WISCONSIN RIVER RAIL TRANSIT COMMISSION
COMMISSION MEETING - FRIDAY, DECEMBER 9TH, 2016 @ 10AM
DANE COUNTY HWY GARAGE, 2302 FISH HATCHERY RD, MADISON, WI

1. 10: 03 AM **Call to Order** – *Alan Sweeney, Chair*

2. Roll Call. **Establishment of Quorum** – *Mary Penn*

Crawford	Tom Cornford, *2nd Vice Chair*	x	Rock	Ben Coopman, Alternate	-
	Rocky Rocksford	x		Wayne Gustina	x
	Derek Flansburgh	excused		Alan Sweeney, *Chair*	x
Dane	Gene Gray, *Treasurer*	x		Terry Thomas	excused
	Jim Flemming	excused	Sauk	Marty Krueger, Alternate	x
	Chris James, *Vice Secretary*	x		Chuck Spencer	x
Grant	Gary Ranum	x		Craig Braunschweig	absent
	Mike Lieurance	x		Dave Riek, *3rd Vice Treasurer*	x
	Robert Scallon, *1st Vice Chair*	x	Walworth	Eric Nitschke	x
Iowa	Charles Anderson, *Secretary*	x		Richard Kuhnke, *2nd Vice Treasurer*	excused
	William G Ladewig	x		Allan Polyock	x
	Jack Demby	x	Waukesha	Karl Nilson, *4th Vice Chair*	x
Jefferson	Jeni Quimby	x		Dick Mace	x
	Gary Kutz	absent		Richard Morris	x
	Augie Tietz, *3rd Vice Chair*	x			

Commission met quorum.

Others present for all or some of the meeting:

- Mary Penn, WRRTC Administrator
- Ken Lucht, WSOR
- Ben Coopman, Rock County Hwy Dept. Sup.
- Duane Jorgenson, Rock County
- Ron Duffy, Town of Bradford, Rock County
- Rep. Amy Loudenbeck, WI State Legislature
- Kim Tollers, Rich Kedzior, Dave Simon, WisDOT
- Eileen Brownlee, Julia Potter, Boardman & Clark
- Allen DeSchepper, Westbrook Eng.
- Jim Matzinger, Dane County
- Erin VanderWeele, SP Star

3. Action Item. **Certification of Meeting's Public Notice** – *Noticed by Penn*

- *Motion to approve meeting's public notice – Ladewig/Gustina, Passed Unanimously*

4. Action Item. **Approval of December Agenda** – *Prepared by Penn*

- *Motion to approve December agenda with changes as presented– Cornford/Anderson, Passed Unanimously*

Alan Sweeney announced that there were some agenda changes. Namely, as Madison Gas & Electric (MG&E) had not been ready to present, Item 15 would be dropped and in order to have access to a Dane County Highway employee who was a notary, Item 14 would be moved to immediately follow Item 8.

5. Action Item. **Approval of draft November 2016 Meeting Minutes**– *Prepared by Penn*

- *Motion to approve November 2016 meeting minutes with minor corrections – Mace/Tietz, Passed Unanimously*

6. Updates. **Public Comment** – *Time for public comment may be limited by the Chair*

Rep. Amy Loudenbeck spoke in support of the Commission resolving the Town of Bradford bridge issues, saying it had been a long time coming. She also spoke about the Great Lakes Basin Transportation (GLBT) project and the postponement of its Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). She asked if WisDOT had any updates. Rich Kedzior said WisDOT was still waiting for the Surface Transportation Board (STB) to provide more route alternatives. He said the STB had requested additional route alternatives from GLBT but GLBT only proposed a single preferred alternative. Therefore, the STB would be creating alternatives for the GLBT. He said WisDOT's attorney Ben Connard had talked to STB about this and had been told the STB would be including existing and abandoned routes among the alternatives. Kedzior said WisDOT was expecting to receive those routes sometime next year.

7. Updates. **Announcements by Commissioners** – *No Discussion Permitted*
There were no announcements by the Commissioners.

REPORTS & COMMISSION BUSINESS

8. WRRTC Financial Report – *Jim Matzinger, Accountant*

Jim Matzinger gave the Treasurer Report to the Commission. He started with the income statement, pointing out that the Commission had added a line item for bridge inspections and noted it was budgeted at $45,000.00. He said that was a negative $45,000.00, as the Commission had initially passed a "breakeven" budget. However, due to the bridge issue, the $45,000.00 put them at a deficit for 2017 and they would need to recover that to break even next year. Matzinger noted there was still another month for expenditures. He said legal expenses for the year had been paid and the bridge inspection invoice which had been submitted at the last minute was anticipated to total about $21,000.00. He added that with only $28,000.00 currently in cash, the Commission could not pay all the bills out of that. Nilson asked which bridge had been inspected. Mary Penn said it was for Sauk City Railroad Bridge.

For cash disbursements, Matzinger listed checks to be approved today, including management, the audit, a full year of legal expenses, accounting in October, and the Westbrook Engineering work in October and the Westbrook dive, which had cost $17,726.25. This made a total of checks of $50,545.51. Dick Mace asked if there were any outstanding bills. Matzinger said buoys had been paid and were listed in the income statement as a reimbursable by WSOR. Gene Gray confirmed that all the Westbrook work had been from the $45,000.00 budgeted. Matzinger explained what remained to be paid for Westbrook and said much more had been paid than was used. Sweeney had Matzinger explain the bridge costs. Gary Ranum clarified that there would be about $25,000.00 of the bridge money allocated remaining. Even so, Matzinger said that still left the Commission at a deficit for the year.

- *Motion to approve the Treasurer Report as presented and payment of bills – Ladewig/Anderson, Passed Unanimously*

9. Discussion and Possible Action on Concurrence with WisDOT, the Town of Bradford, and Rock County on proposed quit claim deeds for bridges on Creek Road and Emerald Grove Road – *Ben Coopman, Dir. Public Works, Rock County*

Ben Coopman gave the background on the Creek Road and Emerald Grove bridges, saying at this point the discussion was primarily for the Creek Road Bridge as the Emerald Grove agreement was not quite ready. Penn distributed copies of both draft bridge bills-of-sale agreements (101 & 103). Coopman said the agreement language in both handouts was basically the same. He said the Town was concerned about ownership and they needed a way to make the transfer permanent. Therefore, a bill of sale. This would show the four parties to the work and make it recordable by the Register of Deeds. Coopman said the significant thing the agreement did was keep the 'sanctity" of the bridge and make the maintenance responsibility be assumed by the Town. He said the Town had met and approved the Creek Road bridge agreement and conceptually accepted the Emerald Grove Road Bridge agreement. Coopman said if the Commission was in concurrence today, they could sign off on them. He confirmed that Agreement 101 was for the Creek Road Bridge and 103 was for Emerald Grove Bridge. He said both bridge projects were approved for design but the Creek Road Bridge was up against the funding sunset date which gave approval today a priority. He added that the Creek Road bridge project was more complicated, with likely a bit longer design and right of way (ROW) approval. He thought that both bridges would be constructed in 2019.

Sweeney asked if the Town representatives attending the meeting had any words. Ron Duffy spoke about the lack of two entities to sign off on Emerald Grove Bridge and hoped those entities would sign off today so the Town could take action on December 20th when they next met. Conceptually, he hoped that the WRRTC and WisDOT approved Agreement 103, as they could approve 101 today.

Eileen Brownlee said both Bill of Sales were fine but said she believed the Emerald Grove agreement would be held in escrow because there were still some details to work out. Ken Lucht said WSOR was ok with the Bills of Sale. Brownlee said the Commission was not giving up real estate through these agreements. Sweeney confirmed that the Emerald Grove Bridge was contingent upon WSOR's and WisDOT's concurrence. Coopman said the contract had been signed by WSOR but not WisDOT. Brownlee said as long as the same actions had occurred on the Creek Road agreement, then the Emerald Grove agreement could be delivered and she had no problem with signing and approving both today.

Ranum asked for confirmation on the title of the bridges. Brownlee said the agreements were written so the titles of the bridges were deliberately ambiguous. Ranum said Paragraph 9 stated the Commission was not giving up title to the land. Brownlee confirmed "title" in the agreement referred to real estate. Mace confirmed the Commission was giving up the bridge, the improvement, not real estate. Allan Polyock asked for the cost. Coopman said it was $1.7M.

- *Motion to approve the Creek Road (Bridge 101) and Emerald Grove (Bridge 103) Bills of Sale – Nilson/Sweeney, All in Favor, Cornford, Rocksford, Gray, James, Ranum, Lieurance, Scallon, Anderson, Ladewig, Demby, Quimby, Tietz, Gustina, Sweeney, Krueger, Spencer, Riek, Nitschke, Nilson, Mace, Morris. Opposed: Polyock, Motion Approved*

Nilson asked Brownlee as to her concurrence. She agreed to the approval of both agreements without hesitation.

10. Wisconsin & Southern Railroad's Report on Operations – *WSOR*

Ken Lucht reported that winter maintenance had begun and construction was over for the year. On capital projects, he reported the Watertown sub was going to install ties and rebuild crossings, beginning in the first quarter of next year. He said the Spring Green Bridge project had been awarded and the contractor was already mobilizing, building an access road. They intended to work on the west section first, then the east side. Lucht said WSOR anticipated the bridge being completed in August, 2017. Lucht also said there were three other groups of bridge projects with completed WisDOT grant agreements, with work to begin next year.

Lucht said the WSOR rail removal in Sauk City had been pretty much completed and WSOR was hauling sticks of rail away. The quantities had been itemized and the sum would be credited to the WRRTC in the next 30 to 40 days. He thanked the Commission for allowing WSOR to do this. Dave Simon asked if they had picked up plates and ties as well. Lucht said only rail and switches were taken. He said WSOR had gotten permission to haul 70 tons away but some materials were still there. Simon said Sauk County would need to pick up any remaining materials.

Mace asked about bridges on the Watertown sub. Lucht said they were not as big as the Sauk City Bridge, mostly land bridges and not over large bodies of water. Nilson asked if they were wooden structures. Anderson asked if bids had come in for the Spring Green Bridge and what they had been. Kedzior said $5.7M was the winning bid. Lucht added that WSOR had gotten a lot of good bids, well under what they thought they would be. Chris James asked for the length of the Spring Green Bridge. Lucht said it was about 2100'. Bob Scallon asked about the number of WSOR employees. Lucht said there were about 200 full time employees. Ladewig asked about the condition of the salvage from Sauk. Lucht said it had been inspected months ago and the rail was a little under 90lb but overall it was good enough, and better than what was in some other places in the system. Augie Tietz asked about a bridge on the Watertown sub.

11. WisDOT Report – *Kim Tollers, Rich Kedzior, WisDOT*

Rich Kedzior said a few weeks ago WSOR had asked for WisDOT to amend a work plan on a 2017 project from Waukesha to Eagle which had been quite comprehensive. In order to achieve some cost savings, WSOR had asked for WisDOT to amend the agreement. The amended project would replace all ties and do all the crossings from Waukesha to Milton, rather than the entire rehab. The remainder of the work would be done over the next 6 years. The WSOR would do all the ties, most of the crossings, and rehab any turnouts for the whole sub now. Kedzior said WSOR had reasoned they could get better bid contracts with economy of scale. He said WisDOT had tentatively approved the amended work plan and now were just negotiating the final details. In the future whenever funding was available, WSOR would put in all the continuous welded rail (CWR) in one shot.

Mace asked if that would be in the 4-year CWR plan. Kedzior said yes but clarified it was in construction years, not calendar years. Sweeney asked if the GLBT project's public comment period had reopened. Kedzior said that was what WisDOT had been told and the public should get another chance to submit comments. He said this was what STB proposed when they spoke to WisDOT attorney Ben Connard.

12. WRRTC Correspondence/Communications and Administrator's Report – *Mary Penn, Admin.*

Penn distributed the 2017 meeting schedule and reported on her administrative duties of the past month. In regard to the Sauk City rail road bridge, she had sent out a press release warning the public about the bridge's instability, said WSOR had had warning signs made which were to be put up that week, that the warning buoys were made and had been delivered to WSOR for winter storage, and that under advisement from Frank Huntington, she had investigated the need for permits from the Coast Guard in the event of the bridge's rehabilitation or demolition. Penn also reported on her activities relating to the Creek Road and Emerald Grove Road bridges in Rock County, her attendance to the 2016 WisDOT Freight Rail Conference in November, and her attempts to get more information from ComEd about the power hookup on the billboard located in the ROW on the Fox Lake Sub in Illinois. She expressed her appreciation to WSOR personnel for taking pictures of the billboard in the fall as that had given her the meter identification number which was vital to finding out who had installed and was paying for power. She had not yet been able to speak to anyone at ComEd to resolve the issue but would continue to work on it. Lastly, she informed the Commission she had received a letter from Eileen Brownlee advising the Commission that her rates would rise slightly in 2017.

13. Report on November 1&2, 2016 Dive, Sauk City Rail Road Bridge – *Westbrook Engineering*

Penn distributed the draft report to the Commission while Allen DeSchepper of Westbrook Engineering explained how the dive went and what was found, pier by pier. Starting with pier 1, the first on the east bank, he explained what it was made of, how they dove it, and what its condition was while Dave Simon passed around a diagram of the bridge. DeSchepper said they were not able to dive the

nose of the pier but they could on the downstream and west side. He said the pilings were sound and it did not appear that any flow was coming across or under the east side where the flow was too strong to dive.

DeSchepper said pier 2 was similar to pier 1 in terms of flow: the current was more intense and the diver was only able to dive the downstream and west face up to a certain point. He said pier 2 was visibly rotated and sinking and he estimated it had sunk 3' and rotated about 6-7 degrees. As the diver came along the west side of the pier, he found the bottom of the pier was undermined and about 2-3' of the pier was exposed. He said there was a definite cross current under pier 2 and suspected a deepening scour hole. DeSchepper said it was reasonable to assume that the piling was similar to pier 1, adding that rip-rap was found in the scour hole. He said pier 3 was made of timber and was in fair condition. There was no evidence of scour. He also said pier 5's sheet piling was in good condition.

Overall, DeSchepper said currently piers 1, 3 and 5 were stable although pier 1 needed some work to maintain it but pier 2 was in a failed condition. He certainly would not want anyone up on the spans in the bridge's current condition. Depending on the flow, he said pier 2 could sit like that in its current condition but it was a gamble, considering how poor of shape it was in.

Sweeney asked how piers were constructed in a river. DeSchepper explained the type of piers for 1 and 2 and the materials used to construct them initially. He said pier 3 was strictly a pile timber pier that had been driven into the water and framed in above. Pier 5 would have been similar to 1 and 2 but the steel sheeting had been left in place.

Dave Simon asked what had caused the failure at pier 2. DeSchepper said in his opinion it was by undermining from the river's flow to such an extent that the pilings had lost bearing or lost bearing and soil had settled in. Westbrook did not find any broken piles but that did not mean they were not broken: they could been washed downstream. DeSchepper estimated the piles were about 30' long and some of the stream bed could have been removed when they were placed. At pier 2, he guessed the piles would have penetrated 10-20' at the most.

Anderson asked if there was any reason why the Great Sauk Trail could not participate in the some of the expenses involved. Sweeney said that was originally the intent but not enough information was known yet.

Jack Demby asked about the possibility of failure before spring. DeSchepper said he did not want to say. Ladewig asked if the piers had any value for a pedestrian bridge. DeSchepper said piers 1 and 5 were ok and pier 3 was a maybe. Chris James asked what would be needed to stabilize them. DeSchepper said adding large rip-rap to pier 1 might work. However, it would be difficult to do with the currents, though not impossible, particularly in the summer when there was low flow. Nilson asked about the concrete and if it were reinforced. DeSchepper said pier 1 had reinforcement at the bottom of the seal. Nilson said when he looked at the bridge pictures, it looked like a majority of river traffic would go under non-existent span 4. DeSchepper said the main flow of the river was through piers 1, 2, and 3. Nilson said in terms of the warning signs, they should go where there was high traffic. He thought warning signs should be where people see them. Sweeney said pier 3 was getting warning signs.

Ranum asked about the pilings and piers and how they provided stability. Then he asked due to the strong current, would the flow angle have had a bearing on the eddies and washing out. DeSchepper said it would. Ranum then asked if when the bridge was built was the current at this same angle. He said as they designed other bridges, if there was pier work, that angle needed to be taken into account. DeSchepper said he had been out on with WSOR to inspect other bridges and he explained the differences in bridges made in the past and the fact that stream flow had changed over time. Robert Scallon asked how old the bridge was. Penn said it was over 100 years old.

Ladewig asked if the Army Corp needed to be alerted. Brownlee said staff had already done that. Ladewig then asked if there were grant programs to pay for situations like this.

Mace asked about span length. Referring to the dive report, DeSchepper pointed out the lengths. Mace said in respect to a pedestrian bridge, was it feasible that pier 2 be removed and then rehabilitate piers 1, 3, and 5. If so, could one span be used to span the river. James said Dane County Parks and Recreation had only done a 100' clear span for a pedestrian bridge.

DeSchepper gave rough cost estimates for the removal of pier 2 and its associated spans. He said it was currently estimated to be about $900,000.00 to remove. Simon asked about equipment mobilization and if that were a big part of the cost. DeSchepper said it was.

Simon said WisDOT had internally discussed the report with their bridge engineer. He said their analysis was pretty consistent with the Westbrook report. In WisDOT's opinion, pier 2 and spans 2 and 3 needed to be removed. In addition, Simon said WisDOT's

engineer did not have any confidence in pier 1 or pier 3: they had "no value" and could not be used to support a railroad structure and did not recommend spending over a million dollars for a recreational bridge resting on them. He said WisDOT believed it was only a matter of time before piers 1 or 3 failed. While the Westbrook report recommended stabilizing those piers, WisDOT did not agree. Simon said as long as a contractor would be paid to mobilize to remove pier 2, span 2, and span 3, it would be wise to also remove pier 1 and spans 1 and 3. Finally, Simon said as long as all of that were being removed, spans 5 and 6 also had no value for railroad use and WisDOT recommended the removal of 5 and 6 as well. He noted that spans 5 and 6 were really one big swing span and they could probably be removed for some salvage value. Simon said it made sense to remove everything except pier 5. Pier 5 did have some historic value. Simon acknowledged that spans 5 and 6 were stable so they would not fall in the water so could be theoretically be used, but everything on the east side should be removed.

Nilson said if the Merrimac Bridge became unusable, the Sauk City Bridge was the alternative route. Simon said the whole bridge would have to be replaced, possibly including pier 5 if rail service returned. Nilson asked Kedzior if the bridge needed replacement for rail service, would the Commission be eligible for Freight Rail Preservation Program (FRPP) funding. Kedzior said that would be the case. Nilson said maybe leave the bridge and if a new bridge was needed, there would be funding.

Allan Polyock said the Commission did not need the bridge but the trail folks did. He recommended getting rid of it.

Mace asked if all the piers but 5 came out, would the Commission be surrendering the corridor. Brownlee said the corridor was still underlying the river, and whether rail banked or not, the Commission was not losing the right to cross the river at this location. She said she could not predict tomorrow's laws, but as far as current water and travel law was concerned, there were multiple agencies and parties and the odds that the regulations among all those agencies would stay the same was unlikely. Regardless of how it went, she said to the extent it was a rail corridor, that did not change.

Ladewig asked what to do next and if there were grant money available, or a process or roadmap. Simon said that was the big question. Hopefully there would be surplus dollars left from the salvage. He said WisDOT might have some money available but he really could not answer the question. Kedzior said the first thing he would suggest is the WRRTC start saving their money. He said WisDOT could not use bond funds for this and WisDOT had already investigated that: there was nothing to bond. He said WisDOT could perhaps scrape together some discretionary funds. Ladewig asked if the Commission could ask its Senators to appropriate funds. Simon said that would be a possibility. Ladewig said maybe the federal government could find money. Simon said there were sources of funding.

Nilson said the steel hanging up in the air made this dangerous so there might be an interim step to remove the steel from a safety standpoint. Sweeney said the tracks might be what was holding the piers in place. Nilson recommended removing all the steel and getting some money for it. Sweeney said it was dependent on the possibility of funding the work. Ranum asked what would be the likely income from the salvaged steel. If it were even near a breakeven point, the Commission should salvage it.

Mace asked if the $900,000.00 estimate in the Westbrook report included the salvage cost of the steel. The low bid for the Spring Green Bridge was brought up. DeSchepper said the savings on the Spring Green project had been low due to current low steel prices. James asked when span 4 and pier 4 were removed and was it a total removal. DeSchepper said he believed pier 4 was removed to the riverbed but there might have been some material remaining.

Grey said the Commission was getting "nickel and dimed to death". At this point they needed help. Polyock said if there were someone who wanted the bridge for its steel, have them salvage the spans and leave the piers. He said sometimes the WDNR would allow you to place material in streams as habitat. Jack Demby said the Wisconsin River Way Board would never allow something to stay in the river. James said perhaps the bridge materials could be used for bank stabilization.

14. Discussion and Possible Action on Sauk City Railroad Bridge – *Alan Sweeney, WRRTC Chair*
Sweeney said the Commission had already talked about this item in the previous discussion.

15. Discussion and Possible Action on Concurrence on Proposed Rental Agreement (Attachment 10 to Agreement No. 0490-40-48(d)) between WSOR and WRRTC for 2017 – *WSOR*
Ken Lucht said this agreement would extend the current rental agreement for another 12 months and was very similar to those approved in the past. Sweeney asked if Brownlee had looked over. She said she had and only the years had changed.

- *Motion to approve Proposed Rental Agreement (Attachment 10 to Agreement No. 0490-40-48(d)) between WSOR and WRRTC for 2017– Nilson/Anderson, Passed Unanimously*

16. Discussion and Possible Action on Proposed Amendment to Operating Agreement 0490-40-48(d) – Section 2.2 Reservation – *WSOR*

The handout was distributed while Ken Lucht said he had briefed the Commission about this a few months ago. He asked if the Commissioners had any questions or concerns. He said he had not had a chance to discuss any questions about the amendment with Brownlee or Simon, noting that the language in question had not been looked at since 1997. He explained this was the agreement language for all the subs except Reedsburg and the Cottage Grove. Much of the language in this went all the way back to 1980 and since then there had been some amendments and language changes, but overall it went back to 1980. Lucht said the Reedsburg and Cottage Grove subs had different agreements for everything else compared to the rest of the system. The blue language highlighted in the distributed old agreement would conform with the language in the Reedsburg and Cottage Grove sub operating agreements, if approved. He said WSOR had had some concerns about item 2.2. The main driver were items 2.2 A and B. In the new operating agreements, the language went beyond that, with changes noted in those from item C through J. Primarily WSOR was concerned with items A and B. He said in terms of railroad safety, and with a major derailment almost every year, the ramifications of the language was a big issue. Lucht expounded on derailments and how spills from them more often than not went well outside the 33' ROW as described in the agreement. He said these derailments were happening at slow speeds and could not be predicted. Lucht said what the proposed language did was expand their partnership to go outside the 33' where WisDOT, the Operator, and the Commission all agreed. He said this was all about safety and uniformity. He reiterated he had not yet discussed this matter with either Brownlee or WisDOT but wanted to bring it up to the Commission today and ask how to proceed. Lucht said the matter could wait until after the new year. Brownlee said she had reviewed the amendment but was not ready to make a recommendation. As a general matter, if the Commission was going to make amendments to the operating agreement(s), she would rather review the agreement as a whole, rather than pick away at it, year by year. She also said there was an overarching 1997 operating agreement addressing all the lines in the system, rather just than Reedsburg sub. She thought this amendment needed to be looked at in a more broad based analysis. Sweeney said given that the Commission had just received the language, it might be a good idea to have it on the January agenda.

- *Motion to postpone Possible Action on Proposed Amendment to Operating Agreement 0490-40-48(d) – Section 2.2 Reservation, to January meeting – Krueger/Gray: All in Favor, Cornford, Rocksford, Gray, James, Ranum, Lieurance, Scallon, Anderson, Polyock , Demby, Quimby, Tietz, Gustina, Sweeney, Krueger, Spencer, Riek, Nitschke, Nilson, Mace, Morris. Opposed: Ladewig, Motion Approved*

17. Discussion and Possible Action on Approval of Co-Sponsoring a Fast Lane Application with WSOR and WisDOT – *WSOR*

Ken Lucht explained how WSOR's application to this funding source had come about, noting it had come up at last month's meeting for discussion. Penn distributed copies of the support letter. He explained the significance of the Fastlane funding and its intended targets, adding that submittal was December 15th. He said Iowa County was a co-sponsor. Lucht said this application was so similar to the TIGER application that WSOR would reapply with that project's criteria so everything applied: only the narrative needed editing. Lucht did say one change was that WSOR would be asking for $3M more than in the TIGER application. He said in the TIGER grant the WRRTC's contribution would have been 2 years of funding, $500,000.00, and what he was asking of the Commission today was their consideration to co-sponsor the Fastlane application with a commitment to the same local match of $500,000.00, as well as the submission of a support letter.

Simon said WSOR had put together a great application. He said WisDOT would submit this on December 14th; as WisDOT's only application. He was cautiously optimistic as to its approval as there was less competition. He said the quick turn-around time also helped. He said he thought it would score well as the project addressed at-grade crossings. He added applying was worth the risk as the reward was very good.

Kedzior reminded the Commission that the funding strategy included $500,000 from the WRRTC. In light of the Sauk City Bridge, he said there was a distinction of funding that WisDOT was authorized to make and possibly, if need be, perhaps the Commission's contribution could be reduced and the state's increased. The WisDOT could bond fund all the improvements on the sub in question.

- *Motion to approval of Co-Sponsoring a Fast Lane Application with WSOR and WisDOT – Ladewig/Mace, All in Favor, Cornford, Rocksford, Gray, James, Ranum, Lieurance, Scallon, Anderson, Polyock , Demby, Quimby, Tietz, Gustina, Sweeney, Krueger, Spencer, Riek, Nilson, Mace, Morris. Opposed: Nitschke, Motion Approved*

Nilson asked where the money would come from. Sweeney said future funding was in question. Mace said the WRRTC committed to TIGER. Ranum said he had noted some interesting verbiage in the support letter and asked if the mention of the mitigation of derailments should be included. Lucht said that was very well noted in the application narrative. Tietz said in 2017 the Commission had already committed to WSOR. Lucht said 2017 and 2018 were allocated to TIGER but since that had not been granted it was now Fastlane. Gray wondered what flexibility the WRRTC had. Sweeney said it would be in the 2017 and 2018 budgets.

Lucht said WSOR had rounded down to $500,000.00 for the Commission's contribution. For 2017 and 2018 the Commission would have more than that from their County contributions. He discussed the contribution impacts to the Commission if they approved the application.

Mace asked why only Iowa County signed on and not Dane. Lucht said this was primarily is a rural project so the majority of investment would be in Iowa County. He said this went back almost 5 years and Iowa County wanted to be a partner.

Eric Nitschke said based on the funding and the obvious issues with the Sauk City Bridge, he appreciated that WisDOT had lots of funding sources and paths. Therefore, he did not agree including Walworth County in approving this application since the Commission did not have the money to pay for the bridge.

Nilson said he really thought that if you did not worry about the concrete, just get rid of the steel, he did not believe the Commission was risking anything. He thought the steel could be salvaged.

Mace said no decision had been made today on the future of the Sauk City Bridge, it was left hanging and he was uncomfortable with that. Sweeney said the Commission was about the rehabilitation of rail infrastructure.

18. Action Item. **Adjournment**

- *Motion to adjourn at 11:52 AM – Gustina/Scallon, Passed Unanimously*