


## INTERMODAL ByThe NUMBERS

\$55 Billion Annual Industry Revenue
350 + Marine and InlandTerminals
10,000 \#3PLs/\$11 Billion in Revenue
A fleet of 2 million containers/61 Providers
18 million loads moved by rail annually 531,000 Drivers/14,000 Drayage Co's 98 million drayage moves annually \$20 Billion in annual drayage revenues 202,000 Loaded MarineTEUs/ day 757,358 Chassis registered in the UIIA system

## A Changing Business Model of Asset Ownership



Intermodal 53' Container Fleets - United States (dry, for railroad)

-U.S. - TOTAL
N-U.S. MotorCarrier/IMC Owned
ㄴU.S. Railroad Owned
LoadMatch \& DRAYAGE.com

* in 11 years, the fleet has DOUBLED in size, in 2012 the 53' cntr fleet was 187,000 total *


## Freight Recession?

| September 2023 | $\mathrm{M} / \mathrm{M}$ | $\mathrm{Y} / \mathrm{Y}$ | YTD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| International | $-3.8 \%$ | $-10.2 \%$ | $-11.9 \%$ |
| Private Domestic Container | $-3.3 \%$ | $9.8 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 . 2 \%}$ |
| Rail Domestic Container | $-5.1 \%$ | $-11.1 \%$ | $-21.0 \%$ |
| Total Domestic Container | $-3.6 \%$ | $5.0 \%$ | $-3.5 \%$ |
| Short Trailer | $-7.9 \%$ | $-36.6 \%$ | $-20.7 \%$ |
| 53' Trailer | $\mathbf{1 . 9 \%}$ | $-15.8 \%$ | $-25.9 \%$ |
| Total Trailer | $-0.7 \%$ | $-22.0 \%$ | $-24.4 \%$ |
| Domestic | $-3.4 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 5 . 7 \%}$ |
| Grand Total | $-\mathbf{3 . 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 4 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 8 . 7 \%}$ |

* Not adjusted for working day effects


## Key Drivers for Intermodal Expansion

## Long Haul Intermodal Lane Opportunities For Study Region

| Service | Market Area | Estimated Highway Miles |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Single Rail Line Carrier | entral Texas | $\times \quad 1,166$ |
| Single Rail Line Carrier | S. Calfiornias | T- 2,106 |
| Single Rall Line Carrier | Western TN | 779 |
| Single Rail Line Carrier | ansas Missour | 611 |
| Interline Service | Coastal Virginia | 1,165 |
| Interline Service | Central PA | 939 |
| Interline Service | New York New Jersey | 1,070 |
| Interline Service | Georgia | -158 |

- National Rail Plan identifies mode shift opportunity
- Railroads want new business from trucks
- New conversion success driven by asset-based carriers \& Freight Visibility
- Workforce, energy, environmental, highway maintenance cost and congestion create public benefit


## Findings

- Double Stack Height Restrictions in Milwaukee are barrier to intermodal expansion for Union Pacific Railroad.Train limits on key shared corridors.
- Contractual Barriers such as trackage rights, and haulage rights, limit routes and potential intermodal connections
- New Marine liner service to Port of Duluth
- CPKC merger Strengthening North South Freight Lanes
- Economic Development Interest in Intermodal Service is Growing
- Eight long-haul routes can generate sufficient Density for New Intermodal Service connecting Wisconsin to global and domestic markets
- Railroads are Seeking Growth Opportunities in a variety of partnership models


## Methodology

METHODOLOGY

- Analyzed freight data
- Developed a location scoring model
- Applied the model to potential sites
- Peer Reviewed the Methodology
- Conducted Stakeholder Interviews
- Participated in Public Engagement


## ECOSYSTEM LANDSCAPE

- Rail Network Capacity and Haulage Rights Agreements are Proprietary
- Physical Barriers (Clearances)
- Land Ownership/Commercial RE
- Merger impacts
- Growth in Private Container Fleets


## Warehouse Locations

 (Green)Often Consolidates
Inbound Consumer
Products Cargo

## Rail Tonnage

(Black)
Note BNSF Dominance

## Highway Tonnage

 (Yellow)Note confluence of
Highway and Rail in
Minneapolis



## Food and

Agriculture Shippers
Ranked by Sales

## $500+$ Locations

from 2020-2021

Representative of outbound shipments

## Terminal Requirements: Examples of Research Findings

$>$ All public terminals in study region have either been built on railroad owned land or public land Arcadia, WI is the exception - NOT open to the public
$>$ Study region terminals each have keystone customers
$>$ Railroads espouse a minimum of 20 K annual lifts for establishment but make exceptions in the study region
$>20 \mathrm{~K}$ in lifts requires about 20 acres depending upon stowage/lift system and chassis provisioning
$>\underline{\text { Study region closure reasons: }}$ below minimum lifts, insufficient lane balance, not meeting profitability thresholds or minimum return on investment
$>$ Terminals may be established to serve either international, domestic or both operations. International considered easiest and most profitable market
> All terminal have double stack intermodal capability
$>$ Railroads usually, but not always avoid opening internally competing terminals
CN opened Acadia, Chippewa Falls, New Richmond less than 150 miles apart

## Terminal Requirement Assessment Methodology

Step 1. Analyze CurrentTerminals \& Identify Successful Attributes

- Terminal locations: Chippewa Falls-CN, Arcadia-CN, New Richmond-CN, Duluth-CN, Shoreham-CP, Midway-BNF, UP-Minneapolis

Step 2. Analyze ClosedTerminals in region for Closure Rationale

- Terminal locations: Green Bay, Neenah, Stevens Point, Portage, Milwaukee

Step 3. Research Industry Heuristics for EstablishingTerminals

- Length of haul, Acreage, Land suitability, Drayage, Lane balance, Catchment areas

Step 4. Develop criteria needed for terminal success and consider providing weighting scale for terminal variations

Step 5. Apply criteria to two existing regional terminals for beta testing
Step 6. Apply criteria to potential new locations in study region

## Score Card Criteria <br> 1. Connection to a Class 1 Railroad

2. Available Terminal Land

## 3. Highway Access

4. Drayage Distance

## 5. Catchment Area.

## 6. Keystone Customers

## 7. Terminal Support

## Defining Attributes

Either located on Class 1 track or trackage/haulage rights to a Class 1 without double stack height restrictions. (Evaluation data - Railroad Maps/FRA Data)

Land must be available and suitable for an intermodal terminal with 20 K annual gate throughput. (Evaluation data - County Land Records)

Highway and bridge access to the terminal and to major highways needs to be suitable for loaded containers/trailers. (State Maps)

Drayage distance to the terminal from cargo generators is cost effective when compared to draying to other terminals. (Map Distances)

Population base that will generate sufficient containerizable cargo to justify an intermodal terminal. Internal competing terminals need to be 150 miles away. Ideally the catchment area will have inbound and outbound cargo approaching lane balance. Catchment area can vary by commodity and carrier.

The catchment area needs to have inbound and outbound cargo opportunities. Warehouses, distribution centers, production facilities and trucking firms as well as population density are indicators of a potential customer base.

[^0]
## Criteria Applied to ExistingTerminals in Study Region

|  | Criteria 1 <br> Connection <br> To Class 1 | Criteria 2 <br> Suitable <br> land | Criteria 3 <br> Highway <br> access | Criteria 4 <br> Drayage distance | Criteria 5 Catchment area | Criteria 6 <br> Keystone <br> Customers | Criteria 7 <br> Terminal <br> Support | Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CN - New <br> Richmond | $3 \text { - 100-mile }$ <br> branch line | $5-\mathrm{Can}$ <br> expand | $\begin{aligned} & 4-12 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { to I-94 } \end{aligned}$ | $4-25 m$ <br> mod congestion | 1 - CN <br> Chippewa <br> Falls 75 miles | 4 - Auto | $5 \text { - State, }$ local support | 26 |
| BNSF - <br> Midway | $\begin{aligned} & 5-\text { on main } \\ & \text { line } \end{aligned}$ | $4 \text { - no }$ <br> more room <br> for <br> expansion | $5-3 \mathrm{~m} \text { to }$ <br> Interstate | $5->10 \mathrm{~m}$ <br> mod congestion | $5-\text { no }$ <br> BNSF <br> competing terminals | $5-\text { Hub \& }$ <br> JB Hunt | 4 - <br> Residents <br> want less <br> truck traffic | 33 |

This metric is a comparative indicator of a terminal's potential. It is subject to changes for example in trade lanes, customer base, politics and economics. The intermodal terminal must be financially viable for all parties as an ongoing operation. These criteria will be applied to the study region's potential locations.


| 18 Possible Terminal <br> Locations and rail service | Criteria 1 <br> Connection <br> To Class 1 | Criteria 2 <br> Suitable land | Criteria 3 <br> Highway <br> access | Criteria 4 <br> Drayage <br> distance | Criteria 5 <br> Catchment <br> arca | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Criteria } 6 \\ \hline \text { Keystone } \\ \hline \text { customers } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Criteria 7 <br> Terminal <br> Support | Totals <br> With Barrier <br> gone |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \|Milwaukee, WI - UP Butler | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | $29 \quad 35$ |
| Milwaukee, WI - UP Jackson | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | $29 \quad 35$ |
| Milwaukee, WI - CPKCMuskego | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 33 |
| Milwa ukee, WI - CPKC - Port | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 32 |
| Sussex, WI - CN | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 28 |
| Neenah, WI - CN | 5 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 28 |
| Oshkosh, WI - CN | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 20 |
| Oshkosh, WI -WSOR | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 25 29 |
| Fond Du Lac, WI - CN | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 32 |
| Sheboygan, WI - UP | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 24 |
| Stevens Point, WI - CN | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 26 |
| Wausau, WI -FOXXY, CN \& UP | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 20 |
| Adams, WI - UP | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | $18 \quad 25$ |
| Tomah, WI - CPKC | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 27 |
| Necedah, WI - UP | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | $17 \quad 21$ |
| Altoona, WI - UP | 1 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | $20 \quad 25$ |
| La Crose, WI - BNSF | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 29 |
| Winona, MN- CPKC | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | $18^{\text {rime Focus LLC }}$ |

## Domestic Truck Freight: Tons

Truck Freight Originating in MN \& WI (2023 Tons)

Truck Freight Destined into MN \& WI (2023 Tons)



Long Lane Options

## Long Haul Intermodal <br> Lanes in Study Region Worth Exploration

- Domestic and International Options Exist
- Balance is critical to profitability \& equipment
- Transit, Network Fit and Reliability Considerations
- Double Stack Impediments must be addressed

| Lane Balance | Direction | State | 11\% Conv to IM Total Containers | 11\% Conv IM Containers Per Day | 45\% Conv IM Total Containers | 45\% Conv IM Containers per Day |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 39\% | Destination | Texas | 15,895 | 63 | 65,024 | 258 |
| 61\% | Origin | Texas | 25,008 | 99 | 102,306 | 406 |
|  | Total | Texas | 40,903 | 162 | 167,330 | 664 |
|  |  |  |  |  | - | - |
| 35\% | Destination | California | 14,018 | 56 | 57,344 | 228 |
| 65\% | Origin | California | 26,468 | 105 | 108,277 | 430 |
|  | Total | California | 40,485 | 161 | 165,622 | 657 |
|  |  |  |  |  | - | - |
| 64\% | Destination | Kansas | 7,775 | 31 | 31,806 | 126 |
| 36\% | Origin | Kansas | 4,374 | 17 | 17,895 | 71 |
|  | Total | Kansas | 12,149 | 48 | 49,701 | 197 |
|  |  |  |  |  | - | - |
| 45\% | Destination | Tennessee | 6,381 | 25 | 26,105 | 104 |
| 55\% | Origin | Tennessee | 7,909 | 31 | 32,353 | 128 |
|  | Total | Tennessee | 14,290 | 57 | 58,458 | 232 |
|  |  |  |  |  | - | - |
| 42\% | Destination | Pennsylvania | 8,151 | 32 | 33,344 | 132 |
| 58\% | Origin | Pennsylvania | 11,431 | 45 | 46,765 | 186 |
|  | Total | Pennsylvania | 19,582 | 78 | 80,109 | 318 |
|  |  |  |  |  | - | - |
| 41\% | Destination | Georgia | 5,909 | 23 | 24,174 | 96 |
| 59\% | Origin | Georgia | 8,449 | 34 | 34,566 | 137 |
|  | Total | Georgia | 14,359 | 57 | 58,740 | 233 |
|  |  |  |  |  | - | - |
| 37\% | Destination | New Jersey | 4,716.41 | 19 | 19,294 | 76.57 |
| 63\% | Origin | New Jersey | 8,154.37 | 32 | 33,359 | 132.38 |
|  | Total | New Jersey | 12,871 | 51 | 52,653 | 209 |
|  |  |  |  |  | - | - |
| 55\% | Destination | Virginia | 4,110.78 | 16 | 16,817 | 66.73 |
| 45\% | Origin | Virginia | 3,419.36 | 14 | 13,988 | 55.51 |
|  | Total | Virginia | 7,530.14 | 30 | 30,805 | 122.24 |

## Public Benefits and Costs - Potential Grant Programs


$\$ .41$ maintenance cost per truck mile 1 Class 8 fatality per 100 Million Miles $\$ 3.55$ per gallon of diesel $4 / 24 / 23$

## Long-Term Demand for Freight Transportation Will Grow

INTERMODAL WILL CONTINUE TO GROW
$>$ Rail service has improved for intermodal
$>$ Long haul trucking may lack adequate capacity
$>$ Highway congestion will increase
$>$ Environmental concerns will increasingly shape transportation decisions
$>$ Rail intermodal is more environmentally friendly than all-truck transportation
$>$ Freight Visibility has improved resulting in better coordination of transportation assets.

ALL FREIGHT WILL CONTINUE
TO GROW


## Recommendations

- Take advantage of the States' significant influence to address infrastructure deficiencies such as clearances
- Encourage State Agencies and NGOs to work in unison to develop transportation systems
- Leverage Grant Resources and state matching funds for rail development
- An emphasis on intermodal development should be included in the States' freight and rail plans, including the identification of infrastructure barriers
- Leverage utilization of $18+$ potential terminal locations in the region
- Engage with Class 1 Railroads, Intermediaries and Shippers to explore terminal options and new intermodal single and interline corridors


## QUESTIONS


[^0]:    A new intermodal terminal is supported by private and governmental entities with incentives and public support. (public funding, zoning, outreach)

