Special Historical Supplement to Report

Supplemental section is derived from IANA’s Equipment Type, Size and Ownership datafile.
The Equipment Type, Size and Ownership Data Subscription provides all the underlying aggregate data used in the compilation of the Intermodal Market Trends & Statistics quarterly analysis report. Available by annual subscription, a monthly data file is e-mailed, furnishing you with the most current information available. Data segmentation is provided in Microsoft® Excel files. Benchmark your company’s performance on a timely basis and make rapid adjustments to keep pace with changing industry trends. Every month you’ll receive a spreadsheet containing a detailed breakdown of monthly traffic for the current subscription year:

- Regional volume flow (excludes intra-region volume)
- Various size and type of equipment
- Equipment ownership: whether private or rail-controlled
- Includes cumulative data by month

### Intermodal Segmentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Container</th>
<th>Trailer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Marine ISO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Domestic &lt;= 45</td>
<td>Domestic &lt;= 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Marine ISO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This analysis aggregates intermodal volume into three segment categories.

### Total Intermodal Volume

This chart displays North American intermodal loads (in millions) aggregated by the three segment categories. It indicates several major results:

- Volume for 2010 reflects a 15.2% increase in volume from 2009.
- Volume for 2010 was still 1.6% below 2008 volume.
- Volume for 2010 was still 5.6% below 2006 volume - the peak volume year.
This chart displays relative growth since 2000 for North American intermodal loads (aggregated by the three segment categories). It indicates several major results:

- The entire industry (the green bar) grew by 28% from 2000 to 2010.
- The Domestic <= 45’ volume declined 72% in this period.
- The Marine ISO segment was growing faster than the industry through 2006 and has now almost come down to the industry as a whole. It is up 35% in this period.
- The Domestic >= 48 volume closely tracked the industry through 2007. Then, over the past three years it has grown faster than the overall industry. It is up 56% this period.

This chart displays the share of North American intermodal loads by the three categories. This chart displays the share of North American intermodal loads by the three categories.

- The last several years have seen a decline in the Marine ISO market share.
- Over the entire period, the Domestic <= 45’ segment has been losing share - and the domestic >= 48’ segment has been increasing.

The interplay of Marine ISO and Domestic >= 48’ is an interesting phenomenon that will recur throughout this analysis. Whereas they were once viewed as distinct business segments, it appeared that they are becoming substitutable for each other.
This chart decomposes 2010 volume to its core equipment type.

- Between them 40’ and 53’ container volume represents 71% of all North American intermodal volume.
- The difference between the two equipment types is miniscule. 40’ containers represent 35.6% and 53’ containers represent 35.4%.
- When the next two largest equipment types are included: 53’ trailers (14.4%) and 20’ containers (5.8%) the cumulative share is over 91%.

In contrast to the previous chart, this decomposes 2000 volume into its core equipment type. The 40’ container was still the largest equipment type, representing 32% of all North American intermodal volume; however, there was a great deal more variety after that.

- The second tier of volume was composed of 48’ container volume at 16.8% and 20’ containers at 14.3% of all North American intermodal volume.
- The third tier of volume was composed of 45’ trailers at 9.2%; and, 48’ trailers and 53’ containers both at 7.4%.
- It is not until the inclusion of the seventh equipment type, 53’ trailers at 4.9%, that the cumulative percentage exceeds 90%.

In retrospect, this analysis indicates the transitional state of the intermodal industry only a decade ago. Trailers were still a key “constituent” and the legacy flat car fleet still required a large proportion of 48’ equipment.
In contrast to the previous chart, this decomposes 2000 volume into its core equipment type. The 40’ container was still the largest equipment type, representing 32% of all North American intermodal volume; however, there was a great deal more variety after that.

- The second tier of volume was composed of 48’ container volume at 16.8% and 20’ containers at 14.3% of all North American intermodal volume.
- The third tier of volume was composed of 45’ trailers at 9.2%; and, 48’ trailers and 53’ containers both at 7.4%.
- It is not until the inclusion of the seventh equipment type, 53’ trailers at 4.9%, that the cumulative percentage exceeds 90%.

In retrospect, this analysis indicates the transitional state of the intermodal industry only a decade ago. Trailers were still a key “constituent” and the legacy flat car fleet still required a large proportion of 48’ equipment.

### Geographical Segmentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Regions From</th>
<th>Regions To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Coast/Interior</td>
<td>EC, NE, SE</td>
<td>MC, MW, MX, SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans-Con</td>
<td>EC, NE, SE</td>
<td>NW, SW, WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Coast/Interior</td>
<td>MC, MW, MX, SC</td>
<td>NW, SW, WC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North - South</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Regions Between</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case #1</td>
<td>MC, MW, MX, SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case #2</td>
<td>NE, SE, EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case #3</td>
<td>NW, SW, WC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This analysis aggregates intermodal volume into four geographies. (Intra-regional moves are excluded.)
This chart decomposes 2010 volume by region. (Volume is the sum of volume by origin and destination region.)

- Between them, Midwest and Southwest volume represents 52% of all North American intermodal volume.
- The other six regions represent 5-11% each.
- Mexico and Middle Canada represent very small amounts.

Chicagoland has traditionally been viewed as the intermodal industry’s load center and this data indicates that this is unchanged.

This chart analyzes the Domestic >= 48’ segment. The left y-axis (and black line) shows the relative volume. (Year 2000 volume is set at 1.00) The right y-axis (and green vertical bars) shows the segment share of volume.

This chart indicates the increasing role of this equipment segment.

- From 2000 to 2010, volume has increased by 56% and market share has grown from 37% to 45%.
- With the exception of 2009, volume has increased every year.
- The reason for market share shrinkage in 2005-2007 is a reflection of relatively flat volume – while the Marine ISO segment was growing.
This chart analyzes the Marine ISO segment. The left y-axis (and black line) shows the relative volume. (Year 2000 volume is set at 1.00) The right y-axis (and green vertical bars) shows the segment share of volume.

This chart indicates the major role of this equipment segment.

- From 2000 to 2006, volume increased by 61% while market share grew from 49% to 58%.
- This was followed by a slight decrease in 2007, and precipitous declines in 2008 and 2009.
- Volumes increased in 2010 – back to 2004 levels.

This chart analyzes the Domestic >= 48’ segment and the entire intermodal market. The left y-axis (and green vertical bars) shows the relative volume for the entire intermodal industry. (Year 2000 volume is set at 1.00) The right y-axis (and two lines) shows the market share of 48’ and 53’ trailers and containers.

- The blue line shows a slight decline (12% to 9%) of trailer’s market share; however, they still retain an industry role.
- The red line shows a significant increase in domestic containers (from 24% to 36%).

It would appear that the trailer business represents a discreet intermodal segment that is not particularly sensitive to generic industry volume changes, whereas containers are growing faster than the general industry. (The increase from 2008 to 2009 will be discussed later.)
This chart analyzes the Marine ISO segment. The left y-axis (and green vertical bars) shows the segment relative volume. (Year 2000 volume is set at 1.00) The right y-axis (and three lines) shows the market share of that equipment and size. This chart demonstrates a remarkable consistency of market share for the entire period – regardless of volume. This would indicate that customer mix remains static and volume changes impact absolute levels – but do not change loading patterns.

This chart analyzes the Domestic >= 48’ segment. The left y-axis (and green vertical bars) shows the segment relative volume. (Year 2000 volume is set at 1.00) The right y-axis (and four lines) shows the market share of that geography. This chart indicates the increasing role of this equipment segment. From 2000 to 2010, volume has increased by 56%. Within this group:

- The West Coast/Interior has retained the largest share – remaining basically unchanged – although there was a slight increase (and subsequent decrease) the last four years;
- The East Coast/Interior share has increased from 22% to 28%, while Trans-Con decreased by almost the same amount 26% to 21%;
- 2005 marked an inflection point when the East Coast/Interior share exceeded the Trans-Con.

Although the market share numbers have changed, all three geographies have seen growth. The Trans-Con has just seen less. Some have questioned whether intermodal has reached a saturation point in the Trans-Con market. The East Coast/Interior growth reinforces the belief that there are a number of intermodal opportunities therein.
This chart analyzes the Marine ISO segment. The left y-axis (and green vertical bars) shows the segment relative volume. (Year 2000 volume is set at 1.00) The right y-axis (and four lines) shows the market share of that geography.

As discussed above, this segment – while still the largest – has become somewhat problematic the last three or four years. From 2000 to 2010, volume has increased by 35% – although in 2006 it was up 61% from 2000.

Within this group:
- The West Coast/Interior has retained the largest share – increasing from 48% to 58%;
- The East Coast/Interior share increased slightly – from 19% to 17%; and,
- The Trans-Con also decreased by 30% to 24%.

These numbers are a little puzzling in light of the extreme publicity about all-water service to the East Coast from Asia. If the impact was as much as believed, you would expect the Trans-Con share to have shrunk more – and the East Coast/Interior share to have increased.

This chart analyzes the West Coast (SW, NW, and WC) equipment balance for the Domestic >= 48’ segment. The left y-axis (and green vertical bars) shows the segment relative volume. (Year 2000 volume is set at 1.00) The right y-axis (and three lines) shows the balance of the two regions. Balance is defined as inbound volume divided by outbound volume. The results are interesting.

- Historically, private trailers are pretty close to balanced. This would indicate that motor carriers manage volume off the West Coast as an intended round-trip.
- Railroad containers show an inbound-imbalanced result. It is not clear what the implications are. The high results would seem to indicate that empty containers may have been surplus on the West Coast until volume improved in 2009.
- Private containers have transitioned from outbound-imbalanced to inbound-imbalanced – to a perfectly balanced 2010.
This chart analyzes the Marine ISO segment by calculating the percentage of imports discharged on the U.S. West Coast that move inland by intact intermodal. The results are striking:

- The percentage of intact 20’ containers has remained fairly stable.
- The percentage of intact 40’ containers has trended down somewhat – but at a lower level than 20’ containers.
- The handling of 45’ containers has almost completely reversed itself in this period. In 2000, 66% moved intact, but by 2010, only 30% moved intact.

These numbers show the impact of transloading. The less dense the commodity, the better the economics of transloading. The intact proportion is inversely related to the ability to transload the cargo.

This chart tracks the relative volume of intact volume moving from the U.S. West Coast to the predominant four inland intermodal regions. (Because the PMA data does not include Canada, this analysis is conducted for U.S. origins and destinations only.) Equipment sizes are converted to TEUs. And volumes are tracked against 2000 as a base year.

The chart shows a bifurcation of volume.

- Total intact volume increased by 24% in this period.
- Volumes to the Midwest and South Central increased (73% and 61% respectively) in this period.
- Volumes to the Southeast and Northeast decreased (5% and 82% respectively.)

This data shows a much clearer impact of all-water vessel deployment.

- The Northeast – with a declining population base experienced all-water conversion from intermodal during the entire period.
- All-water growth to the Southeast was initially about new volume growth (to new distribution centers) and then, eventually, a conversion of the remaining intermodal volume.
- For now, the Midwest and South Central regions are not susceptible to all-water diversion.