

Organizational Results Research Report

June 2009
OR09.024

Columbia Terminal Railroad Feasibility Analysis



Prepared by
Missouri Department of
Transportation

FINAL REPORT

OR09-024

Columbia Terminal Railroad (COLT) Feasibility Analysis

Prepared for the
Missouri Department of Transportation
Multimodal Division

by
Karen Miller
Missouri Department of Transportation
Organizational Results Division

June 2009

The opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this publication are those of the principal investigator. They are not necessarily those of the Missouri Department of Transportation and the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration. This report does not constitute a standard or regulation.

TECHNICAL REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1. Report No. OR09-024	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Columbia Terminal Railroad (COLT) Feasibility Analysis		5. Report Date June 2009	
		6. Performing Organization Code MoDOT	
7. Author(s) Karen Miller		8. Performing Organization Report No. OR09-024	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Missouri Department of Transportation Organizational Results P. O. Box 270-Jefferson City, MO 65102		10. Work Unit No. RD 09 - 025	
		11. Contract or Grant No.	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Missouri Department of Transportation Organizational Results P. O. Box 270-Jefferson City, MO 65102		13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report	
		14. Sponsoring Agency Code MoDOT	
15. Supplementary Notes The investigation was conducted in cooperation with the U. S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration.			
16. Abstract The Missouri Department of Transportation partnered with public agencies and a private company to determine expansion feasibility of intermodal freight movement through the Columbia Terminal Railroad (COLT) in Central Missouri. Businesses and shippers were surveyed to determine feasibility. Survey responses indicated over 450,000 twenty-foot equivalent units (TEU) of freight are passing through Central Missouri annually. Those interested in containerization or transloading service out of Columbia total over 140,000 TEUs inbound and outbound annually. Over half of the survey respondents indicated interest in COLT services. Recommendations for implementation include marketing, business development, intermodal development and public / private partnership development.			
17. Key Words Intermodal terminals, Railroad facilities, Freight traffic, Feasibility analysis, COLT, Containers, Transloading		18. Distribution Statement No restrictions. This document is available to the public through National Technical Information Center, Springfield, Virginia 22161	
19. Security Classification (of this report) Unclassified	20. Security Classification (of this page) Unclassified	21. No. of Pages 26	22. Price

Form DOT F 1700.7 (06/98)

Executive Summary

The Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT) partnered with public agencies and a private company to determine expansion feasibility of intermodal freight movement through the Columbia Terminal Railroad (COLT) in Central Missouri. Businesses and shippers were surveyed to determine feasibility. Survey responses indicated over 450,000 twenty-foot equivalent units (TEU) of freight are passing through Central Missouri annually. Those interested in containerization or transloading service out of Columbia total over 140,000 TEUs inbound and outbound annually. Over half of the survey respondents indicate interest in COLT service so there is an opportunity for expansion. Recommendations for implementation include marketing, business development, intermodal development and public / private partnership development. Increased marketing of COLT services, along with all modal options should be pursued. In addition to those indicating interest in COLT services, other area businesses should be contacted for potential usage. Intermodal development should be investigated with Norfolk Southern and other modal partners based on responses received in order to develop a total intermodal logistics approach. Continuing the public / private coalition will optimize results with each company lending its unique expertise and perspective to identify and explore economic and efficient transportation and business solutions.



Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....iii

Table of Contents.....iv

List of Figures.....iv

Introduction.....1

Technical Approach.....1

Results.....2

Conclusions.....6

Recommendations.....7

Appendix A: COLT Map.....9

Appendix B: Central Missouri Business, Manufacturing and Shipper Survey.....11

Appendix C: Open-ended responses and comments to survey questions.....17

List of Figures

Figure 1: Incoming Shipments – Average Score.....5

Figure 2: Outgoing Shipments – Average Score.....6

Introduction

The Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT) was approached by the Columbia Terminal Railroad (COLT), a short line railroad owned by the City of Columbia, to assess expansion feasibility of intermodal freight in Central Missouri. The COLT railroad line operates between Columbia and Centralia where it connects with the Norfolk Southern railroad line. *See Appendix A for a map of the COLT railroad line.*

A public / private coalition was formed to conduct the feasibility assessment. Partners in this effort included:

- Tina Worley, Columbia Terminal Railroad (COLT), Columbia, Missouri
- Richard Doyle, ADS Logistics, Columbia, Missouri
- Mark Hitt, Department of Agriculture (MDA), Jefferson City, Missouri
- Richard Li, Department of Agriculture (MDA), Jefferson City, Missouri
- Tony Brite, Department of Economic Development (DED), Jefferson City, Missouri
- Don Ransom, Department of Economic Development (DED), Jefferson City, Missouri
- Ernie Perry, Ph.D., Department of Transportation, Multimodal Division, Jefferson City, Missouri
- Karen Miller, Department of Transportation, Organizational Results Division, Jefferson City, Missouri

Nationally, 81% of freight tonnage is carried by truck, 16% by rail and 3% by barge. Further, truck congestion is expected to increase to 50% on Interstate 70 by 2035. Given this growth potential, MoDOT is exploring ways to increase freight efficiency, lessen freight environmental impacts, increase intermodal connectivity and increase economic development.

Technical Approach

The coalition proposed a feasibility survey to determine the potential for expansion of the COLT facility for intermodal connections and container shipping, along with its use as a transloading facility. The team identified 142 businesses that could feasibly ship and receive goods through the COLT facility. These businesses were then contacted for participation in the study and asked to complete a face to face interview that addressed the companies' transportation patterns, transportation needs and desires, and perceived transportation system deficiencies.

The research team then created the Central Missouri Business, Manufacturing and Shipper Survey, to determine the volume of goods shipped and received by businesses within an 80-mile radius of Columbia. *See Appendix B for survey.*

Survey participants were identified by the Department of Economic Development (DED). DED provided a list of 142 mid-Missouri companies based on a Geographic Information Systems (GIS) analysis and North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) codes. The coalition divided the list among common business areas and conducted face-to-face surveys primarily. Some surveys were completed or clarified by phone, e-mail or fax.

Results

Overview

The survey was administered to 118 of the 142 businesses available. Six of the companies approached were no longer in business. A total of 55 companies completed the survey for a response rate of 47%. The majority of respondents (46) were manufacturers with 7 distributors and 2 agriculture service providers. Thirty businesses (55%) indicated interest in containerization or transloading service out of Columbia. Seventeen indicated no interest and eight did not respond to that question. Variability in the responding businesses was large with square footage of shipping and receiving ranging from 300 square feet to 25 acres. The annual inbound freight of all respondents totaled 81,000 twenty-foot equivalent units (TEU) with annual outbound freight totaling 388,000 TEUs. For those interested in service out of Columbia, 64,000 TEUs inbound and 79,000 TEUs outbound were reported on an annual basis.

Business Profile

Of those interested in containerization or transloading service out of Columbia, 26 were manufacturers, 3 were distributors and 1 was an agricultural service provider. The number of years these businesses have been in operation ranged from 2 to 100 years. These businesses were classified as 8 small businesses, 16 medium businesses and 6 large businesses. Business size, as defined by DED, includes the following categories:

- Small - less than 50 employees
- Medium - from 50-250 employees
- Large – over 250 employees for large.

Management of Freight

The majority of those businesses interested in service through Columbia managed both their inbound (63%) and outbound (57%) shipments in-house. A combination of in-house management and external management was the second most frequently reported approach with 13% inbound and 33% outbound.

Those not interested in service through Columbia reported lower levels of internal management with inbound shipments at 41% and outbound at 47%. The combination of both in-house and external management was 23% for inbound and 29% for outbound shipments.

The frequencies of shipments reported was based on the demand of products or services and ranged widely from daily, weekly, monthly, and yearly. The overwhelming method of shipment was truck for all respondents.

Origin or Destination of Freight

Those interested in service through Columbia appear to be more likely to ship internationally, with 37% of companies receiving goods from international origins and 63% shipping goods internationally.

In contrast, 29% of companies reported receiving goods from international origins and 41% shipping goods internationally for those not interested in service through Columbia.

Transportation Costs related to Product Costs

Over half of those interested in service through Columbia reported inbound as well as outbound product cost related to transportation and logistics at less than 10%. This differed from those not interested in service through Columbia with 47% reporting outbound product cost between 11 and 20%. Industry wide, the cost of transportation service for products averages 9%.

Containerized Shipments

Nineteen of 30 companies interested in service through Columbia had received containerized shipments, with 24 respondents indicating they are capable of receiving containerized shipments. Two-thirds of them would consider using other modes to receive or ship products. Nineteen of the 30 companies had, or currently containerize their outbound shipments.

Only four of 17 companies not interested in service through Columbia had received containerized shipments with eight indicating capability. In addition, 41% indicated they would not consider receiving products using other modes and 65% would not consider shipping products using other modes.

Of those interested in service through Columbia, some caveats were provided. In most cases, cost would be a factor. Destination would also matter, especially eastbound freight. Changes in packaging would be required for some respondents. Further, some would require trailer on flatcar (TOFC) service.

Of those not interested in service through Columbia, some respondents indicated all shipments are FOB (free on board) and thus controlled by the vendors or customers. Others specified the nature of their product was time sensitive and thereby not conducive to rail shipments.



Transportation Factors and Preferences

Respondents were asked general questions about perceptions of transportation system deficiencies as well as transportation needs and desires. Three-fourths of all respondents indicated shipping operations being delayed due to incoming suppliers or outgoing service occurring less than 10% of the time.

Respondents were asked to rank why trucks were the primary mode of shipping with the following results. For those interested in service through Columbia, trucks were favored due to:

1. Cost
2. Timeliness / speed
3. Safety and less product damage
4. Easiest available option
5. Only available option

For those not interested in service through Columbia, trucks were favored due to:

1. Only available option
2. Cost
3. Easiest available option
4. Safety and less product damage
5. Timeliness / speed

For all respondents, trucks were favored due to:

1. Only available option
2. Tied between Cost, Safety and less product damage and Timeliness / speed
3. Easiest available option

In order to assess companies' views on the immediate transportation system surrounding their company, respondents were asked to rank the transportation facilities. This indicates the importance of each transportation system to their business:

1. 4-lane or interstate highway
2. 2-lane or state highway
3. Tied between rail and air service for those interested in service through Columbia; tied between rail and port/ waterways shipping for those not interested in service through Columbia
4. Port and waterways for those interested in service through Columbia and air for those not interested

To determine commonalities of shipment delays, respondents were asked to rank common reasons for delays. This is ranked from most to least frequent:

1. Weather
2. Availability of vehicles / service for those interested in service through Columbia; Accident for those not interested
3. Congestion
4. Accident for those interested in service through Columbia; Availability of vehicles / service for those not interested
5. Damage due to rough ride
6. Product transfer site

Respondents were then asked an open-ended question on what they felt were the top three transportation improvements that would provide the greatest benefit to their business. Responses were varied and ranged from:

- Specific to general infrastructure requests (increased bridge weight limits, making highway 36 four lanes)
- Accessibility (more inter-modal options, closer container loading facility)
- Motor carrier requests (insured competition, carrier financial stability)
- Costs (lower fuel costs)

See Appendix C for the complete list of improvements and comments.

Respondents were also asked to evaluate the different modes of transportation (highways, rail, water and air service) on a scale of 1 to 10 with 1 being unacceptable and 10 being excellent. The average rating of responses is graphed below.




Figure 1: Respondents’ average score when rating transportation system for incoming shipments




Figure 2: Respondents’ average score when rating transportation system for outgoing shipments

Highways and rail service scores were aligned between all respondents. Water-based shipping ranked lower by those not interested in service through Columbia. Air scored close to highways in terms of service among all respondents.

Conclusions

Based on the survey responses only, over 450,000 TEUs of freight are passing through Central Missouri annually. Those interested in containerization or transloading services out of Columbia ship over 140,000 TEUs inbound and outbound. Many respondents were not aware of the option to move freight through the Columbia Terminal Railroad (COLT).

If 25% of this interest in COLT can be captured, 35,000 TEUs or 70,000 truckloads per year could be moved to rail and intermodal transfer. At a rate of 155 ton miles* per gallon of fuel for trucks, this represents a potential savings of 2,258 gallons for every mile not traveled.

Assuming a 50% interest would double that number to 140,000 truckloads per year with 4,516 gallons saved for every mile traveled. Assuming a 100-mile trip, this represents over 450,000 gallons of fuel. Along with those cost savings, there would be fewer trucks traveling Interstate 70 to Kansas City or St. Louis, decreasing wear and tear on the roads along with reducing congestion. From an environmental standpoint, this would save over 119,000 tons of CO₂. (COLT, 2007).

While interest in using the COLT services definitely exists, costs may be a determining factor for most businesses.

*Source: “A Modal Comparison of Domestic Freight Transportation Effects on the General Public.” Texas Transportation Institute. November 2007

Those interested in service out of Columbia often had more control of their inbound and outbound shipments and reported higher percentages on importing and exporting products. They reported about 10% lower product cost for outbound shipments than those not interested in service out of Columbia. Those interested in service out of Columbia also reported a much higher percentage of containerization usage.

Although the origin and destination points were requested in the survey, not all respondents were able to provide complete information. Some respondents were not aware of the actual origin or destination of shipments. Therefore, the percentage of companies importing or exporting goods is likely under-reported.

In reviewing why trucks were the primary mode of shipment, cost scored highest among those interested in service out of Columbia with only available option scoring lowest. In contrast, the only available option scored highest among those not interested in service out of Columbia with timeliness scoring lowest. Lower cost may be a catalyst to induce companies' interest in using COLT services.

Highways, whether 4-lane or 2-lane, are the most important transportation system for the respondents, which follow the theme of trucks being the primary mode of transportation. In terms of preferences, highways and air service scored an 8 out of 10 ranking as compared to rail service at 4.7 and water-based service at 5.1 for incoming and outgoing shipments.

Multiple barriers were cited by companies not interested in containerization or transloading services through Columbia. These constraints included:

- Nature of product or packaging requirements (easily damaged, product too small to use rail)
- Timeliness of shipment (must have quick receipt or delivery of product)
- Freight terms (vendor or customer shipping FOB, corporate controlled shipments)
- No rail connection
- Area of delivery (local shipments)

The most common shipment delays were weather and availability of vehicles or service for those interested in service out of Columbia. The highest Other category was breakdowns of trucks which falls into the availability of vehicles category. Congestion ranked third, with damage due to rough ride at second to last, indicating delays due to the transportation system is not a primary issue for these businesses.

Recommendations

The recommendations based on the survey responses are categorized into marketing, business development, intermodal development and public / private partnership development.

Marketing

The responses indicated a lack of awareness of the COLT facility by many respondents and the option to ship through Columbia. While it may not be the solution for every company, increased marketing of COLT, along with all modal options should be pursued with follow up visits to further explore interested companies' transportation needs and desires. Those surveys indicating no interest in service through Columbia should be carefully analyzed as some barriers may be perception issues and can be overcome with education and follow up. Other businesses not included in the survey list may have potential use of the COLT facility given the general lack of awareness of their services.

While marketing COLT services, the myriad of benefits should be presented, including consideration of:

- All modal options available depending on product, shipment or business needs
- Weather advantages of rail service since this was the highest ranked shipment delay reported
- Environmental advantages with reduction of carbon footprint. COLT is pro-actively marketing their ability to reduce the tons carbon emissions by using their services.

Business Development

Follow up should be conducted as soon as possible with those companies expressing an interest in service through Columbia. Most respondents have been affected by the downturn in the economy so getting a competitive modal bid for their consideration would position COLT to benefit when the economy starts to turn around. The survey was not deployed to all potential companies in the region, so these should be pursued in addition to other potential businesses not included on the list.

Careful consideration should be made of the barriers listed by those not interested in service through Columbia to determine if COLT should pursue facility changes or additional services. In addition, a careful review of the comments will address concerns and issues raised by those interested in service through Columbia.

Intermodal Development

Once follow up has been conducted and constraints understood, intermodal development should be aggressively pursued with Norfolk Southern as well as other modal partners identified in the follow up contacts. Additional marketing may be needed based on the total intermodal logistics approach available.


Public / Private Partnership Development

Based on the cooperative public / private coalition conducting the research thus far, this synergy should continue as each partner provided expertise and a unique angle to the process. This produced better results and a more comprehensive understanding of business needs and trends with inclusion of the Department of Agriculture and Department of Economic Development along with COLT and ADS Logistics.

As different options are explored for intermodal development of COLT, each agency's expertise can be drawn upon to identify and explore economic and efficient transportation and business solutions.

Appendix A: COLT Map

Map of the
COLUMBIA
TERMINAL (COLT)
SHORT LINE
RAILROAD



Copyright © 2002 Columbia Water & Light/City of Columbia

Appendix B: Central Missouri Business, Manufacturing and Shipper Survey



Central Missouri Business, Manufacturing and Shipper Survey *Spring 2009*

This survey tool is intended to be deployed as a face-to-face interview with business, manufacturing and shipping organizations in Central Missouri. Interviewers will use this form to collect shipping needs to assist in identifying the right transportation solution. Below is a brief introduction to be used with each survey respondent.

Introduction:

Good morning/afternoon. I am _____ with _____. I am working on a project with the City of Columbia, MoDOT, the Department of Economic Development, and the Department of Agriculture to better understand how businesses in the area use and benefit from transportation. We are interested in finding out how you receive and ship your products, what problems or delays you face, what works well with your receiving and shipping, and what transportation improvements you feel would most benefit shippers in the area. As a shipper in the area, we want to know what you feel works and what needs improvement. All of your responses will be kept confidential.

Thank you for participating. Let's get started talking about your business.

Background:

Name of Business: _____ Address: _____ Respondent Name: _____ Contact information: _____

- 1) What is your core business? _____

- 2) Your secondary business is _____

History:

- 3) Number of years in business at this location: _____
- 4) Number total years in business: _____

Shipping - Inbound:

- 5) How does your operation manage its inbound shipping? Is it: *(Circle one)*
 - a. Self-managed
 - b. Managed by others (list who) _____
- 6) Please answer the following questions regarding the receipt of inbound materials or products to your company. Please list inbound shipments in order of volume.

Name of Good or Product Received	Frequency of Receipt <i>(daily, weekly, monthly)</i>	Primary Inbound Mode <i>(truck/rail/air)</i>	Intermodal Connections <i>(e.g., sea to rail, rail to truck)</i>	Origin of Shipment <i>(Country importing/exporting to or from OR City and Zip)</i>
a.				
b.				
c.				
d.				
e.				
f.				
g.				
h.				
i.				

- 7) What percent of your total inbound product cost do you think is related to transportation and logistics?
 - a. 0 –10% b. 11 – 20% c. 21- 30% d. 31-40% e. Over 41%
- 8) Have you ever received containerized shipments? a. Yes b. No
(Explain if needed - Containerized shipments are generally 48 ft (15 m) and 53-ft (rail and truck) and often expressed in twenty-foot equivalent units (TEU, or sometimes teu). These containers are also termed ISO containers, shipping containers and ITUs (Intermodal Transport Units or isotainers) that can be loaded and sealed intact onto container ships, railroad cars, planes, and trucks.)
- 9) Is your facility capable of handling containerized shipments? a. Yes b. No
- 10) Would you consider using other modes to receive your products? a. Yes b. No

Shipping - Outbound:

- 11) How does your operation manage its outbound shipping? Is it: *(Circle one)*
- a. Self-managed
 - b. Managed by receiver or shipper (list who)
- _____

12) Please answer the following questions regarding the shipment of outbound materials or products from your company. Please list outbound shipments in order of volume.

Name of Good or Product Shipped	Frequency of Shipments <i>(daily, weekly, monthly)</i>	Primary Outbound Mode <i>(truck/rail/air)</i>	Intermodal Connections <i>(e.g., sea to rail, rail to truck)</i>	Destination of Shipment <i>(Country importing/exporting to or from OR City and Zip)</i>
a.				
b.				
c.				
d.				
e.				
f.				
g.				
h.				
i.				
j.				

Surveyor’s Note: Please hand the survey to the respondent to fill out question 13.

13) For outbound shipping, you list _____ *(trucks for example)* as your primary mode of shipping. Please rank the following from 1 to 5, with 5 being most important, the reason this is your primary shipping mode.

- | | <u>Rank</u> |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| a. Cost | _____ |
| b. Safety and less product damage | _____ |
| c. Timeliness/speed | _____ |
| d. Easiest available option | _____ |
| e. Only available option | _____ |

14) Would you consider using other modes to ship your products? a. Yes b. No

15) What percent of your total outbound product cost do you think is related to transportation and logistics?

- a. 0 –10% b. 11 – 20% c. 21- 30% d. 31-40% e. Over 41%

- 16) Have you, or do you currently, containerize your outbound shipments?
 a. Yes, in the past b. Yes, currently c. No
- 17) What percent of your shipping operations are delayed due to either incoming suppliers or due to out-going service?
 a. 0 –10% b. 11 – 20% c. 21- 30% d. 31-40% e. Over 41%
- 18) If containerization service were available out of Columbia, would that be of interest to you and your business? a. Yes b. No

General Questions:

Surveyor’s Note: Please hand the survey to the respondent to fill out question 19-21.

- 19) Please rank the following from 1 to 5, with 5 being most important and 1 being least important for your business?

	<u>Rank</u>
a. 4-lane or interstate highway	_____
b. State highway or 2 lane highway	_____
c. Rail service	_____
d. Port and waterways	_____
e. Air service	_____

- 20) Please rank the following modes of transportation from 1 to 10, with 10 being excellent, 5 acceptable and 1 being unacceptable, in providing adequate service for your incoming and outgoing shipping needs?

Incoming Shipments

	Unacceptable		Acceptable						Excellent	
a. Highways	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
b. Rail service	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
c. Water-based shipping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
d. Air service	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Outgoing Shipments

	Unacceptable		Acceptable						Excellent	
a. Highways	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
b. Rail service	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
c. Water-based shipping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
d. Air service	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

- 21) What is the most frequent transportation delay your shipments face? Please rank delay as 6 being most frequent through 1 as least frequent.

	<u>Rank</u>
a. Congestion	_____
b. Accident	_____
c. Weather	_____
d. Product transfer site (<i>intemodal transfer</i>)	_____
e. Availability of vehicles/service	_____
f. Damage due to rough ride	_____
g. Other _____	_____

22) What are the top three transportation improvements you think will provide the greatest benefit to businesses like yours in this area?

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

23) What is the average number of employees you employ in the mid-Missouri area over the course of a year? _____

24) How large is your shipping and receiving facility in square feet?

25) What is the total volume of goods shipped inbound and outbound from this facility?

a. Inbound (*loads or tons/time unit*) _____

b. Outbound (*loads or tons/time unit*) _____

26) That concludes my questions. Do you have comments or input you would like to add?

We appreciate your participation in the survey, and as we discussed earlier your responses are confidential. This information will help us better understand how to help businesses and shippers in central Missouri.

Thank you.

Appendix C: Open-Ended Responses and Comments to Survey

All responses to survey question 22: What are the top three transportation improvements you think will provide the greatest benefit to businesses like yours in this area?

1. Higher efficiency to lead to lower rates
2. Insured competition
3. Increased load limits
4. Be able to load containers and place on rail at Columbia
5. Make Highway 36 four lanes
6. Keep roads maintained
7. Greater access to air lift (currently Kansas City or St. Louis are only options)
8. Weight limitations
9. 4-lane hwy (under construction and thankful)
10. More accessible rail service
11. Carrier financial stability
12. Continued construction and maintenance of highways
13. Local carrier facilities
14. Satisfied with our transportation issues for our facility
15. Additional lanes added to interstate highways
16. We ship and receive by truck so we'd like inter-modal options available to us
17. Construction delays on I-70 impact time sensitive deliveries to St. Louis & Kansas City
18. Accurate and timely reporting of winter road conditions is critical for time sensitive deliveries
19. Fix the road by the railroad tracks
20. Highway transportation - road improvements
21. Third party logistics support
22. Regularly scheduled service
23. Improved highway system
24. Airfreight improvements
25. Easier rail access
26. Bridge weight load limits
27. More flexibility
28. Availability of containers
29. Additional inland ports
30. Additional rail lines
31. Highway - more 4 lanes
32. Rail
33. Port
34. Better 4 lanes on I-70 and I-44
35. Would like to see Missouri do something like China HUBS or for Europe, specifically like air cargo. Also increase flow and efficiency to overseas customers
36. Bridge weight limits
37. Winding rural roads
38. Improved road maintenance
39. More 4-lane roads
40. 4-lane or Interstate highway through Jefferson City
41. Spend more money on roads
42. Lower taxes for utilities
43. Lower transportation costs
44. Continued reliable and safe transportation
45. Better highways between our business and larger cities (St. Louis, Kansas City, Chicago)
46. Weight limits on bridges (lumber is an ag product but has different rules than grain)

47. For logs we need a fumigation facility
48. Take better care of highways - they have access to a 4-lane highway within 3 miles of facility
49. For OD/OS/OW loads, it is absolutely critical to have up to date construction information to ensure safety of others on highway as well as keep costs low (had to drive 40 miles out of way for a trip to St. Louis when shut down eastbound lane and only working on westbound lane)
50. Earlier notification on changeable message signs to alert drivers of upcoming issues as critical to help OD/OS/OW loads to make decisions
51. MoDOT helps lots with permits and good to work with
52. Turn lane is dangerous
53. Less construction during day when trucks are traveling
54. Four lane Highway 24
55. No issues with highways, unless damage due to rough ride
56. More four lane roads
57. Reduce fuel costs
58. Rules and regulations at railyards - railroads charge you more for everything
59. Expanded Highways (I-70 needs more lanes)
60. Monroe City from Columbia needs better roads
61. Ability to load our park models onto rail and ship nationwide
62. Low cost rail transportation to other parts of U.S.
63. Freight forwarders more accessible for overseas shipments
64. Closer container loading facility
65. 4-lane highway
66. Higher load limits - not increasing axle limits
67. Better roads
68. Rail service would be nice if costs less
69. Rail service in Rolla
70. Cost
71. Availability to reach big cities
72. Being able to ship out UPS later and have it make it next day (air shipments)
73. Having closer access to major interstates (I-70)
74. People are heading towards highway 65 on State Fair Blvd. It can get tricky with truck traffic outside the company, as there are lots of grain trucks and 18-wheelers driving fast. It could be the on-ramps and slopes. This is a very industrial area and the local businesses all let out at the same time (3:30) so there's lots of congestion on State Fair and Main. Traffic backs up to our parking area. Stoplight would help manage traffic flow. Whatever could be done to make more options to get to major Interstates the better. Highway 65 is the only way to get north or south
75. Air and rail shipping availability
76. Need container loading facilities
77. Conditions of the roads are good on 4-lanes; Intermodal facilities in closer proximity would be good. Columbia would be acceptable. Sedalia would be better.
78. 4 lane highway
79. Utilities cost
80. Better roads to our business location as we are out in the middle of nowhere
81. Container loading facility in Columbia
82. Improvement of 2-lane highway
83. Provide intermodal from Columbia to Kansas City and St. Louis
84. Ability to weigh inbound railcars
85. 4-lane interstate
86. 2-lane improvements

All responses to survey question 26: Do you have comments or input you would like to add?

1. Also have facility at Tipton
2. May or may not use a grain loading facility / equipment at a site in Columbia
3. We cannot really use rail service
4. In our case, I am not sure if there are many options as we don't ship enough out to use rail service nor is it quick enough. Trucks are really our best option
5. I based my answers on our normal operating levels. Obviously things have slowed down recently
6. Will the facility handle LTL?
7. Very interested in lowering costs by going through Columbia; Kansas City rail yards charge you for everything
8. Rail is on both sides of them, though they do not use it, and the Mississippi is 20 minutes away
9. Would the facility be able to load flat cars with rail trailers (non-stackables)?
10. Big improvement on Highway 50-65 intersection
11. Use trucks only, no container shipments
12. We are 40 miles from Mississippi River but we have never used it for shipments
13. Have interest in shipping cedar mulch by rail (bulk & bagged)



Missouri Department of Transportation
Organizational Results
P. O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

573.526.4335
1 888 ASK MODOT
innovation@modot.mo.gov