

Wisconsin Freight Advisory Committee Intermodal Subcommittee

Meeting Notes

September 7, 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)
- Brian Buchanan, Canadian National Railway Company (CN)¹
- Bo DeLong, The DeLong Co., Inc.
- Jerry Deschane, League of Wisconsin Municipalities
- Peter Hirthe, Port of Milwaukee
- Shirley Malski, UW-Oshkosh Small Business Development Center (SBCD)
- Ron Mazmanian, Aim Transfer
- Brad Peot, Watco/Wisconsin & Southern Railroad (WSOR; attending for Ken Lucht)
- Steve Rose, Logistics Council of Milwaukee
- David Ruehrdanz, Canadian Pacific

Subcommittee Members Attending by Phone:

- Brian Jackson, JUSDA
- Larry Krueger, Krueger Lumber/Lake States Lumber Association
- Kelli O'Brien, Union Pacific Railroad
- Dr. Ernie Perry, UW-Madison

Other Attendees:

- Mark Berndt, Quetica (by phone)
- Luke Kvapil, Federal Marine Terminals
- Latrice Rice, Union Pacific
- Mark Sericati, Schneider National (by phone)
- Steve Spensley, Lafayette County Board
- Ben Zietlow, Quetica
- Dean Prestegaard, WisDOT
- Dan Thyges, WisDOT
- Jung Song, WisDOT
- Dave Leucinger, WisDOT
- Matt Umhoefer, WisDOT
- Paul Chellefold, SRF Consulting
- Andy Mielke, SRF Consulting (by phone)
- Chris Ryan, SRF Consulting (by phone)

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.

Greeting and Agenda

The seventh meeting of Wisconsin's Freight Advisory Committee's Intermodal Subcommittee was held in Madison on September 7, 2018 at the DATCP headquarters building. Dave Simon welcomed the attendees, noting that Co-Chair Cory Fish had a scheduling conflict and was unable to attend; Mr. Fish, however, did provide notes. Simon added that the survey had been out for several weeks, and that there would be a report on the progress and status of that survey at this meeting. He reflected that the Subcommittee has come a long way, and has made a great team. Much has been learned along the way.

Simon noted that there would be a change in the meeting date for the October Subcommittee meeting. The date would be changed from October 4 to a date later in October (NOTE: this was later determined to be October 24). This will allow for more time to write the Subcommittee's report, and more time for the report to be reviewed by WisDOT's Secretary's Office. There will be time for the Subcommittee to review the report, before and after the meeting of the full Freight Advisory Committee (FAC) on November 15th. In determining a revised timeline, WisDOT staff "worked backwards" to ensure there would be time to comment. Once we get the feedback from the FAC, we will then finalize the report. The goal is to make this a data-driven report. We would like to furnish potential investors with data so they can determine the best opportunities for terminal locations.

New Attendee Introductions

Dave Simon then asked the attendees to go around the table and introduce themselves. Though he had attended via teleconference previously, this meeting was the first time Ron Mazmanian, from Aim Transfer, was able to attend in person. He said his company moves around 300 drayage loads per day to and from the Chicago terminals. Luke Kvapil from Federated Marine said his company operates 13 terminals in the United States, doing cargo loading and unloading of vessels, including at the Port of Milwaukee. He is interested in opportunities to revive intermodal service at the Port of Milwaukee, and for Federated Marine to be an operator of the container terminal. Ben Zietlow of Quetica mentioned he had spent five years as part of the Midwest Area Freight Coalition (MAFC) with Ernie Perry; his background and duties are in freight research and analysis. Zietlow introduced Mark Berndt from Quetica, who was on the phone. Berndt said he had spent 15 years with MNDOT before joining Quetica; the company has clients across the Midwest in Minnesota, Iowa, Illinois, and Nebraska. The company has been accumulating and processing data on intermodal traffic through bills of lading, and now has more than 15 million data points that can help in making decisions for where to site operations.

Latrice Rice from Union Pacific said she had been part of her company's Intermodal Unit for five years, and is based out of Chicago. She is supportive of WisDOT's efforts and wants to hear more. She noted that she and Peter Hirthe at the Port of Milwaukee had been in regular communication with each other over the past two years. Dave Simon reminded new attendees that the notes from the last six meetings are online and are thorough.

August Meeting Recap

Simon then recapped the August Subcommittee meeting. At that meeting, there was discussion on the growth of the Subcommittee; this has been a complex issue, since there has been the potential that many people want to be involved and contribute. The new Subcommittee members were introduced: Chad Olson from Hapag-Lloyd; and Brian Jackson from JUSDA, the logistics arm of Foxconn. The Subcommittee also welcomed Steve Spensley as a guest; he is looking to develop an intermodal operation at Prairie du Chien, among other business ventures. Simon's recap also noted the survey was anticipated to be open until September 14; preliminary maps and test results were to be made available at the September Subcommittee meeting.

The August meeting also included discussion of data services such as Datamyne and PIERS, and what value they might have in providing data for container movement in Wisconsin. The Subcommittee agreed that if any of those sources would be used, that data would be compiled and kept separate from the survey results. The most likely use of such data would be to identify what locations and/or industries were missing from the survey. The Subcommittee also discussed how to improve partnerships.

At the August meeting, Chad Olson talked about the role of the container pool in container management for the liner services, and identified the three potential directions for empty containers: to be reloaded at or near the terminal; to be sent to a container yard to await a container request for an exported load, or to be reloaded as an empty on a rail car, when capacity allows. Other items discussed included the roads to and from intermodal terminals, and the use of overweight permits along those roads to increase potential container capacity (by weight) for imports and exports alike. The Subcommittee discussed how trucking drayage and shortline railroads can help to extend the reach of intermodal service, whether the freight is bulk and is being trucked to a freight transload facility, or if the shortline is operating a container shuttle service to and from a Class I railroad. Matt Umhoefer said the final version of the August notes should have been received by members for their review; the final version of the notes will be posted to the web once Subcommittee members have a chance to offer corrections.

Survey Update

Next, Dave Simon gave an update from Cory Fish on the progress of the survey results, as compiled by Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce (WMC). In the note from Fish that Simon read, it stated that as of the close of business on September 6, 121 responses had been received. Half of those came during the first week the survey was open. That is significantly less than were anticipated. Fish's note said WMC would step up its outreach to its members, and talk to them about why the survey is important and what the members should do to contribute results. Bo DeLong asked Peter Hirthe how many responses the Port of Milwaukee/Metropolitan Milwaukee Area Chamber received in its survey from last year. Hirthe replied that there were about 110 responses, out of a group of over 1,000 companies that received the survey. Dave Simon said that Fish's note said the average survey time took seven minutes, versus thirteen minutes for the beta test. Hirthe said that may suggest that large shippers are not completing the survey, since it should take them longer to make the entries.

Dave Simon said he also didn't believe that many large shippers had filled out the survey. He said that WisDOT and the Subcommittee could brainstorm a large list of potential shippers and work through WMC to encourage them to participate. He also said the survey completion rate was only 55 percent, which is not high and indicates there were many incomplete surveys. He then posed some rhetorical questions. What do we do? Why are the responses low? Perhaps many businesses don't do the survey right away; they may put it on their calendar to be done just before the deadline date. We're hoping for a surge at the end. We have a respectable response rate and expect it to improve. The data is what it is; it will have value and allow us to write the report. He then asked the Subcommittee members to comment.

Dean Prestegaard said that when the survey team will go through the survey results, it will be looking for the NAICS codes of the businesses to learn which industries submitted data to the survey, and which didn't respond. Brad Peot said he sent personal e-mail to several companies. Some said they didn't get any messages when the survey started, so there's a question of whether the survey e-mail and links are getting to the right people. That indicates the Subcommittee members need to reach out to their personal contacts. And there are some operations going through changes – like the Wisconsin Paper

Council. He thought that e-mail sometimes overwhelms people; he suggested personal calls or other ways of getting in touch would make a difference. Prestegaard and Matt Umhoefer said the count of surveys received has grown from 109 to more than 120 in the last couple of days, so those calls may have helped.

Brad Peot said some of the people he reached had said they hadn't filled out the survey; some weren't sure if they received the survey or not. One problem is it's difficult to determine if the low amount of returns is a distribution problem or a matter of the survey being cumbersome and intimidating. Jerry Deschane said he had seen multiple notices about the survey from WMC, so he didn't think that distribution was the problem. He thought the target audience had been reached. Bo DeLong asked Peter Hirthe if he had any record of the shippers who filled out the Port of Milwaukee/MMAC survey, to compare that list with those who filled out the WisDOT/WMC survey. Hirthe replied that he would need to work with MMAC to get the list business names; some who filled out the survey did so anonymously. He said he would contact MMAC - Katie Henry, specifically - to see if they could supply that information. And the Port or MMAC could then ask those businesses to fill out the WisDOT survey, or update their MMAC information by giving us the origin/destination ZIP codes of their shipments. Hirthe said that's where he would start. He added that he has also reached out to the Port's 11 foreign trade zone contacts, who in turn say they have forwarded the survey to the proper contacts. He mentioned some company names – Mercury Marine, Broan-Nutone, CNH, and Foxconn.

Bo DeLong said another challenge is that local managers no longer have the ability to respond on behalf of their company. He said he has contacted area companies and they reply, 'oh, you need to talk to our South Carolina office.' The businesses might have seen the survey, but the people who decide on intermodal shipping – or on whether to submit the survey – are in places like Bentonville, Arkansas. We have Aim Transfer as a local operator and member of the Subcommittee; they have the largest drayage volumes of any company between Wisconsin and the Chicago yards. DeLong asked Ron Mazmanian if any of the companies he serves sent on the survey information to their corporate offices. Mazmanian mentioned In-Sink-Erator, then said he would make a list of companies and people he has as clients, and WMC can follow up with them.

Bo DeLong said he wasn't sure how much Brian Buchanan, David Ruehrdanz, or Latrice Rice knew about the Beneficial Cargo Owners (BCOs) who were their customers, but perhaps they might know what products their customers are moving to Wisconsin. If so, the survey team can take it from there. The steamship lines and freight forwarders could also be approached, but this would have to be within a week to keep the survey deadline. DeLong said he could reach six or seven lines and ask his contacts at each if they could help identify the top importers into Wisconsin.

Dave Simon asked if a final e-mail reminder needed to be sent out on Monday. Steve Spensley asked how many e-mail requests were sent out. Matt Umhoefer said the idea for the survey was that it wouldn't just be one message sent to a company, but that WMC would be the starting point – asking other recipients to forward the e-mail and ask that it be sent to their field of contacts. DATCP sent 3,000 messages to businesses on September 6; the number of recipients is not a closed, set number. Dean Prestegaard said the idea for survey recruitment was to develop a "daisy chain," starting at WMC, and working through associations and individual businesses in a wide blast. Links to the survey were to be repeated through Twitter and LinkedIn. Prestegaard and Shirley Malski briefly conversed about Malski's LinkedIn posts asking her contacts to take the survey; she was promised different pictures to use for her posts so they would not look like the previous posts. Dave Simon said the initial WMC distribution went to about 3,800 contacts. Umhoefer said recipients included all the FAC members, regional economic

groups, and MPOs and RPCs. We asked WisDOT's contacts to send this out to their circle of contacts, but we can't confirm where the messages go after we initially send them. The FAC said an intermodal policy was its most important priority in the Wisconsin State Freight Plan. Now is where they need to demonstrate that.

David Ruehrdanz said he agreed with Brad Peot that the survey team needed to target the large shippers. He said if the subcommittee thinks any of them are Canadian Pacific customers, he will go to his account reps in Canada to ensure they are contacted. Jerry Deschane said he and Cory Fish had tried to contact the large retailers and had difficulty getting through the front door. They have different supply chain flows than other operations.

Example Analysis of Results

Next, Dean Prestegaard led discussion of the data received to date through the survey, the problems encountered in preparing and validating the data, and how the data converts into a visual display. He said that the Subcommittee could be shown the data, but it's a very large and long matrix within Excel – a long string of data. It's a large table with columns that have separate iterations and often include multiple entries, depending on how the survey answers were entered. For the first table, an automated process was developed for the long string of data. The fields measured volumes, then materials, then quantities, and then destinations. He then displayed a table showing the responses for domestic outbound shippers.

Prestegaard said that once the data tables were constructed, the volumes were consolidated to the ZIP code level. He then showed a short data table of the ZIP codes that report actual shipments of domestic outbound intermodal containers. That table is one of eight tables for the survey. From the table, the volumes and ZIP codes are fed into ArcGIS and plotted on maps. There are some concerns we have that some ZIP codes are for very sparsely populated areas; others, in urban areas, are very small relative to other locations. The challenge is how to show equivalency of volumes with the different sizes of ZIP code areas.

Dave Simon said one option could be to not outline the ZIP code areas, but to use symbols or shapes to indicate the volumes, and center those symbols within the ZIP code area. Matt Umhoefer asked if there could be a way to use gradients to show the volumes. Simon said there may be a need to show detailed, specific information, especially in southeastern Wisconsin. The readers of the maps don't need to know which ZIP code is which, but they need to see there is a decent amount of freight volume. Umhoefer asked if the maps didn't break down the volumes by ZIP, how large an area should be aggregated? David Ruehrdanz said the entire southeastern Wisconsin area could be aggregated, up to Manitowoc. Brad Peot said aggregating by ZIP is fine, but if there's a bigger number of ZIP codes in an area, then aggregate by county. Dean Prestegaard said the survey team is going through a process to determine how best to display the data.

Prestegaard then displayed the heat map of the outbound overseas container shipments. He summarized the data, including the TEU volumes. Bo DeLong said something was wrong with that map; he didn't see the data he submitted on the map. DeLong said that he wanted to look at the data; he expected to see four locations which he decided to identify as the locations where the exports originated. He added that he estimated exports of about 8,000 containers; he separated that total into four groups of 2,000 containers, each in different parts of the state. The map showed a large volume (8,000 to 10,000 containers) centered at the ZIP code for Friesland; DeLong said that could be his data, and that he had not separated the volumes as he had thought.

Matt Umhoefer asked the Subcommittee if the rail overlay on the maps was valuable. He said he thought that showing where the rail lines are, relative to the locations of highest intermodal container volumes, would be helpful. Dean Prestegaard added that even if you just put major highways on the maps, they become too busy and cluttered. Peter Hirthe said that for the purpose of the report, railroad lines are the logical overlay. It makes sense to show where the railroads are, relative to the loads. Jerry Deschane said the maps all assume highway access to the railroads. Peter Hirthe replied that point was moot; shippers need to have rail access for imports and exports. Local roads help provide local distribution.

Dave Simon had an observation on volumes in sparsely-populated areas. Steve Spensley said he thought the Prairie du Chien location would be viable with Cabela's. Transloading could also work. Bo DeLong said viability is also a factor of from which port any exports leave. Peter Hirthe asked if the data showing an abnormally-high volume could be in the wrong column. DeLong said someone will need to confirm the largest-volume entries. Dean Prestegaard said there will be a lot of rectification; also, the survey team plans to group the results by commodity/product, so we can see which sectors we have represented, and which we don't. Someone asked what the product was at a specific ZIP – for 53821, the stated export was scrap metals. Simon said the team will need to do extensive checking of the data, and work through the mechanics of the survey results. Prestegaard said that there will be a step-by-step process to go back and look at the results in more detail.

Dave Simon asked about the map of potential shippers – did anything on that map jump out to the Subcommittee? Brad Peot asked if these were all current employers. Jerry Deschane said he noticed Menards is not on the map. Bo DeLong said there should be a lot of activity in Pleasant Prairie, in Kenosha County. Deschane asked if distribution centers used intermodal shipping. DeLong said that happens sometimes. He added that Amazon and Uline would be two companies he would expect to see there, and they are not showing up. The survey is missing a lot of important data. If Aim Transfer brings 300 containers up from Chicago every day, that's 75,000 containers a year – the responses show very little of that. That's a tremendous amount of important data that the survey is missing.

Dean Prestegaard returned to the question of how to encourage a last wave of responses in the final open period for the survey. He asked if we should use the poster image (from the survey page) to place in LinkedIn and other social media outreach. Shirley Malski said yes. Brad Peot noted that the existing survey maps showed nothing from the Green Bay/Fox River Valley area that listed 53' domestic containers, but New North [the region's economic development organization] states the Fox Valley is the state's second-largest region for exporting.

Bo DeLong said he had concerns with the deadline of September 14th; there are a lot of businesses that had not filled out the survey. Peter Hirthe asked how long can the survey go? Can the deadline be stretched out? Dean Prestegaard said that how long it can remain open depends on how long the analysis will take and still meet the deadlines for review before the FAC meeting. We can estimate that time; the design of the data tables and mapping is there. Dave Simon added that extending the open window for the survey doesn't affect the development of the written report. He agreed there are holes in the data, and he asked the Subcommittee for guidance on what to do. Do we want to reconsider using data from other sources if there is no survey data? We have other sources we can turn to. Do we add it in, or do we keep the survey purely from the returns? The question matters, because in cases where we know there is traffic – such as in Green Bay – should we go to the services to get the data, and then include a disclaimer?

Bo DeLong replied that we should consider two sets of maps and tables – the first one using the actual data, and the second with the added data and analysis to create the maps. David Ruehrdanz said the survey team needs to be very careful in how it applies the added data. For example, Amazon’s imports for the region all go to a warehouse in the Chicago area – so the imported products that Amazon brings to Pleasant Prairie always come from Chicago. That won’t change until Amazon’s business model changes. Trucking moves back and forth between the distribution centers and the import warehouses; the buildings surrounding BNSF Joliet all supply the distribution centers of companies throughout the Midwest. Trucks will always be used for those moves. The Joliet area is one of ten import warehouse districts in the United States; there are perhaps 500 distribution center clusters. Dean Prestegaard said that if we bring in data from the services, it needs to be very clear that the cargo destination’s end address is what is needed, not the corporate headquarters address.

Peter Hirthe suggested the survey team builds the tables and maps as best as it can, using the firsthand data from the survey. Then, the team can develop overlays, if the team adds in more data sources and container density. He said he felt that more survey responses were needed. If more data is needed, it should be based on real-time, current criteria. The report would also need to make a clear differentiation – make one set of maps just based on the collected data. It’s also important to pick one source and one method for the overlay mapping. The report needs to justify what is being shown. Someone asked Peter Hirthe if the Subcommittee report could cross-reference the companies that responded to the Port of Milwaukee/MMAC intermodal survey – comparing last year and this year? If those companies that responded last year but not this year were contacted, the Subcommittee could make a personal appeal to follow up on their entry from last year. Hirthe said he would do that, and take on the engagement. Steve Rose suggested taking a snapshot of the current maps to use as a demonstration of how few responses have been received, and resend the invitation to participate.

Bo DeLong said if there were interns available, you could get a good idea of volumes by stationing them on I-94 and I-90 at the state line – and for a week, just count the number of 40’ and 20’ trailers coming into and leaving the state. You should get at least 200 per day on each route. Almost all the inbound containers will be for Wisconsin; very few go from Chicago to Minneapolis. You could also count the 53’ containers as well. Dave Simon said that he used to work in the unit with the responsibility for weigh-in-motion (WIM) equipment. He said there are cameras that photograph every inbound truck. Trucks are weighed by the WIM system. Then the photo is taken, and weights are compared with the number of axles to determine the load per axle. If the load is too heavy, the vehicle is identified and instructed to enter the weigh station for a more accurate weigh measurement. There may be some way to go through the WIM data to get useful information, although there could also be some restrictions on its use.

Bo DeLong said if the survey team had data for a seven-day period, there could be a way to quantify the inbound intermodal container weights – and see how many containers come in empty versus loaded. It would be great if someone could figure out how to get this data, and see how many loaded boxes are entering the state. The survey team won’t be able to know the areas where the containers are going, but we will be able to get the inbound volume data – especially for imports. He said on his way to this meeting, he saw 30 containers on I-90. Dave Simon said the software is web-based; it takes time to load each image – so it’s not a matter of quickly clicking through images to identify which have intermodal containers. It would be a labor-intensive exercise.

Steve Rose asked if railroads don’t already have the waybill information for the containers. David Ruehrdanz said that the information is incomplete; the waybills list the railroad terminal where the

container leaves the rail, but not the container's final destination. It would show all the CP containers going to Wisconsin as terminating in Bensenville. Someone mentioned Datamyne as an alternative; Latrice Rice said Datamyne lists the headquarters of the business, but not necessarily the physical address of the cargo destination. It would be a problem to try and make assumptions about what that destination really is. The survey results need the actual destination of the containers.

Dave Simon said that WIM is only a pre-screening tool to help process which trucks need to be officially weighed. WIM reads 100 percent of the trucks on the Interstate highways, but isn't legal for enforcement. A citation can only be issued for trucks weighed at static scales. Steve Rose asked if there were also cameras on I-41 at the Lake Butte des Morts bridge. Bo DeLong asked if the system can distinguish between a 53' container and a standard 53' trailer.

David Ruehrdanz discussed issues between using a map and a table in depicting the container volumes. Dean Prestegaard said these first maps are only showing the volumes of inbound and outbound containers – they're not identifying the lanes along which the freight flows. He asked the Subcommittee for guidance on how best to illustrate those traffic flows between Wisconsin and the coastal ports. He said he was asking for the group's thoughts; he didn't have any options to illustrate. Steve Rose said a master map showing arrows that have sizes relative to the destinations would be fine. Brian Buchanan said that there should be one of Wisconsin that shows where the containers go and where they come from. Matt Umhoefer said that would not be specific enough – the maps need to have a scale that shows how much is moving in each direction. David Ruehrdanz said it matters where the freight is going. If CN put a ramp in, it would change the flow from West Coast United States to West Coast Canada. Bo DeLong said it mattered if the freight was moving east or west. We know the imports are coming in. Buchanan said the report should focus on where into Wisconsin the containers are going. Brad Peot suggested using heat maps to focus on the inbound flows to the state. But for outgoing, it should be listed in a table. Often, the Beneficial Cargo Owner isn't aware of the route the container takes to get to its destination; some loads going to Asia are getting drayed to Chicago and railed to the East Coast, to be placed on a vessel going through the Panama Canal. Bo DeLong said these issues all come down to needing more data.

Dean Prestegaard said that our data gives us the three-digit NAICS code. Do we need further breakdowns? Peter Hirthe mentioned using the Appendix for raw data to allow people to do a deeper data dive. Brian Buchanan said the differentiation between domestic and international cargo is essential. Prestegaard said that we now have eight sets of maps expected in the report.

Funding Availability

After a break, Dave Simon mentioned that the Subcommittee's report was taking shape, including sections written by SRF, the consulting firm. One of those sections will be in the Appendix, identifying funding options for supporting additional intermodal operations in Wisconsin. David Ruehrdanz asked what that will look like. Dean Prestegaard displayed the section, and Dave Simon mentioned some of the programs. Ruehrdanz asked what was meant by "assistance." Does that mean expertise, or financial aid? Simon replied both are possible. The Freight Rail Infrastructure Improvement Program (FRIIP) offers loans at two percent for a ten-year term. The Freight Rail Preservation Program (FRPP) is a grant program to acquire and preserve viable rail corridors. WisDOT can also serve as a partner on any application for Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development (BUILD) applications, acting as the public-sector partner. Brian Buchanan asked what a railroad would be expected to contribute as part of the application. Dave Simon replied elements such as project engineering and land acquisition could be included as part of the package.

Final Report – First Draft Update

Next, Dave Leucinger led the Subcommittee through a review of the initial sections drafted for the report by displaying it on the video screen. He explained the challenges in keeping the report accurate, thorough, and data-driven, without being too detailed. He noted some of the challenges in data availability due to proprietary restrictions and firewalls that required payment to access data. He noted the report was just in its early version, but that he wanted to ensure the Subcommittee was comfortable with the direction and content to this point.

He started by going through the introduction, which identified the origin and goals of the Subcommittee. Jerry Deschane said that even before this section, the purpose of the report needs to be declared – that in two or three sentences at the start, the themes of supporting, increasing, and enhancing business need to be stated. The report needs to make a very strong statement that anyone can understand.

Dave Leucinger continued by going through the data used to build the background – the scale of international and domestic intermodal, the commodities most moved by containers, and the origins and destinations of the containers. He discussed the equipment used in intermodal freight, including the containers, liner vessels, rail cars, trailers, and port/ground facilities. He said the report would identify the major entities that are involved with intermodal freight movement, including global liner companies, freight brokers, railroads, drayage trucking, warehousing, and domestic container owners. He said the history of the state's intermodal terminals would be discussed, using a detailed narrative provided by Brian Buchanan. Leucinger would also discuss the state's two existing terminals and their customer base. He also showed the narrative where he has identified key terminals in surrounding states, including the rail lanes the terminals serve, and whether they handle international containers, domestic containers, trailers on flat cars, or a combination of the three sectors.

The report would then display the heat maps, and identify many of the factors that could affect intermodal development in Wisconsin. Brian Buchanan said the report should, in addition to looking at the successful ramps, discuss the intermodal ramps that failed, and the factors behind those failures. One of the factors mentioned by Leucinger was the challenge in developing a new facility or expanding a facility at any location, but especially in urban and suburban areas. Kelli O'Brien said that she had a recent conversation with Union Pacific's Public Affairs Manager, and agreed that this is an important topic. She said once you rezone property from industrial to commercial, and perhaps to residential, you introduce conflicts for the remaining industrial users. She said there are things being proposed in other states based on businesses competing with other users. These initiatives can creep up and restrict use without leaving options for the industry. She mentioned one situation in Ames, Iowa, where a line servicing a grain terminal ran into opposition from a subdivision next to the line. Buchanan noted the challenge of finding available land for intermodal ramps is a challenge everywhere – it's difficult to assemble parcels that are big enough to support intermodal operations.

Closing Comments

Dave Simon thanked the attendees, including those in-person and via telephone. Bo DeLong asked what the last day for the survey would be. Matt Umhoefer said that would be determined by the mapping needs. Someone suggested September 28th. Peter Hirthe promised he would follow up with MMAC to have them share their list of identifiable respondents with WMC.