

Improving the Quality of Life by Enhancing Mobility

**University Transportation Center for Mobility** 

DOT Grant No. DTRT06-G-0044

# The 2011 Mileage-Based User Fee Symposium

### Final Report

### Ginger Goodin, Nicholas Wood, and Richard T. Baker

#### **Performing Organization**

University Transportation Center for Mobility™ Texas Transportation Institute The Texas A&M University System College Station, TX

#### Sponsoring Agency

Department of Transportation Research and Innovative Technology Administration Washington, DC



UTCM Project #11-00-64 September 2011

			cal Report Documentation Page
1. Project No. UTCM 11-00-64	2. Government Accession N		3. Recipient's Catalog No.
4. Title and Subtitle The 2011 Mileage-Based User	Fee Symposium		5. Report Date September 2011
			6. Performing Organization Code Texas Transportation Institute
7. Author(s)			Registrate     Report No.
Ginger Goodin, Nicholas Wood	•	er	UTCM 11-00-64
Performing Organization Name and Add     University Transportation		тм	10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)
Texas Transportation In	nstitute		11. Contract or Grant No.
The Texas A&M Univer	sity System		
3135 TAMU			DTRT06-G-0044
College Station, TX 778	343-3135		
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Addres	SS		13. Type of Report and Period Covered
Department of Transpo			Final Report
Research and Innovative 400 7 <sup>th</sup> Street, SW	ve Technology Admin	istration	September 2010–August 2011
Washington, DC 2059	0		14. Sponsoring Agency Code
15. Supplementary Notes Supported by a grant fr Transportation Centers Progra 16. Abstract		nt of Transport	ation, University
The fuel tax is rapidly losing its regulations and the escalating utilize more fuel-efficient vehic nation's roadway network. Give the fuel tax, the likely successed sponsored the third annual two together professionals in the firon current applications and extax.	price of fossil fuels hat les, which will drive do en the challenges assor is a road user fee la b-day Symposium on eld of mileage-based	ave created a some fuel tax revectors and tax revectors argely based or Mileage-Based fees for the pure	trong incentive to develop and venues relative to use of the e declining sustainability of a actual usage. This project User Fees that brought rose of sharing information
17. Key Word		18. Distribution Stat	ement
Mileage-Based User Fees, Dis Road User Fees, Fuel Taxes, Charges, Fossil Fuels, Fuel Ef Revenues, Fees	Mileage, User		ublic distribution
19. Security Classif. (of this report)  Unclassified	20. Security Classif. (o Unclassi		21. No. of Pages   22. Price   22   n/a

#### The 2011 Mileage-Based User Fee Symposium

by

#### **Ginger Goodin**

Division Head

Texas Transportation Institute

#### **Nicholas Wood**

Assistant Transportation Researcher
Texas Transportation Institute

#### Richard T. Baker

Associate Transportation Researcher
Texas Transportation Institute

Final Report

Project # 11-00-64

The University Transportation Center for Mobility™

Project Title: Mileage-Based User Fee Symposium

September 2011

#### **DISCLAIMER**

The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors, who are responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the information presented herein. This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the Department of Transportation, University Transportation Centers Program in the interest of information exchange. The U.S. Government assumes no liability for the contents or use thereof.

#### **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

Support for this research was provided by a grant from the U.S. Department of Transportation, University Transportation Centers Program to the University Transportation Center for Mobility™ (DTRT06-G-0044).

The authors would like to acknowledge the contributions of the 2011 Mileage-Based User Fee Symposium Committee. Without their help, the symposium could not have been the informative and productive event that it was.

Lee Munnich

**Humphrey School of Public Affairs** 

University of Minnesota

Co-Chair

Kenneth Buckeye

Minnesota Department of Transportation

James Whitty

Oregon Department of Transportation

Katherine Turnbull

Texas Transportation Institute Texas A&M University System

Flo Raitano

Move Colorado

Alauddin Khan

**Nevada Department of Transportation** 

Mark Muriello

Port Authority of New York and New Jersey

John Sabala

**Texas Department of Transportation** 

Paul Hanley

University of Iowa

Myron Swisher

Science Applications International Corporation

Paul Sorenson RAND Corporation

**Scott Rawlins** 

Nevada Department of Transportation

Ferrol Robinson

**Humphrey School of Public Affairs** 

University of Minnesota

George Schoener I-95 Corridor Coalition

Gina Bass

**Center for Transportation Studies** 

University of Minnesota

**David Reeves** 

Colorado Department of Transportation

Ed Regan

Wilbur Smith Associates

#### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	Page
Executive Summary	5
Background	7
Structure	7
Findings	8
Conclusions and Recommendations	9
References	10
Appendix A. Participant List	11
Appendix B. Symposium Program	15
Appendix C. Implementation Questions	21



#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The motor vehicle fuel tax is rapidly losing the ability to financially support the needs of the surface transportation system. New fuel economy standards have recently been proposed that will raise the corporate average for passenger vehicles to 54.5 mpg in 2025. Nonetheless, the demand for travel will be sustained in light of collecting less revenue per mile, because fuel efficiency will be increased under this scenario. A number of national commissions, the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission and the National Surface Transportation Infrastructure Commission, have recognized the impending revenue shortfall and have made possible suggestions toward replacing the fuel tax as the primary means of financial support. One common suggestion was to implement a mileage-based user fee that would assess a charge on all the users of the transportation system. However, the path to implementation is unknown due to hardened political opposition and a cynical public that is skeptical toward any increase or change in taxes.

The 2011 Symposium on Mileage-Based User Fees was held in Breckenridge, Colorado, on June 12–13 as an effort to bring together public agencies, academics, consultants, and transportation advocacy groups to discuss potential implementation pathways for mileage-based fees, if they were determined to be the appropriate revenue support mechanism. Participants were presented with 13 questions at the beginning of the symposium that addressed key issues surrounding the implementation of mileage fees, and through a voting process that cumulated after seven panel sessions, were collectively able to select the three most critical questions that were talked about during the interactive discussion. The three selected questions from the symposium were:

- What is the most likely implementation pathway?
- How should research, development, and implementation activities at the state level be coordinated?
- What is the most effective way to increase public acceptance, particularly in the face of lack of public trust in government and public ownership in the problem?

Public acceptance was the topic that generated the most interest during the symposium. An underlying fact is that government institutions, in general, are not trusted by the public. A feeling of uneasiness and distrust among users was cited during the panel session as being the main barrier to implementation. One panelist illustrated the difference between the public and agency administrations as being bipolar, with the professionals seeing a complex, agency with little financial support and a public who believes that all of the revenues are frivolously wasted away. An approach that accepts voluntary adoption by the users of the system was suggested as a potential implementation pathway that could generally be accepted by the public.

#### **BACKGROUND**

Government regulations and market choices are increasing the average fuel efficiencies for passenger vehicles. With the recent announcement by the Obama administration that the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFÉ) standards will increase from 35.5 mpg for model years 2012–2016 to 54.5 mpg in 2025, the possibility that fuel taxes can financially support the transportation system on a long-term basis is highly suspect (1). The funding that supports the Highway Trust Fund will likely decrease because, over time, drivers will pay less in fuel taxes to travel roughly the same distances. This issue is compounded because the public and their representatives in Congress are hostile to any increases in taxes, even though the Federal fuel tax has remained static at 18.4 cents per gallon since 1993.

To address these concerns, the Transportation Research Board formed a committee in 2006 to consider an evaluation of technical options for alternatives to replace the fuel tax with a user-fee based system (2). The National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission made a similar recommendation in their 2008 final report (3). That report recommended that the next transportation reauthorization act require major national studies to develop strategies and mechanisms for transitioning to a usage-based revenue collection system. The National Surface Transportation Infrastructure Commission, in its final report, found that a user-based fee derived from the number of miles driven was the most viable long-term mechanism for supporting transportation needs (4).

In March 2011, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) released a report that stated that mileage-based user fees (MBUF) are a practical option for raising new revenues to offset the funding gap for highway maintenance. The report tested the hypothesis that the costs of implementing a mileage fee with physical toll barriers would outweigh any potential benefits, but found that the practicality of such a system increased with the use of electronic tolling. The CBO did not offer any specific recommendations in the report, but did suggest that miles driven is a more significant factor of respective usage as opposed to the amount of fuel used (5).

The Mileage-Based User Fee Symposia were created to bring experts from the national and international communities together to further the dialogue on the future of mileage-based user fees.

#### **STRUCTURE**

Held in Breckenridge, Colorado, on June 13–14, the 2011 Mileage-Based User Fee Symposium is the third in a series of symposia conducted by the Texas Transportation Institute and the Hubert H. Humphrey School of Public Affairs. Additional support was provided by the University Transportation Center for Mobility of the Texas A&M University System and the Transportation Research Board. Local support came from MOVE Colorado. The overall vision of the conference was to discuss mileage-based fees as a possible revenue generation source to finance the transportation system, and to engage participants in a facilitated discussion on potential implementation pathways (6).

The symposium was attended by approximately 115 participants, representing over 60 organizations. Attendees came from 20 states, the District of Columbia, and Canada. The organizations they represented included all levels of government, academic institutions, trade associations, advocacy groups, and private businesses. See Appendix A for a complete participant list. Two full days of panel

sessions and discussion featured speakers presenting on implementation pathways, demonstration of project public and political acceptance, user perspectives, the roles of the public and private sectors, and perspectives from taxation and revenue agencies. Presentations from the symposium can be found on the University Transportation Center for Mobility website (7). See Appendix B for the complete symposium program.

At the beginning of the symposium, conference attendees were presented with a list of 13 questions addressing various issues confronting an implementation of a mileage-based user fee (Appendix C). During the seven panel sessions, speakers attempted to address some of these questions. Throughout the conference, a large poster board was used as an interactive tool to pare down the original questions to those that the participants thought were the three most pertinent. The poster listed all 13 questions, and each participant was given five adhesive dots to use as votes, which they then placed near the questions they thought most important. Before the interactive discussion held near the end of the conference, the votes were tallied and the three questions with the highest accumulated scores were presented as the topics for the discussion.

When voting was complete, two of the questions with the most interest were combined into one because both dealt with the theme of public acceptance. The three resulting questions that were presented in the discussion were:

- 1) What is the likely implementation pathway?
- 2) How should research, development, and implementation activities at the state level be coordinated?
- 3) What is the most effective way to increase public acceptance, particularly in the face of lack of public trust in government and public ownership in the problem?

The basic structure of the interactive discussion consisted of an inner circle of chairs where symposium participants would sit and discuss the questions presented. Individuals were given roughly one minute per response and only those who sat inside the circle could speak. The overall time limit to discuss each question was set at 20 minutes. Symposium participants also rotated in and out of the circle in a process to encourage involvement from all the attendees.

#### **FINDINGS**

During the symposium, a broad cross-section of stakeholders offered their views. Compared to the two previous symposia, this event was more finely tuned to the issues confronting the implementation of a mileage-based user fee. The 13 questions presented at the beginning of the symposium and the associated interactive discussion likely contributed to this focus.

There are three frameworks for analysis for approaching MBUF implementation — Federal, State, and Market. The overall consensus from the symposium was that a State-led initiative was the most practical approach due primarily to the current lack of action by the federal government on the issue thus far. A national framework would be beneficial in giving the states guidance in adopting mileage-based user fee systems, as users of transportation systems do not want to have to account for multiple charging formats. Interoperability was stressed as a key component due to issues caused by incompatible electronic tolling technology and back office interfaces.

Some participants indicated that sole public agency administration of mileage fee systems is unlikely without a private sector contribution. A perspective that was offered at the symposium defined the preferred roles of both the public and private sectors. The public sector would provide seed money to support the development of sustainable programs and auditing practices that can ensure interoperability, provide equity, and grant access. The private sector would create thousands of new value-added services, prioritize customer service, and maximize profitability.

Many participants at the symposium stressed that coordination among the various states was critical to the implementation of mileage-based fees as a preventative measure to avoid duplication of research activities. A few participants suggested that research would still overlap between different states as state policymakers and elected officials tend to want issues examined from the perspective of their relative constituencies. A pooled fun study established by interested state agencies was suggested as one option to coordinate research on topic areas that may not be explicitly required to be done in-state by political stakeholders.

The major barrier to MBUF implementation identified by attendees was the pathway toward gaining public acceptance. Many underlying issues complicate the task of increasing public acceptance including a general mistrust of government, skepticism about the proposals under consideration, and general ignorance about the transportation system and how it is financially supported. Any change in collecting taxes is viewed as an increase, and a significant share of the public opposes any increase in taxes. Conducting field tests was recommended as one means of orienting user concerns toward the achievement of positive public perception.

A pathway for voluntary adoption was identified as the preferred alternative to mandatory adoption. Many participants felt that acceptance of a mandated system was not realistic because a group of non-compliant users will likely always exist. Any new MBUF system should illustrate the benefits of the new program to the user, as well as show how it would credibly address the problem. In terms of generating support for MBUF implementation, the concepts of equity and fairness may be more important to the public in comparison to emphasizing the gap in financial support.

Value-added services were mentioned by a few participants as having the potential for increasing public acceptance. It was suggested that for MBUF to be successfully implemented, any new program should provide tangible value at the level where pay-for-use can produce clear and direct benefits.

The trucking industry is not entirely convinced of the need to implement mileage-based user fees, at least not in the short- and medium-term. Areas of concern include cost effectiveness, enforcement, and geographic equity.

#### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The themes of implementation pathways, state-level coordination, and public acceptance were the core topics of this conference. Public perception was the most discussed theme, specifically the distrust and skepticism toward government administering the system. Because all user groups are not supportive of a change in the way taxes are collected, voluntary adoption of MBUF was mentioned as the most practical implementation approach.

Both coordination of research and testing, and the creation of an implementation pathway were identified as being most practical at the state-level. Coordination of research and testing in the form of a pooled-fund was mentioned as a possible method to reduce redundancy in research projects. The Federal government was not seen as a viable starting point to progress mileage-based user fees due to greater political resistance. It was felt, however, that a national framework may be useful in standardizing practices and coordinating a vision.

#### **REFERENCES**

- 1. President Obama Announces New Fuel Economy Standards. *The White House Blog*. <a href="http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2011/07/29/president-obama-announces-new-fuel-economy-standards">http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2011/07/29/president-obama-announces-new-fuel-economy-standards</a>. July 29, 2011.
- Committee for the Study of the Long Term Viability of Fuel Taxes for Transportation Finance.
   *The Fuel Tax and Alternatives for Transportation Funding: Special Report 285*.
   <a href="http://onlinepubs.trb.org/Onlinepubs/sr/sr285.pdf">http://onlinepubs.trb.org/Onlinepubs/sr/sr285.pdf</a>. Transportation Research Board,
   Washington, DC, 2006.
- National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission. Transportation for Tomorrow. Final Report. <a href="http://transportationfortomorrow.com/final\_report/index.htm">http://transportationfortomorrow.com/final\_report/index.htm</a>. January 2008.
- National Surface Transportation Infrastructure Financing Commission. Paying Our Way: A New Framework for Transportation Finance. <a href="http://financecommission.dot.gov/Documents/NSTIF">http://financecommission.dot.gov/Documents/NSTIF</a> Commission Final Report Mar09FNL.pdf February 2009.
- Alternative Approaches to Funding Highways. Publication No. 4090. <a href="http://www.ibtta.org/files/PDFs/Alternative%20Highway%20Funding%20CBO.pdf">http://www.ibtta.org/files/PDFs/Alternative%20Highway%20Funding%20CBO.pdf</a>. Congressional Budget Office, March 2011.
- Wood, N. Conference Summary of the 2011 Symposium on Mileage-Based User Fees. University Transportation Center for Mobility. <a href="http://utcm.tamu.edu/mbuf/2011/summary/documents/2011\_MBUF\_Symposium\_Summary.pudf">http://utcm.tamu.edu/mbuf/2011/summary/documents/2011\_MBUF\_Symposium\_Summary.pudf</a>. College Station, TX, August 2011.
- Webpage, "2011 Symposium on Mileage-Based User Fees: Agenda and Slide Presentations."
   University Transportation Center for Mobility website,
   <a href="http://utcm.tamu.edu/mbuf/2011/program.stm">http://utcm.tamu.edu/mbuf/2011/program.stm</a>. Texas Transportation Institute. College Station, TX, August 2011.

#### APPENDIX A. PARTICIPANT LIST

Doug Aden Barbara Catlin TransCore

Colorado Department of Transportation

Gina Baas Kevin Condon Verdeva LLC

University of Minnesota Center for

Transportation Studies Michael Connors
Connecticut DOT

Richard Baker

Texas Transportation Institute Kevin Dawkins

Colorado Department of Revenue

**Jud Barlow** 

Kiewit Infrastructure Group Peter Deem Holcim (U.S.) Inc.

Richard Barone

Regional Plan Association John Doan SRF Consulting

Daniel Baxter

CH2M Hill Brad Doyle

Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.

**Garrett Bernard** 

Interstate Structures Casey Dusza

Texas Transportation Institute

Allen Best

Planning Magazine Bill Elfenbein

Terri Binder David Evancoe

Club 20 Road Commission for Oakland County, Michigan

Dave Brinker Nick Farber
Civil Service Employees Insurance Company NCSL, Denver

Allan Brown Laurie Freedle

Atkins Colorado Department of Transportation

Sara Brown Jon Fricker

Stifel Nicolaus Purdue University

Kenneth Buckeye Tim Gagen

Minnesota Department of Transportation Colorado Department of Transportation, High

Performance Transportation Enterprise

Mark Burris

Texas Transportation Institute James Gates

Ohio Department of Transportation

Martin Glowik

Accenture

Ginger Goodin

**Texas Transportation Institute** 

Kari Grant

Colorado Department of Transportation, High

Performance Enterprise

Allen Greenberg

Federal Highway Administration

Art Griffith

Douglas County, Colorado

Bern Grush

Bern Grush Associates

John Habermann

Indiana LTAP

Paul Hanley

University of Iowa

Randy Harrison

**MOVE Colorado** 

JayEtta Hecker

**Bipartisan Policy Center** 

Todd Hollenbeck

Mesa County, Colorado

James Hovland

Krause & Hovland Chartered

Dave Huber

**GMAC** Insurance

Jill Ingrasia

AAA

Cory Johnson

Minnesota Department of Transportation

Pushkin Kachroo

University of Nevada - Las Vegas

Amy Kennedy

**HDR** Engineering

Harris Kenny

**Reason Foundation** 

Will Kerns

Jefferson County, Colorado

Alauddin Khan

**Nevada Department of Transportation** 

Joe Kiely

Ports-to-Plains Alliance

Fred Koch

Douglas County, Colorado

Sandi Kohrs

Colorado Department of Transportation

Dan Kraft

Allstate Insurance Company

Jon Kuhl

University of Iowa

Naveen Lamba

IBM

Adeel Lari

**Humphrey School of Public Affairs** 

University of Minnesota

Bernard Lieder

University of Minnesota

Ken Lloyd

Regional Air Quality Council

Mark McCabe

CDM, Inc.

**Dennis McCloskey** 

**Denver Regional Council of Governments** 

Mark Mehalko

Gallegos & Associates

Sheryl Miller

SAIC

Tony Milo

Colorado Contractors Association, Inc.

Adrian Moore

**Reason Foundation** 

**Derek Morse** CH2MHill

Richard Mudge **Delcan Corporation** 

Lee Munnich

University of Minnesota

Mark Muriello

The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey

Melissa Nelson Osse

Colorado Department of Transportation

Marthand Nookala

**Public Works Administration** 

Kevin O'Malley

Clear Creek County, Colorado

John Opiola

D'Artagnan Consulting

Benjamin Orr

The Brookings institution

Carla Perez

RTD

**Ed Peterson** 

**Denver Regional Council of Governments** 

Bennett Pierce

Battelle

**Chris Primus** 

Jacobs

Richard Prisinzano

U. S. Department of Treasury

Gene Putman

City of Thornton, Colorado

Mark Radtke

Colorado Municipal League

Florine Raitano **MOVE Colorado** 

David Reeves

Colorado Department of Transportation

**Edward Regan** 

Wilbur Smith Associates

Sharon Richardson

**Denver Regional Council of Governments** 

Charlotte Robinson

Colorado Department of Transportation, High

Performance Transportation Enterprise

Ferrol Robinson

University of Minnesota

Darrin Roth

**American Trucking Association** 

Gabriel Roth

Independent Institute

John Rowland

**IBM** 

Heidi Rudh

Wilbur Smith Associates

John Sabala

Texas Department of Transportation

Robert Sakaguchi

Jacobs

Victor Saltao

Brisa North America, Inc.

**Bruce Schaller** 

New York City Department of Transportation

Dick Schnacke

TransCore

**Ken Simms** 

Mesa County, Colorado

Paul Sorensen

**RAND Corporation** 

Skip Spensley

**Spensley and Associates** 

Karen Stuart

**Collins Engineering** 

John Swanson

Metropolitan Washington Council of

Governments

Myron Swisher

SAIC

Barbara Taylor

State Farm

Mark Taylor

State Farm

David Ungemah

Parsons Brinckerhoff

John P. Van Echo

**AECOM** 

Thom Vyneman

Infinity Property & Casualty Corporation

Karen White

U.S. Department of Transportation

James Whitty

Oregon Department of Transportation

Nick Wood

**Texas Transportation Institute** 

Jeffrey Zupan

**Regional Plan Association** 

#### APPENDIX B. SYMPOSIUM PROGRAM

## OO2017 SYMPOSIUM ON MILEAGE-BASED USER FEES JUNE 13-14 - BRECKENRIDGE, COLORADO **HOSTED BY** University Transportation Center for Mobility Texas Transportation Institute, The Texas A&M University System Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota Center for Transportation Studies, University of Minnesota MOVE Colorado Transportation Research Board

#### SYMPOSIUM ON MILEAGE-BASED USER FEES

his symposium will bring together professionals in the field of road user fees to share information and advance the discussion of usage-based fee systems. Representatives from past, current and upcoming pilot studies and implementations will present lessons learned and key study topics from their projects. Panel discussions will address specific topics such as legislative and policy issues, public acceptance challenges, potential technology applications, and institutional issues. The symposium will incorporate interactive discussion sessions on logical next steps as well as the associated challenges and opportunities.

#### SYMPOSIUM PLANNING COMMITTEE

- Ginger Goodin, Co-chair, Texas Transportation Institute
- Lee Munnich, Co-chair, Humphrey School of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota
- Gina Baas, Center for Transportation Studies, University of Minnesota
- Richard Trey Baker, Texas Transportation Institute
- Kenneth Buckeye, Minnesota Department of Transportation
- Paul Hanley, University of Iowa
- Alauddin Khan, Nevada Department of Transportation
- Mark Muriello, Port Authority of New York and New Jersey
- Flo Raitano, MOVE Colorado
- Scott Rawlins, Nevada Department of Transportation
- David Reeves, Colorado Department of Transportation
- Ed Regan, Wilbur Smith Associates
- Ferrol Robinson, Humphrey School of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota
- John Sabala, Texas Department of Transportation
- George Schoener, I-95 Corridor Coalition
- Paul Sorenson, RAND Corporation
- Myron Swisher, Science Applications International Corporation
- Katherine Turnbull, Texas Transportation Institute
- James Whitty, Oregon Department of Transportation

DAY 1	Monday, June 13, 2011		
7:00 a.m. — 5:00 p.m.	Registration Outside Spruce Room		
7:15 a.m. — 8:15 a.m.	Continental Breakfast Sprvæ Room		
8:15 a.m. — 9:00 a.m.	Symposium Opening and Welcome Spruce Room		
	Ginger Goodin, Texas Transportation Institute, and Lee Munnich, Humphrey School of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota		
9:00 a.m. — 10:15 a.m.	SESSION 1: IMPLEMENTATION PATHWAYS Spruce Room		
	Moderator: Paul Sorensen, RAND Corporation		
	<ul> <li>Conceptual Frameworks for System Trials</li></ul>		
	<ul> <li>Oregon Electric Vehicle Implementation         James Whitty, Oregon Department of Transportation     </li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>New York State Truck Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Fee Pilot Dick Mudge, Delcan Corporation</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Voluntary Adoption Approach         Bruce Schaller, New York City Department of Transportation     </li> </ul>		
10:15 a.m. — 10:45 a.m.	Break		
10:45 a.m. — 12:00 p.m.	SESSION 2: PUBLIC AND POLITICAL ACCEPTANCE Spruce Room		
	Moderator: Lee Munnids, Humphrey School of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota		
	<ul> <li>Congressional Perspectives         Alex Hergott, U.S. Senator Inhofe's Office     </li> </ul>		
	Emerging Policy Issues     JayBta Hecker, Bipartisan Policy Center		

• State Legislative Perspectives

• Public Opinion and Policy Research

 U.S. Department of Transportation Technology Scan Karen White, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Policy

Nick Farber, National Conference of State Legislatures

Paul Hanley, Public Policy Center, University of Iowa

DAY 1	Monday, June 13, 2011		
12:00 p.m. — 1:30 p.m.	LUNCH: Keynote Address Bristlecone Room		
	Mark Mehalko, LS Gallegos and Associates and President of MOVE Colorado		
1:30 p.m. — 2:45 p.m.	SESSION 3: POLICY ISSUES Spruce Room		
	Moderator: Ken Buckeye, Minnesota Department of Transportation		
	Mileage Fees as Revenue Replacement vs. Supplement/New Revenue Source Adrian Moore, Research Foundation		
	<ul> <li>Multi-jurisdictional Charging — I-95 Corridor Coalition Mark Muriello, Port Authority of New York and New Jersey</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Geographic and Income Equity         Mark Burris, Texas A&amp;M University</li> </ul>		
	Rural Issues     Terri Binder, Club 20		
2:45 p.m. — 3:15 p.m.	Break		
3:15 p.m. — 5:00 p.m.	SESSION 4: STATES OF THE PRACTICE: DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS Spruce Room		
	Moderator: Alauddin Kahn, Nevada Department of Transportation		
	Minnesota     Ben Fierce, Battelle Institute (Minnesota Department of Transportation Technology Demonstration)     Nevada		

Bristlecone Room

Texas

Alauddin Kahn, Nevada Department of Transportation

John Sabala, Texas Department of Transportation

DAY 2	Tuesday, June 14, 2011		
7:30 a.m. — 4:00 p.m.	Registration Outside Spruce Room		
7:30 a.m. — 8:30 a.m.	Continental Breakfast Spruæ Room		
8:30 a.m. — 9:45 a.m.	SESSION 5: USER PERSPECTIVES Spruæ Room		
	Moderator: Ferrol Robinson, Humphrey School of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota		
	Panel: Ken Buckeye, Minnesota Department of Transportation		
	Darrin Roth, American Trucking Association		
	Jill Ingrassia, American Automobile Association		
	Dave Huber, GMAC Insurance		
9:45 a.m. — 10:15 a.m.	Break		
10:15 a.m. — 11:30 a.m.	SESSION 6: ROLES OF THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR Spruce Room		
	Moderator: Ed Regan, Wilbur Smith Associates		
	Panel: Jack Opiola, D'Artagnan Consulting LLP		

Bern Grush, Bern Grush Associates

#### Tuesday, June 14, 2011

11:30 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

LUNCH: Updates on National Initiatives Related to Mileage-Based User Fees (MBUF)

Bristlecone Room

Moderator: Lee Munnich, Humphrey School of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota

Panel:

**MBUF Alliance** 

Jack Basso, American Association of State Highway

and Transportation Officials

National Transportation Policy Project

JayBta Hecker, Bipartisan Policy Center

Transportation Research Board VMT Revenues Subcommittee

Ed Regan, Wilbur Smith Associates

State Peer Group

John Sabala, Texas Department of Transportation

1:00 p.m. - 2:15 p.m.

SESSION 7: PERSPECTIVES FROM TAXATION AND REVENUE AGENCIES

Spruce Room

Moderator: Trey Baker, Texas Transportation Institute

Panel:

Rich Prisinzano, U.S. Department of Treasury

Mark Muriello, Port Authority of New York and New Jersey

2:15 p.m. — 2:45 p.m. Break

2:45 p.m. - 4:00 p.m. SESSION 8: INTERACTIVE DISCUSSION

Spruce Room

Moderators: Katherine Turnbull and Ginger Goodin,

Texas Transportation Institute

4:00 p.m. Adjourn

#### APPENDIX C. IMPLEMENTATION QUESTIONS

## OO2017 SYMPOSIUM ON MILEAGE-BASED USER FEES

	SAMBORIAM ON MILEVRE-BYRED AREA LEER
	JUNE 13-14 - BRECKENRIDGE, COLORADO
lf	MBUF is the right solution forward
1.	What is the most likely implementation pathway? (National framework, state led, voluntary opt-in, etc.)
2.	Is it possible to develop a dual infrastructure system to implement a limited, voluntary opt-in MBUF system?
3.	Given the amount of research and testing that has occurred over the past decade, what is the next logical step? Are we at the point of where only large-scale implementation or trails will answer the crucial questions that remain?
4.	What is the most effective way to increase public acceptance?
5.	How can development be advanced in the face of the lack of public trust in government and public ownership in the problem?
6.	How can national, state, and local political leadership be developed?

7. What will be red	uired to produce a coherent vision?
8. Where will fund	ing come for research, testing, and implementation?
9. What are the mo implementing M	ost compelling reasons to pursue? What is the problem(s) being addressed by IBUF?
10. How should res	earch, development and implementation activities at the state-level be coordinated?
11. Who has a stak	e in the development and how should stakeholders be engaged?
12. Who should lea	d the development of privacy standards?
13. Who should lea	d interoperability standards, and how?



University Transportation Center for Mobility™

Texas Transportation Institute

The Texas A&M University System

College Station, TX 77843-3135

Tel: 979.845.2538 Fax: 979.845.9761 utcm.tamu.edu

