

GOODS MOVEMENT ACTION PLAN INFRASTRUCTURE WORK GROUP

Co-Chairs

Kirk Marckwald, Principal, California Environmental Associates

James Spinosa, International President, International Longshore and Warehouse Union

Introduction

Improving the movement of goods in California is among the highest priorities for Governor Schwarzenegger. It is the policy of this Administration to improve and expand California's goods movement industry and infrastructure. The Schwarzenegger Administration has established a Cabinet Work Group to lead the implementation of this policy for goods movement and ports by working collaboratively with the logistics industry, local and regional governments, neighboring communities, business, labor, environmental groups and other interested stakeholders to achieve shared goals.

Beginning in June 2004, the Schwarzenegger Administration began a concerted effort to assemble goods movement stakeholders to learn about the problems, opportunities, and challenges facing the future of goods movement within the State. These efforts led to the formation of the Administration Goods Movement Policy, "Goods Movement in California," in January 2005. The "Goods Movement Action Plan, Phase I, Foundations", was published in September of 2005. Part of a two-phase process, it is an attempt to characterize the "why" and the "what" of the State's involvement in goods movement in the following four segments: (1) the goods movement industry and its growth potential; (2) the four "port-to-border" transportation corridors that constitute the state's goods movement backbone and the associated inventory of infrastructure projects being planned or are underway; (3) the extent of environmental and community impacts—as well as a description of mitigation approaches; and (4) key aspects of public safety and homeland security issues. Substantial effort was focused on developing the inventory of existing and proposed goods movement projects. The listing includes previously identified projects in various Regional Transportation Plans (RTP) and Regional Transportation Improvement Programs (RTIP) prepared by Municipal Planning Organizations (MPOs), Transportation Commissions and Councils of Governments (COGs). In addition, the listings include a wide range of outlined projects underway or under consideration by the ports, railroads, and other third parties.

The Phase II Action Plan, to be completed by December 2005, will develop a statewide implementation plan for goods movement capacity expansion including financing options for facilities, environmental impact mitigation, community impact mitigation, and enhancement of homeland security and public safety. It will define the "how," "when," and "who" required to synchronize and to integrate efforts to achieve relief and improvement as quickly as possible.

The Phase II effort will be executed by work groups comprised of stakeholders, technical experts, and members of the public in conjunction with support from BTH and Cal/EPA staffs.

Work Group Focus

The Infrastructure Work Group will review and evaluate the infrastructure project inventory identified in the Phase I Action Plan and the extensive efforts undertaken at the regional level. This work group will consider three key elements related to the effectiveness and expansion of goods movement infrastructure. These include:

Operational Improvements

By its nature, the intermodal aspects of the goods movement system with its many interfaces between ship and truck, ship and train, and train and truck make it difficult to achieve efficiencies across modes due to jurisdictional, ownership, and other complicating factors. In addition, finding prospective improvements between and among California's four port to border corridors have been problematic. A variety of innovative projects are proposed or are underway that can improve goods movement operations; improvements that can provide congestion relief and subsequent emission reductions. The work group will review the operational improvement projects to determine if State and/or federal action can facilitate the implementation of those measures that improve system performance and increase utilization of existing assets.

Goods Movement Infrastructure Project Prioritization

The methods for prioritizing goods movement projects is an evolving discipline. However, much work has been done at the local and regional levels that provide a sense of relative importance to the overall objectives for system improvement, i.e., velocity enhancement, throughput capability, and predictability of transit time coupled with the key objectives of reducing overall traffic congestion and related air emissions. The Infrastructure Work Group will assess the project lists in terms of programmed funds, regional commitments and priorities, and statewide goods movement infrastructure improvement needs.

Project Delivery

Another aspect that can help advance overall completion of critical projects is the prospects for innovative procurement methods such as public private partnerships, design-build, and design-sequencing. Such methods can result in quicker, less costly construction than when projects are developed using traditional methods. The Infrastructure Work Group will identify projects that would be good candidates for alternative procurement options and other actions to expedite project delivery.

In developing its recommendations, the Infrastructure Work Group will also review, evaluate, and recommend corridor-specific environmental and community impact mitigation strategies and consider homeland security and public safety enhancements.

Framing Questions.

- *What criteria should be applied to select infrastructure projects between and among highway, rail, intermodal, and port candidates?*
- *How should projects that provide marginal improvement to the throughput, velocity, or reliability of goods movement but reduce congestion and emissions, like grade separation projects, be evaluated?*
- *How should prospective operational improvements be evaluated?*
- *What can be done to advance the schedule of projects that provide substantial congestion relief, emission reduction, or throughput improvement that would not otherwise be programmed for a decade or more?*
- *What short-term (one to three years) operational improvements (e.g., Pier Pass) can be made to enhance velocity and throughput, while addressing congestion relief?*
- *Are these improvements able to be implemented statewide or will the improvements need to be specific to particular port-to-border regions?*
- *To what extent should environmental and community impact mitigation be tied to specific infrastructure projects?*
- *What mechanisms should be developed to account for projects that provide benefits between and among corridors (e.g., short rail projects that relieve congestion) but cannot otherwise be reflected in the project's specific value?*