

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL

FREIGHT COMMITTEE



FREIGHT MEETING NOTES, SEPTEMBER 2007

Welcome everybody to the Freight Committee Meeting of September 12, 2007.

Attendees: John Businger, National Corridors Initiative, Bill Cutler, CPTS, Mike Rennie, Pioneer Valley Railroad, Anne Lynch, Massachusetts Motor Transportation Association, Frank DeMasi, Regional Transportation Advisory Council, Rich Rydant, Central Mass Regional Planning Commission, and Walter Bonin, Chair. RTAC Freight Committee.

Highlights

Trucking through Boston – Anne Lynch – Boston has adopted regulation forcing trucks around the City through the suburbs and out to 128. Drivers (not the companies) are facing fines of \$500 to \$1500. Drivers face loss of Certification after two (2) violations and cannot drive heavy trucks. This is causing drivers to refuse to drive in Boston, making trips much longer and expensive and eating into driver's hours of service.

Central Mass Regional Planning Authority – Rich Rydant – Their offices moving to Union Station in December of January. They plan to continue quarterly regional transportation meetings on passenger and freight service. They are doing an excellent job of promoting transportation within Central Mass and beyond with EOT's participation..

Legislative Relations – All – We are still having problems getting the key legislators to interact with us despite our willingness to support legislation they are sponsoring. This will be discussed at the next meeting.

Warehousing – Anne Lynch, Frank DeMasi – There are problems locating warehousing which is essential to the movement of freight. However, local zoning acts as a barrier because no community wants trucks or trains. But they still want goods.

Meeting with Lt. Governor Murray – Frank DeMasi – The Lt. Governor has invited Frank and several of us to meet with him at his office on September 25th. This is a great opportunity to help get our message(s) across and enlist his support. He has been a strong advocate for effective transportation for a long time.

Detailed Notes

Mary Marshall, recording.

Passed out handouts – Walter extends apologies, has to leave promptly at 2 PM.

Frank – On the second batch of handouts, is a report on the MassPike U-turn and the Allston Tolls and its impact on the road system, a Central Mass Freight Meeting Report, and an excerpt from the Montachusets MPO Fitchburg commuter rail line improvements. There's an interesting article on the Florida East Coast Railroad. Most people don't believe you can do short haul inter-modal, but it so happens that Florida East Coast makes a bundle on short haul inter-modal, 350-360 miles of rail. If you do it right, efficiently, and have the volume, short haul can pay and make sense. That's in the second handout package. So we have a third package that we put together for a small group that's going to present our Freight Committee issues to Lt. Governor Murray on September 25th.

Walter - One objective for the committee is building a relationship with individuals within State government, private industries, and within particular organizations. We have some rough updates here. Issues never really discussed are realistic objectives and how we assign responsibility. Some of the individuals to build relations with are in groups that we, through the RTAC, have relationships with. For example, what do we expect from Lynn Vykesland at Massport in terms of connecting us with MassPort? Rich Rydant has done a great job in achieving these type relationships at the Central Mass Regional Planning Commission, which we'll discuss in detail a little later. We have been trying to make connection with some of the key state representatives and senators involved in economic development and transportation and we have a meeting with Lt. Gov. Murray on the 25th, a week after next.

Walter Bonin - I spoke with Mike Rennie who was going to talk to Representative Wagner. Mike said, "What would help at the meeting is sort of a statement or outline of what we're trying to accomplish so we're not going there with our own individual agenda." There should be some consistency in the message that we carry and some understanding of what it is that we expect from these key individuals rather than just get to know them. We actually have to understand what's important to them and they understand what's important to us and what do we expect from them to communicate that to them. To that end, we have put a draft of our planned discussion at our meeting with the Lt. Governor. You can later review those and critique them.

Walter passed out the one he wrote. Walter solicited the committee to critique it and editorialize and would be happy to make any changes. The outline of issues and suggested actions was for a meeting that will take place on the 25th of September.

The format for the meeting with Lt. Governor, and the headers used were suggested by Dom D'Eramo. But whatever we're comfortable with is what we'll do. I'll have my write ups by Saturday. We're wide open for comments, folks.

Richard Rydant - Our offices are going to be moving to Union Station by December and by January or February, we'd like to have another look at the passenger rail section of our strategy to start things off. Hopefully, there'll be some news on the Boston line – I don't

know if that will be the case at that time, but, basically, to have EOT/CSX participate and try to get the message to them as well. The Lt. Governor gave great support to the agency while he was still Mayor of Worcester and was somewhat involved to push for rail. We're prepared to assist him in dealing with that. We're attempting to parochially educate our MPO, commission members as such, but also collaborating with regional groups to get issues on the table and discussions, so we're hoping to continue that.

We had the National Corridor Coalition speak at our annual meeting in June and the need for regional passenger rail went over really big, and of course, what they had done to meet in Springfield, and I think in Providence. In Hartford they had similar meetings on commuter rail, I know I'm talking passenger here, but that's one of the things I think we have on our agenda to continue with that. We want to do freight rail as well, just as we did in Worcester in August.

I have a limited budget, and one staff person that can help me, so I'm trying to have an event at least quarterly, and I want to talk to the trucking industry. Years ago I worked with the ATA Foundation based on a surrogate membership in our area and we got a lot of good feedback. I think they were active in Rhode Island and I'm not sure they are continuing their work. I would like to resurrect whatever type of relationship that might fall in trucking with In Transit Container Corporation. In Transit Container deals with a number of trucking lines, so that would provide great input from trucking and freight carriers.

Thanks Rich.

Frank – Bill Kuttner is there a freight person in CTPS now? I think your listed as freight. Has Bill Moore's position been formally filled?

Bill Kuttner responded that Bill Moore's position has been filled since he left the organization. He thought Ann McGahan has overall freight responsibility at CTPS

Frank D - It would be nice to have someone in our Boston MPO that could act like Rich and as focused as he to incorporate freight in the Boston MPO's RTP. We don't seem to have that type of structure. It may be there, but we're just not tying into that.

One of my missions as part of the RTAC is to manage membership. The Joint Committee on Transportation should be a member or brought into RTAC along with the other legislative folks and other agencies but they never show, so we're here to advocate for freight and to provide the MPO with a public interface to support Transportation initiatives. You would think legislators, and MPO members would be interested to come to our meetings. Something is not working very well here especially at the freight committee where we're trying to get things lined up. You would think that they'd be looking to support this.

John Businger - Right. Pursuant to the legislative bodies, the Joint Committee on Transportation is listed as a member of the archives and they've never shown up. Let me

tell you, it's nothing new. I told you when I was a member of that committee, I ended up at some of the meetings and nobody came.

I wanted to follow up on one of the handouts on the News Release that went out to The Northeast Atlantic Rails and Ports Newsletter. We recently sent a report over to the RPA about transportation improvement program, transportation plan, and we made a pitch for rail freight and improvements to the highway network and that was written up there. One of the things we said that they picked up on – It appears they scratched the surface - There was some good PR from the agency. We made people aware of the freight and that's one of the things we want to educate people on.

I attended a session that I mentioned back in June a meeting of the Drafters. They all seemed to be interested in participating should there be a freight study, and should the EOT work on the update of the state rail plan that happens with the RPA and participate in some fashion. Central Mass is in a good position to facilitate meetings like that and any freight meetings as well that could be separate but also related in some fashion. So I think the RPA's are prepared, I think it behooves them, it's required that the State be moved in the development of the regional transportation plan, things of that nature, that be well aware, but it's up to the MPO to prioritize as such. I don't think the freight got a major prioritization from our MPO.

Walter Bonin - I praise the Central Mass Planning group as the only MPO engaged in Rail and Passenger freight planning.

Frank – What precipitated a meeting with the Lt. Governor was the letter I wrote to him. The call I received from his office to set up the meeting nearly knocked me off my chair, as I never expected a response from him. So I thought it would be good to bring a few members of the RTAC freight committee along. These folks have contributed greatly over the last three years and it gives them a chance to make their thoughts heard.

John Businger - I don't want to hold up the agenda but there's something here I want to talk around or email to you Frank. Rail commissioner. EOT has appointed a director of rail, which to me has to be the same as the MBTA general manager. I suspect if the governor wants it, would he be the MBTA general manager?

Frank DeMasi - No, I think he wants the Rail commissioner to have that authority. Do you know who that might have been? Who's the director of rail? Who did they appoint? I haven't heard a word.

John - We can call the EOT and please give me a call when you know.

Frank - On Senator Baddour –we have tried to get an appointment to see the senator to bring these issues up but we've been put off and put off. Finally, I'm working with one of his staffers and today I spoke with one and said you guys are suppose to be part of the RTAC and we never see a representative from the office coming over. We did get Maria Syniatis several months ago, but it was a one shot deal.

John Businger - I was once a part of that committee, and I wasn't aware we were part of the RTAC.

Yes, they are, they're on our list. And they are a no show!

We're still trying to meet with the Senator, but we're not having much luck.

This organization is by Federal mandate and we're the body utilized by the MPO's as part of its public outreach. I don't ever remember legislatures ever coming to our meetings. The legislators should have a staffer who has an interest to support the freight issues.

Mike Rennie - Are we going to have a meeting in October with Representative Wagner? We will be meeting in Southwick. Rosemary Sandland, Representative Joe Wagner, myself, are having a breakfast meeting at 9 o'clock on Franklin Street. Pretty much going to use the same format as we have prepared for the Lt. Governor. We're going to try to put something out and try to get this law changed.

Where do we stand with Senator Hart, Frank?

Frank DeMasi - Again, I've made several calls over the past month to see what the status of the Senate Bill 2053. Senate 2053 is a bill to try to extend the truck haul over to the Conley Terminal with a planned rail segment. The Bill asks for \$30 million dollars, part of that would be to design the link and the rest would finance constructing the roadway connection. But there's no mention of revenue to payback any bonds, whatever and I think that should be part of Senate Bill 2053. There was a hearing on the bill in May this year, and after the hearing, it was referred to the Joint Transportation Committee. I've been asking for status on that - did they pursue it or is it just sitting there. Who are the proponents for it so we can continue with them? So these are the questions I've been asking but I don't seem to be getting any answers. It seems strange to me to approach the senator's office and offer support of something that he's proposed and I don't get any answers.

John Businger - Is this a bill that Senator Baddour personally invented or is he filing it as a courtesy to a contingent?

Well, I imagine that support must be in the wings somewhere. I'm talking to Kaitlyn Leahey at Senator Hart's office.

John Businger - I know how that office works. I dealt with Rosemary first. She's the person you want to deal with.

Frank D - But Rosemary Powers told me to talk to Kaitlyn. However, Kaitlyn was on vacation, she did come to a prior freight committee meeting. But now I want to pursue it.

I thought that working with Kaitlyn is not the issue, but who in the Joint Transportation Committee has the bill at this time.

I made a call to the committee and I find that Sandra Marcione is the person able to help us get status on the bill. I called her, left my number, and no call back. But she's the person I need to be talking with.

What I learned so far is that the Transportation Committee had a hearing on May 10. No one came to the meeting.

The bill needs help. You just cannot ask for a \$30 million handout without saying there's a possible revenue string to support any bonding. Who is going to come up with that in the face of all these other issues?

Who's going to push that?

Trucking Industry

Anne Lynch - Trucking's been having a lot of internal struggles. What's a pretty significant interest to this group which is borne out of the Boston MPO is truck routing issues have become extremely scarce within the city of Boston and surrounding towns. Due to a mandate of the Mayor's office, it's forcing a lot of trucks back out to 128 and around. The trucks routes that they are enforcing right now have not been federally approved or state approved and they are both required. The trucking association has been actively involved in the Boston Transportation department and others trying to get them aware of these federal and state requirements that they need to meet which have not been met. Anyway, federal regulations for creating a truck route is applicable to all communities and the impact of limiting travel route affects all commuters by adding to congestion on the few routes available to trucks. . I think that if Waltham, Wellesley, Westwood, Dedham, Canton, Randolph, and Braintree knew that Boston is shoving all the truck traffic out to 128, I think they would be saying shame on you Boston. We're in the process of contacting through the Mayor's association some of these affected communities.

Some of the citations that were given to the trucking companies were not at a very significant cost. One type of traffic violation in particular is now moving its way up to higher courts. Unfortunately, when it went up to municipal courts, it was upheld against the carrier.

Where I think this gets more interesting than public feud is recently a very large publication in Massachusetts put their transportation package out to bid. In doing so, they got one bidder instead of multiples that they usually get and that bidder doubled prices and expectations. They only had one bidder, so they had to pay. When public agencies start paying double for transportation of their goods, perhaps then it will be interesting in whether or not the mayor of Boston is productive in the proper way. We were proposing to boycott trucking in the city to reach agreement on establishing

reasonable truck routes and access if the trucking bans have not met with Federal and State requirements.

While we continue to pursue better truck access that is somewhat of an arduous process, we also need to get this understood. I think informing the mayors I had the opportunity to talk to the Mayor of Everett. I told him they were shoving all this traffic into your town because this is not something communities are aware of happening. The cost of this in consumer goods is going to be so significant the fuel farms are all in one port, that cannot change, so all the oil companies and all the gas companies have to go to the fuel farms in one location and they have to load up their fuels there. They go from Everett to say Quincy 9 miles, then go from Everett up I-93N to up around 128 to I-93S. Are you kidding me? It's 61 miles round trip to go that route.

I think that it's unfortunate that we have not been able to get more visibility about this. Boston should be extremely interested in this because the industry in a peripheral way of Boston's surcharge. I have a gallon of heating oil with a Boston surcharge and I have a gallon of gasoline, and this is the kind of thing you get when you have this helter skelter approach towards establishing truck routes. .

Let's talk about port. We also have port carriers. I see by some of your notes about container issues. The containers, for example, are carrying frozen fish and when they come in their oversized containers, but the cargo on that container is not one of the cargos defined under divisible loads, is not eligible for an overweight permit for the Mass Highway. Because of the cramped quarters on Conley Terminal, they've moved all of the chassis and you have to come back, get your container, come back. It's a very time consuming effort but we understand that they need that area in that space of time. What that does is that these trailers are coming in over weight , they have to go to the Boston freight yard to make it a divisible load where they fall in the appropriate weight category. That is 1.3 miles. They have set up prep teams Boston PBA feel that this is their solution for all the funding requirements. They are citing drivers, trucking companies, for significant overweight and that sort of thing. The impact on this cannot be overstated. If we do not allow the containers to get on trucks, the port business will go away. It can cost them about over 40 containers a day. Now they're going to go to New Jersey, New York, they don't care what our problems are. All they want to know it is done when you have a freight company and can't move from that container that chassis out the door. We are going to be seeking a special permit from the Mass Highway for the 1.3 miles. Divisible load that are not gravel asphalt things that are currently defined as divisible loads.

It's interesting that Boston is becoming such a barrier of transportation of the region. I had the Maine and New Hampshire association call me screaming at me because their people can't get to the port. There's a significant routing issue and everyone is suffering from that. They are being fined anywhere from \$500 to \$1500 for a single violation. The companies are saying I'm not driving to Boston – the citation goes to the driver, not the trucking company, and if a driver gets two citations, he loses his Certification to drive heavy vehicles, he cannot work. I don't know if they understand it is very bad.

The host drivers are employed by mostly heating oil companies who are refusing to drive to the city of Boston. We were very fortunate last year in that winter wasn't a bad winter of cold weather, we will tell you that truck production and delivery in heating oil is off 25-50% solely only by the policies by the Mayor of city of Boston. What that does is when you have a crisis situation, we have new hours of service so the trucking companies because you have the go around of 128 and that driver hits his hours of service much more quickly where the average truck, 12,500 gallons in a tanker truck does 4 loads a day with essentially, 50,000 gallons delivery per day. We're down to 25,000-37,500 deliveries per day. Now if you have a winter crisis, I think the first person who dies in their apartment in Boston and is on the front page of the Herald will be the first time we get this bill. It shouldn't happen so fast, but unfortunately, it appears there's a certain time frame there of which we have no control. Going through points and method, it's time consuming, it's expensive, it takes years, but it's a remedy we have for pursuing that. We are also pursuing it through a national organization system to go to federal highway. Cambridge tried to instill other moving issues that were also outside of the scope of federal and state law, you cannot do that. The whole reason that federal and state law for truck routes is that you can't have a patchwork quilt approach for transportation. In one case, the city of Boston has taken Mass Ave off the truck route, the city of Cambridge has made Mass Ave the truck route, so they would get to the Cambridge line, they would have to go to the Newbury Street entrance to the turnpike, that's the turnpike entrance. They would get to the Cambridge line, there would be 500 yards, 3 blocks, to the Mass Pike entrance, and the Boston Police truck team would park there, would stop every traffic from being off the truck route. This abuse should not have to occur which is why we have federal and state routing laws. The Commissioner of Highways has been very kind in writing a letter about the violation of federal law, violation of state law, we still don't have a remedy.

Our remedy now is to go to the Federal Highway Administration and to ask the city of Boston to revise its truck prohibitions. So the issue really becomes all of this cost is ultimately passed through to consumers, and I know, Frank, you have expressed sensitivity about the issues and costs on transportation. When your good at getting heating oil, transportation costs going from \$2.24 cents a gallon to \$5.53, every single consumer in the state will ultimately pay a price for that. We have deep concerns over these other routing issues and in particular, we have a plug rule with the port, they can't get the containers out, we have routing problems for any hazardous materials, they can't use the tunnels, they have to go on surface roads, and they're trying to drive around route 128, and now, it's caused so much congestion on 128, the driver hits his hours of service limit, he has to go off the road, it's a 3-4 hour penalty if he doesn't. The dovetailing of federal requirements in these sorts of matters really is critical to the understanding about their works. With that being said, the new Federal Highway Reports that are out now on usage, trucks are found to contribute 5% of all miles traveled on Massachusetts roads and we're paying 28% for all fees collected.

This is the environment in which those sorts of things should be discussed. There are similar problems in other areas that we've been able to solve more easily. This has direct impact on your transportation planning, on receipt of goods, 97% of all goods in Mass are

delivered by truck. You don't want that, tough, no problem! We don't have to be in your way. So you can see that the moving issue is really a very broad one, one that is very troubling over this, municipal idea that we can do trucking, they have no authority from State or Federal to do that, but the end game on that is going to be consumer cost. Now that publication is getting those kinds of bids in, we'll see if they're interested.

Frank DeMasi - I have a question, it's more generic. Have you seen much of a shift of warehousing, in the core, causing more trucking coming into the area if we had a better way of distributing goods?

Anne - Warehousing, Frank, is primarily a problem with the local zoning board. The only way to really solve that is to give freight an overlay district, like you have port overlay district, you need a plate overlay district. One of my members, in particular, had gotten a permit to put up a truck, inter-modal truck on the site, somewhere in Boston, done, approved by town meeting, over, I'm going to say that was 9-11 years ago, one abutter has taken him to court, he had one report in every single instance, it cost the trucking company \$300,000 in legal fees, that abutter had no costs attached, the abutter has certain rights to object to that, and that facility that was permitted over 9 years ago is still not fixed. That is just a microcosm of the kind of problems we have in addressing the warehousing issue. Trucks don't want to be in the urban area, it's too congested, it's too expensive. If we could do warehousing in outlying areas, certainly that's a remedy for consideration, but the local zoning commission surrounding the site area of warehousing are virtually against trucking facilities.

Frank - We recognize that. We've been trying to support some safeguards, some kind of regional plan that says here are some ideal locations to help distribute the warehousing within eastern Massachusetts. The idea being that we're bringing in interstate trucks directly to deliveries, 53 footers instead of the smaller trucks. Could we find some support from trucking on that?

Anne - You can definitely find support for that, that's not a problem, but here's the problem that we face. The number one issue facing trucking right now is employment shortfalls. In some Midwestern states, they've just gone to triple trailers. Three trailers on one tractor. Can you imagine that thing driving by you on the Pike, it would scare you to death. But they have had to do that because of shortage of employees. Our roads in Massachusetts would never support that size vehicle. When you are out in Idaho, in the Plains, I don't know, but with triples, it would be a lot safer. Doubles, can't practically control tolls in Allston, you see more of that. You don't have the people to drive the vehicles so your notion of lets downsize to smaller trucks increases the number of travel trips so much so now the employment crisis kicks in. So there is a lot of different aspects of this sort coming together to create what is going to be pretty significant transportation issues.

Frank D - Thank you for your update – we were able to share with you some of our comments with our meeting with Lt. Gov. Murray. We would be happy to receive any

comments. I want to with whatever we can fit in with this. My concern is where trucking issues – tell them to help us.

Ann Lynch -To whom or what is the Mayor responding with the truck ban, neighborhood objection or what?

It is my understanding that it is solely the Mayor objection of the people who come to the Mayor directly.

We can pull all the trucks out of Boston, but I'll tell you the Mass Restaurant Association is going to be very unhappy about that.

Well, fishing in a barrel raises revenue. We don't want to think that but it sounds like that.

Why is there such a shortage of truck drivers?

Anne - Are your kids going to be truck drivers, that's your answer! Nobody wants to go into the business. If they are seeing that as an employment opportunity, so the dwindling available numbers of employees –

Even if they have smaller local trucks, those people don't have to go very far if they are home at night and they still have trouble finding people? It's a huge shortfall.

Unless they're in a Union. A lot of companies, I would say, probably close to 50% of our members are Teamsters, something.

The overall shortfall is going to continue – there is a very aggressive recruitment program going on for people getting out of the military to try to recruit them directly to transportation. I know the national ATA has spent a fortune trying to put a recruitment program together recruiting older people that are retiring to drive as couples that has been somewhat successful, but your recruiting someone as old at 55-60, and it means a crisis for the younger, new entrant employee, and you have a federal background check you have to pass now, and if you have anything in your background of a personal nature, you know, when you were 18 years old, you can't get a CDL. There are a lot of different factors coming together that has really created an employment crisis. It's very difficult.

Thank you very much, Frank. I hope that enlightened people.

Frank D - If you have something in writing on the issue that you brought up on the freight/truck routes, could you send it to me? I'll incorporate some of that into our discussions.

I will tell you that the Lt. Governor is really aware of the privatization issues, some of the main issues.

This is the biggest wet blanket in the history of mankind. We were asked to weigh in on the New Bedford port situation and I'd rather go to New Bedford than go here, 100,000 to 1. The problem is the revenue and the profitability for trucking is impossible to say is so tight that once they get some other area developers, I caution you, I would look to some private partners first before you get too far because it's not in terms of profitability.

Frank D - What resonates on that argument is that x amount of models do not support some of these mitigation issues that we're bringing up like the freight to rail because of the facilities that would be required, short sea shipping doesn't have the economic model that supports it from the private point of view, but then we need public policy that says maybe we should subsidize it because the benefit is offloading the I-95 corridor which is a disaster. Unless we get public policy that says there's a public benefit to change the economic model through subsidy, or some alternative to offset cost, we need to take that route and make people aware – you have public health care, but guess what, the transportation system is in need of some public support of private public partnerships to subsidize freight transportation infrastructure.

Without public policy and funding, you end up getting nothing.

I think that's where the focus has to go now. We all know what the benefits would be to offload to short sea shipping. But the economic models don't support it. Same with double stack in Massachusetts. The private side, economics don't support investment on their part but we need public policy and support that says is it worth it for the public to subsidize that. Everybody would benefit as a whole with lower transportation costs. So these are the things that freight does invoke. It impacts the cost of everything we purchase.

The supply chain is taking much longer. It drives inventory and it drives work in process if you're in industry. You can't rely on outside the loop on subcontracted items – you've got to do it all in plant. That drives cost tremendously.

Anne - In Massachusetts there are no major trucking companies left. The focus on bottled water and the energy costs for shipping it as well as the bottles themselves, that gives you the beginning of an understanding and the buy local food stuff where their talking about the transportation costs from California, Costa Rico, wherever, seems impractical for everybody to ship by Massachusetts grown food, but the point is people are beginning to talk, because of the cost of fuel, they're talking about transportation costs and distance.

The transportation finance committee commission is about to release the findings on different ways to be creative in response to support this. Because all you have to do is latch on to those things and say the same argument applies to everything. When the transportation finance committee comes out, I think Lt. Gov. Murray is well aware of this that the Administration will be shocked. Commercial trend will scan in favor of the fuel tax as long as it's dedicated to highways and bridges. We can't pay for things that are low priority. But we are really about what our needs are. I said to Tim Murray, Tim, in

the first time of the history of politics, that the commercial transportation industry is in favor of fuel tax increase and will stand right beside it as long you make it absolutely and without question dedicated. So we're not selfish but we'll be paying.

Bill Kuttner - We remember the gas tax in the 90's which was used to balance the budget, what would you think of increasing gas taxes for "transportation purposes".

Anne - We would support that - Highway and bridges, roads and bridges.

The lawmakers have to do this whether transportation, other than roadways and bridges it should be used for schools passing the budget or bailing out, say, Spaulding over here.

It has to be dedicated money and that's what the highway trust fund that the Feds have was set up as.

You're in a sensitive area, Bill, because the trucking industry for years has said we pay taxes, we pay tolls and that money doesn't support the roads we're supposed to be paying for. Historically they have to say we want it for roads and bridges. They don't like it for transit projects or anything else either.

Bridges and Railroad tracks.

So we have a little bit more liberal viewpoint but we understand where you're coming from.

If we don't service the infrastructure, Minneapolis is sort of a stubborn example of what happens but that's occurring across the country, this is a national crisis.

If we don't look at freight as a multi-modal issue, we lose some balance in those possible revenues. So basically, the committee is supporting multi-modal freight for use of those taxes, but it should go for infrastructure.

It's just got to be made a priority.

We have a report that Marilyn can give us on this U turn which may interest you too. Here we have this U turn to get on Mass Pike, but cannot be used because of a political thing we don't want to change the toll. The public might not like that. So in the meantime, this infrastructure sits idle.

You gave a number and I didn't write it down. You were saying tax wise or whatever.

The most federal highway release numbers, they're like 2 years behind.

In MA we comprise 5% of vehicle miles travel per hour for MA for trucks and we pay 28% of the fees collected of all. It's kind of interesting. There's toll, there's excise, there's use tax, there's a variety of fees. When you look at that as a total picture, trucking

pays 28% of all fees generated by transportation and we do 5% of the vehicle. If you get the railroad guys going, we could drop it to 4 ½.

Thank you.

Who needs handouts?

I think we've covered most of our agenda items. What's really exciting to us is this meeting coming up with Lt. Governor Murray. Is there any comment you folks would have either now or give it to us in writing that maybe you'd like us to consider when we meet with the Lt. Governor. We'd appreciate that.

One of the other things I have that will probably be a klunker with some of you folks, because I personally testified in support of New England Transrail LLC which has some real big problems with environmental issues. Municipal Waste and demolition debris. What I have in this package is a presentation on Freight Village.

Does anyone have any comments or would like to add anything to our deliberations today? We're wide open here and we have a few minutes. No takers?

I'll close the formal part of the meeting but I'm going to be here. We're going to have the RTAC is at 3:00 and we're having a talk on the South Coast Rail by Kristina Eagan. One of the issues, we've asked Kristina to come to the freight committee meeting because we're very concerned about what happens to the freight rail and freight on those lines if and when MBTA purchases them and we'd like to entertain this freight village concept because they're talking about transit-oriented development along roads of those rail lines and we'd like them to concurrently consider freight villages and freight distribution in the same way so that not only can we conserve existing freight but build on it and improve those rail lines for both. So thanks for coming out. I don't know if we've decided on a day or time or place so why don't we email each other.

I'm going to try to make that meeting on Friday, 7:30 AM.

Is anyone planning on going to Suffolk? There's a meeting on transportation strategies.

I plan to attend, maybe we can compare notes at that time, but I'm not sure if Walter can make it. Unless there are any comments, I'm going to adjourn our meeting.