



Upper Midwest Freight Corridor Study

Summary

Steering Committee Meeting
 December 8, 2003 – Noon-4pm (CDT)
 University of Illinois, Urban Transportation Center
 Chicago, Ill.

Participants

William Gardner, Minnesota DOT	Craig O’Riley, Iowa DOT
Keith Sherman, Illinois DOT	Jim Johnson, Illinois DOT
Tom Beck, Indiana DOT	Sandy Beaupre’, Wisconsin DOT
Matt Selhorst, Ohio DOT	Suzann Rhodes, Ohio DOT
Mark Locker, Ohio DOT	James McQuirt, Ohio DOT
Matt Dietrich, Ohio Rail Development Commission	Amar Chadha, Manitoba Ministry of Transport
Steve Call, FHWA-Illinois	Stephanie Hickman, FHWA-Wisconsin
Scott Sigman, Ports of Indiana	Susan Moe, FHWA-Minnesota <i>via phone</i>
Ernie Wittwer, Midwest Regional UTC	Teresa Adams, UW-Madison
Sue McNeil, University of Illinois at Chicago	Travis Gordon, Midwest Regional UTC
Mark Vonderembse, University of Toledo	Kazuya Kawamura, Univ of Illinois at Chi
Peter Lindquist, University of Toledo	Jiwan Gupta, University of Toledo
<i>Items highlighted in yellow are action items or require follow-up.</i>	

Meeting Agenda

1. *Welcome and introductions*
2. *Lunch*
3. *Review purpose of meeting and agenda*
4. *Review study deliverables*
5. *Outreach strategies*
6. *Other topics*

Handout: Meeting Presentation

Study Deliverables

1. Clearinghouse of relevant studies and research

- Selhorst asked if the research team has given thought to maintenance of this after the study ends. The computer infrastructure is in place to maintain this information and to expand it as we progress. If this study leads to the development of a long-term cooperation among the states, then new studies and research outcomes could be added to

the clearinghouse. This is part of the future research efforts, what has been termed ‘next steps.’

2. Clearinghouse of regional freight data, including facility inventory, flow data, and regulatory data

- Rhodes asked if research team was linking to federal level efforts, so to avoid duplicating their work.
- O’Riley discussed how he viewed the vision of this area is that users do not have to have their own GIS software. However, can the states download their own data? Interactive data entry and export is a long-term project.
 - Allows agencies to look beyond their borders, shows how freight moves beyond state lines
- Sigman asked how regularly it will be maintained and discussed issues of data differences and integrity. Lindquist responded how another part of the study, data standards, will address this concern.
- The issue of temporal dimension/ time series data
- Gardner opened the questioning on how will the freight flows be depicted? National assignment? Responses included:
 - Node based data
 - Link based data based on highway definition of study corridor. Rail data is trickier.
- Hickman asked whether the data will be available to MPOs as input to the four step travel model. Responses included:
 - Will meet with MPOs to discuss these issues
 - This is a corridor study so may not be appropriate
 - May be utility in the internet mapping site, but forecasting is not appropriate
- Base map is the National Highway Planning network. Any data related to that network can be included as a spatial overlay.
- Sigman opened the discussion on how through traffic is being handled (e.g. Pittsburgh – Kansas City).
 - Kawamura reported that waybill sample includes national data for OD so includes through traffic
 - Freeway data comes from Freight Analysis Framework (FAF)
 - Most states were not able to provide detailed data, but may have it
 - Canadian data is very good

3. Data documentation and cataloging

4. Surveys of private and public stakeholders

- Public sector – 50% response rate
- Private sector – 10% response rate (500 organizations)

Discussion

Sigman raised the issue of intermodal Bill of Lading (BOL), if the data is able to correctly track how a container shipment, for example, is taken from ship, put on rail, then transferred to truck for part of its trip. Suggested that Reebe may be the only source for this intermodal split. Also noted that empty moves and repositioning of equipment may make up a significant % of traffic.

Kawamura responded that there is a Northwestern study looking at that issue and that we would work with that group. Also discussed constraints in locating terminals where the intermodal splits take place, due to data confidentiality.

5. Maps (Base maps (by mode), Regional commodity flow data by mode, Link-based level of service (LOS), Administrative support facilities, Size and weight regulations, ITS-CVO projects)

- Gardner asked if there will be non-highway level of service maps. Gupta responded that the capacity will define those areas.
- Administrative support facilities include weigh stations, truck stops, overnight parking
- The Size and weight maps will show the differences along the defined corridor network--attribute assigned--, but not impacts
- O'Riley suggested including speed limit differences on these maps

6. Capacity analysis

- Also includes anecdotal bottleneck information. Noted as a feature in database.
- Asked if research is dealing with freeflow? Measuring the capacity with congestion? Operational capacity or idle capacity?
 - Based on physical condition and peak hour
- Asked if research is identifying bottlenecks in the rail network?
 - So far only link capacity has been reviewed.
- Answering question from McQuirt, capacity is for a subset of the highway planning network.
- Waterways? – have not begun to do this.
 - Johnson gave warning to the research team when doing these calculations, there are several other factors at work.
- Beck suggested collecting data on highway expansion. This has been discussed as a next step for the research efforts.
 - Gupta did mention that the analysis will have the capability to change capacity levels and analyze the change in level of service

7. Weight to value ratio

8. Size and weight exemptions

9. Data requirements gap analysis

- There is significant variability in the available data. Beaupre' asked if gaps in public data and private data sources will be looked at, which it will.

10. Impacts of regulatory inconsistencies

- Sigman raised issue of hazmat. Or IMAD, or other federal?
 - All states seem to have adopted federal regulations. There may be some border issues.
 - States do regulate hazardous waste movement. Chada identified the concern of nuclear waste movements.
 - Surveys went to shippers and haulers. Included hazmats etc.
- Dietrich discussed how there are inconsistencies for the railroads caused by legal barriers. Short lines filing for access to Class I railroads. (Senate bill 919). Process is an STB ruling. Shippers are (not?) pushing for more open access.

Discussion

- O’Riley put out the question, “Will this tell us where our problems are in the region?” The research team’s response is that the project gives states the data and information. States need to make the value judgments and the research team should not be doing this. What is a problem for one state may not be a problem for another state.
- From Beaupre’, need to not get carried away with the mapping of things that are not of any use to states, like truck facilities. It is the issue of spatial data vs. analytical data.
- Would be interesting to look at time of day (e.g. Manitoba to somewhere in US)? Probably not in this study.
- Is anything capturing the condition of the infrastructure? Difficult to get this data, but could get anecdotal information.
- Any discussion of putting cost estimates on improvements? This goes beyond the charge.
- Bridge data –clearance, weight restrictions. Interstate roads and mainline rail, in general, are going to be able to handle industry standard loads.

11. Synthesis (Status of ITS-CVO project implementation, Best practices for inter-jurisdictional cooperation, Performance Measurement 101, Performance measurement for other corridor studies, Public and private views of performance measures, Administrative and legislative issues and impacts, Data collection and transfer standards)

- The steering committee supported the synthesis of ALL performance measures being used by state DOTs in the region
- Administrative issues synthesis is a literature review

12. Facilitate regional cooperation

- Need to work together in this area
 - Detailed directory that includes true job functions was suggested by Rhodes
 - Staff sheet with others in the states (beyond this group) that work with freight
 - List responsibilities, a bio, more than a title
 - Sigman suggested conference calls
 - Wittwer suggested smaller groups to oversee a certain group of deliverables
- Gardner stated that it would be helpful to understand what issues other states are grappling with, this helps to look at next steps
- Gardner also explained how regional cooperation may have been more successful in non-transportation venues. There is also problem of institutional issues because planning occurs by mode and by border.

Discussion

- Sigman questioned whether outreach is tied to economic development. Sigman and Beaupre’ pointed out that there is no advocacy organization for freight. The public and the carriers really don’t care until there is a problem. No help from the Class I railroads.
 - Indiana Ports had a successful freight conference in Sept – they were able to identify the audience. Recognition that freight is critical. Problems of short planning horizons.

- Focus on issues that would be of value for multi-state cooperation. But there is also the problem of competition for economic development between states. What you want to do is get the through traffic through the state so you can bring in raw materials and ship products.
- Real questions: is there a set of issues that this group can come together on? Idea of some in the committee is that we need an area where we can jointly get together where we can be successful. Need a win.
 - Dietrich suggested that the group meet when there is an issue that affects all the states
 - Chadha suggested looking at the cost of getting goods to market
 - Beaupre' suggested that some issues will stand out once the products of this study are delivered
 - Example – the Chicago rail bottlenecks alleviation (CREATE plan) will help everyone.
 - Coalesce around 1-2 issues that have low sensitivity but high payoff
- Forum for advocacy for transportation expenditures in general. Need numbers and analysis to support this.

13. Data integration framework and tools (Internet data reporting system)

- Lindquist presented this area, asking the committee to think about several areas: What data are appropriate? What kind of standards? Is this an activity that should be ongoing?

14. Framework for assisting decision makers to select and implement freight performance measures

- Identifying data needs. For example, travel reliability or travel time between major metropolitan areas and market areas.
- Discussion of measurement for investment in manufacturing or distribution
 - Vonderembse stated that looking at investment in distribution centers is better measure of the transportation system. Manufacturing is more related to labor costs.
 - Do you want to look at the relationship to private sector costs or shipping costs?
 - Do we want to look at distribution of warehousing? (See distribution logistic listing of 100 most warehouse friendly locations.)

Outreach

1. Outreach to State DOTs

- Discussion of issues of relevance to the state
- The study group will put together a presentation for the DOTs
 - Need to focus on the reason for the study
 - High level presentation
 - Awareness of this study and freight more generally
 - Illustrate the importance of the states working together on regional projects

2. Outreach to other stakeholders

- Look at ODOT's six presentation on the website
- Some disagreement as to whether a reactive approach is appropriate
- Sigman suggested using the Freight Bottom Line Report (AASHTO). Need to pitch it to the general public.
- Discussion about how MPOs may be the way to get to the public because they are required to have a public involvement process. Maybe this will help them to get to freight.
- Need to deliver the freight message in simple terms
- Increase public awareness of the importance of transportation and illustrate the importance of the states working together on regional projects
- Alternatives are the mayor's conferences, the county engineers, etc.
- Examples of presentation from Sigman (Port of Indiana)
- Also supporting statistics from Manitoba
- What about getting out to transportation conferences? Specifically state and MPO level?
 - IDOT fall planning conference. Ohio. TRB. MPO directors.
- Several different organizations in Ohio focusing on Economic Development. Dietrich is a past representative from one of these groups.
- Based on the Indiana Conf, 39 people indicated interest – they are now doing facility tours - <http://www.indianalogistics.com>
- Groups to extend outreach efforts to
 - Friends of the advisory committee (although may be part of the choir)
 - Council of Logistics Management
 - Minnesota Freight Advisory Committee
 - Chambers of Commerce / World Trade Clubs

3. Have any of the states done anything about the economic impact of freight and/or transportation?

- Impacts of Rail in Iowa mentioned by O'Riley
- Corp of Engineers report on benefits of upper river system suggested by Johnson
- St. Lawrence Seaway shared by Sigman
- City of Kansas and shortline railroad effects on grain (North Dakota) – see: <http://www.ugpti.org/research/agtrans/index.php>
- Again, the Freight Bottom Line Report by AASHTO was suggested
- Aside: <http://www.reebie.com/images/ReebieNews/pr37.htm> link to Impact of Rail on the Chicago Economy

Reactions

1. Gardner – suggests a presentation to freight advisory committee meeting
2. O'Riley – useful meeting. Presentation will be useful.
3. Selhorst – anxious to see products. Good to get the data out there.
4. Dietrich – filling the data gaps will be interesting.
5. Rhodes – focus on corridor – what can we do? How do we get money from the feds?
6. Locker – interesting effort – important to have multiple states
7. McQuirt – data geek – interesting to see how some of the data is going to be used.

8. Sigman – thanks for the opportunity to participate
9. Hickman – productive, got a handle on what we are trying to do
10. Beck – it will be interesting to see what the data looks like. It will be useful to look at the joint ideas/ projects/ issues.
11. Beaupre’ – would be possible to get stuff before the meeting? Felt a little lost in the discussion of deliverables. Need to focus on how to raise the visibility of the issues.
12. Call – dittos. Would like to see more federal participants.
13. Moe – looking forward to products. Being on the phone was useful.
14. Sherman – Why not more interest? Economic value is important.
15. Johnson – Useful
16. Chadha – Interesting. Data sets will be important, including definitions.

Adjourn (3:45pm)

Next meeting will be March 29-30, 2004 in Milwaukee. The steering committee may meet separately before the reception on the night of the 29th.

Debriefing

- What is a common project? Need to be thinking about this. Border issues?
- Seemed to basically ratify the deliverables
- Good discussion. Fairly balanced.
- Economic development is challenging. Driven by governors.
- Infrastructure issues?
- Any future problems with “my intersection is not included?”