



Policy & Strategic Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

**October 5, 2007
Washington, DC**

1. Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review

Mark Muriello and Greg Oliver, Committee Co-Chairs, opened the meeting. Mark provided an update of activities since the Committee's inaugural meeting – held April 18; the day's agenda was then reviewed and attendee self-introductions were made.

2. Policy Considerations for the Next Reauthorization

Emil Frankel, Director of Transportation Policy at the Bipartisan Policy Center, provided his thoughts on the next round of Reauthorization. It was noted that the Bipartisan Policy Center (BPC) is undertaking a privately-funded study of transportation policy with a focus on the links between transportation and the economy, with a focus on energy and security issues as well. The BPC's Study is intended to complement the work of the national commissions authorized by SAFETEA-LU and the many studies that have been undertaken by transportation-related groups (e.g., TRB, AASHTO). A key goal of BPC's Study is to engage new interests in the discussion of a new vision for national transportation policy, such as civic, business, political, environmental, and academic leaders. BPC's project is co-chaired by former Virginia Governor Mark Warner, former U.S. Senator Slade Gorton, and former U.S. Congressman Sherry Boehlert, and its executive committee, so far, includes Jane Garvey, Tom Downs, David Goode (retired CEO of Norfolk Southern Railroad), Alan Altshuler, Lillian Borrone, Steve Ramsey (top environmental executive of GE), Douglas Holtz-Eakin (former Director of CBO), Sean McGarvey (Sec'y-Treasurer of AFL-CIO's BCTD), and Doug Foy, and it will include senior executives of the energy, oil, automobile, telecommunications/IT, and other major sectors of the economy.

Mr. Frankel's key statements on Reauthorization were submitted as follows:

- We can't predict what the shape of the next surface transportation reauthorization will be. We don't even know if the National Surface Transportation Policy & Revenue Commission will be able to develop a consensus around urgent issues of the viability of the HTF and transportation financing, let alone around the a national vision.
- Certainly, there is very little incentive for Congress to change from the current structure of reauthorization bills that have, increasingly, become major public works bills with lots of "special projects" and new categorical programs for each and every member of both Houses of Congress.
- One could imagine a scenario for the next few years of continuing resolutions, single-year appropriations, and no agreement on the key elements of a multi-year program.
- However, I think that the work of the Commissions, the BPC, and all of the "visioning" research and reports by various organizations are incredibly important, and are leading to the development of the elements of a new set of national transportation goals and the outline of new transportation policies and programs.

- The major elements of new transportation vision and policy that could be introduced into the discussion of the new Reauthorization Bill in 2009 include:
 - (a) The application of the traditional goals of national transportation policy – economic growth and competitiveness, connectivity, mobility, and national security – to new circumstances.
 - (b) America’s transportation systems have not kept pace with the Nation’s significant economic, social and demographic changes.
 - (c) American society today is marked by rapid population growth and an extraordinary wave of immigration.
 - (d) Patterns of urban settlement are evolving.
 - (e) The American economy is part of an international system of trade, dependent on logistics, supply chains, and just-in-time deliveries.
 - (f) And, America’s place in the international economic system increasingly depends upon the competitiveness of its service and knowledge-based economy, centered on 30 or 40 great, growing, and converging metropolitan regions.
 - (g) Seven or eight of those mega-regions are located in this Corridor, and the international competitiveness and economic productivity of each of these mega-regions, of the I-95 Corridor, as a region, and of the Nation, as a whole, depend upon personal mobility
 - (h) The supply of labor, the flexibility of job markets, and the accessibility of work within these mega-regions depend upon efficient metropolitan transportation systems.
 - (i) Less recognized in the discussions about transportation policy are new realities about climate change, energy and environmental constraints, and national security.
- So, what need to be the goals of national transportation policy?
- First, to preserve, restore and strengthen the Nation’s great connecting transportation systems, not just highways, bridges, and tunnels, but transit, intercity and freight rail systems, ports and inland waterways, and aviation, and the connections between these modes.
- Second, to assure mobility within America’s great metropolitan regions.
- And, third, to provide for energy security and to minimize the impacts of transportation systems on the environment and on global climate change.
- These national security issues are, perhaps, the most urgent.
- Even though the transportation sector is almost totally dependent on oil, energy diversification and security have gone largely unaddressed in the development of transportation policies and programs.
- This has left the Nation unacceptably vulnerable to the volatile, fragile, and increasingly hostile nations and regions of the world on which we depend for oil.
- And yet, energy efficiency, the use of alternative fuels, and fuel efficiency have never really been involved in transportation funding and policy decisions.
- I believe that these interests, values, and concerns will increasingly become part of the making of national transportation policy – they will, because they must.
- They may not lead to substantially different outcomes in the next reauthorization bill, they should be introduced into that debate and can increasingly become central to future transportation bills, policies, and programs.
- There is another point that is particularly relevant to the I-95 Corridor Coalition: the incorporation of new, or altered, national interests, values, and goals into transportation policies and programs can only occur with significant institutional reform and change.

- Institutional roles at all levels – Federal, state, regional, and local, public and private sector – are going to have to be redefined, and we must develop new forms of institutional collaboration and cooperation across sectors.
- I believe that these institutional issues are as important as the financial needs of transportation systems (and I do not mean to minimize the need to assure adequate public and private investment in the Nation’s transportation infrastructure, once we have defined and clarified our goals and priorities).
- That is why the I-95 Corridor Coalition, and entities like it, are going to be increasingly important in the reshaping of national transportation policy.
- “Modally agnostic” (to use the phrase of the Eddington Report) transportation systems that assure mobility within mega-regions and connectivity between them, are going to depend upon new cooperative arrangements between states, localities, agencies, and sectors.
- And transportation agencies at all levels are going to have to “step up” to introduce technological innovations, performance measures, competition, accountability, and appropriate pricing of transportation to assure efficiency in operations and to enhance the use of alternative fuels and greater energy conservation.
- So urgent are the national security and climate change issues to transportation that we can wait for, or depend upon, Federal action, alone.
- States and localities, hopefully working together, are going to have to take steps to regulate and stimulate fuel efficiency in transportation, to improve the efficiency of systems operations (which is where this Coalition began), to demand and measure outcomes, in terms of better and more efficient operation of transportation systems, and, importantly, to price transportation appropriately.
- Transportation must bear its full share of environmental and energy impacts, and the States and localities of the I-95 Corridor are going to have to make sure that these steps are taken in this region, whatever national policy may be.
- The Federal Government’s role will be to stimulate and to support, as it is doing in the “Urban Partnerships” and “Corridors of the Future” programs.
- But the initiatives must come from States, localities, and transportation agencies, collaborating in these initiatives.
- Change will come from the “bottom up.”
- All these measures are critical to the Nation’s economic competitiveness and prosperity, and to its security.
- These are urgent requirements, not ones that are 20 or 30 or 50 years out.
- And protecting them will increasingly depend upon organizations and arrangements, represented by the I-95 Corridor Coalition.

3. State of the Highway/Rail System in the Corridor

To prepare for the afternoon’s discussion on the Long-Range Vision Study, Lance Grenzeback provided a detailed presentation on the current and anticipated state of the highway and rail system in the corridor, and the related information produced (and to be produced) by Coalition projects such as the Mid-Atlantic Rail Operations Study (MAROPs), the Mid-Atlantic Truck Operations Study (MATOPs) and the Integrated Corridor Analysis Tool (ICAT).

On the rail side, data was provided on the current rail system and its expected capacity in 2035 (with and without improvements) and the investment requirements to support the expected

volumes. Rail freight system issues in the region include: the role of rail in the corridor (freight, intercity passenger and commuter), rail investment programs, institutional framework for planning and coordination, and financing major public-private rail improvements.

On the Highway side, truck freight flows and bottlenecks throughout the Nation and the Corridor were presented. The ICAT program was highlighted, specifically referencing its safety and planning capabilities. Highway freight system issues in the region include: the role of highways in the corridor (freight transportation, intercity business and recreational travel, and commuting), highway investment programs, institutional framework for multi-state planning and coordination, and financing major highway bottleneck improvements. A copy of the presentation is posted with these minutes.

4. The Coalition's Long Range Vision Study

Gary Maring provided an update on the activities related to the scope development for the Coalition's Long-Range Vision Study. Working in conjunction with the Working Group established for the project and including input from the committee, the following objectives and tasks for the Study were developed:

Objectives:

- To develop a strategic vision to meet the future corridor-scale transportation issues and investment requirements
- To forecast long term (30-year) demand related to the long distance movement of passengers and freight in the Coalition region across all modes
- To analyze the implementation issues and related costs and benefits associated with scenarios of capacity and operational improvements
- To analyze a range of policy issues associated with the management and investment strategies, with particular focus on financing and institutional issues.

Tasks:

- Task 1: Corridor Vision and Policies – assess emerging state/corridor policy issues and activities, assess other related visioning efforts, draft preliminary corridor vision
- Task 2: Demand Forecast – bracket uncertainties regarding future demographic, economic, land-use, and travel projections
- Task 3: Alternative Supply Scenario Analysis – three alternative supply (capacity and management) scenarios will be analyzed
- Task 4: Policy Issues Analysis – a range of policy issues will be identified and analyzed
- Task 5: Reporting – executive summary and technical support

The project schedule was also reviewed, showing project completion in the summer of 2008.

During the discussion following the presentation, it was suggested that an opportunity be provided to allow member reaction and input, after scenario analyses are completed. It was further suggested that a step be added, perhaps between Tasks 3 and 4 to produce an interim report and conduct outreach to members to help develop final problem statements and policy options.

5. Reauthorization

George Schoener raised the question of the Coalition's efforts in Reauthorization, seeking reaction to two possible roles:

1. Making the case to continue the I-95 Corridor Coalition's funding, and
2. Engaging in efforts to promote issues of importance to corridors and multi-jurisdictional regions.

The first role, seeking continued funding for the I-95 Corridor Coalition, is an ongoing process. The second role, developing policy and program proposals, has not yet been undertaken; however, the Coalition may be in a position to promote policy and program proposals and should determine if that's an area to approach. Following discussion on the pros and cons, it was noted that the same issue will be presented to the Executive Board for further discussion.

Greg Oliver provided an update on NASTO's Reauthorization efforts, noting NASTO's interest in working with the I-95 Corridor Coalition to leverage activities.

6. Corridors of the Future

George Schoener announced that the I-95 Corridor has been designated, by USDOT, as a Corridor of the Future. The Corridors of the Future Program develops multi-state corridors to help reduce transportation congestion and improve mobility. The I-95 Corridor Coalition's proposal contained four primary initiatives:

- Real-Time Traffic Information
- Bottleneck Financing Solutions
- Expedited Incident Clearance
- Integrated Intercity Air/Bus/Rail and Local Transit Services

Additional information on the designation and related activities will be known once meetings with USDOT and with North Carolina DOT (representing the proposal submitted by the five southern states) are conducted.

7. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Policy and Strategic Planning Committee will likely be held in April or May of 2008. Details will be announced as available.

Attendees were thanked for their participation and the meeting was adjourned.

Attachment

Presentations

Scope of Work

Comments on Scope



Policy & Strategic Planning Committee Meeting

Attendees

Agency/Organization	Representative(s)
American Trucking Associations	Ted Scott
Amtrak	John Bennett
APTA	Rob Padgette
Bipartisan Policy Center	Emil Frankel
Cambridge Systematics, Inc.	Lance Grenzeback, John Kaliski, Gary Maring
CONEG	Anne Stubbs
Connecticut DOT	James Boice
DC DOT	Rick Rybeck
Delaware DOT	Greg Oliver
	David Ewing
FMCSA	Jeff Secrist
Florida DOT	Dave Lee (by telephone)
Georgia DOT	Matthew Fowler
I-95 Corridor Coalition	George Schoener, Marygrace Parker, Bill Stoeckert
Maine DOT	Gary Williams
Maryland DOT	Missy Cassidy, Steve Gaudio
Maryland SHA	Mike Zezeski
Maryland Transportation Authority	Melissa Williams
MTA Bridges & Tunnels	Daniel Jacobs
New Jersey DOT	Mark Stout
New Jersey Transit	Sandra Check
New York City DOT	Joseph Barr
New York State DOT	Bob Zerrillo (by telephone)
North Carolina DOT/Governor's Office	Susan Howard
PB Consult	Steve Lockwood
Port Authority of NY & NJ	Mark Muriello
Telvent Farradyne Inc.	Gary Euler, Patty Reich
University of Maryland	Phil Tarnoff