



**Oklahoma Freight Advisory Committee (FAC) Meeting #3**  
**June 27, 2017**  
**MEETING SUMMARY**

**Attendees**

Project Management Team

Dawn Sullivan  
Linda Koenig, ODOT Project Manager  
Joe Bryan, Consultant Project Manager

ENTITY/AGENCY

ODOT Director of Capital Programs  
ODOT Planning & Policy Analyst  
WSP

FAC Members or Alternates Present

John Sharp  
Kathryn Wenger  
Paul Cristina  
Jake Kimery  
Kermit Frank  
Troy Rigel  
Judy Petry  
Larry Ramsey  
Isaac Akem  
Huy Nguyen  
Jim Rodriguez  
Abbi Hirsekorn  
Derek Sparks  
Lynne Jones  
Betty Thompson  
Jim Reese  
Michael Craig (for Jon Chiappe)  
Craig Moody  
Lt. Kirby Logan  
Lori Peterson  
Jim Newport  
David Murdock  
Brad Banks  
Darrin Karley  
Brandon Morris

ENTITY/AGENCY

ACOG  
ACOG  
BNSF Railway  
Chesapeake Energy Corporation  
Dolese  
Equity Marketing Alliance  
Farmrail System, Inc.  
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration  
FHWA - OK - Planning  
FHWA - OK - Safety  
Oklahoma Aggregates Association (OKAA)  
Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce  
Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce  
Oklahoma Corporation Commission  
Oklahoma Dept. of Agriculture, Food & Forestry  
Oklahoma Dept. of Agriculture, Food & Forestry  
Oklahoma Department of Commerce  
ODOT – Rail Division  
Oklahoma Highway Patrol, CMV  
Oklahoma Railroad Association  
Oklahoma Trucking Association  
Oklahoma Turnpike Authority  
Port of Catoosa - Tulsa  
Seaboard Foods  
Union Pacific

Guests

Eric Donoley	AOK Rail Road
David Donoley	AOK Rail Road
Kevin Keller	HDR
Carl Selby	FHWA

Freight Plan Consultant Team

Susan Atherton	Freight Insights
Sebastian Guerrero	WSP
Alan Meyers	WSP
Kristi Pempin	MacArthur Assoc. Consultants/Redbud Marketing LLC

ODOT Staff

Mitch Surrett	ODOT - Legal
Matt Warren	ODOT - Traffic Engineering
Matthew Blakeslee	ODOT - Strategic Asset & Perf. Management
Sam Coldiron	ODOT - Strategic Asset & Perf. Management
Terri Holley	ODOT - Strategic Asset & Perf. Management
Daryl Johnson	ODOT - Strategic Asset & Perf. Management
Lisa Lam	ODOT - Strategic Asset & Perf. Management
Randy Lee	ODOT - Strategic Asset & Perf. Management
Dustin Thoendel	ODOT - Strategic Asset & Perf. Management

Invited Organizations Not Attending

Chickasaw Nation  
Choctaw Nation  
Consolidated Grain & Barge  
Devon Energy  
Ditch Witch  
FedEx  
Indian Nations Council of Governments (INCOG)  
McAlester Army Ammunition Plant  
McCorkle Truck Lines  
Oklahoma Grain & Feed Association  
Oklahoma Office of Energy and Environment  
ONE Gas  
Pelco Structural, LLC  
Port of Muskogee  
Spirit AeroSystems  
Sunoco Logistics  
Tinker Air Force Base  
Tulsa Chamber of Commerce  
Tulsa International Airport  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers - Tulsa District  
United Petroleum Transports, Inc.  
UPS  
Walmart  
Webco Industries, Inc.

## **Welcome and Introductions**

Linda Koenig, ODOT Planning & Policy Analyst and Project Manager for Oklahoma Freight Transportation Plan, facilitated a round of participant introductions. Dawn Sullivan, ODOT Director of Capital Programs, opened the meeting and welcomed the attendees.

## **Presentations and Discussion Agenda (Joe Bryan)**

Joe Bryan, the WSP Project Manager, reviewed the agenda for the presentation and discussion.

### **Update on Freight Flows (Joe Bryan)**

Joe Bryan presented updated information on estimated freight flows for Oklahoma. Initial data estimates had been presented at earlier FAC meetings, and were subsequently refined and finalized.

#### Key Points of Presentation

- In 2015, Oklahoma handled an estimated 817 million tons of freight worth approximately \$1.3 trillion dollars; over 60% of tons and 80% of value is passing through Oklahoma. Oklahoma origin-destination freight is estimated at 305 million tons and \$224 billion in value.
- Through 2045, Oklahoma is projected to add 375 million tons of freight, of which 53 million tons is from Oklahoma origin-destination freight.
- Examples of energy and grain volumes mapped over the state highway and rail networks were presented.

#### FAC Questions (Q), Answers (A), and Comments (C)

- None

### **Performance Measures and Strategies (Alan Meyers)**

Alan Meyers from WSP led a discussion on performance measures and strategies. The discussion addressed: freight goals and performance measures; examples of specific measures; and freight policies and strategies.

#### Key Points of Presentation

- The overall freight plan vision is: *“Oklahoma will continue to provide for the safe, reliable and productive performance of our multimodal freight system as a mainstay of our economy and an essential supplier of goods to our people.”* This vision is supported by a set of goals/objectives, and progress towards achieving goals/objectives can be tracked using performance measures.
- The LRTP has six goal areas, and the Freight Plan establishes corresponding freight goals for each of these areas. The areas are:
  1. Safety and Secure Travel
  2. Infrastructure Preservation
  3. Mobility: Choice, Connectivity and Accessibility
  4. Economic Vitality
  5. Environmental Responsibility
  6. Efficient Intermodal System Management and Operation
- The freight plan establishes highway-related performance measures (applicable to Oklahoma’s National Highway System facilities) and other types of performance measures.
- Each of the six goal areas listed above has at least one performance measure. Examples of recommended NHS Bridge Condition and Pavement Condition measures were presented.

The method for developing the federally-required freight performance measure (Travel Time Reliability Index) was discussed, and the resulting index was presented. The methods for calculating other performance measures were described.

- Each of the six goal areas listed above also has one or more identified freight strategies to implement the goals/objectives.

#### FAC Questions (Q), Answers (A), and Comments (C)

- Q: Regarding Oklahoma’s performance measures, does having good freight performance scores make us less competitive for freight funding?
  - A: For competitive grant programs like TIGER and FASTLANE (now INFRA), projects must demonstrate the achievement of public benefits and national goals; and even if overall state-level performance is good, beneficial projects should be competitive. It does not impact the availability of National Highway Freight Program funds, which are allocated by formula to states. It should also be noted that Oklahoma may use stricter criteria than the federal government requires for bridges, pavement, and other areas. Overall, it certainly does not hurt us to be able to measure and report on freight performance.
- Q: Regarding the performance measure for environmental responsibility, did the CNG subsidies from year 2014 increase the development of CNG facilities and CNG use?
  - A: It has accelerated work by the Clean Cities groups in OKC and Tulsa.
  - C: Seaboard Foods operates a 50% CNG fleet, so the availability of facilities is important. However the economics are still challenging for some heavy haul trucking markets.

#### **Freight Bottlenecks (Sebastian Guerrero)**

Joe Bryan introduced this discussion by noting that bottlenecks associated with all freight modes will be addressed in the freight plan. He then introduced Sebastian Guerrero from WSP, who led a discussion on focused on highway network bottleneck identification.

#### Key Points of Presentation

- For the Freight Plan, a “Freight Bottleneck” is defined as *“a part of the transportation system that causes disproportionately high costs to the movement of freight in terms of delay and unreliability.”*
- The bottleneck identification process included:
  - Defining the relevant network (Oklahoma’s NHS) and roadway segments
  - Calculating performance metrics (recurring travel time delay and non-recurring time delay)
  - Determining the physical location of leading bottlenecks
  - Examining other data (volume, geometry, safety, pavement condition, and stakeholder comments collected in this study) to identify factors that may relate to the existence of a bottleneck
  - Developing rankings of bottleneck severity
- Over 170 highway system bottlenecks were identified in both urban and rural areas. The list included some that had been previously suggested by stakeholders, along with many new locations that had not been previously identified for examination. The maps indicate areas where bottlenecks are most severe (the top five percent in either delay or unreliability).

#### FAC Questions (Q), Answers (A), and Comments (C)

- Q: Bottlenecks are identified in Guymon and Woodward, but not Enid – should we also see issues in Enid?

- A: Truck volumes are believed to be lower in Enid, but this will be checked. *[Note: follow-up research indicated that truck volumes are lower in Enid than those two other cities, from 700-800 truck AADT on US-60 and 800 truck AADT on US-81. The delay and unreliability in Enid are also not as high as these two other cities.]*
- Q: Problems are not showing up on SH 74 – have issues there already been addressed by improvements?
  - A: Issues on SH 74 may not be truck related. Total congestion and truck-only congestion issues can be difficult to separate.
- C: More performance issues might have been expected at I-40/I-240.
- Q: Is this 24-hour data?
  - A: Yes, it represents 24 hours, and looks at differences between more congested and less congested periods. The travel time data is year 2016.
- In Tulsa, the Inner Dispersal Loop (IDL) is actually performing well today. The data should be checked to see if it reflects the impacts of construction. Also SH 169 in the Tulsa area should be checked.
  - Followup to this question indicates that the IDL does display high levels of delay and congestion, which coincide with construction activities. Truck volumes on this road segment are high, between 1,500 to 3,000 per year. With regards to SH-169 in Tulsa, we found significant bottlenecks in the "golden triangle" where SH-169 connects with I-44 and SH-51. Truck volumes are significant on this road, with values between 2,500 to 4,000 in Tulsa.

### **Candidates for Critical Rural and Urban Freight Corridors (Joe Bryan)**

Joe Bryan led a discussion of critical Rural and Urban freight connectors. The designation of these corridors can reflect a variety of considerations, and is important for accessing available freight project funding.

#### Key Points of Presentation

- The FAST Act directed FHWA to establish a National Highway Freight Network (NHFN) and created a dedicated pool of funding for freight projects to improve this system. For Oklahoma, approximately \$100 million in National Highway Freight Program (NHFP) funding is available over five years.
- FHWA designated part of the NHFN by establishing a “Primary Highway Freight System” consisting of higher-volume interstates, the remainder of the interstate system, and designated connectors.
- Additionally, the FAST Act allows each state to designate Critical Rural Freight Connectors (CRFC)(up to 160 miles in Oklahoma) and Critical Urban Freight Connectors (CUFC) (up to 80 miles in Oklahoma), which also become part of the NHFN.
- Candidate CRFC mileage can be identified based on: rural location; truck volumes; truck percentages; and connections to major freight traffic generators. 473 miles of high volume and 1,151 miles of high truck percentage rural routes have been identified. From this, 160 miles may be selected.
- Candidate CUFC mileage can be identified based on: functional classification; traffic volume; freight facility and multimodal connectivity; and MPO plans/programs. In Oklahoma City, 43 miles of CUFCs have been identified; in Tulsa, 37 miles have been identified.

#### FAC Questions (Q), Answers (A), and Comments (C)

- None

## **Project Selection Criteria (Joe Bryan)**

To wrap up the formal technical discussion, Joe Bryan led a discussion of project selection criteria.

### Key Points of Presentation

- Oklahoma DOT is implementing a formal project selection process including the use of quantitative criteria and performance measures.
- Project selection should be tied to the achievement of the freight vision and goal/objective areas established in the freight plan.
- Identifying recommended projects is the next step in the work process.

### FAC Questions (Q), Answers (A), and Comments (C)

- Q: Will the selection metrics be qualitative or quantitative? Will there be thresholds?
  - A: The metrics discussed and presented today are quantitative in nature, and the intent is to use them in a quantitative process. Thresholds will be determined as needed, within the larger overall Oklahoma DOT process.
- Q: Will this information be used to identify candidate projects, or to help prioritize projects?
  - A: The pool of candidate projects are already listed in the Eight -Year Construction Work Plan. There is a high correspondence between high percentage/high volume truck corridors and the listed project locations. The information developed in the freight plan will help prioritize the listed projects for implementation.
- Q: Will there be weighting of different quantitative factors?
  - A: There may be a weighted analysis process. We will work with ODOT staff.

## **Discussion and Conclusion (Joe Bryan, Linda Koenig)**

Joe Bryan described the next steps in the freight plan process, and opened the floor for additional comments.

- Q: Will there be policies as well as projects in the final plan?
  - A: Yes. The general direction for policies is consistent with the Long Range Transportation Plan.
- Q: Will the possibility of greater federal funding, and possibly private funding make a difference?
  - A: For now, we need to complete the freight plan with the rules and funding in place. Beyond these statutory requirements, we need to identify areas where future additional funding – especially public-private partnership funding – could be applied in the future, as available.
  - C: The dedicated federal freight funding for Oklahoma is \$18.5 million per year, versus \$500 million in federal funds per year for the larger transportation work program.  
  
In addition to using dedicated freight funding, we need to look at integrating freight projects within the larger work program.
- Q: Is the plan addressing oversize/overweight truck issues and port connectivity?
  - A: Yes, we have heard about these issues from multiple stakeholders, and intend to address them in the plan.

Linda Koenig asked for comments on the minutes of FAC Meeting #2; none were noted. Linda then asked attendees to complete and return a short survey form. Finally, Linda thanked the attendees for their continued strong participation and valuable input.

*Submitted by:  
Alan Meyers, WSP  
July 12, 2017*