

# **The AASHTO/FHWA Freight Transportation Partnership III Meeting**

**Building for the Future**

**Final**

September 2010



U.S. Department of Transportation  
Federal Highway Administration

## **Notice**

This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the U.S. Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The U.S. Government assumes no liability for the use of the information contained in this document. This report does not constitute a standard, Specification, or regulation.

The U.S. Government does not endorse products of manufacturers. Trademarks or manufacturers' names appear in this report only because they are considered essential to the objective of the document.

Further: This document is a synthesis of the information shared through presentations and discussion. Statements, including the findings, are the opinions of the participants and not necessarily of their employers, and inclusion in the report does not imply endorsement by FHWA or USDOT

## **Quality Assurance Statement**

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) provides high-quality information to serve Government, industry, and the public in a manner that promotes public understanding. Standards and policies are used to ensure and maximize the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of its information. FHWA periodically reviews quality issues and adjusts its programs and processes to ensure continuous quality improvement.

# Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Key Conference Findings and Outcomes.....</b>	<b>3</b>
Opening Remarks.....	3
Panel Discussions.....	4
Work Group Sessions .....	8
<i>Implementing Multi-jurisdictional Decision Making.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Key Points from Discussion.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Freight Performance Measures .....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Funding and Financing Freight Transportation Projects.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Projects Successfully Funded (and How).....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Projects Unsuccessfully Funded.....</i>	<i>15</i>
Round Table Discussions.....	16
<i>The Regional Setting.....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Field Trips.....</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Reauthorization Discussion.....</i>	<i>17</i>
<b>Recommendations and Requests .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Appendix A: Work Group Sessions Summaries.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Appendix B: AASHTO-FHWA Freight Partnership III Meeting Participant Feedback.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Appendix C: Program .....</b>	<b>20</b>

## List of Tables

Table 1. Recommendations and Requests Identified During the Freight Partnership III Meeting	iv
Table 2: Introduction and Welcome Key Points.....	3
Table 3: Multi-Jurisdictional Decision Making: I-70 Corridor Panel Key Points.....	5
Table 4: Freight Performance Measures Panel Key Points .....	6
Table 5: Funding and Financing Freight Transportation Panel Key Points.....	7
Table 6: Barriers to Coordination and Implementation .....	9
Table 7: Maximizing Safety by Improving the Safety of the Freight Transportation System .....	11
Table 8: Ensuring an Efficient Freight Transportation Network .....	12
Table 9: Improving Operations of the Existing Freight Transportation System by Ensuring Travel Time Reliability .....	12
Table 10: Improving Operations of Existing System through Maintenance and Preservation.....	13
Table 11: Better Management of Environmental Impacts of Freight Transportation .....	13
Table 12: Key Points on Reauthorization .....	17
Table 13. Recommendations & Requests Identified During the Freight Partnership III Meeting	19

# Executive Summary

## Background

In recognition of the specific issues associated with freight transportation in the United States, the importance of freight transportation to the Nation's economic growth and development, and the anticipated growth in demand for freight transportation, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) have forged a freight partnership. This partnership is designed to bring public sector transportation professionals together to discuss transportation issues and solutions specific to the movement of freight. Private sector freight stakeholders are included in the discussion to ensure that the identification of issues and solutions best reflects the nature and character of freight transportation, which is the responsibility of both the public and private sectors.

The hallmark of the partnership created by AASHTO and FHWA has become the Freight Partnership Meetings. The meetings are jointly sponsored and include State DOT representatives, FHWA, Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), the Federal Motor Carrier Administration (FMCSA) and Maritime Administration (MARAD) staff, as well as metropolitan planning organization (MPO) representatives and representatives from the private sector. The meetings are structured to focus on a few critical issues with discussion on solutions that participants can take back and utilize to improve freight transportation in their areas of jurisdiction and beyond.

The meetings have been held biennially starting in 2005 in Columbus Ohio; the first meeting was co-hosted by the Ohio Department of Transportation. The second meeting in 2007 was in Natchez, Mississippi, co-hosted by the Mississippi Department of Transportation, and the third meeting was held in Philadelphia Pennsylvania from March 10<sup>th</sup> through the 13<sup>th</sup>, 2009, and was co-hosted by the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation and the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC). Each meeting has built on the previous event, taking the freight transportation discussion to the next level.

The Freight Partnership III meeting in March 2009 focused on: 1) implementing multi-jurisdictional decision making within regions or on corridors, 2) developing freight performance measures so that organizations can track progress towards meaningful goals, and 3) identifying funding needs and learning about funding options.

## Meeting Summary

Throughout the three-day meeting, participants had the opportunity to listen to three panel sessions and participate in three work group sessions to discuss issues and solutions. The panel and work group sessions focused on 1) multi-jurisdictional decision making, 2) freight performance measures, and 3) funding and financing freight transportation. In addition, round tables were included in this meeting to encourage discussion on different topics. The DVRPC and AASHTO arranged for four field trips to freight facilities in the Philadelphia area. The meeting ended with an open discussion session on the Surface Transportation Reauthorization.

## Panels – Key Messages

The panelists shared their experiences with the meeting participants and provided the foundation for the work group discussions. Key points made in each of the panel sessions included but were not limited to the following:

## **Multi-jurisdictional Decision Making**

- Freight movement is not constrained by state or MPO boundaries but moves where the market demands.
- Public agencies and organizations that are responsible for the transportation system need to reach outside their jurisdictional boundaries to work with others to develop solutions.
- Goals for a corridor need to be established that all the participants can agree on.
- Identify and engage with all stakeholders at the right time.
- Varying laws and regulations that govern organizations may conflict from one location to the next.
- Multiple solutions may need to be considered within a corridor considering both State and local challenges –dedicated truck lanes may solve some problems but not others.
- Everyone has to agree to “TRY”: there will be funding, legislation, and other issues along the way, but agree to try to make decisions that are best for the corridor, for the users of the corridor, or for a region.
- You have to keep the interest going. You have to communicate and communicate often.

## **Freight Performance Measures**

- There is an evolutionary/educational process to get to the point where you can develop freight performance measures and it is not easy.
  - You need to understand freight movement, and
  - You need to be able to transition from planning to implementing freight transportation improvements.
- Working across State and municipal boundaries enables you to think on a larger scale that can be more appropriate for many freight performance measures. You can establish focused performance measures for core programs that can help you advance (rail, etc.).
- You need to know who your customers are and what they require of the transportation network to move freight.
- You need to measure what matters.
- Data is key.

## **Funding and Financing Freight Transportation**

- Funding freight projects across jurisdictions requires organizations to think beyond their boundaries and agree on a set of principles for funding.
- Funding rail projects in Pennsylvania includes general funds, transportation funds, and bonds.
- Expansion of the rail program and projects (double stacking and double tracking as well as building new intermodal terminals) are viewed as economic development activities, bringing significant jobs to different locations.
- County and City planners make significant decisions about where money will be spent, therefore it is imperative for them to understand freight transportation needs.
- A freight vision and plan are critical to making informed decisions on what projects to fund.
- Identifying benefits from funding freight projects helps build the case for funding.

- Freight advisory committees that include public and private sector members can be most effective in identifying projects, prioritizing where funds should be spent, and being advocates for those expenditures.
- Need to tie freight transportation benefits into funding for more general purpose benefits such as NHS projects.
- Need to identify priority list of projects to fund but then have to find the funding.
- Create a national bank for funding:
  - Avoids duplication from region to region;
  - Enables access to federal credit support; and
  - Facilitates national responsibility for projects of national significance.
    - A national bank could include:
      - Discretionary grants;
      - Credit programs;
      - Bond allocations;
      - Provide grants to support public or private projects; and
      - Projects would have to have completed environmental analysis and review prior to issuing funding.
- Financing and resources may be more readily available than people think – need to look for them.
- Create a freight funding program at the national level with both apportionments and discretionary funding.
- Funding should come from both industry and other beneficiaries.
- Funding being discussed:
  - Diesel tax increase dedicated to highway infrastructure;
  - Revenues from a carbon tax;
  - Customs revenues dedicated to freight infrastructure; and
  - Charge per ton mile of freight on all modes.

### **Work Group Focus**

The meeting included three working group sessions focused on implementing multi-jurisdictional decision making, freight performance measures, and funding and financing for freight transportation projects. The purpose of implementing the multi-jurisdictional decision making work group was to generate insights that will help participants succeed in implementing multi-jurisdictional decision making in their regions/corridors. Participants discussed:

- Why people and organizations make decision to work across boundaries.
- Barriers to coordination and implementation.
- Key elements that indicate a corridor should advance to a multi-jurisdictional project.
- How to define logical break points/corridor definitions.
- How to craft an agreement that has continuity over time.
- Key stakeholders who need to be engaged.

The purpose of the freight performance measures work group session was to develop a list of freight performance measures that can help organizations or regions track progress towards

meaningful goals. The objectives were defined for the group discussion so the focus would be on performance measures. Groups walked through the following three step process:

- Step 1: Define performance measures.
- Step 2: Define what data is needed, from whom, in order to evaluate the measures.
- Step 3: Define the measurement/evaluation approach.

The purpose of the funding and financing freight transportation work group was to identify successfully funded freight projects as well as funding needs/opportunities to advance potential freight projects. Participants were asked to share:

- Projects successfully funded (and how).
- Projects unsuccessfully funded.
- Barriers to advancing freight projects.
- Enablers that allow agencies to advance critical freight transportation projects.
- What FHWA/AASHTO can do to help.

### **Recommendations & Requests**

There was a great deal of information shared and productive discussion on the three focus areas for the meeting. Both issues and solutions were discussed in the Work Group Sessions and the details are included in the appendices of this report. Participants did have several recommendations and requests for follow up. In all of the work group sessions, participants stated that more guidance and direction from FHWA and AASHTO is needed to assist them in making positive progress. Areas that people were looking for guidance in include but are not limited to the items in the following table:

**Table 1. Recommendations and Requests Identified During the Freight Partnership III Meeting**

<b>Recommendations/Requests</b>	<b>Who is Responsible?</b>
Provide examples, resources, and guidance to help States successfully implement multi-jurisdictional decision making as well as share lessons learned from existing agreements	FHWA
Provide resources and training on the development and tracking of freight-specific performance measures	FHWA
Develop a National freight plan	US DOT/FHWA
Address funding needs and ideas that were identified during the meeting	AASHTO/FHWA
Increase the freight dialogue among and within States.	All freight stakeholders
Provide guidance on reaching out to private industry and other freight stakeholders.	FHWA
Hold follow-up outreach for State DOTs and MPOs who did not get an opportunity to participate	AASHTO/FHWA
Commit to work on building relationships with the private sector and other freight stakeholders	All meeting participants



## **Introduction**

The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), with the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) and the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC) co-hosted a meeting of State Department of Transportation (DOT) representatives, FHWA Division Office and Resource Center staff, FHWA headquarters staff, Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) and Maritime Administration (MARAD) staff, metropolitan planning organizations (MPO) and private sector representatives, on March 11-13, 2009 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. This meeting was the third in a series of freight meetings the first of which was held in Columbus Ohio in 2005 and the second held in Natchez, Mississippi in February 2007. Each meeting has identified select items to focus on that would enable the participants to advance freight transportation decisions within their organizations and geographic areas of responsibility. In March 2009 the three areas of focus were:

- Implementing multi-jurisdictional decision making in regions and/or on corridors;
- Defining freight performance measures so that progress can be measured; and
- Identifying funding options (both existing and potential) and cataloging freight transportation projects that have been funded.

The meeting was structured to include a panel and work group session for each topic, a set of round tables for informal discussion on select topics, four field trips, and a session on reauthorization that included discussion of:

- Expiration of the current bill;
- Challenges of creating a new bill; and
- The importance of people and organizations voicing their needs.

## **Background**

Both AASHTO and FHWA have invested considerable efforts and resources in advancing the state of the art for freight transportation over the past 10 years. The AASHTO Standing Committees that focus on freight transportation and the FHWA Office of Freight Management and Operations have aggressively highlighted freight issues and solutions with their customers, partners, members, as well as political officials. Efforts by both have included reaching out to define and engage with a high variety of freight stakeholders in both the public and private sectors, recognizing that there are issues specific to freight transportation that require engagement with diverse interests and perspectives. A partnership between AASHTO and FHWA has evolved out of common interests and the various activities conducted over the past 10 years. The Freight Partnership Meetings that are now conducted jointly every other year are a product of this partnership.

In April 2005, AASHTO and FHWA jointly sponsored the first Freight Partnership Meeting with the Ohio Department of Transportation co-hosting the event. The goal of this meeting was to define a position description framework for a State-Level Freight Coordinator(s) through the identification of the roles and responsibilities of a State-Level Freight Transportation Coordinator, the skill sets required for the Freight Transportation Coordinator position, and the organizational and institutional issues that need to be addressed to advance freight transportation

projects more effectively. In addition participants at the meeting expressed a need for a national freight policy. Products from this meeting included but were not limited to 1) a position description for a freight coordinator that could be used and adapted by State departments of transportation (available on FHWA's freight web site <http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/freight/FPD/assistance.asp>) and 2) a framework for a national freight policy. The US Department of Transportation, Office of the Secretary, convened a group of freight stakeholders to develop the draft Framework for a National Freight policy.

In February 2007, AASHTO and FHWA jointly sponsored the second Freight Partnership Meeting, which was co-hosted by Mississippi DOT. The Freight Partnership II meeting was held to build upon the outcomes of the first Freight Partnership conference by populating the national freight policy framework (available on the US DOT web site <http://www.freight.dot.gov/>), identifying and sharing successes in developing champions and permanent capacity that have occurred since the first conference, and identifying freight professional development needs that are necessary to build permanent capacity and advance freight transportation. Products of that meeting include but are not limited to: 1) the Freight DVD entitled "Keeping the Global Supply Chain Moving" (available upon request), 2) the Freight Industry Internship, 3) a Freight Scholarship program through FHWA/National Highway Institute, and 4) creation of the Framework for a National Freight Policy on the US DOT web site (see link above). The Freight Partnership III meeting was held to build upon the outcomes of the first two Freight Partnership conferences by generating insights that will help organizations succeed in 1) implementing multi-jurisdictional decision making in their regions or corridors, 2) initiating a discussion of the development of freight performance measures so that agencies can track progress towards meaningful goals, and 3) identifying successfully-funded freight projects and funding needs/opportunities to advance potential freight projects.

In addition to this meeting was an opportunity for informal discussion on a number of topics in the form of round tables. Each round table was hosted by an individual or individuals who had specific expertise in the topic area. There were also four field trips scheduled to enhance the participants' education.

# Key Conference Findings and Outcomes

## Opening Remarks

The March 2009 Meeting was kicked off by Pennsylvania Governor Ed Rendell; Barry Seymour, Executive Director of the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission; Jeff Lindley, Associate Administrator of Operations for the Federal Highway Administration; and Allen Biehler, Secretary of the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation. Table 2 provides a summary of their speeches. Notes from the introduction and welcome section can be found in Appendix A.

**Table 2: Introduction and Welcome Key Points**

Presenter	Key Points
Ed Rendell, Governor of Pennsylvania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If you compare the 10 largest ports of the US and China, China’s ports have three times the throughput of the US. Only two US ports would have cracked the top ten in China (NY/NJ and Long Beach/Los Angeles). They have the ability to move goods infinitely better than we do.</li> <li>• In America, we have the potential to have a first class freight system.</li> <li>• Here in Pennsylvania we are suffering like every State; we have a 2.5 billion deficit and are cutting back our budget. However, even with this, we have to continue to invest in things to grow the economy.</li> <li>• We have committed 34 million over the next 3 years to do a project with CSX and an additional 45 million with Norfolk Southern. Both of these projects cover a number of States and development of intermodal terminals.</li> <li>• Intermodal facilities are job producing centers. We developed an intermodal facility that borders Maryland which has attracted two distribution centers and as a result created 2,000 jobs.</li> <li>• For infrastructure, we all have to be advocates. As a country we are investing over \$100 billion in infrastructure, but we need to invest \$2.2 trillion just to get what we have in good condition.</li> <li>• President Obama’s economic stimulus is the first step, but we all need to be mindful that this does not result in a check of the infrastructure investment box, there is much more that needs to be done. The fact of the matter is that we are in a recession, we’re not getting out of this within the next 18 months; we need a 5-10 year revitalization plan.</li> <li>• We have to do something and the time is now; we need you all to talk to people and get them excited about infrastructure. Infrastructure changes will not come from Washington down, it will come from you.</li> <li>• If we do it right, we will have the American people behind us, but we have to work together.</li> </ul>

Presenter	Key Points
Barry Seymour, Executive Director, Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We all owe an enormous debt of gratitude to the Governor – he gets it. He brought the Governors and President Obama to Philadelphia to talk about the need to invest in infrastructure and helped to put the term on the national agenda and is responsible for getting that funding into the Stimulus bill.</li> <li>• No matter where you come from around the country, we all share similar problems and challenges, congestion is growing across all modes.</li> <li>• Growth in freight, traffic, and goods movement is outpacing facilities and reinvestments.</li> <li>• Since 1992 our goods movement task force has brought together the public and private sector to learn from each other, share information and data, and develop a regional plan.</li> <li>• As Ben Franklin said, "All humanity is divided into three classes: those who are immovable, those who are movable, and those who move!"</li> </ul>
Jeff Lindley, Associate Administrator – Operations, Federal Highway Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As the interest in freight has grown, many of you in the room have helped increased the professional capacity of the public sector.</li> <li>• FHWA is committed to continue this and we are working on strengthening our technical expertise through creating freight as a separate discipline internally.</li> <li>• It is clear that the message in reauthorization is that not only is freight important, but now is the time to start doing something about it.</li> <li>• Each of us have a different role to play in this, we need to be working together to deliver the solutions to make freight move better.</li> <li>• I applaud you for the work you have already done and what is coming next.</li> </ul>
Allen Biehler, Secretary, Pennsylvania Department of Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Governor is passionate about transportation issues. He also believes that even with the economic downslide and needing to trim the budget that this is the time to make investments in our economy that will make a difference.</li> <li>• We need more freight investment and we need to increase our freight infrastructure and multi-jurisdictional understanding.</li> <li>• We have seen truck traffic grow on highway systems and we need to take notice of the future freight projections of both truck traffic and containers at ports.</li> <li>• Reauthorization is an opportunity to emphasize the importance of freight and why we need a broader approach to infrastructure.</li> </ul>

### ***Panel Discussions***

Throughout the three-day meeting, participants had the opportunity to listen to three panel sessions and participate in breakout group sessions to discuss their experiences and ideas. These sessions focused on multi-jurisdictional decision making, freight performance measures, and funding and financing freight transportation.

The panel session discussions highlighted the following lessons learned and needs:

#### **Multi-jurisdictional Decision Making**

- Focus on what you have in common – there may be more commonalities than first realized and this will help build positive momentum.
- The first step is to agree to work together. There will be funding, legislation, and other issues along the way, but agree to try to make decisions that are best for the corridor, and for the users of the corridor.

- Heads of agencies change so it is important to educate new leadership on what the project is and why it is important.
- You have to keep the interest going. A project like this is a long-term project—you have to communicate and communicate often. We talk at least once a week.

**Freight Performance Measures**

- The fundamental challenge for successful performance measures is people don't know enough about them – there needs to be more education on how to define and track freight specific performance measures.
- Focus on low hanging fruit when you are getting started with freight performance measures.
- We need to get planners thinking about delivery of goods from the source to the shelf – this is a little more complex than someone commuting to work.

**Funding and Financing Freight Transportation**

- County and city planners are the decision makers for where money gets allocated, so it is very important to educate them. You need to have a freight plan and vision – understand why individual projects are good to fund. You also need to look at what has been funded already and look for opportunities to draw benefits to freight from those projects.
- Updating the long-range plan is a good time to capitalize on building freight projects into the plan.

Tables 3-5 show the topics, presenters, and key points from each panel session. Notes from the panel discussions, questions and answers, and complete conference proceedings can be found in Appendix A.

**Table 3: Multi-Jurisdictional Decision Making: I-70 Corridor Panel Key Points**

Presenter	Key Points
Keith Bucklew, Indiana DOT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goals for I-70:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reduce congestion.</li> <li>○ Enhance mobility and reliability.</li> <li>○ Improve safety (separation of trucks and cars will help this).</li> <li>○ Enhance economic development.</li> <li>○ Reduce impacts: environment, communities, and public health.</li> <li>○ Improve security.</li> <li>○ Facilitate intermodal integration (we have to bridge the gaps from rail to water ports).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Each state and MPO still retains its own internal planning and each organization sends a key member to coalition meetings.</li> <li>• Heads of agencies change so it is important to educate new leadership on what the project is and why it is important.</li> <li>• You have to keep the interest going. A project like this is a long-term project—you have to communicate and communicate often. We talk at least once a week.</li> </ul>

<b>Presenter</b>	<b>Key Points</b>
Kathryn Harvey, Missouri DOT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We had to make some decisions—in rural areas, we are proposing our preference that trucks are in the center of the facility and that we have a grass median between lanes. We’ve done a lot of renderings to help people visualize. We try to stress that there will still be trucks in lanes with cars at times because they have to have access. This is much more difficult in urban areas—no space for grass medians.</li> <li>• We are in process of a supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS) being done in the corridor. In our SEIS, we have identified three dedicated truck lanes (DTL) with complete separation.</li> <li>• Our original documents don’t even talk about DTLs but the push came when one of our Senators latched on to the idea and began advocating it.</li> </ul>
Daniel Haake, Mid Ohio Regional Planning Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We view the Panama Canal as key driver of our container traffic as it will allow more east coast ports to receive more containers. This will move more containers through Ohio.</li> <li>• The Canal will be capable of over 400,000 lifts per year.</li> <li>• Our involvement with the freight community began in 1994 with some freight studies that identified weaknesses and areas that the MPO could help to alleviate some of those weaknesses.</li> </ul>

**Table 4: Freight Performance Measures Panel Key Points**

<b>Presenter</b>	<b>Key Points</b>
Bill Gardner, Minnesota DOT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A lot of work on performance measures has been part of the Minnesota freight advisory committee.</li> <li>• The fundamental challenge for successful performance measures is people don’t know enough about them – we need to have more education and advocacy.</li> <li>• We are much better off as part of multi-State initiative to be able to implement these larger scale initiatives.</li> <li>• We are focusing on solutions; we’ve turned the corner from planning to implementing, and our performance measures need to follow suit.</li> </ul>
Barbara Ivanov, Washington State DOT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eighty percent of urban trips deliver food/fuel/retail goods. You need to know who your customers are and what they require the system to accomplish for them. It is important to measure what matters.</li> <li>• Washington State legislature funded research that looked into whether the public sector could use commercially available GPS to measure performance of the system as well as what improvement would be achieved. There is real data so we can measure the reliability in urban delivery systems and travel times between important origin-destination pairs.</li> </ul>
Dan Murray, American Transportation Research Institute	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The economy is not a pretty picture right now, but with that said, in the first two weeks in February we saw stable and increasing tonnage so we may be able to get out of the recession by the end of 2009.</li> <li>• We have seen a net decrease in trips and a significant drop in trucking revenue. The average profit margin for trucking companies is about 3.2 percent on a typical year; this year, many companies are in the red.</li> <li>• Congestion is a message that resonates, need to look for win-win solutions as long as industry is not priced out.</li> </ul>

**Table 5: Funding and Financing Freight Transportation Panel Key Points**

Presenter	Key Points
Eric Madden, Pennsylvania DOT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pennsylvania is a railroad state; we have 6,000 miles of rail and 67 class railroads.</li> <li>• Trucking is 80 percent of the business, rail-freight will never replace that, but we need to have a system that provides options.</li> <li>• We have a transportation assistance program that utilizes bond money. The Governor has increased the amount to \$30 billion.</li> <li>• There is an online grant process where people can apply for funding for projects. We review them to find priority projects that will have the most positive impact and help to take trucks off the road. We don't do all this in a vacuum, we go out and talk with the highway district, ask them what they know about it and how it will impact the highway. We also look at the economic development side of things, environmental impacts, as well as reach out to the MPOs.</li> </ul>
Ted Dahlberg, Delaware Regional Valley Planning Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• County and city planners are the decision makers for where money gets allocated so it is very important to educate them. You need to have a freight plan and vision – understand why individual projects are good to fund. Also need to look at what ones have been already funded and look for opportunities to draw benefits to freight from those projects.</li> <li>• Updating the long range plan is a good time to capitalize on building freight projects into the plan.</li> <li>• Another good thing to have is a freight advisory committee that consists of both planners and citizens.</li> </ul>
George Schoener, I-95 Corridor Coalition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The I-95 Corridor Coalition identified projects of national and regional significance and formed an agreement on critical projects.</li> <li>• Unfortunately, it stopped there. Then we had to figure out how to pay for everything. We decided to dig into this and see if we could present alternative solutions. We contracted with Mercator advisors to design approaches to finance projects and began to build on national discussions about infrastructure banks and AASHTO's freight policy recommendations.</li> <li>• The drawback of a regional bank is that States will not be excited to put money into a regional bank without the context of a project and there may be some issues with legislation in order for states to be authorized to do this.</li> <li>• The advantage of a national bank is that it avoids duplication with multiple regions, will allow for access to Federal credit support, and creates national responsibility for funding projects of national significance.</li> </ul>

Presenter	Key Points
Leo Penne, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Around the country people struggle because they do not have the resources to do freight projects; in Pennsylvania apparently they do, there is a lot to be learned from them. When most people think they do not have the resources and financing, in fact they do. The challenge here is do we have a solution that can address the problems we discuss?</li> <li>• Much of highway improvements also bring benefits to freight. We need to identify programs that can have freight benefits tied in and also restore the buying power of the gas tax.</li> <li>• AASHTO has proposed \$60 billion in freight funding as part of the next authorization and also proposed that freight be considered a program and within the highway trust fund. This would mean that half of the funding would be discretionary at the Federal level.</li> </ul>

### **Work Group Sessions**

Responding to feedback from previous Partnership Meetings, the Freight Partnership III Meeting was designed to provide more interaction among attendees. Participants were broken into six regional breakout groups with a mix of Federal, State DOT, and MPO perspectives represented to discuss three topics: implementing multi-jurisdictional decision making, freight performance measures, and funding and financing freight transportation projects.

Below is a summary of the key points that were generated by the discussion by topic and common themes from each of the work group sessions. Notes from the work group sessions can be found in Appendix B.

### **Implementing Multi-jurisdictional Decision Making**

The purpose of this work group session was to generate insights that will help participants succeed in implementing multi-jurisdictional decision making in their regions/corridors. Participants discussed the motivating factors and what agencies hoped to gain by entering into multi-jurisdictional decision making; barriers to multi-jurisdictional decision making and potential actions people could take to address those barriers effectively; what indicates that a corridor is ready to advance to a multi-jurisdictional decision-making framework; how a corridor’s break points or perimeter can be defined; how they could create a framework or agreement that can withstand the test of time; and whose active support is needed to help craft/establish an effective agreement.

### **Key Points from Discussion**

#### **Why People and Organizations Make Decisions To Work Across Boundaries:**

- Common goals, needs, and problems;
- Freight knows no boundaries – bigger than one State;
- Regional benefits;
- Doesn’t duplicate efforts;
- Bigger collective voice;
- Increases regions’ capability to compete globally;
- Shared resources;
- Need to pool resources together to do more with less;



- Maximize and leverage funding sources and opportunities;
- Ensure continuity in the planning process, and ensure that jurisdictions are working towards alternatives that may achieve synergy to better address transportation system deficiencies; and
- Support from Federal government for such efforts.

**Table 6: Barriers to Coordination and Implementation**

<b>Barrier</b>	<b>Strategies to Overcome</b>
Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved communication across departments and functional areas.</li> <li>• Earlier attention during the planning process.</li> </ul>
Private industry commitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Language barrier with the private industry</li> <li>• Define benefits of coordination they can understand.</li> <li>• Encourage involvement on freight councils/committees.</li> </ul>
Legislation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change the law.</li> </ul>
Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish dedicated freight funding.</li> <li>• Create intermodal freight funding mechanism.</li> <li>• Discretionary program.</li> </ul>
Competing priorities and understanding the role and importance of freight	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a comprehensive statewide freight plan.</li> <li>• Develop selection criteria to prioritize projects.</li> <li>• Identify a freight champion.</li> </ul>
Too long to implement projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advance short term projects to attract and keep private sector interests then program longer term projects.</li> <li>• Consider innovative project delivery strategies.</li> </ul>

**Key Elements that Indicate a Corridor Should Advance to a Multi-jurisdictional Project:**

- A freight champion is in place;
- Project of national or regional significance;
- Core group ready to talk and act;
- Common problem;
- Impacts spread across the corridor;
- Emergency action required;
- Public support exists; and
- Political and legislative support exists.

**How to Define Logical Break Points/Corridor Definitions:**

- Political boundaries;
- Origin/destination patterns or locations;
- Intermodal terminals;
- Major corridor intersections;
- Consensus; and
- Areas that experience similar problems.

### **How to Craft an Agreement That Has Continuity over Time:**

- Have motivated/dedicated staff that can keep it moving;
- Develop a strategic plan;
- Make it binding – MOUs;
- Identify roles and responsibilities – but keep it flexible;
- Identify funding sources; and
- Identify benefits to both the public and agency.

### **Key Stakeholders Who Need To Be Engaged:**

- FHWA, State DOTs, MPOs & RPCs;
- Private sector;
- Elected officials;
- Economic Development/Chamber of Commerce;
- Environmental agencies;
- Other State agencies: Department of Commerce, Department of Agriculture, etc.;
- All appropriate modal agencies and companies; and
- The public.

### **Freight Performance Measures**

The purpose of this work group session was to develop a list of freight performance measures that can help organizations or regions track progress towards meaningful goals. It is said that “that which gets measured gets done.” But any organization that has ever attempted performance measurement knows that measuring performance can be time and data intensive. Too often, organizations expend valuable resources measuring data points that only tell part of the story or that don’t contribute to a measurable understanding of key goals. Groups walked through the following three-step process:

#### **Step 1: Define Performance Measures**

Groups were provided five freight goals based on the objective areas from the National Freight Policy and asked to develop performance measures based on those goals. The five freight goals were:

- Maximize safety by improving the safety of the freight transportation system;
- Ensure an efficient freight transportation network;
- Improve operations of the existing freight transportation system by ensuring travel time reliability;
- Improve the operations of the existing freight transportation system by maintaining and preserving the infrastructure; and
- Better management of the environmental impacts of freight transportation, including but not limited to GHG, emissions, energy consumption, community impacts, and natural resource impacts.

Tables 7-11 summarize the performance measures and data requirements discussed in the work groups for these freight goals.

**Step 2: Define What Data Is Needed, from Whom, in Order To Evaluate the Measures**

Once the performance measures had been identified, groups were asked to specify needed data and the potential sources of that data. Identification of data and sources helps to more realistically plan and cost an implementation strategy when the time comes.

**Step 3: Define the Measurement/Evaluation Approach**

The final step is determining how the performance measures will be evaluated and who/which organization would be the best suited to do this for each measure. Some measures may be agency-specific. In other cases, they may be multi-jurisdictional (in that case agencies may want to consider which organization should have the lead for coordinating implementation of the metric). In either case, data may be required from multiple sources to evaluate a metric.

**Table 7: Maximizing Safety by Improving the Safety of the Freight Transportation System**

Goal	Potential Measures
<b>Performance Measures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recurring reliability</li> <li>• Vehicle volumes axle counts peak v. non-peak</li> <li>• Travel time/delay</li> <li>• Avg. delivery time by commodity or area</li> <li>• Incident management/response rates</li> <li>• Number of large truck crashes</li> <li>• Number of fatalities in work zones</li> <li>• Clearance time for truck-related incidents</li> <li>• Emergency response impact on freight</li> </ul>
<b>Needed Data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tons per trip</li> <li>• Connectivity gaps between modes</li> <li>• Crash/fatality data</li> <li>• Geographic area for collection of data – impact zone</li> <li>• Number of crashes in work zones</li> <li>• Number of incidents</li> <li>• Truck volumes</li> <li>• Queue lengths</li> </ul>
<b>Data Sources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shippers</li> <li>• State DOT</li> <li>• Traffic management center</li> <li>• Enforcement/police reports</li> <li>• FMCSA – SAFESTAT database</li> <li>• Weigh stations</li> </ul>
<b>Approach to Implement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish your benchmark and monitor to see how it changes – self evaluation.</li> <li>• Identify safety hot spots</li> <li>• Promote corridor approach</li> <li>• Enforcement</li> <li>• Public money</li> <li>• Public facility</li> <li>• Freight planning model</li> </ul>

Goal	Potential Measures
<b>What Decision Making can this Measure Influence?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction choices</li> <li>• Signalization</li> <li>• Public information and outreach campaign</li> <li>• Dynamic message signs</li> <li>• Money or time</li> </ul>
<b>Owner or Objective and Measure</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agency (state, MPO, towns etc.)</li> <li>• Shipping firm</li> </ul>

**Table 8: Ensuring an Efficient Freight Transportation Network**

Goal	Potential Measures
<b>Performance Measures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvement of truck movement: # of truck units leaving ports</li> </ul>
<b>Needed Data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data from ports</li> <li>• Throughput per hour</li> </ul>
<b>Data Sources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meet with port, request truck data from DOT</li> </ul>
<b>Approach to Implement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meet with the ports</li> <li>• Tell them about data needs</li> <li>• Interchange between trucks and ports</li> </ul>
<b>What Decision Making can this Measure Influence?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify congestion points at nodes coming out of ports</li> <li>• Improve efficiency and reduce queuing</li> <li>• Will incentivize to make things more efficient (truck and trailer get hooked up)</li> <li>• Lower costs, improved emissions</li> </ul>
<b>Owner or Objective and Measure</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seaport, state DPT, MPO, towns etc.</li> <li>• Air quality management district</li> </ul>

**Table 9: Improving Operations of the Existing Freight Transportation System by Ensuring Travel Time Reliability**

Goal	Potential Measures
<b>Performance Measures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Travel speed by time of day</li> <li>• Travel time by time of day</li> <li>• Congestion – both recurring and non-recurring congestion</li> <li>• Number of Bottlenecks / hot spots / hours of delay</li> </ul>
<b>Needed Data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overweight vehicles</li> <li>• Time of day</li> <li>• Day of week</li> <li>• Volume mix</li> <li>• Delivery window</li> <li>• Turnaround time of vessels</li> <li>• Hours of delay</li> </ul>
<b>Data Sources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urban transit fleets equipped with GPS</li> <li>• Traffic.com</li> <li>• Truck travel time</li> <li>• Reroute information</li> <li>• TTI Reliability Index (it is v/c ratio to create speed; not hardcore observed data)</li> </ul>

Goal	Potential Measures
<b>Approach to Implement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Added capacity</li> <li>• Signal retiming</li> <li>• Traffic information</li> <li>• Mode shift</li> <li>• Traveler information and relationship building</li> <li>• Creation of traffic operations center to manage incidents/congestion; management of exogenous factors</li> </ul>

**Table 10: Improving Operations of Existing System through Maintenance and Preservation**

Goal	Potential Measures
<b>Performance Measures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pavement condition (smoothness): IRI (highways) and equivalent for railroad. Improvement of extension in service life</li> <li>• Lifecycle of facility</li> <li>• Weight limits – posted bridges</li> <li>• MPO freight funding (maintenance)</li> <li>• Condition and investments – Locks and dams (dredging)</li> <li>• Condition and investments – Rail</li> <li>• Condition and investments – Airport</li> <li>• Condition and investments –Intermodal</li> <li>• Condition and investments – Pavement condition</li> </ul>
<b>Needed Data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HPMS for highways</li> <li>• Private industry for railroads</li> </ul>
<b>Data Sources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HPMS</li> <li>• Private railroad</li> <li>• National bridge replacement inventory</li> <li>• STIP</li> <li>• Long range plan</li> </ul>
<b>Approach to Implement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved routing and access planning</li> <li>• National evaluation of current funding levels by mode</li> <li>• Project – bottlenecks / hot spots</li> <li>• Prioritization</li> </ul>
<b>What Decision Making can this Measure Influence?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change in priority status based on need.</li> <li>• Dollar amount committed to freight and divisions among modes</li> </ul>
<b>Owner or Objective and Measure</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State DOT</li> <li>• Transportation policy committee of Regions—State DOTs</li> </ul>

**Table 11: Better Management of Environmental Impacts of Freight Transportation**

Goal	Potential Measures
<b>Performance Measures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase efficiency by mode of freight/ transition away from fossil fuels</li> <li>• Measured pollutants</li> <li>• Mobile source air toxics</li> <li>• Number of spills (all modes)</li> <li>• Number of CMAQ “green” freight programs and projects</li> <li>• Emissions per ton-mile move / Particulate matters for both rail and highway scenarios</li> </ul>

Goal	Potential Measures
<b>Needed Data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Category: fleet efficiency. Mode split, cost per unit of energy for each mode of freight (e.g. electric truck vs. internal combustion)</li> <li>• Number of diesel retrofits</li> <li>• Waterway retrofits</li> <li>• Fleet conversions</li> </ul>
<b>Data Sources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manufacturers, most likely not private data.</li> <li>• Operators (e.g. how many trucks are hybrids)</li> <li>• Advocacy web resources/web sites</li> <li>• VIUS can address this topic; needs to be reinstated by census</li> <li>• National CMAQ Database</li> <li>• Air quality monitoring stations</li> <li>• VMT for time of freight move</li> </ul>
<b>Approach to Implement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cheap solutions for quick results</li> <li>• Federal Regulation/Policy</li> <li>• Diesel retrofits</li> <li>• Hybrids</li> <li>• Replacing as the fleet ages</li> <li>• 100 % match (no S/L source)</li> <li>• Federal regulation (policy)</li> </ul>
<b>What Decision Making can this Measure Influence?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Private sector takes first step, then public can take over</li> <li>• MPO ranking of projects</li> <li>• State DOT ranking of projects</li> </ul>
<b>Owner or Objective and Measure</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State DOT</li> <li>• MPOs</li> <li>• Private fleet owners</li> </ul>

## Funding and Financing Freight Transportation Projects

The purpose of this work group session was to identify successfully funded freight projects and identify funding needs/opportunities to advance potential freight projects. Participants were asked to share what projects they have successfully funded and how; what projects they would have liked to fund and couldn't; what were/are the barriers to advancing freight projects; and what they would like to see put in place to enable them to advance critical freight transportation projects.

### Projects Successfully Funded (and How)

There were a number of projects discussed that had been successfully funded. Funding was often granted as a result of being able to show the public the benefits of the proposed changes. Common sources of funding included: DOTs, State legislatures, Federal Aid program funds (notably Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality funds), earmarks, and toll road profits. Here are just a few examples of projects that have been funded:

- Alaska: Intermodal freight yard in Fairbanks funded with State bonds;
- California: Grade separation, double-tracking, and bridge projects funded through dedicated State funding source with matching funds from local agencies and the private sector;

- Colorado: Bridge and safety improvements funded with State funds and increase in vehicle registration fees;
- Maryland: Inter-county connector funded with bonds and toll revenues; and
- Oregon: Diesel retrofitting of garbage trucks funded with CMAQ funds.

### **Projects Unsuccessfully Funded**

While many projects have been successful, there were a significant number of projects that have not been successfully funded. The primary reasons for this were lost funding as a result of the economy or other priorities identified by State leadership and lack of public interest and support. Here are just a few examples of the types of projects that have not been successfully funded:

- New intermodal connectors;
- Rail (such as double-stacking and developing direct routes);
- Trucking (such as truck parking and weigh-in-motion technology);
- Highway projects with primarily freight benefit; and
- Water (such as barges, locks, and dredging).

### **Barriers to Advancing Freight Projects:**

- Lack of sufficient weighting criteria to reflect freight benefits in project planning and decision-making;
- Competing priorities for funding;
- Geographic equity of benefits – neighboring jurisdictions may benefit from upstream investments (or reverse—experience detrimental impacts);
- Absence of national freight policy mechanism that identifies standards and expectations for freight planning;
- Legal challenges often contribute to project delays and add additional uncertainty that may result in project cost escalation;
- Negative public perception of vehicle operators towards freight;
- Local problems are often also regional problems, so you need more than one champion for a project to succeed; and
- Environmental concerns.

### **Enablers for Agencies to Advance Critical Freight Transportation Projects:**

- A national freight plan/policy;
- Need to have a consensus on what a freight project is;
- States more actively integrate freight in decision making through the statewide plan and consensus building on freight;
- Training on “best practices” for developing a freight plan, with templates and a flow chart that outlines the general process;
- Increase awareness and outreach on freight and integration of freight into all of the modes;
- Elimination of State constitutional barriers to inter-state freight projects;
- Political support; and
- Educating the public about what freight investments can accomplish.

### **What FHWA/Congress/USDOT Can Do To Help:**

- Develop a national freight plan which identifies projects of regional or national significance, identifies strategically important corridors, and is forward thinking;
- Support freight-friendly funding by expanding eligibility or changing the rules on funding mechanisms that are currently modally or geographically-constrained;
- Establish a dedicated funding source for projects of regional and/or national significance;
- Clarify eligibility criteria for public-private partnerships;
- Use existing structures such as Statewide Long Range Transportation Plan process and MTP process to address freight;
- Increase the freight dialogue among and within States; and
- Provide guidance on reaching out to private industry and other freight stakeholders.

### ***Round Table Discussions***

In addition to the panel and work group sessions, 10 round table discussions for the participants were held. This was in response to requests from participants at the Freight Partnership II meeting to provide as much opportunity as possible for discussion and sharing of information rather than listening to speakers. The 10 topics covered were:

1. A State approach to Freight Transportation – highlighting the accomplishments of the Washington State Department of Transportation with Barbara Ivanov hosting the discussion.
2. Coordinating Port and Metropolitan issues – hosted by representatives from the US Maritime Administration.
3. Incorporating the private sector in freight transportation planning - what works and what doesn't work – hosted by DVRPC – Don Shanis and Ted Dahlberg.
4. Freight data – local and national – hosted by Rolf Schmitt and Michael Sprung (FHWA).
5. Corridor Coalitions – The I-95 Corridor Coalition – hosted by George Schoener and Marygrace Parker.
6. Rail and Intermodal Rail – hosted by Rick Crawford, Norfolk Southern, and Bill Goetz, CSX.
7. Harnessing information transfer technology to improve freight efficiency – Cross Town Improvement Program (CTIP) – Hosted by Randy Butler (FHWA).
8. Truck Size and Weight Enforcement Technologies and Program Issues – Hosted by Mike Onder, Tom Kearney and John Nicholas (FHWA).
9. Situational Awareness – how to keep your fingers on the pulse (industry, economics, fuel prices etc.) – Hosted by Chip Millard and Tony Furst (FHWA).
10. Freight Professional Development Program and National Highway Institute – Hosted by Budd Cribbs and Carol Keenan (FHWA).

These round tables were informal and for discussion only so no meeting notes were taken. The round tables lasted for two hours from 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM and the participants could change tables as they wished. It is noted that people who participated were engaged in discussion for the entire time with few if any leaving prior to 6:00 PM.

### **The Regional Setting**

Philadelphia and the Delaware Valley possess a freight network that is exceptional in its variety, comprehensiveness, and magnitude. Defining attributes of this unique regional asset are:



- 286 million tons of annual domestic shipments (2002 FAF 2.2);
- 5th ranked U.S. port (tonnage);
- 3 Class I freight railroads, and 10 short lines;
- 14th ranked North American airport (tonnage);
- 11 freight villages/intermodal facilities;
- 31 miles of National Highway System connectors; and
- 3 private truck stops and 11 rest areas.

The regional freight environment is also highly dynamic: cargo levels are growing, private and public sector stakeholders are numerous, growth pressures are exerted by competing land uses, and freight operations sometimes conflict with community goals.

### Field Trips

The DVRPC coordinated four field trips that were sponsored by AASHTO.

1. South Philadelphia Intermodal Facilities  
This tour featured stops at the region’s largest marine terminal, a break bulk marine terminal, and the region’s largest railroad intermodal terminal.
2. Pureland Freight Village  
Highlights of this tour of a 3,000 acre industrial complex were a distribution center, a bio-fuel transfer terminal, a short-line railroad operation, and a meeting with local officials.
3. Keystone Industrial Port Complex  
A solar farm, windmill plant, bulk port facility, and truck scale complex were among the sites visited at or adjacent to the transformed former steel mill, which is 2,400 acres in size.
4. Philadelphia International Airport  
This tour offered visits to a UPS air hub, belly cargo operations, U.S. Customs, and a Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board distribution facility.

### Reauthorization Discussion

The meeting ended on Friday, March 13, 2009, with a group meeting on surface transportation reauthorization. Leo Penne and Tony Furst led the discussion by providing insights into the process of creating a new bill and important issues.

**Table 12: Key Points on Reauthorization**

Leo	AASHTO
	Need support from all of you for AASHTO freight transportation recommendations (\$60 billion in freight funding, create a freight program – half discretionary at the Federal level – see panel notes).
	In the past a surplus from the Trust Fund has been available to carry the surface transportation program forward, but there is no surplus now. Need to talk to your constituents and Senators so they clearly understand the need and emergency situation.
	AASHTO’s job is to communicate the emergency situation and we need your help in doing this.
	Stimulus money is very important: restores some purchasing power.
	Stimulus money must be spent well! Chances of having a large surface transportation

<b>Leo</b>	<b>AASHTO</b>
	program may be negatively affected if the stimulus money is not spent well.
	Stimulus money should not negate transportation from getting additional funding.
	If people do not obligate the stimulus funds or the reports on job creation are not positive there may be no way to justify a big transportation investment.
	AASHTO is monitoring the stimulus funding to ensure it is spent well and quickly.
	The White House has a very strong interest in transportation infrastructure and we anticipate more active involvement than in the past.
<b>Tony</b>	<b>FHWA</b>
	Current bill expires 9/30/2009.
	Serious funding issues with the Trust Fund that need to be resolved.
	Anticipate a new 6-year bill.
	Changes in US DOT & FHWA affect the Administrations' ability to develop a new bill.
	Performance measures and a performance-based system are anticipated to be important in a new bill, but may not be fully developed for this bill.
	Multiple funding sources are being discussed: a user-based funding system, public-private partnerships, tolling, new technologies, etc. Have to determine how to get there.
	Freight is being discussed by key players for a new bill (Section 1909 Commission report, GAO, House and Senate, organizations, etc.).
	Transportation policy needs to be integrated with environment, energy, and trade policies.

## Recommendations and Requests

At the beginning of the meeting, FHWA Associate Administrator Jeff Lindley stated “each of us have a different role to play in this; we need to be working together to deliver the solutions we need to make freight move better.” In the closing remarks, both Tony Furst and Leo Penne echoed this statement, urging increased involvement, investment innovation, and greater emphasis on freight planning for the future.

In all of the work group sessions, participants stated that more guidance and direction from FHWA and AASHTO is needed to assist them in making positive progress. Table 13 summarizes these recommendations and requests from the participants.

**Table 13. Recommendations & Requests Identified During the Freight Partnership III Meeting**

<b>Recommendations/Requests</b>	<b>Who is Responsible?</b>
Provide examples, resources, and guidance in order to help States successfully implement multi-jurisdiction decision making as well as share lessons learned from existing agreements.	FHWA
Provide resources and training on the development and tracking of freight-specific performance measures.	FHWA
Develop a National freight plan.	FHWA
Address funding needs and ideas that were identified during the meeting.	AASHTO/FHWA
Increase the freight dialogue among and within States.	All freight stakeholders
Provide guidance on reaching out to private industry and other freight stakeholders.	FHWA
Hold follow up outreach for State DOTs and MPOs who did not get an opportunity to participate.	AASHTO/FHWA
Commit to work on building relationships with the private sector and other freight stakeholders.	All meeting participants

**Appendix A: Conference Proceedings**

**Appendix B: Work Group Sessions Summaries**

**Appendix C: AASHTO-FHWA Freight Partnership III Meeting  
Participant Feedback**

**Appendix D: Program**