

Appendix A: Stakeholder Outreach

This Appendix presents the approach, findings and recommendations from the rail stakeholder outreach activities conducted by the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the Ohio Rail Development Commission (ORDC) for the development of this Ohio Statewide Rail Plan. It includes five sections and two attachments:

- A.1 Description of the Stakeholder Outreach and Involvement Plan for the Statewide Rail Plan
- A.2 Outreach Activities and Participation
- A.3 Summary of Stakeholder Comments, Concerns and Issues
- A.4 Recommendations based on Outreach Comments
- A.5 Next Steps

Attachment 1 to Appendix A: Statements presented to ORDC by the Ohio Railroad Association

Attachment 2 to Appendix A: Outreach session handouts, sign-in sheets and comment forms; rail and shipper interview survey questionnaires and cover letters

A.1 Stakeholder Outreach and Involvement Plan

ODOT and the ORDC are committed to an ongoing stakeholder and public involvement process. This process includes continually engaging rail stakeholders and the public in rail planning activities for this plan and in future policy development and program decision making. To accomplish this, a “Rail Stakeholder Outreach and Involvement Plan” was developed that describes the approach, activities, and schedule to engage rail stakeholders and the public in the development of and revisions to the “Ohio Statewide Rail Plan.”

The intent of the “Rail Stakeholder Outreach and Involvement Plan” is to include adequate and reasonable notice and opportunity for comment and other input for a variety of stakeholders, including the public, rail carriers, commuter rail and transit authorities operating in, or affected by rail operation within the state; local governments; and other interested parties. ODOT and ORDC are seeking comment and involvement of these stakeholders and the public through a variety of regional rail workshops, mail surveys and stakeholder interviews, as well as making work products available on the ODOT web site for review and comment.

Prior to and during the development of this plan, extensive public and stakeholder outreach activities relative to Ohio’s passenger rail initiatives have taken place statewide. These passenger initiatives include both the 3C Corridor studies as well as high speed rail studies. Complimenting these efforts were broad-based outreach activities sponsored by the Governor’s 21st Century Commission, which were held in 2008. These outreach activities sought input and comments on the overall vision and direction for Ohio’s multimodal transportation system. Additional overarching transportation outreach will begin during the spring of 2010 for the “ODOT Transportation Futures Plan.” As a result of these past and proposed transportation stakeholder and public outreach efforts, passenger and freight rail and the overall vision for integrating all modes of transportation will be discussed and an overall vision for Ohio’s transportation system developed in the Futures Plan.

The approach for rail stakeholder and public involvement for this statewide rail plan focuses on complementing, integrating, and filling any gaps in the other ODOT and ORDC outreach activities.

A.1.1 Goals for Stakeholder and Public Involvement

The goals for stakeholder and public involvement for the statewide rail plan for ODOT and ORDC are to reach out to rail stakeholders and the public to:

- Identify potential rail projects and improvements to rail policies and programs to better meet transportation needs while making Ohio a more attractive location to conduct business and a better place to live
- Understand the need, the potential impacts of and opportunities for rail transportation to improve the overall efficiency and sustainability of Ohio’s transportation system
- Provide input for developing a strategy for making rail investment decisions

A.1.2 Role and Responsibilities of Steering Committee

A steering committee was named for this rail planning study. Its members are to guide the plan development and outreach approach and to recommend the final draft plan to the ORDC Commission. Throughout this study the steering committee, identified in **Exhibit A-1**:

- Participated in meetings, telephone, face-to-face discussions, and, when possible, individual interviews to discuss ideas, vision, and concerns about the study
- Reviewed and commented on the project approach, key findings, and first drafts of all recommendations and documents prior to review by the stakeholders, the public, ODOT leadership or ORDC
- Notified federal, state, and local governments and agencies as appropriate, and railroads operating in Ohio of the development of the plan, its status, and how they can have input
- Shared information with ODOT and ORDC leadership
- Collected leaderships’ feedback and use to direct the study
- Approved the final draft documents prior to submission to ORDC Commissioners

Exhibit A-1: Ohio Statewide Rail Plan Steering Committee Members

Individual	Representing
Leonard Evans	ODOT, Committee Chair
Matt Dietrich	ORDC Executive Director
Barbara Bennett	ORDC Commissioner
William Lozier	ORDC Commissioner
Bridget Garrigan	ODOT Staff
Lou Jannazo	ORDC Staff
Don Damron	ORDC Staff
Andrea Stevenson	ODOT Staff
Dan Haake	MORPC Staff

A.1.3 Role and Responsibilities of Consultant Team

The consultant team, as directed by the steering committee, gathered data, held workshops and meetings, conducted interviews, performed analyses, and summarized comments from all stakeholder and public outreach activities. Scheduling and timing of the activities was coordinated jointly by the steering committee and consultant team.

A.1.4 Outreach Approach

As stated, extensive and ongoing ODOT and ORDC passenger rail and other transportation planning outreach has already taken place or is planned. Therefore the approach and activities for the Ohio Statewide Rail Plan focused on complementing, integrating, and filling any gaps in the other stakeholder outreach and input. It was the consensus of the steering committee and consultant team that due to the extensive amount of recent outreach regarding rail issues, that it would be duplicative and redundant to hold numerous public meetings for the statewide rail plan. Therefore, outreach activities for the statewide rail plan, focused on freight stakeholders and freight issues. Input for the rail plan was gathered in a number of ways. **Exhibit A-2** presents the methods used and the purpose for each.

Exhibit A-2: Outreach Approach

Outreach Methods	Purpose
Key stakeholder surveys and interviews	To individually inform key stakeholders of the study and obtain their input primarily focused on rail freight
Stakeholder briefings/workshops	To meet with, inform and obtain input from freight stakeholder groups and agencies on the purposes of the statewide rail plan, as well as to solicit specific issues which impact rail operations
Government agency and railroad coordination	To inform government agencies, shippers, businesses and the railroad companies doing business in Ohio of the study, its status and activities and provide them a forum for review and comment

A.1.5 Agency coordination

The steering committee contacted and informed governmental agencies and railroads operating in Ohio that the statewide rail plan was being developed and stakeholder activities underway.

A.1.6 Contact Database

All interviewees, meeting participants, media, and the public who participate in outreach activities had their comments and contact information entered into a database. Information captured includes: name, title, address, city, state, zip code, and e-mail. This information is included as an attachment to this appendix.

A.1.7 Communications/Media Protocol

The primary media contact for the study was the ODOT Deputy Director of Communications or a designated ORDC or ODOT public information officer. All media inquiries were directed to this study contact. All materials distributed to the media received approval by this individual. Outreach conducted by members of the consultant team to promote public meeting events was with the approval of the Executive or public information officer (PIO) of ORDC.

A.1.8 Documentation

Comments and input from passenger rail outreach activities have been integrated into the 3C documents or the passenger rail chapters. Freight rail stakeholder comments and concerns solicited through the outreach effort described in this appendix, are documented in **Section A.3** and **Attachment 2** to this appendix. Findings will also be summarized and presented to the steering committee and ORDC. Statements presented to ORDC and ODOT

from the Ohio Railroad Association are included as received in **Attachment 1** to this appendix. They have not been edited or altered in any way.

A.2 Outreach Activities Conducted and Participation

Freight rail outreach activities conducted for this plan included regional rail briefings / workshops, rail and shipper surveys and interviews.

A.2.1 Stakeholder briefings/workshops

As shown on **Exhibit A-3**, five stakeholder briefings / workshops were held during January and March, 2010. Because so much of the outreach for the “3C Quick Start” passenger rail study was conducted in Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton, and Cincinnati, it was agreed that the briefings/workshops would take place with multimodal freight coalitions and committees established in the Akron/Canton/Youngstown, in the Cincinnati and Toledo areas. Ohio currently has active freight intermodal coalitions or organizations in each of these areas. Their memberships include private sector companies that are actively engaged as freight shippers and receivers as well as private sector and public agencies that fund or construct freight related projects. (The consulting team also met with the Ohio Railroad association in November, 2009 to inform them of the rail planning efforts and receive their initial comments.)

Exhibit A-3: Schedule of Rail Briefings / Workshops

Host Organization	Date	Location	Participation
Ohio Railroad Association (ORA)	November 19, 2009	Columbus, Ohio	Both Class I railroads, several short lines, ORA staff, chair of ORDC, ODOT staff
Toledo Metropolitan Council of Governments (TMACOG), Freight Committee	January 27, 2010	Toledo	30+ stakeholders including MPO staff, local businesses, rail shippers, rail union members, government agency representatives, etc.
Ohio Association of Regional Councils (OARC)	January 28, 2010	Columbus	Executive Directors from Ohio’s 17 MPO and several regional agency directors
Ohio Kentucky Indiana Council of Governments (OKI), MPO Freight Advisory Council	March 3, 2010	Cincinnati	20+ stakeholders including MPO staff, local businesses, rail shippers, rail union members, government agency representatives, etc.
Ohio Railroad Association	March 4, 2010	Columbus, Ohio / ODOT	Both Class I railroads, 5 short lines, ORDC Commissioners and staff, ODOT staff
North East Ohio Trade and Economics Consortium (NEOTEC)	March 19, 2010	John Carroll University, Cleveland	Over 100 rail stakeholders

Source: Summarized from information in Attachment 2 to this appendix

Three briefings/ workshops were held with regional freight coalitions. Two additional briefings were also held with key Ohio associations. One included the Ohio Association of Regional Councils (OARC) representing Ohio's seventeen MPOs and regional development agencies. The other was held with the Ohio Railroad Association (ORA) representing Ohio's Class I and short lines railroads in Ohio.

During the briefings/workshops a short presentation summarizing the Statewide Rail Plan was shown and a set of questions provided to stimulate discussion. ORDC Commissioners, ODOT and ORDC staff and consultant team members participated in each of these briefings/workshops to answer questions and to document comments. Participants received fact sheets and survey forms in advance of the meetings and again during the meetings. These survey forms were used to provide their input, concerns and issues on freight rail. The survey could be completed prior to or at the event or returned separately to the consulting team. This multi-level approach provided concerned, informed groups of public and private sector stakeholders with a variety of opportunities to provide comments and input to the statewide rail plan. Copies of all handouts, the presentation used, sign-in sheets and survey forms are included in **Attachment 2** to this appendix.

A.2.2 Key Stakeholder Interviews and Surveys

In addition to the workshops, over 100 key stakeholders, including a random sample of major manufacturers and shippers, all Ohio class I railroads and all short lines operating in Ohio were sent a letter notifying them about the development of the statewide rail plan and a survey form requesting their input. Each recipient was called at least twice and given the opportunity to respond to the survey in the form of an interview. Interviews were conducted by a consultant staff with 30 years experience working for a Class I railroad. Approximately 44 key stakeholder interviews were completed and documented. Others chose to complete and mail in their comments. During the interviews stakeholders identified existing issues, policies and concern relative to rail transportation. Many requested meetings with ORDC staff stating they had specific needs or ideas that could lead to improved business productivity for Ohio. Interviews began in January and continued through March 2010. The findings are summarized in **Section A.3**. A copy of the letter, surveys, and mailing list are provided in **Attachment 2** to this appendix.

A.3 Stakeholder Outreach Findings - Vision, Comments, Concerns, Issues

Over 200 rail stakeholders including the public, the Class 1 and short line railroads, industries, shippers, and metropolitan planning and regional logistic agencies and organizations welcomed the opportunity to provide comments and suggestions for the Statewide Rail Plan and rail services in Ohio. This section presents a summary of the many, diverse comments and opinions received through the outreach conducted as part of the development of this rail plan. A number of specific comments were provided confidentially by private sector shippers, businesses and Ohio railroads interviewed. Their comments are presented in general terms to protect the proprietary and competitive nature of the businesses who shared their ideas with the consultant team. This specific information has been shared as appropriate with ORDC staff. **Exhibits A-4** and **A-5** present tables summarizing the list of interviewees and returned survey and findings.

It is noted that the comments and opinions presented in this Appendix are those of stakeholders who participated in outreach activities for the plan. The comments have not been altered or edited; and are those of the stakeholders alone. The comments and opinion in this Appendix do not represent the opinions or positions of the Ohio Rail Development Commission or the State of Ohio.

A.3.1 Overarching Themes

Several consistent and overarching themes were received from multiple stakeholders from various parts of the state throughout the outreach process. These themes are listed below. They are explained in more detail in **Section A.3.2**.

One consistent comment was the recommendation that this Statewide Rail Plan includes goals, recommendations and actions to support and enhance Ohio's rail system. As has been noted, ODOT is in the process of developing a rail vision and recommendations as part of their comprehensive multi-modal "Ohio Transportation Futures Plan." However, based on the overwhelming sentiment and concerns expressed during the outreach for this Statewide Rail Plan, recommendations are included in **Section A.4**. It is hoped that ODOT and ORDC staff and the ORDC Commission will review, consider and discuss these recommendations and potentially adopt or incorporate them into the "Ohio Transportation Futures Plan."

Overarching themes heard during stakeholder outreach include:

- Rail plays a critical role in Ohio's economy; provides environmental benefits especially to air quality and supports an integrated multimodal freight transportation system.
- Stakeholders compliment ORDC and ODOT on proactive efforts to improve rail service in Ohio
- While stakeholders support passenger rail service, many cautioned not to let passenger service degrade existing freight service
- Improved partnerships (business relationships) between Class I's and Ohio short lines are needed – ORDC should take a leadership role in developing partnerships and negotiating issues and potential linkages
- Opportunities are being lost to trucks - Cost is the primary reason Ohio shippers use other modes instead of rail services
- There is a need to take better advantage of the rail access to Ohio's water ports
- Costs for rail infrastructure improvements should be shared by both public and private sources, both benefit from these improvements

"Comments and opinions presented in this Appendix to the Ohio Statewide Rail Plan are those of stakeholders who participated in outreach activities for the plan. The comments have not been altered or edited; and are those of the stakeholders alone. The comments and opinion in this Appendix do not represent the opinions or positions of the Ohio Rail Development Commission or the State of Ohio."

A.3.2 Statewide Comments, Concerns and Issues

As stated, over 200 individuals and businesses provided written comments, participated in interviews or made statement during briefings/workshops for this rail plan. This section presents and summarizes their comments. Also as part of the outreach activities, the Ohio Railroad Association presented an official statement and a set of comments on the plan and the proposed “benefits calculator tool” to ORDC and ODOT. These are included as received in **Attachment 1** to this appendix. The statements that were gathered from this study’s outreach efforts have not been edited or altered in any way.

Recognition of Role of Rail in Ohio and ORDC

- Stakeholders recognize that rail plays a critical role in Ohio’s economy and integrated multimodal freight system
 - Rail connects Ohio to national and international markets
 - Rail service makes the state marketable to industry
 - Many Ohio industries depend on rail service
 - Better public education is needed on the benefits of rail service - Stakeholders feel the public and decision makers need better education on the benefits of rail service – specific examples should be identified and presented as part of an education program
- Stakeholders complimented ORDC and Ohio on proactive efforts to improve rail service in Ohio
 - Even though business and the economy is currently down Ohio should continue to protect and maintain tracks and switches and buy or protect abandoned track for future use should continue
 - ORDC’s safety program is respected
 - ORDC’s support for short lines should continue and be expanded

Proposed Passenger Rail Service

- Overall stakeholders expressed support for passenger rail service; many stakeholders cautioned not to let passenger service degrade existing freight service
- Support heritage and tourism trains

Business Opportunities

- Opportunities are being lost to trucks
 - Cost is the primary reason Ohio shippers/manufacturers select other modes over rail services
 - Many industries and manufacturers have loads that are too small to interest the Class I railroads; the cost for trans-loading are high and have resulted in many shippers using trucks because they are more cost competitive than rail service
 - Access by shippers to rail infrastructure is inadequate, additional rail siding and spurs to industries by both Class 1 and Short lines are needed. According to the Ohio Railroad Association, “62% of Ohio manufactures are within 1 mile of a rail line but only 1/3 have connectors”
 - Class 1 Railroads (for many reasons including limited marketing staff) do not seek out businesses with small loads or those needing less frequent service. On the other hand, smaller shippers

“Comments and opinions presented in this Appendix to the Ohio Statewide Rail Plan are those of stakeholders who participated in outreach activities for the plan. The comments have not been altered or edited; and are those of the stakeholders alone. The comments and opinion in this Appendix do not represent the opinions or positions of the Ohio Rail Development Commission or the State of Ohio.”

cannot afford Class 1 prices needed to make their smaller loads cost competitive for the Class 1's to accommodate them

- Help short lines – they help smaller shippers
- Short line railroads, small hauls, smaller industries are not well served in Ohio by Class 1 because they lack large enough commodity volumes to meet the Class 1 business models
 - Class 1's are not interested in smaller quantities
 - Improved access is needed by short lines and smaller industries that have quantities Class 1's not interested in
 - Develop “mini-unit” trains that behave like trucks (note: “mini-unit” is a term used by an individual who provided comments during the outreach session – in Toledo) / Develop trains need to run like trucks (i.e. run on schedules and are flexible in pickup and delivery locations)
 - There are numerous potentials for consolidating loads regionally. Currently railroads are not reaching all businesses – some small industries are forced to use trucks
- Look for opportunities to run trains like trucks, this can be accomplished by consolidating loads from several small industries now forced to use trucks
- There is a need to take better advantage of Ohio's Lake Erie and Ohio River water ports
 - Access to Lake Erie and Ohio River ports needs to be expanded to permit increased service by short lines; the need to cross Class I track is part of the issue
 - Water / rail intermodal opportunities need to be explored - especially considering the expansion of the Panama Canal
- Improved partnerships between Class I's and Ohio short lines are needed
 - ORDC should take a leadership role in developing partnerships and negotiating linkages with Class 1 Railroads on issues such as restrictions in crossing their lines especially in providing access to Ohio water ports and smaller businesses.
 - Opportunities are being lost because of the restrictions on short lines to cross Class 1 tracks to get to smaller shippers and the ports. The reasons for this vary but are most often a safety and cost issue related to need to coordinate the timing of short lines crossing with current traffic on the Class 1 tracks.
- Preserve freight right of way
- Redevelop brown fields

Infrastructure Issues

- As trains are getting longer, sidings need to be extended to accommodate additional train cars
- A mechanism is needed for industries to increase sidings or add switching. (For example in VA – there is a loan program for industry to build this, and each year a part is forgiven if facility is used. makes Ohio less competitive with other states that do this)
- More spurs are needed
- There is a lack of passing lanes and this is causing problems

Funding for Rail

- Support public private partnerships
 - Costs for rail safety and capacity improvements should be assumed by both public and private sources, both benefit from these improvements

“Comments and opinions presented in this Appendix to the Ohio Statewide Rail Plan are those of stakeholders who participated in outreach activities for the plan. The comments have not been altered or edited; and are those of the stakeholders alone. The comments and opinion in this Appendix do not represent the opinions or positions of the Ohio Rail Development Commission or the State of Ohio.”

- Funding partnerships should be encouraged; rail infrastructure funding should come from both public and private sources
- Increase the state program size / emphasis
- Neighboring states invest proportionately more in their rail programs
 - Class I railroads are investing millions of private sector funding into Ohio's rail infrastructure, major national double stack projects and new terminals such as North Baltimore in Ohio and in meeting national regulatory requirements
 - Heartland Corridor, National Gateway and the Chicago Create project are all seen as needed and worthy of public funding support

Regulations

- The ORDC should consider taking a position on increased federal rail regulations
 - Positive Train Control (PTC), for which the costs must be borne by railroads and local governments, will result in only \$1 in benefits for \$20 cost born by the railroads – forcing the railroads industry to spend money on mandates undercuts their ability to re-invest in infrastructure
 - Traffic preemption (signal timing) rules are changing and costs are to be borne by local governments – this is seen as an unfair burden to local governments
- The PUCO crossing inspectors rely primarily on their own judgment for defining the quality and need for improvements to railroad / roadway surface crossings; there are no standards. The PUCO forces the railroad to fix crossing sited by the PUCO deadline or face \$5,000/day in fines; the railroads would like to have agreed upon standards used in evaluating the roadway surface grade crossings
- Problems have happened since deregulation (ex. Reduced fleets and services, the railroads are serving fewer and making more money.) The small shipper is cost out of the market for using rail as a mode of transportation
- ODOT studied the impact of truck size and weight but did not change any policies (steel coils are just a “symptom” of a larger problem)

Miscellaneous Comments (please note these are opinions and unedited comments from stakeholders)

- Several stakeholders expressed the opinion that “Class I railroads are monopolies,” there is a lack of competition and their costs are high because they are the only option; their rates are difficult for small companies to pay because they want companies with larger volumes
- The Class I railroads are under staffed
 - Currently base service levels are OK but when there is a ramp up of new business railroad will not be able to deal with this – railroad can't ramp up even if infrastructure in place – if not enough staffing – can't provide the service.
 - When talk about congestion – the problem is not in the main lines it is in the yard – problem is the elimination of employees so cannot switch out cars efficiently. This problem is also in the terminals not just the yards.
- There are dwindling revenues for roadway improvements and maintenance; the nation and Ohio needs to come up with another method to generate revenues for highways.
- There is switching of chemical cars going on near homes; the railroads have limited staff managing this switching
- Things are so automated that there are too few people actually watching the tracks

“Comments and opinions presented in this Appendix to the Ohio Statewide Rail Plan are those of stakeholders who participated in outreach activities for the plan. The comments have not been altered or edited; and are those of the stakeholders alone. The comments and opinion in this Appendix do not represent the opinions or positions of the Ohio Rail Development Commission or the State of Ohio.”

- A lot of what is shipping on rail in Ohio is coal, there is a concern for the impacts if Cap and Trade is enacted
- Incorporate vision and recommendations into the Statewide Rail Plan

A.3.3 Location Specific Comments and Concerns

NE Ohio

- There is a need to maintain current tracks leading to businesses– need to get rail to the right place to serve current warehouses and businesses
- Some rail cars under utilized
- Need to create better rail access to water ports
- Need to address choke points in NE rail system
- Need to take better advantage of diesel pipeline network in Cleveland area; Need to take advantage of and tap into the Marcellus shale gas reserve; the third largest natural gas reserve in the world
- Concern that North Baltimore improvements have cut off rail competitiveness of NE Ohio

Port of Cleveland

- The Port is served by both NS and CSX – but each has access to a different part of the port. Due to unloading schemes, customer materials are put on one rail line (ex. CSX) even though their out of town customers are on the other. This results in an expensive two-line hauls. If the 2 track were connected, cars could shift between them saving businesses money and providing a more efficient system

Toledo

- Port of Toledo – There is limited competitive access to the port. One thing that is prohibiting access is the \$400 / car charge and lack of “qualified” crews for short line to cross the Class 1 tracks. Other issues include institutional barriers by Surface Transportation Board (STB) relating to Wheeling Lake Erie Railroad. This has limited the full potential of the port.
- In the Toledo area the Class I railroads removed diamonds or switches, i.e. removed infrastructure; this resulted in the locals losing economic opportunities – ex. Defiance, Walbridge plant at Stanley yard; East Toledo Oregon – potential foundry; NASA at Sandusky in front of NASA Plumb brook facility (magnesium foundry- lost)
 - Note – one participant said that this information is published in the Federal Register (if industry moves and no need for switch and the railroad decide to remove it. Concern was raised that sometimes the railroads remove switches even these even if they are in use.)
- The Toledo rail yard needs to be expanded to include longer sidings to allow for 90 car trains
- There is a bottleneck on the main line between Bellevue, Ohio and Oak Harbor, Ohio and it is reducing access a major interchange with the Canadian National in Toledo, Ohio (Lang Yard).
- There is an untapped opportunity at the “Mixing Centers” at the closed automotive plants are – it is an asset now available

Cincinnati

- Sharonville Yard is at 10% capacity – is there a right of way or crossing that could be restored; the locals understand this is an at grade crossing issue; they expect Sharonville to grow given changes at Rickenbacker

“Comments and opinions presented in this Appendix to the Ohio Statewide Rail Plan are those of stakeholders who participated in outreach activities for the plan. The comments have not been altered or edited; and are those of the stakeholders alone. The comments and opinion in this Appendix do not represent the opinions or positions of the Ohio Rail Development Commission or the State of Ohio.”

- The AK steel and Sunoco plant will bring more cars to area; they expect growth that may clog the urban area
- Local governments in the Cincinnati area would like to paint the railroad bridges in their area but not been successful in negotiating with the railroads; they are seeking help from ORDC or ODOT on this

Mahoning Valley (Youngstown/Warren)

- Needs intermodal services/ trans-loading facilities to handle container cars

Mansfield / Willard

- Yard facilities are inadequate for growth and for handling larger trains such as grain trains
- Congestion and bottle neck problems exist in the area

Mingo Junction

- The yard is congested; Steel, Coke, Iron Ore, Scrap, Stone, Salt, Fertilizer and other commodities are all moved through this yard.

Wellsville on the Ohio River

- Has a container crane that could be marketed by the state

A.4 Recommendations based on Outreach

The following recommendations are based on the comments, concerns and suggestions from the hundreds of stakeholders who participated in rail outreach activities.

A.4.1 Role of ORDC

In executing its legislative duties to develop, promote and support safe, adequate and efficient rail service throughout the state, ORDC should:

- Increase direct contacts with shippers / manufacturers / railroads
 - During interviews and workshops, key shippers, manufacturers and railroads requested one-on-one discussions with ORDC staff. Many had ideas for specific projects, specific problems or opportunities. Because of the private sector competitive nature of freight rail, individuals and businesses requested confidentiality. ORDC staff will be provided with a list of those requesting meetings. ORDC should schedule interviews with these businesses
- Take a leadership role to improve partnerships (business relationships) between Class I's and Ohio short lines
 - For example: Issues relating to short lines crossing Class 1 tracks were raised during outreach sessions throughout the state and in survey responses. ORDC and ODOT should take a more active role in negotiating with Class 1 Railroads on their restrictions in crossing their lines. These issues have resulted in limited access to Ohio water ports and businesses. For example, there are some industries, shippers and ports, with small loads that do not have access to short line rail service because they cannot afford the fees or are not permitted to cross Class I lines. It is acknowledged that from the Class I perspective, there are safety and train timing issues resulting in increase costs to the Class I's for permitting these crossings. ORDC could help to

“Comments and opinions presented in this Appendix to the Ohio Statewide Rail Plan are those of stakeholders who participated in outreach activities for the plan. The comments have not been altered or edited; and are those of the stakeholders alone. The comments and opinion in this Appendix do not represent the opinions or positions of the Ohio Rail Development Commission or the State of Ohio.”

negotiate agreements and organize partnerships to fund infrastructure that could open business opportunities in the state and spur economic development

- Take a leadership role in negotiating conflicts between the railroads and local governments
 - For example: Projects such as the desire by the City of Cincinnati to paint the rail bridges may have a solution that will be a win-win for the public and the railroads
- Work in partnership with the Ohio Department of Development (ODOD)
 - ORDC staff needs to define themselves as an economic development agency and work in partnership with to improve rail / economic development linkages in Ohio
 - ORDC should work to improve rail efficiencies to retain jobs, grow existing businesses and attract new businesses
- Develop policies to promote fully functioning intermodal freight service

A.4.2 Passenger Rail Service

- Strive to maintain a balanced freight and passenger railroad system that can respond to changing economic conditions and industry needs
- Improve air quality and addresses highway congestion by reducing the number of passenger vehicles and trucks from Ohio roadways
- Provide technical and potentially financial assistance to local governments to aid them in the development of passenger rail stations
- Support heritage and tourism trains

A.4.3 Business Opportunities

- Identify and take advantage of Ohio's many untapped rail opportunities for short hauls, small loads, and irregular service (40- 50 car daily round trip unit trains)
 - If groupings of these small-loads can be identified and linked together through a type of "shipper business alliance" or "shuttle train," considerably more freight could be moved off Ohio roadways and onto Ohio's rail system
 - A number of these small load opportunities are specifically identified in the interview findings and surveys conducted for the outreach efforts
 - Sidings are needed to get to smaller business opportunities and open land for development
 - Team tracks or shared or trans-loader tracks – is an underutilized opportunity – especially for small communities, shippers and small businesses
- Create and support "Shipper Alliances" / "Shuttle Trains" / Trains that run like Trucks
 - Number of shippers (major US industries) that are now using trucks stated in the interviews that they would use rail if they had spurs or sidings; these opportunities should be pursued
 - ORDC should identify and link the short and small haul opportunities; many short haul and small loads were identified through the interviews and are documented on the interview forms; ORDC should go through the forms and contact the interviewees and try to identify potential regional alliances or create shuttle trains and combine small loads into groupings large enough to make business sense for the short lines and Class I's
- Ports
 - Work to improve access to the Lake Erie and Ohio River water ports; access needs to be expanded to permit increased service by short lines; the need to cross Class I track is part of the

"Comments and opinions presented in this Appendix to the Ohio Statewide Rail Plan are those of stakeholders who participated in outreach activities for the plan. The comments have not been altered or edited; and are those of the stakeholders alone. The comments and opinion in this Appendix do not represent the opinions or positions of the Ohio Rail Development Commission or the State of Ohio."

- issue; ORDC should take the leadership role in negotiating and resolving these issues to the benefit of Ohio’s economy
- Explore water / rail intermodal opportunities especially considering the expansion of the Panama Canal
 - In terms of the Panama Canal - It should be clarified to local government water port project sponsors that ocean going ships from the Pacific will most likely continue to the east coast ports (e.g. Norfolk); they are not likely to trans-load to river barge in New Orleans and bucking the currents to go up the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers only to trans-load again to rail or trucks and again. This is why the Heartland Corridor and National Gateway projects were pushed by the Class 1s. It is very expensive and time consuming for the commodities on Pacific oceangoing carriers to trans-load multiple times when they can just proceed to east coast water ports more quickly and at a lower cost. It may however be an advantage barges carrying commodities and leaving on the Ohio River by giving them better and less costly access to Asian markets
- Explore and support public private partnerships for port/rail projects
- Recommend legislation providing tax credits for investments in rail infrastructure; tax credits could be offered over time based on the number of years the improved rail infrastructure is used
- Look for and support trans-loading opportunities

A.4.4 Recommendations - Infrastructure Issues

- Continue to preserve rail lines where there is a future potential for passenger or freight rail
- Review the list in **Section A.3.3**, location specific projects, and work to identify areas that need sidings, passing lanes, spurs and switches maintained
- Evaluate the need for an intermodal project at the Parsons Yard

A.4.5 Recommendations - Strategies for Making Rail Infrastructure Investment Decisions

- Continue to develop and advance the concepts presented in the benefits calculator tool discussed in **Section 12.3** of this Statewide Rail Plan
 - The benefits calculator tool should be developed on at least two levels, one for larger projects using TIGER criteria and one for the smaller cost projects more typical of the type project ORDC currently funds
 - Also see unedited comments on this issue in **Attachment 1** from Ohio Railroad Association members
- The following criteria were recommended to guide investment decisions
 - Expansion of system to capture new, under- or un-served industries
 - Improvements to freight capacity and efficiency (eliminating choke points – rehab tracks)
 - Safety improvements
 - Public benefit measured as jobs created or payroll created or added value created; number of jobs retained / Define job retention the same as job creation
 - Other economic development benefits – not just jobs
 - Amount of financial participation in project by both public and private sources
 - History of investments by applicant in their own system
 - Improvements to air quality (diesel emission reduction projects)
 - Cost savings to roads

“Comments and opinions presented in this Appendix to the Ohio Statewide Rail Plan are those of stakeholders who participated in outreach activities for the plan. The comments have not been altered or edited; and are those of the stakeholders alone. The comments and opinion in this Appendix do not represent the opinions or positions of the Ohio Rail Development Commission or the State of Ohio.”

- Improvements to intermodal freight service
- Commitment by applicant to a long term program of investments over time

A.4.6 Recommendations – Impact of Regulations

- Review the new federal regulations (as identified in **Section A.3.2**), prepare a white paper on their impacts to Ohio and discuss with the ORDC Commission to determine if they would like to take an official position on these issues

A.4.7 Recommendations - Miscellaneous

- Benchmark with neighboring states
 - Lessons can be learned from how neighboring states provide funding, encourage partnerships (business relationships), and deal with short lines and Class I's
- Educate the public, elected officials and appointed decision makers about the economic development benefits of rail; request success story examples from the railroads, for example:
 - Norfolk Southern serves 2 mines in Eastern Ohio, moving coal to a river barge transfer facility. One move is 18.1 miles and the other is 15.5 miles. In 2009 these 2 mines shipped over 10 million gross tons of coal by train. The equivalent of roughly 400,000 fully loaded coal trucks. Each 67 car train for these moves hauls the equivalent amount of coal to equal 300 to 350 coal trucks that would otherwise be on local roads
- Expand safety education programs directed to public
 - Explain that crossing tracks in arbitrary locations is unsafe and trespassing on private property owned by the railroads
 - Explain that property owners near railroad crossings should make an effort to keep vegetation clear to improve sight distances

A.5 Next Steps for ORDC and ODOT

The development of this Statewide Rail Plan should be seen as an initial step in defining and re-evaluating ORDC and ODOT's rail vision, goals, programs and policies. Response to the stakeholder outreach was overwhelming. Hundreds of concerns, comments, suggestions and potential rail opportunities were identified. ODOT and ORDC staffs should review and discuss the stakeholder comments and recommendations generated by them.

As next steps, ORDC and ODOT should:

- Share with the ORDC Commission the comments, concerns and recommendations as identified through the outreach
- Meet directly and individually with each short line and Class 1 in the state; this was offered during discussion with the Ohio Railroad Association and the opportunity should be used
- Meet directly with the businesses and industries who requested this in their interviews conducted for the outreach for this Plan
- Contact neighboring states rail offices to benchmark on programs and approaches
- Further evaluate recommendations in this Plan and findings from the one-on-one interviews and benchmarking
- Implement changes as determined to be warranted
- Find the linkages – and create trainloads – act as a matchmaker

“Comments and opinions presented in this Appendix to the Ohio Statewide Rail Plan are those of stakeholders who participated in outreach activities for the plan. The comments have not been altered or edited; and are those of the stakeholders alone. The comments and opinion in this Appendix do not represent the opinions or positions of the Ohio Rail Development Commission or the State of Ohio.”

- As discussed in **Section A.4.7**, find the success stories and share them with legislators and decision makers
- Move ahead with the Benefits Calculator Tool
- Establish performance criteria based goals for rail service in Ohio
- Commit to annually measure progress in meeting these performance criteria
- Be prepared to offer specific, focused recommendation for “Futures Plan”

“Comments and opinions presented in this Appendix to the Ohio Statewide Rail Plan are those of stakeholders who participated in outreach activities for the plan. The comments have not been altered or edited; and are those of the stakeholders alone. The comments and opinion in this Appendix do not represent the opinions or positions of the Ohio Rail Development Commission or the State of Ohio.”



Exhibit A-4: Interviewees and Returned Surveys

Company Name	City	State	Contact
1st Energy/Rosebud Mines	Multiple	OH	Mike Jamison
Archer Daniels Midland	Port of Toledo	OH	Mark Gergan
Alcoa (Cleveland)	Knoxville	TN	Ed Hamorski
The Andersons Inc.	Maumee	OH	Mike Irmen
The Andersons Inc.	Maumee	OH	Jim McKinstry
The Andersons Inc.	Maumee	OH	Rob Greenlese
Ashland Railroad	Mansfield	OH	Don Cleveland
Bellisio Foods Inc.	Jackson	OH	Mike Evans
Buckeye Industrial Mining	Lisbon	OH	Jack Grinnis
Camp Chase RR	Oakmont	PA	James Street
Cleveland-Cuyahoga Port Authority	Cleve	OH	Eric Hirsimaki
Cleveland Commerce Railroad	GlenWillow	OH	Bill Brown
Cooper Tire	Findlay	OH	Missy Depinet
Coshocton Grain	Coshocton	OH	Rhoda Crown
CSX	Columbus	OH	Rusty Orben
Empire Wholesale Lumber	Akron	OH	Jim Johnson
Farmers Coop	Various	OH	Glen Lehner
Indiana Eastern	Edwardsville	IL	George Andres
Indiana Northeastern Railroad	Milford	IN	Gale Schultz
Jones Hamilton	Walbridge	OH	Chet Rolak
Kraft Foods	Toledo	OH	Tim Kyle
Kraft Maid Cabinets	Middlefield O	OH	Tom Bolden
The Lubrizol Corporation	Deer Park	TX	Gaylin Perry
Mercer Landmark	Celina	OH	Tom Belt-Pres. Gary
The Mennel Milling Company	Fostoria	OH	Strausbaugh
Meyers Industries Inc.	Akron	OH	Pam Scofield
National Lime	Canton	OH	Ken Danwith
Norfolk Southern	Columbus	OH	Bill Harris
Ohio Rail Corp	Steubenville	OH	Powell Felix
Ohio Valley Coal/ AEP.	Alliedonia	OH	Chuck Kaluger
Owens Corning Fibre	Toledo	OH	Brad Parkhurst
Rail America	Jacksonville	FL	Josh Putterman
RJ Corman	Nicholasville	KY	Zane Duncan
Toledo Midwest Terminal	Maumee	OH	Jason Lowry
Wheeling & Lake Erie Railway Co.	Brewster	OH	Jonathan Chastek

“Comments and opinions presented in this Appendix to the Ohio Statewide Rail Plan are those of stakeholders who participated in outreach activities for the plan. The comments have not been altered or edited; and are those of the stakeholders alone. The comments and opinion in this Appendix do not represent the opinions or positions of the Ohio Rail Development Commission or the State of Ohio.”

Exhibit A-5: Summary findings from Interviews and Returned Surveys

Type Company	Number completed surveys / interviews	Project Requests	Total \$ Amount of Project-Needs Requested	# Individuals requesting personal interviews w/ORDC	Primary Issues - Concerns
Manufacturer/shipper	15	N/A	N/A	1	Rail system sometimes not located where shippers need them. Poor service/cooperation between railroads. Need more rail ramps for intermodal business. Keep rail rates in check-often trucks are more competitive. Need for more efficient interchanges & switching
Coal, aggregates	3	N/A	N/A	2	Face challenge of upgrading facilities to speed & size required w/ today's rail companies.
Agricultural products	5	N/A	N/A	1	Need to educate local development leaders on the advantages of using rail. Bad rail service drives up costs & is making trucking look like a better option. Waste too much time waiting for RR switches.
Railroad	11	20	\$34,250,000	N/A	More adequate rail infrastructure needed. Expansion of rail capacity. Have a more balanced multi-modal perspective. Less cumbersome requirements to get projects started.
Port Authority	1	N/A	N/A	1	Need better rail facilities on-site & more dependable service from carriers. Get RR's interested in serving small shippers.

* Not included is the \$60 million in funding from ARRA/TIGER/ State programs for the National Gateway project

"Comments and opinions presented in this Appendix to the Ohio Statewide Rail Plan are those of stakeholders who participated in outreach activities for the plan. The comments have not been altered or edited; and are those of the stakeholders alone. The comments and opinion in this Appendix do not represent the opinions or positions of the Ohio Rail Development Commission or the State of Ohio."