MAP-21 Implementation: States & the Future of Transportation

This brief is an extended version of an article that appears in the 2013 edition of CSG's The Book of the States.

The federal surface transportation bill known as MAP-21, which President Obama signed into law July 6, 2012, authorized programs and funding for two years. In addition to providing at least a modicum of certainty for state transportation agencies, the legislation incorporates important policy changes: consolidating and streamlining programs to give states added flexibility, including provisions designed to accelerate the delivery of projects, moving ahead with a performance-based approach to transportation investment and providing a boost to a popular credit assistance program that could help some states tackle expensive projects. State transportation officials from four states in different regions of the country say while many of these policy changes are welcome, much remains to be done to ensure MAP-21’s success and to ensure the next federal bill addresses the long-term future of the federal transportation program.

Some Greater Certainty for States

Congress passed legislation to authorize federal surface transportation programs for two years June 29, 2012. Known by the acronym MAP-21—which stands for Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century—the legislation came as something of a surprise to state officials, many of whom may have assumed Washington’s partisan gridlock of recent years and lack of agreement on how to sustain the federal program long term would doom the bill during a contentious election year. It followed nearly three years during which Congress extended the previous authorization legislation—known as SAFETEA-LU—10 times. “It was literally day to day and nobody knew what was going to come out of it,” Rhode Island Department of Transportation Director Michael Lewis said of the pre-MAP-21 period during a February 2013 telephone interview. “Do we get a one-month extension? Do we get an extension to the end of the fiscal year? Do we get an extension to the election? What happens beyond that? … There was obviously all the discussion (in early 2012) around how the House was looking at a six-year (bill) with a reduced level of funding and the Senate was looking at two years. There was a lot of heat and smoke and energy being spent wondering what was going to happen, if anything was going to happen.”

Indeed, many state transportation officials saw the passage of MAP-21 as a welcome relief after months of fearing the worst. It came just months after Congressman Paul Ryan, the eventual Republican vice presidential nominee, proposed a budget that would have cut transportation spending by 25 to 35 percent. “When we saw that future, we were more than happy to accept just a two-year bill that kept us mostly level while the rest of this gets sorted out,” said Paula Hammond, who retired in March 2013, after a 34-year career at the Washington state Department of Transportation, the last six as secretary. The legislation also included many policy changes long sought by state governments that seem likely to have an impact long after the legislation expires in the fall of 2014. “MAP-21, I think, did a couple of things,” Hammond said. “It provided some stability for two years as the recession works its way through. … But I think more importantly, what MAP-21 did was start shifting the policy framework for how federal transportation funds will be spent.”
Lewis agreed. “It definitely introduced many of the reforms we were looking for,” he said. “The introduction of performance measurement and the like, the consolidation of programs … All those things were good. Obviously what it didn’t bring was a new revenue stream and I think that’s what really pushed it to be a two-year bill, because they couldn’t afford beyond a two-year bill.”

For that reason, other state DOT officials say MAP-21 did little to relieve their anxiety as they work to plan transportation projects that won’t actually be built for years.

“In our world, two years is not much better than six months,” said Tennessee Department of Transportation Commissioner John Schroer. “Quite frankly, all (MAP-21) is is another extension.”

Where past authorization bills had been five- or six-year bills, MAP-21 is two years for one major reason: Congress was only able to put together the funding for that long. The Highway Trust Fund, on which many federal transportation programs rely, has seen dwindling revenues from the federal gas tax in recent years as fuel efficiency has improved and other factors have taken their toll. Congress has had to make several general fund transfers in recent years just to keep the trust fund solvent. MAP-21 relies on another general fund transfer of $18.8 billion, as well as an additional $2.4 billion from the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund.

But beyond the expiration of MAP-21 in September 2014, there is no agreement about what happens next: whether Congress will transfer additional general funds to again shore up the trust fund, whether it will raise the gas tax to bring in additional revenues, whether it will cut funding for programs and projects or whether it will seek new revenues from other sources.

“Our goal is to push back our major spending further down the line with smaller spending. That has lots of advantages to it. It makes us turn projects over quicker. It lets us have an impact on our transportation infrastructure a lot faster.”

— John Schroer, Tennessee DOT

“The lack of certainty around the federal contribution is a very disruptive force … as we’re trying to plan long-term, integrated transportation investments,” said Hammond.

Impact of Federal Uncertainty

In many cases, the continuing uncertainty in recent years has caused states to rethink the kinds of transportation projects they pursue.

“We have a program within our department we just started doing called right-sizing,” said Schroer. “We’re starting to look at every project and ask ourselves, ‘Is that really the size project that we need to do or is there something that we can do that’s a lot less extensive that might solve the problem and that we could do quicker?’ … We’re building a lot of smaller projects rather than two big projects. And I think in the long run (it) will help with our uncertainty because we’re not going to need those big, major overhauls for a while.”

Schroer said Tennessee’s approach to tackling project funding manifests itself in numerous ways.

“Because we are a non-debt state, we can’t do a $500 million project,” he said. “We just don’t have the capacity to do that. So we do a lot of $50 million and $60 million projects. We’ll divide projects in thirds or fourths and work them out that way. … (If) our local partners and our legislators think that I ought to build a new four-lane road on new alignment, … what we’re trying to do is see if we can fix their issues on existing alignments, maybe building a super two-lane (highway) rather than a four lane, and trying to figure out the minimum we can do to solve a transportation issue without building a Cadillac.

“Our goal is to push back our major spending further down the line with smaller spending. That has lots of advantages to it. It makes us turn projects over quicker. It lets us have an impact on our transportation infrastructure a lot faster.”

For others, though, the effects of uncertain federal funding are perhaps more subtle.

“We’re identifying what our needs are going forward no matter what the funding levels are and what the (funding) sources are,” said Rhode Island’s Lewis, who is serving as the 2013 president of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, known as AASHTO. “That doesn’t change. What changes is somewhat your prioritization, how far deep you go in your prioritization list based on available resources, what the balance between preservation and rehabilitation and replacement is. It limits your ability to expand capacity because of limited resources.”

Lewis argues that states like Rhode Island don’t necessarily face as much uncertainty as other states do.

“I’m not sure that it has a complete dampening effect on what your planning process is,” he said. “Because for a state like Rhode Island, which isn’t expanding capacity—we’re repairing and rehabilitating our existing infrastructure—and that need is there no matter what our funding source is. It’s just a question of how quickly you can get to that need. Can you get there quickly enough that you aren’t losing ground...
Every year? Other states that are in a growth pattern are looking at large, multi-year expansion projects. I think it is more of an uncertainty for them than some of the states that are more in a fix-it-first mode like Rhode Island."

One byproduct of the uncertainty about federal transportation funding may be that states are now taking a proactive approach to meeting their own transportation needs, according to Kirk Steudle, director of the Michigan Department of Transportation.

"The fact of the matter is we really don’t think Washington is going to deal with this problem," he said. "We don’t see them coming up with more money in the future. We don’t think that they have the ability to do that. We’ve said that we’re taking our future into our own hands and we’re going to address our infrastructure problems right here at home. And I think you’re seeing more and more states do that. You’re seeing a lot of states looking at sales tax, gas tax, a whole variety of things."

Program Restructuring Brings Greater Flexibility for States

MAP-21 restructured core highway formula programs, created new ones and eliminated a long list of discretionary programs. Most projects that previously fit into those discretionary programs are now eligible under other programs.

"I think the shrinking or the elimination of a lot of very distinct and controlled programs into fewer numbers gives us good flexibility," said Hammond.

“It’s definitely confusing to learn a whole new set of terminology, but we in our state have had a very inclusive process with our cities and counties and (metropolitan planning organizations) on how we will split up and share the federal money where there’s discretion (allowed). … We looked at some of these programs … and talked a lot about what we wanted as a state and how we would make the decisions and who would make the decisions about how some of this spending happens (and) we reached a good conclusion. We’re comfortable with that as a group of transportation agencies and we’re ready to move forward with this new program structure.”

Schroer believes the restructuring is a significant improvement.

“Last year, we got funded in 100 different fund codes and that’s ridiculous," he said. "We designed our program to fit within codes so that we didn’t leave any dollars on the table. The last thing that we want to do as a state is to leave any federal dollars in Washington. … I like the fact that it’s more streamlined and it’s more flexible and that we don’t have to spend quite as much time trying to channel our objectives to fit certain fund codes.”

But Rhode Island’s Lewis noted that the elimination of a set-aside program called Transportation Enhancements, which funded numerous bike and pedestrian facilities, among other things, around the country, wasn’t popular in all circles.

“Some of the advocates of nontraditional transportation feel like maybe they were left out,” he said. “We don’t see it that way because I think we have the flexibility to include those projects under the (new Transportation Alternatives) program. … But I think it gives us some greater tools as a state to go back to the advocates of those kinds of projects and say, ‘Listen, (in) a state like Rhode Island that has a greater than 20 percent structurally deficient bridge count, we’ve really got to think about where we put the money that comes to the state that has the greatest effect on the overall economy of the state.’

“So I think it gives us some tools to make good decisions without excluding any interests or any parties. ... Generally people understand if you don’t have your bridges in good shape, bike paths are difficult to get to.”

Count Michigan’s Steudle as someone who believes the transition to the Transportation Alternatives program could create challenges for some states. Under MAP-21, states are required to sub-allocate 50 percent of their funding under the program to metropolitan planning organizations.

“We have turned that (portion) over to (the metropolitan planning organizations) and a number of them have come back and said, ‘We like the program that you have set up that already has a competitive process to it. We’d like you to just continue to do that for us,’” said Steudle. “So I think implementing some of those things where there are changing roles (is) going to be a bit of challenge because every time there’s a process change, people have to get adjusted to a new process and a new way of doing business.”

Environmental Streamlining & Accelerating Project Delivery

Congress also incorporated into MAP-21 a series of provisions designed to accelerate transportation project delivery and to streamline environmental review processes, which some believe have become major contributors to project delays.

According to a 2011 Congressional Research Service report, major highway projects can take 10 to 15 years to plan and build.6 MAP-21 seeks to accelerate projects in a number of ways—allowing more phases of a project to run concurrently, encouraging earlier collaboration among state and federal agencies, reducing and consolidating paperwork and bureaucratic requirements, and establishing new deadlines and penalties for delays in permitting processes.

The legislation seeks to streamline the environmental review process required under the 1970 National Environmental Policy Act, which put in place an interdisciplinary, environmental impact-focused approach to project planning and decision-making for projects that receive federal funding.
MAP-21 continues a transition to a performance and outcome-based transportation program that has been germinating at the state level for years.

In addition, MAP-21 includes provisions aimed at increasing innovation and improving efficiencies in government operations, contracting, right-of-way acquisition and construction. Many of those provisions mirror strategies already in use in a number of states that are promoted as best practices by a Federal Highway Administration initiative called Every Day Counts.

“There’s a recognition that we need to be more streamlined and we can’t be talking about a project for 10 years because the opportunities are lost,” said Rhode Island’s Lewis. “We can’t afford to have the resources spent on projects that languish for decades and don’t go anywhere. There’s no silver bullet (in MAP-21), but I think it is supportive of a movement and a recognition that we need to move projects in a way that actually can affect the travelling public in a beneficial way more quickly without giving up the environmental and social protections that the NEPA process instills.”

Michigan’s Steudle believes MAP-21’s project acceleration provisions can make a difference.

“The (provisions) that require the participating agencies…to actually work together and move a project along faster, I think, are absolutely essential,” he said. “I’m coming from a state where our system is largely built. We’ve got to build some additions to it and some modifications, but we don’t have a lot of big environmental documents that are out there that are getting hung up…But I think for the states that have those big environmental documents, getting them to the finish line faster, I think, is going to be tremendous.”

Tennessee’s Schroer said the environmental process has been a significant contributor to project delays in his state.

“Our number one slow-up on projects is the environmental process,” he said. “While there are a lot of good things that come out of that (process), I think the pendulum has swung too far in one direction.…. If you go back to the year 2000 or 1998 and look at what we had to do environmentally back then and what we have to do now, it has increased exponentially and the delivery of projects has slowed in a corresponding manner.”

Others have learned from experience that redundant document requirements can slow projects considerably and the ability to not have to reinvent the wheel for each one can make a difference in reducing project delivery times.

“We’ve had the ability even before MAP-21 to test some of these same kind of provisions, especially in the environmental streamlining area,” said Washington state’s Hammond. “We had an example on our (State Route 520) corridor where we were allowed to work some of our environmental impact statement/NEPA documents along with some of the pre-design (documents) and it shortened a year or two out of the entire length of time it took to get projects to construction.”

Emphasis on Performance Measurement & Management

MAP-21 continues a transition to a performance and outcome-based transportation program that has been germinating at the state level for years. As part of the national program, states will invest in projects to achieve individual state targets that are expected to make progress toward national goals in safety, infrastructure condition, congestion reduction, system reliability, freight movement and economic vitality, environmental sustainability and reduced project delivery delays.

Steudle said performance measurement has been a focus in Michigan since the mid-1990s.

“We’re right on board trying to figure out how to enable this to go forward on a national level,” he said. “We need to be able to say, ‘This is what we got for these billions of dollars invested in the road and bridge network and transit network.’ We need to be able to say, ‘Here’s what you will get and with the level of funding, here’s what you can expect.’ Whether it’s going up or going down in a particular category.”

Tennessee DOT’s Schroer agreed.

“We’re a performance-based DOT,” he said. “I think we have to be held accountable for what we do.”

The Washington state Department of Transportation, now seen as leader in performance management, began operating that way in 2001, said Hammond.

“I think it’s right for the federal government now to get on that same model of accountability and performance-based investment,” she said. “I think all of us at state DOTs agree that the public wants accountability. The public wants to know how tax dollars are spent and it’s appropriate to make investment decisions based on performance data and performance measurements.”

Lewis of the Rhode Island DOT also expects the focus on performance to pay dividends down the road.

“It’s a tool for the federal government to see where the priorities lie, to see what the level of investment means in terms of reducing the backlog of needed infrastructure repairs,” he said. “But … I think perhaps most importantly, over time it’s going to provide us a vehicle for better articulating to the public and to elected officials the value of investment in infrastructure, the efficiency or lack thereof of certain investments, and the cost/benefit of certain investments so that I think we’re going to be able to, over time, make a much better case for targeted investment and with a rate of return.”

But Lewis noted not all states are at the same level in developing performance measures.
“There are some states that are further along than others in every aspect,” he said. “I don’t think there’s any one state in the country that is first in all areas. But there are certainly states that are leaders in performance management. Missouri has long been a leader. I think North Carolina has a good system. So there are role models to go out and for the states that are further behind to be able to catch up and quite frankly that’s what Rhode Island is doing. We steal with pride. We will take best practices from around the country and implement them.”

Lewis said it also will be important that the development of performance measures and national goals take into account the diversity of states and the transportation challenges they face.

“Let’s not forget that there are geographical differences, there are climatic differences,” he said. “The Northeast is very different from the Southwest in terms of the climatic conditions, the environmental conditions that affect the roads and bridges. But I think there’s flexibility in MAP-21 to take those issues into account.”

**Popular TIFIA Program Doesn’t Benefit All**

MAP-21 provided a significant increase in funding available for the Transportation Infrastructure Financing and Innovation Act, or TIFIA, program. Created in 1998, the program provides federal credit assistance to eligible transportation projects in the form of secured loans, loan guarantees and lines of credit.9 The Government Accountability Office reported that as of April 2012, the U.S. Department of Transportation had, since 1998, executed 27 TIFIA credit agreements for 26 projects with project sponsors such as state DOTs and transit agencies. Demand for the program had surged considerably since 2008, with requests exceeding budget resources by more than 10-to-1, GAO said.10

MAP-21 authorized $750 million in the 2013 fiscal year and $1 billion in 2014 for the program. Funding had topped out at $122 million in previous years. A $1 billion TIFIA authorization will support about $10 billion in actual lending capacity, according to the Federal Highway Administration. In addition to providing the cash infusion, MAP-21 requires 10 percent of the funding be set aside for rural projects, increases the share of eligible project costs TIFIA can support and revamps the application process to allow assistance to be awarded at any time of year.11

Paula Hammond said Washington state has benefited from TIFIA in the past.

“We’ve been able to access in the last year $300 million of TIFIA funds (for the SR-520 project),” she said. “We got an interest rate of 2.99 percent, which was far better than had we bonded that money ourselves.”

Hammond said MAP-21’s funding increase for the TIFIA program has the potential to benefit more states and could play a role in another big ticket project in Washington.

“We have a project with Oregon that is a replacement bridge on Interstate 5 that crosses the Columbia River and we’re … looking at going after $1 billion of TIFIA funds to help lower the cost of financing for that project,” she said. “So I think it’s great, especially in the absence of federal grant funds, where there’s not a way for the feds to give large grants like these. This kind of borrowing is almost a supplement to that because it helps us lower our financing costs and helps our money go further.”

In Rhode Island, TIFIA could play a role in helping the state address deteriorating conditions on its bridges, Lewis said.

“I think that’s where it comes into play when you have large, capital-intensive projects, complex projects that are made up of multiple financing strategies,” he said. “We’ve got to develop a plan that addresses our deficient bridges in a relatively predictable period (of time) and that goes beyond what our likely federal apportionment will be and TIFIA may very well play into that strategy.”

But others caution against seeing TIFIA as a savior for transportation.

“TIFIA is useful because it’s a low-interest loan, (but) the key word there is it’s still a loan,” said Michigan’s Steudle. “Our problem is we’ve come up with all these fancy financing tools but we just fundamentally don’t have enough money to pay back the bill. … The TIFIA loan, I think, is going to be a very worthwhile tool. We just have to remember what it is.”

For a state like Tennessee that is unwilling to take on new transportation debt, the TIFIA program is likely to have little utility, Schroer noted.

“The reason why I don’t like it is because it’s the federal government encouraging state governments to take on more debt,” said Schroer, who chairs AASHTO’s Standing Committee on Finance and Admin-
MAP-21 Implementation Challenges

As the state transportation officials spoke in February 2013, implementation challenges with MAP-21 remained. Five months after the start date of MAP-21, federal transportation agencies were still hard at work writing rules and offering guidance to states on how to implement multiple aspects of the legislation.

The process of developing performance measures and goals is scheduled to extend long past MAP-21’s expiration date in 2014.

“I think we’re going with the assumption that we’re working towards those and the successor to MAP-21 will pick up where MAP-21 left off,” said Michigan’s Steudle. “I think that there’s a general acceptance to that approach across the country.”

Others noted that a freight program was included in the bill without the funding to pay for it.

“We were very anxious to see this national freight policy and freight program get created because we’re such a trade-dependent state,” said Hammond. “Those of us on the West Coast are all looking very anxiously at how we can improve our economic corridors, access to ports, etc. so that our global trade that ends up in Chicago or elsewhere can be easily transported. We think the funding of the freight program is going to be critical and essential.”

Similarly, the latest iteration of a program called Projects of National and Regional Significance, originally created under SAFETEA-LU, is pending a $500 million appropriation from the general fund and will require more definition of the projects that qualify, officials said.

“National significance you can understand,” said Michigan’s Steudle. “Regional significance is going to be very hard to understand. What does regional significance, regional cooperation mean? Does it mean multi-state? Does it mean multi-county? Multi-small local agency? What does regional collaboration mean? And I think the definition of that is going to be one of the most challenging pieces. What are we really looking at here? We’ve just got to get a definition as to what it means.”

Tennessee’s Schroer believes the lack of program definition at this point makes it unlikely the program will take hold before MAP-21 expires next year.

“We think we’ve got a road that would fit in that and yet (the program) hasn’t been funded and no one has any idea how it will be distributed, when or what the parameters are,” he said. “Hell, we’re damn near six months (into MAP-21) and my guess is, if I were to predict, (funding for the program) won’t ever come to fruition because there’s not going to be enough time to put the rules together to have it happen.”

But Hammond said it’s important that the program eventually gets off the ground and that it ultimately succeeds.

“We’re also hoping the Projects of National and Regional Significance is an essential next step for the feds to start really focusing,” she said. “If they’re going to give grants, do it in a way that’s going to help not just a state or a community enhancement, but something that’s more regional or even national in (impact). And there are a lot of those important projects around the country that could help focus where the spending goes.”

Rhode Island’s Lewis expects all the implementation issues with MAP-21 to be resolved eventually.

“We all work in fairly large, not necessarily nimble bureaucracies and that’s true of the U.S. (Department of Transportation) and it’s true of many states,” he said. “We’re used to a certain format … and now you’re shifting gears. It takes time to recalibrate.”

Lewis noted that AASHTO, the state transportation officials group, has put together implementation working groups that are looking at each aspect of MAP-21, giving advice to states on how to implement each one in an efficient way, and working closely with agencies like the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration.

“There will be blips,” he said. “There will be hurdles. But I have no reason to believe those won’t be able to be resolved … There are probably tweaks along the way, but I think … this is the new roadmap going forward. Not all the exit ramps are in place yet but it gives you a vision for where you’re going. I think the energy collectively now needs to be how do we fund this new map so that it can really achieve the performance goals that it’s looking for. … I certainly hope that this is a long-term policy bill that will be tweaked, improved, modified as we go forward.”

MAP-21’s Successor & the Long-Term Challenge

While state transportation officials mostly laud the significant policy elements included in MAP-21, they say the debate over its successor in the months ahead must pivot to the issue of how to stabilize long-term funding for federal transportation programs.

“I think at this point in time we just need to talk money,” said Tennessee’s Schroer. “I’m happy right now with MAP-21. I think (Congress) did a great job and I think they put a lot of effort into it and
they listened to state DOTs about what needed to be done … But what they didn’t address is the big, giant elephant in the room and that’s funding. And until we as a nation address funding, we’re (just) fooling ourselves … We just have to address that and Congress seems unwilling or unable to do that.”

Michigan’s Steudle agreed.
“I would hope in (2014), we don’t have the whole policy debate again and that we allow the policies that are in place to actually get implemented,” he said. “I’m hopeful that we can let the policy stuff continue to run its course and not have that debate but talk about how are you going to fund this … I think that’s what the debate ought to be next year.”

While hoping for a longer-term bill next time out, Rhode Island’s Lewis said it will be important to do more than tread water in the next few years.
“Going back four years to when Rhode Island did its blue ribbon panel report of (transportation) needs, we’re underinvesting in our infrastructure just to get into a state of good repair,” he said. “We have a shortfall of $3 billion over the next 10 years. That hasn’t changed. It’s actually probably gotten worse because we haven’t raised any new revenues in the four years since the report came out. So the need is still there. The need increases every year that we don’t provide additional funding. A longer-term (federal authorization) bill that is the same funding level would provide certainty but it wouldn’t necessarily get into our backlog of needs any more quickly. More funding would. It’s a simple math exercise.”

But Washington state’s Hammond sees a broader issue that needs to be addressed as part of the next federal authorization as well.
“I think we’re at a turning point and I think it’s really important that the next transportation act clarify the federal role in state and local transportation,” she said.

One area in which that clarification may be especially needed, Hammond said, is the issue of which roads states are allowed to toll.
“Not all states care about it, but others are trying to find a way to both manage their traffic demand and fund big infrastructure projects by using tolling and I think the federal provisions are very tentative on that so far,” she said. “I think we need to be a little more aggressive in getting federal approval and guidance on that.”

Ultimately, Hammond believes, the role of the federal government in transportation and the future of transportation funding are two issues that need to be addressed in tandem.
“I think the federal involvement and control needs to match the level of investment that the feds make,” she said. “If we’re not going to have additional federal funds in the future and we’re going to start seeing that investment at the federal level drop, then we need to question what the federal role of transportation is in our state and how much oversight and how much control federal rules and regulations should have.”

Schroer thinks it’s likely the role of the federal government will be on the wane in the years ahead.

“I wouldn’t be surprised if the federal government would say … we’re not going to come up with a new plan,”’ he said. “We’re not going to raise the gas tax, and so states, we’re going to give you more flexibility with your dollars but you’re going to get X (amount) and don’t look for anything else’ and put the pressure back on the states. That wouldn’t surprise me a bit if that happened.”

Still, Lewis sees the need to maintain a federal role in transportation going forward.
“Rhode Island is dependent upon how a container gets out of the Port of San Diego,” he said. “There’s an impact there and so there’s a national need. It’s not just about what happens in and around San Diego but it’s about what happens to the interstate in Wyoming. It’s what happens to the locks and dams on the Ohio River. It’s all connected and there is a federal system. Now, as you work way down into the tentacles (of the transportation system), the feds shouldn’t be involved in every detail in a local community but I think there needs to be a federal model.”

But many are convinced that while completion of the interstate system provided motivation for transportation investment during the second half of the 20th century, the nation lacks a similarly galvanizing federal transportation purpose or project to tackle now. Lewis believes it’s important that policymakers and the public realize progress made to date in the nation’s transportation system can easily be lost to neglect if solutions aren’t forthcoming soon.
“I have limited patience with people saying, ‘We built it once and so we shouldn’t have to pay for it again,’” he said. “How many of us are driving the first car we bought? This stuff has a service life and needs to be reinvested in and it’s a big ticket. But if we don’t invest in it, we can go back quickly to (what it was like) in the pre-interstate era. It’s not a future that any of us really want.”
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