

STRATEGIES TO BETTER LEVERAGE THE FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION DOLLAR AND PROMOTE INCREASED NON FEDERAL INVESTMENT

Statement of
JayEtta Z. Hecker

Director of Transportation Advocacy
National Transportation Policy Project
A project of the Bipartisan Policy Center

United States Senate Environment and Public Works Committee
Hearing on
"Federal, State and Local Partnerships to Accelerate Transportation Benefits"

March 11, 2010



Madam Chair, Ranking Member Inhofe and Members of the Committee,

I am honored to be here speaking on behalf of the Bipartisan Policy Center's (BPC), National Transportation Policy Project (NTPP). The BPC was founded by four former Senate majority leaders, Tom Daschle, Bob Dole, Howard Baker and George Mitchell. BPC was created to help provide the motivation and infrastructure to forge the bipartisan consensus we believe is necessary for durable change across a range of difficult policy challenges. In line with the BPC's overarching purpose, which is to develop and advance pragmatic, politically viable solutions to critical public policy problems, NTPP was designed to bring new approaches and fresh thinking to our nation's pressing transportation challenges. The Project's membership includes experts and leaders in transportation policy, as well as users of the system whose voices have not typically been heard in previous policy debates. The NTPP is co-chaired by four former elected officials: your former Senate colleague Slade Gorton, former Congressmen Martin Sabo and Sherry Boehlert, and former Detroit Mayor Dennis Archer. Your current colleague, Senator Mark Warner, was an original co-chair before stepping down to join the Senate and you may know continues his interest and commitment to advancing a performance-based transportation program. The BPC works to develop and promote sound policy solutions that can attract public support and political momentum to achieve real progress in a wide range of sectors including national security, agriculture, energy, health care, financial services, debt reduction, and science.

Prior to my current work with the NTPP, I had the honor of serving as a Director of Physical Infrastructure at the GAO, directing hundreds of comprehensive studies of the nation's surface transportation programs, many for this committee, over my 25 years of service with GAO.

We are appreciative of this opportunity to address the central question of this hearing - leveraging federal dollars and stimulating non federal investments. My statement is drawn from the comprehensive research, deliberations and consensus report of the NTPP[1]. The report concluded a two-year effort with a wide range of business, academic and civic leaders[2], calling for U.S. transportation policy to be more performance driven, more directly linked to a set of clearly articulated goals, and more accountable for results. Our principle message aligns with the focus of this hearing today – that resources will always be scarce and that achieving critical national goals will require a wide range of efforts to restructure the federal program to better leverage the federal dollar and incentivize and reward performance of non federal partners for addressing the nation's critical transportation needs.

My statement is organized around three central observations and conclusions of our report on surface transportation policy:

[1] PERFORMANCE-DRIVEN: New Vision for U.S. Transportation Policy, National Transportation Policy Project, BPC, 2009

[2] A list of all NTPP members is included at the end of this statement.

(1) The federal program should be restructured to move toward direct accountability for "wise" investment of federal funds that optimize specified PERFORMANCE results;

(2) Federal policies and programs need to provide direct INCENTIVES to non federal partners for more strategic investments and sustainable funding strategies; and

(3) New FINANCING MECHANISMS may not necessarily incentivize non federal investment.

Background

To set the stage for my remarks, I'd like to briefly summarize the NTPP conclusions, many of which reflect a widespread consensus on the need for fundamental reform of the existing program to foster performance, accountability, and results.

It is widely recognized that that a critical flaw in our existing national surface transportation policies and programs is the absence of clear, overarching, consensus-based national goals[3]. Since the era of interstate highway construction over a half century ago, this lack of defined goals has undermined federal efforts to keep pace with changing transportation needs and the need to promote the more effective management and maintenance of infrastructure that is critical to national interests. Absent clear goals, it is not surprising that the current system of transportation planning and funding, at all levels of government, lacks accountability. This has been a common theme of reviews by many stakeholders—and was the central finding of a body of GAO work concluding that existing programs lack a well-defined national vision, have no links to performance, and fail to address current nationally significant challenges including freight congestion and transportation's unsustainable impacts on the environment[4].

---

[3] National Surface Transportation Policy Study and Revenue Commission. "Transportation for Tomorrow." 2007;

National Surface Transportation Infrastructure Financing Commission. "Paying Our Way- A New Framework for Transportation Finance." February 2009;

National Conference of State Legislatures. "A Transportation System for the 21st Century." Federal Issue Brief. NCSL Policy – Surface Transportation Federalism. Web. March 8, 2010;

National Governors Association Economic Development & Commerce Committee. "Policy Position: EDC-13. Surface Transportation." July 20, 2009. Web. March 8, 2010;

Kavinoky, Janet. "U.S. Chamber Applauds Recommendations for Performance-Driven Transportation Policy." U.S. Chamber of Commerce. June 9, 2009. Web. March 8, 2010;

Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program. "A Bridge to Somewhere: Rethinking American Transportation for the 21st Century." 2008;

[4] Surface Transportation Programs: Proposals Highlight Key Issues and Challenges in Restructuring the Programs. GAO-08-843R: July 29, 2008; Surface Transportation: Restructured Federal Approach Needed for More Focused,

The problem of accountability stems in part from a well-intended effort to provide the states, which are the primary recipients of most federal transportation funds, with extensive flexibility to shift federal dollars to any "Title 23" or federally eligible road or project. The current structure amounts to a de facto block grant program. Federal oversight is almost entirely process-oriented and focused on the front end with little attention to the outcome or impact of the investment of federal dollars. Federal oversight that does exist - in terms of eligibility requirements for highway projects - is often criticized as adding considerable cost and time; and yet despite the costs and delay of the process-oversight, the quality and outcome of investments are rarely considered[5].

More importantly, there is no current federal requirement to optimize any "return" on transportation investments, or even to estimate the potential returns or cost-effectiveness of alternate investments in most cases[6]. Formula funds, which constitute the bulk of federal funding, contain no requirement that grant recipients focus on results or even consider economic analyses of project costs or benefits. This simple mechanism for transferring funds may have had merit during the interstate construction years, when a national system had been agreed upon. But today there is no agreed-upon national plan. Recent research has documented that since the completion of the Interstate Highway System the returns on public highway investments have reduced to single digits[7], due in part to inefficient policies and the failure to promote sound management of existing infrastructure while maximizing the returns from new investments.

Simply put, the existing system is based on a lack of accountability by recipients of federal funds who have never been asked to track the results of their investments of federal, state, and local funds – and has no consequence for poor investment choices or deteriorating system condition and performance. Further, the concern that federal dollars substitute for states' own transportation funds was the subject of a rigorous GAO study which updated and refined the most sophisticated econometric work on the subject. That research demonstrated that during last 20 years, as federal investment levels increased, state substitution of federal dollars for levels of funding they would otherwise be expected to have made increased to over 50 cents on dollar[8]. The structure of the federal program directly affects how

---

Performance-Based, and Sustainable Programs. GAO-08-400: March 6, 2008; Transforming Transportation Policy for the 21st Century: Highlights of a Forum. GAO-07-1210SP: September 19, 2007.

[5] Federal-Aid Highways, Federal Requirements for Highways May Influence Funding Decisions and Create Challenges, but Benefits and Costs Are Not Tracked. GAO-09-36: December 2008, p.4.

[6] Highway and Transit Investments: Options for Improving Information on Projects' Benefits and Costs and Increasing Accountability for Results. GAO-05-172: January 24, 2005.

[7] Shirley, Chad and Winston, Clifford, Firm Inventory Behavior and the Returns from Highway Infrastructure Investments, Journal of Urban Economics, Volume 55, Issue 2, March 2004, pp. 398-415.

[8] Federal-Aid Highways: Trends, Effect on State Spending, and Options for Future Program Design. GAO-04-802: August 31, 2004.

well the federal dollar is leveraged – and has the potential – not yet realized – for improving the performance of the nation's transportation system.

With this context of the significant flaws inherent in the current policies, programs, and relationships, I turn to the focus of this hearing - exploring how the federal transportation dollar can be effectively leveraged and how the federal program can incentivize an appropriate increase in state, local and private dollars. Recall my remarks are organized around three key points:

- ✓ Federal policy should promote "wise" investment to optimize performance.
- ✓ Specific policies are needed to directly incentivize non federal investment.
- ✓ New financing mechanisms will not necessarily incentivize non federal investment.

In each section, I highlight specific NTPP recommendations for Congressional action to better leverage the federal transportation dollar.

ASSURE FEDERAL DOLLARS ARE INVESTED WISELY TO PROMOTE PERFORMANCE

Performance is central to the question of effectively leveraging the federal dollar. Without clear federal goals and dynamic measures to focus the use of federal funds, the federal program lacks direction and inherently fails to leverage non federal funds. As long as federal funds flow as an uninterrupted stream without regard to performance, there is little incentive for public or private entities to take the political risks necessary to make strategic transportation investments.

As with nearly all other observers, we concluded that there is an urgent need for defining specific goals for the federal transportation program that direct resources to the achievement of clear national interests.

RECOMMENDATION: NTPP recommends the national interests in transportation investment be recognized as advancing the following key national concerns:

- **Economic Growth—**Producing maximum *economic growth* per dollar of investment

- **National Connectivity—***Connecting* people and goods across the *nation* with effective surface transportation

- **Metropolitan Accessibility** —Providing efficient *access* to jobs, labor, and other activities throughout *metropolitan* areas

- **Energy Security and Environmental Protection**—Integrating *energy security* and *environmental protection* objectives with transportation policies and programs

- **Safety** —Improving *safety* by reducing the number of accidents, injuries, and fatalities associated with transportation

At the same time we recognize that moving toward a performance-driven approach requires fundamental reform and involves far more than identifying clear national goals. Implementing a performance-driven approach and introducing accountability will challenge entrenched interests and require government institutions at all levels to change longstanding practices and ways of doing business. Accordingly, we believe it is essential for Congress to support the development of more specific *outcome-oriented* measures outlining the desired outcomes of federal investments. Performance metrics must be fair, transparent, and free of bias toward particular transportation modes or geographic regions.

There is compelling evidence that increasing the focus of the federal program on nationally significant and outcome-oriented performance metrics will require substantial development, refinement, application and testing, to build a reliable foundation for public and political confidence in core performance measures.

As a result, NTPP's core recommendation is that a long term commitment is needed to begin a systematic transition from a process and revenue sharing model to a performance-based program.

RECOMMENDATION: Congress should begin an aggressive transition to a performance-based system with **SUPPORT FOR COMPREHENSIVE TESTING AND REFINING OF OUTCOME-ORIENTED NATIONAL METRICS.** This will mean pilot testing the application of broad, mode-neutral national performance metrics on the state and metropolitan level to identify and address specific implementation challenges.

FEDERAL POLICIES SHOULD DIRECTLY INCENTIVIZE INVESTMENT

UPDATE AND REFINE THE NATIONAL SYSTEM TO FOCUS FEDERAL LEADERSHIP AND CLARIFY AREAS FOR DIRECT STATE AND LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY

A discussion of better leveraging the federal dollar begins with assuring the federal dollar is focused on truly national interests and is clear which areas and parts of the overall transportation system are inherently state and local responsibilities. Federal funds will certainly displace and substitute for state or local governments funds if federal funds - and even more so with a high federal match - are provided for assets those governments would - or should - have the inherent interest in providing and maintaining.

The National Highway System (NHS), which includes the Interstate Highway System, represents only one mode and has no consistent foundation for inclusion or exclusion and is thus inconsistent in the

type of roads included or excluded in every state. As the current threshold for eligibility for most highway federal funds, it is not focused, consistent, or effective in distinguishing federal from state and local leadership roles. It is therefore unsuitable for the purpose of understanding the true national system. It includes many facilities that are providing primarily local benefits and thus should not be eligible for federal funding to cover a majority share of the preservation costs.

A more focused role for the federal government means not only emphasizing preservation and performance of the existing national network, but preserving what is truly a federal system. For example, nearly every bridge in the country is considered a bridge of federal interest and drives the formula for how bridge funds are distributed to each state – including every culvert over 20'. A comprehensive GAO report of the national program revealed that while the bridge program has been successful in reducing the number of structurally deficient bridges over the last ten years, that measure neither captures overall reduction of the safety or risk associated with specific bridges or promotes the use of federal funds for major bridges of direct significance to interstate commerce. GAO reported that most of the improvement over the past 20 years has been in locally owned and rural bridges as opposed to the large bridges that are most critical for interstate commerce. The result is that states use their federal bridge funds for smaller bridge rehabilitation projects and when major bridges need replacement or rehabilitation, states for the most part seek earmarks or other funding sources. Since bridge funds are apportioned to states without regard to furthering *national* goals, states have no incentive to focus on the most nationally significant projects and are not held accountable for the results of their investments[9].

Federal dollars will be best leveraged when they provide incentives for state and local entities to dedicate their own funds toward areas with clear national benefits, where they might not otherwise have the incentive to do so. At the same time, this will clarify areas of primary state and local interest and provide a clear incentive for local choices of investment levels, funding strategies, and priorities.

NTPP concluded that a wholesale re-examination of what is and what is not part of the federal surface transportation system is required[10]. That system should include freight and passenger rail as well as highway infrastructure and should include access to ports and airports. NTPP believes that Congress should appoint a bipartisan commission modeled after the Defense Base Closure Realignment Commission (BRAC), which was relatively successful in objectively deciding which military bases to close. The nation similarly needs to decide which elements of the NHS (and nearly 1 million miles of federal-aid eligible highways) should be included in a redefined national system going forward, as well as which non-highway elements should be included.

---

[9] "Highway Bridge Program, Clearer Goals and Performance Measures Needed for a More Focused and Sustainable Program." Sep. 2008. GAO-08-1043. p. 40.

[10] This recommendation mirrors similar calls in the work of GAO, the National Policy and Revenue Study Commission (Policy Commission), and the National Surface Transportation Infrastructure Financing Commission (Finance Commission).

It is this newly redefined system that should be the target of future formula funding. The formula funds intended to preserve vital national connections must be used to reduce the maintenance backlog and improve the performance of this national system. Once consensus is achieved on the extent of the system, additional suggestions could be made regarding important bottlenecks. These targeted bottlenecks could then potentially be used as a method of funding distribution.

RECOMMENDATION: Establish **BIPARTISAN COMMISSION TO UPDATE THE SCOPE OF THE NATIONAL SYSTEM.** Develop a new consensus that redefines what is meant by the national transportation system through the establishment of a bipartisan commission. This will mean narrowing the defined National Highway System – but at the same time broadening the system to include critical freight corridors and nodes, including rail, maritime and aviation links.

TRANSITIONING TO MODE NEUTRAL OUTCOME-ORIENTED PROGRAMS WILL BETTER LEVERAGE THE FEDERAL DOLLAR AND INCENTIVIZE POTENTIAL RECIPIENTS

The current program impedes the distribution of funds on a mode-neutral basis and thus reduces the overall performance of the system. This is a particular problem for metropolitan programs because, despite some funding flexibility, projects are forced into either "highway" or "transit" categories—even though highway and transit systems work best as components of a multi-faceted *program* to successfully address metropolitan mobility needs and system performance. The modal silos are an even more severe constraint for freight projects, which are best identified by an unbiased assessment that considers all mode choices and promotes the development of partnerships and linkages across modes. However, adopting a mode-neutral approach to new investments will remain extremely difficult in practice as long as most of the funding is coming from users of one mode.

STRUCTURAL REFORM RECOMMENDATIONS:

Move toward consolidating surface programs into new mode-neutral and performance-based formula and competitive programs focused on **METROPOLITAN ACCESSIBILITY, NATIONAL CONNECTIVITY,** and **ESSENTIAL ACCESS** for integrating programs for rural, isolated, and disadvantaged populations.

SUPPORT SUSTAINABLE STATE AND LOCAL FUNDING

The nation has a direct interest not only in the sustainability of its own federal program, but enhancing the ability of state and local governments to meet their share of the overall funding responsibility. The federal government can recognize that decisions by state or local governments to charge direct user fees for new capacity introduces significant financing complexities as well as political challenges for state and local officials.

Direct user fees, such as a mileage-based charge, can improve system performance and represent a critical tool for states and metropolitan areas to supplement or eventually replace traditional revenue

sources. Support should be provided to states or groups of states piloting new comprehensive user-based fees. This includes developing specific strategies for garnering public support and confidence in privacy protections for users, as well as developing an efficient and reliable administrative pricing and payment mechanism. NTPP relied on and supports the numerous specific recommendations made by the Finance Commission, which was specifically chartered to evaluate funding options by the Congress in SAFETEA-LU, on this issue.

While NTPP supports a well defined federal focus on nationally significant infrastructure, there is clear national interest in supporting and incentivizing state and local governments to develop sustainable funding sources for locally significant infrastructure investments. Historically there has been some evidence that states have reduced their own funding as federal transportation grants increased. While state revenue sources vary, the real value of the average state gas tax has declined by more than 30 percent since the late 1950s[11]. It is clear that achieving national performance goals for our entire transportation system will require that states and local governments have an ability to substantially increase revenues for needed infrastructure investments.

Accordingly, NTPP concluded that the federal government should facilitate state and local capacity to develop sustainable, equitable, and performance-enhancing revenue streams. States and localities have a wide range of transportation investment and revenue-raising options at their disposal, including private partnerships, fuel and/or dedicated sales taxes, congestion pricing, developer fees, toll roads, HOV conversion to HOT lanes, and value capture from transit development. While the federal government should not be in the business of prescribing specific state and local strategies, it can remove impediments and support efforts to use creative financing tools at the state and local level.

NTPP concluded that performance and environmental goals are likely to be most cost-effectively achieved with the greater use of variable pricing on congested roadways. The federal government can clearly promote performance-enhancing and sustainable state and local investment by removing remaining restrictions to instituting such policies on the nation's roadways, albeit with appropriate controls and oversight measures[12]. In addition, with the removal of restrictions on pricing, the TIFIA program should be expanded to allow for loans that are paid back with variable pricing tolls on national highways. In fact, the TIFIA program, with an established record, has proven to be an effective tool for leveraging of federal funds, promoting direct user fees, introducing market discipline and facilitating private participation. Congress could more systematically link the TIFIA program to national interests by directing DOT to apply the performance metrics we have proposed to aid in their assessment of projects.

[11] "Future Financing Options to Meet Highway and Transit Needs," NCHRP Project 20-24(49): December, 2006

[12] Highway Public-Private Partnerships: More Rigorous Up-front Analysis Could Better Secure Potential Benefits and Protect the Public Interest. GAO-08-44: February 8, 2008.

RECOMMENDATION: Congress should establish specific provisions to **SUPPORT EFFORTS BY STATES TO IMPLEMENT DIRECT USER CHARGES** including reducing restrictions on **ROAD PRICING,** expanding **TIFIA,** and facilitating **PRIVATE INVESTMENT** with carefully targeted controls.

NEW FINANCING MECHANISMS WILL NOT NECESSARILY BETTER LEVERAGE THE FEDERAL DOLLAR

Numerous proposals are being advanced to establish a new national infrastructure "bank" or "fund" as a way to increase federal investment and address critical national needs. At the same time, a significant economic downturn and the delay in Congressional enactment of a new surface transportation program has led to the most significant dedication of General Funds to transportation since before the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

NTPP cautions that creation of a new special-purpose financing entity does not necessarily address any of the fundamental performance challenges that confront our transportation programs. Issuing new federal bonds or establishing and capitalizing a national infrastructure bank are ideas that need to be recognized as forms of borrowing. The NTPP panel was unanimous is agreeing that the use of general taxpayer funds should be limited to programs which demonstrably generate nationally significant and broadly-based public benefits.

NTPP supports the Finance Commission's delineation of critical factors that need to be addressed to provide the foundation for any new (or existing) infrastructure financing entity:

- The critical infrastructure improvements being targeted;
- The types of (existing or new) financing assistance necessary or helpful in accelerating the investments;
- The sources of revenue used to fund the investments and repay any financing assistance
- The control over resource allocation; and
- The federal budgetary impact and other policy issues.

RECOMMENDATION: NTPP believe that the purposes of any new financing entity need to be **CLEAR, SPECIFIC, AND TRANSPARENT REGARDING ACTUAL REVENUE SOURCES AND BENEFICIARIES**. Any new entity should be directed to apply rigorous quantitative performance metrics covering the range of national interests that need to be balanced, and strive to align funding sources with the beneficiaries of federal investments. Finally, establishing a new financing entity must not be seen as a substitute for moving aggressively to develop sustainable and adequate sources of revenue for transportation infrastructure that are supported—to the maximum extent possible—by well-designed user-based fees.

The NTPP panel also underscored the important reality - that how transportation revenue is raised and the extent to which system costs are transparent has direct effects on both the performance of the system and the level of total investment needed. The close relationship between how transportation

systems perform and how transportation revenues are generated led to our conclusion that, beyond simply addressing the need for additional revenue, policymakers must also ensure that revenue is generated in ways that provide more accurate signals to users of system costs and thus promote improved system performance.

Recognizing that the financing mechanisms in place to support the nation's highway and transit programs are unsustainable and in need of significant reform, NTPP made several specific recommendations for thinking longer term about a sustainable – and performance enhancing strategy for raising revenue. The problem is not just that the current fuel tax and other taxes that support the highway and transit trust funds have not been increased or pegged to inflation, and that this is causing a growing funding shortfall. Rather, the central flaw of existing financing mechanisms is that they provide a poor signal to users about the costs they impose on the system. In other words, *how* we raise money for transportation is itself an extremely important policy decision—quite apart from decisions about how much money needs to be raised, where that money should go, or how the federal government can focus its program to enhance non federal investments. Thus, reform of current financing mechanisms must be central to any effort aimed at making overall U.S. transportation policy more performance-based, effective, and efficient. Federal leadership is required to assist and support both states and local governments in developing the next generation of an efficient user-based funding mechanism.

With the major advancements in technology, a future funding system can more accurately and directly charge users - notably differentiating for mileage in high congestion zones or for travel during more congested times of day. A new system could also apply different fees based on vehicle fuel economy and emissions. Such tailored alignment of fees to distinct costs will send the proper price signals to users, thereby reducing congestion, emissions, and fuel consumption. Mileage-based fees that vary based on congestion would provide incentive for drivers to shift to off-peak periods, consolidate trips, use less congested routes, use alternative modes, or telecommute. Fees can also be tailored to avoid penalizing rural drivers who travel long-distances on relatively empty roads. Finally, a corollary benefit of increasing the transparency of costs is that capital investment decisions will be guided by quantitative signals of increased demand for physical capacity.

Over a longer time horizon, a vehicle-based revenue system may offer additional efficiencies and dramatic new safety benefits if it is integrated with developing proposals for integrating "smart road–smart car" technologies. The platform of on-vehicle GPS technology is already being applied to advanced innovations with automatic crash prevention. Other applications are being adapted to provide diverse consumer services including routing, vehicle optimization, and payment of a range of services such as parking, registration and weight or emissions-related fees.

The Finance Commission clearly concluded that direct user charges in the form of mileage-based user charges are the most viable and sustainable long-term "user pay" option for the federal government to raise adequate and appropriate revenues to provide the federal share of funding for the system. They noted that real-world examples as well as academic research demonstrate that VMT fee systems, in addition to raising needed revenues, also would result in additional benefits, including more efficient

use of transportation infrastructure, reduced environmental and social externalities, and improved information for drivers. The Commission also noted that national leadership in this arena will play an important role in facilitating states and localities ability to implement their own VMT-based charges, and savings on their administrative costs by piggybacking on the national system. The Commission noted that the primary federal role in furthering state and local governments' ability to use these techniques consists of limiting restrictions on their use and facilitating and encouraging states and localities to experiment where appropriate. In addition, because many states and localities have already begun implementing pricing and tolling options, Congress needs to address interoperability concerns to reduce the likelihood of incompatible equipment and technologies which could soon impede progress on a future national VMT-based charge system.

RECOMMENDATION: CHARTER COMPREHENSIVE RESEARCH, PILOTS AND PLANNING FOR EQUITABLE AND SUSTAINABLE NATIONAL USER-FEE. Due to the many benefits of a comprehensive national user-based funding mechanism, NTPP recommends a national commitment to completing the needed research and planning to transition to a national user-pay funding mechanism by a date certain. The Congress should call for identification of both short and long term strategies for transitioning to a more performance and use-based funding structure.

_____

In sum, the federal government has many opportunities – and indeed a responsibility – to reform and refocus federal transportation programs to provide the nation, its communities, businesses and individuals, value for the money spent – and accountability for performance. Specific measures to incentivize and reward states and local entities for developing sustainable funding sources are needed – and can be a core part of the reforms the Congress enacts as it charts a new vision for federal transportation programs.

This concludes my prepared remarks. I look forward to any questions you may have – and stand ready to support the committee in its significant challenges ahead.

National Transportation Policy Project Members

Dennis Archer - Former Mayor of Detroit
Sherwood Boehlert - Former New York
Slade Gorton - Former United States Senator from Washington
Martin Sabo - Former United States Congressman from Minnesota

---

Alan Altshuler - Harvard professor (Kennedy School and Graduate School of Design); former Massachusetts Secretary of Transportation
Jack Basso - American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO); former Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs, United States Department of Transportation
Lillian Borrone - Board Chair of the Eno Transportation Foundation; former senior executive of Port Authority of New York and New Jersey
Josephine Cooper - Toyota Motor Group, Vice President, Government & Industry Affairs
Tom Downs - Former CEO of Amtrak; former Commissioner of New Jersey Department of Transportation; former President of the Eno Transportation Foundation
Mike Erlandson - Vice President Government Affairs, SUPERVALU
Douglas Foy - Serrafix Corporation; former President of the Conservation Law Foundation
Jane Garvey - Former Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration; JP Morgan
David Goode - Former CEO of Norfolk Southern Corporation
Douglas Holtz-Eakin – President, DHE Consulting LLC; former Director of Congressional Budget Office
Nancy Kete - Senior Fellow and Director of EMBARQ-The World Resources Institute's Center for Transport and Environment
Ann Klee - Vice President, Corporate Environmental Programs, General Electric
Mark Laswell - President, CH2M Hill Transportation Business Group
William Lhota - President and CEO of the Central Ohio Transit Authority (COTA); former senior executive at American Electric Power
Bob Lowe - President and CEO of Lowe Enterprises, Inc.
Sean McGarvey - Secretary-Treasurer, Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL-CIO
Bryan Mistele - President and CEO of INRIX
Jim Runde - Managing Director and Special Advisor, Morgan Stanley
Chris Vincze - Chairman and CEO of TRC Companies
Martin Wachs - Director of RAND Corporation's Transportation, Space, and Technology Program; Professor Emeritus at the University of California Berkeley
Dr. John Wall - Vice President Chief Technical Officer at Cummins Engine
Lynda Ziegler – Senior Vice President at Southern California Edison