Meeting Summary & Highlights

Presiding: Rep. Judy Clibborn (D-Washington), Transportation Public Policy Cmte. Chair

Overview:
This session featured three speakers:
- Dave Nichols, Missouri Department of Transportation, Director
- Mara Campbell, Missouri Department of Transportation, Customer Relations Director
- Larry Frevert, American Society of Civil Engineers, Member

Introduction:
Committee Co-Chair Rep. Judy Clibborn opened the meeting with brief remarks about The Gray Notebook, the Washington State Department of Transportation’s quarterly accountability report, which provides the latest information on system performance and project delivery in the state. WSDOT has been publishing The Gray Notebook since May 2001. Clibborn said such state efforts can inform the national focus on performance measurement under MAP-21, the 2012 surface transportation authorization bill.

- Clibborn: “I think as we move forward with the requirements under MAP-21, these kinds of processes are going to become more important for us to maintain our funding at the state level. … It’s been sort of the gold standard and I’m sure other states are now catching on. … It also feeds into a performance dashboard so we can look at trends. It has been very valuable for us to know how we’re doing as we put our funding packages together to make sure we’re actually getting performance for what we’re investing. The other thing our state has is we have performance goals that we measure. Right now we have safety, preservation, mobility, environmental stewardship and economic vitality as
those things that we’re measuring in the Gray Notebook and also it feeds into a biennial attainment report. … The interesting thing is we’re having a little argument now about whether we should add health and there was a bill last year to add health as one of the measurement tools and it became quite a fight. There were people who got up and said ‘I don’t want anybody coming to my house and looking in my refrigerator.’ But yesterday we were talking about health assessments as part of how we look at what we’re doing at the state level. The other side has decided they’d like to ask for congestion. So even though we have mobility as a measurement, there is this fight about whether that really deals with congestion.”

**Highlights of Speakers’ Remarks:**

**Dave Nichols, Missouri Department of Transportation, Director**

- **On MAP-21 and Performance Measurement:**
  Nichols: “MAP-21 was actually one of the most transformational surface transportation acts in the history of the transportation industry. … MAP-21 has some really good features in it. (Rep. Clibborn) talked about the Gray Notebook in Washington State and Mara’s going to talk about our metric that we use and our recording document called the Tracker here in Missouri and it is about performance management. One of the things that Congress talked to us about as we were developing MAP-21 … y’know we states are always talking about we need to get the federal government out of our business but we still want them to send us the money every year and so Congress said ‘okay, well how do you know what the health of your infrastructure is?’ For example, I remember getting asked the question—I’m on one of the committees at AASHTO called the Standing Committee on Performance Management—and a person from the U.S. Department of Transportation asked ‘what is the health of our interstate system in the United States?’ If you had to grade it today, what would it be? Well that’s all across the board. In some areas it’s really good. In some areas it’s not so good depending on what’s your measure. Is it congestion/mobility? Is it safety? Is it pavement condition? Is it bridge condition? Those are the things that actually become the metrics of accountability for the dollars that we get sent to us through MAP-21. And I have to tell you that it is meeting with a lot of consternation throughout AASHTO, through our 50 states, Puerto Rico and DC as part of our AASHTO body. But we’re getting there. Matter of fact we just had a big meeting in Washington, DC two weeks ago with our Standing Committee on Performance Management about implementation of performance management at the state level for those very high level six metrics that we have actually codified in the act. We’re actually going through rulemaking right now as we speak with MAP-21. … But I want you to know this is a good thing. It’s one of the few things that we’re doing in transportation that I would argue we need to be doing across the board with a lot of federal aid type of activities.”
• **On MAP-21’s program consolidation:**

Nichols: “The surface transportation act, whether it was SAFETEA-LU, ISTEA or any of the previous acts, every (one) grew with more and more carve-outs for very specific programs that you could spend money on. … And states had very little flexibility to intermix things together. … That was one of our messages that we sent to U.S. DOT and it actually got codified in (MAP-21). … We actually have half as many programs now than we had before so it’s much better than it was but it creates its own issues because now the states are delegated with that federal aid that comes through US DOTs at the state level that gets transferred to cities or counties. Now the states have more of a role in determining how those dollars are being spent. I can tell you in Missouri as I talk to county governments and city governments, that causes them some concern because change is hard … and those little bits of carve-outs of federal aid that go to cities and counties in Missouri in particular are very, very important to them. But one of the things that U.S. DOT said is there are too many dollars being left on the table at the end of each program year. … I talk to my county officials and they say ‘look Dave, we only get maybe $50,000 a year out of the … funding program that goes to bridge replacement—the off-system bridge replacement program—and I have to bank that money for five years or so to be able to do a small bridge replacement on a county road. The challenge that they have is the accounting. (The Office of Management and Budget) is looking at these big bank accounts of dollars being unspent and we’re going to Congress and saying ‘we need more money, we need more money.’ Yet they see these bankrolls sitting there with huge amounts of money—billions of dollars left in the bank account. We’ve got to figure out a way to spend down those balances and that’s one of the things that we’re working on with our local officials but also at the state level too. So that’s something to keep in your thoughts.”

• **On MAP-21’s provisions to accelerate project delivery and streamline environmental requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act**

Nichols: “There are some very specific checkpoints if things aren’t making progress through the reviews and in particular resource agencies, there are accountability measures and things have to be done or there are some accountability measures there. We really don’t have that problem in Missouri because we worked really well with our state resource agencies—our Department of Natural Resources, Conservation Department—and also with our federal resource agencies—Corps of Engineers, Coast Guard, Fish and Wildlife, etc.—we really have a partnering relationship and that is key to getting these processes through on the pre-planning phases. If there’s anything that really holds up projects—which was why this was enacted in law—it’s getting all of that environmental clearance, that public involvement clearance done on the front end very quickly in a very methodical fashion. Things kind of sat on the books for many, many years. It took longer to get through NEPA than it did to actually build projects all across the country. We don’t
have that problem here in Missouri per se and I know there are some states around the country who are struggling with that big-time. So those accountability measures are in there to help streamline project delivery.”

**On how MAP-21 did not address future transportation funding concerns**

Nichols: “The things that we see that are the really big challenges all revolve around money. … MAP-21 did not address this challenge that we have that the (Highway) Trust Fund is insolvent. … They already had to infuse general revenue funds to the tune of about $45 billion just to keep it solvent to get us through the two years of MAP-21, which is the first time we’ve had a surface transportation bill that was only two years long. By the time we get MAP-21 implemented, we’re already starting reauthorization. We’re actually (already starting) that process. Matter of fact, one of my staff is in DC this week working on it. So no sooner did we get MAP-21 implemented, here we are starting with the new authorization. … There probably isn’t going to be (a) new authorization in the next 18 months in DC. There’s probably going to be a continuing resolution which is really the root of the problem that we deal with with federal funding. How do we plan five years in advance when we don’t know what level of federal funding that we’re going to get? There could be $5 billion in the trust fund or there could be $50 billion annually in the trust fund and we’re making at the state level very significant financial assumptions that are critical to project development and project delivery. So those are some key things that we’re dealing with at the federal level. We’re very engaged through our AASHTO governing body. We’re very engaged with our Congressional delegation. I can tell you that our two Senators and our Congressional people, regardless of partisan politics, are very supportive of the needs of transportation in our state and in our country. They’re just frustrated they can’t get anything done.”

**On state transportation funding options Missouri is considering**

Nichols: “We do see that we are not going to have major change happening with federal funding and that we’re going to have to take our issues with funding in our own hands here in the state of Missouri and we have done that. We’ve been talking for the last years about what are the transportation funding mechanisms—there’s only so many that we have at our disposal in our various states. In Missouri right now, we are really funded through our gas and diesel tax, the licensing for vehicles, the registration fees and the sales tax on vehicles. That’s really where we predominantly get our funding for transportation. … The funding mechanism that we’re talking about right now in Missouri is a temporary one-cent sales tax. As a matter of fact, Representative (Dave) Hinson was the sponsor in the House for this bill to go through the legislative process. … In Missouri, we have this thing called the Hancock Amendment. Anything that generates over a certain amount of dollars, which in Missouri is about $80 million … so really any substantive increase in funding for any particular program in Missouri, has to go by law to the voters. It’s good accountability but I’ll tell you it’s problematic and it’s a challenge that we deal with in our state because you’ve really got to sell it. We’re a pretty
conservative state by nature and it’s hard to get the voters to support something. But at the end of the day when they do, they’re behind you 100 percent. So the legislature actually developed a bill that had this flexible funding that could be used for any transportation purpose. It had a 10-year sunset on it because again as we’re talking to the public, they want to make sure there’s some accountability in there. So it’s a 10-year sunset on this funding. It actually has a requirement for specific use of the funds so we have to develop a list of projects that we’re going to deliver with it. … And it also has other accountability measures in there about reporting the progress on it every year and then it also has the prohibitions on it that we will not do. Missouri is not a tolling state and we’ve had a lot of dialogue about doing some tolling in the state. Again, it’s another funding mechanism and as this funding mechanism moves forward, there would be a prohibition during this time frame that we would not put a toll on any existing road in the state of Missouri. Right now I-70 has got a target on it so to speak but I-70 is a 200-mile corridor between Kansas City and St. Louis that needs to be rebuilt and expanded not unlike many of the interstates in your states. So this new funding mechanism actually made it through the legislature to the last week and it got filibustered and it didn’t make it. So now there is a process that was actually started (Monday, September 16) called a voter-generated initiative petition where you go out and have to get signatures from a certain percentage of voters and in certain Congressional districts and then it goes on the ballot ultimately for the voters of the state to vote on to approve it. So we’re beginning that process. Obviously as a state government entity, we can’t get involved in the campaign part of it but as a transportation advocate, I’m standing out and talking a lot to anybody that will listen to us about it. So it’s a very key issue. It’s interesting to see that the gas tax model is getting less and less and less support from the taxpayers and citizens of Missouri and I’m assuming around the United States. The consumption of gasoline is going down, which isn’t a bad thing. But when you use it as your primary funding source, how do you keep your roads and bridges in good condition and how do you provide other transportation services without having some new source of funding? So the sales tax model is the one we’re looking at right now and we’re going to push really hard and see how that moves forward. Our voting is going to be in November of 2014.”

**Mara Campbell, Missouri Department of Transportation, Customer Relations Director**

- **On Performance Management and MAP-21**

  Campbell: “(Performance management) is a journey. It’s not just a destination. It has evolved over the last eight, nine years. And let me tell you the other quick story. Implementation of a performance management system is not pretty. It’s kinda ugly. And it can get ugly and then it becomes pretty and then it becomes ugly again as it evolves and matures. So (it doesn’t just) pop out and it’s beautiful. And I think it’s real important that you know that because as Congress tries to implement MAP-21 and the performance
management elements of that, it’s not going to be potentially pretty initially. Last but not least, as state DOTs, we have to get ready because it’s no longer optional fun. This is a mandate that we all have to do and we all need to be responsible and accountable because, guess what? We asked for it. We absolutely went to Congress and said ‘we’re ready. We want to be transparent and open and accountable because we do great things with the money you give us. We just don’t have enough of it. So hold us accountable.”

- **On MoDOT’s experience with performance management**
  Campbell: “Our journey started in 2005 with Director Pete Rahn. … He came on board in September of 2004 … and in January (we) populated our first performance management effort—performance measures in the Tracker, … It’s evolved through today and through Dave (Nichols’) leadership and has been supported through our commission, which is the way that we’re organized and structured.”

- **On the performance metrics used by MoDOT**
  Campbell: “So you might ask ‘what do you base your metrics around at MoDOT?’ We base (them) around our tangible results, which are identified as something that we believe our customers expect us to deliver. … Basically our customers expect us to keep them safe. They expect us to have roads that are smooth and unrestricted and bridges too. They expect us to provide outstanding customer service, something everyone in this room is probably interested in. They expect us to deliver great projects of great value and promote economic prosperity. So we hinge our performance measures around what we expect these tangible results we expect our customers to produce. And we send it to everybody and ask them ‘how are we doing?’ We’re telling you—open and honest, warts and all—this is exactly what we’re doing with the dollars you’ve invested in us.”

- **On the importance of leadership buy-in to the success of performance management**
  Campbell: “Nothing works as effectively as top leadership buy-in. It’s the hugest, probably the most important thing that we’ve been able to accomplish in the last eight years. From when Pete Rahn started it to today, our executive leader—our director—believes in it and holds people accountable to it. Decisions are made from it. … Why performance management? Why is it a great tool? Four things: what gets measured, gets done. Second thing: if you don’t have the right data and the right facts, how can you make good decisions? And when you’re in scarce resources … it absolutely helps us decide where to place those resources. Lastly, accountability because every employee at MoDOT knows what the Tracker is, they know how they’re tied to it, and they clearly understand that they’re responsible in some form or fashion (for) moving that needle.”

- **On where MoDOT is now with their performance management efforts**
  Campbell: “In eight years, was it pretty? No. Did we have some struggles along the way? Yes. And just like The Gray Notebook we’ve evolved as well and now we are absolutely ready for national performance measures. … Our fatality numbers have gone down. What a fabulous trend. Why? Because we’ve implemented statewide strategies like guard cable throughout our interstate corridors. So we have looked at our data, we’ve made good decisions, we’ve put the resources where we needed to and we held people accountable.”
And I have to tell you, at the end of the day, I think that’s exactly what Congress was trying to do with MAP-21. They really just want to know what’s going on so they can better assess how well things are going.”

- **On MAP-21’s national performance goals**
  Campbell: “(In MAP-21, Congress) identified seven national goals, which probably are very similar to what your DOTs have as well, and then they identified four program areas. … The first program area that they are requiring metrics is in safety. That’s understandable and appropriate. So what we did through AASHTO … is we actually said as a team ‘what do we want to measure and what is the right thing to measure and what’s the definition, etc. But actually in the law these metrics are actually required. So this isn’t one that we get to decide what’s going to be measured. …What we at AASHTO have done is we’ve actually taken it a little bit further and said ‘we don’t want a three-year rolling average; we want a five-year rolling average. We want it based on a calendar year instead of everyone having different fiscal years. So what we’ve done is kind of taken the parameter and kind of narrowed it.”

- **On how performance measures can be like comparing apples and oranges**
  Campbell: “We can’t agree what serious injuries are. So Massachusetts has a different definition than we do and Kentucky has a different definition than someone else. So there is no guidebook out there that says a serious injury is going to be defined by X, Y and Z. So that is what is making the implementation of MAP-21 just holistically very concerning because we aren’t all on the same playing field. We don’t have the same definitions. We’re not collecting the data the same way. It’s like an apple and a watermelon. Fruit but definitely different fruit. So this is what makes national-level performance measures kind of concerning.”

- **On target setting under MAP-21 and concerns about consequences for states**
  Campbell: “What MAP-21 also required is they’re going to set targets and then say ‘you have to meet this target.’ And in some cases, like pavement condition, there are consequences associated if you don’t make it. Fiscal consequences. What the big gorilla, elephant in the room that my colleagues and I fear is we don’t want our federal dollars to be adjusted in any way or tied to national performance measures at least at the beginning because at the beginning implementation is ugly.”

- **On measuring interstate performance under MAP-21**
  Campbell: “In MAP-21, they basically said ‘we want you to measure the performance of the Interstate. We don’t know how. We don’t know what indicator you’re going to use. We don’t know what data you’re going to get it from. But we want that.’ And so now at AASHTO we have recommended annual hours of delay as a potential (way to measure) performance of the Interstate.”

- **On the lack of specificity of some measures**
  Campbell: “So out of these 12 mandatory measures that are identified in MAP-21, some are very specific. … And in other areas of the bill, it’s kind of ‘well, we don’t really know but this is what we kind of want.’ So it’s not a metric, it’s just a topical area. …
Then we get into even more fuzzy land, which is congestion, environmental sustainability and freight and economic vitality. Again, not a specific measure. They just say ‘we need to measure traffic congestion.’ Well if we can’t agree as a nation on a definition of serious injury, how well do you think we’re going to agree on something as contentious as traffic congestion? … (The Texas Transportation Institute) puts out a report every year and tells us where congestion is and has defined that. Congress doesn’t necessarily like that definition. So again, here we are halfway through the period of MAP-21. It’s going to be over in (a year) and we haven’t even defined it.”

- **On defining “significant progress” under MAP-21**
  Campbell: “(National) minimum levels will be set for certain things. … States and metropolitan planning organizations will be required to set targets. So we have to say ‘we’re going to have our pavement in this condition and our bridges at this level, etc.’ And here’s the key (term) in the whole MAP-21 bill: significant progress. How would you define significant progress? … Significant progress has to be defined as well because how well will we know we’re doing in meeting this target. What is significant progress?”

- **On performance plans required under MAP-21**
  Campbell: “The other component of MAP-21 that is a nuance is that they’re going to require performance plans. So in the safety arena, we’ve been producing a highway safety plan for several years. They have taken that approach and basically said ‘well now I not only want one for highway safety but I also want one for risk-based asset management. And then I want one for air quality.’ So we will be submitting a plan of how we are going to handle our assets here in Missouri—risk based—and that includes pavement, bridges, all of our assets to the Federal Highway (Administration) for them to look at.”

- **On performance reporting under MAP-21**
  Campbell: “Part of the bill says that within four years of enactment—and remember, we’re already a year and a half into (MAP-21)—and biennially thereafter, U.S. DOT is going to produce a report on how well we’re doing on these 12 measures and whether or not we have sufficiently made significant progress. I don’t know about you but there are lots of reports out there … and everybody gets their data from different places. There’s a professor (David Hartgen at UNC-Charlotte) in the southern part of the United States who puts out a report about pavement condition every year and professor Hartgen just goes out to the national database and pulls this down. But little does the professor know that that database isn’t quite accurate because the way that we calculate our pavement condition is different in Mississippi, is different than Tennessee, and is different than Washington State. So it’s not simple. You can’t just go out to an arbitrary database, pull it down and create a report. And this is what (the) Federal Highway (Administration) and U.S. DOT and Congress has mandated through MAP-21. And what I’m worried about and what I assume you would be as well is that they’re going to compare Missouri to Massachusetts to Alaska … and it’s not apples and apples. And in some cases it’s tomatoes and carrots versus watermelons and bananas. That’s the variance.”
On awaiting federal rulemaking from USDOT
Campbell: “We’re waiting for USDOT to come forth with their rule and say ‘well, we’ve thought about it and this is how we’re going to define safety and serious injuries’ and ‘we’ve thought about it and this is how we’re going to collect the data.’ This is the timeline: they are to have produced a notice of proposed rule by the end of (September). … So all of these dates that they told us we would have this done by are now kind of being pushed out. … So you might ask ‘well, what’s next?’ And I will say what’s next is when that first published rule comes out, state DOTs across the nation will get a very good glimpse as to how we need to be reacting. It will tell us about target setting. Are they going to hold sanctions against us or are they not? Are they going to give us flexibility or are they not? Are they going to attach my funding formula or are they not? At the end of the day, I really hope that your DOT is measuring performance for your state. And I can tell you right now my friend Daniela Bremmer (at the Washington State Department of Transportation) does a fabulous job and I know a lot of your state folks that do great jobs. But we need to do this. We don’t have a choice. It’s here. But at the end of the day, measuring our performance is the right thing to do but implementing it is messy and so it’s going to take some work.”

Larry Frevert, American Society of Civil Engineers

On ASCE’s 2013 Report Card for America’s Infrastructure
Frevert: “We evaluated 16 areas of infrastructure ranging from aviation to wastewater. There were six (areas) that showed improvement this year. Most of them were miniscule improvements—maybe from a D-minus to a D. The most significant improvement was in rail. Rail went from a C-minus to a C-plus. There have been significant investments in the last four years by the rail industry, most of which is private industry and it has had a significant impact. Right here in Kansas City, Kansas City Southern is headquartered here and they have made a significant investment in dual-tracking their facilities to the deep ports in Texas and Mexico for freight distribution. Likewise the Burlington Northern has made a significant investment in East-West dual trackage all the way across the Midwest to the deep ports in Los Angeles and Long Beach for the distribution of freight. So that is why we’re seeing such a significant increase in the rail condition.”

On what the report card said about Roads
Frevert: “Forty-two percent of America’s highways remain congested. We did see a slight increase in the grade for roads from a D-minus to D. So we are seeing some improvement but still you’re spending about half your time in congested areas.”

On what the report card said about Inland Waterways
Frevert: “Inland waterways—a grade of D-minus. Right here in Kansas City, Missouri, I look back in history and the Missouri River was a very important part of our trade and our commerce. Yet the ability to use that river for freight distribution is almost minimal
at this point. Fifty-two service interruptions a day are occurring on our inland waterways.”

- **On what the report card said about Ports**
  Frevert: “Ninety-five percent of overseas trade moves through our ports. I was in Minneapolis last week. The Minnesota chapter of the American Public Works Association was doing a Minnesota 2050 program and I was filming an introductory video for that. And somebody said ‘well, why are we concerned about ports?’ And I said ‘have you been to Duluth lately? Have you looked at Lake Superior? It is the most significant inland port in the United States and how much freight is coming in and passing through the Port of Duluth and moving back through the St. Lawrence Seaway.”

- **On what the report card said about Aviation**
  Frevert: “Aviation got a grade of D. Twenty-two billion dollars is the cost of congestion at airports and I saw a map recently that showed all of the flights in the United States in a day that were either delayed on departing or arriving and it’s unbelievable. The map is almost solid red with areas of congestion. But the other aspect of aviation which is often overlooked is the freight movement that goes through aviation. A lot of our airports have a significant amount of cargo that is going through. Do you know that the Kansas City, Missouri International Airport terminal, which many of you probably flew into, is the largest distribution hub of fresh flowers in the United States? Right here in the central part of the United States, fresh flowers come in and they’re distributed out from the Kansas City hub. …”

- **On what the report card said about Bridges**
  Frevert: “Bridges—a slight improvement. We’ve still got significant problems with our bridges but there has been a concerted effort to make some investment in our bridges and it was appropriate that we see a slight increase in the grade. But yet 11 percent of our bridges remain structurally deficient as we speak today.”

- **On what the report card said about Rail**
  Frevert: “Rail as I said made the largest jump going from a C-minus to a C-plus because the rail industry has invested $75 billion in the last four years in their own infrastructure.”

- **On what the report card said about Transit**
  Frevert: “As I get older … I’m gradually moving out of my career and into another phase of my life and I’m looking at many baby boomers who are like that and we’re going to become more and more dependent on transit to get to the doctor’s office, to get to our churches, to get to our shopping activities and 45 percent of Americans do not have access to transit. … The younger generation is being attracted to communities where light rail and streetcars are available. That’s one of the reasons why Kansas City is making a significant investment in a streetcar system. If you travel downtown you will see the beginnings of that work.”

- **On what is needed to address infrastructure needs**
  Frevert: “We’ve got increasing demands and it requires action. Whether it’s failure of our infrastructure, whether it’s responding to superstorms like Katrina or Sandy, we’ve got
issues. … What can we do about it? Well, it’s going to take bold leadership and it’s going to take a compelling vision. It’s going to take meeting and communicating with you—state legislators—and with our United States legislators. It’s going to take us as engineers building in more sustainability and resilience. What does sustainability mean? It means how can we have in the future what we have now? How do we produce something for our grandchildren that we enjoy now? And resilience? We’ve got to make our structures out of better materials. We’ve got to do a better job of designing. I read somewhere that homes in the United States are expected to last 70 years. In the (United Kingdom), they’re expected to last 125 years. Why can’t our homes in the United States last as long as they do in the U.K.? The same logic should apply to our infrastructure. We’ve got to build it to last longer. Great progress is being made in research through organizations like the Strategic Highway Research Program. Better materials, better methods, and we need to be utilizing those. And you need to be holding your engineers accountable to do that. … Prioritize, plan and fund for the future. The Iroquois Indians said that we should plan seven generations in advance—basically 140 years out. Are you thinking about what your state is going to look like in 140 years? If you’re not, who is? The responsibility is on us.”

- **On the potential impact of failing to invest in infrastructure**
  Frevert: “With the investment that we’re advocating—the $3.6 trillion—if we don’t do that, we’re going to face a $3.1 trillion annual loss in gross domestic product. Each family is going to see a $3100 loss in their personal, disposable income. And 3.5 million jobs are at risk across the country. That’s a third of our unemployed people in the country right now. That number is going to be added to that. Infrastructure impacts 3.5 million jobs. The transportation industry, the electrical transmission industry, the water and wastewater industry, the aviation industry, and waterways and ports. That’s where the jobs are. That’s where they’re going to go if we don’t take care of our infrastructure.”

- **On how ASCE can help legislators as they push for increased infrastructure investment**
  Frevert: “The burden is on you and the burden is on my profession. How can we help you? Three things: we can make resources available to you. When you’re considering legislation, consider talking to ASCE and we can provide someone with engineering expertise to come and provide testimony for you and provide information to you to help you with your legislation. We can provide you with the reports that I’ve described today and we can provide you with some model legislation that you can consider.”