



MAFC Survey Results regarding State designation of Critical Rural and Critical Urban Freight Corridors.



Ernie Perry, Eric Oberhart, Ben Zeitlow and Teresa Adams.

1) For CRFC, have you made your designation of 150 miles or 20% of your PHFN? How many miles have you/do you plan to designate?

MAFC States have not made designations for Critical Rural Freight Corridors, but are in the process of gathering feedback on potential designations. Most members plan to designate as many miles as possible.

State	Miles	Response
Illinois	337	We have not finalized but have received input from stakeholders.
Indiana	TBD	INDOT has not yet decided whether we will designate any CRFC. INDOT views NHFP funds as re-arranged money taken from our existing federal funding, not new money. We have plenty of funding needs on the existing PHFS, including significant funding needs for the un-built portions of I-69. If possible, we will explore designating the existing highway that will be converted to I-69 (IN-37) as a CRFC so we can use NHFP funds (and apply for FASTLANE funds) to support its completion.
Iowa	150	Has not designated mileage yet but will likely designate all 150 miles.
Kansas	150	N/A
Kentucky	150	KYTC has not yet designated the CRFC but is planning to designate 150 miles.
Michigan	150	Michigan has not yet made the formal CRFC designation. We plan to designate an amount in close approximation to 150 miles.
Minnesota	TBD	No, we have not. We plan to designate as many miles as we can.
Missouri	TBD	No
Ohio	284.91	Ohio plans to designate 284.91 CRFC miles which is 20% of Ohio's PHFN.
Wisconsin	150	Not yet. 150 miles.

2) What process did (will) you use to identify routes for inclusion in CRFC list? Did you have a prioritization process to guide selection?

States are using feedback from local planning organizations like RPCs and MPOS, as well as data-driven approaches in line with federal guidance or previous selection processes to identify routes for inclusion in the CRFC list.

Many states are also developing a prioritization process in conjunction with their freight planning efforts.

Illinois	We asked for input from Regional Planning Councils as well as the State Freight Advisory Council. The input was limited and we will likely designate the balance to rural interstates.
Indiana	See above. If designation of the final section of I-69 is not possible, we may explore designating other state routes not currently on the PHFS in order to free up funding for I-69. To plan for designation of CRFCs in the future, our new freight plan will include a process and criteria for prioritization and designation of CRFCs.
Iowa	Iowa DOT is surveying MPOs first in order to prioritize and designate CUFCs. Once these corridors are designated, CRFCs will be determined once connectivity and continuity needs are identified. Freight-generating facilities, freight clusters, truck traffic, and the recently designated Iowa Multimodal Freight Network will assist in determining CRFC designations. Consideration may also be given to designating more complete corridors, as opposed to shorter connections.
Kansas	Currently developing a prioritization process in coordination with statewide freight plan consultant. Will vet through Kansas Freight Advisory Committee.
Kentucky	KYTC plans to select the routes on the Kentucky Highway Freight Network (but not on the NHFN) using the data and weighting from the data-driven project prioritization process developed over the last year for use in highway project prioritization.
Michigan	MDOT is beginning to identify routes using the seven criteria (A-G) outlined in the federal guidance under CRFC. Additional criteria will be used to satisfy item G of the list (volume, tonnage and value thresholds were established). The routes' location on MDOT's corridors of highest significance (COHS) network are also being considered. COHS is an integrated, multi-modal system of transportation infrastructure along corridors that provide a high level of support for the international, national, and state economies.
Minnesota	We currently are debating a few processes, namely whether to 1) designate corridors using a data-driven process, and then solicit for projects after the corridors have been designated, or 2) solicit for projects, and, if the project is selected, then designate the corridor the project falls on in order to provide NHFP funding for it. We are leaning toward the latter process (#2, the project-driven corridor selection process).
Missouri	We looked at our Tier 1 routes from the State Freight Plan that were omitted from the Primary Highway Freight Network. This far exceeded the 20% available. MoDOT is considering all the options, but does not, at this time, have urgency to this designation. There are far more immediate freight needs on Missouri's PHFN than available freight formula funds.

Ohio	Ohio is in the process of establishing a methodology to designate the miles, which will likely be located along the Strategic Transportation System (STS) establish during the Long Range Transportation Plan and Freight Plan efforts.
Wisconsin	Still in process, but will work with MPOs and Regional Planning Commissions (RPCs)

3) Who did (will) you collaborate with to aid in identifying CRFCs?

MAFC states are collaborating primarily with regional and local planning organizations, as these organizations may have deeper insight into specific transportation issues in their own areas. Feedback is often supplemented by outreach to state economic development agencies, or interested industries. State Freight Advisory Councils are often asked to review draft corridors.

Illinois	Regional Planning Councils, State Freight Advisory Council
Indiana	MPOs, Economic Development, Ports of Indiana
Iowa	18 Regional Planning Agencies
Kansas	Rural freight stakeholders, industry organizations, FAC
Kentucky	Highway District Office, Area Development District Planners, FAC
Michigan	MPOs, DOT Regions, and interdepartmental staff.
Minnesota	DOT Districts, State Aid Office, MPOs
Missouri	RPCs, MPOs, Department of Agriculture, Regional FACs
Ohio	Rural Transportation Planning Organizations, DOT senior leadership
Wisconsin	FAC, MPOs, RPCs

4) Is your CRFC list a static network or do you see it as more of a rolling list to address project needs?

Most states plan to use a rolling list, currently only Illinois plans to use a static list.

Static: IL

Rolling: IN, KY, MI, MN, OH

TBD: IA, KS, MO, WI

Illinois	At this point I would call it static. The same will not necessarily be true of the Urban.
Indiana	If INDOT chooses to designate CRFCs, we will likely treat them as a rolling network to address project needs.
Iowa	Iowa DOT is still having internal discussions to determine which approach the Department will take with CRFCs and future project needs. These decisions will most likely be made after CUFC designation.
Kansas	Following the identification of the initial CRFCs annual reviews will be conducted to determine if any changes in rural freight transportation needs warrant modifications/additions to the system.
Kentucky	Kentucky envisions the CRFC as a rolling designation to address project needs.
Michigan	MDOT expects the network will be a rolling list that will serve to address project needs in the State.
Minnesota	Assuming we go with process #2 referenced earlier, we see it as a rolling list.
Missouri	Undetermined at this time.
Ohio	It will be a rolling network to address freight issues within the STS network.
Wisconsin	This is still under discussion but early indications are leaning toward a rolling list

Critical Urban Freight Corridors

1) For CUFCs, have you made your designation of 75 miles or 10% of your PHFN? How many miles have you/do you plan to designate?

States plan to designate as many miles as possible, but designations have not been finalized.

State	Miles	Response
Illinois	168.5	We have not finalized determining these. We allowed a total of 168.5 more miles, but stakeholders have requested almost double that.
Indiana	N/A	As with the CRFCs, INDOT has not yet decided whether <u>we</u> will designate any CUFCs. INDOT views NHFP funds as re-arranged money taken from our existing federal funding, not new money. INDOT has a number of planned but unfunded or only partially funded projects that will improve freight mobility on the existing PHFS.
Iowa	75	Iowa DOT has not designated mileage yet but will likely designate all 75 miles.
Kansas	75	Designations have not been made. CUGC – 75 miles
Kentucky	75	KYTC has not yet designated the CUFC but is planning to designate 75 miles.
Michigan	75	Michigan has not yet made the formal CUFC designation. We plan to designate an amount in close approximation to 75 miles.
Minnesota	N/A	No, we have not. We plan to designate as many miles as we can.
Missouri	N/A	No. The St. Louis and Kansas City regions have made recommendations.
Ohio	142.46	Ohio plans to designate 142.46 CUFC miles which is 10% of the PHFN.
Wisconsin	75	Not yet. 75 miles.

2) What process did (will) you use to identify routes for inclusion in CUFC list? Did you have a prioritization process to guide selection?

Many states are cooperating with their MPOs to develop a selection process. They are soliciting feedback from their MPOs in two ways, 1) asking for MPOs to provide routes, or 2) asking MPOs to review routes established by the DOT.

Illinois	We are establishing criteria in cooperation with the TMAs for inclusion. CMAP has given us their criteria and we will work to finalize very soon.
Indiana	To plan for designation of CUFCs in the future, our new freight plan will include a process and criteria for prioritization and designation of CUFCs.
Iowa	In order to identify potential routes for inclusion on the CUFC list, Iowa DOT has developed a map showing freight facilities, FHWA intermodal connectors, and the National Highway Freight Network for each of the nine MPOs in the state. Each MPO is being asked to review these maps, add major freight facilities not included, verify intermodal connectors, and make prioritized recommendations for CUFCs in their area. Once we receive recommendations from each of the nine MPOs, we will combine all corridors to a single list. Internal discussions will then take place to determine the 75 miles that gets designated.
Kansas	Currently developing prioritization list in coordination with consultant working on statewide freight plan.
Kentucky	KYTC plans to select the routes on the Kentucky Highway Freight Network (but not on the NHFN) using the data and weighting from the data-driven project prioritization process developed over the last year for use in highway project prioritization. This list will be provided to the MPOs with over 500,000 population to assist in their proposal of urban routes for designation and to the remaining MPOs for their review and comment.
Michigan	MDOT is beginning to identify routes using the four criteria (A-D) outlined in the federal guidance under CUFC. Additional criteria will be used to satisfy item D of the list (volume, tonnage and value thresholds were established). The routes' location on MDOT's corridors of highest significance (COHS) network are also being considered. MDOT will work together with Michigan's two large MPO's to utilize the criteria outlined in the federal guidance to select routes within their urban boundaries.
Minnesota	We currently are debating a few processes, namely whether to 1) designate corridors using a data-driven process, and then solicit for projects after the corridors have been designated, or 2) solicit for projects, and, if the project is selected, then designate the corridor the project falls on in order to provide NHFP funding for it. We are leaning toward the latter process (#2, the project-driven corridor selection process). For CUFCs, MnDOT has the responsibility of designating CUFCs in the urbanized areas of our seven MPOs with populations less than 500,000. Our one MPO with a population greater than 500,000 (The Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities) will have responsibility for designating CUFCs within their urbanized area. We will need to work with the Met Council to ensure a proper distribution of the 75 miles.
Missouri	MoDOT is meeting with all MPOs during the Spring 2017 transportation planning meeting to discuss how to designate such few miles. Options will be discussed at that time.
Ohio	Again, it is intended that the designated route mileage will fall along the established STS Long Range Transportation Plan and Freight Plan efforts. This includes last mile

	connections into and out of intermodal facilities. This will need to be coordinated with MPO's over 500K in population.
Wisconsin	Still in process, but will work with MPOs and Regional Planning Commissions (RPCs)

3) Who did (will) you collaborate with to aid in identifying CUFCs?

States will be collaborating with MPOs, RPCs, and DOT regions to identify CUFCs.

Illinois	Regional Planning Councils, State Freight Advisory Council
Indiana	MPOs, the Indiana Economic Development Corporation, other partner organizations.
Iowa	MPOs
Kansas	MPOs, key urban freight stakeholders and industry organizations. FAC review
Kentucky	Regional HDO Planning staffs, ADD Transportation Planners. Review/comment by KFACT, MPOs.
Michigan	MPO's, DOT Regions, interdepartmental staff
Minnesota	DOT Districts, MPOs, Counties and Cities within MPOs.
Missouri	MPOs
Ohio	MPO's, and ODOT, leadership, business and industry (TBD).
Wisconsin	FAC, MPOs and RPCs

4) Do you have an MPO greater than 500,000 in population? If so, how did you address and balance the MPO designated routes as well as state designated routes in other urban areas across your state?

All MAFC states have at least one MPO with population greater than 500,000. States are planning on working closely with these MPOs to balance route designations, although designations are in the early stages.

Illinois	We have not yet finalized this. We have two of them.
Indiana	Indiana has 4 MPOs greater than 500,000 in population, 2 of which are multi-state MPOs. They have not approached INDOT in regards to designating CUFCs. Both of those MPOs have significant portions of the existing PHFS within their boundaries, with needs that will address freight mobility on those routes.
Iowa	The only MPO greater than 500,000 population in Iowa is the Omaha-Council Bluffs metropolitan area, the majority of which is in Nebraska. The MPO will lead the CUFC designation effort but this process has not been completed yet.
Kansas	Yes. Routes will be determined through consultation with the MPOs, key freight stakeholders and industry organizations. Route prioritization identifiers will also be taken into consideration as part of the process.
Kentucky	Cincinnati-Northern Kentucky (OKI), and Louisville KYTC intends to solicit recommendations from OKI and Louisville for their designated routes and will prioritize those routes with routes from other urban areas in a data-driven process.
Michigan	Michigan has two MPO's greater than 500,000 in population. MDOT and the MPO's will ultimately work together to address the balance of routes designated by each party. Further coordination is necessary to begin determining the route designations.
Minnesota	Yes, the Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities. This is an open question for us; we are not sure how we will approach it.
Missouri	Yes. MoDOT is meeting with all MPOs during the Spring 2017 transportation planning meeting to discuss how to designate such few miles. Options will be discussed at that time.
Ohio	In urbanized areas over 500,000 in population the MPO will be taking the lead, with ODOT consultation, to designate mileage within those boundaries. Ohio has (6) areas which meet that threshold ie. Akron, Cincinnati, Columbus, Cleveland, Dayton and Toledo. The urbanized areas under 500K in pop (13) ODOT will take the lead in designating mileage. Preliminarily, ODOT is analyzing the total STS mileage of the 19 areas and is developing a percentage to distribute the 142.46 miles between areas
Wisconsin	Yes, we will work closely with the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission to designate routes. Their most recent long range plan does not include specific freight routes.

5) Do you have any multi-state MPOs? If so how did you/will you approach this situation, and how will you collaborate to make CUFC designations?

Nine of ten MAFC states have multi-state MPOs. While states plan to coordinate designations with these multi-state MPOs, coordination is in the early stages, and details are not available.

Illinois	We have East West Gateway which is mainly in MO. I don't think it's going to be a problem, they have given us input as to what they want and it appears to be workable.
Indiana	Indiana has two multi-state MPOs, with the bulk of the population of each in the other states (Ohio and Kentucky). We have not determined how we will approach this situation, and we have not yet been contacted by the MPOs regarding CUFCs.
Iowa	Yes. These MPOs will be asked to consider the multi-state nature of their respective areas when recommending locations for CUFC designation.
Kansas	Yes. Kansas City and St. Joseph (MO)/Elwood (KS). Will work with the MPOs and MoDOT.
Kentucky	Kentucky has several multi-state MPOs. KYTC will collaborate with these MPOs and their respective DOTs with regard to designating CUFCs in those areas.
Michigan	Michigan's MPO's are not multistate, but part of Michigan is included in Toledo's MPO and South Bend's urbanized area. It has not yet been formally determined how this coordination will occur.
Minnesota	Yes, four: Metropolitan Interstate Council (Duluth/Superior) and La Crosse Area Planning Committee – these are both MN and WI, and Grand Forks/East Grand Forks MPO and Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments – these are both MN and ND. We are not sure how we will approach this – we are interested in how other states will handle this.
Missouri	Yes, 3. The St. Louis TMA made recommendations split by state.
Ohio	Ohio has (7) multi-state MPO's ie. Cincinnati - OH, KY, IN; Huntington – OH, WV, KY; Parkersburg OH, WV; Toledo – OH, MI; Weirton—Steubenville – WV, OH, PA; Wheeling – WV, OH; Youngstown – OH, PA.
Wisconsin	We have multi-state MPOs but we haven't thought through how we'll approach it.

6) Is your CUFC list static or do you see it as more of a rolling list to address project needs?

Most MAFC states see their CUFC list as rolling, while three are still determining what form their lists will take.

Rolling: IL, IN, KS, KY, MI, MN, OH

TBD: IA, MO, WI

Illinois	This one I expect to be more fluid.
Indiana	If we choose to designate CUFCs, we will likely treat them as a rolling network to address project needs.
Iowa	Iowa DOT is still having internal discussions to determine which approach the Department will take with CUFCs and future project needs. These decisions will most likely be made after CUFC designation recommendations have been submitted and reviewed, as described in CUFC question #1 above.
Kansas	Following the identification of the initial CUFCs annual reviews will be conducted to determine if any changes in rural freight transportation needs warrant modifications/additions to the system.
Kentucky	Kentucky envisions the CUFC as a rolling designation to address project needs.
Michigan	MDOT expects the network will be a rolling list that will serve to address project needs in the State.
Minnesota	Assuming we go with process #2 referenced earlier, we see it as a rolling list.
Missouri	Undetermined at this time.
Ohio	Ohio anticipates a rolling list for the greatest amount of flexibility.
Wisconsin	This is still under discussion but early indications are leaning toward a rolling list

7) Have you considered any kind of sequencing between the two types of designations in order to connect the CUFCs and CRFCs? For example, is it best to work with MPOs to designate CUFCs first in order to determine if some CRFC mileage is necessary for better connections to the NHFN and/or for better connections to the other CRFC designations?

Currently, five MAFC states will not consider sequencing, while only one has stated they would consider sequencing. The four remaining states are waiting to make a decision.

Yes: KS

No: KY, MI, MN, MO, OH

TBD: IL, IN, IA, WI

Illinois	We will be needing to manage the rural miles once we have nailed down the Urban. I think that at that time, these considerations will be addressed.
Indiana	INDOT has not yet decided if we will designate any CUFCs or CRFCs.
Iowa	Iowa DOT is surveying MPOs first in order to prioritize and designate CUFCs. Once these corridors are designated, CRFCs will be determined once connectivity and continuity needs are identified.
Kansas	Will consider sequencing as part of the prioritization process.
Kentucky	KYTC does not expect to sequence the designations but will be working on both designations simultaneously with the stakeholders for the various areas, regions, and subject matter.
Michigan	As yet, MDOT has not deemed sequencing necessary in establishing connectivity between CUFC/CRFC routes and the NHFN.
Minnesota	We have not considered a sequencing process. We would be interested if other states are considering a sequencing process.
Missouri	Not at this time. The CUFCs that have been proposed so far are larger routes already making those connections.
Ohio	Interesting concept, but no...Ohio has not gotten that far yet.
Wisconsin	That sounds reasonable, but the determination hasn't been made yet.

8) In assigning the CRFC and CUFC network, to what extent are you considering access to key industries and natural resources?

In general, states are considering industries and resource access when designating networks. However, it is not yet clear how data and feedback concerning industries and natural resources will be incorporated into the prioritization and designation process.

Considering: IL, KS, KY, MI, MN, OH, WI

TBD: IN, MO

Illinois	Connection to industries is of paramount importance.
Indiana	INDOT has not yet decided if we will designate any CUFCs or CRFCs.
Iowa	Major freight-generating facilities and areas were mapped as an initial step of CRFC/CUFC analysis in Iowa. Iowa DOT is still determining whether these locations will be used for determining routes or truck traffic numbers will be used.
Kansas	These components will be included in the prioritization process.
Kentucky	Kentucky's Highway Freight Network was developed to provide access to major freight generators such as its automotive manufacturing facilities and to the State's resources such as coal and agricultural products. The designations will depend most on the data-driven project prioritization data and weighting factors with further review and comment from the HDOs, ADDs and the KFACT.
Michigan	Connection distance of key industries and natural resources to the CUFC/CRFC and the NHFN will be considered to the extent necessary.
Minnesota	We imagine it will be a component of project and corridor selection, but we're not sure how to quantify it.
Missouri	Undetermined at this time.
Ohio	Ohio is currently conducting a series of 2 lane or general system corridor studies to identify low to medium cost roadway issues that impede freight from flowing freely. This effort includes targeted interviews with business and industry to gain insight into traffic issues, such as reliability, congestion etc. they are most concerned about. Last mile access to intermodal facilities will also be considered.
Wisconsin	In our early discussions, this will be a factor.

9) In assigning the CRFC and CUFC network, to what extent are you considering connectivity to other freight modes?

Overall, states are considering connectivity to other freight modes

Considering: IL, IA, KS, KY, MI, WI

TBD: IN, MN, MO, OH

Illinois	It is of utmost importance and will be a key criteria for inclusion.
Indiana	INDOT has not yet decided if we will designate any CUFCs or CRFCs.
Iowa	Connections to intermodal, transload, and other multi-modal facilities will most likely be targeted in CUFC and CRFC designation.
Kansas	Connectivity/proximity to other modes will be important, specifically CRFC and connections to the state's rail system.
Kentucky	The Kentucky Highway Freight Network was developed using a data-driven process in which access to and connectivity with other modes of transportation were considered. Routes proposed for inclusion in the CRFC/CUFC networks will use the current data-driven project prioritization data and weighting which includes connectivity and modal access factors.
Michigan	Connection distance of rail, air and port intermodal facilities to the CUFC/CRFC and the NHFN will be considered to the extent necessary. MDOT and the MPO's will work together in identifying connectivity to other freight modes in their urbanized areas.
Minnesota	We will certainly consider it a positive if a proposed project helps increase connectivity to other freight modes (an intermodal rail yard or a water port, for example) and would like to actively seek out those types of projects. However, we anticipate that many of our projects will primarily focus on benefits to truck movement.
Missouri	Undetermined at this time.
Ohio	It is intended that route designations will consider, intermodal facilities, port and terminal access, rail/truck facilities
Wisconsin	In our early discussions, this will be a factor

10) Other comments/suggestions on CRFC or CUFC designation?

Illinois	None
Indiana	INDOT has a number of planned but unfunded or only partially funded projects that will improve freight mobility on the existing PHFS. We anticipate using NHFP funds on projects already in the STIP; at the relatively low level of funding for the existing mileage, there is no compelling reason to designate more mileage at this time.
Iowa	Iowa DOT will be surveying MPOs on CUFCs in the near future and will hopefully be closer to final designations by the end of the year with final CRFC designations taking place in Spring 2017.
Kansas	None
Kentucky	<p>Kentucky Highway Freight network was developed based on providing access to major freight generators, including agricultural facilities such as grain elevators, and access to other freight modes such as the public riverports. Coal has had a major impact on Kentucky's transportation network in previous years but with the changes in the utility industry, past experience with mining, loading, or utility locations is no longer a reliable indicator of future performance or needs.</p> <p>Over the last year, with input from all subject areas within the Cabinet and from HDOs, Kentucky has built a robust data-driven project prioritization process for selection of highway projects for inclusion in the state's multi-year highway plan. Data and weighting factors from that process will be used in the analysis of routes to be designated as CRFC or CUFC routes.</p>
Michigan	MDOT feels the maximum mileage for both CRFC and CUFC designations is extremely limited.
Minnesota	We are very curious how many other states are considering a project-driven corridor selection process, as opposed to designating the network first without any consideration for where projects are planned and programmed.
Missouri	As presented at MAASTO, MODOT is a state with >2% of the PHFN, thus limiting where the freight formula funds can be used. However, Missouri has multiple major bridges crossing state lines. If either state desires to designate these bridges on the CRFC or CUFC, both will need to reach agreement.
Ohio	None
Wisconsin	None