

MTSNAC Intermodal Committee Meeting  
April 10-11, 2008  
Office of the World Shipping Council  
1156 15<sup>th</sup> St. NW  
Suite 300  
Washington, D.C.

MEETING SUMMARY

Working Group

Anne Kappel (WSC) – Chair  
Jean Godwin (AAPA)  
Bill Kopicki (AAM)  
Paul Bea (Coastwise Coalition)  
Ray Bucheger (AgTC)  
Matt Paxton (SCA)  
John Gray (AAR)  
Curtis Whalen (ATA)  
Leo Penne (AASHTO)  
Richard Lolich (MARAD)

By phone (on 4/11/08) –  
Norman Fassler-Katz (CALMITSAC)  
Susan Lee (MARAD)

Process

The team reviewed the MTSNAC charter for guidance on where efforts should be focused and then reviewed the latest Intermodal Committee update to MTSNAC. The group then agreed to a high-level framework for thinking through the information that might be included in an updated report. The framework essentially grouped information into four categories or buckets:

1. **Background information** to provide context
2. **Identify the issues** (guided by Charter scope and objectives)
3. **Inform on progress** of planned initiatives and actions, particularly those underway by non-federal entities like the private sector, state and local governments including port authorities and others.
4. **Recommend actions** for the federal government and DOT in particular.

The team agreed that information related to #1, Background, should be included after the issues and recommendations are concluded so that the background information is specifically relevant to the report content. There is a lot of information readily available and the most appropriate pieces can be incorporated fairly easily.

The team then agreed to use the recommendations from the last report as the basis to guide the meeting's discussion and to think about those recommendations and new information in the context of the 4 categories outlined earlier.

After about 6 hours of discussion, the working team recapped the discussion to other team members who dialed in by phone and there was general agreement with the approach and observations taken at the meeting.

### General Observations

Some general observations were made about the timing of this report versus the timing of the last report. These included:

- Export volume is way up causing different kinds of problems for MTS and intermodal movements. How is the infrastructure handling those?
- International intermodal container moves are a small fraction of what is moving on the MTS so we need to consider issues related to other categories – e.g. bulk; vehicles, etc. as well.
- All modes of transport are needed to accommodate growth.
- In all likelihood, this report will be given to a “new” Secretary, so we should select information for the report considering what the new Secretary needs to know about MTS.
- The roles of the various public entities (local, state, federal) are not always clear to stakeholders making issue resolution more difficult.
- The federal government has not been asserting its authority in areas where it should (and does) have jurisdiction, like interstate commerce.
- We should build off the last report, since the recommendations are still valid but we would like to add more specificity – i.e. include the “how.”

### Issues and Recommendation Discussion

- Parking Lot: Two issues were identified as very important and very problematic to developing and adding capacity to the MTS. The team felt that they were important enough to cite as issues but we were unable to conclude on specific recommendations and agreed more work was needed on these. They are:
  - Permitting – the entire permitting approval process is cumbersome, time-consuming and costly. One possible recommendation may be to advocate for use of processes that have been put in place to help overcome this problem. There was something established for dredging, through CMTS, and the team is looking into others. Also complicated by state/local versus federal role.

- Land-use – again, one of the biggest issues/challenges facing expansion for the MTS but a very complicated issue – perhaps the most complicated. Team members will be reaching out to other stakeholders to see what if anything could be recommended here.
- Emerging Recommendations: There was consensus for several recommendations that should likely be included, and some action steps identified for consideration. These are:
  - **Continue to advance intermodal transportation as a national priority.**
    - Possible Actions:
      - Eliminate modal silos within DOT
      - Re-establish the Office of Intermodalism at senior level in DOT
      - Re-energize and complete the National Freight Policy Framework
  - **Protect system reliability by preserving freight infrastructure.**
    - Possible Actions:
      - Use funds for their intended purpose – i.e. HMTF
      - Recognize the need and advocate for maintaining and expanding harbor navigation channels
      - Need status of US Chamber recommendation to catalogue existing brown-field sites for freight
      - Inland waterways must be maintained
  - **Enable timely, consistent, and accurate measurement of capacity and productivity.**
    - Actions related to this recommendation are currently underway in DOT/MARAD. The team will provide recommendation actions for the new report once full status of the current activity is known.
  - **Encourage private sector investment.**
    - The team is investigating details of this further but agreed in general to outline government-initiated incentive programs that do work, like short-rail line tax incentive or other regulatory incentives; as well as to identify incentive programs for the private sector that do not really work and why. The team observed that this was a very meaningful recommendation but that the appropriate actions (the how), should not be limited to tax incentives, in part because the railroads (and other companies that would invest in rail) are the only private sector entity in the MTS that are looking for tax incentives. At the same time, it would be meaningful to

show the Secretary and others in government where and why certain programs are not being used by the private sector so the programs can be re-designed or the money allocated to a program that does work.

- **Continue to recognize and support regional freight solutions.**
  - Possible Actions:
    - DOT should act as an advocate/conduit for bringing together appropriate parties to advance multi-jurisdictional projects.
    - Implement existing programs and processes – i.e. take advantage of what is there like Projects of National and Regional Significance program.
    - Team is considering whether it can and should provide a “regional definition for the MTS” with a recommendation for DOT to use it as a guide.
  
- **Provide transportation service providers with single, national standards and regulations.**
  - Possible Actions:
    - Assert jurisdiction of the federal government over interstate commerce.
    - Deliver roadability regulations for trucking, which are at least 18 months past due
    - Advocate for national environmental standards that pre-empt states’ from taking individual actions
  
- **Support the continued development of a marine highway system as it will be needed to accommodate future growth.**
  - Specific actions still need to be developed. Discussion noted that the new short-sea shipping program passed into law is not funded.
  
- **Recruit, train and retain sufficient personnel.**
  - Specific actions still need to be developed. It was noted that this is both a public and a private sector issue. There are a number of examples of efforts underway in both sectors, which should be highlighted. Additionally, there is legislation pending to allow for the automatic conversion of a licensed military driver to a commercial driver’s license. There is a need for more scholarships and concern was raised over the impact of TWIC to this recommendation.

- **Support the efforts of the private sector to improve the efficiency of the system.**
  - This recommendation asks DOT to support private sector efforts, which would be summarized to include all of the actions taken under the “private sector recommendations” section of the last report, as well as some new efforts underway – like increased terminal productivity through introduction of technology and others; investment and development of new port/terminal facilities and others. It may be appropriate to include actions relative to the permitting and land-use issues here if we are able to identify anything specific after further discussing those issues.

**NEXT STEPS**

- Meeting Summary out to full committee for comment by April 21
- Summarize comments by April 30
- Hold conference call to discuss “open” items – permitting, land-use, specific actions not yet defined by May 9
- Circulate draft presentation for full MTSNAC meeting in June by May 16
- Finalize presentation based on input by May 28

##