

Chapter 11, Appendix 11-1 – Environmental Resource Agency Input

1. ERA Consultation #1 Agenda
2. ERA Consultation #1 Summary List
3. ERA Consultation #1 Meeting Summary
4. ERA Consultation #2 Agenda
5. ERA Consultation #2 Summary List
6. ERA Consultation #2 Meeting Summary

ERA Consultation #1 Agenda

**State Freight Plan
Environmental Resource Agency Consultation meeting
Pyle Center, 702 Langdon Street, Madison, WI**

**February 9, 2016
9:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.**

AGENDA

Agenda Item	Schedule	Participation
Welcome	9:00 a.m. – 9:15 a.m.	Aileen Switzer, WisDOT, Administrator, Division of Transportation Investment Management
Introductions	9:15 a.m. – 9:25 a.m.	All
Overview of State Freight Plan and process	9:25 a.m. – 9:40 a.m.	Jesse Patchak, WisDOT, Economic Development Chief
Wisconsin State Freight Plan Consultation, System-plan Environmental Evaluation and Environmental Justice Process	9:40 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.	Jennifer Sarnecki, WisDOT, Statewide Planning Chief
BREAK	10:00 a.m. – 10:15 a.m.	
Review of Discussion Questions	10:15 a.m. – 10:45 a.m.	All
Breakout Sessions	10:45 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.	All
Report Out	11:45 a.m. – 12:15 p.m.	All
Wrap-Up and Next Steps	12:15 p.m. – 12:30 p.m.	Donna Brown-Martin, WisDOT Director, Bureau of Planning and Economic Development

ERA Consultation #1 Summary List

WISDOT STATE FREIGHT PLAN

Environmental Resource Agency Input

Coordination Meeting Summary

WisDOT sought input from state and federal environmental resource agencies in February in preparation for a system-plan environmental evaluation (SEE) as part of the State Freight Plan. The SEE will evaluate qualitative environmental impacts resulting from the policies and actions defined within the Freight Plan. The goal of the coordination meeting was to gather input regarding the existing concerns, programs, and policies from the various regulatory agencies around the state. The group walked through a series of discussion topics ranging from wetland impacts to traffic congestion. Highlights and major themes resulting from this consultation include:

- Agencies have multiple documents and regulations covering the SEE categories.
- Secondary impacts resulting from the development of large distribution centers should be considered.
- Concerns of congestion relative to loading facilities for all modes (i.e. transload, intermodal, etc.).
- Idle reduction technologies and alternative fuels for trucks and trains are gaining popularity in Wisconsin; while similar technologies for boats and planes are still being explored.
- Multiple state and nationwide programs are in place regarding air quality and climate variability (i.e. CMAQ, SmartWay, and Green Tier).
- Recent studies have shown that localized air quality impacts from maritime freight movement are greater than originally anticipated.
- Impacts to surrounding land uses should be considered when reactivating rail lines.
- Topsoil replacement and soil compaction are major concerns resulting from development, especially pipeline development.
- Adequate off-site/support facilities need to be considered as part of the development of new facilities (i.e. rest areas, overnight parking, etc.).
- Emergency incident response is of concern for local first responders. Locals should be equipped with the resource and training to respond to an incident.
- There are established threshold for noise and vibration impacts for some modes, but not all.
- Impacts to historic and cultural resources need to be factored into the process.
- Historic bridges need to be considered, especially when re-establishing rail lines.
- Wetlands are impacted from a variety of actions. The USACE has regulations in place.
- The Wisconsin DNR regulates project level stormwater permitting.
- There is little information available for the impact to wildlife from new or expanded corridors.
- The Coast Guard is involved with the handling of ballast water.
- Disposal of dredge material from ports is a concern. The DNR and USACE have regulations in place.
- Agencies have various conservation plans, ranging from a specific site to a statewide level.
- Public health impacts should be considered in the air quality analysis.
- Emergency management should be contract to incorporate their plans and policies.

ERA Consultation #1 Meeting Summary

**State Freight Plan
Environmental Resource Agency Consultation meeting
Pyle Center, 702 Langdon Street, Madison, WI**

**February 9, 2016
9:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.**

Meeting Summary

Attendees:

Name:	Representing:
Carolyn Amegashie	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Jennifer Blonn	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency – Region 5
Donna Brown-Martin	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Ian Chidister	FHWA – Wisconsin Division
Kimberly Cook	WI State Historical Society
Stephanie Falkers	SRF Consulting Group, Inc.
Michael Friedlander	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Rebecca Graser	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Heather Graves	Office of the Commissioner of Railroads
Michael Halsted	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Jonquil Johnston	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Jeff Kwilinski	Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration
David Leucinger	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Jeff Lyon	Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection
Theresa Macfarlane	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
John Nordbo	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Diane Paoni	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Jesse Patchak	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Mark Razny	Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration Central Region Field Operations
Jennifer Sarnecki	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Dan Scudder	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Caitlin Shanahan	WI Department of Military Affairs, Division of Hazard Mitigation
Aileen Switzer	Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Patricia Trainer	Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Meeting Summary:

Jennifer Sarnecki opened the meeting, thanking everyone for their attendance. Introductions were done around the room. Jennifer provided a brief overview of the agenda and then introduced Aileen Switzer.

Aileen Switzer welcomed all agencies and provided an overview of the DOT's Division of Transportation Investment Management. She provided an overview the State Freight Plan and the goal of accommodating mobility for all modes. Aileen noted that this is WisDOT's first multimodal freight plan.

The State Freight Plan will include System-plan Environmental Evaluation (SEE) and Environmental Justice (EJ) analysis as part of the long range plan development. The plan is anticipated to be completed this year. Aileen thanked everyone for their time and expertise.

Jesse Patchak provided an overview of the State Freight Plan and the supporting legislation. He noted that the plan will use a 20 year planning horizon and will provide a first look at long range planning for pipelines. Jesse reviewed key themes, anticipated content, public involvement opportunities, and the overall anticipated timeline of the plan. Jeff Lyon questioned what comments were due by March 11th, as noted in the presentation. Jennifer Sarnecki responded that any additional comments from today's discussion should be returned to the department by March 11th. This may include additional conversations with others in your organization based on our conversations today. The DOT encourages agency comments and participation through the entire process.

Jennifer Sarnecki provided an overview of the System-plan Environmental Evaluation and Environmental Justice process. She reviewed the legislation of Trans 400 which requires the qualitative review and a discussion of mitigation at the system plan level. Jennifer noted that the base condition and resulting plan condition would be analyzed within the SEE. An overview of the different elements of both the SEE and EJ analysis were provided. Jennifer added that this isn't the only time that the DOT will reach out for input from environmental agencies. A meeting will be held after the plan is released for review and comment.

Dave Leucinger provided an overview of the group breakout sessions. Meeting participants were split into two smaller groups for discussion. Dave also provided a quick overview of the ten questions that will be discussed. Each breakout group discussed the ten questions and two to three bonus questions. A summary of the discussion at each table is attached. Key messages or specific resources are highlighted in blue text.

Following the group discussion, Donna Brown-Martin thanked everyone for their input and participation and closed the meeting.

State Freight Plan
Environmental Resource Agency Consultation meeting
February 9, 2016
Discussion Question Results

The results of the group breakout sessions are included with each of the overall questions and organized by table. Key messages or specific resources are highlighted in [blue text](#). Resource agency attendees were split into the following groups:

Table 1

- Heather Graves – Office of the Commission of Railroads
- Michael Halsted – DNR
- Jeff Kwilinski – Federal Motor Carriers Safety Administration
- Jeff Lyon – DATCP
- Caitlin Shanahan – Wisconsin Department of Military Affairs

Table 2

- Jennifer Blonn – EPA – Region 5
- Ian Chidister – FHWA, Wisconsin Division
- Michael Friedlander – DNR
- Rebecca Graser – USACE
- Mark Razny – Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration

General Impacts to Sensitive Resources from Freight Transportation:

- 1. Where are freight facilities most likely to have impacts on wetlands? On agricultural and forest lands? On threatened or endangered species (or other species of concern)? How would those threats be manifest? How extensive could secondary/induced impacts be? What mitigation measures should be considered in each of these locations?**

Table 1 Discussion:

Wetlands

Michael Halsted – The expansion of existing or construction of new lines (rail or highway) as well as expansions of ports (Superior in particular) could create wetland impacts. However these impacts are likely to be project specific and not detailed in a system level plan. The rail lines in northern WI come to mind. Consider recommendations of Connections 2030.

Caitlin Shanahan – The WI Department of Military Affairs (DMA), Division of Hazard Mitigation’s biggest concern regarding wetland impacts would be decreased water capacity (resulting in drought) and increased flood potential as a result of projects. [The main concern is the natural system’s ability to handle highs and lows following construction.](#)

Agricultural Land/Key Soils

Jeff Lyon – Rail lines and pipelines may have impacts on wetlands and agricultural land. Assuming that pipelines should be considered as a freight facility, there are some impacts from an agriculture perspective. Agricultural Impact Statements have been prepared for above ground pipelines. Impacts to agricultural land are of concern with new pipeline construction, as agricultural land tends to be the path of least resistance. A primary concern with underground lines is that the land is put

back to the pre-existing condition. [Topsoil replacement can be an issue](#). Dave Leucinger questioned if clear zones were an issue.

Michael Halsted – The protection of agricultural lands can take precedent over other protections or policies. A project on I-90 is a great example of this, where design standards were modified to limit the need for right-of-way acquisition from agricultural properties. [A goal would be staying within existing right-of-way for corridor expansions](#).

Forest Land

Michael Halsted – Regarding forest land, there are some specific ecosystems that provide key habitats that have very little protection. [A section regarding the protection and mitigation of impacts related to rare habitats and ecosystems of concern would be beneficial](#).

Michael Halsted – The construction of major facilities (i.e. Walmart Distribution Center) results in the construction of new surrounding facilities which result in secondary impacts. Secondary impacts (for some resources) can be forecasted, especially for wetlands.

Dan Scudder – In terms of rail and pipelines facility impacts, what might the secondary impacts be? Secondary impacts from trucking or port facilities are easier to define.

Table 2 Discussion:

Rebecca Graser – Wetland impacts include all direct fill issues. Indirect impacts include change of flows and fragmentation of habitation, etc. Some actions impact wetlands more than others. [Meet with major industries to find out how they would react to reduced bottlenecks](#).

Ian Chidister – Agricultural land and forest land impacts near bottlenecks should be considered. Indirect land conversions resulting from nearby transportation improvements are a possibility. [Make sure to contact Fish and Wildlife especially when identifying sensitive species \(including any upcoming designations\)](#).

2. What sensitive operations are most vulnerable to noise and vibration? At what thresholds do vibration and noise become issues with freight operations? What mitigation practices are suggested?

Table 1 Discussion:

Dan Scudder – The expansion of rail generally results in increased safety concerns for adjacent uses.

Jeff Lyon – Questioned if studies have already been done related to the impact of noise and vibration on surrounding uses.

Michael Halsted – There is a standard section regarding the mitigation practices for noise and vibration impacts from roadways. Dan Scudder added that is correct, [however there are no mitigation practices for other modes](#).

Jeff Lyon – The expansion of rail does result in safety concerns.

Heather Graves – [Rail lines can be a real quality of life issue](#).

David Leucinger – Quiet zones can help relieve some of these issues.

Jeff Lyon – There needs to be a balance between quiet zone implementation and safety practices (related to noise).

Michael Halsted – The effects of noise on wildlife are generally unknown at this point. Michael will check with other DNR staff on this issue.

Dan Scudder – It doesn't appear that wildlife avoid existing corridors for any reason.

Michael Halsted – It is hard for turtles to cross rail lines. [Turtle crossings have become a feature in some locations.](#)

Table 2 Discussion:

Jennifer Blonn – The USDOT thresholds should be used – dark skies ordinance and quality of life.

Ian Chidister – The quantities of realignments, construction, and major expansion via different standards should be incorporated into construction plans. [The FTA and FRA have standards for passenger rail.](#) Tribal consultation will help identify concerns they want addressed and their sacred places (easiest to identify with projects but can list potential impacts for type of freight access).

Jonquil Johnston – Historic resources may be sensitive to vibration. Section 106 – traditional cultural resources for the Ho Chunk near a project and noise pollution. [Local dark sky ordinance and light increase should be considered.](#)

Rebecca Graser – [The I-90 EIW has examples of noise disruption at a resource \(cemetery\) that went through the 106 process.](#)

Ian Chidister – Archeology and ground disturbing activities are important considerations. Increased light from a project can be an impact on endangered species of bat (i.e. construction lighting). It would be good to emphasize additional opportunities to comment at the project level when doing PIMs and PIs.

Trucking and Rail:

- 3. Truck and rail idling and operations – discuss the current protocol of keeping diesel trucks and railroad locomotives at idle, and how the concentration of vehicles at these facilities creates localized AQ concerns. How may this be mitigated? What other technologies are also being adopted that can minimize AQ impacts for both stationary and in-motion operations?**

Table 1 Discussion:

Heather Graves – [Air quality isn't just an issue in rail yards, it is also an issue for sidings and stops during backups and idling trains in back yards.](#) The blocking of public crossings during backups also poses a safety concern.

Jeff Kwilinski – [The use of Auxiliary Power Units \(APUs\) is becoming more popular versus idling technologies.](#) APU use is generally quieter and runs off of a small separate engine. However, the APUs add additional weight (approximately 600 to 700 pounds) to the truck, reducing the payload

capacity. This is especially prevalent in the winter with additional weight from snow and ice is added to the truck. Some states are allowing for additional weight above the standard in winter months to account for this. Dan Scudder questioned if there was any effect to fuel efficiency as a result? Jeff responded that there was not a major difference.

Michael Halsted – The WI DNR has a robust [Idling Plan to address air quality impacts](#). Mike Friedlander is the expert in this area. The plan is poised to make operational and culture changes and supports fleets equipped with oxidizers and ultra-low sulfur diesels. When modal shifts occur to move goods by another mode, a review of air quality benefits should occur. Are there any studies currently in place? It is presumed that rail travel has less impacts than truck movements. Jeff Kwilinski added that a major component of that is congestion.

Michael Halsted – The current non-attainment areas throughout the state should be reviewed. The DNR can assist with this.

Jeff Lyon – The air quality impacts differ between truck and rail, but the distance of travel should also be considered. Movement of freight over 250 miles may have some benefit on rails vs truck.

Jeff Kwilinski – Secondary distribution (first and last mile) of freight also needs to be considered as it results in congestion.

Dan Scudder – Questioned where the loading of rail occurs. Heather Graves noted that it can occur at the two intermodal facilities in the state or at the source. Donna Brown-Martin added that it can also occur at transload facilities. The first and last mile connections are important considerations within the plan.

Jeff Lyon – The new Amazon facility in Southeast Wisconsin has spurred a lot of development in the surrounding area. Dan Scudder added that this model puts pressure on multiple modes.

Jeff Kwilinski – Have studies been completed related to the impacts of existing distribution centers such as Wal-Mart? It would be interesting to see if additional traffic was generated.

Jeff Lyon – Is the big box distribution model going to change? If it does, what changes will occur and what affect will it have on air, rail, trucks, etc.

Michael Halsted – Regarding mitigation, there are already systems in place (i.e. Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)).

Jeff Lyon – The regulations are already in place, but we'll need to ensure that the changes in technology are recognized (i.e. AUPs).

Jeff Kwilinski – There may be areas throughout the state where certain types of vehicles could be restricted as a mitigation measure. Compressed natural gas (CNG) is in use throughout the state, but does come with associated issues. The tanks have a 10-year shelf life, without a reuse purpose. Many companies are interested. UPS or FedEx recently bought a lot of CNG vehicles to incorporate into their fleet. There may be a significant increase in CNG vehicles regionally; however, over the road use isn't known yet. [The biggest question is where one can fuel up with CNG.](#)

Dan Scudder – CNG fueling locations is another impact that should be considered. Jeff Lyon added that Kwik Trip has current plans for CNG expansion and they could be consulted.

Caitlin Shanahan – DMA’s largest concern would be climate change, including greenhouse gas emissions beyond the local air quality concerns. Dan Scudder questioned if any specific fuel use resulted in community right to know issues.

Table 2 Discussion:

Ian Chidister – An example of mitigation in Kentucky where a truck rest area with local power to lower idling onsite. This could be considered on a major project.

Michael Friedlander – [Broadening ports and airport idling should be considered. Promote efficiencies and idle reduction via different technologies and polices to repower. The Diesel Emissions Reduction Act and Partners for Clean Air Clean Diesel Group should be looked into.](#)

Jennifer Blonn – The EPA seconds the DNR’s comments on idling.

Mark Razny – Emergency order sets rules on idling trains.

4. If the interest in freight rail is sufficient, there may be requests to re-establish rail service along former rail corridors, including some state-owned corridors that have been converted into recreational trails. How should WisDOT address any such proposal? What measures for safety, access, and other factors should be incorporated?

Table 1 Discussion:

Michael Halsted – A portion of the Sugar River Trail near Monroe was converted back to rail in the recent past. Michael will connect with another DNR staff member for more information. The DNR understands that the conversion back to rail is a reality that needs to be considered. [Where possible, we’d like to see a new parallel trail constructed in these cases.](#) When studying the high speed rail, it was found that a trail component within the corridor showed compatibility and met safety concerns.

Caitlin Shanahan – Studies have shown that people will use a parallel trail when it is available and will stay off of the rail, especially when a fence is in place.

Jeff Lyon – How long was the Monroe conversion (a relatively short distance)? The WI Southern Rail Badger Ethanol Connector is another example. What considerations need to be made for abandoned rails vs. rails to trails projects? Dave Leucinger noted that there are few abandoned rails currently in Wisconsin.

Dan Scudder – Would the construction of a parallel trail require the acquisition of additional right-of-way? Michael Halsted responded that no additional right-of-way was required for the high speed rail project, but it may for others.

Jeff Lyon – Rail expansion projects are likely to have positive and negative impacts to agriculture. Expansions may be beneficial for agricultural shipping. Before a line is re-established, the original reason for the closure should be reviewed (i.e. if it was closed due to low volumes, have enough changes occurred to result in higher volumes).

Michael Halstead – The additional crossing should also be considered. Impacts to field access may result.

Dan Scudder – If an established rails to trails project was reverted to an active rail line, would the DNR be interested in building a parallel facility? Additional right-of-way, wetland, etc. impacts may occur. Michael Halsted responded that the DNR would likely be interested, adding that safety would be the biggest concern.

The group discussed the ownership of rails to trails corridors. Jesse Patchak noted that the corridors rarely reside on personal property, but additional right-of-way acquisitions would be from individuals.

Michael Halsted – There are corridors that have been platted for the construction of a highway, but were never built. West of the existing Highway 14 corridor, an area was originally platted for its construction. The parcels are still platted in this manner and may be an option for development.

Heather Graves – Community outreach is an important element with the construction of new lines. Crossing safety is also very important.

Table 2 Discussion:

Jennifer Blonn – Have there been any requests to re-establish lines? Property values will change from trail to active rail line.

Ian Chidister – There is language in the easements for rails to trails regarding reverting the trail back to rail use.

Mick Friedlander – Contacts will be made with State Trails Coordinator. The Northwood facility is an example where planning for a rail spur has been identified with mobile source reductions from modal shift. This is maximizing environmental performance through rail.

Rebecca Graser – New land use may have resulted following the rails to trails project; that may now conflict with re-establishment of an active rail line. This should be considered for out of service lines that are reactivated as well – especially with neglected infrastructure. How should this be used in the State Freight Plan?

Jonquil Johnston – There needs to be a balance with economic development, including tourism use as trail and transportation, rail spur closure is an example of isolating businesses.

Mark Razny – Rock Island reactivation is an example with houses encroaching on the rail line, legally the railroad had the right and the residents shouldn't have been encroaching on it. Residents were surprised about the property boundaries. Examples of short line railroad importance.

5. **How much of a concern are issues with dust/particulate matter from hauling sand, aggregate, or other loads? What are your concerns over vegetation control along both highway and rail corridors? Is neighborhood access across rail lines or highways heavily used by trucks a current or potential issue?**

Table 1 Discussion:

Dust/Particulate Matter

The group discussed the impacts of frac sand and particulate matter pollution. Michael Halsted noted and studies are being developed on the impacts of frac sand. [The DNR is concerned about dust impacts of silica, but information isn't known at this time.](#) Michael will confirm with another DNR staff.

Vegetation

Heather Graves – Rail employees have concern about the use of proper equipment when spraying herbicides. [Maintenance of proper sight triangles along rail lines is a growing concern.](#) Beautification and upkeep can be challenging as it is the individual railroad's responsibility. [Fires resulting from sparks on the tracks are still an issue.](#)

Michael Halsted – [Resistant species along rail corridors are of concern.](#) Jeff Kwilinski added that the spread of non-native species along all corridors should be monitored as freight moves in from other areas. Jesse Patchak added that it is also a concern with ports.

Jeff Lyon – The DATCP has a Pesticide Applicator Program that all applicators need to participate in prior to performing an activity.

Michael Halsted – Dialog of regulatory controls is on-going. [The DNR would like to implement a maintenance program, but money is the biggest hurdle.](#) Rail corridors are challenging because they are mostly private. Expansion of freight will increase the need for more resources and control.

Jeff Lyon – This is an agricultural issues as well. Without control there can be impacts on fields with the encroachment of invasive species.

Neighborhood Impacts

Dan Scudder – Increase highway traffic makes crossings even more challenging.

Jeff Kwilinski – Increased traffic gets back to the quality of life impacts for adjacent neighborhoods.

Table 2 Discussion:

Jennifer Blonn – [The EPA has best practices for truck dust control.](#) Also for vegetation control of the right species. Neighborhood access across rail lines is a big concern, especially concerning neighborhood cohesiveness, environmental justice and other barriers. Bottlenecks near sensitive communities are also an issue.

Michael Friedlander – [The State Bike Plan and Recreation Plan should be considered to identify important factors.](#) [The EPA has an EJ mapping tool online that is useful for EJ screening.](#)

Ian Chidister – Do the Bike/Recreation Plan priorities conflict with the State Freight Plan? Pedestrian/bicycle safety at intersections should be considered. How can the State Freight Plan

match with local plans? Kids' health and access to schools, etc. to be considered. Maybe consider kids in the State Freight Plan project in the Southwest Region realignment for large trucks from where they are closer to schools.

Mark Razny – Pedestrian crossings of rail are very important. Re-ratings of crossings are important, especially when trail traffic is up.

Jennifer Blonn – The EJ screening includes recommendations aimed at kids' health.

Waterborne Transportation:

- 6. What concerns do you have for Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) distribution through the Great Lakes Basin via a) "Salties" bringing AIS from freshwater sources outside of North America; b) "Lakers" redistributing small, localized AIS colonies to different habitat areas; and c) the failure of the Chicago & Illinois Canal System's barrier from Asian carp species? What roles and practices should be considered in avoidance and/or mitigation**

Table 1 Discussion:

Michael Halsted – [The DNR has three ballast water experts that deal with regulations and permits.](#) Both salties and lakers are considered, but more information will need to be provided to see if they are handled differently. Michael will connect with the ballast water experts for more information.

Dave Leucinger – There are international treaties related to this (Canada for example).

A secondary question regarding concerns for areas where transportation provides a barrier to public water access was asked to the group.

Heather Graves – This is a hot topic, as there are long stretches (15 to 20 miles) between one town and another where there are no crossings. In some situations there may be a public parking lot on the opposite side of the rail with no legal crossing to the water. The State Legislature is looking at a bill to allow the public to cross a railroad at any point, as long as they are crossing perpendicularly; however, this is not a good safety message. [The Office of the Commission of Railroads has a process to approve new crossing locations and people are encouraged to identify locations where a crossing is needed.](#) There is little use of this program, but the office would like to spread awareness.

Table 2 Discussion:

Jennifer Blonn – A multistate working group, including the NDR, works on aquatic species. [The Great Lakes and Mississippi Interbasin Study \(GLMRIS\) should be reviewed.](#)

Mark Razny – The Messina Checkpoint (Coast Guard) on the St Lawrence should purge ballast water before this side of the Messina locks. Commander Souma is the head of prevention.

Rebecca Graser – The Mississippi River should be included. There is a St. Paul local dam study to limit carp migration (EPA Civil Works Section). Various EPA sections work on this: Rock Island – Lower Mississippi; Detroit – Great Lakes; and St. Paul – Up Stream Mississippi.

Discussion regarding the end of summer movement of salt and oil northbound on the Mississippi via barges.

Terminal and Intermodal Facilities:

- 7. Safety and congestion are concerns that have been raised by residents near the major intermodal facilities near Joliet, IL. Are there other concerns that should be recognized should a new intermodal facility be created in Wisconsin? What concerns do you have on runoff of potential contaminants at intermodal yards, rail yards, truck terminals, and warehouse locations? How is your agency addressing potential environmental impacts from Intermodal operations, both in Wisconsin and other states? What practices should be considered/encouraged to minimize these impacts?**

Table 1 Discussion:

Jeff Kwilinski – Most of the issues are highlighted in the question. For the most part, private companies are doing a pretty good job. Wal-Mart, for example, has controlled access limiting the undesirable on-site activity. [Off-site areas are more likely to be areas of undesirable activity \(i.e. fueling sites\).](#)

Michael Halsted – The DNR enforces the Wisconsin Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (WPDES), which is required for all facilities. Each facility has its own number and regulatory information. [Run-off isn't expected to be an issue because the WPDES permit is already in place.](#)

Dan Scudder – Is additional light or noise pollution of concern? Michael Halsted responded that it can be an issue, but there are no regulations. Light and noise pollution are issues typically raised by the public when they are trying to stop a project. Dan Scudder spoke of new lighting standards used to reduce light pollution on various projects.

Michael Halsted – There are multiple mitigation techniques in place (oil/water separators, absorbent materials, etc.).

Dan Scudder – Is there concern about emissions from freight movement (i.e. emissions from the vehicle or its contents)? Michael Halsted responded that it is a concern, and it is covered in the WPDES but more could be done.

Caitlin Shanahan – There are community right to know issues with the movement of hazardous chemicals. [Usually companies that use hazardous chemicals have to report to the Department of Military Affairs and pay a fee.](#) There is a list of what facilities use which chemicals.

Table 2 Discussion:

Jennifer Blonn – The EPA monitors noise, air quality, light pollution, and runoff prevention.

Ian Chidister – [Historic buildings are of special concern with vibrations during construction and operations.](#) If a small area is anticipated to have impacts there may be staff available to analyze (identify gaps in the State Freight Plan to help locals).

Mark Razny – [Discussion of the Elwood terminal and intermodal controversy](#) – there are details available online. The terminal encouraged growth (business and residential) that now conflicts with the original use. There are issues with out of town residents not being able to visit land uses. The bridges are not able to carry larger trucks.

Rebecca Graser – The Minnesota yards in Duluth don't have storage capacity to serve expanded terminal and they want to fill in 25 acres of wetlands. [If the State Freight Plan addresses expected needs of a new or expanded facility, it should include its storage needs as major component.](#)

Ian Chidister – How will WisDOT influence implementation of the plan, especially if it is not a WisDOT project? Will most plan actions be dependent on local actions or WisDOT? [A hope would be to use the plan as a tool to tie in state and local priorities](#) (i.e. prioritize highway projects but separate projects through local program prioritization process (area with state priority should examine local needs at the same time)).

Mark Razny – Using the Elwood example again, the bridges only have a 20 year lifespan for forecasted truck traffic, but then the intermodal facility came along changing the bridge weight/traffic needs. It takes years of planning and permitted to redesign and construct a bridge and the locals may not have the money to do it.

Michael Friedlander – Noise and air quality research should be done. Barriers and vegetation (barrier for sound traps pollution which is mitigation with vegetation). Jay Walschmidt is a contact for this information.

Ian Chidister – Vegetation along as a mitigation method for air quality has very limited effectiveness.

- 8. To what degree would you expect secondary/cumulative land use changes at a Wisconsin intermodal facility – comparing potential development outcomes at a brownfield/redevelopment site with a greenfield/new development facility? Do the same concerns also apply to single-mode facilities (truck terminals, rail yards)? Is the large volume of container drayage (trucking of loaded and unloaded containers) into and out of Wisconsin a concern for your agency? How should WisDOT approach mitigation concerns over these facilities?**

Table 1 Discussion:

Caitlin Shanahan – Development of a brownfield and site remediation over a greenfield would always be recommended. Other productive land and facilities are likely in place with brownfield development.

Heather Graves – Existing infrastructure may already be in place to service new development with a brownfield over a greenfield.

Jeff Kwilinski – [When planning for new facilities, adequate off-site facilities \(parking, etc.\) need to be considered.](#) Facilities should include rest stops and supporting services.

Michael Halsted – The bigger picture of ensuring adequate rest areas and overnight parking areas needs to be considered across the state.

Jeff Lyon – Another benefit of brownfield development is that it is likely zoned and subdivided for development. However, land use controls need to be considered. These sites also have limitations and the thought of “build and they will come” may not apply. Factors such as volumes need to be considered. This backs up the importance of land use planning and location of places with minimal impact.

Michael Halsted – WisDOT has a process tied to NEPA that is in place for defining indirect impacts (Indirect and Cumulative Effect (ICE) process). The plan could simply state that the ICE process should be followed. Dan Scudder added that the ICE process is used at the project level. This plan considers and recognizes the good and bad potential consequences. Michael Halsted spoke of various documents with great ideas about indirect impacts. EPA's indirect cumulative effects under NEPA should be referenced.

Table 2 Discussion:

Ian Chidister – The impacts are location specific. It is hard to say generally for a state plan. [Zoning and status of utilities is important to determine if greenfield or brownfield developments have more impacts.](#)

Jennifer Blonn – [The EPA encourages development in existing developed areas.](#) Health at the site, especially air quality, is an important factor.

Michael Friedlander – [There is a PM 2.5 hot spot analysis for highways and intermodal facilities](#) (rail and transfer sites). There is not much in Wisconsin for concentrated diesel emissions that would drive additional analysis. Idling reduction and increased efficiencies at any freight transfer facilities is beneficial. SmartWays can be used to provide mitigation.

Jennifer Blonn – Avoidance is important, not just mitigation.

Jonquil Johnston – Trucking use goes up with intermodal facilities. Jonquil will put some comments together regarding bottlenecks and cumulative impacts.

Pipelines:

- 9. Pipelines have not been previously addressed in any of our planning efforts. We are aware of direct impacts from construction, maintenance, and, of course, from potential incidents. We also recognize that pipeline terminals are a concern for safety and trucking congestion. What other concerns should we be aware of?**

Table 1 Discussion:

Jeff Lyon – [Compaction and soil condition should be considered as previously discussed.](#)

Michael Halsted – The concept of short duration pipe has been discussed recently. It has been found that short duration can be more economical for the short distance movement of things beyond natural gas and oil. Jesse Patchak added that short duration pipe can be used to move natural gas directly to a destination rather than movement by truck.

Jeff Lyon – There are positive and negative impacts from short term pipe. A positive impact would be the reduction in traffic congestion.

Caitlin Shanahan – The DMA has regulations in place for pipeline disasters, but responsibility falls on the individual companies.

Table 2 Discussion:

Rebecca Graser – There is talk of concerns about modal safety for oil/petrol product. [Concerns of corridor fatigue from multiple pipelines](#), and it may be something Minnesota has looked into.

Examples being expansion of a corridor to accommodate maintenance (it was also addressed that this has been discussed in Minnesota hearings). [The DNR has a draft EIS address this \(contact person – Dave Siebert\).](#)

Mark Razny – Hazmat focused issues are regulated by the state agency, follow up should be done with them.

Mike Friedlander – Trucking congestion is a concern. There are opportunities for idling reduction in all modes (scheduling loads at pipeline terminals). [Recommendations from the SmartWay program should be considered as recommends in the State Freight Plan.](#) Jennifer Blonn added that a contact for the SmartWay program will be provided.

Incident Management:

10. Are there plans or policies the State Freight Plan should incorporate to address private and public-sector first response and recovery efforts from potential freight transportation incidents?

Table 1 Discussion:

Caitlin Shanahan – The DMA has policies and procedures in place when a pipeline incident occurs. The incident is reported to the DMA and the responsibility falls on the company. [County Hazard Mitigation Plans will include a pipeline discussion, when applicable.](#) A local response squad would respond to the incident. Coordination occurs through the DMA. There is a Wisconsin Emergency Response Plan in place. There is a person on call at all times to respond to incidents. This can include radioactive/hazardous materials shipping and spill response. Impacts to the public, such as water supply, are considered.

Dave Leucinger – Who responds to incidents in public waters (lakes, rivers)? [Michael Halsted noted that the DNR has a spill response hotline.](#) Dan Scudder added that the USACE and Coast Guard will respond to incidents in major waters.

Dan Scudder – [Community impacts when facilities are in populated areas need to be considered.](#) Especially, the responsibility of the local response teams, fire, police, etc. when a HAZMAT team isn't rear. Jeff Lyons questioned if the appropriate trainings are in place for those individuals.

Michael Halsted – There is a debate over the riskier mode (trucks and pipeline) for the movement of various materials. Dave Leucinger added that the resulting spill of a pipeline tends to be worse, but generally the transport method is safer via pipeline than truck.

Jeff Lyon – [Implements of Husbandry should also be considered.](#) Various materials are being transported down county roads.

Table 2 Discussion:

Michael Friedlander – Ballast water contamination in the Great Lakes is not regulated.

Jennifer Blonn – Emergency response staff at EPA will have more information (Jennifer will reach out).

Mark Razny – N+I Incident Management System → Incident command structure and regulations that everyone follows. [There is a regional response team \(EPA and Coast Guard\) tasked with a “clean up](#)

the mess plan". The NRRM works with oil spills and with oil trains soon. The wreck in Galena, IL is an example of where local were ahead of the issue on their own observations. Lt. C. Mobley from the Response Division is a recommended contact.

Ian Chidister – [The plan recommendations are a good time to ensure locals are equipped to handle the changes coming their way in terms of emergency response.](#) Jennifer Sarnecki added that it may be beneficial to include contact information for project managers to use.

Bonus Questions:

A. Does your agency encourage modal diversion from more fuel-intensive transportation modes (air, trucking) to less-fuel-intensive modes (rail, waterborne)? If yes, how is it encouraged?

Table 1 Discussion:

Jeff Kwilinski – Measures for alleviating congestion are being considered, but there aren't any specific programs to speak of.

Michael Hasted – The DNR has staff in sustainability sections with goals of reducing multimodal impacts with various programs (rideshare, etc.). The [Green Tier](#) program, for example, encourages the use of other modes.

Caitlin Shanahan – The DMA is an advocate for reduction of impacts from all modes.

Jeff Lyon – DATCP doesn't support any modal diversion from an environmental perspective, but does work from an economic perspective. What is the best/most efficient way to move items (International Trade Team).

B. What are the impacts (and their degree) from dredging operations at port facilities? How can these be minimized and/or mitigated?

Table 1 Discussion:

Michael Halsted – [The disposal of spoils from dredging continues to be a question.](#) Beneficial reuse components are being considered for the disposal of the waste. Guidance was recently passed to reduce heavy tipping fees.

Dan Scudder – Sediments within the spoils can be contaminated and will need to be handled as hazardous waste.

Michael Halsted – Specific codes related to the dredging of materials from ports ([728/345/347](#)) regulate the handling and permitting.

Dave Leucinger – Do the containments of the spoils vary by location? Michael Halstead responded that they are not site specific, but the spoils are becoming less contaminated. The human pathways (dust) are heavily regulated. There is good coordination with the HAP grants between the DNR and DOT.

C. Should WisDOT discuss the environmental impacts of large out-of-state freight facilities that serve Wisconsin, even though they aren't in Wisconsin?

Table 1 Discussion:

Michael Halsted – Origin/Destination studies would be telling for this. A synergy between weight limits and other restrictions should be in place with other states.

Caitlin Shanahan – Movement towards a regional systems approach is encouraged. An inventory or description of the existing system should be included, noting that there are out of state facilities that affect the system.

Michael Halsted – If Chicago plans to send additional trucks through a non-attainment area, how is this studied?

Dave Leucinger – Wisconsin has a lot of product that needs to be exported, while there isn't as much being imported. Stephanie Falkers added that the understanding of freight movements without an origin or destination within the state (overhead freight) should be acknowledged in the plan.

Michael Halsted – The economics of freight movement have an effect on decision in the private sector. For example, when the shipping of fly ash from Missouri becomes cost prohibitive, the use of Portland cement increases.

Jeff Lyon – There are many food processing facilities throughout the state, especially in rural areas. We should make sure the infrastructure is in place. Michael Halsted added that a candy maker in Jefferson uses a rail to connect to an ethanol plant.

D. Historic and archaeological structures and sites – what are some of the potential examples where existing/expanded freight operations will have the greatest potential for direct and indirect impacts? How should avoidance and/or mitigation be practiced?

Table 2 Discussion:

Generally, responses to this question were covered in other places.

Rebecca Graser – Historic districts, especially in area with reactivated rail lines should be considered.

Jonquil Johnston – Bridges can also be considered historic resources.

Ian Chidister – Programmatic mitigation activities at the corridor level. Memorandum of agreement documentation. There is an advisory organization on historic preservation.

- E. Wisconsin’s air freight sector currently has a minor presence (relative to Chicago and Minneapolis), with limited expectations for significant expansion during the plan period. How should the Plan discuss the types and degrees environmental impacts from air freight? What changes in aviation technology or air freight operations can be expected within the plan period? How will those affect the environmental footprint of impacts from air freight?**

Table 2 Discussion:

Rebecca Graser – The type of aircraft may change the airport infrastructure. Existing airports tend to be near wetlands, creating a risk from waterfowl.

Michael Friedlander – Runway expansion in the Mitchel Field Plan. The DNR has been on the planning team for the project. Conformity analysis was necessary – electrification opportunities could be used for mitigation. Idling and electric ground vehicles considered (fuel changes for planes is not imminent).

Jennifer Blonn – New plane fuels are not imminent. Need to talk about climate change impacts, greenhouse gases, etc. (not just about airports, but all modes). Climate resiliency, global change – goal to identify where we can dive deeper and use the resiliency discussion to cloak climate change discussion.

Ian Chidister – There are national pilot examples of climate resiliency. Recommends to include climate change discussion in the SEE. Examples from Maryland, Florida, and Long Beach.

Jennifer Sarnecki – Local plans may address resiliency and transportation examples.

Michael Friedlander – Refined and enhanced freight data collection would be useful (especially more detail) in the plan – especially regarding air quality. Air quality impacts from maritime traffic is weak in WI.

Mark Razny – Crude oil transportation emergency issues are being discussed as a group (including the EPA). Railroads want to provide shipping details.

Ian Chidister – Maybe an increase in discretionary funding would allow for better data to be collected.

Additional Comments from Table 2:

Ian Chidister – INVEST is a sustainability tool that should be considered in this planning effort. Some states have used it for planning.

Jonquil Johnston – Environmental justice needs to be addressed. Zero vehicle households are important because freight and passenger rail use the same rails disproportionately impacting them.

Jennifer Blonn – Jennifer would like to see a draft of the EJ analysis and would like to contribute.

ERA Consultation #2 Agenda

Wisconsin State Freight Plan

Environmental Resource Agency (ERA) Consultation Meeting #2

WisDOT Hill Farms | 4802 Sheboygan Avenue RM 144B | Madison, WI 53705

August 17, 2016 | 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM | RM 144B

Teleconference Information

Dial In: +1 (408) 650-3123

Passcode: 570-902-021

Weblink: <https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/570902021>

AGENDA

Agenda Item	Schedule	Lead
1. Welcome	10:05 AM – 10:10	Aileen Switzer, WisDOT Division of Transportation Investment Management (DTIM) Administrator
2. Introductions	10:10 – 10:15	All
3. Review Comments from February ERA Meeting	10:15 – 10:30	Jennifer Sarnecki, WisDOT Planning Section Chief
4. State Freight Plan Summary and Progress Report	10:30 – 10:45	Ken Brotheridge & Dave Leucinger, WisDOT Economic Development Section
5. Walkthrough SEE Chapter	10:45 – 11:15	Kristofer Canto, WisDOT Planning Section
6. Walkthrough EJ Chapter	11:15 - 11:45	Kristofer Canto, WisDOT Planning Section
7. Wrap-Up/Next Steps	11:45 – 12:00 PM	Donna Brown-Martin, WisDOT Bureau of Planning and Economic Development (BPED) Director

Please contact Kristofer.Canto@dot.wi.gov with any questions regarding this meeting.

For more information, visit: wisconsinfreightplan.gov

ERA Consultation #2 Summary List

WISDOT STATE FREIGHT PLAN

Environmental Resource Agency Input

Consultation Meeting #2 Summary

WisDOT invited state and federal environmental resource agencies to review and discuss the progress of the System-plan Environmental Evaluation (SEE) and Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis for the Wisconsin State Freight Plan in August of 2016. The draft SEE and EJ chapters were provided to attendees in advance of the meeting. The goal of the consultation meeting was to gather input regarding the direction of the draft chapters and to identify areas where more focus or clarification could be provided. The group walked through the overall state freight plan process and background before walking through the SEE and EJ chapters. Highlights and major themes resulting from the discussion include:

General Plan Discussion

- Pedestrian, bicycle and wildlife crossings of rail and other freight corridors should be an important consideration for expansion and new construction projects.
- Additional coordination with railroads was suggested in cooperation with the Office of the Commissioner of Railroads. This coordination could provide information that may not have been provided during general Freight Advisory Committee meetings.

System-plan Environmental Evaluation

- The concept of adaptation should be included in the discussion of climate change mitigation.
- Impacts to adjacent sensitive land uses should be discussed. Examples were provided of safety and quality of life impacts with the development of a freight corridor and adjacent senior housing facility.
- Safety, particularly safety of the public at crossings and connections points, should be included within the SEE. Operation Lifesaver should be referenced as well.
- The EPA and USDOT released new medium- and heavy-truck emission standards in August. The new regulations should be discussed.
- Increased discussion of rail service expansion should be included.
- Impacts from hazardous material movement should be discussed. Coordination with the Department of Military Affairs' current risk assessment will be beneficial.
- Include a comparison of impacts by each mode.

Environmental Justice Analysis

- Review the CDC's social vulnerability index which includes other variables for vulnerable populations that could aid the EJ analysis.
- Discussion of future demographic shifts and the EJ analysis were discussed.

ERA Consultation #2 Meeting Summary

**Wisconsin State Freight Plan
Environmental Resource Agency (ERA) Consultation Meeting #2
WisDOT Hill Farms, 4802 Sheboygen Avenue RM 144B, Madison, WI 53705**

**August 17, 2016
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.**

Meeting Summary

Attendees:

Name:	Representing:
Carolyn Amegashi	WisDOT
Tim Asplund	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR)
Chad Atkinson	Wisconsin Department of Military Affairs
Mitch Batuzich	FHWA Wisconsin Division
Jennifer Blonn	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA), Region 5
Kennethneth Brotheridge	WisDOT
Donna Brown-Martin	WisDOT
Kristofer Canto	WisDOT
Thomas Clauder	Wisconsin Office of the Commissioner of Railroad
Kimberly Cook	Wisconsin Historical Society
Michael Davies	United States Department of Transportation (DOT) Federal Highway Administration
Stephanie Falkers	SRF Consulting Group, Inc.
Rebecca Graser	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Alice Halpin	Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP)
Bob Kammel	National Park Service, Midwest Region
David Leucinger	WisDOT
John Madden	National Park Service, Midwest Region
Susan Meilahn	Wisconsin Department of Military Affairs
John Nordbo	WisDOT
Mark Oesterle	Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Wisconsin Division
Diane Paoni	WisDOT
Jesse Patchak	WisDOT
Marshall Plumley	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Rock Island District
Christopher Ryan	SRF Consulting Group, Inc.
Phillip Rynish	WisDOT
Jennifer Sarnecki	WisDOT
Dan Scudder	WisDOT
Aileen Switzer	WisDOT
Marilyn Weiss	Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP)
Ryan Wozniak	Wisconsin Department of Health Services, Bureau of Environmental and Occupational Health

Meeting Summary:

Aileen Switzer opened the meeting, outlined the meeting agenda, and introduced the presenters before handing the presentation over to Jennifer Sarnecki.

Jennifer provided a general overview of the System-plan Environmental Evaluation (SEE) and Environmental Justice (EJ) chapters, as well as SEE requirements under Trans 400, which includes two analytical parts: a comparison of the base case versus draft plan alternatives, and the qualitative analysis of potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures. Jennifer stressed that both the SEE and EJ chapters are largely qualitative, at a statewide levels, and are not focused on project-level analyses. Mike Davies inquired about a connection between health impacts and EJ, to which Jennifer replied that public health addressed all populations, with additional emphasis given to low-income and minority populations in the EJ chapter of the draft plan.

Jennifer explained that in addition to a draft plan analysis, and the development of potential avoidance, minimization, or mitigation actions, the Plan was also informed by consultations with federal, state, and tribal land management, wildlife, and regulatory agencies. The process required a comparison of the draft plan to state and tribal conservation plans or maps, as well as natural and historic resource inventories.

Jennifer provided a summary of key feedback from the February consultation meeting. A number of follow up actions were completed as a result of this meeting, including coordination with US EPA and Wisconsin Department of Health Services. This resulted in the inclusion of a youth category in the EJ analysis. Furthermore, emergency management was addressed by meeting with Wisconsin Emergency Management, resulting in the inclusion of language to “improve emergency response to make the transportation system more resilient”. A review of state and national programs resulted in the inclusion of the Wisconsin Emergency Operations and Public Health Emergency plans, while similar review of documents for other states and agencies for environmental topics revealed that Wisconsin exceeds the standards of other states. It was also noted that SmartWay is discussed in the SEE, but could be expanded upon as policies are finalized in the Draft State Freight Plan.

John Madden noted that there are a large number of rail crossings along the Ice Age Trail corridor serving approximately 1.5 million visitors annually. He added that wildlife crossings of existing rail corridors are needed in addition to pedestrian crossings.

Tim Apslund inquired whether the concept of adaptation was being included in addition to climate mitigation and other strategies, and indicated that there are resources available to inform analysis. Jennifer responded that they should connect following the presentation to discuss further.

Following Jennifer’s presentation, Kenneth Brotheridge and Dave Leucinger provided a summary of the State Freight Plan and a progress report, which included an overview of the vision, goals, and strategies, as well as the key considerations, anticipated content, and development timeline. Kenneth stated that considerations were initially being developed for the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21).

Marilyn Weiss noted that agriculture is greatly affected by freight movement and economic development, and inquired where this would be discussed in the Freight Plan. Kenneth replied that a

discussion of agriculture would be contained in the economic development chapter currently under development, with the goal to release the draft plan in its entirety by mid-September.

Thomas Clauder inquired whether the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) had yet to meet with railroads, to which Kenneth replied that they had met with the Freight Advisory Committee (FAC), which has railroads as members. Thomas also stated that Office of the Commissioner of Railroads (OCR) has regular meetings with various railroads and suggested that WisDOT personnel attend these meetings to get feedback from the railroad companies. Dave Leucinger indicated that the Bureau of Rails, Harbors, and Roads had also been formally and informally consulted throughout the process. Thomas expressed concern that WisDOT's five regions don't communicate or coordinate with one another, to which Donna Brown-Martin indicated that WisDOT will work to attend Railroad Commission meetings. Thomas also expressed concerns about new development (particularly senior living facilities) occurring adjacent to railroad tracks and crossings, often leading to the need for safety improvements and public requests for the implementation of quiet zones.

Following Kenneth and Dave's presentation, Kris presented the walkthrough SEE chapter. Tim Apslund inquired whether the Chapter 11, System-Plan Environmental Evaluation, was complete. Kristofer Canto replied that was still a draft, with Donna adding that it will be complete by mid-September. Mike inquired about the timeframe for submitting/receiving comments on the plan, to which Donna replied that the plan would be released in mid-September followed by a comment period of 45 days.

Donna Brown-Martin provided a clarification that the chapter is not focused on the project level, but does not take anything away from the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review process and will supplement future project-level efforts.

Tim inquired whether anything was found to be "significant" as defined in Trans 400, or if it was an exercise of going through the motions. Kris replied that Trans 400 provides flexibility in this area, but the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act) asks states to give a closer evaluation for freight planning and policies. He added that the SEE chapter will provide a high level comparison of the impacts between the base case and draft plan alternatives.

Marilyn asked about the impacts resulting from a significant increase in rail traffic as discussed within the chapter. Donna responded that the increases were a result of the forecast model developed as part of the overall plan development. She explained that this information will be addressed in other chapters of the plan, and increases will be discussed in a manner similar to the aviation plan by indicating that said increases will be mostly confined to existing facilities, and, therefore, will not result in significant new "land grabs."

Bob Kammel noted that the discussion of safety generally applies to all freight modes, and inquired if discussion will capture anything regarding safety to the public at crossings and connections. Kristofer responded that this discussion will be included. Stephanie Falkers noted that safety will be specifically discussed along with the discussion of community impacts. Tom added that Operation Lifesaver should be referenced/discussed in the plan, as the program promotes safety for the entire rail system. Kristofer commented that additional focus will be added regarding bike/ped connections.

Mark Oesterle noted that EPA Administrator McCarthy and DOT Secretary Foxx signed final regulations on August 16, 2016 aimed at reducing greenhouse gases and fuel consumption from heavy-duty vehicles for model years 2018 and beyond. Kristofer noted that WisDOT was aware of this action and would be including discussion within the SEE.

Kristofer finished presenting the walkthrough SEE chapter and preceded with presenting the walkthrough EJ chapter. He stated that EO 12898 is the justification for the EJ requirement, but WisDOT policy also mandates this type of review

Chad Atkinson inquired whether WisDOT was aware of the CDC social vulnerability index. He explained that it aggregates a number of EJ variables contained in the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ASTDR) section, but also includes LEP, and other variables for vulnerable populations (density, etc.). He continued by suggesting that WisDOT consider including these other variables in the analysis. Chad also inquired at what census level the data is available, to which the Christopher Ryan replied that most are at the block group level, while disability data is at the tract level.

Tim Apslund inquired about the 2010 base case scenario, and asked if WisDOT was trying to predict geographic and demographic changes, and, if so, will they be shown and how will they be included. Kristofer replied that they will be included in the mitigation and avoidance discussion of the chapter. Tim continued by asking if a 70 percent increase in freight movement would be contained to existing corridors, system expansion, or both. Donna replied that WisDOT was not able to answer that question at this point.

Kristofer wrapped up the discussion of the draft EJ Chapter, and asked if there was anything missing from the current drafts of the SEE and EJ chapters. Thomas Clauder stated that as rail volumes increase, it will impact a variety of things like safety, development, and transportation (reduced trucks). He continued by saying that impacts resulting from rail service expansion are missing. Thomas provided an example from an expansion project from Rhinelander to Goodwin that is affecting 15 counties. Kristopher stated that all of this will need to be looked at a project level down the road. Thomas then commented that there should be discussion of the physical barriers caused by railroads; as well as diversion to emergency services due to high volumes rail/highway freight traffic.

Chad asked if there are plans to look at specific impacts and potential risks of hazardous materials. Susan Meilahn noted that the Department of Military Affairs is in the infancy stages of a statewide risk analysis of the transportation of hazardous materials across all modes. Dave Leucinger made a related comment stating that it is very difficult to estimate these volumes, such as Crude-by-rail, which depends on the regional, national and global economies.

Marilyn asked if a comparison of impacts between the different modes would be made in the SEE chapter. Stephanie replied that the narrative for each impact category would include a comparison, along with the Comparison of Environmental Impacts and Benefits table at the end of the chapter.

Following Kristopher's presentation, Donna Brown-Martin provided a wrap up and the next steps following the consultation meeting. She provided the upcoming dates for five public involvement meetings throughout the state.

Tim asked what the timeline was for agencies to submit comments, to which Donna replied that they would take what they could get from attendees based on the comments provided on the draft chapters. She continued by saying that once the draft plan is released, that comments would be appreciated by early October, around the 5th of the month.

Jennifer Sarnecki added that if there are red flags that need to be addressed before the release of the draft plan, to please let WisDOT know as soon as possible.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK