



Interested Party Testimony - Ohio Transportation Budget - House Bill 53
Jack Shaner, Deputy Director, Ohio Environmental Council
Submitted to the Ohio Senate Transportation, Commerce, and Labor Committee
Ohio Statehouse - March 11, 2015

Chair Manning, Vice Chair Patton, Ranking Member Cafaro, and Members of the Committee-

Thank you for this opportunity to testify as an Interested Party on House Bill 53 (As Introduced), the biennial Transportation Budget.

My name is Jack Shaner, and I am Deputy Director for the Ohio Environmental Council. The OEC is a network of more than 100 local and statewide environmental-conservation organizations and several thousand individual citizen members. The mission of the OEC is to secure healthy air, land, and water for all who call Ohio home.

My testimony presents four chunks of information:

Part 1: Brief background information on our current transportation network and the challenges it presents to air quality, household income, mobility, and economic growth.

Part 2: Brief backgrounder on the energy and environmental benefits of marine and freight rail transportation and public transportation.

Part 3: Brief summary of the Ohio Transportation Budget's incremental progress on rail freight transportation and public transportation.

Part 4: OEC policy recommendations to substantially increase Ohio's investment in public transportation.

PART 1 – BRIEF BACKGROUNDER ON AMERICA'S CURRENT TRANSPORTATION NETWORK IMPACTS

Today's Transportation Network: Major Driver of our Economy + High Standard of Living

By any measure, our state and nation's transportation system is remarkable. It conveys us to work, school, and other important destinations and back home again. It moves raw materials to our factories, finished products to our shops, and food to our tables. Virtually every tangible thing that we rely upon for life, itself, is moved by pipeline, water, rail, highway, or airway. Our

transportation network is truly an extraordinary and fundamental part of our economy, our high standard of living and our enjoyment of life. Without it, our modern economy would grind to a halt.

Our current transportation network, though, also takes a toll on our public health and environment, our household income, and, for many Americans, our mobility options.

Today's Transportation Network: Major Energy Consumer + Major Source of Emissions

According to the US Department of Energy, the transportation sector accounts for:

- One-fourth (27%) of all energy use in the United States, second only to the electric power generation sector to energy consumption.
 - The transportation sector relies almost entirely on one fuel—petroleum—which accounts for 95.8% of all transportation energy consumption.
 - When it comes to transportation, highway transport dominates energy use by the US transportation sector. Highway modes (passenger cars and light trucks, buses, and medium and heavy trucks) account for 80.7% of all energy consumption by the transportation sector; all other modes (water, pipeline, rail, and water) account for 19.3%.
- Nearly three-quarters (73.2%) of all air emissions in the US of carbon monoxide (CO), a highly poisonous gas that reduces oxygen delivery to the body's organs and tissues.
- More than half (57.9%) of all air emissions in the US of nitrogen oxides (NOx), a basic precursor to harmful ground-level ozone and particle pollution, which can cause a variety of health problems from difficulty breathing to asthma and even heart attacks;
- more than a third (37.7%) of all air emissions in the US of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), a variety of chemicals, some of which can have short- and long-term adverse health effects from eye, nose, and throat irritation to cancer.
- A third (33.2%) of all carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuel in the United States-- second only to the electric power generation sector for greenhouse gas emissions.

Today's Transportation Network: Inadequate to meet America's future freight transport needs

According to USDOT's 2011 "America's Marine Highway Report to Congress" (<http://goo.gl/8bVP3B>), our current system of freight transportation in the United States will be hard-pressed to meet America's future transportation needs with regard to maintaining national economic competitiveness, environmental sustainability, public safety, and emergency preparedness. Freight tonnage of all types, including exports, imports, and domestic shipments, is expected to grow 73 percent by 2035 from 2008 levels. Land-based infrastructure expansion opportunities are limited in many critical bottleneck areas due to geography or very high right-of-way acquisition costs, particularly in urban areas where surface traffic congestion is the most severe. In many locations, existing infrastructure is suffering from overuse and will place growing demands on scarce public and private resources simply to sustain it. Accordingly, traffic congestion will almost certainly worsen significantly if the reliance on land-based transportation is not reduced.

Today's Transportation Network: Major Drain on Household Income

According to the US Department of Transportation:

- Transportation is the second largest expense for most households after housing.
- Households living in auto-dependent locations spend 25 percent of their income on transportation costs.
- Housing that is located closer to employment, shopping, restaurants and other amenities can reduce household transportation costs to 9 percent of household income.
- Living in a location where only one car per home is needed can reduce your total housing and transportation costs to 50 percent of income or less² with the following benefits:
 - Transit users in cities with robust transit systems can save up to \$10,230 per year by taking transit rather than owning a vehicle.
 - While 69 percent of communities are affordable under the conventional definition (housing costs < 30 percent of income), only 39 percent are affordable using a more comprehensive definition (combined housing and transportation costs < 45 percent of income).
 - In a nationwide study comparing 18 communities, housing in mixed-used neighborhoods performed better than conventional development in resale value comparisons and had a higher price per square foot - indicating a higher value for these homes overall.

Bottom line: Smart transportation policy and convenient public transit can help people save money, build wealth, and enjoy a higher quality of life.

Today's Transportation Network: Major Obstacle to Mobility Options, especially for "transportation disadvantaged" seniors

The U.S. and Ohio's population is aging, and access to transportation, via automobile or other modes, is critical to helping individuals remain independent as they age. "Transportation-disadvantaged" seniors—those who cannot drive or have limited their driving and who have an income constraint, disability, or medical condition that limits their ability to travel—is a growing reality that cuts across socio-economic strata. This is hardly an urban condition; it especially affects seniors living in rural areas who often have no access to public transit services.

According to the Government Accountability Office, national data indicate that common types of needs not being met include those for trips (1) to multiple destinations or for purposes that involve carrying packages; (2) to life-enhancing activities, such as cultural events; and (3) in rural and suburban areas. Local transportation service providers have implemented a variety of practices—including increasing service efficiency, improving customer service, and leveraging available funds—that enhance mobility and the cost-effective delivery of services. Still, senior mobility experts and stakeholders identified three primary obstacles to addressing transportation-disadvantaged seniors' mobility needs:

1. Seniors are not sufficiently encouraged to plan for driving alternatives.
2. Government policies do not always address seniors' varied needs.
3. Funding constraints limit local agencies' ability to address needs.

PART 2 – BRIEF BACKGROUNDER ON MARINE + FREIGHT RAIL + PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION BENEFITS

Marine + Freight Rail = Energy Efficiency + Reduced Air Emissions

According to a 2007 report by the Texas Transportation Institute, **marine and rail freight transport are far more energy efficient than truck transport**. The report estimated that, on average:

- truck transport, on average, can carry one ton of freight for approximately 155 miles on a gallon of diesel fuel (i.e., 155 ton-miles of freight per gallon), equivalent to 842 BTU per ton-mile
- rail transport achieves 413 ton-miles of freight per gallon (316 BTU per ton-mile)
- tug-and-barge operation can get as much as 576 ton-miles of freight to a gallon of fuel (227 BTU per ton-mile)

According to International Maritime Organization data, **marine and freight rail transport emit far fewer units of carbon dioxide** per ton on freight moved in one mile than truck transport:

- truck transport emits from 117 to 264 grams of CO₂ per ton-mile of freight
- rail transport emits from 15 to 73 grams of CO₂ per ton-mile
- from 10 to 88 grams of CO₂ per ton-mile for self-propelled oceangoing ships

For the movement of containers and trailers:

- rail transport emits from 51 to 73 grams of CO₂ per ton-mile
- self-propelled ships emit from 53 grams (small containership) to 88 grams (small RoRo) per ton-mile

The use of larger self-propelled ships would likely lead to a lower range of CO₂ emissions. Many Marine Highway services, particularly those linking to the inland waterway system and along shorter

coastal routes, will rely on tug-and-barge operations. A study by the Texas Transportation Institute calculates that:

- tug-and-barge operations can carry freight at a carbon cost of as little as 17.5 grams of CO₂ per ton-mile.

Cleaner fuel requirements adopted by the USEPA for non-road diesel fuel have decreased the allowable levels of sulfur in fuel used in marine vessels by 99 percent compared to levels allowed before the effective date of 2007. The rules have created significant environmental and public health benefits by reducing particulate matter (PM) emissions from new and existing engines. In March 2008, EPA issued a final rule that implemented a three-part program that will greatly reduce emissions from marine diesel engines below 30 liters per cylinder displacement. These engines include marine propulsion engines used on vessels from recreational and small fishing boats to towboats, tugboats and Great Lake freighters, and marine auxiliary engines ranging from small generator sets to large generator sets on oceangoing vessels. The rule will cut PM emissions from these engines by as much as 90 percent and mono-nitrogen oxides (NO_x) emissions by as much as 80 percent when fully implemented.

Similarly, according to the USEPA, new federal rules adopted in 2008 for new locomotives will:

- dramatically reduce emissions from diesel locomotives of all types -- line-haul, switch, and passenger rail
- cut particulate matter (PM) emissions from these engines by as much as 90 percent and NO_x emissions by as much as 80 percent when fully implemented

All Class I railroads, incidentally, have joined the EPA's Smart Way Transport Partnership, a voluntary partnership aimed at improving fuel efficiency and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

According to the Federal Railroad Administration:

- Freight railroading efficiently transports more than 40% of the freight revenue ton-miles in the nation.
- Energy savings and reductions of air pollution can be achieved through greater use of railroads for freight transport.

According to the Association of American Railroads:

- A freight train can move a ton of freight an average of 484 miles on a single gallon of fuel. That's close to four times as far as it could move by truck.
- A train can take the load of 280 or more trucks off the road. That's like removing 1,100 cars from the road for every freight train.
- On average, each ton-mile of freight moved by rail rather than highway reduces greenhouse gas emissions by 75 percent.
- On average, freight trains are four times more fuel-efficient than trucks.
- If only 10 percent of the long-haul freight currently moved by highway switched to rail, national fuel savings would exceed one billion gallons a year and greenhouse gas emissions would fall by 12 million tons.
- In 2010 alone, U.S. freight railroads consumed 3.7 billion fewer gallons of fuel and emitted 41 million fewer tons of carbon dioxide than they would have if their fuel efficiency had remained constant since 1980.

Public Transit = Energy Efficiency + Reduced Emissions + Reduced Congestion + Increased Mobility + Affordable Transportation + Positive Return on Investment

Sharing rides through public transportation delivers a host of public benefits. It:

- saves fuel
- reduces overall vehicle emissions
- relieves highway congestion
- increases transportation options and mobility
- decreases the need for constructing more transportation infrastructure and extracting more fossil fuels, meaning further energy savings and fewer environmental impacts

Public transit also delivers economic benefits.

According to the Federal Transit Administration, the annual benefits that transit returns to the national economy easily outpace costs (by \$26 billion in 1997). During the 1990s transit returned \$23 billion per year in affordable mobility for households that prefer not to drive, cannot afford a car, or cannot drive due to age or disability; \$19.4 billion per year in reduced congestion delays for rush-hour passengers and motorists; \$10 billion per year in reduced auto ownership costs for residents of location efficient neighborhoods; up to \$12 billion per year in reduced auto emissions; \$2 billion savings per year in local human service agency budgets; and a 2 percent boost in property tax receipts from commercial real estate.

Petroleum use in private vehicles and vehicle miles traveled are among the main drivers of the growth in energy usage in the United States. Public transportation encourages energy conservation, as the average number of passengers on a transit vehicle (10 for bus, 25 for a rail car) far exceeds that of a private automobile (1.6). Even as a single transit vehicle consumes more energy than a private vehicle, the average amount of energy utilized per passenger is far less.

In fact, a study by ICF International found that in 2004, taking transit saved 947 million gallons of fuel that would have been used if transit passengers had driven cars instead.

Congestion relief through the use of transit also saves fuel as vehicles stuck in gridlock waste fuel and generate emissions. The Texas Transportation Institute's 2007 Mobility Report estimates that if public transportation service was discontinued nationwide and the riders traveled in private vehicles instead, urban areas would have suffered an additional 541 million hours of delay and consumed on the whole 340 million more gallons of fuel in 2005. The value of the delay and fuel that would be consumed if there were no public transportation service would be an additional \$10.2 billion congestion cost, a 13 percent increase over current levels.

PART 3 – SUMMARY OF THE OHIO TRANSPORTATION BUDGET'S INCREMENTAL PROGRESS

The Executive's proposed Ohio Transportation Budget for FY 2016 – FY 2017 makes incremental progress toward broadening Ohio's long-time bias toward a single mode of transportation--highway transportation. Rather, the Executive Budget begins to help recover funding for freight rail and public transportation. The Executive Budget boosts General Revenue Fund (GRF) support for both freight rail transport and public transit by \$1M per FY, respectively. Though modest, it is progress and we thank the Kasich Administration for it. The House of Representatives has the opportunity to make even more progress and we respectfully and vigorously urge this Committee to recommend a much more substantial investment in freight rail and public transit. Such an investment will leverage additional benefits for Ohio's economy, shippers and manufacturers, commuters and the general public, as well as energy demand and air quality.

Highway transportation funding continues to dominate all modes, while funding for public transportation receives modest funding increases.

According to the LSC Red Book analysis, the Governor's Budget for ODOT proposes 5.87B over the biennium for Ohio' transportation budget. For the biennium, the Executive Budget propose these funding levels for the following three modes:

Highway Transportation

- \$5B for highway construction and maintenance, or 85.9% of the Transportation Budget

Rail Transportation

- \$36.2M, or 0.6% of the Transportation Budget.

Public Transportation

- \$105.5M, or 1.5% of the Transportation Budget. Note: The Governor's Budget includes a \$2M increase in GRF funding for public transportation compared to the previous biennium.

Part 4: OEC POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

As the Committee considers final amendments to the Transportation Budget, OEC respectfully asks consideration of the following recommendations:

1. Federal funds for intermodal freight transportation - Require ODOT to pursue more Federal funds for efficient intermodal freight transportation to save shippers time and expense, reduce shipping congestion, and reduce harmful air emissions. Federal funds covered one-third of the successful \$15M Third Rail Line project in Cincinnati; see the [USDOT fact sheet](#) for more information.

2. GRF funding for public transportation - Follow the recommendations of the ODOT Statewide Public Transit Needs Study to substantially increase state support for public transportation for rural and urban transit agencies. See the study [findings snapshot](#) for recommended funding levels to meet the current unmet need in rural and urban areas. (See discussion, below.)

3. Federal flexible funds for public transportation - Require ODOT to flex more Federal funds for public transportation. According to the most recent [ASHTO](#) survey of state funding for public, there is a strong relationship between state and Federal funding. The seven states with the largest state funding amounts—NY, CA, MS, MA, NJ, and IL—collectively, allotted \$11.5 billion in state funding. About \$5.2 billion—more than half of all Federal funds spent on transit—went to these seven states. The remaining 40 states allotted a total of \$2.76 billion in state funding and shared about \$5.0 billion in Federal funds; Ohio is among the remaining 40 states. In fact, only 12 states invested less state funds in public transportation than Ohio: MO, KY, ME, MT, NH, ID, GA, NV, UT, HI, AZ, and AL. This strongly suggests that Ohio is not helping itself enough and not leveraging its fair share of Federal flexible funds for public transportation. (See discussion, below.)

4. Require ODOT to consolidate human services transportation funding - As recommended by the ODOT Statewide Public Transit Needs Study, encourage the consolidation of human services transportation funding through ODOT Transit. This will save taxpayer dollars by leveraging more federal transit funds (80:20 match) instead of federal Medicare funds (50:50 match). (See ODOT Transit Needs Study.)

5. Create a Transportation Choice Fund to match local pedestrian, bicycle, transit projects - Just 2.5 percent of Federal flexible transportation funds could fund a \$75M fund to match local family-friendly transportation projects. (See proposal, below.)

OEC COMMENT ON HOUSE AMENDMENTS

1. Ohio Rail Development Commission (DOTCD4)

OEC strongly supports the House amendment to maintain the Ohio Rail Development Commission as an independent commission and to reject the Governor's proposal to abolish the ORDC and to replace it with a new Division of Freight. While there is merit in a unified approach to intermodal transportation, this should not come at the expense of the repeal of the ORDC and its effective track record of achievement to maintain and enhance rail infrastructure.

2. Metrics to develop Statewide Strategic Transportation Planning Across Transportation Modes (DOTCD30)

OEC supports the House amendment to enable a fair comparison of costs and benefits of the various transportation modes associated impacts of transportation modes on maintenance costs, short- and long-term economic impact, regional job growth and job retention, and safety. If implemented fairly and without prejudice for or against any particular transportation modes, this study could help Ohio chart a responsible roadmap for current and future investment. One friendly amendment we suggest is consideration of costs and benefits for energy and air quality.

3. Elimination of alternative fuel usage requirements for state vehicles (DOTCD5)

OEC opposes the Governor's proposal to repeal this sensible investment in Ohio-grown bio-fuels and the economic, energy, and clean air benefits this program provides.

4. Assumption of duties from Federal agencies (DOTCD3)

OEC is neutral on the Governor's proposal for ODOT to administer compliance with the Federal National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for transportation projects.

Marine and Freight Rail Marine Transportation - further discussion

A robust transportation network should effectively and efficiently move raw materials to processors and finished goods to market. This involves a mix of all transportation modes. The OEC urges greater consideration of policies to bulk up the intermodal transportation of freight, leveraging more movement of freight by marine and rail transport--the most energy efficient transportation modes--to meet this objective. OEC is neutral on the Governor's proposal to establish a new Division of Freight. We support more integrated planning by ODOT to promote intermodal transportation and we believe the Freight Division could bring positive outcomes. But we are concerned with the elimination of the Ohio Rail Development Commission which we believe has a solid record of achievement for Ohio's freight rail infrastructure.

The OEC respectfully asks the Committee to ask ODOT to share with the Committee:

- a copy of its business plan for the prospective new Division of Freight
- a list of important maritime and rail development projects it plans for the new biennium
- a summary of its plans to draw down federal matching funds and any other funds it may leverage to develop maritime and rail projects

NOTE: Third Rail Line, Cincinnati, OH is a successful project that utilized Federal Congestion and Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds to construct a new rail line to reroute train traffic and relieve freight train congestion experienced by 85 percent of trains in the corridor. The project reduces congestion at truck/rail grade crossings and shifts truck freight to rail. The total cost of the project was \$15 million, comprised of \$5 million in CMAQ funds and \$10 million in private funds. The estimated truck emissions reductions were 26 kg/day VOC, 130 kg/day CO, and 395 kg/day NOx. (See the USEPA fact sheet: <http://goo.gl/myA3cA>).

- information on why line item 776662 Federal Fund Group for Federal rail funding and Local Rail Freight Assistance is dropping from nearly \$1M over the past four fiscal years to \$0 over the next two fiscal years

Public Transportation - further discussion

The demand for public transportation is growing in this state and nation. In CY 2013, Ohio's 61 local transit agencies (31 rural and 29 urban) serviced more than 115.1M passenger trips. The Governor's Budget proposes a modest increase in GRF support -- an additional \$2M over the new biennium. This is a start; but the need is so much greater. The House of Representatives has an opportunity to accomplish so much more.

The OEC respectfully asks the Committee to take the following actions:

- As recommended by the Ohio Statewide Transit Needs Study, substantially increase the state's GRF support for public transportation.
- Ask ODOT to share with the Committee its plan for the recommendations of the Study Committee.
- Ask ODOT and/or LSC to share with the Committee a list of all qualifying Federal flexible funds that may be flexed for public transportation operations and projects along with ODOT's plans to utilize Federal flex funds for public transportation in the new biennium.
- Establish an Ohio Transportation Choices Fund to provide a source of state matching funds for qualifying local transit, pedestrian, and bicycle projects, as described below.
- Ask ODOT to share with the Committee its plans to support Transit Oriented Development (TOD) projects which use public transportation projects to help leverage commercial real estate investments.

NOTE: Cleveland's HealthLine BRT (Bus Rapid Transit) system is widely considered to be one of the most advanced in the country. In the first 3 years of operation, the HealthLine increased bus travel speeds by 34 percent and ridership numbers by 60 percent. (BRT ridership now exceeds Cleveland's light rail system). An estimated \$4.2 billion in new real estate investments have lined the Euclid corridor since the system opened, placing the HealthLine at the center of a significant urban renewal project See the case study: <http://goo.gl/zj5bME>.

Ohio Statewide Transit Needs Study highlights

To ODOT Director Wray's credit, ODOT commissioned the Ohio Statewide Transit Needs Study, an independent and comprehensive review of ridership trends and funding needs of Ohio's 61 local transit agencies, both rural and urban. See the study findings "snapshot" at <http://goo.gl/D18jS2>. This report offers compelling information for a much greater investment in Ohio's public transit system. The report finds:

- **Ohio's transit systems need to provide an additional 37.5M public transportation trips over current levels to meet existing unmet demand.**
- In 2015, an additional \$96.7M in operating funding is needed to expand service to meet existing unmet demand, \$47.5M for urban systems and \$49.2M for rural systems. In 2015, an additional \$192.4M in capital investment is necessary to purchase new vehicles and infrastructure to meet current unmet demand.
- By 2025, an additional 140.2M additional transit trips over current levels are estimated to meet future demand. An additional \$592M in annual operating funding is estimated to meet this future demand. This includes a projected demand for 5M new rural transit trips, including to the 27 rural counties that currently do not have public transit service.
- To meet the 2025 funding gap, funding from all sources (federal, state, local, fares, other) needs to approximately double.

- If state funds covered 10% of transit spending, costs would equal:
 2015: \$37M capital + \$83M operating = \$120M total ODOT funding goal
 2015: \$53M capital + \$130M operating = \$185M total ODOT funding goal

Use of Federal Flexible Funds

According to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials' (ASHTO) most recent annual survey of state funding for public transportation (based on 2012 data) <http://scopt.transportation.org/Pages/MTAPublications.aspx>, there is a strong relationship between state and Federal funding. Specifically, the seven states with the largest state funding amounts—NY, CA, MS, MA, NJ, and IL—collectively, allotted \$11.5 billion in state funding. About \$5.2 billion—more than half of all Federal funds spent on transit—went to these seven states. The remaining 40 states allotted a total of \$2.76 billion in state funding and shared about \$5.0 billion in Federal funds; Ohio is among the remaining 40 states. In fact, **only 12 states invested less state funds in public transportation than Ohio**: MO, KY, ME, MT, NH, ID, GA, NV, UT, HI, AZ, and AL. This strongly suggests that Ohio is not helping itself enough and not leveraging its fair share of Federal flexible funds for public transportation.

According to the American Public Transit Association, over the 17-year period of FFY 1992 - FFY 2008, more than \$14.9B in "flexible" Federal Highway Funds were transferred to public transit uses. (Source: *APTA Primer on Transit Funding, FY 2004 Through FY 2010*) The APTA report identified 6 Federal Highway Programs with components that directly or indirectly could be "flexed" to transit uses:

- Congestion Mitigation Air Quality
- Surface Transportation Program
- National Highway System
- Interstate Maintenance Program
- Bridge Program
- Equity Bonus

It is our understanding that all of these programs--with the lone exception of the Bridge Program--have been continued or otherwise have been consolidated into the current Federal MAP-21 program. Under MAP-21, the following Federal Highway Programs include components that directly or indirectly can be "flexed" for public transit and other public transportation purposes:

- National Highway Performance Program
- Surface Transportation Program
- Highway Safety Improvement Program
- Congestion Mitigation Air Quality
- Transportation Alternatives

It is our further understanding that the following three programs are not eligible for highway or bridge construction:

- Surface Transportation Program
- Highway Safety Improvement Program
- Congestion Mitigation Air Quality

Ohio Transportation Choices Fund

The OEC supports the proposal of the coalition, Ohioans for Transportation Choice, to create a Transportation Choice Fund in the ODOT budget to increase Ohio's transportation choices for transit and non-highway dependent transportation modes. We are asking the General Assembly to appropriate \$75 million in flexible federal transportation funds for each state fiscal year in the new biennium. We respectfully ask you to carefully evaluate this proposal and recommend its establishment. \$75M represents approximately 2.5 percent of each fiscal year's appropriations, as proposed in the Governor's Budget for the Department of Transportation (\$2,85B in FY 2014 and \$3.12B in FY 2015). By comparison, the United States Census estimates that 9 percent of Ohio households have no car. Beyond those households with no car, there likely are many households with unreliable cars as well as households with a car that is shared among multiple wage-earners per household. As a rough calculation, if Ohio spent 9 percent of its ODOT budget on public transportation, ODOT would be spending \$256M per FY.

Transit Oriented Development

We respectfully ask the Committee to give special attention to projects involving Transit-Oriented Development. TOD focuses growth around transit stations to promote ridership, affordable housing near transit, revitalized downtown centers and neighborhoods, and encourage local economic development.

Federal Matching Funds – Public Transportation

There seems to be some debate of whether Federal highway funds exist that may be "flexed" to match state funds for non-highway, public transportation purposes. Such funds most certainly do exist.

Chair Manning and Members of the Committee, thank you for your considering our recommendations and perspective.

Sources of information:

US Department of Energy http://cta.ornl.gov/data/tedb29/Edition29_Chapter12.pdf

US Department of Transportation <http://goo.gl/ZyEoY>

US Government Accountability Office <http://goo.gl/f2w0v>

US Environmental Protection Agency <http://goo.gl/stvh8> + <http://goo.gl/cwNJJu>

Federal Transit Administration <http://bit.ly/hzjtXa>

US Department of Transportation 2011 "America's Marine Highway Report to Congress"
<http://goo.gl/8bVP3B>

Federal Railroad Administration <http://www.fra.dot.gov/rpd/freight/25.shtml>

Association of American Railroads <http://bit.ly/aES1Cw>

WIS-DOT "Freight Rail Assistance Policy Issue Paper – August 15, 2012 <http://goo.gl/pPSCN>

Tax Foundation "Road Spending by State Funded by User Taxes and Fees, Including Federal Gas Tax Revenues" <http://goo.gl/TDKMm>



**Jack Shaner | Deputy Director, Sr. Director of Legislative
& Public Affairs**

Ohio Environmental Council

1145 Chesapeake Ave, Ste 1, Columbus, OH 43212

(614) 487-5822 desk

(614) 309-1169 cell

[Twitter.com/StatehouseJack](https://twitter.com/StatehouseJack)