

Upper Midwest Freight Corridor Study

Summary

Research Team Meeting

December 7-8, 2003

Chicago, Ill.

Participants

Ernie Wittwer (MRUTC)

Teresa Adams (UW-Madison)

Mark Vonderembse (Toledo)

Jiwan Gupta (Toledo)

Peter Lindquist (Toledo)

Sue McNeil (UIC)

Travis Gordon (MRUTC)

Kazuya Kawamura (UIC)

Items **highlighted in yellow** are action items or require follow-up.

Day One (call to order 1:15pm Central)

Handouts: Agenda, Final Products List, Administrative Issue Presentation

1. Administrative Issues Update-Adams (see presentation for details)

- Objectives
- Progress - overview
- Task by task descriptions
- Products

Presentation Supplement:

- McNeil reported that the USDOT and TRB reports on *Size & Weight* are intertwined and overlap, but are separate
- Adams pointed out that survey results show that states are starting to cooperate using CVISN technology, gives support to synthesizing CVISN plans for region

Further Information (to be followed up with):

- Wittwer - Exemption on garbage trucks in Wisconsin
- McNeil - New England Transportation Consortium unified permitting.
- Kawamura - CVO GCM email distribution issue is quite active. Kazuya to forward to Teresa.

2. Best Practices Update-Gordon

- Received several suggestions regarding the direction of this part of the study
 - Best practices of what? Must answer this question before any other. **Suggestions follow:**
 - Research sharing
 - Data management
 - Regional cooperation/Coalition building (see details below)
 - State suggestions

- Can also look at existing corridor studies and look at deficiencies and strengths
- Regional cooperation/Coalition building
 - How to
 - Sharing info, Data issues
 - Administration, Funding
 - What takes a group to the next level
 - Lessons learned; and conclude with
 - Where is this region lagging
- Current list of multi-jurisdictional efforts needing more in depth research
 - Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission
 - I-10 National Freight Study, I-95 Corridor Coalition
 - Midwest Regional Rail Initiative
 - Minnesota
 - Statewide Intermodal Freight Planning (VA)
 - Freight Mobility Investment Board (FAST Corridor)
 - Southern California Alliance of Governments, LATTs
- **Suggestions to add**
 - Northeastern Associations of State Transportation Officials (NASTO) Freight Study
 - Easy Pass
 - New York/New Jersey Study
- A need for selection criteria for these efforts
 - Multi-mode, multi-state, current status

3. Clearinghouse Update-Gordon

- <http://www.mrutc.org/doclib/index.php>, focus is a searchable database
- Includes what each public agency is doing in freight;
 - Cooperative efforts in freight; and,
 - Research of relevance to this region
- Other ideas, possibly for future, include:
 - Freight news that impacts the region
 - Improvements that involve the public sector
 - All freight transportation research (is there already a collection of this?)

4. Performance Measures Update-Wittwer (see handout for details)

Handout: Observations of Performance Measures

- Performance measures 101: No-one doing much. Need to put performance measures in the context of objectives and goals etc.
- Suggested measures from the literature – NCHRP, FHWA, SCAG (Faucett)
- Proposed measures – improved economic competitiveness, increased reliability, increase safety, remove impediments – need to address environment.
- Outline for report.

- Behind schedule – probably February for draft report, an absolute deadline of March meeting

Discussion

- Goals are based on discussion in Toledo
 - Measure list is based on discussions at the June 3rd meeting in Toledo
- Some of these measures are very relevant but hard to measure.
- What spatial level do we report this data at? Perhaps we need point-to-point measures.
- Basically need to look at cost, efficiency, environment, etc.
- Some concern that GDP is a confounded measure
- Time frame – current condition versus planning. If it is planning then need to do some forecasting.
- Wittwer would like to create a picture of how freight moves in the region which is then used to help decision makers focus on a specific area.
- Lindquist says that some of these things can be added to the GIS database.
- Gupta – need to think about what is realistic. Will not be able to collect all this data in this study.
- McNeil and others - making the other sub-projects based around the performance measures, willing to help Wittwer with this.

5. Capacity Update-Lindquist, Gupta

Data Collection/ Data Acquisition/ Data Storage and Management

- Objective is to have a comprehensive database, including data repository
- Data Collection
 - Deliverable – internet based data reporting page.
 - Basis – National Highway Planning Network – will included selected access ramps, toll plazas, weigh stations, intermodal connectors
- Data Acquisition and Management
 - Secure FTP website (at <http://www.midwestfreight.utoledo.edu>), those that requested access will receive email from network administrator when ready
 - Students have been documenting issues => data reporting standards and protocols
 - Aim – make this a long-term endeavor

Discussion

- Weigh stations are being entered by students at Toledo, this overlaps with efforts by Adams
- Group requested that this site add a function to record anecdotal collection of bottlenecks from visits with local transportation organizations
- Will the states value this mapping tool?
 - Will it be compatible with what the states are doing?
- Need to manage temporal data
 - Lindquist described possibly adding a layer for each year

Capacity-Highways

Handout: Upper Midwest Freight Corridor Study (Highways)

- Study area
- Data attributes
- Data availability
- Capacity model (defaults)
- Capacity analysis

Discussion

- How do you deal with ramp metering and HOV?
 - Example – Minneapolis/St. Paul – can check against ramp metering study.
 - Also as a check in the Chicago area – can get speed data?
- How do you do deal with seasonality?

Capacity-Railroads

Handout: Upper Midwest Railroad corridor

- Data Sources – rail links and nodes (crossing data)
- Data Attributes
- Flow diagram for theoretical model
 - Close to FRA capacity => link model

Capacity-Other Modes

- Waterway, landside access to airports and ports etc.

Discussion

- Wisconsin has other data available.
 - What do we do with this?
 - Do we use this to look into the future?
 - Do we use this to identify locations for more detail analysis?
 - How does this fit with the FAF? Capacity is based on vehicles not volume of freight.

6. Usage-Kawamura (see presentation for details)

Handout: Usage Analysis Update

7. Final Products List (see handout for details)

- What do we need to do tomorrow? How can we do this so it does not look like four or five studies?
- Categories (see presentation for complete results)

- Data
- Map
- Analysis
- Advisory/ Decision Support/ Synthesis

Adjourn for day (5:45pm)

Day Two (call to order 8:15pm Central)

Handouts: State Meeting Summary

1. State Meetings (Wi, Mn, Oh, Il, In, Ia)

- Need to follow up with Iowa (Craig O'Riley), and Minnesota (Gardner)
- To get cooperation with MPOs, need to understand how this will help them

2. Afternoon meeting

- Objective is to get input from the steering committee
- Who are our customers and stakeholders

3. Status / Budget / Progress reports

- Get those reports in! (January 8, 2004)

4. Economic Development

- Groups form around the theme of economic development
- These groups are a prime customer of our work
- Find out who are the development groups
 - 10-12 major areas in the region
 - Use MPOs to help find
- A higher level sales pitch would fit this group better
 - Address how this study and issue will help them
 - Not telling them what they know; new ways of presenting it (regionally)
 - Freight 101
 - Could ask, "What questions do you have with freight affecting your decisions?"
 - Trial runs with this presentation at Madison (WMC) and Toledo

5. Outreach

Inside the DOTs

- Again, a higher level sales presentation would better fit this group
- Need to get on their agendas

Other

- Local transportation booster groups in other states?
 - Wisconsin: Transportation Development Association
- Letters of support from transportation associations
- Prepare presentation for TDA DC fly-in for March 2004

- Newsletter? Vonderembse questions the utility in this format, rather updates when needed given to stakeholders.
- Website – components, get rid of present on calendar, include the TRB paper as a working paper

6. Data

- Gordon explained need for Illinois road categorization. UIC group to follow up with Adams on IRIS manual.
- Gordon described questions from Steve Smith of InDOT regarding the roads being looked at for capacity analysis and other analysis (“Why not the entire NHS for the region?”) Support for our procedure includes:
 - Not all of the NHS in the region is important to freight
 - We could back up and look at the roads in the corridor with the greatest % of truck movements
 - Overall, the time and budget limitations prevent the comprehensive analysis
- Speaking of the corridor roads, Raja (Toledo) to map this and send to group in appropriate format
- Teresa – weigh stations, rest area, and ambiguity with designated roads?

Data Process

- Data needs (capacity, usage, administrative) <leads to> Data gaps and bottleneck request
 - Kawamura to send this file out to group, or maybe just post to website
 - Group to review this before the other site visits
- Data sources
 - States: Minnesota (UIC), Wisconsin (UIC), Iowa (UT), Illinois (UIC), Indiana (UT), Ohio (UT), Michigan (UIC), Manitoba (UT), Ontario (UIC)
 - Contacts: Rob Robinson (Illinois), O’Reilly (Iowa), Gardner (Minnesota)
 - 1st tier MPOs: Major cities in the region (10?)
 - Research team to visit these sites and do outreach at the same time
 - Gordon to send out MPO list to research team
 - 2nd tier MPOs: Other MPOs
 - Find contact person, send a letter, call, document
 - Other sources – econ development
- Kazuya to coordinate with Raja

7. House and Senate Committee Bills

- Senate
 - competitive UTCs (match 80/20) + Asset Management Institute
- House
 - 5 national – Alaska, West Virginia, Minnesota, Illinois, Wisconsin – match (50/50), unfunded, national agenda

8. March meeting agenda

- Evening social/ Petri as speaker
- Full day steering and advisory meeting

- Useful to have a separate steering committee meeting (3-5pm before evening event or early AM on second day?)
- Update on the progress: Where are we going to be at?
- Make as interactive as possible – use the five product areas. Think about a large group facilitated process.

Adjourn (11:30am)

Next Research Team conference call has been scheduled for December 18, 2003 at 1:00pm Central time. Also scheduled is a conference call for January 8, 2004 at 1:00pm Central. Both calls fall on Thursdays.