FHWA Talking Freight Seminar Series

FHWA Freight Intermodal Connectors Study Intermodal Connector Assessment Tool

February 15, 2017

Presented by Dike Ahanotu, Ph.D. Cambridge Systematics



Overview of Discussion

- Description of overall study
- Consideration of changes to designation criteria
- Freight intermodal connector data quality and availability
- Long-term data program for connectors
- Guidance on intermodal connector planning



Description of Overall Study



Changes to Designation Criteria Considered

Expanding definition to include truck-truck terminals

Raising the minimum truck volume threshold from 100 trucks

Designating routes that connect terminals to the Interstate system

Developing signage for designated NHS connectors

Other changes as identified by stakeholder



Outreach to Transportation Agencies

- Seven State Departments of Transportation (DOTs)
 - » Florida, Georgia, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota
- Five Metropolitan Planning Organizations
 - » Capital District Transportation Committee
 - » Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency
 - » Chicago Metropolitan Agency of Planning
 - » Delaware Valley Regional Planning Council
 - » Mid-American Regional Council



Feedback from Stakeholders

Expanding definition to include trucktruck terminals

- » Truck-truck terminals (e.g. freight villages) are growing in number and importance
- » Defining truck-truck terminals is challenging in terms of both geometry and truck volumes
- » Mixed opinions on need for NHS connector designation, especially with critical rural/urban corridor designations available
- Raising the minimum truck volume threshold from 100 trucks
 - » 100 trucks per day was deemed as appropriate
 - » Strong desire to find a way to replace truck threshold value with economic importance surrogate
 - » Desire to apply marine cluster exception to other modes



Feedback from Stakeholders

Little to no interest in other changes

- Designating routes that connect terminals to the Interstate system or developing signage for freight connectors
- » State ownership and operation of all NHS connectors
- » Dedicated freight connector funding programs
- » Rescreening existing connectors for eligibility
- Lack of current and accurate data was the most common need for freight intermodal connectors
 - » Truck volumes on connectors in HPMS does not match field data
 - » Many connectors are not yet included in NPMRDS
 - » Publishing private sector terminal operator data can be problematic
 - » More sophisticated metrics desired such as value of goods, cost of delay

FHWA Intermodal Connector Assessment Tool

- Commissioned by FHWA in 2008
- Based on survey information on freight connectors conducted on State DOTs
- 21 data fields across four categories
 - » Identification/ownership
 - » Use vehicle classification data
 - » Condition pavement quality, roadway geometric configuration and restrictions
 - » Performance volume/capacity ratio, crash rates
- Information collected from less than a dozen states



Options for Improving Data Quality

Truck count data

- » Make increased data collection on connectors an HPMS requirement
- » Add current information on truck, auto and train volumes at crossings on connectors

Speed data

» Increase coverage of NHS freight connectors that are included in the NPMRDS data

Freight Performance Measures Data

Standardize and increase the number of update cycles linking roadway network identification between HPMS and NPMRDS

Crash data

» Require truck-involved and total crash data to be provided for NHS freight connectors



Options for Improving Data Quality

Origin-destination data

» Can be obtained through gate survey or truck GPS data

Supply chain data

- » Most easily obtained from interviews of terminal operators, shippers, and carriers
- » Expanding options to obtain this data from freight transaction data



Potential Schematic for a Stand-Alone Database

- 34 data fields identified
 - » 23 critical data fields
- Expands upon fields in existing ICAT database
- Considers available formats for data and compatibility across formats





Supporting IMX Planning Through Existing Databases

- Build from the ground up based on existing data in several sources
 - » HPMS
 - » NPMRDS
 - » Crash data
 - » BTS GeoSpatial Tool
- Effort focused on linking information together
 - Potentially synchronizing over time



Supporting IMX Planning Through Existing Databases (continued)

- BTS GeoSpatial database has the potential to allow for additional fields
 - Station type (origin, destination, transload)
 - » Terminal type
 - Handling activity (loading, unloading)

Site_Name	CITY	STATE	PADD	STATION_TY	FACILITY_T	HANDLING
Agnew Crude Terminal	Oklahoma City	ОК	2	Transload	Terminal	Loading
Albany Terminal	Albany	NY	1	Transload	Terminal	Unloading
Albany Terminal	Albany	NY	1	Transload	Terminal	Unloading
Albuquerque Terminal	Albuquerque	NM	3	Origin	Terminal	Unloading
Ardmore Terminal	Ardmore	OK	2	Transload	Terminal	Loading
Bakersfield Refinery	Bakersfield	CA	5	Destination	Refinery	Unloading
Bakken Oil Express	Dickinson	ND	2	Origin	Terminal	Loading
Bakken Oil Express	Dickinson	ND	2	Origin	Terminal	Loading
BakkenLink Rail Hub	Fryburg	ND	2	Origin	Terminal	Loading
Baltimore Transload Terminal	Baltimore	MD	1	Destination	Terminal	Unloading
Barnhart Terminal	Barnhart	TX	3	Origin	Terminal	Loading
Basin Transload (aka Zap Terminal)	Beulah	ND	2	Origin	Terminal	Loading
Baton Rouge Refinery	Baton Rouge	LA	3	Destination	Refinery	Unloading
Bayway Refinery	Linden	NJ	1	Destination	Refinery	Unloading
Bayway Refinery	Bayway	NJ	1	Destination	Refinery	Unloading
Black Run Rail Facility	Frazeysburg	OH	2	Origin	Terminal	Loading
Black Thunder Terminal	Gillette	WY	4	Transload	Terminal	Loading
Borger Terminal	Borger	TX	3	Transload	Terminal	Unloading
Brown field Terminal	Brownfield	TX	3	Origin	Terminal	Unloading
Brownsville Terminal	Brownsville	TX	3	Transload	Barge	Unloading
Carleton Terminal	Carleton	OK	2	Transload	Terminal	Loading
Casper Crude to Rail Terminal	Casper	WY	4	Transload	Terminal	Loading
Catlettsburg Refinery	Catlettsburg	KY	2	Destination	Refinery	Unloading
Centane Rail Loading Terminal	Carlsbad	NM	3	Transload	Terminal	Loading
Cherry Point Terminal	Ferndale	WA	5	Destination	Refinery	Unloading
Cheyenne Crude Terminal	Cheyenne	WY	4	Transload	Terminal	Loading
Cheyenne Logistics Hub	Cheyenne	WY	4	Transload	Terminal	Loading
Chickasaw Terminal	Chickasaw	AL	3	Destination	Barge	Unloading
COLT Hub	Epping	ND	2	Origin	Terminal	Loading
Columbus Terminal	Columbus	ND	2	Origin	Terminal	Loading
Corous Christi Definen/	Corpue Christi	TV	2	Dectination	Definery	Unloading



Recommended Intermodal Connector Database

- Stand-alone and using existing data options compared across several dimensions
 - » Accuracy
 - » Accessibility
 - » Ease of future updates
 - » Maintenance requirements

Using existing data options found to be more feasible



Guidance on Intermodal Connector Planning

- Ongoing task to review state freight planning guidelines and identify locations for consideration of intermodal connector planning
- Link to sate freight plan guidance

https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2016/10/14/2016-24862/guidance-on-state-freight-plans-and-state-freightadvisory-committees

- Example #1 Critical rural and urban freight corridors
- Example #2 Inventory of facilities with freight mobility issues



Next Steps

- Complete technical memo on guidance for planning related to freight connectors
- Develop final report highlighting findings from all subtasks
- Project completion projected for mid-June 2017



Questions and Comments

For additional information, contact: Tiffany Julien FHWA Project Manager tiffany.julien@dot.gov

