

Wisconsin Freight Advisory Committee Intermodal Subcommittee

Meeting Notes

June 8, 2018

9:00 AM - 12:00 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)
- Bo DeLong, The DeLong Co., Inc.
- Jack Heinemann, DATCP
- Peter Hirthe, Port of Milwaukee
- Larry Krueger, Krueger Lumber/Lake States Lumber Association
- Kelli O'Brien, Union Pacific Railroad
- Brad Peot, Watco/Wisconsin & Southern Railroad (WSOR; attending for Ken Lucht)
- Dr. Richard Stewart, UW-Superior

Subcommittee Members Attending by Phone:

- Tom Bressner, Wisconsin Agri-Business Association
- Ron Mazmanian and John Thomure, Aim Transfer
- Dr. Ernie Perry, UW-Madison
- Steve Rose, Hub Group/Logistics Council of Milwaukee

Other Attendees:

- Jason Murphree, Watco/WSOR
- David Ruehrdanz, Canadian Pacific Railway (by phone)
- Mark Sericati, Schneider National (by phone)
- Dean Prestegaard, WisDOT
- Dave Leucinger, WisDOT
- Matt Umhoefer, WisDOT
- Paul Chellevoid, SRF

Introductions and Review

The fourth meeting of Wisconsin's Freight Advisory Committee's Intermodal Subcommittee was held in Madison on June 8, 2018 at the DATCP headquarters building. Dave Simon greeted the attendees and gave an introductory anecdote from a meeting with Amtrak that he had just attended in Chicago, where Canadian Pacific (CP) managers were also in attendance. Those managers had just spoken with the railroad's internal forecasting unit on the company's projected volumes of intermodal traffic, which are forecast to grow by 25 percent within the next 12 months. As CP is trying to gear up for that demand, WisDOT recognizes that potential for overall intermodal growth in Wisconsin and wants to be part of the considerations – and influence - when it comes to locating a terminal. The timing is good for the Subcommittee; the momentum from the business surveys will build the next piece.

Following introductions of attendees and a review of the day's handouts, Simon briefly reviewed

Meeting #3 of the Subcommittee, held May 2, 2018. He then stated the agenda and goals for Meeting #4, including the Survey Development and discussion on what Section VIII of the Report (“How can the state’s potential for intermodal development be improved?”) should include. The idea is to get to solutions by focusing on the endgame early through brainstorming; we hope to make progress towards that.

In review of Meeting #3, Simon said that at that meeting, the Subcommittee felt we needed to invite participation by a steamship line, but that we needed to compile more data before bringing them into the Subcommittee; they are a big player in intermodal operations. The Subcommittee went over data assignments, including container shipping lanes and drayage/trucking costs. The group then began to go through development of the survey, including questions on current and potential use and connectivity. The current draft looked to be on the right track to allow us to develop the heat maps. That will help direct investment, although we know there is a lot of interest in investment now. The survey results should help push the investments further.

The Subcommittee also held a teleconference on Friday, May 25th, where it went over a draft slide presentation for the Freight Advisory Committee (FAC). Many of the Subcommittee members are also part of the parent FAC. At the May 30 FAC meeting, attendees heard from the home builders that they were having a boom; by contrast, the FAC heard that agriculture is struggling, and that the loggers are also having challenges. The FAC meeting included an overview of Foxconn developments, and then had a panel session on Air Freight. From that panel, the FAC heard several common themes to those we’ve heard through the Subcommittee – there are labor shortages, trucking/driver shortages, and air freight companies are having trouble getting into Chicago – waiting hours at O’Hare for their freight to be accepted by the air cargo companies. It’s analogous to the rail challenges. Matt Umhoefer asked if Aim Transfer had any drayage to/from O’Hare and Rockford, and if their experience matched the stories we heard from the Air Cargo Panel. Ron Mazmanian replied that they don’t go to Rockford, but they do have TSA-certified drivers to go to O’Hare. Aim hasn’t experienced congestion problems at O’Hare; they run around the clock and make many moves to and from Chicago at night, when it’s less congested.

Mr. Simon continued by noting the presentation on the efforts of the Subcommittee to the FAC went well, with good discussion. Bo DeLong asked if the final version of the FAC presentation could be shared with the Subcommittee. Matt Umhoefer said he would share the entire slide deck from all the FAC presentations with all Subcommittee members.

Survey Development

Mr. Simon continued with a review of the survey development process and the survey content. At the FAC, Simon talked about how important the efforts are. He said he sees the survey development as a three-part process. The first part is the content of the survey – what we’ve been working on; the meat of the Subcommittee’s work. We think we have the content nailed down. Next, there is the packaging – that’s what will be talked about at this meeting. Is the survey user-friendly? Is the software we have thought about – like Survey Monkey – the best method to view the survey? The last part is the distribution – how we get the survey to the right people. We’re looking to cast a wide net, and we expect many responses.

Matt Umhoefer noted the most recent version of the survey (as of the meeting) was Version 3.7; it has slight modifications from Version 3.1, which was sent out as part of the pre-meeting e-mail. He said that the introduction drafted is open to change; we can look to find ways to shrink the verbiage. We can also discuss whether the introductory language should be embedded in the survey’s web page or as part of

the e-mail. As far as the recommended packaging – if you see something to remove, let us know if you have thoughts.

Dave Simon said we've heard we need to have some way to 'hook' the recipient – this is what we're looking to develop. Larry Krueger said that if you're looking for a hook, shorter is better; Kelli O'Brien agreed. Mr. Krueger said the existing language was too much. Dave Simon replied that WisDOT was trying to strike a balance; we want critical information in there, and we want to highlight the most critical information. Mr. Krueger replied that the introduction needed to link to things that are important to the recipient – an opportunity to lower costs, and an opportunity to improve container availability. Kelli O'Brien said there needed to be a 'hook' line – what things would grab and keep the interest of the person reading the survey? Dave Simon asked if the subject line of the e-mail should be that link. Jack Heinemann said that the best hook would be through the wallet. In the link to the survey, we need to hit them with the pocketbook, right at the top. If the respondent has more questions, that person can read through the details at the end of the introduction.

Dean Prestegaard said the introduction should include who is doing the survey. Larry Krueger said the survey should identify the group that formed the survey – a combination of voices from industry, agriculture, and the railroads. Peter Hirthe said he would start the narrative by saying the business community has the opportunity to improve the state's transportation options that they haven't had before. Then in the second sentence, put the statement about the survey's goal right there. We need the goal stated before the link to the survey. The third sentence should start, "to get us to this goal,..." But the first line must say that this is an opportunity to improve freight. Bo DeLong said it should begin by mentioning the chance to improve both efficiency and costs. Then, identify who the group is behind the survey. Then, state the goal of the survey. Then, add the link to the survey. After that link to the survey, you can include the rest of the background information for the recipients, if they have interest in knowing that.

David Ruehrdanz said that there's value in identifying who you are working with in the introduction, and how you are working with them – especially the railroads. Bo DeLong suggested that the bullets in the introduction be more generalized to cover freight moved in intermodal containers by dropping the 'by rail' phrase. People might be confused and ignore the survey if they don't use rail within Wisconsin or if someone else handles their logistics. Small importers might not know their whole supply chain. Peter Hirthe said that we need to identify who we are on the Subcommittee – Class I railroads, importers, exporters – Subcommittee members are key stakeholders. The first three sentences should be – in order – the 'hook' statement, who we are as the Subcommittee, and the goal of the survey. Then post the survey link for those who don't want to read more, and put the rest after the survey link. Someone said that it was important to keep the survey simple; Bo DeLong and Kelli O'Brien questioned whether or not all the recipients would understand what defines "intermodal." Peter Hirthe suggested that a specific definition of "intermodal" be included in the bottom of the introductory page.

Dave Simon asked if it was OK to use the wording of "shipping containers" in the survey language; the group said that "boxes" or "containers" could be used; Peter Hirthe said use both – saying one is also known as the other. Bo DeLong said that once you get through the "goal" statement, the last paragraph and the bullets are redundant. Brad Peot asked if having a picture of a container to show the recipients would help. Matt Umhoefer said an image would need to be at a web page to be visible as a clicked link. Mr. Peot replied that if you sent the survey as an e-mail, you could have a picture embedded in the message. Then the recipient could just click on the survey. Of the people who get the survey, not all will be answering it right away, or answering it themselves. It will be passed along at a lot of companies. The

Subcommittee has to guard against multiple submissions. Dean Prestegaard said that will be managed by tracking the characteristics of the respondents. The survey will target respondents in an email “blast”; the characteristics of the firms will let us remove redundancies. We’ll also look at the role of the person responding – store managers’ responses won’t be as important as distribution center leaders’ responses.

Jason Murphree said the introduction needs to be concise; if they see a long introduction, they’ll think it’s going to be a long survey and won’t reply. We want to have a high response rate. Larry Krueger said we should send people to a web page link if they want more information. Bo DeLong said for brevity, he didn’t think a reference to the Port of Milwaukee survey is needed in the intro. Dave Simon said it seemed that the group agrees that the survey introduction should include a ‘hook’ line to attract a response based on cost savings, a brief identification of who is conducting the survey, and the goal of the survey – those three items plus a picture in the e-mail.

Paul Chellevoid wondered if the survey should state an approximate length of time to complete it. Jack Heinemann said that once people get into the survey, they will find they need to pull data – and that could take time. Dean Prestegaard said there’s technology that looks at the size of the survey and number of remaining questions to display the percentage of the survey completed. Dr. Richard Stewart said that a key item for him is to make sure that in the beginning, there’s a statement that all the data will be confidential and aggregated. Then, the survey needs to be beta-tested. Send it to some people we know, or do it ourselves, so we have answers to the questions – How long will it take to complete? Do the respondents need to gather data sets to complete the survey? Then, we will need to review the data we get on a spreadsheet to ask – is the data useful? We should tell the users of the data that it will be shared with railroads. As far as whether or not to ask about weights for the domestic intermodal – weight is neither here nor there. It’s the container count that’s important. Bo DeLong said he disagreed – container weight was important in his shipping. Dr. Stewart replied that years ago, he sent out a survey that asked for how much lumber is shipped by your company. He got responses in five different metrics – board feet, weight, value – it’s so critical to have a beta test before sending the survey out *en masse* so we can see if the answers we receive are really what we need.

Dave Simon said the survey may be available as a handout, but will be structured an e-mail. We will put it in the right format for e-mail. We will put in pictures and the WMC logo. We want it to look like a classy marketing piece. Cory Fish confirmed that WMC will have the software to do that, and that they will look at the survey companies to see what works best. There was discussion over whether Survey Monkey or a different survey tool would be used. Dave Simon said we will resolve these issues over the next few weeks. Jason Murphree asked what format was used in the survey done by the Port of Milwaukee. Peter Hirthe replied it wasn’t a deep dive into the data, just volumes of inbound and outbound containers. Jason Murphree said he thought a good response rate would be tough, given the large amount of information requested. Jack Heinemann said his estimate is that the survey would take ten to fifteen minutes. Peter Hirthe said it would depend on whether a company did both inbound and outbound, or both international and domestic. He added that when the Port of Milwaukee first sat down with the Class I railroads to look at the numbers from its survey, those were the first volumes the Port had in five years. It needed something recent to show the existing demand. That’s the least the Subcommittee can do to help railroads. The Port’s intent was always to do a deep data dive at a later point – officials knew they needed more in-depth data.

Dr. Stewart asked the Class I railroads if the survey would give them the information they needed. Kelli O’Brien said yes, this is the detail that Class Is need. She felt the Subcommittee captured most of what

railroads need with the questions. Peter Hirthe said that should be reflected in a disclaimer – that the quality of the survey depends on the quality of the feedback from survey respondents. The Subcommittee needs to emphasize that what is asked on the survey form is what it will take to improve the opportunities for intermodal freight. It will be helpful for the state’s businesses to prove what the demand is. That should be stated in bold. The survey is not meant to be quick. We can say what the number of questions is, and say we need that detail to make a data dive. The benefit/reward for the respondents is a potential facility and service in exchange for your time investment. Jason Murphree said we should be honest; that it won’t be quick. Mr. Hirthe replied that yes, but we needed the positive message that the data offers a real opportunity to improve the freight system for Wisconsin. Tom Bressner said he had nothing more to add; he thought the survey was good and liked the direction of the survey.

Dave Leucinger noted the importance of preparing the recipients before the survey is even sent out – so that rather than the survey being a “cold call” in their e-mail inbox, that the companies are looking forward to getting the survey. We expect that WMC and other members of the Subcommittee will cast the first “look for an upcoming survey” in messages to their members; we also should be sending more messages out to “cast ripples” for all the other companies not represented on the Subcommittee. Dr. Stewart agreed that we should send out an advance note that the intermodal survey is coming; it could encourage them to start getting together data that will be requested. Matt Umhoefer said he would be briefing all the state’s regional economic groups on June 12 with information on the survey, so they could in turn alert their members and communities. Jack Heinemann added that the June 12 forum encompassed the regional leadership of all groups, including city- and county-level.

Larry Krueger said he would include an e-mail and a cover letter from Lake States Lumber to his members and timber producers. Kelli O’Brien encourages a push through multiple groups. Jack Heinemann said his group also makes presentations to businesses, and as he collects business cards, he passes them on to Matt Umhoefer for his distribution list. Dean Prestegaard said that when we send out the notice of the upcoming survey, we can also start to vet out the recipients within the companies and establish what is to come. Ron Mazmanian said many companies have no traffic manager; their logistics staffs can be just two or three individuals. Mr. Prestegaard said our intent is to get to large groups, give them a form document that gives all the information, then that group can resend the survey and cover letter to its members. WisDOT doesn’t have a data base with contacts to every business. We need to use the business groups, and hope to use their networks to cover the state and filter out any redundancies.

Dr. Stewart said the reality is that most businesses don’t have 30 extra minutes to generate multiple responses; they’ll put the survey in the hands of one person. Peter Hirthe said it would be easy to initially reach out through the form letter, and have trade groups add a more direct appeal with a personal e-mail to their members, in which the sender says why this survey is important to the group. Jason Murphree asked if there was a goal for the number of responses. Matt Umhoefer said there isn’t a goal for the number of respondents, but that there needs to be a statistically significant number to allow WisDOT to extrapolate data. Dean Prestegaard said that the survey is asking responding companies to self-identify with the NAICS code of their primary industry. Once the survey is closed we can compare the number of responses from industries in that sector to the overall number of establishments in the state in that sector. Then we can find out what percentage of total firms responded, and we can do some extrapolation.

Dean Prestegaard said the team would re-craft the introduction, and put it in the WMC template. Dave Simon said the updated version would be re-shared with the Subcommittee. Matt Umhoefer said there

could also be a beta test before the next meeting. Dr. Stewart said that at the back of the survey, there should be some way for the respondents to see the results – a link to a website or a way to register to receive notification via e-mail. Matt Umhoefer said we could add a statement that the report's results would be available through both WisDOT and WMC.

Dean Prestegaard then discussed the NAICS code question and the ways to categorize the type of business responding. He said that this part of the survey would use a drop-down box where the respondent would find their primary industry and self-select their sector from short lists – either two- or three-digit level. We will also have a place where larger firms could add a secondary NAICS code. We'll also have a field for the size of the firm, by number of employees. It will help establish current business patterns, as different-sized businesses operate differently. Dr. Stewart asked, who is this data important to – the railroads, or WisDOT? Dean Prestegaard replied that we need to take a statistically-relevant sample to be able to say something about that industry. Dr. Stewart asked if this was another piece in the survey that the Subcommittee needs to get. He is concerned that the businesses will see this as a data-mining attempt and will stop right there. He's also concerned over how businesses will self-identify size – will it be just the operations at that location, or across the entire company? Whether the survey covers a branch versus a whole company, that difference is so critical. Dean Prestegaard said that's why we need to talk about the role of the person filling out the survey. Jack Heinemann said that a branch location may ship out of a different location than a headquarters location. To get accuracy, you would need to clarify in your questions if the employment number is just at the location of the stated ZIP code, or is it a number for the county, state, or country.

Jason Murphree noted that if you were to ask him about his company's employment, WSOR has 250 employees in Wisconsin; Watco has 4,000 employees around the country. That shows why the question needs to be clear. Bo DeLong said you need to at least separate Wisconsin employment from national employment. Brad Peot said he thinks that asking for the NAICS codes is a good idea, but he doesn't think business size is needed for what we're trying to capture. Some of the biggest rail users are not larger employers. Dean Prestegaard replied that economic impact is relative to the size of the firm, and employment is the best means of determining that impact. WisDOT's concern is that unless we get businesses of different sizes, we are only capturing a subset of industry. Jack Heinemann asked if employment levels matter to Class I railroads. Kelli O'Brien read through the existing categories – port of origin, port of entry, yard used, destination ZIP code, annual container volumes, and general contents – these are the items that matter to railroads.

Matt Umhoefer said that without the business size and NAICS data, WisDOT couldn't build extrapolated heat maps. So, if there were two maps – we could show one based on, say, 131 responses, versus a map that extrapolates volumes for all firms. Is there weight to producing that second map? Do the railroads trust those extrapolated volumes without doing the work themselves? Jason Murphree said the process becomes so subjective based on different assumptions, so the numbers can be easily modified. Kelli O'Brien agreed. David Ruehrdanz said he backed Kelli; employment has no relevance to railroad decision-making – volumes do. Jason Murphree said that in terms of extrapolation, each organization will do that on its own, and will conduct research on its own to follow up on the survey to see that the findings match the customers.

Peter Hirthe said he is going with Larry Krueger's message: keep it simple. Get the data first. That at the end of the survey – the last thing – once the data is entered by the company, then ask for information on the company, with the offer of allowing them to share contact information. But get the data first. Don't make it a requirement of the survey-taker to give the NAICS and business size first before they

share the data. Mr. Hirthe said he understood the reasons to ask such details – to validate codes and understand the businesses shipping. But do that last.

Dean Prestegaard asked if there were other characteristics we needed to ask about – how to ask about the role of the responders. Bo DeLong said that if he got the e-mail, he would be able to get 90 percent of the information in ten to fifteen minutes. Jason Murphree asked about data integrity – how do we ensure the survey goes to the person with the right role in an organization? Dr. Stewart said that if the Subcommittee is not going to confine the list of recipients, then it's important to do outreach through organizations such as the Council of Supply Chain Management Professionals and the Logistics Council to help properly direct the respondents. The survey will go out to many respondents; the Subcommittee needs to ensure against double- and triple-counting. So, we need to include the statement, "please submit only one survey for each operational location" – we need to indicate that somewhere. Matt Umhoefer said we can add that as a passage right before we link to the survey. There was more discussion amongst Dr. Stewart, Cory Fish, and Matt Umhoefer over how best to minimize the number of survey responses that overlap or double-count.

Peter Hirthe said that their surveys got the e-mail address of each respondent and cross-checked the companies responding to remove any double counting; the Port thinks there wasn't any significant problem with the data. It showed volumes three to five times higher than what had moved in the Port's peak year. The Port showed the numbers to Class Is – that there is greater demand now than ever before. At the end of the survey the Port asked people to provide an e-mail address if they wanted Port officials to follow up with them – about 95 percent gave us their addresses. The Port had the hook in its questions – expressing a willingness to engage with surveyed companies for future rail service. Then they volunteered. David Ruehrdanz said we can then look at domains to see if there are possible redundancies. Dr. Stewart said we can review the returns after the first 100 or so are collected – it should be easy to see redundancies. Peter Hirthe said that since Metropolitan Milwaukee Association of Commerce held the information for the Port, there were no concerns over public records disclosures. Matt Umhoefer confirmed that the survey would move the NAICS question to the end and add a place for respondents to include their e-mail addresses.

After a break, Matt Umhoefer resumed the review by asking if other changes to the survey itself were needed. Dr. Stewart said that the "ISO" designation for international containers should be included in the actual question for A1; it's first mentioned under (a), just below. Someone asked if in the vernacular of container sizes, is 53' automatically a domestic container, or are there 53' international containers? Dr. Stewart replied that this is where the survey will be challenged, since there's a growing use of transloading 40' international containers into domestic 53' containers just after they're brought onshore. You can get about 3 40' containers of goods into 2 53' containers, so that reduces the number of loads being brought inland. The contents are imports, even though they're brought by 53' containers. David Ruehrdanz said the basic sizes are 20', 40', and 53' and all can contain imports, even if they're transloaded at the dock. Bo DeLong said David makes a good point; international means 20' and 40' containers; domestic containers are 53' and usually use different ramps. Kelli O'Brien says for UP, it varies as to which ramps handle which containers; someone said the survey is fine as it is. Dr. Stewart noted there are a small number of 45' international containers; they're being phased out over the next two to three years.

Matt Umhoefer wondered in building heat maps if the maps should be built with TEUs or with containers, converting the 40' containers to 2 TEUs. David Ruehrdanz said there are small numbers of 20' containers; for the purposes of the heat maps, you don't need to convert. Each container is a move.

That's the real valuable information. Peter Hirthe asked if we are going to be able to aggregate container loads by ZIP code to display a density of containers by TEUs – will we also be able to pull up how many of each size are available at each ZIP in absolute numbers? Kelli O'Brien said that would be a great user function. Dr. Stewart said it could show that a location is really active – but it could give an inaccurate measure of capacity if you have a large number of 20' units inbound. You could have lots of empty boxes but the wrong size.

Bo DeLong asked – if I import product that is transloaded from 40' containers to 53' containers before it gets to Wisconsin, how do I account for that? Is it a domestic move or an international move? Peter Hirthe asked if we should add another column for these moves. Bo DeLong asked if there was a way to show transloads happening in Chicago – just like in the Inland Empire of California – where international containers never even make it to Wisconsin. David Ruehrdanz it would be good for the survey to add some verbiage to specify what we're asking, and relate that to what we're looking to do – which is to offer an alternative to Chicago ramps. Perhaps in the introductory paragraph we can talk about that situation – we don't want it to get lost. And the right column of the survey just offers a binary choice. Bo DeLong asked if we should count the load as what is done now. David Ruehrdanz said that if the load is put in a domestic 53' container in California and sent to Wisconsin, it's a 100% domestic move. If the ocean container is just for a port-to-port move, that's not an international move for the survey. Peter Hirthe confirmed it's a domestic move. Larry Krueger said, so when Kohl's brings its product into the ports in 40' containers and reloads them in 53' containers, that's what they're doing. Bo DeLong confirmed the question is – is the product coming into Wisconsin in 20' or 40' containers, in a 53' container, or in something different? David Ruehrdanz said yes, that's the determining factor.

Peter Hirthe said the shipper would have to decide to change containers from the 40' into the 53' as part of that move. But if there was an intermodal terminal in Wisconsin, perhaps they would bring the 40' containers in all the way. That is the potential. The Subcommittee can agree that some domestic loads are actually import/export loads on their way to/from transloading into a 40' container. But the importers would need to make the change to bring the 40' containers inland. The question, he asked, is if the survey shows big domestic container numbers to and from the coastal port ZIP codes, could that be evidence of a transload between 53' and 20'/40' containers? Brad Peot said the way the questions are laid out – the questions allow for those details to emerge. So, Kohl's would be replying to question A2 – that's where their responses would fall. Matt Umhoefer confirmed the question should be – how are they received by you? So that would put their responses from A1 into A2. Kelli O'Brien said that distinction is on the right track. David Ruehrdanz agreed. Bo DeLong suggested the addition of a line after A1(b) and A1(d) – 'do you have further comments,' which would allow respondents to explain if/how they transload any imports or exports. Also, to clarify, the (d) question for future use doesn't need 'Do not use;' that's redundant.

Discussion then moved to the "General Contents" column. Bo DeLong said the category will need to include need bulk agricultural products and logs...There might be 18 different codes to consider. But we should make it easy and focus on what the railroads care about. The survey can add waste paper and freight of all kinds (FAK). Someone mentioned a drop-down list that had 38 codes at the two-digit level. David Ruehrdanz said that level of detail is more important to the ocean carriers. He recommended adding hazardous materials and refrigerated/temperature-controlled items. Mr. Ruehrdanz and Kelli O'Brien agreed to cooperate on recommendations for general contents to be included on the drop-down selection list.

Jason Murphree asked for a clarification on the structure of the survey. Dean Prestegaard said that

depending on the survey tool, the structure of the questions could vary. Bo DeLong questioned the need for the “B” section (anticipated future use of intermodal). He felt the data in that part would be too subjective. If we are looking for what determines where a facility should be, then it should be based on section “A.” Dr. Stewart asked how WisDOT would present section “B” to the public. Peter Hirthe said that the report could do a separate heat map, showing where expansion of intermodal could be of interest. Jason Murphree said that the results from “B” would effectively be a pool of sales leads for the railroads. Section “B” also looks ahead to growth and expansion. Dave Leucinger said the intent in “B” is to explore not just if the companies surveyed in “A” plan on expanding along existing lanes, but expanding to different lanes and/or products shipped. Peter Hirthe said the Port of Milwaukee survey asked about future interest in intermodal as part of its survey, but the Port’s survey didn’t ask for details. Kelli O’Brien said once you get a company’s interest in intermodal, then you need to get to the details with them on service and cost. Brad Peot talked about how interested companies would be in using intermodal if other lanes were available to them that aren’t there now. Dave Simon asked how a shipper who filled a container every so often would navigate the survey. Peter Hirthe said that after filling out the “A” section, the respondent could answer whether or not they want more opportunities. If yes, the respondent would go to section “B;” if not, they would go to the end. Bo DeLong confirmed that the end of the survey would offer respondents the opportunity to add comments.

Bo DeLong said that at the end of the survey, where the NAICS codes questions will be, the survey should have the name of the person to contact for questions – right there in the survey. He suggested including examples of survey responses to the survey recipients. Dean Prestegaard said that as an electronic survey, that including those items would require some work. Jack Heinemann said that the Subcommittee should beta test the survey with people not on the Subcommittee, to see if they understand what we’re asking for. Peter Hirthe asked Ron Mazmanian if Aim Transfer had customers they would volunteer as beta testers. Mr. Mazmanian replied that yes, they have good customer contacts; Mr. Hirthe joked that he expected Aim would be good at strongly encouraging them to fill out the surveys. These close contacts with shippers can be used to the advantage of the Subcommittee. Mr. Mazmanian asked for the beta version to be sent to him when it was ready to be tested.

Dr. Stewart re-stated that in questions B1 and B2, the weight of contents was irrelevant; the trailer volume was critical. He suggested that for clarity, the column should be labeled as 53’ trucks (to remove consideration of twin 28’ trailers and similar configurations). David Ruehrdanz agreed that the weight was a moot point, and that the 53’ length applies to both rail and trucks. Matt Umhoefer asked if there would be another way to estimate the volumes in that column. David Ruehrdanz said that it’s important the survey defines “intermodal” for the shippers/survey recipients. There are companies that won’t have large volumes of items that can move to intermodal; in reality, most of these companies probably won’t make any changes. Peter Hirthe said that the need to define intermodal makes it important to funnel the survey to the right person at the targeted companies.

Matt Umhoefer noted interest in the Subcommittee by Representative Steffen of Green Bay; Schneider National is located in his district. Mr. Umhoefer asked Mark Sericati from Schneider if Rep. Steffen was up to date on the Subcommittee’s efforts. Mr. Sericati confirmed that Rep. Steffen had seen the notes from the Subcommittee meetings and was in the loop.

Peter Hirthe asked about the distribution list for the survey and the timing of its anticipated distribution. Cory Fish replied that of all the survey tools reviewed, the one that was best able to perform the survey was Survey Monkey; it was also the one most in-line with the price range. Dean Prestegaard said the Northwoods Freight Rail Study serves as an example of how the survey will be generated. The use of an

online survey for that study required WisDOT to put the survey in the proper format, while trying to keep the context the same. The survey development wasn't an obstacle. Paul Chellevoid said qualifiers displayed to the survey takers could be included in the survey itself – such as number of questions remaining or number of minutes to go. There are a number of points in the survey where, depending on how you answer, it kicks you to other parts of the survey. Then, for the survey-taker, it's just a matter of clicking or using the drop-down boxes. Every question can be edited while the survey is in the beta form; it's easy to change.

Matt Umhoefer asked if WMC would be ready once WisDOT makes its final edits from the Subcommittee's recommendations. Brad Peot asked if that meant ready for beta testing. Mr. Umhoefer said no, to go live. He then said that we may need to come back to the Subcommittee between meetings to get approval. Someone asked how long the survey would be open – 45 days? 60 days? Dave Simon said we can keep the survey active even after the official "close" date to capture additional data. Peter Hirthe said if the survey were to start during the week of July 4, then a 60-day window would allow it to remain live until just before Labor Day. He asked if we'll be able to track the responses in real time and know at any given time the number of responses. Paul Chellevoid asked if there would be a dashboard for tracking. Matt Umhoefer said it would be monitored through WMC. Cory Fish asked if the survey would be sent to a closed universe, or open to a larger pool. Mr. Umhoefer said the volume of survey results would be open-ended. Dean Prestegaard said there will be a live dashboard for the Survey Monkey survey. The specifics of what might be reported could be different, but could include the number of total responses, the number of importers responding, and the number of exporters responding.

Peter Hirthe said if the survey goes out after July 4th, it would be nice for the Subcommittee to review the status of responses at the August meeting to see where we stand. Paul Chellevoid said that would also be an opportunity to see if the questions are getting the answers we are seeking. Mr. Hirthe said that the Port and its partners sent their survey out a second time last year to try and increase responses, and had a significant number of new responses back from their shippers. Bo DeLong asked if the survey can be edited if it is determined a question isn't getting the desired response. Paul Chellevoid said that yes, editing is possible for questions and answers, which is especially good if there are two responses from the same company. Brad Peot said if we are short of the goal number of survey responses, we will need to target the major shippers to see if we get responses – and Cory Fish will need to push the responses up. If we meet in August, we can look at the numbers then and see if we will need to help him push the response rate up.

Jack Heinemann mentioned potential problems with anonymous e-mail addresses – that's a problem if a lot of companies or large volumes get included in that category. Peter Hirthe said that as gatekeeper, WMC should know whether the responses have identifiers. Brad Peot said someone needs to maintain identities of who is responding; someone else replied that we don't know if the survey can do that and still allow the respondent to remain anonymous. Peter Hirthe said it would be a challenge if there is no other data or a code to confirm identity. That could be a problem if there is redundancy with the questions. The survey needs to ask for voluntary identification and see what responses come back.

Dr. Stewart recommended the survey include a profile of the product categories for the NAICS codes. He asked how the survey will define "annual" for the volumes. Is it for the past year? For the last calendar year? After some discussion, the Subcommittee agreed it should be for the 2017 calendar year. Dr. Stewart also said that the data receives may require the report outline to change.

Cory Fish asked how close is WisDOT to sending out information on the survey. He would like to send something in advance to his members asking them to be ready with NAICS codes and data. Matt Umhoefer replied that he has briefed the regional economic development organizations, and he has identified all of them so they will be able to blast the survey link to all their contacts. Peter Hirthe said he'll work to employ the same mechanisms that were used for the Port's survey; he'll send a blast notice in advance to all the contacts from the Port survey to let them know about the Subcommittee survey and he will use the same effort to promote responses. David Ruehrdanz said he thinks everyone needs to route things via WMC, or we might get five different survey responses; he worries if everyone makes a different pitch. Dean Prestegaard replied that the intent is to allow redundancy to come in, as long as we identify the right person to receive the survey. WisDOT will not try to control how far the survey distribution goes; we'll deal with the results on the back end.

Paul Chellevoid said one challenge will be that without a list of all the survey recipients, we won't have any ability to calculate a response rate. Dean Prestegaard said that still, we will be able to have an overall count of responses. Brad Peot said he can give the survey team a list of WSOR's "heavy hitters" that should directly receive the survey; he will also personally follow up with each of them. Peter Hirthe said the survey should be good as long as 80 percent of the data is not redundant. If there are items that look to be duplicated or where our confidence isn't there, we may need to err on the side of undercounting. Paul Chellevoid said he's hoping for 95 percent without duplication; people who want intermodal options will fill out the survey. That would mean minimal cleanup.

Brad Peot said that when we ask the respondents for a phone number or e-mail for follow-up, we need to convey to them that it's very important for the survey to get the most accurate determination of container volumes. Paul Chellevoid said that the respondents may not give their ZIP code but may say what county they're in. Bo DeLong asked to confirm what location information will be tied to the company and the data. Peter Hirthe said that it will be just as with the Port of Milwaukee survey; the confidentiality comes from WMC keeping the raw data, and all that data will be aggregated before going public. The end of the survey will include the question, 'can we contact you if we have further questions on your responses?' and the open invitation, 'if you would like us to notify you when the final report is ready, please include your e-mail address here.' Jack Heinemann said we should add 'or if we need more detail' to the question. Peter Hirthe said the Port survey also said the information provided would be gatekept, and that the respondent would only be contacted if more information or clarification was needed. The Port also reached out to companies to encourage their interest by framing intermodal service as a growth opportunity.

Dave Simon said the next steps will be the modification of the survey based on the feedback from this meeting. The revised survey will be sent out in a few days, and we'll also talk about other next steps in that e-mail. We didn't get to discuss the content of Section VIII of the report outline; we may get to it next meeting. We'll look at government roles for things like permitting, and private sector roles as well. Kelli O'Brien said she had some trepidation about coming into the Subcommittee, but the notes brought her up to speed, so it was easy for her to jump in.