to what's attainable; implementable
 - Ranking priorities (funding)
 - What can actually be accomplished
 - Voice in shaping decisions
 - Other regional/coalition plans
 - Help us move closer to implementation
 - Focus on obtainable goals
 - Get maximum returns on funding
 - Should be linked closer to efforts from the Governor's Office
- Land use planning and freight transportation
 - Connect local plans among local entities for corridor preservation efforts
 - Look at broader state & local plans
- Coordinating across the state and local borders
 - Look beyond jurisdictional borders for solutions
 - Are there ways we can work together to do that?
 - Jurisdictional gaps
 - Presentation on best practices from other states
 - Regional efforts to connect with neighboring states
 - Broader multi-state scope
 - "Mega Region" approach
 - Looking at development of regional plan
 - Freight doesn't recognize borders
 - Look at cross-state line issues that Ron Chicka brought up

- More in-depth subject review
 - Additional subcommittees or roundtables
 - More opportunities to take a deeper dive into specific topics/projects
- Discussion of specific department efforts
 - How to be a pro-active department
 - Dealing with adaptive management
 - Being responsive to economic changes
 - Are there ways to provide WisDOT more agility in addressing issues?
 - Have department report back on prior topics, if there's been movement or a change
 - Examples of how other states have changed – what drives it?
- Future trends discussions
 - Presentations on major trends or industry changes that impact freight
 - Technology
 - New investment
 - Dying/changing industries
 - Explore ways to provide WisDOT and local governments more agility in addressing emergent and emerging issues
- Technology
 - How technology could be used to improve/address freight issues
 - E-commerce and supply chains
 - Changing distribution center locations
 - Automated delivery/drones
- Plans of major companies and their statewide impacts/effects
 - Foxconn
 - Uline
 - Amazon
 - How does the infrastructure handle the changes these companies will bring?
- Implements of Husbandry – farm equipment issues
- Corridor preservation
 - Preservation of corridors via official mapping
 - Efforts on non-commodity specific OW laws
 - Preservation of OSOW corridors through local land use plans
 - Milwaukee and Madison are already looking at this
- Empowering the FAC
 - Mechanism to affect state budget
 - Use FAC to drive legislative direction
 - Report out what the FAC is doing
 - Use this information to influence where to spread the pot of money that the legislature has
 - Work with WisDOT's legislative liaison to give direction to the legislature
 - Provide materials to take back and update others
- Rail issues
 - Ways to improve rail in northern WI
 - Leasing operations to short lines

- Cold supply chain (refrigerated logistics)
 - Containers
 - Opportunities
 - Time-sensitive transportation
 - Challenged by train wait times in Chicago
- Intermodal
 - Continued intermodal discussion
 - Clearinghouse for container shipment information
 - Sub-committee report-out and next steps
- Efficiency
 - What supports an efficient freight system?
 - What are customer/business needs?
- Redundancy
 - Set policies for parallel routes so commerce isn't crippled by a single bridge
- Focus on how freight actually implements moves; bottlenecks
- Cultural aspects
 - Address culture and population change (demographics)
 - Roadbuilding that addresses population growth and commerce versus other ways and modes to remove congestion
 - How to prioritize
 - How decisions are driven
- Other issues
 - Truck Parking
 - Tolls
 - Status of air freight
 - Railroads
- Collegiality
 - Networking opportunity after meeting (or night before)

Question 4

As the Department continues to look for ways to improve communications and become more efficient in its activities, we continue to look for ways to incorporate private sector business best practices and develop partnerships where common interests exist.

One such possibility may be to hold events such as the Freight Advisory Committee meeting and the Governor's Freight Industry Summit on the same day (GFIS in the morning, FAC in the afternoon) in order to maximize the use of resources (staff, facilities, etc.) and increase communications between the two groups

Please share your thoughts on this potential partnership.

- **What concerns would you have should the two forums be held the same day?**
- **What, if any, benefits would you anticipate coming out of such a strategy?**

NOTE: If more than one FAC member made similar comments, the numbers in parentheses reflect the number of FAC members who those comments

- Attendance
 - Broaden the base
 - Good to combine by including more people
- Combining the meetings – in favor
 - Two-day combined meetings are good (5)
 - Co-scheduled is a good idea
 - Central location – Rothschild
 - Seemed to work well as two back-to-back events at central location
 - Good events over two days; works well - successful
 - Good networking; socialization opportunities
 - Value in evening informal networking
 - Synergies
 - Could increase participation statewide
 - Bring more factions together
 - Broaden the base
 - Probably get optimum attendance
 - The two-day event is effective but demanding on resources
 - Give-and-take in terms of resources
 - Back-to-back days rather than same day
 - Yes, if Summit serves as a way:
 - To present ideas to FAC for deliberation and refinement
 - To validate recommendations from FAC
 - To preserve the FAC role of finding solutions
 - Good idea, but maybe shorter meeting for the FAC
 - Do them the same day
 - Incorporate similar themes
 - 4 hour FAC meeting and shorter GFIS (2)
 - 2-day meetings OK
 - ½ days good; keep separate
 - Once short FAC meeting a year is OK
 - Same people need to plan both meetings
 - Different agendas for each meeting
 - Careful not to duplicate info
 - It might be hard to get it all done in one day but it is worth it
 - Benefit would be in cost savings
 - Cost savings for agencies, businesses
 - Can maximize resources
 - Kill two birds with one stone – time/money
 - Voice of customer
 - Plan it so it is done by 3:30
 - Opportunities to combine with other events
 - WisDOT Annual Rail Meeting (2)
 - Co-scheduling could be beneficial
 - Bring rail leaders to FAC
 - Possibly combine with Freight Rail Conference
 - Wisconsin Commercial Ports Association annual meetings
 - Agriculture groups

- Combining the meetings - opposed
 - Not enough time to do both same day
 - Maybe shortened agendas for each would not be as useful
 - If the combination makes the meeting longer, concern for people who day-trip to the meeting
 - While it would be nice to shorten the time, combining may not allow the time needed to get the best results
 - FAC is an event
 - If you turn it into a half day you may lose attendance
 - Length of meetings
 - Only end longer/later for the combined meeting
 - Keep FAC by itself (3)
 - Two different goals for FAC and GFIS
 - Summit goal is for reporting (WisDOT staff comment: it was not specified who was doing the “reporting”, or regarding what topic) and present ideas to FAC for deliberation and refinement
 - Also to validate recommendations from FAC
 - FAC role: solutions
 - Concern that it would divert the focus of the group
 - If you could focus the Summit on FAC topics...
 - Repetitive
 - Would require FAC members to attend the Summit
 - Concern about trying to cram too much into one day to combine the FAC and GFIS
 - Could artificially limit agendas and goals
 - Limits what can happen
 - Limit on time for discussion
- Agendas
 - If done – need to consolidate information into a concise package
 - Allow enough time to cover each event adequately in one day
 - There is a lot of cross-over
 - Too repetitive between meetings
 - GFIS is a larger group
- Materials
 - Simpler, more visual communication

Question 5

Was there anything in the summary of other states’ Freight Advisory Committees (provided in the Background Paper) that stood out to you as a positive feature that the Wisconsin FAC should consider adopting?

- Not enough time to review white paper
- Since the info wasn’t sent out in advance, we weren’t prepared to discuss this topic. In future, send out one month in advance.
- Didn’t read it
- Nothing specific