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ABSTRACT

This paper summarizes selected intermodal and multimodal freight policy, planning, and programming efforts in state agencies over the decade following passage of Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA). The paper provides a snapshot of state freight activities in the early 21st century, and supplements previous reviews of these activities. The paper begins by reviewing freight policy planning and programming requirements in ISTEA and the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA 21). This is followed by references to other studies that have summarized efforts by state transportation agencies to implement ISTEA, TEA 21, and other freight-related requirements. The bulk of the paper summarizes selected freight efforts recently completed or underway in state agencies, primarily state transportation agencies. The summary of recent and current efforts focuses on published documents, mostly freight studies and plans, and freight offices or programs. The report may be useful to freight advocacy groups, organizations developing freight outreach programs, and groups developing recommendations for federal or state legislation addressing freight issues. Further review of the freight studies, plans, offices, and programs may suggest ideas for research problem statements to submit for funding consideration. Submissions of problem statements might focus on filling gaps in existing information or data, assessing the effectiveness of freight program activities, or analyzing a wide variety of other topics to advance the understanding and practice of freight policy, planning, and programming in state transportation agencies.
INTRODUCTION

Passage of the federal Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) in 1991 resulted in a heightened emphasis on intermodal and multimodal freight policy, planning, and programming. This emphasis was manifested in new freight planning requirements for states and metropolitan areas and in the requirement for state transportation agencies to develop management systems, including Intermodal Management Systems. Passage of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA 21) in 1998 further extended federal requirements for states and metropolitan areas.

This paper summarizes selected intermodal and multimodal freight policy, planning, and programming efforts in state transportation agencies over the decade following passage of ISTEA. The paper provides a snapshot of state freight activities in the early 21st century, and supplements previous reviews of these activities. Moreover, the paper complements Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) freight outreach and assistance efforts, and extends discussions from the 2002 annual meeting of the Transportation Research Board where six sessions focused on “Freight Issues, Needs, and Responses: A Decade of Responses after ISTEA.”

The paper begins by reviewing freight-related requirements in ISTEA and TEA 21. This is followed by references to other studies that have summarized efforts by state transportation agencies to implement ISTEA, TEA 21, and other freight-related requirements for policy, planning, and programming. The bulk of the paper summarizes selected freight efforts recently completed or underway in state agencies, primarily state transportation agencies. In a few cases, the paper refers to private-sector freight efforts that have contributed to policy, planning, and programming in state agencies.

The summary of recent and current state efforts highlights published documents, mostly freight studies and plans, and freight offices or programs with personnel working on freight policy, planning, and programming. Included in the discussion are references to selected other aspects associated with state activities; e.g., common themes in studies and plans, presence of freight advisory groups, legislative impetus for state freight efforts, and consultant assistance with studies and plans.

ISTEA AND TEA 21 FREIGHT REQUIREMENTS

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (1) emphasized freight policy, and planning, and programming in three major ways. First, the first word in the act’s title highlighted the importance of intermodal movements in a multimodal transportation system. Various provisions in the act referenced the need for state and regional transportation agencies to plan for freight and passenger intermodal movements.

Second, the act established 20 state-level and 15 metropolitan-level factors that state and metropolitan agencies were required to use for transportation planning efforts. Of these factors, two each at the state and metropolitan levels explicitly addressed the need to more fully incorporate freight considerations in transportation planning.

Third, state transportation agencies were required to develop an Intermodal Management System (IMS). Although this requirement was rescinded with passage of the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995 (2), it contributed to better intermodal and freight planning in a number of state transportation agencies. Information on the current status of state intermodal
management systems is challenging to uncover; as recently as 1996, at least 30 state transportation agencies had implemented some form of an IMS (3). The number of states today with an IMS likely is much less than in 1996.

The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (4) continued ISTEA’s emphasis on statewide and metropolitan planning factors, but reduced the number of factors to seven at the state level as well as seven at the metropolitan level. Compared to ISTEA, freight’s importance was proportionally greater in planning factors for TEA 21. Of the latter’s planning factors, two of seven referred to freight or goods movement, compared to two of 20 at the state level and two of 15 at the metropolitan level in ISTEA. On the other hand, TEA 21 was less prescriptive than ISTEA in requiring statewide and metropolitan planning factors to be included in plans; i.e., sections 1203 and 1204 in TEA 21 specify that failure to consider the statewide factors shall not be reviewable in the courts on matters affecting transportation plans, transportation improvement plans, projects or strategies, or certification of planning processes.

TEA 21 further expanded opportunities for the freight community to participate in statewide and metropolitan processes by explicitly specifying that freight shippers and providers of freight transportation services shall be provided with reasonable notice of opportunities to comment on state and metropolitan long-range transportation plans and project programming documents. Other TEA 21 provisions that could be used to support freight policy, planning, and programming included the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (also in ISTEA), National Corridor Planning and Development Program, Coordinated Border Infrastructure Program, Transportation and Community and System Preservation Pilot Program, High Priority Projects Program, and several rail programs.

To help states and metropolitan areas implement the provisions of ISTEA and TEA 21, the Federal Highway Administration administers various funding programs. Federal State Planning and Research (SPR) funding, for example, supports a variety of long-range planning and short-range programming activities. The SPR program has been used by a number of state and metropolitan transportation agencies to help fund freight studies and policy, planning, and programming efforts.

PREVIOUS STUDIES, REPORTS, AND PRESENTATIONS

In the mid-1990s, the Transportation Research Board sponsored a National Cooperative Highway Research Program synthesis project on *Freight Transportation Planning in the Public Sector* (5). This study reviewed recent research in freight planning, development of freight-based performance measures, and sources of data for freight planning. It also presented case studies of freight planning in five states: California, Florida, Ohio, Oregon, and Wisconsin. For California, Florida, and Oregon, the emphasis was on the development of intermodal management systems and the integration of freight into these systems. For Ohio (*Access Ohio*) and Wisconsin (*Translinks 21*), the emphasis was on incorporating freight into statewide planning efforts. The study’s author concluded by identifying several opportunities, including the need to better summarize freight policy issues, identify gaps in freight training, clarify freight data needs and develop data to meet these needs, and distribute data and tools to practitioners.

In the late 1990s, personnel at the Lyndon Baines Johnson School of Public Affairs, University of Texas at Austin, coordinated three policy research projects to summarize and provide case studies of transportation planning in the U.S. and abroad. The first study (6) provided summaries of exemplary rail freight and passenger programs, including examples from
rail freight programs in North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, and Washington. The study also provided rail profiles for 32 states and the New England region. The second study (7) covered “best practices” in multimodal and intermodal transportation policies, plans, and programs in nine U.S. states, three European countries, and three Latin American countries. The third study (8) extended the second study by providing a more detailed appraisal of multimodal and intermodal practices in selected states, metropolitan areas, and European countries; included in the appraisal were freight-related case studies for programs in Florida, Washington, and Wisconsin.

As part of its outreach and assistance efforts, the FHWA in the year 2000 sponsored a National Freight Transportation Workshop to “elicit and consider the varied experiences of the attendees related to intermodal freight planning, policy, performance measurement, and investment” (9). The workshop served as an opportunity to better understand public- and private-sector decision making, the status of intermodal freight planning in the late 1990s, best practices to address current and emerging challenges, and successful applications of performance measurement for freight transportation activities. Presenters provided summaries of statewide freight transportation policy, planning, and programming for the following: California (10), Minnesota (11), Oregon (12), Pennsylvania (13), Texas (14), Washington (15), and Wisconsin (16).

In another outreach and assistance effort for freight planning and project implementation, the FHWA on October 1-3, 2001, sponsored a National Freight Planning and Programming Conference that covered national freight movements and freight policies and options. One of the papers was titled “Addressing Freight in the Transportation Planning Process” (17). The paper noted that California, Florida, Maine, Maryland, New Jersey, Ohio, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin were among the states that have “started to build statewide pictures of freight movement and tie freight policy and transportation investments more closely to state economic development goals.” The paper’s author noted that many state DOTs do not have staff dedicated expressly to identify freight needs. Moreover, he noted that while state long-range plans address freight movement, they do not provide a systematic approach of freight needs at the state level.

**METHODOLOGY FOR COLLECTING INFORMATION**

To update previous work and provide a better understanding of recent freight policy, planning, and programming efforts at state transportation agencies, the author reviewed previous studies, conducted a search of state transportation agency Web sites, and contacted selected federal and state transportation agency personnel by e-mail, by telephone, and in-person. The author then developed a draft paper summarizing the information collected, and submitted the paper for TRB review pursuant to the January 2003 annual meeting.

After receiving reviewer comments and making a few revisions, the author sent the paper to state transportation agency contacts and asked for their review and feedback on the paper’s accuracy as well as on a number of questions addressing information gaps and reviewer comments. As of November 15, 2002, responses had been received from 17 states. Some of the comments from state transportation agencies have been incorporated into the CD ROM version of this paper. Other comments from respondents will be incorporated into a later version of the paper. The following sections of the paper address the information collected thus far.
FREIGHT STUDIES, PLANS, AND ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A number of state transportation agencies have sponsored or developed freight studies or plans over the last decade. Table 1 provides information on studies and plans according to the following characteristics: sponsor of the study or plan; title, year of publication, and Web page if available, and miscellaneous comments about the study or plan.

The geographic focus for studies and plans in Table 1 is entire states or a single large region within a state. While most documents in the table cover freight statewide, studies in Colorado, Minnesota, West Virginia, and Washington cover multi-county substate regions.

A number of the studies and plans have been undertaken to support statewide long-range transportation planning; e.g. in California, Florida, Nevada, Ohio, Oregon, and Vermont. Several have been developed in response to state legislative direction; e.g., in California, Florida, and Washington. In Florida, the statewide Chamber of Commerce has sponsored a multi-faceted study that focused heavily on freight. This study is an important contributor to freight-related activities in the Florida Department of Transportation. Private-sector consultants and university professors have helped develop freight studies or plans in most states, including Colorado, Florida, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington.

Studies and plans tend to have several common themes: freight community outreach through technical advisory or other committees, relationship of freight planning to overall transportation planning, inventory (including commodity flows) of the existing freight system, forecasts of volumes and/or value by mode, identification of freight needs and projects, and development of next steps, action plans, and strategies/recommendations for implementation. A couple states—Florida and Washington—have established multimodal freight funding programs to help build projects and implement programs identified in next steps, action plans, strategies, or recommendations. A number of states have modal funding programs for rail and/or marine freight mobility projects.

In California, Florida, Maine, Maryland, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and Wisconsin, an explicit effort has been made to link freight mobility to economic competitiveness, development, or well being. Most states with freight studies or plans are located along the east or west coasts of the U.S. or along borders with Canada or Mexico. This suggests that international trade is a key variable in identifying which states have documented freight trends and concerns.

Innovative or unique aspects of studies or plans include: focus on freight issues and problems for international global gateways (California), utilization of a charette to develop solutions and strategies for freight problems (Maryland), and development of freight performance measures (Minnesota). One of the most innovative efforts is Washington’s Freight Implementation Plan, which identifies who within the Washington State Department of Transportation is working on freight-related issues, what they are doing and when they are going to do it, and how it fits with existing plans and budgets.

Studies and plans have been done in conjunction with a freight or transportation advisory committee in California, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Virginia. In a few states, freight advisory or similar committees have been established for longer than the time needed to prepare studies and plans. The Minnesota Freight Advisory Committee, for example, has been advising the Minnesota Department of Transportation since 1998 on freight policy.
issues and project investments. A similar committee has been established in Oregon and is under
consideration for establishment in other states such as California.

In Florida, a Transportation Policy Outreach Advisory Council makes annual
recommendations to the Florida Legislature on prioritization and selection of high priority
projects that will preserve existing transportation infrastructure, enhance Florida’s economic
growth and competitiveness, and improve travel choices to ensure mobility. The Transportation
Policy Outreach program is multimodal in scope and provides funding for a variety of
improvement categories, including roadway access projects to freight facilities, seaport projects,
air cargo projects, and rail freight projects.

In Washington state, the Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board reviews, prioritizes,
and recommends freight mobility transportation projects that are of strategic importance to the
state of Washington. This includes creating a comprehensive and coordinated state program to
facilitate freight movement between and among local, national, and international markets, and
finding solutions that lessen the impact of freight movements on local communities.

Additionally, several states have established rail freight advisory committees, especially
in conjunction with the development of statewide rail plans.

FREIGHT OFFICES AND PROGRAMS

Table 2 identifies states with established freight offices and programs according to the following
characteristics: freight office or program name, administrative home or authority for the office
or program, Web site addresses for further information, roles and responsibilities of the office or
program or their staff, and number of managers and staff. Similar to Table 1, information for the
10 states in Table 2 was obtained by reviewing previous studies, conducting a search of state
transportation agency Web sites, and contacting state transportation agency personnel by e-mail,
by telephone, and in-person.

As noted for freight studies and plans, most states in Table 2 are located along the east or
west coasts of the U.S. or along borders with Canada or Mexico, suggesting that international
trade is a key variable in identifying which states have freight offices or programs. Six states are
among the nation’s 10 most populated, suggesting that size of the population and economy is
another key variable.

Table 2 includes information only for state transportation agencies with a freight office or
program that is multimodal in name or scope. A number of other states, for example, have rail
offices that include freight specialists and program activities. Several programs shown in the
table are primarily rail freight programs with an additional emphasis on one or more other modes
such as marine. A few states (e.g., Colorado, Ohio, and Oregon) have multimodal freight
specialists but no formal freight office or freight program.

The available information suggests no universal theme for administrative home or
authority. Offices and programs tend to be administratively housed within modal transportation
offices or transportation planning offices. In Washington, freight office personnel report to the
agency Chief of Staff. In Washington, personnel for a freight project funding program (Freight
Mobility Strategic Investment Board) work closely with state DOT staff but in a separate office,
and report to a board appointed by the state’s governor.

For the majority of states with freight offices or programs, the focus is on overall policy
formulation, outreach to stakeholders and the general public, analysis of data and information,
and identification of freight problems, solutions, and funding needs. Several freight offices or
programs also focus heavily on rail freight issues such as grade crossing improvements, track and other infrastructure needs, rail freight planning, and financial and technical assistance, especially for short line railroads. Two states—New Jersey and Washington—have corridor programs (Portway and FAST) to identify and implement infrastructure and other improvements in heavily traveled freight corridors important for international trade.

State freight offices and programs generally have fewer than 10 management and staff; a majority have fewer than five. Three offices or programs have between 10 and 20 management and staff; two of these are offices or programs with a strong rail freight emphasis. Personnel generally consist of managers or supervisors, planners, analysts, modal specialists, engineers or engineering technicians, and office administrative/support staff.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This report summarizes information about the development of state freight transportation studies, plans, advisory committees, offices, and programs in the decade since passage of the federal Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act. The report places this information in the context of

- federal legislation encouraging states and metropolitan areas to incorporate freight into policy, planning, and programming efforts,
- previous summaries of state and metropolitan freight planning initiatives, and
- recent Federal Highway Administration freight outreach and assistance activities.

As such, the report provides a snapshot of recent and ongoing activities which may be useful to other state transportation agencies with existing freight programs, agencies undergoing expansion of existing programs, or agencies considering new freight studies, plans, or program development.

The report may be useful to freight advocacy groups, organizations wishing to develop outreach programs to assist state transportation agencies in developing freight policy, planning, and programming capacity, and groups developing recommendations for future federal or state legislation addressing freight issues. For example, authors of new legislation may find this report useful in drafting language encouraging or requiring states or metropolitan areas to develop better practices for incorporating freight in long-range transportation planning and short-range program funding.

The report is consistent with Transportation Research Board (TRB) efforts to address freight in policy studies such as Policy Options for Intermodal Freight Transportation (18), in freight theme issues of the Transportation Research Record—Journal of the Transportation Research Board, and in National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) projects, including projects for the synthesis program. For example, information in this report likely will complement information being developed for NCHRP Project 08-47, “Policy, Planning, and Programming for Goods Movement and Freight in Small and Mid-Sized Metropolitan Areas” (19), as well as for NCHRP Synthesis Topic 33-12, “Freight Transportation as a Good Neighbor” (20).

Further review of the studies, plans, offices, and programs discussed in this report may suggest ideas for research problem statements to submit for funding consideration through the NCHRP or other TRB programs, FHWA’s State Planning and Research Program, other programs of the FHWA or U.S. Department of Transportation, or programs of other public and private sector entities. Submission of problem statements might focus on filling gaps in existing information or data, on assessing the effectiveness of freight program activities, or on a wide variety of other
topics to advance the understanding and practice of freight policy, planning, and programming in state transportation agencies.

In conclusion, numerous state transportation agencies have increased their efforts to address freight policy, planning, and programming. This has occurred primarily through overall multimodal/intermodal transportation activities. In some states, the level of effort has grown to include statewide or multi-county regional studies, as well as in-state and multi-state corridor studies. About 10 states have established offices or programs to focus specifically on freight. Persons connected with these programs generally believe their programs have been at least modestly successful, but that more work remains to be done. Re-authorization of TEA 21 may provide additional tools and opportunities for states to go beyond where they have gone during the 10 years since ISTEA was passed and signed into law.
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1. Examples of Freight Studies or Plans

2. State Freight Transportation Offices or Programs
TABLE 1 Examples of Freight Studies or Plans*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Title, Year of Publication, and Web Page</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Global Gateways Development Program—2002 (22) <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ogm/GGDP_Final_Report.pdf">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ogm/GGDP_Final_Report.pdf</a></td>
<td>Report is the result of a state Senate Concurrent Resolution requesting Caltrans and others to prepare a proposal for a global gateways development program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Colorado Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Eastern Colorado Mobility Study—2002 (23) <a href="http://www.dot.state.co.us/EastCOMobilityStudy/FinalReport.htm">www.dot.state.co.us/EastCOMobilityStudy/FinalReport.htm</a></td>
<td>Lead consultant: Felsburg, Holt, and Ullevig. Study focuses on the feasibility of improving existing and/or constructing future transportation corridors and intermodal facilities in and through the eastern half of Colorado.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Maine Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Maine Integrated Freight Plan—1999 (26) <a href="http://www.state.me.us/mdot/freight/ffp.htm">www.state.me.us/mdot/freight/ffp.htm</a></td>
<td>Lead consultant: Cambridge Systematics. 1998 plan is being updated in 2002.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Maryland Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Maryland Freight Mobility Plan—2001 (27)</td>
<td>Lead consultant: Parsons Brinkerhoff Quade and Douglas. Planning effort included a “freight strategies charrette” to develop solutions and strategies that reflected consensus of private sector and internal working group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Study Title</td>
<td>Lead Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Minnesota Department of Transportation</td>
<td><em>Minnesota Freight Flows—1990</em> (29)</td>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Minnesota Statewide Freight Flows Study—2000</em> (30)</td>
<td>Cambridge Systematics. Study was done with encouragement of the Minnesota Freight Advisory Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Northwest Minnesota Freight Flow Study—1998</em> (31) and <em>Northeast Minnesota Freight Flow Study—1999</em> (32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Nevada Department of Transportation</td>
<td><em>Nevada Statewide Intermodal Goods Movement Study—2000</em> (33)</td>
<td>Wilbur Smith Associates. Study prepared as the goods movement element of the statewide long-range intermodal transportation plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Ohio Department of Transportation</td>
<td><em>Ohio Freight Study—2002</em> (34)</td>
<td>Cambridge Systematics. Study done to help update 1993 statewide multimodal plan called <em>Access Ohio</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Transportation</td>
<td><em>Freight Moves the Oregon Economy—1999</em> (35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td><em>Freight Movement in the Commonwealth—1999</em> (36)</td>
<td>Gannett Fleming. Study prepared to discover ways to allow freight shippers and carriers to transport goods more easily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Agency/Department</td>
<td>Report/Study</td>
<td>Authors/Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Vermont Agency of Transportation</td>
<td>Vermont Statewide Freight Study—2001 (37) <a href="http://www.aot.state.vt.us/planning/studies.htm">www.aot.state.vt.us/planning/studies.htm</a></td>
<td>Lead Consultant: Cambridge Systematics. Study was done to help incorporate freight transportation planning into the statewide transportation planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Virginia Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Virginia Intermodal Feasibility Study—2000 (38)</td>
<td>Consultant: Parsons Brinckerhoff. Study investigates the potential for new intermodal facilities in Virginia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://leg2.state.va.us/dls/2d0j76p3fcdpj_nsf/d035e5a60132441d85256b0002d09973/f65916e0e9058b22852569c30070110d?OpenDocument">http://leg2.state.va.us/dls/2d0j76p3fcdpj_nsf/d035e5a60132441d85256b0002d09973/f65916e0e9058b22852569c30070110d?OpenDocument</a></td>
<td>Authors: Erik Johnson and David Roberts. Report summarizes the Virginia Intermodal Feasibility Study and was submitted to the Virginia General Assembly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia Transportation Research Council</td>
<td>Application of a Statewide Intermodal Freight Planning Methodology—2001(40)</td>
<td>Authors: James Brogan, Stephen Brich, and Michael Demetsky. Report is part of the research council’s multi-phase Freight Transportation Study; it provides commodity flow information and forecasts for the Virginia Department of Transportation to use in identifying system improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Freight Mobility Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Findings and Recommendations—1997 (41)</td>
<td>Report prepared for the Legislative Transportation Committee. In part led to the creation of the Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Eastern Washington Intermodal Transportation Study—1992 to 1998 (42) <a href="http://ewits.wsu.edu/reports.htm">http://ewits.wsu.edu/reports.htm</a>]</td>
<td>Plan identifies who in WSDOT is working on freight, what and when they are doing it, and how it fits with existing plans and budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WSDOT Freight Implementation Plan—2002 (43) <a href="http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/freight/ImpPlan.htm">www.wsdot.wa.gov/freight/ImpPlan.htm</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Institution/Source</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Appalachian Transportation Institute and the Center for Business and Economic Research, Marshall University</td>
<td>Two-phased report examines commodity flows, inventories the transportation infrastructure, assesses transportation network capacity and operating costs, and explores remedies to transportation disadvantages in 13 counties of western West Virginia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Report was done to support TransLinks 21, Wisconsin’s statewide intermodal transportation plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The number in parenthesis after the year of publication refers to the location of the publication in the list of references.*
# TABLE 2 State Freight Transportation Offices or Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Freight Office or Program</th>
<th>Roles and Responsibilities</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| California | Office of Goods Movement Division of Transportation Planning Planning and Modal Programs California Department of Transportation [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ogm/ogm.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ogm/ogm.htm) | - Develop strategies, policies and methodologies that work to improve the freight transportation system in California  
- Conduct analysis of freight transportation system performance and future trends  
- Recommend improvements through system planning, regional planning, intergovernmental review, and other activities  | 6: office chief and staff specialists for:  
- freight rail  
- trucking  
- seaports  
- air cargo  
- corridors and borders  
- GIS and ITS  
- Caltrans district liaisons |
| Florida    | Seaport Office Public Transportation Office Florida Department of Transportation [http://www11.myflorida.com/seaport/default.htm](http://www11.myflorida.com/seaport/default.htm) | Has responsibility for programs relating to seaports, intermodal development, and planning for freight movement/intermodal connections | 4: manager, seaport systems specialists, 2 intermodal systems specialists |
| Maine      | Office of Freight Transportation Deputy Commissioner of Policy and Administration Maine Department of Transportation [www.state.me.us/mdot/freight/homepage.htm](http://www.state.me.us/mdot/freight/homepage.htm) | Formulate policy, programs, and projects that use Maine’s freight transportation network | 7: director, secretary, and 1 staff specialist for each of the following:  
- freight rail  
- ports and marine  
- commercial vehicle operations  
- air freight and finance  
- borders, Canadian relations, and small harbors |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Freight Services Section</td>
<td>• Manage activities associated with the continuance of rail freight service</td>
<td>18: 5 managers, 1 secretary, 12 analysts, engineers, and engineering technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freight Services and Safety Division</td>
<td>• Work with railroads and local governments to develop and implement local highway-railroad grade crossing improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bureau of Urban and Public Transportation</td>
<td>• Inspect Division financed track and signal projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan Department of Transportation</td>
<td>• Administer freight economic development program, local road/railroad grade separation loan program, and rail loan assistance program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.mdot.state.mi.us/uptran/fss/index.cfm?page=home">Website</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Office</td>
<td>Intermodal Policy Division</td>
<td>• Develop freight policies and plans</td>
<td>3 full-time senior staff dedicated to freight activities, plus partial-time use of other staff as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bureau of Transportation Planning</td>
<td>• Collect and monitor freight data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan Department of Transportation</td>
<td>• Coordination waterborne commerce activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.dot.state.mn.us/ofrw/freight.html">Website</a></td>
<td>• Participate in various rail, marine, motor carrier, and aviation projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Freight Section</td>
<td>• Review the Department’s role in freight transportation</td>
<td>4: Director, project team leader, principal planner, information and data analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office of Freight, Railroads and Waterways</td>
<td>• Develop strategies for Minnesota DOT to improve knowledge and integration of freight transportation into policy, planning, and investment processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modal Operations Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Delivery Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minnesota Department of Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.dot.state.mn.us/ofrw/freight.html">Website</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Bureau of Freight Services</td>
<td>• Develop and maintain data support for decision making</td>
<td>12: Manager, supervisor, secretary, 2 administrative analysts, 2 environmental compliance investigators, 2 planners, 1 engineer, 1 research analyst, 1 transportation analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Division of Transportation Services</td>
<td>• Provide for public safety through programs ensuring the safe and efficient movement of goods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Jersey Department of Transportation</td>
<td>• Administer regulatory and enforcement programs which enhance public safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.state.nj.us/transportation/public/check_points/org300c.pdf">Website</a></td>
<td>• Assure maximum funding eligibility for safety programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.state.nj.us/transportation/public/check_points/org300c.pdf">Website</a></td>
<td>• Provide DOT Management with a voice in executive decision making on all motor carrier issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| New Jersey | Bureau of Intermodal Planning and Coordination—Portway Unit and Intermodal Coordination Unit Division of Systems Planning and Research New Jersey Department of Transportation [www.state.nj.us/transportation/portway/index.htm](http://www.state.nj.us/transportation/portway/index.htm) | • Develop comprehensive statewide freight plan  
• Provide administrative and staff support to implement a series of projects that will strengthen access to and among the Newark-Elizabeth air and seaport complex, intermodal rail facilities, trucking and warehouse facilities, and the region’s highway system | 6: managers and staff specializing in intermodal coordination, freight services, mobile strategies, policy advice, project management, and project scoping |
| New York   | Freight and Economic Development Division Office of Freight and Passenger Transportation New York State Department of Transportation [www.dot.state.ny.us/fedd/fedd.htm](http://www.dot.state.ny.us/fedd/fedd.htm) | Has responsibility for  
• a broad range of policy development, planning, and program management for the movement of freight by rail, water, and/or truck  
• development of transportation-related economic development projects  
• the expansion and improvement of intercity rail passenger service, including the development of high-speed passenger rail | 16: 4 managers, 3 intermodal specialists, 3 rail specialists, 3 economic development specialists, 1 railroad corridor manager, 1 GIS coordinator, 1 Web content coordinator |
| Pennsylvania | Bureau of Rail Freight, Ports, and Waterways Deputy Secretary for Aviation, Rail, Freight, and Ports Pennsylvania Department of Transportation [www.dot.state.pa.us/penndot/Bureau/BRF.nsf/frmBRFPW?OpenFrameSet&Frame=contents&Src=_g5t0f5arjecmm8bq2elp6aoblecyn4k65pn76phf91nmappac5jmakf6a1bjujrgcln4cerrdjkja2tkdft374obdcu90.(http://www.dot.state.pa.us/penndot/Bureau/BRF.nsf/frmBRFPW?OpenFrameSet&Frame=contents&Src=_g5t0f5arjecmm8bq2elp6aoblecyn4k65pn76phf91nmappac5jmakf6a1bjujrgcln4cerrdjkja2tkdft374obdcu90.)] | • Preserve and improve rail freight infrastructure and service  
• Promote economic development through the rail freight properties directory and the grant programs  
• Provide financial and technical assistance to railroads and businesses  
• Facilitate the integration of rail freight movement with other modes of transportation  
• Facilitate the resolution of issues between the railroads and the public | 10: Director, civil engineer manager, 2 railroad civil engineers, railroad construction specialist, transportation planning manager, 2 freight analysts, administrative officer, administrative assistant |
| Tennessee  | Office of Rail and Water Transportation Public Transportation, Waterways, and Rail Division Tennessee Department of Transportation [www.tdot.state.tn.us/Chief_Engineer/assistant_engineer_Planning/pub-tr~1/railnwater.htm](http://www.tdot.state.tn.us/Chief_Engineer/assistant_engineer_Planning/pub-tr~1/railnwater.htm) | Has responsibility for  
• Railroad regulations  
• Grade-crossing safety  
• Short-line railroad assistance  
• Rail planning  
• Waterway assistance | 4: manager, 2 rail specialists, 1 rail and water specialist |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Office of Freight Strategy and Policy&lt;br&gt;Chief of Staff&lt;br&gt;Washington State Department of Transportation&lt;br&gt;<a href="http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/freight/">www.wsdot.wa.gov/freight/</a></td>
<td>• Provide leadership for freight issues and serve as a principal point of contact for those issues&lt;br&gt;• Participate in planning and budgeting efforts to make sure that freight capacity needs are addressed</td>
<td>3: Program manager, freight strategies specialist, and secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board&lt;br&gt;(Governor appointed board)&lt;br&gt;<a href="http://fmsib.wa.gov">http://fmsib.wa.gov</a></td>
<td>• Optimize freight mobility by reducing barriers on Washington’s strategic freight corridors&lt;br&gt;• Take leadership role informing the public regarding freight mobility transportation needs and issues&lt;br&gt;• Cooperate and coordinate with the public and private transportation partners to work together cost effectively</td>
<td>2: Executive director and secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freight Action Strategy (FAST)&lt;br&gt;Program&lt;br&gt;WS DOT Planning and Policy Office and Puget Sound Regional Council&lt;br&gt;<a href="http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/mobility/fast">www.wsdot.wa.gov/mobility/fast</a></td>
<td>Understand and resolve freight mobility needs within and through the central Puget Sound area</td>
<td>1: Program manager (WSDOT)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>